



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 155

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, JANUARY 26, 2009

No. 15

## House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland).

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,  
January 26, 2009.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DONNA F. EDWARDS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,  
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

### MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 6, 2009, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 30 minutes and each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, limited to 5 minutes.

### THE STIMULUS PROPOSAL AND LONG-TERM BUDGET CONTROLS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. Madam Speaker, I know that each Member of this body, Democrat and Republican, understands that our country is in trouble. The CBO recently projected that the Federal budget deficit for the fiscal year, which started last October, will balloon to \$1.2 trillion. This number, which Senate Budget Chairman KENT CONRAD called "jaw-dropping," does not include the \$825 billion stimulus plan we are scheduled to consider in the House this week.

David Walker, former U.S. Comptroller General, has said, "We should not just engage in timely and targeted stimulus. We need to put a process in place that will enable elected officials to make a range of tough decisions," and this institution does not make tough decision, "that have been delayed for too long."

Richard Fisher, president of the Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas, has called our situation "catastrophic," noting that "doing deficit math is always a sobering exercise. It becomes an outright painful one when you apply your calculator to the long-term fiscal challenge posed by entitlement programs."

Federal Reserve Chairman Bernanke has said, "The quality of the future we will endow to our children and our grandchildren will depend in important measure on how well we rise to that occasion."

I could stand here all day quoting different experts about our Nation's grave long-term outlook. I believe that most Americans know that our country is facing dire economic conditions that will continue to deteriorate unless we change our current course. The fact is the American people are ahead of the Congress.

As elected officials and Members of the 111th Congress, we have an obligation, a moral obligation, to find solutions to the long-term nightmare that our children and grandchildren will wake up to should we choose to do nothing. We are talking about over \$56 trillion in unfunded obligations through Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid, the national debt nearing \$12 trillion, and China now holding the paper on 1 out of every 10 American dollars. America is now being sold to China. Does that make this Congress feel very good?

By letting the stimulus legislation pass the House without addressing the underlying problem of out-of-control spending, we are evading our responsi-

bility as Members of Congress. David Brooks said this package has no "strategic vision." He said it has a relatively modest short-term impact, and then he said "there is no sunset."

Is it right for us to ignore the fact that we are mortgaging our children's and grandchildren's future? We must set up a difficult bipartisan mechanism to deal with the underlying problem of autopilot spending and show the American people that we can make the difficult choices.

There is a bipartisan plan already on the table to review Federal spending in every area, entitlements and tax policies. It garnered the support of 110 Members in the last Congress, Republican and Democrat. You have heard me talk about it many times. It is the Cooper-Wolf SAFE Commission plan, similar to a Senate effort led by Budget Chairman KENT CONRAD and Ranking Member JUDD GREGG.

We offered the bipartisan SAFE Commission as an amendment when the Appropriations Committee marked up the stimulus last week. It failed on a mostly partisan vote. I will go to the Rules Committee on Tuesday to ask that the amendment be made in order so that it can be voted on by the full House during the stimulus debate.

If we look the other way now, Congress will have fundamentally failed the American people. Congress will have to explain to the American people that when it had the chance to act in the best interests of future generations, meaning children and grandchildren and existing generations, it chose to do nothing.

Make no mistake. This could well be the toughest economic issue our Nation will be faced with, but we can't afford to wait. The future of the children and grandchildren hang in the balance.

I will end with President Obama's words from his inaugural address. He said that the current state of affairs is the result of "our collective failure to

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H495

make hard choices and prepare the Nation for a new age." He went on to say that "our time of standing pat, of protecting narrow interests and putting off unpleasant decisions, that time has surely passed." I could not agree more. For years I encouraged the Bush administration to adopt this process. They did not. We have also reached out to the new administration and his economic team.

This is an economic, moral, and generational issue, and I am astounded as we prepare to debate the stimulus on the floor that we are doing so without having bipartisan entitlement reform as part of the underlying package.

#### PRESIDENT NOT WELL-SERVED BY SOME ECONOMIC ADVISERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Madam Speaker, today's headlines are pretty grim about job losses across America. The Bush legacy lives on.

George Bush has made a horrible hash out of this economy with his trickle-down economics favoring those at the top, with his deregulatory policies, dismantling those things which protect consumers, people's 401(k)s and their investments from fraud and abuse, and with his unnecessary war.

President Obama sees and realizes the pain across America and wants to take positive steps to put people back to work and get this economy back on course. That is the good news.

The bad news is that I don't believe the President is well-served by a number of his economic advisers. Some of them do not now, nor have they ever believed, that rebuilding the foundations of our economy with investment in infrastructure, putting millions to work, increasing the wealth of the country, making us more efficient and competitive in the international economy, delivering our goods more fuel effectively, getting people out of congestion in their cars and getting them to work more efficiently, they don't think those are good investments. They say that is not what we want. They want tax cuts. They want other spending that is more immediate. We do not need another consumer-driven, borrowed-money—because all this money is borrowed—bubble for this economy. We need to get back to basics. We need to rebuild our foundations.

Unfortunately, this bill dedicates about 6 percent, 6 percent of \$825 billion, to our transportation infrastructure. In contrast, the Chinese are spending, over the next 2 years, \$600 billion on their transportation infrastructure to make their country more fuel efficient, to make their country more competitive. And we in the United States can only come up with \$40 billion for transportation infrastructure?

They say that it can't be spent quickly enough. That is not true. The

list of deferred maintenance in projects is long. The known need far exceeds that short-term outlook, just for this year's deficiency in investment. We could spend much more, we could spend it more productively, and we could put millions of Americans back to work.

For every \$1 billion we spend on transportation infrastructure, by the most conservative of estimates, you get a six times multiplier effect in the economy and you put 28,000 to 30,000 people to work. For a dollar in tax cuts, you get back, depending on whether or not people spend them or use it to replenish their depleted savings, very, very little stimulative effect.

The Bush tax cuts, \$160 billion borrowed last spring, gave us a whole one-quarter of one percent bounce in one quarter for the economy. \$160 billion borrowed, an obligation for the next 30 years for our kids and grandkids, and that is what we got? No, we need more substantial investment.

There a lot of talk about "shovel-ready." There is a lot of talk about infrastructure. We need to deliver on those promises, and thus far this legislation that is being proposed falls short.

I don't fault my colleagues here. It is coming from the Senate. It is coming from downtown. But we can do better. We are the people's House, the House of Representatives. We don't need to have \$275 billion in tax cuts and we don't need to take those dictates from somewhere else, and particularly the President's advisers when they are wrong.

I know the President's heart is in the right place. I am hoping we can do a better bill.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DEFAZIO) at 2 p.m.

#### PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer: Lord, our God, Source of life and love, hear the prayer of Congress, both for the good of this Nation and the good of humanity around the world. Help this Congress and the President to discern Your will in our day. By drawing upon the truth taken from a diversity of opinions, may a solid foundation be formed upon which a stable future may be built.

May short-term gains or self-interest never prove to be an obstacle to true

vision. Rather, Lord, grant depth perception, clear analysis, and creative response to the needs of our time for solidifying the common good. For we freely choose to be Your people, and act accordingly, now and forever.

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 New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. LUJÁN 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.

#### TIME TO BUILD UP AMERICA

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

Mr. KUCINICH. At a time when millions of Americans are losing jobs, homes, pensions, our government is prepared to give another trillion dollars to the banks, ready to compound the moral hazard by nationalizing banks, which are allegedly profit-making entities. This is anti-democratic.

Instead of nationalizing banks, we should nationalize the money system by placing the Federal Reserve under the U.S. Treasury, end the fractional reserve and stop banks from lending credit into circulation. Then, instead of borrowing money from the banks and creating debt, government can spend the money into circulation to rebuild and restore America with money for jobs, housing, health care, and education. I will soon be introducing legislation to accomplish this.

Banking is not a proper function of the government, but oversight is. The Treasury Department should not be outsourcing to the Fed its oversight responsibilities. The Fed, which failed miserably to oversee banks, should be put under Treasury instead.

It's time for our government to operate in the public interest, not in the interest of private banks. It's time for us to stop bailing out banks and begin building up America.

#### THIS IS NOT A STIMULUS

(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, I have significant concerns

about the spending bill before us this week. How will billions spent on school snack programs and repairs to the Smithsonian Institution stimulate the economy? How will \$3 billion being spent for a prevention and wellness fund stimulate the economy?

It is clear that this spending package has become a one-stop shop for every item on a spending agenda—a massive, unprecedented spending bill aimed to bypass the normal appropriations process and subsidize a broad range of existing and new government programs. We must do better, and together we can do better to create jobs.

A targeted stimulus package of tax relief and assistance for small businesses would fuel this Nation's entrepreneurial spirit and help private industry and individuals create jobs. Our focus should be on growing the American economy and not on growing an already massive government.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th.

#### LAND OF ENCHANTMENT

(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, New Mexico is known as the Land of Enchantment because of our people, beautiful landscapes, clear skies, and fresh air. My district is home to millions of acres of Federal lands and countless natural resources—resources that create opportunities and challenges.

One challenge my district faces is water availability and allocation. Water projects on either side of the State have been long planned, and now may come to fruition. As someone who tends to the acequia, the ditch on our small family farm, I know the importance of water to rural economies across America.

Land, water, and sustainability are not only fundamental to life in my State, they are fundamental to rich cultures and traditions that make New Mexico great, like acequias and land grants, which are an essential part of the rural economies of my district.

Let us work together in protecting New Mexico's rich culture and traditions.

#### RESIGNATION FROM THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation from the House of Representatives:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
CANNON HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING,  
Washington, DC, January 26, 2009.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,  
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER, I am writing to resign my position as the United States Representative for the 20th District of New York

effective Monday, January 26, 2009. Governor David Paterson of New York has selected me to fill the vacancy left in the U.S. Senate by Hillary Rodham Clinton's resignation to become our Secretary of State. My letter of resignation addressed to the New York Secretary of State is attached.

It has been a great privilege for me to serve the constituents of New York's 20th District in the House of Representatives for the past two years. I hope to build on the work I began in this district, to help all of the people of New York.

I also want to thank you, Madam Speaker, my colleagues in the House, and in particular the New York Congressional delegation. I am so grateful for my time in the House, for and the honor working with so many outstanding Members. I look forward to continuing our work and collaboration to build a better New York and a better America.

Thank you and God bless,  
KIRSTEN E. GILLIBRAND.

Attachment:  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
CANNON HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING,  
Washington, DC, January 23, 2009.

Hon. LORRAINE CORTES-VASQUEZ,  
Secretary of State, Department of State, Washington Avenue, Albany, NY.

DEAR SECRETARY CORTES-VASQUEZ: This letter is to inform you that effective immediately, I resign my seat in the United States Congress in order to assume my duties as United States Senator.

Very truly yours,  
KIRSTEN GILLIBRAND.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under clause 5(d) of rule XX, the Chair announces to the House that, in light of the resignation of the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the whole number of the House is 433.

#### RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1730

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California) at 5 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

#### 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 after 6:30 p.m. today.

#### NATIONAL DATA PRIVACY DAY

Mr. WELCH. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 31) expressing support for designation of January 28, 2009, as "National Data Privacy Day".

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 31

Whereas the Internet and the capabilities of modern technology cause data privacy issues to figure prominently in the lives of many people in the United States at work, in their interaction with government and public authorities, in the health field, in e-commerce transactions, and online generally;

Whereas many individuals are unaware of data protection and privacy laws generally and of specific steps that can be taken to help protect the privacy of personal information online;

Whereas "National Data Privacy Day" constitutes an international collaboration and a nationwide and statewide effort to raise awareness about data privacy and the protection of personal information on the Internet;

Whereas government officials from the United States and Europe, privacy professionals, academics, legal scholars, representatives of international businesses, and others with an interest in data privacy issues are working together on this date to further the discussion about data privacy and protection;

Whereas privacy professionals and educators are being encouraged to take the time to discuss data privacy and protection issues with teens in high schools across the country;

Whereas the recognition of "National Data Privacy Day" will encourage more people nationwide to be aware of data privacy concerns and to take steps to protect their personal information online; and

Whereas January 28, 2009, would be an appropriate day to designate as "National Data Privacy Day": Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports the designation of a "National Data Privacy Day";

(2) encourages State and local governments to observe the day with appropriate activities that promote awareness of data privacy;

(3) encourages privacy professionals and educators to discuss data privacy and protection issues with teens in high schools across the United States; and

(4) encourages individuals across the Nation to be aware of data privacy concerns and to take steps to protect their personal information online.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Vermont.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WELCH. I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WELCH. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support today of House Resolution 31, introduced by Representative

PRICE of North Carolina. This resolution correctly identifies the importance of data security in all of our lives. Particularly, as we continue to incorporate Internet use into our daily lives and routines, it's vital that we focus on the need to protect the sensitive information that is transmitted over the Internet.

Over the past few years, as we all know, we have seen numerous and troubling incidences involving data breach that compromise private information. That includes credit card numbers, bank statements, Social Security numbers, and health records. According to the Privacy Rights Clearinghouse, over 250 million records containing sensitive personal information has been subject to security breaches since 2005. We know we have got to protect security if we are going to have the advantages of electronic transmission of records.

Just last week, it was reported that another data breach involving credit and debit card information potentially exposed tens of millions of consumers to the risk of fraud. These incidents underscore the need for vigilance in protecting the privacy of sensitive information.

At this time, Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the author of the resolution, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I want to thank the gentleman from Vermont for yielding, and for his good work in bringing this resolution to the floor.

I am here as the lead sponsor, among many sponsors, of House Resolution 31, supporting the designation of January 28 as National Data Privacy Day. In the last 10 years, the Internet has become the preferred carrier of communication in our society. Electronic communications dominate workplaces, and are increasingly prevalent in commerce, in interactions between the public and government at every level, and through social networking sites on the Internet.

While we have realized incredible efficiencies and other benefits from new electronic technologies, those technologies have also raised challenges for protecting the privacy of personal and proprietary information. If we are going to fully realize the potential of electronic communications, we must address these challenges, and that is what H. Res. 31 is all about.

Fortunately, we are off to a good start. On Wednesday, privacy professionals, corporations, government agencies, nonprofit organizations, academic institutions, and students across the Nation are already planning to come together to raise awareness and underscore the importance of data privacy protection as part of National Data Privacy Day.

Academic institutions such as the Wharton Business School, Arizona State University, Santa Clara Law School, and Ohio State University,

have planned events and panel discussions on a broad range of data privacy issues ranging from information security best practices to data privacy issues at public and private institutions of higher education.

One of the major focuses of Data Privacy Day will be to educate teenagers about the importance of online privacy. An estimated 55 percent of American teenagers with access to the Internet use social networking Web sites, and an even greater engage in real-time information sharing through instant messaging, cell phone text messaging, and chat rooms.

While pre-teens, teenagers, and young adults are often the most sophisticated and skilled Internet users—we all know that—many are too often neglectful of their personal safety online. Young people who are participating in online social networking should be made aware of the dangers of failing to protect their personal data. They need to know that not everyone on Facebook or MySpace is a friend.

On Wednesday, educators and privacy professionals across the country will lead discussions with young people to raise awareness about online privacy to promote safe use of the Internet and to help them learn about how to protect the privacy of their personal data.

I am especially proud of events in North Carolina surrounding Data Privacy Day. This week, the Carolina Privacy Officials Network will host panels on consent policy options in health care, information security breaches, and off-shoring of data. At the Sanford Institute of Public Policy at Duke University, representatives from Intel, the Institute for Homeland Security Solutions, the Triangle Center on Terrorism and Homeland Security, the Provost's Office at Duke University, the Duke Center for European Studies, the Center for International Studies, and the Triangle Institute for Security Studies, will gather with officials from the United States Departments of State, Justice and Homeland Security, as well as the European Commission, to discuss issues surrounding the protection of national security and privacy.

Madam Speaker, H. Res. 31 underscores the importance of data privacy protection and expresses support for the designation of January 28, 2009, as National Data Privacy Day. I want to thank the Members who cosponsored this important resolution, and members of the Energy and Commerce Committee, Chairman WAXMAN, for moving H. Res. 31 to the floor today. It's a resolution that has good bipartisan support. I appreciate that support, and I urge my colleagues to support the measure.

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

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I am also pleased that our data privacy resolution could

be considered on the floor today, and I would like to thank, obviously, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, for introducing this important resolution, as the lead cosponsor on the Republican side. I am glad to be able to support it. As well as Chairman BARTON from the Energy and Commerce Committee; Mr. MARKEY, the former chairman of the Telecommunications Committee; and, Mr. RADANOVICH, who will speak later, for their support as well.

My colleagues, this resolution supports the designation of January 28 as National Data Privacy Day. As ranking member of the Communications, Technology, and Internet Subcommittee, I am especially concerned about the challenges that all of us face today protecting the privacy of personal sensitive information.

Most of our work product and personal records are now, obviously, digitally stored, as well as transferred. The timesaving convenience of instantaneous communications means we all rely heavily on the Internet and the latest state-of-the-art technology in our simple daily interactions. And, more often than not, all of our electronic communications leave behind a digital fingerprint that opens the potential for abuse if the information is in the wrong hands.

That is why it is pertinent that we, as representatives of the American people here in Congress, take the simple initiative to draw awareness to the importance to protecting sensitive personal information, including financial and health records, from misuse and theft.

Consumers must be vigilant in protecting their data. They have a personal responsibility, and they must be cautious with whom they do business with. Likewise, we must continue to ensure that legitimate businesses which collect and store U.S. consumer personal data will respect the privacy of those consumers at all times and employ the necessary protections to safeguard that data.

Data security is not a new issue. We examined this problem related to data breaches in the Energy and Commerce Committee as far back as the 109th Congress that were spurred by breaches at data brokers affecting millions of our citizens. We learned that State laws created numerous notice requirements that were to inform the customer of these breaches, but it is unclear, Madam Speaker, how many data breaches occurred before those laws took place.

The problem continues to affect countless Americans every year. In fact, there are estimates of data breaches since 2005 that indicate that as many as 251 million records have been exposed or compromised. That is due to these breaches.

The result is often credit card fraud or, worse, identity theft, which can require time, money, and energy from consumers to repair their good name and, obviously, restore their credit history.

Furthermore, universities all across this Nation have had names, photos, phone numbers, and addresses of their students and staff compromised or stolen. Sensitive technology companies such as Science Applications International Corporation and Boeing have also had data security breaches. Breaches have also occurred in large financial institutions such as Bank of America and Wachovia Bank.

Also, in the private sector a single stolen computer at Ford Motor Company exposed the names and Social Security numbers of 70,000 current and former employees, and hundreds of hospitals have had the personal information of their patients compromised.

Breaches are pervasive in government agencies such as the IRS, the Federal Trade Commission, the FDIC, the State Department, the Department of Veterans' Affairs, the Department of Justice and Energy, and the U.S. Navy. Of course, the list goes on.

Clearly, the resolution we are considering tonight is timely. Just last week we were reminded again of how pervasive this problem is with the announcement of Heartland Payment Systems, a credit card processor, that over 100 million personal records were compromised. This could be, to date, one of the largest known security breaches in our Nation.

Thus, Madam Speaker, highlighting problems such as this to Americans will increase their awareness and encourage them to exercise more diligence and care in protecting their personal information today. So I thank my colleagues for their support and recognition of the importance of data privacy and the benefits of designating January 28, 2009, as National Data Privacy Day, and I look forward to generating support in my home State of Florida for this important initiative.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WELCH. I am the last speaker on my side, and I will continue to reserve.

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. RADANOVICH).

Mr. RADANOVICH. The capabilities and, in some cases, the failures of modern technology, have brought the issues of data privacy and data security into the lives of all Americans. Whether it be at work, in health, in finance, or online generally, we all must be concerned about the unauthorized access to personal information, access which could put our livelihoods and, in extreme cases, our lives even at stake.

The Subcommittee on Commerce, Trade, and Consumer Protection has received testimony over the years about corporate data breaches that have damaged people financially as well as heard heartbreaking stories of stalkers stealing or buying personal information. As the new ranking member of the subcommittee, I am particularly concerned about these issues.

Just last week, we got reports about the hacking of the New Jersey-based

credit card processor, Heartland Payment Systems. This company processes more than 5 billion transactions a year, involving tens of millions of credit card numbers, and someone was able to break into their system and monitor these transactions.

This is just another example of how all of us must be aware of the security of sensitive information. Furthermore, not only must individuals be careful with their information, but the businesses which we entrust with that data must guard it as if it were their very own.

I want to commend Mr. PRICE and Mr. STEARNS for bringing this resolution before us today, and I want to thank Mr. BARTON, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. DINGELL for their continued efforts to address this issue. I want to lend my support to their efforts to educate the American public about ways to protect their personal information.

I look forward to continuing to work in this Congress to ensure the proper security of data and appropriate notice to consumers when their information is lost or revealed and there is significant risk of damage, financial or otherwise.

I fully support the goals and ideals of the National Data Privacy Day on January 28, and I urge all my colleagues to join in this effort.

□ 1745

Mr. STEARNS. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WELCH. Madam Speaker, I want to thank Chairman PRICE and Ranking Member STEARNS for this excellent resolution. It draws attention to the importance of privacy protections by supporting the designation of January 28, 2009 as the National Data Privacy Day. It seeks to inform the public of data privacy concerns and urge them to take steps to ensure that their own private data is secure and accounted for. In that vein, State and local governments, as well as schools, are encouraged to educate citizens about data privacy. I thank the Representative from North Carolina for authoring this resolution.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, H. Res. 31 seeks to protect the personal interests and information of men and women across the country who exchange personally identifiable information across the Internet. I salute my colleague, Representative PRICE from North Carolina, in his efforts to designate January 28, 2009, as "National Data Privacy Day."

It is our duty and obligation to protect those victims of the exploitation of their personally identifiable information who often face a difficult and arduous process of cleaning up their credit records. These innocent victims, who may be an aging grandmother attempting to retire from over 30 years of labor as a housekeeper, or a young man who balances three jobs and is seeking a college loan, will be left to face lengthy investigations by credit card companies, financial institutions, and law enforcement agencies, while these cyber-criminals take minutes or less to destroy a name-sake that has taken years to build.

#### TEXAS PRIVACY EFFORTS

Texas seeks to perform its part through the Texas Business and Commerce Code, which bolsters the security of personally identifiable information, with respect to an individual who is the owner or operator of a computer, including first name or first initial in combination with last name; a home or other physical address, including street name; electronic mail address; a credit or debit card number; a bank account number; a password or access code associated with a credit or debit card or bank account; a Social Security number, tax identification number, driver's license number, passport number, or other government-issued identification number; or any information if the information alone or in combination with other information personally identifies the individual.

#### DATA PRIVACY

According to the Privacy Rights Clearing House, since February 2005, more than 100 million records containing personal information have been subject to some sort of security breach.

Data privacy concerns exist wherever personally identifiable information is collected and stored—in digital form or otherwise. Improper or non-existent disclosure control can be the root cause for privacy issues. Data privacy issues can arise in response to information from a wide range of sources, such as: healthcare records, criminal justice investigations and proceedings, financial institutions and transactions, biological traits, such as genetic material, residence and geographic records.

The greatest challenge that we face in data privacy is to share data while maintaining a high level of protection amongst personally identifiable information. The ability to control what information one reveals about oneself over the Internet, and who can access that information, has become a growing concern over the ability for emails to be stored or read by third parties without consent, as well as the possibility of web sites which are visited collecting, storing, and possibly sharing personally identifiable information about users. For many reasons, individuals may not wish for the revelation of personal information such as their religion, sexual orientation, political affiliations, or private activities.

The economic crisis that our country is faced with today calls for an elevated guard of our financial information, as identity theft and a multitude of cyber-crimes are on the rise. Information about a person's financial transactions, including the amount of assets, positions held in stocks or funds, outstanding debts, and purchases can be sensitive. If criminals gain access to information such as a person's accounts or credit card numbers, that person could become the victim of fraud or identity theft. Information about a person's purchases can reveal a great deal about that person's history, such as places visited, persons contacted, products used, as well as activities and habits.

National Data Privacy Day provides for an international collaboration, and a nationwide and statewide effort to raise awareness about data privacy and the protection of personal information on the Internet and will call for government officials from the United States and Europe, privacy professionals, academics, legal scholars, representatives of international businesses, and others with an interest in data privacy issues to work together on this date to

further the discussion about data privacy and protection.

CONCLUSION

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the promotion of the protection of personal information and data by designating January 28, 2009, as "National Data Privacy Day," which will endorse the safeguard of personal information online and affects all of us.

Mr. WELCH. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 31.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

Mr. WELCH. Madam 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.

HONORING THE HEROIC ACTIONS OF THE PILOT, CREW, AND RESCUERS OF US AIRWAYS FLIGHT 1549

Mr. COSTELLO. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 84) honoring the heroic actions of the pilot, crew, and rescuers of US Airways Flight 1549.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 84

Whereas US Airways Flight 1549 took off from LaGuardia Airport in Queens, New York, on January 15, 2009, bound for Charlotte, North Carolina, and lost engine power shortly after takeoff;

Whereas Captain Chesley B. Sullenberger III and First Officer Jeffrey B. Skiles recognized the need to land the plane quickly and sought out the Hudson River as the best option to avoid populated areas;

Whereas Sullenberger and Skiles displayed quick thinking and skillful control of the aircraft, setting the plane down in a controlled landing in the water;

Whereas flight attendants Sheila Dail, Doreen Welsh, and Donna Dent of Flight 1549 reacted swiftly to prepare passengers for impact in a minimal amount of time;

Whereas local ferry boats, official police boats, and U.S. Coast Guard crafts were able to reach the airliner quickly and rescue the passengers and crew from the near-freezing water;

Whereas Dail, Welsh, and Dent evacuated all 150 passengers onto the awaiting U.S. Coast Guard, ferry boats, and official police boats within minutes;

Whereas even as the plane began sinking in the Hudson River, Sullenberger remained in the plane surveying the aisle twice to make sure all passengers had gotten out safely before he exited the aircraft; and

Whereas due to the heroic efforts of the flight crew of Flight 1549, and the rescue boats, all 155 passengers and crew survived, without serious injury: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) applauds the skill, quick thinking, and bravery of Captain Chesley B. Sullenberger III and First Officer Jeffrey B. Skiles;

(2) commends the quick response by the flight attendants Doreen Welsh, Donna Dent, and Sheila Dail of Flight 1549 to prepare passengers for impact and rapid evacuation; and

(3) praises the quick response from the boats, first responders, and private citizens that arrived at the scene to aid and rescue passengers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COSTELLO) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COSTELLO. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H. Res. 84.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 84, a resolution honoring the heroic actions of the pilot, crew, and rescuers of US Airways Flight 1549.

I want to thank my colleague, Mr. CROWLEY, for introducing this resolution. LaGuardia Airport is in the congressional district represented by Congressman CROWLEY, and he has represented that district for some time. I know that he is very proud of all of the men and women whose actions resulted in a safe outcome for everyone. It is truly remarkable and a testament to all involved in the emergency landing and rescue that all passengers and crew got out safely, without serious injuries or death.

On January 15, 2009, US Airways Flight 1549 was departing LaGuardia Airport for Charlotte, North Carolina and, within minutes, lost engine power. Captain Chesley Sullenberger III and First Officer Jeffrey Skiles realized the seriousness of the situation, and immediately sought a safe place to land.

The Hudson River was their only option, and these two pilots, as well as flight attendants Sheila Dail, Doreen Welsh, and Donna Dent, worked together to prepare the 150 passengers for the emergency landing. The crew did an excellent job on the controlled landing in the Hudson River. The flight crew and flight attendants did exactly what they were trained to do, and they did it superbly.

This incident demonstrates the importance of training and preparation, showcases the skill of our aviation and first responder workforce, and reinforces the importance of consistent vigilance and oversight of our aviation safety.

I also want to commend the emergency crews in New York City who

reached the crew and passengers in record time and immediately began rescue operations.

Again, we honor the crew, passengers, and emergency responders involved in US Airways Flight 1549, and I urge my colleagues to strongly support H. Res. 84.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PETRI. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

I would like to just begin by commending and thanking the chairman of our Aviation Subcommittee for giving all of the members of the subcommittee an opportunity to meet some of the people who were involved in this, what could have been tragic, and turned out to be a heroic day, on February 24 when we have tentatively scheduled a subcommittee hearing to meet and find out what worked, what didn't work, and what could be done even better in the future.

But I certainly on this day rise in support of the resolution before us, House Resolution 84, honoring the heroic actions of the pilot, crew, and the rescuers of US Airways Flight 1549.

Like so many flights leaving New York's LaGuardia Airport on January 15, 2009, US Airways Flight 1549 pushed back late from the terminal with passengers ready to get to their destination in Charlotte, North Carolina. What happened next was anything but normal.

Shortly after takeoff, the airplane, carrying some 155 passengers and crew, unexpectedly struck a flock of large birds, causing both engines to fail.

Captain Chesley B. Sullenberger III, a veteran pilot with decades of experience in both the commercial airline industry and the United States Air Force, was forced to ditch his aircraft in the icy cold waters of the Hudson River.

That every person onboard the flight survived the dual engine failure and the aircraft's controlled ditch into the frigid waters of the Hudson River is an extraordinary testimony to the hard work of all aviation safety personnel. I applaud the quick actions of pilot and crew alike, and commend their actions as critical to the survival of all 150 passengers.

Also to be commended are those who so quickly responded to rescue those precariously balanced on the wings of the sinking plane. Indeed, even after surviving impact of a skillfully executed ditch effort, survivors of this accident still face the perils of hypothermia in the cold waters of the Hudson River. The quick action of police, Coast Guard, ferry operators, and other first responders ensured the survival of all involved in the accident, and their efforts are to be commended.

The robust training programs within the airline industry, Federal Aviation Administration safety oversight efforts, as well as the equipment improvements by aircraft manufacturers, all contributed to the survival of those aboard Flight 1549.

January 15 could have been a day stained by tragedy, but thanks to individual actions of Captain Sullenberger, the crew onboard, and the ongoing safety efforts of so many within the industry, we will remember that day differently. The outcome of Flight 1549 affirms the value of the hard work of the aviation safety professionals, but also renews the call for continual improvements in aviation safety.

I salute those safety professionals and crew who played a role in that day's events, support House Resolution 84, and look forward to the opportunity on February 24 for us to meet some of the heroes of that day and to learn from their testimony.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COSTELLO. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York, the sponsor of the resolution, Congressman CROWLEY.

Mr. CROWLEY. I thank my friend from Illinois for yielding me this time.

Madam Speaker, the successful landing of US Airways Flight 1549 on Thursday, January 15, 2009, was nothing short of a miracle, and I rise to honor and thank all those who were involved in this rescue and recovery effort.

Shortly after takeoff on Thursday, January 15, US Airways Flight 1549 departed LaGuardia Airport in my district in Queens, was struck by a flock of birds, and lost power in both engines. After the collision, the pilot and copilot literally had seconds to determine how to get that plane back to the ground. Captain Chesley B. "Sully" Sullenberger III and First Officer Jeffrey B. Skiles thought about trying to land back at LaGuardia or even getting over to Teterboro Airport, New Jersey, but realized that there was not enough power to get that far. Instead, they decided to attempt an emergency landing in the least populated area of New York City, the Hudson River.

Water landings, also referred to as ditching, are incredibly difficult, and any minor error could cause the landing to end in tragedy. But the tremendous skills of the captain and the first officer were on display that day, and they successfully glided the plane down and safely landed it on the river. In the meantime, the flight attendants, Donna Dent, Doreen Welsh, and Sheila Dail, prepared passengers for impact.

When the plane came to a complete stop, Ms. Dent, Ms. Walsh, and Ms. Dail quickly opened the doors of the plane and started to evacuate passengers safely and efficiently. Within minutes, all the passengers were evacuated onto the wings of the plane, where boats, ferries, and others on the scene approached the sinking jet and began helping the passengers and crew off the wings and safely away from the near freezing Hudson River waters. They were not just New Yorkers; there were folks from New Jersey as well helping in this rescue effort.

Still, as the plane continued to sink into the freezing waters, Captain

Sullenberger walked the cabin not once, but twice, to make sure everyone was safely off the plane before deplaning himself.

Due to the skill and coordinated efforts by the pilots, crew, and first responders on the scene, everyone on the plane is alive and well today.

Madam Speaker, we owe a debt of gratitude to the crew of Flight 1549 and all the first responders who helped evacuate passengers.

Madam Speaker, some people call this event "the miracle on the Hudson." I say this was no miracle. This was the skillful flying of two veteran pilots, the quick reaction of highly trained flight attendants, and the responsiveness of Coast Guard ships, ferries, and private citizens. These people showed to the world the best of our aviation and first responder system. I am proud of the heroic actions of everyone involved.

I hope you will join me in honoring Captain Sullenberger, First Officer Skiles, Flight Attendants Dail, Welsh, and Dent, and all the men and women who came to the aid of the passengers, and the passengers themselves, the cooperation they demonstrated that day, those passengers stuck on the wing of a sinking plane in the middle of a freezing Hudson River. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this resolution.

Madam Speaker, I would just add, as the congressional representative of LaGuardia Airport where Flight 1549 took off, I often have to answer complaints, particularly from my constituents, about the airport and those who fly through or live by the airport. It is not often we get to say good things about LaGuardia Airport.

Like any airport, LaGuardia produces noise, but on January 15, the crew of Flight 1549 made all of us and LaGuardia Airport proud.

□ 1800

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

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. CROWLEY. Congressmen NADLER, MCMAHON, and MCNERNEY and I introduced this legislation because we wanted to pause and recognize the heroic efforts of the first officer, the captain, the flight attendants, as well as all the first responders. They deserve our thanks and applause. We have heard it said in the past, boy, that was a close call. I think in the future you're going to hear it said, boy, that was a 1549. At least I like to think that that will be catchy.

I urge all of my colleagues to please support this resolution.

Mr. PETRI. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COSTELLO. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York, Congressman HALL.

Mr. HALL of New York. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Madam Speaker, I rise today also to pay tribute to a heroic achievement.

It's nearly unimaginable that a commercial airliner would be forced to land in a busy river. And as a sailor who has sailed through New York Harbor on the Hudson River on all different sizes and shapes of power and sailboats, I can only imagine what it's like to try to land a 55-ton glider, which is in effect what Captain Sullenberger had. And fortunately he was not only trained in flying gliders, but he was an instructor in flying gliders and had that experience to call on and was able to land softly without catching a wing tip. We've all seen those terrible water landings, which of course George Carlin used to call "a crash," but the water landings where one wing tip catches and the plane winds up somersaulting and coming apart, it really is miraculous, but it's also the most amazing demonstration of aviation skill, one of them, that I have ever seen.

And because of the actions of Captain Sullenberger, First Officer Skiles and their uncommon bravery, despite the loss of both engines, they were able to land where they would not cause casualties on the ground in the Hudson River. And the fact that he checked the plane twice behind every seat, looking up and down the aisles twice to make sure that no one was left before he left his aircraft is another sign of his professionalism and bravery, as was the demonstration of coolness and professionalism by Sheila Dail, Doreen Welsh and Donna Dent, the flight attendants and the 150 passengers who remained on board and held hands and bonded with each other, including my constituent, Diane Higgins of Goshen, New York, and her 85-year old mother who were led to safety. They were all heroes on that plane, but there were also the first responders, the ferry boat captains, the police and Coast Guard who brought the passengers and crew safely to land from that near freezing water. This is what our first responders are trained to do. And like the crew on board Flight 1549, they did so perfectly and without incident.

Madam Speaker, the quick thinking and the heroic actions of the flight crew and first responders are something we are all proud of. I urge support of this resolution.

Mr. COSTELLO. Madam Speaker, at this time I yield 2 minutes to my friend from New Jersey, Congressman ALBIO SIRES.

Mr. SIRES. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the outstanding work by rescue and nonrescue workers in the New York and New Jersey region in responding to January 15's emergency water landing of US Airways Flight 1549. I commend them for their amazing efforts to safely rescue the flight's 155 passengers.

I would like to publicly thank Captain Chesley Sullenberger and the flight crew whose heroism and guidance helped everyone survive the water landing. Secondly, the quick reactions from New York Waterways ferry operators and the area's first responders

should be recognized and commended. Their quick response allowed all passengers to exit the plane before it was fully submerged and to be quickly retrieved from the frigid waters. New York Waterways, a ferry company based in Weehawken, New Jersey, that usually shuttles commuters back and forth across the Hudson River, played a critical role in the rescue efforts. Boats were able to reach the crash site within minutes of impact and deliver passengers safely to the shores of New York and New Jersey where they could receive medical attention if necessary. Fortunately, major injuries were few. And I am extremely thankful for the response of New Jersey hospitals, including Christ Hospital, Palisades Medical Center, Hoboken Medical Center and Jersey City Medical Center, that treated the injured and those suffering from exposure to extremely cold temperatures.

I am inspired by the heroic efforts of all involved that led to the rescue of all 155 passengers. And I am impressed by the teamwork that contributed to this successful rescue mission.

I would also like to recognize the following New Jersey-based organizations that came to the aid of Flight 1549: Weehawken and all Regional Emergency Management Services, Office of Emergency Management and Hudson County, North Hudson Regional Fire and Rescue, Police Departments of Weehawken, Union City, Guttenberg, West New York, Port Authority of New York New Jersey, and New Jersey Transit, Hudson County Sheriff's Department.

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

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. SIREN. Hudson County Sheriff's Department, Weehawken Parks and Recreation and Senior Center Staff, Arthur's Landing Restaurant of Weehawken, Sheraton Hotels of Weehawken, Modell's Sporting Goods Store of West New York, and the Office of Mayor Richard Turner of Weehawken and Mayor Brian Stack of Union City.

Mr. COSTELLO. Madam Speaker, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California and a member of the Aviation Subcommittee, Mr. McNERNEY.

Mr. McNERNEY. I thank the gentleman from Illinois.

And I rise this evening to add my voice to the chorus of praise for Captain Sullenberger, who on January 15 safely set down a US Airways Flight 1549 on the icy waters of the Hudson River. Captain Sullenberger is a graduate of the United States Air Force Academy and spent years as an Air Force pilot before going to US Airways. He was always a proponent of safety and training. Captain Sullenberger wasn't one who looked for trouble, but he was one who was ready when trouble came. And on January 15, trouble found Captain Sullenberger and Flight 1549.

Captain Sullenberger and the crew of Flight 1549 were ready with less than 2 minutes, the time that I'm speaking here right now, made critical decisions and safely set down the plane on the Hudson River. Because of the heroic action of Captain Sullenberger and the crew of Flight 1549, 155 American citizens are home safe with their families tonight. There wasn't one fatality and not one critical injury.

This Saturday, in Captain Sullenberger's hometown of Danville, California, in my congressional district, more than 5,000 people came out on a dark, windy, cool day, a damp day to give praise and to give honor to Captain Sullenberger. And Captain Sullenberger is a true American hero. He is not an action figure from a movie. He is a true American hero.

I commend Captain Sullenberger and the crew of 1549 and urge my colleagues to join me by passing House Resolution 84.

Mr. COSTELLO. Madam Speaker, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER of New York. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution honoring the heroic actions of the pilot, crew and rescue teams with respect to US Airways Flight 1549. When that flight suffered catastrophic engine damage shortly after takeoff, Captain Chesley B. "Sully" Sullenberger, III, took prompt action. Faced with the very real prospect of losing the lives of all the passengers and crew, he maintained his calm and executed a textbook water landing. His flawless technique and quick judgment allowed him to bring the plane down in one piece and to avoid collisions with any of the countless vessels sailing the river. There is no doubt that his years of service as a decorated pilot in the U.S. Air Force helped prepare him for the difficult task that he confronted that day.

His efforts were aided by the heroic actions of his crew, who quickly completed an orderly evacuation of the frightened passengers, and of the very many people from the local organizations, such as New York Waterways, the fire department, the police department, the Coast Guard and others who all rallied to the rescue.

The bravery and the selflessness on the part of Captain Sullenberger and his crew were matched by the swift response from local police and fire departments. The first responders were able to reach the plane within 2 minutes and begin to rescue the stranded passengers. This rapid response was crucial to the survival of the passengers and the crew as the plane had landed in the middle of a busy waterway with air temperatures well below freezing.

I would point out that since World War II, there are a number of cases of aircraft that had to land in the water, commercial aircraft, major commercial airlines that had landed in the

water, and in every case except this one, at least half the passengers died. In this case, not one single passenger, not one single crew member died. There was not even a really serious injury because of the flawless performance of the pilot in bringing the plane down in one piece, even so it didn't tip over, making sure it missed the George Washington Bridge and still landed right next to the ferry terminals where there were ferry boats waiting.

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

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield the gentleman 30 additional seconds.

Mr. NADLER of New York. There could have been no better expertise and display of heroism and skill than that shown by the pilot and his crew and by passengers, too.

And finally the staff of the many hospitals that cared for the injured passengers deserve our praise as well. We thank the staff at St. Vincent's Hospital, New York Downtown Hospital, St. Luke's Hospital, Jersey City Medical Center and Meadowlands Hospital.

So, Madam Speaker, I'm proud that we have convened here today to honor all those involved in the safe return of 155 people. Acting with no small measure of heroism, these ordinary citizens lived up to the highest ideals of their professions and deserve the most sincere admiration and respect of this Congress.

Mr. COSTELLO. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. McMAHON).

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

Mr. McMAHON. To the chairman and to my colleagues from New York led by JOE CROWLEY, Congressman NADLER, Congresswoman MALONEY and Congressman HALL and our colleague across the water, Congressman SIREN, as well as Congressman McNERNEY, who hosts this great pilot in his district, I'm honored to cosponsor House Resolution 84 honoring the heroic actions of the pilot, crew and rescuers of US Airways Flight 1549.

When Flight 1549 landed in the cold, icy waters of the Hudson River on the afternoon of Thursday, January 15, 2009, many of us in New York feared the worst. What started out as a routine flight from LaGuardia to Charlotte, North Carolina, quickly turned into a nightmare. Passengers heard a loud bang just after takeoff and were told to brace for impact as the plane ditched into the Hudson.

What forced the plane to make an emergency water landing remains under investigation. But what is clear is that the 155 people aboard Flight 1549 owe their lives to the quick maneuvering and skill of the pilot, Chesley B. Sullenberger, III, commonly known as "Sully," and the flight crew that allowed every person on board to survive the impact.

When both engines failed, Mr. Sullenberger's critical decision to land

in the river and avoid densely populated areas on land not only allowed the people on board the plane to survive, but also saved countless lives of people on the ground. In addition, the crew of Flight 1549 showed the utmost professionalism and training by quickly getting the passengers off the plane and into waiting rescue watercraft.

In addition to the heroes on the plane, the passengers and crew owe their lives to the quick actions of ferry boat operators and the first responders in New York and New Jersey who evacuated everyone from the downed plane and rescued those people who had fallen into the frigid water. Today we honor and commend the crews of the New York Waterways ferry boats, other commuter lines and the numerous boats from the New York City Fire Department, the New York City Police Department, the Coast Guard, practically every city, State and Federal agency that patrols the waters around New York for springing into action so fast, and of course all the heroic men and women who work so hard every day in our hospitals.

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

Mr. COSTELLO. I would ask how much time we have left on our side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield 30 seconds to my friend.

Mr. McMAHON. It is nothing short of a miracle that everyone on US Airways Flight 1549 survived. The families of the passengers and crew and all of us owe an enormous debt of gratitude to the extraordinary work and heroism of people that helped save lives, from the skill of the flight crew and air traffic controllers who performed a near perfect landing, to the crew, who evacuated the cabin and cared for the passengers, even giving their own clothes off their own backs to keep passengers from developing hypothermia, to the first responders and good Samaritans on the commuter ferries who helped bring people to safety, and to the pilot who did not even leave the plane until he walked the aisles of the cabin twice to be sure everyone had been evacuated. The rescue demonstrated to the world once again the bravery and goodness of our people, the best of New York and the best of America.

I urge my colleagues to enthusiastically support this resolution and offer my personal thanks for the hard work, courage and kindness that saved so many lives and brought a happy ending to a story that could have turned out so much differently.

Mr. COSTELLO. Madam Speaker, I yield the remaining 2 minutes on our side to the Congresswoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

□ 1815

Mrs. MALONEY. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong and enthusiastic support for this resolution which was led by my

Queens colleague, Congressman CROWLEY.

On January 15, we all stood in awe as we watched as events transpired on the Hudson River. Today, we honor the crew of US Air Flight 1549. Their presence of mind and the extraordinary circumstances on that day led to a miraculous outcome. The more we learn about the details of the flight, the more we can admire what New Yorkers are now calling the miracle on the Hudson River.

We must praise the captains and crew of each of the New York Waterway ferryboats which were on the scene next to the plane within minutes of it hitting the water. It reminded us of the rapid response of 9/11, selflessly giving of your time, your effort, and your possessions to help those in need.

Captain Sullenberger, First Officer Skiles, and flight attendants Dail, Dent, and Welsh all reacted with their brains and heart, using their training and vast experience. They average over 54 years of flight experience, and they swiftly and safely prepared the passengers for impact and evacuated them safely into waiting vessels, saving 150 lives.

The outcome here could not be better, and that is a testimony to the crew and the rescuers. We learned again this month, as we learned on 9/11, that ordinary people doing their jobs are the true American heroes and heroines.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Speaker, I strongly support H. Res. 84, which praises the pilots and flight crew of US Airways Flight 1549, and the first responders who assisted on the scene. Captain Chesley B. Sullenberger III and First Officer Jeffrey B. Skiles reacted quickly to engine failure following takeoff, and masterfully glided the plane to an emergency water landing. Flight attendants Sheila Dail, Doreen Welsh, and Donna Dent quickly prepared passengers for landing and assisted in a speedy evacuation.

Captain Sullenberger expertly utilized his training and experience to land the plane in the Hudson River, so as to avoid an emergency landing in a densely populated area. This resolution commends the bravery of Captain Sullenberger, who walked up and down the aisles of the aircraft twice to ensure that all passengers left the aircraft safely. He was the last to exit the plane.

After landing on water, the flight attendants and passengers removed the emergency doors, and exited onto the wings of the plane. Minutes after, ferry boats, the U.S. Coast Guard, and police boats rushed to rescue everyone.

All 155 people on Flight 1549 survived unharmed due to the swift action of the pilots, flight attendants, and rescuers. The passengers, families of those onboard, and all Americans—and those around the world who witnessed this remarkable event unfold, are extremely grateful.

This event underscores the importance of vigilance in aviation safety, including flight crew training. In this case, the pilots and flight crew did what they were trained to do to keep everyone safe.

I thank the gentleman from New York, Mr. CROWLEY, for bringing H. Res. 84 to the floor, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 84, honoring the heroic actions of the pilot, crew, and rescuers of US Airways Flight 1549.

Madam Speaker, a jetliner, floating in the Hudson River in New York City, on a cold, January afternoon, was an incredible image. More incredible was that no lives were lost when Flight 1549 was forced to land on the river after running into a flock of birds. Through the steady skill and quick thinking of Captain Chesley B. Sullenberger III, First Officer Jeffrey B. Skiles, and the entire flight crew of Flight 1549, serious injuries and fatalities were averted. Their professionalism and unflappability enabled them to overcome the direst of circumstances on January 15, 2009. Pilots Sullenberger and Skiles adeptly landed their crippled aircraft on a busy and churning river. Flight crew members Sheila Dail, Doreen Welsh, and Donna Dent calmly and efficiently made it possible for all of the 150 passengers to exit the plane without major incident.

Unfortunately, Madam Speaker, New Yorkers are no strangers to tragedy. I commend the flotilla of commercial and civil watercraft that so swiftly reacted to assist the passengers and crew. Once again, New Yorkers went, without hesitation, to the scene of an emergency without thought for their own safety. In addition, the first responders of the New York Police Department, Fire Department of New York, and of course, the U.S. Coast Guard, skillfully and quickly were able to come to the aid of Flight 1549. Their actions made it possible for the crew and passengers to escape any harm after leaving the plane.

Madam Speaker, I ask that we all extend our deepest gratitude to the crew of Flight 1549, the first responders and those individuals who rushed to the scene. I strongly support H. Res. 84 and I urge all of my colleagues to also support this resolution.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, today I speak in strong support of H. Res. 84, and thank my colleague Congressman JOSEPH CROWLEY, for authoring this important resolution.

Madam Speaker, the first week of January Americans witnessed no shortage in heroic activity, from the dramatic rescue of an elderly woman by Houston Metro officer Eliot Swainson, to what we recognize here today. The heroic efforts by everyone involved in the emergency landing of flight 1549. This was one of many events this year alone where the world once again recognized the U.S. as a country of doers.

Flight 1549 is now known as the Miracle on the Hudson. A miracle it may be, but what are not surprising or any less miraculous are the coordinated efforts by the pilot, crew and rescuers, who under immense pressure proved that even a battered and bruised American spirit has the strength to overcome indescribable odds.

Captain Chesley Sullenberger "Sully" pilot of the U.S. Airways flight, is no stranger to heroism. A former Air Force officer, he has served the United States proudly for many years. Through his calm and confident ways he successfully maneuvered an enormous aircraft onto the still and icy Hudson River, saving the lives of over 155 passengers.

Just like every hero there is a team of people working with them ensure that no task is left undone and that all measures are taken, even in the most terrible situations. His honorable crew, First Officer Jeffrey B. Skiles, Flight

Attendant Sheila Dail, Flight Attendant Doreen Welsh and Flight Attendant Donna Dent, along with Captain Sullenberger worked tirelessly upon the aircraft's landing to insure that all 155 passengers aboard the aircraft were evacuated and ready to be boarded onto one of the various boats sent to the landing site to assist in the rescue. The strength and sheer will of the entire crew aboard Flight 1549 is what caused this miraculous landing to occur.

As subcommittee chair of Transportation Security and Infrastructure Protection I have been an advocate for both the TSA and the FAA for many years. I am particularly proud of the ability of these organizations to prepare those affiliated with them in the best way possible. Crew members are highly trained.

Once the passengers exited the cabin of the plane they were met instantly by the Coast Guard, Harbor Patrol, water taxis, and other various watercrafts. Passengers were transported to a fleet of ambulances and emergency personnel waiting by the shores of the river to assist in anyway possible. Once again New Yorkers demonstrate in the face of devastating circumstances they will respond in ways that almost seem impossible to the average human being. New Yorkers, just as people of my district have done in the wake of Hurricanes Katrina and Ike, with that helpful nature and American courage to take on any task all things are doable.

Most importantly the common variable in this impressive act of heroism is the strength of a united American spirit. This spirit, that when directed toward a problem no matter how immediate or great in scale, can be handled through a combined effort by a unified American people behind one common goal. This spirit is exactly what the United States needs right now.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing the heroic actions of pilot Chesley Sullenberger, crew members Donna Dent, Doreen Welsh, Sheila Dail, Jeffrey B. Skiles, as well as all of the rescuers standing by for U.S. Airways Flight 1549 on the shores of the Hudson. These heroes on the Hudson are examples of the common humanity that flows through the veins of this Nation.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the resolution honoring the heroic actions of the pilot, crew, and rescuers of U.S. Airways Flight 1549.

What will be remembered in New York as the "Miracle on the Hudson" owes less to divine intervention than it does to the training, experience and quick thinking of Captain Sullenberger, his crew, and the first responders who bravely rescued every passenger aboard Flight 1549.

All too often we hear about delays, breakdowns, and disappointment in air travel. We frequently overlook how hours upon hours of flight training and simulation keep air crews sharp and prepared. And rarely do we stop and praise them for making the kind of good decisions every day that are surely responsible for saving lives and keeping us feeling confident when we fly, but that otherwise go unnoticed.

On behalf of the pilots, flight attendants and first responders I represent, I thank the gentleman from New York, Mr. CROWLEY, for offering this resolution to make sure we recognize those heroic acts on and above the Hudson. This measure, Madam Speaker, like the

crew of Flight 1549 and the first responders who answered the call that day, goes a long way to preserve our faith and confidence in air travel.

Mr. COSTELLO. Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 84, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COSTELLO) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 84.

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. COSTELLO. Madam 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.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m.

□ 1832

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ADLER of New Jersey) at 6 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.

#### 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. Res. 31, by the yeas and nays;

H. Res. 84, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The second electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

#### NATIONAL DATA PRIVACY DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 31, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 31.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 402, nays 0, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 30]

YEAS—402

Abercrombie	DeFazio	Kind
Ackerman	DeGette	King (IA)
Aderholt	Delahunt	King (NY)
Adler (NJ)	DeLauro	Kingston
Akin	Dent	Kirk
Alexander	Diaz-Balart, L.	Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Altmire	Diaz-Balart, M.	Kissell
Andrews	Dicks	Klein (FL)
Arcuri	Dingell	Kline (MN)
Austria	Doggett	Kosmas
Baca	Donnelly (IN)	Kratovil
Bachmann	Dreier	Kucinich
Bachus	Driehaus	Lamborn
Baird	Duncan	Lance
Baldwin	Edwards (MD)	Langevin
Barrett (SC)	Ehlers	Larsen (WA)
Barrow	Ellison	Larson (CT)
Bartlett	Ellsworth	Latham
Barton (TX)	Engel	LaTourette
Bean	Eshoo	Latta
Becerra	Etheridge	Lee (CA)
Berkley	Fallin	Lee (NY)
Berman	Farr	Levin
Berry	Fattah	Lewis (CA)
Biggart	Filner	Lewis (GA)
Bilbray	Flake	Linder
Bilirakis	Fleming	Lipinski
Bishop (GA)	Forbes	LoBiondo
Bishop (NY)	Fortenberry	Loeb sack
Blackburn	Foster	Lofgren, Zoe
Blunt	Fox	Lowe
Bocciari	Frank (MA)	Lucas
Boehner	Franks (AZ)	Lujan
Bonner	Frelinghuysen	Lummis
Bono Mack	Fudge	Lungren, Daniel
Boozman	Gallely	E.
Boren	Garrett (NJ)	Lynch
Boswell	Gerlach	Mack
Boucher	Giffords	Maffei
Boustany	Greigey (GA)	Maloney
Boyd	Gohmert	Manzullo
Brady (PA)	Gonzalez	Markey (CO)
Brady (TX)	Goodlatte	Markey (MA)
Braley (IA)	Gordon (TN)	Marshall
Bright	Granger	Massa
Brown (GA)	Grayson	Matheson
Brown (SC)	Green, Al	Matsui
Brown, Corrine	Griffith	McCarthy (CA)
Brown-Waite,	Guthrie	McCarthy (NY)
Ginny	Hall (NY)	McCauley
Buchanan	Hall (TX)	McClintock
Burgess	Halvorson	McCollum
Burton (IN)	Hare	McCotter
Butterfield	Harman	McDermott
Buyer	Harper	McGovern
Calvert	Hastings (FL)	McHenry
Camp	Hastings (WA)	McHugh
Campbell	Heinrich	McIntyre
Capito	Heller	McKeon
Capps	Hensarling	McMahon
Capuano	Herger	McMorris
Carney	Herseth Sandlin	Rodgers
Carson (IN)	Higgins	McNerney
Carter	Hill	Meek (FL)
Cassidy	Himes	Meeks (NY)
Castle	Hinche	Melancon
Castor (FL)	Hinojosa	Mica
Chaffetz	Hirono	Michaud
Chandler	Hodes	Miller (MI)
Childers	Hoekstra	Miller (NC)
Clarke	Holden	Miller, Gary
Cleaver	Holt	Miller, George
Clyburn	Honda	Minnick
Coble	Hoyer	Mitchell
Coffman (CO)	Hunter	Mollohan
Cohen	Inglis	Moore (KS)
Cole	Inslee	Moore (WI)
Conaway	Israel	Moran (KS)
Connolly (VA)	Issa	Moran (VA)
Conyers	Jackson (IL)	Murphy, Patrick
Cooper	Jackson-Lee	Murphy, Tim
Costa	(TX)	Murtha
Costello	Jenkins	Myrick
Courtney	Johnson (GA)	Nadler (NY)
Crenshaw	Johnson (IL)	Napolitano
Crowley	Johnson, E. B.	Neugebauer
Cuellar	Johnson, Sam	Nunes
Culberson	Jones	Nye
Cummings	Jordan (OH)	Oberstar
Dahlkemper	Kagen	Obey
Davis (AL)	Kanjorski	Olson
Davis (CA)	Kaptur	Olver
Davis (IL)	Kennedy	Ortiz
Davis (KY)	Kildee	Pallone
Davis (TN)	Kilpatrick (MI)	Pascrell
Deal (GA)	Kilroy	Pastor (AZ)

Paul	Sánchez, Linda	Tauscher	Austria	Driehaus	Larsen (WA)	Radanovich	Scott (GA)	Thompson (PA)
Paulsen	T.	Taylor	Baca	Duncan	Larson (CT)	Rahall	Scott (VA)	Thornberry
Pence	Sánchez, Loretta	Teague	Bachmann	Edwards (MD)	Latham	Rangel	Sensenbrenner	Tiahrt
Perlmutter	Sarbanes	Terry	Bachus	Ehlers	LaTourette	Rehberg	Serrano	Tierney
Perriello	Scalise	Thompson (CA)	Baird	Ellison	Latta	Reichert	Sessions	Titus
Peters	Schakowsky	Thompson (MS)	Baldwin	Ellsworth	Lee (CA)	Reyes	Sestak	Tonko
Peterson	Schauer	Thompson (PA)	Barrett (SC)	Engel	Lee (NY)	Richardson	Shadegg	Towns
Petri	Schiff	Thornberry	Barrow	Eshoo	Levin	Roe (TN)	Shea-Porter	Tsongas
Pingree (ME)	Schmidt	Tiahrt	Bartlett	Etheridge	Lewis (CA)	Rogers (AL)	Sherman	Turner
Pitts	Schock	Tierney	Bartol (TX)	Fallin	Lewis (GA)	Rogers (KY)	Shimkus	Upton
Platts	Schrader	Titus	Bean	Farr	Linder	Rogers (MI)	Shuler	Van Hollen
Poe (TX)	Schwartz	Tonko	Becerra	Fattah	Lipinski	Rooney	Shuster	Velázquez
Polis (CO)	Scott (GA)	Towns	Berkley	Filner	LoBiondo	Ros-Lehtinen	Sires	Visclosky
Pomeroy	Scott (VA)	Tsongas	Berman	Flake	Loebsock	Roskam	Skelton	Walden
Posey	Sensenbrenner	Turner	Berry	Fleming	Lofgren, Zoe	Ross	Slaughter	Walz
Price (GA)	Serrano	Upton	Biggett	Forbes	Lowey	Rothman (NJ)	Smith (NE)	Wamp
Price (NC)	Sessions	Van Hollen	Bibray	Fortenberry	Lucas	Roybal-Allard	Smith (NJ)	Wasserman
Putnam	Sestak	Velázquez	Bilirakis	Poster	Luján	Royce	Smith (TX)	Schultz
Radanovich	Shadegg	Visclosky	Bishop (GA)	Foxx	Lummis	Rush	Smith (WA)	Waters
Rahall	Shea-Porter	Walden	Bishop (NY)	Frank (MA)	Lungren, Daniel E.	Ryan (OH)	Snyder	Watson
Rangel	Sherman	Walz	Blackburn	Franks (AZ)	Lynch	Ryan (WI)	Space	Watt
Rehberg	Shimkus	Wamp	Blunt	Frelinghuysen	Mack	Salazar	Speier	Waxman
Reichert	Shuler	Wasserman	Bocieri	Fudge	Maffei	Sánchez, Linda T.	Spratt	Weiner
Reyes	Shuster	Schultz	Boehner	Gallegly	Maloney	Sanchez, Loretta	Stearns	Welch
Richardson	Sires	Waters	Bonner	Garrett (NJ)	Manzullo	Sarbanes	Stupak	Westmoreland
Roe (TN)	Skelton	Watson	Bono Mack	Gerlach	Markey (CO)	Scalise	Sullivan	Wexler
Rogers (AL)	Slaughter	Watt	Boozman	Giffords	Markey (MA)	Schakowsky	Sutton	Whitfield
Rogers (KY)	Smith (NE)	Waxman	Boren	Gingrey (GA)	Marshall	Schauer	Tanner	Wilson (OH)
Rogers (MI)	Smith (NJ)	Weiner	Boswell	Gohmert	Massa	Schiff	Tauscher	Wilson (SC)
Rooney	Smith (TX)	Welch	Boucher	Gonzalez	Matheson	Schmidt	Taylor	Wittman
Ros-Lehtinen	Smith (WA)	Westmoreland	Boustany	Goodlatte	Matsui	Schock	Teague	Wolf
Roskam	Snyder	Wexler	Boyd	Gordon (TN)	McCarthy (CA)	Schrader	Terry	Woolsey
Ross	Space	Whitfield	Brady (PA)	Granger	McCarthy (NY)	Schwartz	Thompson (CA)	Wu
Rothman (NJ)	Speier	Wilson (OH)	Brady (TX)	Grayson	Green, Al		Thompson (MS)	Yarmuth
Roybal-Allard	Spratt	Wilson (SC)	Bralely (IA)	Green, Al	Griffith			
Royce	Stearns	Wittman	Bright	Guthrie	Hall (NY)			
Rush	Stupak	Wolf	Broun (GA)	Hall (TX)	Halvorson			
Ryan (OH)	Sullivan	Woolsey	Brown (SC)	Hare	Harman			
Ryan (WI)	Sutton	Wu	Brown, Corrine	Harper	Hastings (FL)			
Salazar	Tanner	Yarmuth	Brown-Waite, Ginny	Hastings (WA)	Heinrich			

NOT VOTING—30

Bishop (UT)	Graves	Rodriguez
Blumenauer	Green, Gene	Rohrabacher
Cantor	Grijalva	Ruppersberger
Cao	Gutierrez	Simpson
Cardoza	Luetkemeyer	Solis (CA)
Carnahan	Marchant	Souder
Clay	Miller (FL)	Stark
Doyle	Murphy (CT)	Tiberi
Edwards (TX)	Neal (MA)	Young (AK)
Emerson	Payne	Young (FL)

□ 1858

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HONORING THE HEROIC ACTIONS OF THE PILOT, CREW, AND RESCUERS OF US AIRWAYS FLIGHT 1549

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 84, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COSTELLO) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 84.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 402, nays 0, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 31]

YEAS—402

Abercrombie	Adler (NJ)	Altmire
Ackerman	Akin	Andrews
Aderholt	Alexander	Arcuri

Buchanan	Burgess	Burton (IN)	Butterfield	Buyer	Calvert	Camp	Campbell	Capito	Capps	Capuano	Carney	Carson (IN)	Carter	Cassidy	Castle	Castor (FL)	Chaffetz	Chandler	Childers	Clarke	Cleaver	Clyburn	Coble	Coffman (CO)	Cohen	Cole	Conaway	Connolly (VA)	Conyers	Cooper	Costa	Costello	Courtney	Crenshaw	Crowley	Cuellar	Culberson	Cummings	Dahlkemper	Davis (AL)	Davis (CA)	Davis (IL)	Davis (KY)	Davis (TN)	Deal (GA)	DeFazio	DeGette	DeLaHunt	DeLauro	Dent	Diaz-Balart, L.	Diaz-Balart, M.	Dicks	Dingell	Doggett	Donnelly (IN)	Dreier
----------	---------	-------------	-------------	-------	---------	------	----------	--------	-------	---------	--------	-------------	--------	---------	--------	-------------	----------	----------	----------	--------	---------	---------	-------	--------------	-------	------	---------	---------------	---------	--------	-------	----------	----------	----------	---------	---------	-----------	----------	------------	------------	------------	------------	------------	------------	-----------	---------	---------	----------	---------	------	-----------------	-----------------	-------	---------	---------	---------------	--------

NOT VOTING—30

Bishop (UT)	Graves	Rodriguez
Blumenauer	Green, Gene	Rohrabacher
Cantor	Grijalva	Ruppersberger
Cao	Gutierrez	Simpson
Cardoza	Luetkemeyer	Solis (CA)
Carnahan	Marchant	Souder
Clay	Miller (FL)	Stark
Doyle	Murphy (CT)	Tiberi
Edwards (TX)	Neal (MA)	Young (AK)
Emerson	Payne	Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members have 2 minutes remaining to vote.

□ 1908

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent from this Chamber today. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall votes 30 and 31.

REPORT ON H.R. 679, AMERICAN RECOVERY AND REINVESTMENT ACT OF 2009

Mr. OBEY, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 111-4) on the bill (H.R. 679) 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, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1, rule XXI, all points of order are reserved on the bill.

HONORING TARAVELLA HIGH  
SCHOOL

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

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the members of the J.P. Taravella High School Marching Band and their director, Neil Jenkins.

Taravella was selected by the Presidential Inaugural Committee as the only high school marching band from the State of Florida to participate in the 2009 Inaugural Parade, and these students from Coral Springs made us all proud. Their journey was possible because business owners and citizens from across our community came together and they raised \$150,000 to make the trip.

I hope that being in Washington D.C. for this historic inauguration was as meaningful to these young musicians as it was for me. I know they will carry memories of this extraordinary event with them for the rest of their lives.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer my congratulations to these fine students, their parents, teachers and chaperones for being part of the 2009 Presidential Inaugural Parade.

MOUNT AIRY GRANITE BEARS  
FOOTBALL TAKE STATEWIDE  
TITLE

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, last month the Granite Bears of Mount Airy, North Carolina, notched one final win in their perfect 2008 season. The Bears won a decisive victory over Williamston in a North Carolina 1-A State high school football championship game on December 13.

The Bears 37-14 championship victory was reminiscent of their triumphant 2008 season, in which they allowed only 80 points in their first 15 games. In the playoffs Mount Airy dominated every opponent they faced, scoring 261 points to their opponents' meager 26 points.

Coach Kelly Holder and the whole Mount Airy team, led by quarterback Aaron Wheeler, made the Mount Airy community glow with pride when they capped their perfect season with the State title. And with 16 seniors filling the team's roster, the State championship is a crowning achievement for a team of young men who have played together for so many years.

I congratulate the players, coaches, parents, teachers and fans for a perfect season and State championship. The Mount Airy Bears deserve to be celebrated for making this community proud in their 2008 season.

KNOXVILLE UTILITIES BOARD,  
BRIGHT LIGHT OF CORPORATE  
RESPONSIBILITY

(Mr. DUNCAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, with news reports that 68,000 jobs were shed just today, a bright light of corporate responsibility is emerging from my district in Tennessee, which should be applauded and hopefully be an example that is followed around the Nation.

The Knoxville Utilities Board announced that it will not follow through with previously planned electric and water rate increases due to the current economic situation. Oftentimes, the national news reports only stories about businesses behaving badly. But business is not the enemy. KUB employs many people in my district and supplies vital public services. KUB announced that it will hold off on all utility rate increases as long as possible, and they will instead follow through with new cost management measures in order to help out its customers during this hard time. True success in the business world comes when you not just not watch out for your bottom line, but for your employees and customers.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I want to commend the staff at KUB and its board of commissioners for acting in the best interests of the people they serve and the Nation. I encourage other businesses to follow their lead as we navigate through this economic downturn.

□ 1915

SPEECH IN OPPOSITION TO  
FEDERAL WAIVER ON EMISSIONS

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

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge the President not to waive the Federal law on emission standards that is currently protecting Californians from Governor Schwarzenegger's crusade to save our planet by destroying our economy. Putting aside the highly questionable junk science behind the Governor's proposal, the net effect would add up to \$5,000 to the price of a new car.

Automobile sales normally account for one-fifth of California's sales taxes, which have already fallen by \$1½ billion over the past 12 months. Ironically, the Governor's also asking the President to bail out California's growing budget deficit at the same time.

So I would respectfully suggest to the President that California's economic folly is not something that he should be copying.

BURGESS QUESTIONS SENATE  
CONFIRMATION OF GEITHNER

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, we heard this evening the unwelcome news

that the Senate, the other body, had confirmed the nominee for Secretary of the Treasury. I cannot tell you how disappointed I am that the Senate saw fit to do that. This is going to be a distraction at a time when our Nation's financial state deserves close attention. How can we ask our citizens to pay their taxes if we appoint tax evaders to head the Department of Treasury?

I think it would have been appropriate to resist the temptation to be impulsive and instead take the time to make sure that the candidate we put to this high office is someone with more than just a solid resume. Make sure it is someone who will make a personal commitment to upholding the law.

Tax evasion, be it by design or inattention, trivializes other citizens' duty to pay their taxes, and it makes the tax burden of proof even that much greater for those who do bother to follow the law.

We have called this a time of change in our Nation, but this decision is another illustration of the perception that Washington is a place where the well-connected are given special privileges. At a time where Americans are losing faith in Congress, it is imperative that we convey it's not okay to appoint leaders who break the law. It's time to bring credibility and integrity back to this government.

AIR FORCE ONE—MADE IN FRANCE

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the name Air Force One really says it all, doesn't it? It's the number one plane—the most sophisticated and advanced piece of aviation technology, designed specifically for our Commander in Chief, the President of the United States. It's a national symbol.

Since the inception of Air Force One, it has been made in, of all places, America. Now it seems that the Pentagon thinks it would be better for a foreign company to build the next flying White House—a French company at that. Well, excusez moi, but that just ought not to be.

Mr. Speaker, if anything should be made in America, it ought to be the most important military aircraft we have. The Pentagon wants to let the French, the French-based Airbus, to have a crack at it. But, au contraire, mon frere.

I have filed the Air Force One Built in America Act to ensure that Air Force One is made in America by Americans. Outsourcing Air Force One is not an option. It's un-American. If the Pentagon has their way, au revoir, American jobs and national security. What's next? Are we going to replace the American apple pie with crepes?

And that's just the way it is.

## 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 gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

## NEW STIMULUS MATH

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. Mr. Speaker, they say we have to spend more money that we don't have to stimulate more spending by the American people. This is supposed to save us all from economic chaos. I think I'm missing something here. How does borrowing money just to spend it help out the citizens who not only have to come up with the money in the first place but also have to pay the interest on the government's shopping spree?

This stimulus package, which filters money to special interest groups, will cost \$825 billion. But if we add up last year's so-called stimulus package that didn't work, and all the bailouts to the special interest groups, like the big bank robber barons, the Congressional Budget Office says we will have to borrow all the money to pay for it. That means a total of an additional \$2 trillion in deficit.

So, Mr. Speaker, how does borrowing money just to spend \$825 billion make sense? Why don't we just not spend the money in the first place. Let all Americans have an across-the-board tax cut, those Americans that do pay taxes, and let them decide how to spend their money. Cut the corporate income tax, then businesses can stimulate the economy by hiring more workers.

But, Mr. Speaker, that is not going to happen because the mindset in the United States now is that the government is smarter than the people. So government saves us all from ourselves.

Thomas Jefferson knew better. He said a long time ago, "I predict future happiness for Americans if they can prevent the government from wasting the money and labors of the people under the pretense of taking care of them." Oh, I wish we'd have listened to Thomas Jefferson. If this prediction is true, then there are going to be a lot more unhappy Americans because wise ole Uncle Sam is planning to spend our money in the name of stimulating the economy.

Here are a few examples in the \$825 billion stimulus package. I like this one. The National Mall is going to get

some new grass that will cost \$200 million. That is about \$1.5 million per acre. Mr. Speaker, what kind of grass is that? Gold-plated AstroTurf? I'm sure that spending this money will help the economy way down there in Dime Box, Texas.

Here's another one: \$726 million for after-school snack programs for school children. I'm sure our school kids need more snacks at taxpayer expense, but does anyone really think that will help the economy? Probably not.

What is \$825 billion anyway? Well, since Uncle Sam doesn't have the money left in his bank, that means every man, woman, child, and illegal in the United States will have to eventually come up with \$2,700 apiece to pay for Uncle Sam's spending appetite.

All this stimulus package does is put us more in debt to China, which weakens our dollar and our national security. The government needs to put the money back where it belongs, in the hands of the people who earned it. Let Americans decide how to spend their money. After all, it doesn't belong to Uncle Sam.

And that's just the way it is.

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.)

## FOCUS ON EDUCATION SPENDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, tonight, as we sit here in this Chamber, all across America there are school superintendents, there are boards of education, there are boards of finance that are grappling with the greatest economic downturn since the Great Depression. And as we know from press reports all over the country, hundreds of thousands of school teachers have been given layoff notices. Forty-four States are now in deficit; \$95 billion for 2009 fiscal year, \$145 billion for the 2010 fiscal year, as all these local officials, who have the responsibility of making sure that we have school programs that our children can have an opportunity to thrive and grow, are bracing themselves for Governors who inevitably are going to be reducing State support for education.

It is in that context, Mr. Speaker, that as we proceed as a Congress to take up the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act on this Wednesday, that I think it's important to focus for a minute on the education spending which is included in this legislation.

Under this measure, under this recovery act that President Obama and the congressional leadership have voted on last week, over \$145 billion will flow

out directly to school districts across this country. For example, there will be \$13 billion to pay for Title I, a Federally-mandated program which has been underfunded as part of the disgraceful unwillingness of the Federal Government to pay for the No Child Left Behind Act over the last 6 years. And \$13 billion of additional funds will go out to pay for special education. Again, a disgraceful nonfunding by the Federal Government since 1975 when Gerald Ford signed the Special Education Act into law, mandating that all these local officials, again, who are trapped tonight, have to come up with the resources to pay for the special education needs of children all across the country.

And \$14 billion to pay for school construction. Again, directly to local communities so that they will have the funds to modernize and retrofit schools all across the country and immediately putting to work the construction trades, which is the hardest hit sector in the American economy.

A \$79 billion economic stabilization fund, which will flow directly into States through your education cost sharing formulas all across America to make up for the inevitable shortfall which Governors and State legislators are going to be forced to cut back on as they deal with, again, this historic economic downturn.

President Obama understands that we must act with this American Recovery and Reinvestment Act with funding for education; number one, to make sure that hundreds of thousands of teachers are not going to be laid off, along with staff, who, again, we entrust with making sure are children are going to be educated every single day across this country.

He also understands long term that the failure to step in and avoid larger class sizes, which will result in teacher layoffs, is going to ensure that our economy will grow not just in the short term, not just as we get through this economic crisis, but also to make sure that long term that America's competitiveness will be maintained.

We know what is happening across the world today. That there are countries which are beating us in science, in engineering, in math. And if we allow as a Congress to step back and leave local communities on their own, with declining property tax revenues and declining State support for public education across this country, we will damage not only this country in the short term, but we will damage it in terms of our long-term ability to compete and thrive and grow as a Nation.

This past Saturday, I sat down with school superintendents all across the Second Congressional District of eastern Connecticut to talk about the dilemma with which these school superintendents and boards of education find themselves in. Again, all of them are in the process of coming up with contingency plans to lay off staff and teachers across their district.

When I walked through with them the provisions of President Obama's recovery act in terms of the funds that they will get this year if we get this to the President's desk by President's Day, signed into law, the funds will flow by July 1 for this fiscal year, there was skepticism, and I don't blame them. The Federal Government has not funded Special Ed, has not funded No Child Left Behind.

But when I explain to them that this measure has passed the Appropriations Committee, the Ways and Means Committee, the Energy and Commerce Committee as of last week, and we are voting on it this coming Wednesday, after the stunned silence, the room burst into applause because these folks are feeling the pressure of this economic downturn just like people in the private sector are.

□ 1930

But what we need to do as a Nation is, again, to make sure that in terms of trying to deal with this short-term crisis that we are in, that we are not going to do long-term damage to the young people of this country who had no responsibility for the fiscal and economic idiocy of the last 8 years. And that is why it is so important, as a Congress, we must step forward and support the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act and make sure that America's public education will endure.

#### OBAMA ADMINISTRATION STATEMENTS

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. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask my colleagues a question: Who said this: "The problem with socialism is you eventually run out of someone else's money" that is the problem with big spending in government when you don't have it?

My good friend, Mr. POE, just talked about a lot of the waste that is in the so-called stimulus package. But you know, in addition to that there are a lot of other things that worry me, like the things that the President just said and some of his cabinet members just said, and what the vice president just said.

Let me just read to you a quote from President Obama which was on Friday, January 16. He said, talking about the \$835 billion stimulus package, "This plan is a significant down payment on our most urgent challenges." Down payment? That is almost \$1 trillion, plus the \$700 billion that we put in the bailout bill for the banks and Wall Street. So that is \$1.5 trillion, and he says this is a down payment on our most urgent challenges.

We are spending so much money that we are going to have hyperinflation down the road. And it won't be just us that will be paying for it; it will be our

kids and our grandkids, and the quality of life for everyone is going to suffer.

And then, of course this Sunday, appearing on CBS face the Nation, Vice President BIDEN said that, "Obama's choice for Treasury Secretary, Timothy Geithner, will soon recommend to President Obama whether more money is needed beyond the \$700 billion already allocated to American banks."

So the \$700 billion, \$350 billion of which we don't know anything about, it may have been wasted, at least a large part, and there is another \$350 billion in the tank that President Obama is going to use; and now Vice President BIDEN is saying that they may need more than the \$700 billion.

So here, we hear the President talking about a down payment on the money that is going to be spent, \$835 billion, and Lord only knows how much is going to be added to that. And then, Vice President BIDEN says that Mr. Geithner might want more than the \$700 billion that has been used for bailing out the banks and Wall Street. And then of course, on Meet the Press Sunday, Lawrence Summers, a top economic adviser to President Obama, said, "The government can't afford to spend more than \$1 trillion to boost the economy and save financial institutions."

I would just like to say to my friends who might be paying attention, it is not the government that is spending that money; it is the taxpayers that are spending that money. And we are spending this country right down into a dark black hole from which we may never get out. I mean, it is tragic that we are just throwing money at this, when we should be cutting taxes across the board to give Americans and business more disposable income so they can get this economy moving again in the right direction through the free enterprise system.

President Barack Obama signed his first two Presidential memoranda aimed at getting us on the path to energy independence; and what he said when he signed those just today or yesterday, he said, "That is a down payment on a broader and sustained effort to reduce our dependence on foreign oil."

Everything is a down payment, which means they are going to spend trillions more, billions and trillions more of money that they don't have that is going to have to be printed or we are going to have to borrow from someplace like China.

We are putting this country into an economic black hole that we shouldn't be doing right now. What we should be doing is stimulating the economy the right way, by giving the American people part of their hard-earned money back and creating an incentive for business to invest in this country, like cutting the capital gains tax at least for 1 or 2 years. If we did that, we would have true economic recovery that will last, and not something that is just going to last until we print more money.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### OUR ECONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, our economy is far from healing. Economists believe that the proximate cause of our economic crisis is the housing foreclosure crisis. I agree. Thus, I want to help explain how the very banks the Executive Branch is bailing out have and continue to make money off our constituents through deceptive practices in the housing industry, specifically through the sale of those mortgages.

I have a constituent in Sandusky, Ohio, who refinanced his home due to a divorce to an adjustable rate mortgage through an Ohio bank. But then, J.P. Morgan Chase Bank in New York bought the bank and closed the deal on the refinancing of the mortgage. Chase did not properly disclose to this gentleman that the rates were higher than what was in the original loan documents, which violates the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act and the Truth in Lending Act.

My constituent has paid and, to the best of my knowledge, is making regular payments on his mortgage to an escrow account; however, around last October, with the help of a lawyer, he served J.P. Morgan Chase a notice of rescission on his loan due to the aforementioned violations. His lawyer requested that Chase inform him of any interested parties and holders of his mortgage to properly notify them of his rescission. Chase has not properly answered his query, so the case is going to court.

It is the belief of my constituent's lawyer that Chase cannot name the holder of the mortgage. His loan was sold to a bank which placed his mortgage in a loan serving pool. Then his loan was chopped up into parts, bundled, and sold as mortgage-backed securities to hundreds of large institutional investors. Involved are trust oversight managers, depositors, underwriters, trust administrators, investors, trust fund issuing entities, trustees. But who really knows who all are involved? But we know this: They all got a piece of the pie on the transaction.

This loan pooling process, some would say a Ponzi scheme, for securitization of loans make one's head spin. But at its core is one thing: Lots of profit on the upside, and now lots of loss on the downside.

I do not know if my constituent can rescind his loan, avoid foreclosure, save

his credit rating and, therefore, his financial future, because he cannot properly notify the holder of the mortgage. No one knows who it is.

My constituent's situation is not unique, and in fact the story reverberates from sea to shining sea. We bailed out the banks because of these very practices which created certain toxic assets; yet, the practices continue: People lose their homes, the economy is tanking, and the bailed out banks are filling their coffers, paying dividends, making acquisitions, giving bonuses, holding auctions of these properties.

Furthermore, I would like to call your attention and include in the RECORD today's Wall Street Journal article titled, "Lending Drops At Big US Banks." According to the article, 10 of the 13 biggest beneficiaries of bailout monies who received \$148 billion of our taxpayer money saw their outstanding loan balances decline by a total of \$46 billion between the third and fourth quarters of 2008. That means they weren't making loans with the money they got. The intent of bailing out Wall Street by those who voted for it was to free up credit. They didn't do it. And, Federal regulators are aiding and abetting them.

Rather than using the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the Securities and Exchange Commission as the proper agency for mortgage resolution, what we continue to see is Treasury in charge, which is a revolving door between Wall Street and the highest levels of our government.

Paul Volcker put out a report last week on behalf of the Group of 13, calling for nations to reform their pro-cyclical regulatory and accounting rules. Unless this is done, why would our government allocate one more penny of taxpayer funds to cleaning up the mess that Wall Street and Washington leaders have gotten us into?

[From the Wall Street Journal, Jan. 26, 2009]  
LENDING DROPS AT BIG U.S. BANKS—TOP BENEFICIARIES OF FEDERAL CASH SAW OUTSTANDING LOANS DECLINE 1.4% LAST QUARTER

(By David Enrich)

Lending at many of the nation's largest banks fell in recent months, even after they received \$148 billion in taxpayer capital that was intended to help the economy by making loans more readily available.

Ten of the 13 big beneficiaries of the Treasury Department's Troubled Asset Relief Program, or TARP, saw their outstanding loan balances decline by a total of about \$46 billion, or 1.4%, between the third and fourth quarters of 2008, according to a Wall Street Journal analysis of banks that recently announced their quarterly results.

Those 13 banks have collected the lion's share of the roughly \$200 billion the government has doled out since TARP was launched last October to stabilize financial institutions. Banks reporting declines in outstanding loans range from giants Bank of America Corp. and Citigroup Inc., each of which got \$45 billion from the government; to smaller, regional institutions. Just three of the banks reported growth in their loan portfolios: U.S. Bancorp, SunTrust Banks Inc. and BB&T Corp.

The loan figures analyzed by the Journal exclude some big TARP recipients that haven't reported fourth-quarter results yet, such as Wells Fargo & Co.

The overall decline in loans on the 13 banks' books—from about \$3.36 trillion as of Sept. 30 to \$3.31 trillion at year's end—raises fresh questions about TARP's effectiveness at coaxing banks to reopen their lending spigots.

"It has failed," said Campbell Harvey, a finance professor at Duke University's business school. "Basically we have dropped a huge amount of money . . . and we have nothing to show for what we actually wanted to happen."

#### CREDIT CONSTRAINTS

In a survey last month of 569 U.S. companies, Mr. Harvey and researchers at Duke and the University of Illinois found that 59% felt constrained by a lack of credit. Many of those firms are shelving expansion plans and cutting jobs as a result of funding shortages, according to the survey, which is expected to be released this week.

Bankers say it is unfair to expect them to funnel a large portion of their government capital into loans so soon after receiving it. They say it takes time to make prudent loans and to attract new deposits that will allow them to lend out their new capital efficiently.

Demand for low-risk loans is also ebbing as consumers and businesses rein in their spending and try to conserve cash, according to bank executives. Even though mortgage rates are down, for example, applications in the week ended Jan. 16 declined about 10% from the previous week, according to the latest data from the Mortgage Bankers Association.

Meanwhile, federal regulators have been pushing many banks to set aside extra capital to cushion against losses. Bankers say that is at odds with the government's encouragement to make more loans.

The fact that loan portfolios are shrinking at many of the largest TARP recipients underscores how few strings Treasury Department officials attached to the infusions. That has made it hard to prevent banks from using the money to pay dividends, make acquisitions and fund bonuses for top executives.

Federal officials argue that the downturn in lending would have been much more acute without the TARP funding, and that attaching additional strings to the money could have led banks to make risky loans or to refuse to accept the government capital.

Obama administration officials acknowledge that TARP hasn't managed to jump start lending as intended, and say they plan to overhaul the program to address the shortcomings. TARP recipients must submit lending data to the Treasury Department by the end of January, though industry officials don't expect the disclosures to divulge much more than what banks already include in routine regulatory filings.

Around the world, bankers are under pressure from regulators and lawmakers struggling to prop up the financial system. Politicians in the U.S. and overseas are ratcheting up their rhetoric about banks needing to do their part. On Sunday, Franz Müntefering, chairman of Germany's Social Democrats, said in an interview with a German newspaper that "most of the bankers are competent and responsible, but there are also some beatniks, pyromaniacs and gangsters."

#### NEW STUDENT LOANS

In a sign that banks are feeling political heat, Citigroup is expected to announce Tuesday a plan to use some of its TARP money to finance tens of billions of dollars in new loans this year, according to people

familiar with the situation. The push will include credit cards, student loans and mortgages aimed at specific segments of the population, one person said.

Of the \$45 billion it got from the government, Citigroup last fall invested \$10 billion in Fannie Mae's short-term commercial paper, which the company views as relatively low risk, according to the person familiar with the matter. The remaining \$35 billion hasn't been put to use yet.

Even critics of TARP's capital injections say that they steadied financial institutions and soothed investors, averting possible catastrophe. The first capital infusions were announced about a month after Lehman Brothers Holdings Inc. filed for bankruptcy protection, igniting fears that other shaky financial companies could collapse.

The fourth-quarter decline in overall loan volume at the 13 banks coincides with an industry-wide retreat from broad swaths of consumer lending. Banks have scaled back on mortgage lending, canceled or substantially reduced many home-equity and credit-card lines and, in some cases, simply stopped making certain types of loans unless they're guaranteed by the U.S. government.

#### RECESSION WOES

Despite dismal economic conditions, many bankers insist they are making every good loan that they can. Bank of America and J.P. Morgan Chase & Co., which got a combined \$70 billion in government capital, said they originated a total of \$215 billion in loans in the fourth quarter. Their combined loan portfolios shrank by about \$28 billion in the same period.

Scott Silvestri, a Bank of America spokesman, said the Charlotte, N.C., bank's loan balances declined in part because more borrowers have been paying off their debts. In addition, "there were fewer opportunities to make high-quality loans because of the recession," he said. A spokesman for J.P. Morgan declined to comment.

The loan volumes that banks disclose publicly only reflect outstanding loans on their books, many originated years ago, not the actual amount of new loans made in a given quarter. While several banks reported the amount of new loans they made in the fourth quarter, they didn't disclose comparable figures from prior periods.

"What you can't tell is how low they would have sunk in the recession we're in were it not for the TARP money," said Walter Moeling, a partner in the banking practice at law firm Bryan Cave LLP.

The overall decline in loan balances during the fourth quarter reflects the huge hurdles and conflicting agendas that need to be overcome before credit can start flowing smoothly again.

For instance, many banks have said they are using TARP funds to cover current or anticipated defaults on a wide variety of loans.

At the same time, shareholders at many institutions have demanded that they slim down their balance sheets to reflect the new risk-averse environment.

At BB&T, a Winston-Salem, N.C., bank that got \$3.13 billion from TARP, fourth-quarter lending volume rose about 2%, or \$2 billion. While BB&T is making new loans, Chief Executive Kelly King said the bank invested much of its taxpayer capital as a way to earn a decent return while shunning risk.

"We parked it there, and will redeploy it as quickly as we can, not in a panic," Mr. King said last week on a conference call with analysts. "We're not going to make a bunch of bad loans."

The overall loan decline likely understates the magnitude of the industry's retrenchment.

In normal times, banks would make loans and then sell many off to investors or financial institutions. But that practice has

ground to a halt, so more loans today are staying on banks' books. As a result, some banks' loan portfolios could appear larger than they would have in the past, even though they aren't actually making more loans.

Bank balance sheets also have been inflated as more companies draw on credit lines that banks committed to before the financial crisis erupted. Last fall, an increasing number of borrowers started tapping those lines, banks say, either because other types of credit were evaporating or out of an abundance of caution.

For example, KeyCorp, where total loan balances declined by about \$200 million in the fourth quarter, saw a \$1.3 billion leap in its commercial, financial and agricultural loans. Chief Financial Officer Jeffrey Weeden said that was primarily the result of clients dipping into their revolving lines.

KeyCorp, which is based in Cleveland and received \$2.5 billion in federal capital, made or renewed \$5.7 billion of loans in the fourth quarter. But KeyCorp has stopped making student loans unless they're backed by the U.S. government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman 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.)

#### ECONOMIC STIMULUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, the current economic crisis requires bold solutions that address the magnitude of our economic woes, and the American Recovery and Reinvestment Plan will do just that. The \$825 billion recovery package that we will vote on this week will create or save an estimated 4 million jobs and will make key investments in our future.

First and foremost, the economic recovery package focuses on blunting the effects of the recession and helping families in need by increasing food stamps for some 30 million Americans, expanding unemployment benefits, and preserving health care benefits.

Our plan protects health care coverage for nearly 20 million Americans during this recession by increasing the Federal Medicaid Assistance Percentage, FMAP, so that no State has to cut eligibility for Medicaid and SCHIP, the Children's Health Insurance Program, because of budget shortfalls.

I am encouraged that in my home State of New York, where we have an unemployment rate of 7 percent, the State would qualify for an additional 6 percent FMAP on top of the 4.9 percent base FMAP increase, for a total of 10.9 percent, resulting in roughly \$10.4 billion over nine quarters. This is critical funding for our State which is seeing an increase in caseloads as a result of the recession.

We will also provide health care coverage for nearly 8.5 million Americans

through a tax credit that would allow newly uninsured and unemployed Americans to keep their health insurance through COBRA, as well as a new option in Medicaid for low income people who lack access to COBRA.

The recovery plan also invests in important needs that have been neglected over the past 8 years. America's schools, roads, bridges, and water systems are in disrepair, and this is creating a drag on economic growth. We will embark on the most ambitious public investment agenda since the 1950s, when we created the Interstate Highway System, which provided an important engine of economic growth.

We have an historic opportunity to make the investments necessary to modernize our public infrastructure, transition to a clean energy economy, and make us more competitive in the future.

Our plan will modernize our transportation infrastructure, and repair thousands of miles of roadways; enhance security at 90 major ports; renovate 10,000 public schools, and improve the learning environment for about 5 million children; launch thousands of clean drinking water and wastewater initiatives; computerize every American's health record in 5 years, reducing medical errors and saving billions of dollars in health care costs; undertake the largest weatherization program in history, modernizing 75 percent of Federal buildings and 2 million homes; and, double our renewable energy generating capacity over the next 3 years, creating enough energy to power 6 million American homes.

Our plan also supports working families by providing a \$1,000 Making Work Pay tax cut for 95 percent of workers and their families. In addition, we will expand the child care tax credit, providing a new tax cut for parents of more than 6 million children, and increasing the benefit of the existing credit for more than 10 million young people.

By including major fast-spending provisions like tax cuts for middle-class families, measures to avoid State health care cuts, and temporary expansions of unemployment insurance, food stamps, and health care for unemployed Americans, the package will spend out at least 75 percent of its total commitment within the first 18 months after passage. The plan will spread job creation out over the next couple of years, which will soften the downturn and foster a solid economic recovery. This is a balanced stimulus plan that benefits all Americans by creating jobs across a variety of sectors.

As President Obama recently said, "This is not just a short-term program to boost employment. It's one that will invest in our most important priorities, like energy and education, health care, and a new infrastructure, that are necessary to keep us strong and competitive in the 21st century."

Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke voiced optimism for the recovery plan, stating that, if enacted, it would "provide a significant boost to economic activity." It is time to get our economy back on track. I urge my colleagues to support this important measure.

□ 1945

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SHERMAN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### THE BANK BAILOUT DEBACLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, this evening I would like to have a discussion about what is going on in the American economy, how it is affecting the American people, the decisions that Congress made to make it possible for financial instruments to become so complicated that it furthered speculation in the marketplace, the decision that Congress made to bail out the banks and the impact on our economy, some solutions that may help us dig our way out of this financial mess, and some suggestions for restructuring some of the institutions of our government that would enable it to more effectively serve the public interest.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin with a discussion of a news item which was published today in the New York Times with the headline "Pfizer to buy Wyeth in \$68 billion deal." This deal, according to the Times, would create a pharmaceutical behemoth, the \$68 billion deal. One of the most noteworthy parts of the report indicated that Pfizer's bid is being financed by four banks that received Federal bailout money, Goldman Sachs, JPMorgan Chase, Citigroup, and the Bank of America.

It goes to say that such banks have been criticized for not doing more lending since they received government aid. Needless to say, most consumers will understand that if you see a conglomeration in the pharmaceutical industry, it can only mean higher costs for pharmaceuticals for the American people. But what is interesting is this is being facilitated with money from the American people, money that went to banks that claimed that they needed the money to survive, but now they are using the money instead to help finance acquisitions.

And they are using the money instead to enable banks to be in a position of making direct investments in individual banks if they want to, but more specifically, banks have taken a

no-strings-attached approach to the bailout which has enabled them to possibly pay down their debt, acquire other businesses, or make investments for their future.

So the taxpayers of the United States, when we look around this country, they are suffering in so many ways, their jobs are at risk, their homes are at risk, their pensions are at risk, are financing a windfall for bankers. The Treasury Secretary said some time ago that the banks should use the money to help struggling homeowners stay in their homes and avoid foreclosure.

But that isn't what has happened. Because whenever the banks went to Treasury, they were essentially told, look there are no strings attached and no conditions attached. We know that in the Cleveland area, one bank took \$7.7 billion from the Treasury and used it to acquire National City Bank which will cost our Cleveland area thousands of jobs. National City was sold at fire sale prices. Their stock was driven down. The kind of financial double dealing and misconduct that went on that made it possible for one corporation to take over another corporation's asset, effectively reducing the value of the stock and the holdings of stockholders and driving a bank out of business that had been in business 162 years and should still be in business today, underscores what has been wrong from the beginning with this approach of the so-called Troubled Asset Relief Program.

At the beginning, it was supposed to be about, and it should have been about, helping people avoid bankruptcy. That is what Congress had anticipated. But instead, what has happened is the banks have seen it as a windfall. The government should have looked at the mortgage-backed securities, taken a controlling interest and helped millions of people stay in their home by loan modification and by writing down the principal, perhaps lowering the interest and extending the terms of payment, the time of payment because after all, it was the meltdown in the subprime mortgage industry that resulted in banks being in so much trouble. So wouldn't it make sense that if you enabled people to pay their mortgages and stay in their homes that it would have a beneficial effect on the banks? But no. What has happened is that homeowners are still struggling to survive all around this country from East Coast to West Coast and looking at mortgage resets that are coming up in 2009 with Alt-A and jumbo mortgages. People are in over their head on their mortgages because of misconduct in the industry and because of changes in the economy. And instead of getting help from their government, the government is helping the banks with a \$700 billion bailout.

Now it would be nice if this would be the end of it. In an article in the Times called "The End of Banking As We Know It," we have this, "it's too soon

to say how much taxpayers' money will be spent trying to rebuild banks hollowed by out by bank's lending practices." Paul Miller, an analyst at Friedman Billings Ramsey thinks that the Nation's financial system needs an additional \$1 trillion in common equity to restore confidence and to get lending. It goes on to say that trillion dollars could come on top of the funds disbursed already through the Troubled Asset Relief Program, which has tapped \$700 billion and on top of President Obama's stimulus plan clocking in at \$825 billion. So, hold on to your hat, Mr. and Mrs. America, because the banks are not done with this Congress yet. They are going to be looking for even more money. And they are not talking about saving homes. They are not talking about saving jobs. They are using this opportunity to game the system.

Tom Friedman, in another article in the Times headlined, "Time for Shock Therapy," it's all about the banks, folks, quotes David Smick, author of "The World is Curved," who says that the bankers are sitting on mountains of cash, including our bailout money, because they know their true balance sheets are a disaster, far worse than publicly stated. No one trusts the banks. And even the bankers don't trust each other. Smick goes on to say that bringing clarity to bank balance sheets is the first step to fixing America's bank lending problem. Friedman writes that only after we bring full transparency to bank balance sheets will we see private capital buying into banks again at scale.

He quotes Stephen Eisman, a portfolio manager and banking manager at FrontPoint Partners "the loss of confidence is just a symptom of bad credit and overleverage. The banks are not lending because they know their balance sheets are loaded with future losses and they don't have enough capital." Friedman concludes by saying that a stimulus package that does not also unclog the arteries of our banking system will never stimulate sufficiently.

So there is a synergistic relationship between the way we are handling this situation on Wall Street and the way that we hope to get the American economy moving again with a fiscal stimulus. But we cannot keep giving away money to the banks and ignore the underlying crisis of failure to help Americans save their homes. There could be 10 million homes in jeopardy, and people are will say, well, look, if somebody didn't do the right job in financing their homes and didn't pay enough attention to what they needed to do to protect themselves financially, they're on their own. Well, wait a minute. This is affecting all Americans. There are neighborhoods in Cleveland where the values of property have dropped 25, 30 percent because of foreclosures in the neighborhood. Don't think for a moment that just because you haven't been foreclosed that you aren't paying

a price with this foreclosure crisis because the value of your property is going down. All over America this is happening. And what does this mean? It means that there is a massive shift of wealth in this country going on. It's going on for the American taxpayers. It's going on for the American homeowners. And it's going right to the top, right to the top. The banks are cashing in. Forget moral hazard. It doesn't matter any more if someone doesn't do business in the right way. We're bailing them out. Today we see stories about nationalizing banks. That is not a proper function of the government, to run banks. And yet, we've already moved down that path. It's anti-democratic. It could lead to fascism. We have to think about the implications of what is happening in our economy.

We've seen the speculation driving this economy. An economy built on gambling and not real production is not sustainable. That, of course, means that moving to the financial sector as a source of profits is an unsustainable Ponzi scheme. It is based on the arrogant belief of those who know the math of the so-called Black-Scholes model, which is a mathematical model for pricing options and now nearly every income stream can never be wrong. But they were. And the result is not nice to see: Massive gambling debts that their formula said were nearly impossible and are truly impossible to pay without taking from those at the bottom of the economic pyramid. Remember, this time in our national experience is all about taking wealth from the great mass of the American people, from your paychecks, your wallets, your purses and pocketbooks and just moving it right to the top.

The reason for the breakdown in the financial system is not complex. Because we no longer make stuff for a profit, we have to leverage up financial instruments, sometimes 30 to 40 times to one to get good returns. It is a game for the truly arrogant. It is another example of the "smartest guys in the room" like Enron. No one, unfortunately, is that smart or that perfect. And the bite of leverage, when the investment, homes, in this case, goes south, is terrible to behold. When all sectors are included, the total debt as a percentage of gross domestic product grew 151 percent in 1959 to an astronomical 373 percent in 2007.

This is a discussion that comes from an article written by John Bellamy Foster and Fred Magdoff in the December "Monthly Review" called the "Financial Implosion and Stagnation: Back to the Real Economy."

So we are in a debt-based economy. We are creating more and more debt. The world of financial socialism, in which corporations join with the government to strip the remaining assets of the middle class, is upon us. Stark economic and political decisions offer a truly explosive political scenario over the next several years. The redistribution of wealth upwards has surged over

the last 28 years and will not be readily accepted by those at the bottom forced to accept structural adjustments to their lives while the plutocrats luxuriate.

In the United States, the top 1 percent of wealth holders in 2001 together own more than twice as much as the bottom 80 percent of the population. I want to repeat that. The top 1 percent of wealth holders in 2001 together own more than twice as much as the bottom 80 percent of the population. What does that say about a democracy? If this were measured simply in terms of financial wealth, that is, excluding equity and owner occupied housing, the top 1 percent own more than four times the bottom 80 percent. And this, again, is in the Foster and Magdoff article.

From my own research based on the Congressional Research Service, the following exponential growth of wealth at the top is illustrative of the problem of our faltering consumer economy. The income from wealth, and that is interest, dividends, rent and capital gains, between 1979 and 2003 for the top 1 percent of the population grew from 37.8 percent of the total pie to 57.5 percent in that 24-year time period. The wealth of America is accelerating to the top. We are in a cycle of debt deflation in which financial institutions and individuals see they must unwind, deleverage, their 20 to 41 bets, the bail-out money was doomed to fail, because as Keynes said, it would be hoarded. The vicious cycle is that as banks and others sell their assets to reduce their exposure to the bursting asset bubble, the value of those assets drop. The result is the falling price of a deflationary cycle.

Now, the pros who put us in this situation don't have any idea, or they refuse to examine the evidence, that massive debt imposed on families and society is the problem. Debt is the problem here. As wages were stagnant, the Fed intentionally created the housing bubble to lure people on to debt treadmills to keep the economy afloat. Americans own less and less of their homes. And the belief that asset inflation separate from wages is real wealth is ludicrous.

Our economy has hit a massive debt iceberg. And what is the solution of the navigators who took us there? Steer north into greater ice floes. Using capital for casino games and not to increase production is a totally misguided policy. I'm calling for a manufacturing and industrial policy, an American manufacturing policy, which says that the maintenance of steel, automotive, aerospace and shipping is vital to our national economic security and it is vital to our ability to defend our Nation.

If you look at Iceland, whose government is falling right now, and you look at Russia and the Baltic States, you get some idea of what these neo liberal economic policies would do to this country. The total asset of Iceland's banks grew from 96 percent of its gross

domestic product at the end of 2000 to nine times its gross domestic product in 2006. And as Magdoff, et al., states, now Icelandic taxpayers, who are not responsible for these actions, are being asked to carry the burden of overseas speculative debts of their banks resulting in a drastic decline in a standard of living. And it's exactly what we're looking at in this country, unless we change directions, unless we stop bailing out the banks, and unless we take a new direction in how we manage our economy.

We know that the private sector is in a downward spiral that feeds on itself. Consumers and businesses are spending a lot less on goods and services. As a result, workers at businesses are producing fewer goods and services. That means that fewer workers are actually working and fewer businesses are working at their potential. Consumers are spending less because they have lower incomes. Businesses are not spending money on investments and expansion because no short-term profits can be seen.

There is one unique feature of this recession that we need to keep in mind. Consumers are not just out of work and with a lower income but they are also highly indebted thanks to the subprime mortgage lending, the proliferation of credit cards, and payday lending. That is important to keep in mind because it will affect consumers' behavior when they receive money, either from the government as a rebate or at work. They use a lot of whatever they get to pay down the debt.

I would like to ask the Speaker how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 40 minutes remaining.

Mr. KUCINICH. Let's look at the current unemployment situation because we should not have any discussions in this Congress without talking about what is essential to the American people, and that is jobs. Unemployment in December rose to 7.2 percent. 524,000 full-time jobs were lost. December was the 12th straight month of job losses. Approximately 2.6 million jobs were lost in 2008.

Let's get beneath the statistics here. Think of what happens when a mother or father comes home and says, I'm out of work. Think of the impact that has on a family, especially, as most Americans, they are living paycheck to paycheck. What does it mean? It means a whole way of life changes. Suddenly the home is in jeopardy because the mortgage can't be paid. Suddenly a child's college education is in jeopardy. Health care benefits suddenly become threatened. Pensions end up in trouble. Credit card debt cannot be paid. Tensions begin to build inside homes. We have to remember how this is affecting American families, the instability that comes about as a result of unemployment. We have to be in touch with the American family and how it is suffering right now, not only from the real loss of jobs, but from the insta-

bility of the potential of losing a job from cuts in wages and cuts in benefits. And of course there are 8 million people who are working part-time when they want to be working full-time. This is about 13.5 percent of the American workforce. More than one in eight workers in the United States, over 21 million people, now are either unemployed or underemployed. In December, over 40 percent of unemployed workers had been out of a job for at least 3 months. And 23 percent had been out of a job for at least 6 months.

□ 2000

This job situation cuts across all sectors. Manufacturing lost 791,000 jobs. Construction job losses reached 899,000. Job losses in professional and business services totaled 490,000. And there were 522,000 job losses in retail trade.

You only need to think about the past holiday season. There weren't as many employees in those retail establishments, and people weren't buying as much. They were just looking.

We need a comprehensive and an ambitious response that addresses every sector of the economy and cuts to the epicenter of the financial crisis that brought us to this point.

In my own State of Ohio, the unemployment rate hit a 22-year high last month, 7.8 percent. And 2 weeks ago, so many Ohioans attempted to file unemployment claims that the Website crashed. The phone lines were also down because they couldn't handle the call volume, over 10 times the normal call volume.

Later this week we are going to consider the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. And that, of course, is only a beginning.

I want to applaud President Obama, Speaker PELOSI, Chairman OBEY, and everyone who has worked to craft a package that essentially is going to be a downpayment on economic recovery. But we have to remember it is only that.

The Federal Government must spend. The government cannot, as in recessions past, rely on the American consumer to spend the money out of a downturn. Americans have no cash to spend and no credit to access. The government must be the employer of last resort and the spender of last resort, and the government must spend enough to create demand for the goods and services of a full employment economy.

America has come a distance since the era of Ronald Reagan who saw government as the problem. Today in 2009, government is not part of the problem, government is the only solution. And if you don't believe me, ask those banks who are getting \$700 billion and want another trillion; from whom, the government.

Businesses will respond by spending on investments to meet the demand, and consumers will be earning money as workers, making the goods and services the government is paying for.

Now we need a broad-based response to the unemployment situation. Former Secretary of Labor Robert Rice advocates at least temporarily lifting the 60-month limit on welfare benefits. As the nature of work changes, we must modernize the safety nets that assist individuals and families in time of distress.

This should include expanding funding and access to Food Stamps, women, infants and children's benefits, as well as food banks and emergency food providers. There is no reason for us to go back to those images of the Depression where people were waiting in bread and food lines trying to survive.

The stimulus bill increases social safety net spending, \$43 billion for increased unemployment benefits and job training. But you can't train people for jobs that don't exist. There is \$20 billion to increase Food Stamp benefits, \$200 million for senior nutrition services, \$726 million for after-school meals, \$150 million for food bank assistance, and \$1 billion for community services block grants, but it is just the beginning.

We must also modernize the way we provide unemployment benefits and measure the ranks of the unemployment because, as we know, many people are not even measured in the unemployment statistics. Most States have requirements that preclude many people who are losing their jobs from receiving benefits. For example, a person working two part time jobs who loses both those jobs would be ineligible for benefits in a State that requires dislocation from full-time work.

All levels of government should temporarily relax the rules for providing unemployment benefits. We must make sure that all dislocated workers, full time, part-time, contract workers, Congress needs to make sure that such workers are not falling through the cracks.

Let's speak about housing. An \$8 billion housing bubble has burst. That is home equity. That will never return in the lifetimes of American homeowners.

In some areas in Cleveland, my community, housing prices have deflated by as much as 75 percent. Some neighborhoods in my community in Cleveland still average two foreclosures a day. Foreclosure filings increased 303,000 in December, a 17 percent increase from November. Foreclosures have increased a staggering 41 percent in the last year. Almost every economist and policymaker acknowledges that subprime mortgages initiated a foreclosure epidemic that is the epicenter of our current financial crisis. The American economy will not begin to recover unless we address this core problem of foreclosure. We must begin with a massive campaign of mortgage principal modifications to make loans available to homeowners. This would solve the problem of the borrower as well as the investor. The homeowner can afford to stay in his or her home, and the investment stabilizes and re-

gains its potential to return a profit, albeit at a smaller margin.

Mr. Speaker, when I grew up in Cleveland, my parents didn't own a home. We were renters. And as our family grew from one to seven children, we kept moving. Some people will remember that in the 1950s, there were ads in newspapers that said one child only, two children, and if you had more, you were out of luck if you were a renter.

□ 2015

By the time I was 17, we lived in 21 different places, including a couple cars. I can understand what it's like for Americans who are worried about where they're going to live, about parents who are worried about having a shelter over their children's head. I can understand that. I can tell you that when I bought my first home, a home that I still live in, I bought it in 1971, it was one of the proudest days of my life. Think of how many Americans had that same feeling, and now we see that there's no hope for them. We have to change that.

It's said that the stimulus package could include anywhere from \$50 to \$100 billion. But unless we direct loan modification in the language of the legislation, there's no guarantee that when Treasury hands that money over to the banks there's going to be any relief at all for the American people.

Now, in the last 30 minutes I've talked about the banks and the bailout, I've talked about the plight of the American people, unemployment, housing foreclosures. I want to speak about health care as a stimulus.

Today, this day, H.R. 676, the Expanded and Improved Medicare for All Act was reintroduced. Medicare for All, H.R. 676, a bill that is the Conyers bill, a bill that I helped to write with John Conyers, is one of the best ways we can help boost our economy. It eliminates billions of dollars in bureaucratic waste that are being funded by everyone who receives health care and allows money to be channeled into the economy. In fact, it saves so much money that it will be able to cover everyone in the U.S. for all medically necessary services.

We pay almost twice as much for health per person than the average of other industrialized nations, yet the World Health Organization ranks our health care system 37 in the world. The situation is worsening as costs continue to increase, employers continue to scale back coverage, and the number of uninsured—now 46 million—continues to rise.

Four out of five, 82 percent, of the uninsured are in working families. Think about it. You are working and you still can't afford health insurance. What's happened in America? How many people are not getting the care they need because they can't afford to pay their hospital bills, in this, a country where by the end of this year I predict we will have given \$1.7 trillion to the banks.

The inefficiency of privately administered health care is especially stark. Between 1970 and 1998, total health care employment in the United States grew 149 percent while the number of managers in health care grew 2,348 percent. Managed care has failed to control costs and reduce the number of uninsured and underinsured. Employer-based insurance is failing and dragging down American businesses. Insurance companies make record profits. How? They make money by not providing health care. What a business.

We need to control costs by addressing the real inefficiencies, not by continuing to subsidize the financially unsustainable insurance industry. And we know exactly how to do it. Traditional Medicare enjoys consistently higher satisfaction ratings than private insurance. Its overhead costs are about 3 percent compared to overhead costs of private health plans, which average about 31 percent. Medicare's rates of cost increase have been significantly lower than private insurance plans. We need such a time-tested, rock-solid model like Medicare to address our health care crisis. In fact, by addressing the inefficiencies, we would bring everyone in the U.S. under Medicare and they would pay no premium, no deductible and no copayments.

So, how would H.R. 676 boost our economy, since that is the question of the moment? First, it would lower out-of-pocket costs for a vast majority of Americans by well over \$1,000, enabling them to spend that money. And of course it would provide insurance for the 47 million Americans who currently are completely without insurance. But it would also eliminate about half of all bankruptcies in the United States by addressing the enormous problem of the underinsured. Let me explain.

About half of all bankruptcies, Mr. Speaker, in the United States are related to medical bills. Of those who are bankrupted by medical bills, three-quarters had some kind of insurance before they got sick. I cannot stress enough the importance of this statistic; half of all bankruptcies in the U.S. related to medical bills. Of those who were bankrupted, three-quarters had some kind of insurance before they got sick. Three-quarters of all medical bankruptcies happened to people who already had insurance. It tells us in very stark terms that too many Americans think they're getting full health insurance when in reality they're getting only partial health insurance.

Health insurance is full of holes. Insurance companies make money by denying care. In this case, that means selling plans that have limited coverage, and you don't find that out until you actually need it. In other words, you have great health care unless you get sick. But under H.R. 676, there are no more out-of-pocket costs and everyone is covered for all medically necessary services. That means that at least half of all bankruptcies are history. Imagine what families could do

with the money when they don't have to worry about climbing out of bankruptcy.

Families would save money in a host of other ways as well; for example, car insurance rates would go down because there are no more disputes over who pays for health care. Everyone would already have health care. The same goes for medical malpractice. Under H.R. 676, not only will doctors drastically reduce the amount of defensive medicine they practice in order to avoid lawsuit exposure, but they will also pay so much less for medical malpractice insurance. Why? Because everyone's covered and there is no need to go to court over who will pay doctor bills.

H.R. 676 would provide immediate and substantial relief for American businesses large and small. American businesses currently bear the burden of the vast inefficiencies in our health care system because they provide health care to most Americans lucky enough to have it. But all other industrialized countries have universal health care that costs less. The result is that our businesses are losing competitive advantage. Ontario now makes more cars than Detroit. Canadian GM, Ford and Daimler Chrysler signed a letter in support of their single-payer health care system specifically because of the competitive advantage it gives them.

These are only some of the reasons that H.R. 676 now has a national movement behind it. It's been endorsed by 479 union organizations in 49 States, including 118 Central Labor Councils and Area Labor Federations, 39 State AFL-CIOs, 14,000 physicians and thousands of nurses. The deans of Harvard and Stanford medical schools, the former editor of the *New England Journal of Medicine*, two former Surgeons General now support national health insurance. Nobel Prize winning economist supports a single-payer system like H.R. 676. Public surveys consistently place support for Medicare for All approach to health care at about 50 percent.

The legislature in the State of California has twice passed a single-payer health care plan. States, counties and municipalities all over the country have endorsed the bill. In the last Congress, the bill had 93 cosponsors.

We have to regard health care as an opportunity for creating not just a stimulus, but part of a long-term restructuring of the American economy since about 16 percent of our gross domestic product deals with health care. It's a great opportunity for us.

It's a great opportunity to look at a universal prekindergarten program, which would, in the long term, pay for itself because it would be an investment in our youngest citizens—children ages three, four and five—that would enable them to be able to have access to full-time day care, would enable their parents, who are now paying a premium if they're able to afford childcare, would enable them to be able

to have solid childcare for their child and not have to pay the premium that in many cases is choking family budgets.

Last week, I introduced legislation to accomplish that. It has broad-based support among children's advocates. The number of the bill is easy to remember, it's H.R. 555—picture three children's hands with their stamp on the legislation. This is a bill which also can contribute to changing the pyramid which is causing wealth to accelerate to the top and enabling more middle class taxpayers to have some benefits in this economy, and enabling stabilization of family income.

The Congress is going to have to take quick action to protect the savings and pensions of Americans from the cascading failure of the entire financial system. It's good that we increase the kind of protection that people needed in their deposits, that's a good step in the right direction. But even with the action that we've taken, there is no guarantee that our country is not headed into the worst economic slowdown since 1933. The bailout is having little or no impact on the looming municipal bond meltdown and a host of other financial crises coming from the slowdown in tax receipts and consumer spending.

The hemorrhaging brought about by our addiction to debt is far too great for simple solutions. The growth of our private and public debt from \$10.5 to \$43 trillion during Alan Greenspan's tenure from 1987 to 2006 gives us some sense of the real magnitude of the problem. But there is a danger in acting rationally with recognizing what we're doing. And I will say that I think that Congress acted rationally in helping to facilitate a \$700 billion bailout without putting any restraint on the banks, enabling banks to have, as the *New York Times* reported a Sunday ago, "a blank check," use the money any way they want. Taxpayer money should not be expended to line the pockets of those who drove the economy into a ditch nor provide them with new wheels to drive off the road in another month or two. Money must not be frittered away to guarantee the shareholders of financial institutions when the American family and pensions may well need direct hope in the immediate future.

I believe in capitalism and market discipline. And I think that we need to look at the direction that we take in this country. We have to have regulatory and supervisory reform. If you look at the Fed, the Fed knew what was happening with these banks and the subprime meltdown that was coming, but yet we saw Alan Greenspan pretend that he didn't have a clue. What's happened is that the Fed didn't do its job. Now, under those circumstances, would you want the Fed to have greater power? Remember, the Fed is not run by the Federal Government; it's no more Federal than Federal Express. It is a collection of pri-

vate bankers that was established in 1913 by the Federal Reserve Act.

We have to get control of this Federal Reserve. And we have to make sure that the government and the Treasury Department and the Securities Exchange Commission, with the Treasury Department, develops the regulatory and supervisory reform that will match the changes that were created in the Financial Modernization Act of 1999 that took down the Glass-Steagall protections of 1933.

□ 2030

Under Franklin Roosevelt we know that Glass-Steagall prohibited intermingling of commercial banks with investment banks, but those protections were eroded. Some at the time, and I was one of those, who argued against the Financial Services Modernization Act by saying we'd end up with lack of transparency, conflicts of interest, mega-banks, every one of us who voted against it, we know we were right, but it's little comfort to the American taxpayers who are being stuck with this \$700 billion and maybe another trillion dollar debt as a result of the Ponzi scheme that was enabled by the Financial Services Modernization Act. The same people that took us into that situation may be in a position to do it to us again, but someone has to stand up for the American taxpayers and say stop it. Stop these bailouts.

Federal regulation was lax, and the Federal Government has to stand up for the American people as regulators. Taxpayer money must end up helping to facilitate credit flowing, but that's going to be up to the Treasury to take that responsibility. American pensions must be saved. The best way to do that is to buy the companies at a deep discount and then prop up the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation. Wasting hundreds of billions by propping up financial assets of well-to-do Americans might be acceptable in less troublesome times; however, at the present time, precious money can't be frittered away bailing out those with plenty of discretionary income. As David Cay Johnston points out in "Perfectly Legal," the top 13,400 families in our country have more yearly income than the bottom 96 million Americans.

The financial sector has built an economic system that rewards gamblers with lower tax rates and insurance while subjecting the American family to growing job insecurity, deteriorating wages, evaporating savings, vanishing pensions, disappearing health care.

This isn't a matter of blaming another political party, by the way. This has been a bipartisan debacle. The obscenity of hedge fund managers paying a tax rate of about 15 percent for most of a billion plus in income while some who clean our bedpans pay a higher tax rate must be recognized for what it is: greed and a repudiation of the merit of hard work.

But the middle class has one thing that is growing, and that's debt. More

and more Americans have been maneuvered onto debt treadmills by the “banksters,” as President Franklin Roosevelt called them. Greed evolved into a civic virtue and not a cardinal sin until the market collapsed.

But we could take a new direction, and that direction, Mr. Speaker, must include monetary reform. As Stephen Zarlenga writes, the bulk of our money supply is not created by our government but by private banks when they make loans. Through the Fed’s fractional reserve process, the system creates purchasing media when banks make loans into checking accounts. So most of our money is issued as interest-bearing debt.

Under the Constitution, Article 1, Section 8, our government has the sovereign power to issue money and spend it into circulation to promote the general welfare through the creation and repair of infrastructure, including human infrastructure: health and education.

It’s no secret that our Nation’s infrastructure is an unprecedented need of upkeep, repair, and replacement. It would take more than \$1.6 trillion to bring our country’s roadways up to speed. The Department of Education found that we need \$127 billion to bring schools nationwide into adequate conditions. A study by the Water Infrastructure Network found that it would take \$1.3 trillion over 20 years to build, operate, and maintain needed drinking water and wastewater facilities.

It’s rapidly becoming cliché that crisis and opportunity are synonymous. We can turn these difficult times into an opportunity by creating millions of new jobs in infrastructure projects. The U.S. Conference of Mayors released a report last month that found a \$73 billion investment in infrastructure would yield about 850,000 jobs in the next 2 years, would go a long way to meeting our infrastructure needs.

A good start would be to invest in the maintenance and repair of roads, bridges, tunnels that are in greatest need. In particular, we should invest in a section in the TEA-LU called MEGA Projects. It was designed to fund projects that cost \$500 million or more and have some national significance. These projects are not necessarily ready to go today. States could compete to build special projects. States could even team up together on high-speed rail or build new bridges. A perfect example is the need for a new inner belt bridge in Cleveland.

Now, infrastructure has to be part of and it is part of our stimulus package, but we have to go far beyond what we have in this first stimulus package. We have short-term fixes, which a stimulus is, but we have to look at long-term restructuring in order to get to where we want to go, which is financial stability for all Americans. And so long term, we’re looking at monetary reform. Monetary reform is achieved in three parts which must be enacted together for it to work.

We are at a time in our country’s history where the immediate response has been to pour money into the banks who are hoarding it, who are not lending it, who are using it for other acquisitions or helping to fuel other purchases, and we have an economy that is stagnating. But it’s time that we asked about some deeper structural questions, about the nature of our monetary system, and now is the perfect time to begin that discussion.

So once again I want to bring this before the Congress because if we’re looking at economic stimulus alone, down the road we may ask why that didn’t work because if we have a monetary system that still exists to accelerate the wealth to the top, God forbid under the nationalization of banks, we are all going to wonder what happened to the money. You achieve monetary reform in three parts. Any one of them or two alone won’t do it and could actually harm the monetary system. Because of this monetary crisis, we have an opportunity here, and I want to make these suggestions:

First, instead of giving the Federal Reserve even greater power, private bankers, giving them greater power, we should incorporate the Federal Reserve into the U.S. Treasury where all new money could be created by government as money, not interest-bearing debt, and spent into circulation to promote the general welfare. The monetary system would be monitored to be neither inflationary nor deflationary.

Second, halt the banks’ privilege to create money by ending the fractional reserve system. I mean banks essentially create money out of nothing. We take out a loan, they take that money, and then they leverage it perhaps nine times or more through a system of fractional reserve. Past monetized private credit would be converted into U.S. Government money. Banks act as intermediaries accepting savings deposits and lending them out to borrowers. They would continue to do what people think they do now under this new approach. And what would the government do? Well, we wouldn’t have to borrow money from the banks and then own the banks money to continue to finance the needs of this country. We could instead spend money into circulation on infrastructure, including the crucial human infrastructure of education and health care needed for a growing society.

Now, as Zarlenga points out, the false specter of inflation is usually raised against suggestions that our government fulfill its responsibility to furnish the money supply for the Nation. He says that’s a knee-jerk reaction, the result of decades, even centuries, of propaganda against government because when one actually examines the monetary record, it becomes clear that government has a better record of issuing and controlling money than the private issuers have.

We are at a moment of change in this country. It’s a change that millions of

Americans celebrated last week. I had the opportunity to join Members of Congress and watch that incredible moment of the inauguration. We saw millions of people coming together in celebration of this great Nation. And whether we are Democrats, Republicans, or independents, we could not help but be moved by that moment, not just the transfer of power but a reaffirmation of who we are as a Nation. A government of the people, by the people, and for the people, as Lincoln stated at Gettysburg. A government which has the dream to keep unfolding to adapt to an undreamed of future. We are at a moment of crisis, but that crisis has created new opportunities. It’s an opportunity for us to reset the pointer of where we go as a Nation and try to get control of our Nation again.

We have lost a lot of control with the \$700 billion bailout to the banks. We will lose even more control if we give the banks another trillion dollars. We will lose even more control if we permit the Fed to have total control over supervising corporate conduct in the United States.

But if we take a new direction, if we see government having the capability to prime the pump of the economy; if we see government having the capability to create jobs where the private sector isn’t creating jobs; if we see government having the capability of creating health care, which will be a tremendous help to the private sector, which is laboring right now under tremendous costs for health care; if we see government creating possibilities to invest in technology at NASA and in other areas of our Nation where we can help to serve as the incubators for investment in the private sector, we don’t even know the kind of growth that we are capable of, by moving towards a works green administration, towards wind and solar and micro technologies that would enable us to move in a new era of energy and a new era of cleaning up our environment. There is a role to work together with the private sector, but we’re at a moment where the government has to take the initiative.

And it’s very clear. I don’t want the government running the banks. I would like to see the government take control of the monetary supply and system. I don’t want the government bailing out the banks. I want capitalism to have a fair chance to succeed or not. We have a moment where we could come together, Democrats and Republicans alike. So as we get ready to address, as we will, this American Recovery Act, we need to look at how we cannot just recover as a Nation but how we can begin anew to restore our country to fiscal integrity, restore the American family to health, restore the American family to prosperity, and once again restore people’s faith in their government.

Mr. Speaker, I thank all those who have listened for this past hour.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 181, LILLY LEDBETTER FAIR PAY ACT OF 2009

Ms. SLAUGHTER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 111-5) on the resolution (H. Res. 87) providing for consideration of the Senate bill (S. 181) to amend title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967, and to modify the operation of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 and the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, to clarify that a discriminatory compensation decision or other practice that is unlawful under such Acts occurs each time compensation is paid pursuant to the discriminatory compensation decision or other practice, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

□ 2045

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1, AMERICAN RECOVERY AND REINVESTMENT ACT OF 2009

Ms. SLAUGHTER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 111-6) on the resolution (H. Res. 88) providing for 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, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

HEALTH CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I thought I would come to the House floor and talk a little bit about health care, because for better or for worse, this Congress is likely to be remembered for some time as the Congress that did tackle health care. And the question that's on everyone's mind is will we help or will we make things worse?

Now, 2 weeks ago Congress was sworn in for the 111th Congress, we took to the floor of the House and we passed, under what is called suspension of the rules, we passed an expansion of the State Children's Health Insurance Program. Now, passing under a suspension of the rules is a special case—usually that's reserved for noncontroversial items—but anyone who followed the activities of the 110th Congress knows that this bill was far from noncontroversial. In fact, it had several provisions that created a good deal of

controversy in the fall of 2007 and on into the spring of 2008.

But we passed the bill under suspension of the rules because the Democratic leadership told us we didn't need to debate the bill any more because we had worked on it in the Congress before. But a lot of things were different in this bill, things we hadn't talked about in previous Congresses.

And, in fact, there are 54 new Members of Congress, that means that greater than 12 percent of the Congress is new this year. That means that between 30 and 40 million Americans did not have representation in Congress when that bill was discussed in the 110th Congress, and their representatives were effectively cut out of the process.

But when it comes to constructing a health care plan for America's children, I think it's important for us to do it right. Remember that the State Children's Health Insurance Program was started in 1997 by a then Republican Congress, it was authorized for 10 years. Everyone who was sworn in the last Congress knew that prior to September 30 of 2007 we would have to reauthorize the bill.

What did we do? We waited till the last minute, had a big fight, had to extend it. The President vetoed it, it came back, the veto was sustained, fought some more. Sent it back down to the President, he vetoed it, sent it back, the veto was again sustained. And then we reauthorized the continuation of the State Children's Health Insurance Program for 18 months, bringing us to the end of March of this year. So, to their credit, the majority leadership, the Democratic leadership of the House did not wait till the last minute as they did 2 years ago, but they tackled it the first week of the session but, again, tackled it in an odd way. We didn't have a single hearing.

We didn't have what's called a markup in either subcommittee or full committee on the Committee of Energy and Commerce or the Committee on Ways and Means. A markup is where you go through a draft of the bill and see if there are any improvements that either side can make. We went through a 12½ hour markup last Thursday night on this so-called stimulus bill.

I am not sure we got a great amount of work done in that 12½ hours but, nevertheless, the minority and the majority, members on the committee who sit way down on the front who lack seniority were able to have their voices heard as this legislation worked its way through the committee, but not so with the State Children's Health Insurance Program. So I guess the question I would have, and this is my fourth term, perhaps I should be getting used to such things at this point, but I still find them odd.

If the Members on the Democratic side are so confident in their ability to legislate and so confident on the merits of their legislation, why seek to stifle the opposition? What are you afraid of?

Bring the bill to committee. Let's have a hearing or two, let's have a markup. Let's bring it to the Rules Committee, let's bring it to the floor like we do with bills all the time.

What is the reason to hide behind a suspension of the rules of this very, very important legislation. And, again, I would stress, 54 Members of Congress here in the 111th Congress were not present in the last Congress. So it's all well and good to say, oh, it's old stuff, we have debated it before, we have worked it out before, it's just a rehash of something that has gone on previously. Even if that were true, and it's not, but even if it were true, Mr. Speaker, those 54 new Members didn't have an opportunity to weigh in one way or the other, and they may have had some good ideas.

That's why we have elections every 2 years. That's why there is turnover in this Congress, because new Americans sign up to offer themselves in service of their country. They go through the rigors of an election, they are elected. They come to this Congress, they are full of good ideas, why turn them out?

Why say "no," what you are bringing to this Congress is unimportant because we talked about it last year. We talked about it the year before. You couldn't possibly have anything to add to this near-perfect bill that was vetoed twice by the previous President.

Well, lack of input into the bill has led to a number of problems in the current bill. The bill was passed by the House. It has gone over to the Senate. The Senate is taking it under consideration at some point. We will likely get it back, whether it's an identical bill to what we sent over there, or whether it will have to come back to a conference committee remains to be seen. But, nevertheless, the bill has gone from the House over to the Senate and awaits its fate over in the Senate.

One of the things that was most disappointing about this legislation, remember that this is the State Children's Health Insurance Program to enroll children of families who earn at or below 200 percent of the Federal poverty level. In round numbers, that's about families of four who earn around \$41,000 to \$42,000 a year. So those are the families, the children of those families are the ones that would be eligible for coverage.

But there are a number of children in those families that are eligible for coverage that are not covered, about 800,000. And wouldn't it be reasonable to take the steps to cover those children first before we expand coverage to children in higher income brackets. Many of us thought so 2 years ago, a year ago. Many of us still feel that way today, but this was a concept that was not allowed to be debated on the floor of the House.

Oddly, and I don't know that I have ever seen legislation quite crafted in this way, we picked the ending numbers, and then we weren't going to build the legislation around it. This

bill had to cover 10 million children, we heard it several times from the Speaker of the House on the various Sunday shows, she wanted 10 million children covered under this bill, and she wanted to spend \$35 billion.

Regardless, instead of the policy informing the numbers, the numbers dictated the policy in this case. The problem is, under their own Congressional Budget Office estimate, the only way to get to 10 million children to be covered under the State Children's Health Insurance Program was to displace 2 million children off of private coverage and put them on to State programs. You might wonder, well, what's the problem with that, one insurance is just as good as the next.

But talk to your pediatrician in practice in your town. I don't mean your academic pediatrician at the medical center, at the big medical school in the big metropolitan area, I mean your pediatrician on the street corner, your pediatrician who works in your community. Find out if the State Children's Health Insurance Program reimburses at the same rate as, oh, I don't know, Mr. Speaker, Cigna, Aetna, United, regardless of the private insurance company, may differ some from community to community.

But I know in my home State of Texas numbers are vastly different. The State Children's Health Insurance Program reimburses at about a 50 cents on the dollar rate compared to private health insurance.

That's a significant change for the practicing pediatrician, because pediatricians, after all, function very close to the margin every month. They don't have a lot of excess in their cash flow every month.

So the effect of displacing 2 million children and essentially cutting the reimbursement rates for 2 million children is, in fact, one big significance, to say nothing of the fact that now the child is on a different insurance than the parent, and that creates some difficulties with just getting care when the time comes to get care.

Now, the other thing this bill did, which I am really questioning whether it was a good idea, it weakened the requirements to verify citizenship. There is a concept known as "at a station," that is simply a test for citizenship rather than having to show proof of citizenship, like some type of identification card. So if someone comes into the office where you would enroll in this program and simply say, "I am a U.S. citizen," that is going to be, under the new Democratic bill, that is going to be proof positive that that person is, indeed, eligible to sign up for the insurance.

Now, many Americans, tax-paying Americans—and I know the Secretary of the Treasury doesn't pay taxes—but many Americans do pay taxes, and it's of concern to them. The tax-paying Americans are now going to be paying the freight for people where we are not even sure if they are in this country leg-

ally. If that's what we want to do, we at least need to be honest with the American people and tell them that, say we are not really even going to check as to whether or not these individuals are citizens as they sign up.

And it may be for the best of intentions, we want to be kind to their children, we want to provide them with health insurance. After all, it's cheaper to provide health insurance at the front end than high-dollar care at the far end, but we need at least to be honest with the American people and tell them that's what we have done. But I don't know that that information has actually made it out into middle America. I rather suspect that some people will be upset with that information when they find that out. But the bottom line is, as the bill stands, as it left the House of Representatives, the government will end up covering children that may or may not be United States' citizens.

Another problem with the bill, as written, is the funding is not provided by any sort of stable funding source. Regardless of how you feel about taxes on cigarettes, or so-called sin taxes, excise taxes, regardless of how you feel about that, what happens as a practical matter when you fund a bill like this with a sin tax, with a tax on tobacco.

If you are successful, you drive down smoking rates, which arguably is a good thing, but if you are successful, you reduce the funding available to fund the program, and that would be a bad thing. And this discrepancy is not reconciled within the bill that we passed in the House and sent to the Senate. You have a real problem with the stable funding source, because this funding source, in this bill that we passed out of the floor of the House, funds the bill for 4½ years on a 5-year authorization.

So that means after 4½ years everybody falls off a cliff because there is no more money. What happens then is anyone's guess. I suspect, as Congress always does, it will find someplace else to gather the money, but that means we do take it from some other source.

A twist that actually borders on the bizarre, you wonder what it was even doing in the bill. The State Children's Health Insurance Program bill, as passed the House of Representatives 2 weeks ago, prohibits building physician-owned hospitals or expanding existing physician-owned facilities. Let me just say that again, because it is so incredibly, incredibly bizarre, the bill prohibits building physician-owned hospitals or expanding existing physician-owned facilities.

Now, where else, where else, what other government in the world would prohibit someone from a lawful business practice simply because of the type of professional degree that they have? You go to medical school, you can't build a hospital. What an odd bizarre twist, and what an odd thing to put this in a bill for funding State children's health insurance.

So, State children's health insurance, a good cause. I supported the original concept of SCHIP, I supported the original reauthorization, the 18-month extension we did in December of 2007. I would have supported a reasonable reauthorization in this Congress, but this was anything but reasonable. It was a badly written bill. It badly needed to be improved, and, again, it just begs the question, are we going to be helpful or are we going to foul things up in this Congress, particularly when it comes to health care.

Now, I already alluded to the so-called stimulus bill that came through the House Energy and Commerce Committee last Thursday. We debated the bill. We marked up the bill for a 1½ hour session. It wasn't just health care. We had a lot of stuff thrown in that day. We had energy, we had all kinds of things that were heaped into that bill, but we did debate health care.

Oddly enough, the health care part of that debate, you heard Mr. KUCINICH talk for an hour earlier, he thought that was a pretty important part of the stimulus bill. So, oddly a very important part of the stimulus bill was left right until the very end, and then our time was severely curtailed. We were allowed to talk for 2 minutes instead of the normal 5 on any amendment that we had to this bill.

One of the amendments was proposed by Mr. WHITFIELD of Kentucky. You know, we have a problem in Medicare. Every year we come in and we say, well, you haven't got quite enough money, so we are going to cut doctor reimbursement rates just a little bit this year and a little bit next year, and over time you begin to talk about real money.

□ 2100

So we are facing a reduction in physician reimbursement rates in December of 2009, 11 months from now, and that reduction of reimbursement is going to be 20 percent. Well, what is the practical effect of that? It makes it harder for people to find a doctor who takes Medicare. Mr. WHITFIELD's district is in Kentucky. This has been a particular problem for him. And he had an insightful amendment to try to correct this problem.

Now, you look at the stimulus bill as drawn. We don't have to justify paying for anything in the stimulus bill. It's all money that just comes from somewhere. One of the headlines in one of the magazines up here a few weeks ago was, "It's raining money." Well, if it's raining money and we perennially have a hard time finding the funds to do away with this physician reimbursement nick that we put in every year, why not just repeal that part of the Medicare law? Why not repeal the so-called sustainable growth rate formula just outright. Since cost is no object, it doesn't matter how much money we spend, there is no upper limit. Truth be told, this isn't really money anyway. It's already been reimbursed to the doctors.

But, because of a funny budget gimmick in the Medicare law, we have got to go back for well over a decade, well back to the early nineties, every year, and capture all the savings we should have gotten had we enforced this every year, and tack that on to the end.

So they are not real dollars. They have already been dispensed. In fact, if we were a private company and did this, we'd look just like—well, I won't go into it. But we'd probably have an ankle bracelet if we did this in the real world.

But, nevertheless, we had an opportunity in amending this bill to repeal the sustainable growth rate formula outright, since money is no object, we've got all kinds of money to spend, and the amendment was defeated. Every Democrat in committee that evening voted against repealing the sustainable growth rate formula. No hesitation; no, Can I ask you one more question about that? It was simply a straight "no" to the amendment.

Well, suffice it to say, I was pretty disappointed by that, but undaunted. I thought, Well, maybe, maybe we could offer an amendment—and, in fact, this was an amendment offered by Mr. DINGELL during the Deficit Reduction Act a few years ago. This would have stopped the cuts in the sustainable growth rate formula for 2 years. Not a great heavy lift. Again, we've got plenty of money in this bill. It seems like money is no object because we can buy grass for the Mall. All kinds of things are in this bill. Why not pay for a 2-year moratorium and at least give our physician community a little bit of stability in planning their businesses?

Again, turned down. Every Democrat in committee voted against that amendment. Oddly enough, every Democrat had voted for that amendment when their ranking member, Mr. DINGELL—when they were in the minority when that amendment was proposed by Mr. DINGELL.

Well, we also had some information technology contained within that stimulus bill. Again, you heard Mr. KUCINICH talk about it. Information technology is going to deliver untold promise to the practice of medicine. There will be no problem with money in future because of the benefit brought by information technology. In fact, we are going to give our doctors a bonus for implementing information technology. It's not a big bonus, but it's a bonus nevertheless. This bonus is going to go into effect in 2011.

Wait a minute. It's a stimulus bill. It's 2009. So I offered an amendment to accelerate those bonus payments. Let's start paying them in June of this year, rather than waiting until 2011. Almost everyone in this body hopes that the recession will be done by 2011. So that bonus will have no positive effect on the recession. Let's go ahead and provide that money to the physicians now. Again, that amendment was defeated. Every Democrat in the committee room voted "no."

Mr. BARTON, the ranking member of the committee, also offered one more chance to allow doctors to own hospitals and surgery centers. Again, that amendment was turned down. Every, every Democrat voted "no" on that bill.

Now there are a lot of things we can talk about in health care, and I see I have been joined by some of my friends. Just three quick things I want to mention when we talk about going forward and what perhaps we'd like to see in any sort of health care legislation that is crafted.

There's no question that the way the current tax code is drawn, it does discriminate against individuals who want to own their own insurance. It does load the system to those who earn at the upper end of the income scale. So at some point someone is going to have to look at that inequity and see if there's not a better way to approach it.

But, in the meantime, just keeping it very, very simple, why not allow someone who purchases their own health insurance, why not allow that to be deductible from their income tax? If they are working and they want to purchase their own insurance policy but they don't really make enough money to pay much income tax, provide them a tax credit. Give them a little help.

That is the people that Mr. KUCINICH was talking about. The working poor. Sure enough, let's give them a little bit of help. If we wanted to go one step further and help those who were without health insurance, why not provide—called it a voucher, call it a tax credit, a refundable credit, advanceable tax credit, call it what you will—but why not perhaps incorporate that into the tax code.

These are three relatively simple things we could do tomorrow and vastly have a significant effect on the ability of individuals to have health insurance in this country.

We are going to hear a lot of discussion over, I suspect, over the next months and even years on the whole issue of are we going to have to mandate coverage or do we have some other way to get people the coverage they need without requiring a mandate?

Now some people may recall we faced that same dilemma in the Medicare Part D. In Medicare Part D, many people wanted a mandate you're going to have to buy this prescription drug coverage on Medicare. Dr. Mark McClellan, who was the head of CMS at the time, and Secretary Mike Levitt over at Health and Human Services decided they were going to take a different track, and I am so grateful that they did. They said, We are going to create programs that people actually want rather than forcing them into a program that may be of limited utility for them. So they did.

They spent a great deal of time crafting programs that would actually help people. They had six protected classes of drugs. There had to be at least two options in each protected

class of drugs. Now I have been so far removed, I don't remember them off the top of my head. But it was a brilliant strategy.

As a consequence, as a consequence, the signup for Medicare Part D, the percentage of seniors who now have some type of credible coverage for prescription drugs is in excess of 90 percent and, more importantly, the satisfaction rate is in excess of 90 percent, and perhaps most importantly is it didn't cost nearly what the projections said it would cost initially.

The initial premiums for part D were set by the Center for Medicare and Medicaid services at nearly \$39 per member per month. The actual cost has come in somewhere between \$22 and \$24. It's gone down a little bit in subsequent years, but a significant decrease over what was projected by both the Congressional Budget Office, CMS, and even the Office of Management and the Budget down at the White House.

So a much more reasonable way to approach things rather than telling people what they must do, and that is always hard in a free society. Always hard. My home State of Texas has an individual mandate for automobile insurance. But not everybody signs up for it. In fact, the city of Dallas just started a program where if you're stopped for whatever, taillight busted or ran a red light, and you don't have car insurance, your car is towed. See you later. You're on the street. Find another way to get home.

Well, we really can't do that in health insurance, but that just underscores the difficulty that you have with enforcing a mandate. But, creating programs that people want—remember, over 90 percent of seniors now have credible prescription drug coverage because someone took the pains to find out what people wanted. Find a way to make it cost effective and find a way to make it available to them.

I would stress for both sides of the aisle, when we talk about health care in this Congress, do remember, it's more about cost than coverage. This is about caring for people. Medicine, and I can say this because I spent a lifetime practicing medicine, it is both an art and a science. It's constantly evolving and transforming. We are on the cusp of one of the most transformational times that has been seen in medicine, ever. The human genome has been sequenced. We can know more about people before it happens to them than at any time for any group of healers that never had that kind of power in their hand in the past.

Dr. Elias Zerhouni recently left as the Director of the National Institute Of Health. And he used to talk about medicine. Because of the discoveries of the human genome, medicine is going to become a great deal more personalized. Well, that's a good thing, personalized medicine. We'd all like to see that.

Medicine more personalized, it's going to become more predictive. Because it's more predictive, that leads

to more prediction. But part of the key is going to have to be a lot more participatory. You cannot be a passive actor in tomorrow's health care environment and expect to get the rewards that it is capable of delivering.

But how ironic. As we stand upon in this transformational time in medicine, what is the one thing, what is the one thing that could divert from this path? It's the United States House of Representatives.

We are inherently transactional, not transformational. We take from one group and we give to the next. And we have the power within our hands to derail the transformation that is, even today, taking place in medicine.

For all of the faults of American medicine, for all of the faults of private insurers—and Mr. KUCINICH detailed them in laborious detail—for all of those faults, things are beginning to move in a positive direction.

Information technology, health insurance technology. Do we really need the government to write the code for medical information technology? Wouldn't we be better to just simply set some parameters and get out of the way and let the people who know what they are doing actually do that?

No. We are going to try to write every jot and piddle of the code so that we control it from start to finish. But the reality is across the country, and I know this because I have spent the last 6 months going across the country, people are incorporating electronic medical records into their individual physician practices, into their larger hospitals, into their health maintenance organizations, into their insurance regimes. It's happening already.

Part of the challenge for us is to make sure that all those part interconnect properly and there is proper communication, proper transparency, so the patient who goes to one large multispecialty clinic in the Midwest and transfers to another large multispecialty clinic in the gentleman from Ohio's hometown, that those two clinics, the record from those two clinics can talk to each other.

But that is just a technical problem. That can be solved. And it doesn't require the United States Congress writing the computer code in order to make that happen. In fact, if we'd relax a little bit on our regulatory laws, the so-called Stark laws that were written back in 1981. It's the 21st century, for crying out loud. That's nearly 30 years ago. And we are still putting the same constraints on medical practices today that they were back in 1981.

If we define privacy once and for all, tell people what we mean by privacy, and then not change our minds every 3 months, maybe they could get this done. But there is a transformational change taking place. And you can see it in the insurance companies, the physician practices, hospitals and clinics, Federally-qualified health centers across the land. And the only thing that can stop this evolution in health

care is the United States Congress. So that is kind of a daunting possibility.

When we hear people talk from the floor of this body about all the wonderful and great things that they want to do with health care, we do always need to remember that we have it within our power to allow that transformation to blossom or stop it dead in its tracks.

Now I have been joined by some of my colleagues, and I think we still have about half the time left, so I will yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia, Dr. GINGREY, the other Dr. PHIL.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. I might say the real Dr. PHIL, as a matter of fact. I am certainly pleased tonight to join my colleague, my colleague that I have just joined on the Energy and Commerce Committee in this 111th Congress, and I am proud to have the opportunity to do that, to really have a seat at the table of one of the two main committees of the House that deal with health care, deal with all of Medicare and Medicaid and SCHIP, many of the things that the gentleman from Texas, Dr. BURGESS, Mr. Speaker, had been speaking about during the initial part of this hour.

These are very important things, as he talked about the recent passage of the expanded reauthorization of the SCHIP program, the State Children's Health Insurance Program, what I am referencing, and brought out the fact that there were so many things in that reauthorization and expansion over the next 4½ years that caused Dr. BURGESS and myself and many of my colleagues on this side of the aisle to vote "no" on something that, quite honestly, we really had hoped to be able to vote "yes" because this idea that was originated back in 1997 for this legislation to help families who are not poor enough to be eligible for Medicaid.

□ 2115

And that is at 100 percent of the Federal poverty level, about \$22,000, \$23,000 a year for a family of four. They are not below that level of income, but yet not making enough money to really be able to afford to provide health insurance for their children.

So that is what the original SCHIP bill was all about it. It was authorized for 10 years; it was a \$40 billion bill, as I recall, and it would cover those children whose family income was above 100,000 but under 200,000. So you are talking about \$44,000, \$45,000 a year for a family of four. And, clearly, providing health insurance on that kind of income is a strain, is a struggle, and of course many of those youngsters were not insured.

So the program was good; and of course it expired. It was time for reauthorization. Former President Bush realized that more money needed to be appropriated for this program. There were a significant number of children, maybe as many as 2 million or 3 million, that were not being covered who were in that income category, their

family income, between 100 and 200 percent of the Federal poverty level. And I certainly was in favor of a 25 percent, 30 percent, maybe even a 40 percent expansion of the program to make sure that we reached as close as possible to a 100 percent saturation level, Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues, for those children. I think everyone on both sides of the aisle would agree that that clearly needs to be done. But, unfortunately, for some reason the Democratic majority wanted to expand this program. When you extrapolate from the 4½ year amount of expenditure to a 10-year program, it would be a 100 percent increase in the amount of funding.

The thing about it is that there are things in the bill that allowed the abuses that existed to continue and even worsening that situation. And I want, Mr. Speaker, to mention a couple of those, because I think it is very important for people to understand why a physician member of this body, indeed two right here on the floor this evening, who delivered babies as a profession, brought little children into the world, would vote against this program. And here are some of the reasons:

One of the changes in the reauthorization said that no longer would an immigrant have to have a 5-year waiting period before they would become eligible. Well, indeed, our immigration laws have been on the books for a long time. They get changed periodically. But in the last significant change of immigration law, it basically said: We don't want to have a magnet here in this country and to say to everybody across the world, come one, come all, to come to this country and get on the government dole, the freebies. No, that is not the reason we want immigrants to come to the country. We want them to come, to assimilate into our society, to contribute to our society, to, yes, enjoy the American dream. But that provision says that as a legal person comes into this country, they have to have a sponsor. They have to have someone who is willing to say that that won't happen, that they will not become a ward of the state, certainly not within 5 years. So this reauthorization says: Oh, no, we are going to do away with that. States don't have to abide by that anymore. They can spend SCHIP money on someone that has been here 6 months.

Even worse than that, Mr. Speaker, is the provision in regard to illegals. It says specifically in the language of the bill that no illegal immigrant is eligible; but yet, then it goes on to say that the verification system for an immigrant, whether or not they are here legally, is so watered down that it is almost like a wink and a nod to say, "Come on, it is okay. All you have to do is give a nine-digit number for your Social Security number. You don't have to show a Social Security card, but you have to give a number. Yeah, that is nine digits; you are eligible."

These kind of things were bad enough, but I want to point out something else, Mr. Speaker, and that is a little game that some States I think 13 or 14, and my colleagues are aware of this, a little game that some States have been using to disregard, to actually disregard blocks of income, to say, "Oh, you are making 350 percent of the Federal poverty level. So you wouldn't normally be eligible, but we are just going to simply not count that money that your parents have earned above 200 percent. We are not going to count that. We are just going to simply disregard it." And they are getting away with that. And so in some States there are indeed, and it will continue, that children of families making up to 350 percent of the Federal poverty level, I think we are talking now about \$80,000 a year for a family of four, where they can indeed afford to pay for private health insurance for their children, and they are insured in many instances. So naturally, if they get an opportunity like this, a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to drop that private coverage and get on the freebie government trough, who wouldn't? Well, I wouldn't. But a lot of people would and a lot of people did and do.

So I had an amendment, a very straightforward amendment that said we are going to end the shenanigans of income disregard both for the Medicaid program and for the SCHIP program.

Why would I want to do that, Mr. Speaker? I would want to do it so that those children who truly have the need, for whom the program was designed, for whom we are willing to spend taxpayer money, that they get coverage, and it doesn't go to the upper middle income who clearly don't need it.

So there are a lot of little things that I could go on, on that, but I know that we have got others who want to speak tonight on health care and I want to make sure there is plenty of time for others. And hopefully during the hour, time permitting, I would like to come back to some of the other issues that Dr. BURGESS was talking about, Mr. Speaker, in regard to this economic stimulus package that we are about to vote on tomorrow and why I think that it is not going to work. I wish it would work. I hope and pray that it does work. But I have grave misgivings about it, and I would like to have an opportunity later on in the hour to discuss that further, as I know that my colleagues will, also.

Mr. BURGESS. I thank the gentleman. We will probably go for about another 7 or 8 minutes on health care, and then I am going to yield the balance of the time to Judge LOUIE GOHMERT from Texas, who wants to talk about some other things related to the economy and perhaps some issues related to the confirmation of the Secretary of the Treasury today.

One of the things that when we talk about health care in the broad perspective, and it comes up periodically, is some of the difficulties encountered in

our system because of the onerous burden placed by our medical justice system, cost of medical liability insurance. I just bring that up to point out how, in my home State of Texas recently was passed a bill that placed limits on noneconomic damages, and we have seen a dramatic reduction in premiums for liability insurance. Last Congress, I offered a bill that would incorporate the Texas plan countrywide, to coin a phrase. That bill did attract significant cosponsors, and I will be introducing that bill again.

We hear other proposals for lightening the load of medical liability. Certainly some people like medical courts. Certainly that should be worth some scrutiny and study by our committee. I hear other people talk about early offer, and in fact several years ago we heard testimony in our committee how a concept like early offer and arbitration might work and might lighten the load.

But here is a different concept that I would like my colleagues to consider that maybe is a little bit of out-of-the-box thinking; and let me give credit to the ranking member on our health subcommittee, NATHAN DEAL, because this idea largely originated with him. But we have a very large Medicare system in this country paying \$300 million, \$400 million a year in health care for the Nation's seniors. Now, this is not a State program, it is a Federal program, so it is administered equally across the land.

Since it is a broad Federal program, what if we had some requirements to be met, to be sure. But if a physician fulfilled those requirements as set out, that we would allow that individual to have their liability coverage under the Federal Tort Claims Act as we would in a federally qualified health center.

Now, some of the parameters that we might ask for in return would be certainly full deployment of health information technology, electronic medical records in that physician's or hospital's practice record. That seems pretty straightforward. There was a demonstration project done at the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services that is now 2 years into the study looking at some of the things that is called the Physician Group Practice Demonstration Project. It is looking at some things like medical homes care coordination, and they have come up with some interesting data.

For example, a patient who is admitted into the hospital with congestive heart failure, if that patient is given a slip with an appointment within 5 days back to their primary care doctor, their risk of readmission is very low. If they do not have such an arrangement made, their risk of readmission goes up significantly. What do you think the cost of that readmission looks like? It is pretty steep, much more than the original admission. So a very simple, simple task to undertake to ensure that everyone who leaves the hospital after this diagnosis for uncompensated

congestive heart failure has a 5-day follow-up in their family physician or primary internal medicine doctor's office to ensure that they are complying with their medications, that they are indeed on the path to recovery that everyone thought they were on when they left the hospital.

Other things, like during that "welcome to Medicare" physical, even just a brief episode of patient education about things like advanced directives, not to require the patient to sign up for an advanced directive, but just to make them available so that when heart decisions come up later on in life, that they have at least already been approached; because, as we all know, some of the most expensive care is that care that we pay for in the last 2 weeks of life, and oftentimes that is care that really has no hope of delivering a good result and may in fact even be deleterious. So worthwhile to have these discussions at the front end. And, they might save some money, but more importantly, it might be a better way of taking care of people. Remember, I alluded to it is not all about cost and coverage, it is about taking care of people in the right way.

If we set out these parameters, and if a physician group or an individual physician or individual practice agreed to abide by these restrictions, then cover them under the Federal Tort Claims Act. Can you imagine the relief from having to carry that on the individual physician's balance sheets. That is like \$100,000 a year in real money in that physician's office. I suspect, rather than having doctors leave the Medicare system, we would have doctors who would say, "You know what? I'll just take care of Medicare patients if we are going to be under those kinds of rules, because it is a lot easier than having to put up with that grief in the other parts of my practice." Something we should think about, some out-of-the-box thinking to provide a little bit of relief, a modicum of relief in the arena of liability reform.

Medicaid, we haven't really talked about that much. There is going to be a push for a vast expansion of Medicaid in this Congress; indeed, it is already upon us in the stimulus bill, because we don't have to worry about how we are going to pay for it, we don't have to worry about what tomorrow looks like. But shouldn't we at least ask that there be a little bit of transparency in the system so that someone can look and see how many MRIs are done on a particular diagnostic group of patients, to have some idea as to whether or not these services are being utilized in a wise fashion?

Similarly, should we not have someone who is responsible for coordination of benefits? Medicaid, if it exists in conjunction with a private insurance, always is supposed to be secondary; that is, the private insurance should be the insurer of first resort, Medicare should be the insurer of last resort. But in about 13 to 15 percent of Medicaid

cases across the country, there is in fact a primary insurer who just has not paid. Medicaid then goes from secondary to primary, and that bill is put on to the American citizens when in fact that bill actually was the responsibility of a private insurance company.

□ 2130

And why does that happen? It is because of the lack of reciprocity. And we get into this in a lot of different areas. But it is that inability of insurance companies to function across State lines. Some of that State reciprocity could actually go a long way. Again, when you are talking about a program that spends upwards of almost \$600 billion a year, a 15 percent savings starts to look like real money. So I just offer those as a couple of things that we might consider as we go through this process, Mr. Speaker.

I do know that Judge GOHMERT from Texas, LOUIE GOHMERT from Texas, did want to talk to us a little bit about the financial bailout package and the rescue package. Let me see if the gentleman from Georgia, Dr. GINGREY, had some final thoughts on the health care aspect before we leave that and go to the economy.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Dr. BURGESS, thank you. And I also want to hear, Mr. Speaker, from Judge GOHMERT on this very important subject. I just want to mention one other thing, Mr. Speaker, in regard to this so-called rescue, or economic stimulus package, that we marked up in the Energy and Commerce Committee last Thursday in a 12-hour markup. Dr. BURGESS initially was talking about a couple of amendments that he and Mr. WHITFIELD from Kentucky had in regard to a sustainable growth rate. And this was a golden opportunity to fix that. Unfortunately, along party lines, Mr. Speaker, both of those very good amendments were voted down. And then finally, yours truly, Dr. GINGREY, had an amendment that said, okay, if you won't do that, how about just simply freezing the reimbursement rate for physicians at 2009 levels for 2010? No update, no upgrade whatsoever, just simply freeze it. And Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, the chairman's response was, we want to do that, but not in this bill. It's not time. And I think I said, well, if not us, who? And if not now, when? And so we went back and forth. And unfortunately, along party lines, my simple amendment failed as well. And I was very, very disappointed.

But I want to thank the gentleman, again, from Texas, Dr. BURGESS, for giving me an opportunity to join with him tonight and give me some time. And I yield back to him so that we can hear from LOUIE GOHMERT, Judge GOHMERT, from Texas.

Mr. BURGESS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

May I ask the Speaker, may I inquire as to the remaining time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. BURGESS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GOHMERT. I thank my friend from Texas, as well, Dr. BURGESS and Dr. GINGREY. And I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

But this all ties in together, when we're talking about health care, I had my staff pull the last numbers they could get. And for the year 2006, if you add together all of the Federal tax dollars that are spent on health care, and you add that to the State tax dollars that are spent on health care in the year 2006 per household, it was right around \$8,400.

Well, \$8,400 per household in America? You know, we have talked about health savings accounts and how that could restore power into the hands of the American public. That could restore the good old doctor-patient relationship. Because what we have right now is not a doctor-patient relationship. What we have is a doctor either insurance company or government patient relationship, because either the insurance companies or governments are between the doctor and the patient.

Well, man, some people, I have had retired folks say, well, I can't ever have a health savings account. I can never accumulate that money because I'm too old and I'm too sick to ever accumulate that money. But if you look at it, and you go, wow, \$8,400, that was in 2006. Now it is even more than that. But you could give every household in America a \$3,000 health savings account. And if you establish this relationship with you and your doctor, and then here is another \$2,000 or \$3,000 on top of that to buy your catastrophic care insurance, then you get back to a doctor-patient relationship.

But why would we not want to do that? Well, I would submit to you it's because there is a culture of arrogance in Washington, D.C., and it has been here for a while. It's not a new thing. It has been building. And I think it is one of the things that actually turned voters off about the Republican administration. I think the world of George W. Bush. I like that man. He is a good man. But he got some bad advice from some arrogant people. And look at what was done and the advice that was given. Heck, back in September, the advice was, well, we may have a depression, but if you will give me starting off \$350 billion but maybe get to \$700 billion, start with \$350 billion, I can fix it. That is arrogance. The people in America are not smart enough to fix this. Give me the money, and I will fix it.

It permeates this town. It permeates this capital. It's an arrogance that says, "the American people are just not smart enough. They wouldn't be able to go back to the doctor-patient relationship the way it used to be. They wouldn't be able to help the economy by spending their own money properly. Let's make them give it to us through taxes. And then we will spend it. Because they're just not smart

enough to know how to spend it in a way that is best for them."

And that is what we've got. So you have the Bush administration that took \$350 billion, and Secretary Paulson, King Henry, was going to spend that in such a way that it would encourage lending and get the credit flowing and so people who had fallen behind on their mortgage could come forward and refinance and borrow more money to catch up. This was going to help fix that. Well, they gave all that money to the banks. And now it's even harder to get a loan than it was before they squandered all that \$350 billion. So what have we gotten? Well, now, frankly I have had, and I'm still holding out, hope for the Obama administration. They come right in. They say, Bush, before you leave, why don't you go ahead and request that other \$350 billion? Because we are going to want to spend that. And then on top of that, we're going to ask for another \$800 billion or so. And you know what? We may need \$1.2 trillion before it's all over.

Now that is interesting. Of course, as my friends here from Georgia and Texas know, I filed a 2-month tax holiday bill that just says, we don't need the arrogant bureaucrats in Washington to spend our money because we are too stupid to spend it ourselves. What we need is to give the American people the strength of this country, the American people, let them have their own tax dollars for 2 months. If you let them keep every dime of withholding for Federal income tax and every dime for FICA withholding, if you let the American people keep their own money for 2 months, then it comes up to around \$334 billion. That would jumpstart this economy.

Now, we've been saying that for a couple of months. And here, lo and behold, within the last 10 days, Moody's Economy came out with a study that showed of all the tax proposals—and that included tax proposals that I know my friends here agree with, like cutting capital gains and cutting corporate taxes. I get sick and tired of hearing people say that we will never get manufacturing jobs back in America. Because some of us went and talked to CEOs in China and asked, why did you move over here? I figured they would say because labor is cheap. They said, you know, we had a lot better quality control in the United States with our products. But the corporate tax is less than half here, and they cut us deals on corporate tax.

So we agree. We need to drop the corporate tax and drop capital gains. That will get jobs flooding back in here. But when it comes down to the American money, the thing that will get the economy going the quickest and that will increase the gross domestic product faster in 1 year than any of these tax proposals, it is the tax holiday proposal giving the American people their own money.

Now, it's interesting to me that President Obama is now saying, do you

know what? We may need \$1.2 trillion to really get the American economy going. Do you know why that triggered something special in me? It is because, I know, I asked for the numbers, the amount of money that the American individual taxpayers paid per year this last year is right at \$1.2 trillion in individual income tax. Wow. Can you imagine? Can you get your mind, Mr. Speaker, around the thought of not paying income tax for a whole year? Can you imagine if the American public were told, do you know what? We had wanted a \$1.2 trillion stimulus package to try the best we can to get the economy going. But then it hit us. Do you know the American people are not as stupid as we have characterized them as being? So let's let the American public have that \$1.2 trillion for this year. They won't pay any income tax for the whole year. It would be the same thing. No individual income tax or giving Washington \$1.2 trillion and let them try to spend their way into helping the American public. Well, the American public is not as stupid as this town has cast them as being. They can figure out good ways to spend the money that they earned and getting this economy going.

Because what are they trying to do? Well, we want to help Detroit. We want to help with jobs. Can you imagine if everybody in America had their own withholding and FICA withholding for a year, the cars that would be bought, the stock that would be bought, the homes that would be bought, the homes that would be built and the businesses that would be built with their own money? They don't need some arrogant bureaucrat in Washington saying, give me \$1.2 trillion, and I will try to spend it the right way to get the economy going.

If you let the American people have \$1.2 trillion with no individual income tax for a year, this economy would explode. It would be going so good, people would want to rush back into America with these jobs, because this is where it's all happening.

So, I'm still holding out great hope, because one of the things, and Mr. Speaker, I know, I feel sure that President Obama inspires you as he does me, I sat there listening to that inaugural address. And I was inspired. And I know there are critics out there who say, well, I was expecting a better speech from him. I really was. That was a great speech.

□ 2145

The problem that President Obama has is he is so good at speech making, people have come to set the bar so high

that he can give a great speech and people are not impressed. Well, I was impressed. Of course he talked about Washington, and that struck a chord with me. When he said: "With hope and virtue, let us brave the icy currents," well, I agree with him. With hope, we have got that. Virtue, well, we just approved a new Treasury Secretary that wasn't virtuous enough to pay his income tax, but apparently we are going to overlook that kind of virtue requirement. Yes, we have some conflict of interest problems with some other appointments. Maybe we will just go forward with hope because we are losing the virtue issue here with some of the recent appointments.

But I am hopeful that this President will understand some of the things that some of the people around President Bush did not, and that is the American people are not as stupid as this town has cast them. They are smart enough to know how to spend their own money, smart enough to get the economy going if we let them have their own money to do it. I am still holding out hope. As the poet says, there is the hope that springs eternal in the human breast. I have got it and I know you guys have it too, Mr. Speaker. We have that hope that springs eternal, but we need to recognize that the arrogance in this town, the arrogance of this capital is much too pervasive and that the hope for this country does not arrive on Air Force One, but we need to take responsibility. We need to let the American public get the economy going with their own money, cut the arrogance and recognize the American people for the backbones of this country that they are. I appreciate the opportunity to vent a little bit from my friend, Dr. BURGESS.

Mr. BURGESS. I thank the gentleman. This proposal that you've put forth is terribly intriguing, and I suspect we will get a lot of interest. I know we have to direct our comments to the Chair and not to the cameras, but I would be curious if the gentleman has a bill to that effect.

Mr. GOHMERT. The bill is H.R. 143. It is a two-month tax holiday that lets people keep all of their own withholding and all of their FICA for two months. And all it takes is passage and the next paycheck, it is not six months down the road, it is all of their withholding in the check as soon as we pass the bill. That is what H.R. 143 is about. I hope people call the White House and say President Obama, you have inspired me so please, let us have our own money. H.R. 143 is the way to do it and the way that the President can keep his promise.

Mr. BURGESS. I thank the gentleman for that insight. Am I recorded as a cosponsor on H.R. 143?

Mr. GOHMERT. The gentleman is. The gentleman has been a confidante and adviser and has been here longer than I have. I have greatly appreciated the advice and wisdom of Dr. BURGESS.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. I also would like to inquire if I too am a cosponsor of that excellent piece of legislation.

Mr. GOHMERT. Dr. GINGREY is a cosponsor and trusted confidante and adviser.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. RODRIGUEZ (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of travel delays.

#### 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 Mr. COURTNEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SHERMAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. COURTNEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MALONEY, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BURTON of Indiana) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. CALVERT, for 5 minutes, January 27 and 28.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today, January 27 and 28.

Mr. OLSON, for 5 minutes, January 28.

Ms. FOXX, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 27, 2009, at 10:30 a.m., for morning-hour debate.

#### EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for speaker-authorized official travel during the fourth quarter of 2008 pursuant to Public Law 95-384 are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, MARIAH SIXKILLER, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN DEC. 17 AND DEC. 19, 2008

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Mariah Sixkiller .....	12/17	112/19	Pakistan .....		75.00		13,900.00				13,975.00
Committee total .....											13,975.00

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.  
<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

MARIAH SIXKILLER, Jan. 14, 2009.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO POLAND, GEORGIA, AND ICELAND, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN DEC. 15 AND DEC. 20, 2008.

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Allyson Schwartz .....	12/16	12/20	Poland, Georgia, Iceland .....		1,495.00						1,495.00
Hon. David Dreier .....	12/16	12/20	Poland, Georgia, Iceland .....		1,495.00						1,495.00
Hon. Donald Payne .....	12/16	12/20	Poland, Georgia, Iceland .....		1,495.00						1,495.00
Hon. Adam Schiff .....	12/16	12/20	Poland, Georgia, Iceland .....		1,495.00						1,495.00
Hon. Bill Shuster .....	12/16	12/20	Poland, Georgia, Iceland .....		1,495.00						1,495.00
John Lis .....	12/16	12/20	Poland, Georgia, Iceland .....		1,495.00						1,495.00
Kay King .....	12/16	12/20	Poland, Georgia, Iceland .....		1,495.00						1,495.00
Brad Smith .....	12/16	12/20	Poland, Georgia, Iceland .....		1,495.00						1,495.00
Margarita Seminario .....	12/16	12/20	Poland, Georgia, Iceland .....		1,495.00						1,495.00
Rachael Leman .....	12/16	12/20	Poland, Georgia, Iceland .....		1,495.00						1,495.00
Tommy Ross .....	12/16	12/20	Poland, Georgia, Iceland .....		1,495.00						1,495.00
John Sherry .....	12/16	12/20	Poland, Georgia, Iceland .....		1,495.00						1,495.00
Committee total .....					17,490.00						17,490.00

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.  
<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. ALLYSON Y. SCHWARTZ, Chairman, Jan. 12, 2009.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2008

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Grace Napolitano .....	11/9	11/11	Spain .....		713.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				713.00
Hon. Henry Brown .....	11/9	11/11	Spain .....		734.40		( <sup>3</sup> )				734.40
Hon. Grace Napolitano .....	11/11	11/12	United Arab Emirates .....		517.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				517.00
Hon. Henry Brown .....	11/11	11/12	United Arab Emirates .....		517.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				517.00
Hon. Grace Napolitano .....	11/12	11/14	Qatar .....		731.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				731.00
Hon. Henry Brown .....	11/12	11/14	Qatar .....		772.71		( <sup>3</sup> )				772.71
Hon. Grace Napolitano .....	11/14	11/16	Italy .....		995.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				995.00
Hon. Henry Brown .....	11/14	11/16	Italy .....		995.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				995.00
Julia Hathaway .....	11/17	11/25	Morocco .....		2,307.00		3,137.00				5,444.00
Committee total .....					8,282.11		3,137.00				11,419.11

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.  
<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.  
<sup>3</sup> Military air transportation

HON. NICK RAHALL, Chairman, Jan. 8, 2009.

(AMENDED) REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON RULES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2008

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Muftiah McCartin .....	10/26	10/31	China .....	14,746.67	2,155.00		11,880.48				14,035.48
Hon. James P. McGovern .....	11/8	11/13	Ecuador .....		1,223.00		2,333.23				3,556.23
Cindy M. Buhl .....	11/8	11/13	Ecuador .....		1,223.00		2,333.23				3,556.23
Committee total .....				14,746.67	4,601.00		16,546.94				21,147.94

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.  
<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. LOUISE M. SLAUGHTER, Chairman, Jan. 9, 2009.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, JOINT COMMITTEE ON TAXATION, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. AND DEC. 31, 2008.

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return.

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.  
<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL, Chairman, Jan. 12, 2009.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,  
ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

239. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Review Group, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Direct and Counter-Cyclical Program and Average Crop Revenue Election Program (RIN: 0560-AH84) received January 21, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

240. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Emamectin; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0261; FRL-8397-9] received January 13, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

241. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Extract of Chenopodium ambrosioides near ambrosioides; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0528; FRL-8396-2] received January 7, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

242. A letter from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's "Major" final rule — ENHANCED DISCLOSURE AND NEW PROSPECTUS DELIVERY OPTION FOR REGISTERED OPEN-END MANAGEMENT INVESTMENT COMPANIES [Release Nos. 33-8998; IC-28584; File No. ST-28-07] (RIN: 3235-AJ44) received January 21, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

243. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's report for fiscal years 2005 to 2006 on the Family Violence Prevention and Services Program, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 10405, section 306; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

244. A letter from the Assistant Secretary Employee Benefits Security Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Investment Advice — Participants and Beneficiaries (RIN: 1210-AB13) received January 21, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

245. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's report entitled, "Concentrating Solar Power Commercial Application Study: Reducing Water Consumption of Concentrating Solar Power Electricity Generation," pursuant to Public Law 110-140, section 603(b); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

246. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's report outlining the status of the Exxon and Stripper Well oil overcharge funds as of September 30, 2007, pursuant to Senate Report 108-341 and the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 2005; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

247. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Finding of Failure to Submit a Required State Implementation plan Revision for 1-Hour Ozone Standard, California--San Joaquin Valley — Reasonably Available Control Technology [EPA-R09-OAR-2008-0862; FRL-8763-5] received January 15, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

248. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Nevada; Vehicle Inspection and Maintenance Program [EPA-R09-OAR-2008-0705; FRL-8748-7] received January 15, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

249. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Quality: Revision to Definition of Volatile Organic Compounds — Exclusion of Propylene Carbonate and Dimethyl Carbonate [EPA-HQ-OAR-2006-0948; FRL-8763-7] (RIN: 2060-AN75) received January 15, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

250. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Finding Failure to Submit State Implementation Plans Required for the 1997 8-Hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard; North Carolina and South Carolina [EPA-R04-OAR-2009-0043; FRL-8764-8] received January 15, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

251. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Oil Pollution Prevention; Non-Transportation Related Onshore Facilities [EPA-HQ-OPA-2008-0546; FRL-8764-9] (RIN: 2050-AG49) received January 15, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

252. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Spiromesifen; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0262; FRL-8398-8] received January 15, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

253. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Operating Permit Programs; Flexible Air Permitting Rule [EPA-HQ-OAR-2004-0087; FRL-8764-1] (RIN: 2060-AM45) received January 15, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

254. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; West Virginia; Update to Materials Incorporated by Reference [WV102-6039; FRL-8750-1] received January 7, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

255. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Finding of Failure to Submit State Implementation Plans Required by the 1999 Regional Haze Rule [FRL-8762-7] received January 13, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

256. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Utah's Emission Inventory Reporting Requirements [EPA-R08-OAR-2007-1031; FRL-8754-7] received January 13, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

257. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection

Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Arkansas; Emissions Inventory for the Crittenden County Non-attainment Area; Emissions Statements [EPA-R06-OAR-2007-1153 FRL-8762-4] received January 13, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

258. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Texas; Approval of the Section 110(a)(1) Maintenance Plan for the 1997 8-Hour Ozone Standard for El Paso County [EPA-R06-OAR-2006-0357; FRL-8761-4] received January 13, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

259. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Washington; Interstate Transport of Pollution [EPA-R10-OAR-2007-0110; FRL-8760-7] received January 7, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

260. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) and Nonattainment New Source Review (NSR); Aggregation and Project Netting [EPA-HQ-OAR-2003-0064, FRL-8762-8] (RIN: 2060-AL75) received January 13, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

261. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

262. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's Performance and Accountability report for fiscal year 2008; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

263. A letter from the Acting Director, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — National Security Personnel System (RIN: 3206-AL75) received January 21, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

264. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, GSA, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; FAR Case 2007-013, Employment Eligibility Verification [FAC 2005-29, Amendment-1; FAR Case 2007-013; Docket 2008-0001; Sequence 2] (RIN: 9000-AK91) received January 21, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

265. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary — Human Capital, Performance, and Partnerships, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's report on their competitive sourcing efforts for fiscal year 2008, pursuant to Public Law 108-199, section 647(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

266. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, transmitting notification that the Service intends to follow the advisory guidelines set forth in the No Fear Act; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

267. A letter from the Deputy Director, National Science Foundation, transmitting notification that the Foundation intends to follow the guidelines set forth by the No Fear Act; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

268. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's annual report on the Refugee Resettlement Program, pursuant to Section 413(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

269. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Civil Monetary Penalty Inflation Adjustment Rule [FRL-8760-4] (RIN: 2020-AA46) received January 7, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### 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. OBEY: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 679. A bill 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 (Rept. 111-4). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 87. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (S. 181) to amend title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967, and to modify the operation of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 and the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, to clarify that a discriminatory compensation decision or other practice that is unlawful under such Acts occurs each time compensation is paid pursuant to the discriminatory compensation decision or other practice, and for other purposes (Rept. 111-5). Referred to the House Calendar.

Ms. SLAUGHTER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 88. Resolution providing for 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 (Rept. 111-6). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WAXMAN: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 629. A bill to provide energy and commerce provisions of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009; with an amendment (Rept. 111-7, Pt. 1). 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 Mr. OBEY (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. GORDON of Tennessee, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. SPRATT, and Mr. TOWNS):

H.R. 1. A bill 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 fiscal year ending September 30, 2009, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Approp-

riations, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, 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. BORDALLO (for herself, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. KIND, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, and Mr. KILDEE):

H.R. 669. A bill to prevent the introduction and establishment of nonnative wildlife species that negatively impact the economy, environment, or other animal species' or human health, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 670. A bill to authorize Federal payment to first responders for costs associated with providing emergency services at the international borders of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 671. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to issue a medal to certain veterans who died after their service in the Vietnam War as a direct result of that service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 672. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to require the Department of Defense and all other defense-related agencies of the United States to fully comply with Federal and State environmental laws, including certain laws relating to public health and worker safety, that are designed to protect the environment and the health and safety of the public, particularly those persons most vulnerable to the hazards incident to military operations and installations, such as children, members of the Armed Forces, civilian employees, and persons living in the vicinity of military operations and installations; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Transportation and Infrastructure, Natural Resources, 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. FILNER (for himself and Mr. MCHUGH):

H.R. 673. A bill to amend the definition of a law enforcement officer under subchapter III of chapter 83 and chapter 84 of title 5, United States Code, respectively, to ensure the inclusion of certain positions; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 674. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a one-time increase in the amount excludable from the sale of a principal residence by taxpayers who have attained age 50; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 675. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide police officers, criminal investigators, and game law enforcement officers of the Department of Defense with authority to execute warrants, make arrests, and carry firearms; to the Committee on Armed Services, 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. CONYERS (for himself, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. WATSON, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. HINCHAY, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. LEE of California,

Mr. MASSA, Mr. NADLER of New York, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. OLVER, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. FARR, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. TONKO, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. CLAY, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 676. A bill to provide for comprehensive health insurance coverage for all United States residents, improved health care delivery, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Natural Resources, 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. FILNER:

H.R. 677. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to delay the effect of reclassifying certain nonattainment areas adjacent to an international border, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 678. A bill to require the Commissioner of Social Security to revise the medical criteria for evaluating disability in a person diagnosed with Huntington's Disease and to waive the 24-month waiting period for Medicare eligibility for individuals disabled by Huntington's Disease; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 680. A bill to require that the aircraft used as Air Force One by the President be an aircraft that is made in America by an American-owned company; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WAXMAN (for himself, Ms.

BALDWIN, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mrs. CAPPAS, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. DOYLE, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GORDON of Tennessee, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. HILL, Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. PIERLUISI):

H.R. 681. A bill to amend the Digital Television Transition and Public Safety Act of 2005 and the Communications Act of 1934 to establish a new digital television transition date, to improve the digital-to-analog converter box program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BAIRD (for himself, Ms.

SLAUGHTER, and Mr. WALZ):

H.R. 682. A bill to prohibit securities and commodities trading based on nonpublic information relating to Congress, and to require additional reporting by Members and employees of Congress of securities transaction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committees on House Administration, the Judiciary, Agriculture, and Standards of Official Conduct, 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. BERKLEY:

H.R. 683. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 with respect to the proper tax treatment of certain indebtedness discharged in 2009 or 2010, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BERRY (for himself, Ms.

SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr.

TIERNEY, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. FILNER, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mrs. MALONEY, and Ms. PINGREE of Maine):

H.R. 684. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to deliver a meaningful benefit and lower prescription drug prices 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. CLAY (for himself and Mr. WAMP):

H.R. 685. A bill to require a study of the feasibility of establishing the United States Civil Rights Trail System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California (for herself, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. ISSA):

H.R. 686. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to permit local public agencies to act as Medicaid enrollment brokers; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. FOXX (for herself, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. PITTS, and Mr. HENSARLING):

H.R. 687. A bill to amend titles 23 and 49, United States Code, to repeal wage requirements applicable to laborers and mechanics employed on Federal-aid highway and public transportation construction projects; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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 Ms. GRANGER:

H.R. 688. A bill to amend title XXI of the Social Security Act to reauthorize the State Children's Health Insurance Program through fiscal year 2013, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HERGER:

H.R. 689. A bill to interchange the administrative jurisdiction of certain Federal lands between the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas (for himself, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. HERGER, Mr. CANTOR, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mrs. BONO MACK, and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California):

H.R. 690. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to remove cell phones from listed property under section 280F; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MEEK of Florida:

H.R. 691. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit against income tax for businesses furnishing broadband services to underserved and rural areas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROHRABACHER (for himself, Mr. JONES, and Mr. PAUL):

H.R. 692. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income compensation received by employees consisting of qualified distributions of employer stock; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROSKAM (for himself, Mr. MANZULLO, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. FOSTER, Mrs. HALVORSON, and Ms. BEAN):

H.R. 693. A bill to designate a rail right-of-way as a corridor for inter-suburban commuter rail, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SESTAK:

H.R. 694. A bill to extend temporarily the 18-month period of continuation coverage under group health plans required under COBRA continuation coverage provisions so as to provide for a total period of continuation coverage of up to 24 months; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, 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. WEINER:

H.R. 695. A bill to provide for a green building certification program as part of the Energy Star program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WEINER:

H.R. 696. A bill to prohibit United States military assistance for Egypt and to express the sense of Congress that the amount of military assistance that would have been provided for Egypt for a fiscal year should be provided in the form of economic support fund assistance; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WEINER (for himself, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. NADLER of New York, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Ms. LEE of California, and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 697. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act, the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, and chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code, to require coverage for the treatment of infertility; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Education and Labor, and Oversight and Government Reform, 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. CROWLEY (for himself, Mr. NADLER of New York, Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. TONKO, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. LEE of New York, Mr. WEINER, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. SIRES, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. PETRI, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. COSTELLO):

H. Res. 84. A resolution honoring the heroic actions of the pilot, crew, and rescuers of US Airways Flight 1549; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. FLAKE:

H. Res. 85. A resolution amending the Code of Official Conduct in the Rules of the House of Representatives to strengthen the reporting requirements for Members who request earmarks; to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

By Mr. FILNER:

H. Res. 86. A resolution expressing support for the designation of Four Immortal Chaplains Day in remembrance of the 4 men who paid the ultimate sacrifice in the name of compassion for those of different races and faiths; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BACA (for himself, Mr. FILNER, Mr. ADLER of New Jersey, Mr. CHILDERS, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts, Mr. WALZ, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. ROSS, and Mr. KAGEN):

H. Res. 89. A resolution supporting and encouraging greater support for Veterans Day each year; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SESTAK (for himself, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HOLT, Mr. KIRK, Mrs. MALONEY, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Mr. POE of Texas):

H. Res. 90. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Campus Safety Awareness Month; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. FILNER introduced a bill (H.R. 698) for the relief of Shigeru Yamada; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 13: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.  
 H.R. 16: Mr. BARTON of Texas.  
 H.R. 23: Mr. ACKERMAN and Ms. KOSMAS.  
 H.R. 25: Mr. OLSON.  
 H.R. 31: Mr. REYES and Mr. RANGEL.  
 H.R. 74: Mr. SOUDER, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. BURGESS, and Mrs. BACHMANN.  
 H.R. 81: Ms. WOOLSEY.  
 H.R. 111: Mr. HODES and Mr. ORTIZ.  
 H.R. 137: Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California and Mr. MCCOTTER.  
 H.R. 155: Mr. SOUDER, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. MICHAUD.  
 H.R. 156: Mr. Heinrich, Mr. PETRI, Mr. ARCURI, Ms. TITUS, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. MARKEY of Colorado, and Mr. PETERS.  
 H.R. 200: Mr. WATT, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. WU, and Mr. BERMAN.  
 H.R. 205: Mr. OLSON, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. PITTS, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Mr. COBLE.  
 H.R. 226: Mr. WHITFIELD.  
 H.R. 227: Mr. OLSON.  
 H.R. 272: Mr. WESTMORELAND and Mr. BRADY of Texas.  
 H.R. 275: Mr. MCHUGH.  
 H.R. 294: Mr. BROWN of South Carolina.  
 H.R. 305: Mr. GONZALEZ and Mr. REICHERT.  
 H.R. 336: Mr. PETRI, Mr. RUSH, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. HOLT.  
 H.R. 345: Mr. PETRI.  
 H.R. 361: Mr. MINNICK.  
 H.R. 365: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.  
 H.R. 367: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.  
 H.R. 368: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.  
 H.R. 374: Mr. THOMPSON of California.  
 H.R. 385: Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. BARTLETT and Mrs. MYRICK.  
 H.R. 398: Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. WALZ, Ms. NORTON, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. GIFFORDS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. OLVER, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Ms. LEE of California, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. SIRES, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. MITCHELL, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. SUTTON, Ms. HARMAN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. FILNER.  
 H.R. 417: Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan.  
 H.R. 422: Mr. BRADY of Texas.  
 H.R. 430: Mr. OLSON.  
 H.R. 433: Mr. OLSON and Mr. SOUDER.  
 H.R. 445: Mr. PETERS.  
 H.R. 450: Mr. LAMBORN.  
 H.R. 460: Mr. MCINTYRE, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. NORTON, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr.

CUMMINGS, Mr. FILNER, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, and Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 470: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. LINDELL, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. GALLEGLY, and Mr. BILBRAY.

H.R. 483: Mr. SPACE, Mr. ALTMIRE, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 489: Mrs. MYRICK.

H.R. 502: Ms. FOX.

H.R. 503: Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. WEINER, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. BARTLETT, and Mr. LANCE.

H.R. 510: Mr. SPACE, Mr. HERGER, and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.

H.R. 521: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 527: Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. SIRE.

H.R. 548: Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. KIND, Mr. DOYLE, and Mr. CAMPBELL.

H.R. 578: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia and Mr. BISHOP of New York.

H.R. 579: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 590: Mr. PLATTS and Mr. CAMPBELL.

H.R. 591: Mr. FILNER, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, and Mr. FARR.

H.R. 605: Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. OBERSTAR.

H.R. 607: Mr. BURTON of Indiana and Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H.R. 615: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. WEXLER.

H.R. 618: Mr. SERRANO, Mr. ELLISON, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 622: Mr. SHULER and Mr. SIMPSON.

H.R. 624: Ms. LEE of California, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. SHULER, and Mr. DINGELL.

H.R. 625: Mr. TERRY and Mrs. MYRICK.

H.R. 640: Mr. WU and Mr. MACK.

H.R. 655: Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 661: Mr. SCALISE and Mr. LEE of New York.

H.J. Res. 11: Mrs. MYRICK.

H. Con. Res. 14: Ms. NORTON, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. KENNEDY.

H. Res. 19: Mrs. BACHMANN and Mr. WOLF.

H. Res. 22: Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. OLVER, Ms. WATSON, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, and Mr. RANGEL.

H. Res. 31: Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. FOX, Mr. WATT, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mrs. BONO MACK, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. WU, and Mr. CLAY.

H. Res. 36: Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. KOSMAS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. SCHIFF.

H. Res. 45: Mr. CHANDLER.

H. Res. 47: Mrs. MYRICK.

H. Res. 49: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. MEEK of Florida, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H. Res. 54: Mr. DENT, Mr. HERGER, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. JORDAN of Ohio, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. OLSON, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. INGLIS, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BONNER, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. LUCAS, Ms. FALLIN, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. HARPER, Mr. PENCE, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. PITTS, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. COLE, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. BROWN of Georgia, and Mr. WESTMORELAND.

H. Res. 70: Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. VISLOSKEY, and Mr. SHULER.

H. Res. 76: Mr. HONDA, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FARR, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr.

SERRANO, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. MCCOTTER.

H. Res. 77: Mr. SCOTT of Georgia.

H. Res. 81: Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. GUTHRIE, and Mr. JONES.

### CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

#### OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Appropriations, in H.R. 1, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009, do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9(d), 9(e), or 9(f) of rule XXI.

#### OFFERED BY MR. SPRATT

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on the Budget in H.R. 1, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009, do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9(d), 9(e), or 9(f) of rule XXI.

### AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

#### H.R. 1

##### OFFERED BY: MR. MANZULLO

AMENDMENT NO. 1: In part 1 of subtitle G of title I, add the following new section:

#### SEC. 1605. TEMPORARY CREDIT FOR PURCHASE OF PASSENGER VEHICLES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subpart B of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 is amended by inserting after section 30D the following new section:

#### “SEC. 30E. TEMPORARY CREDIT FOR PURCHASE OF PASSENGER VEHICLES.

“(a) ALLOWANCE OF CREDIT.—There shall be allowed as a credit against the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year an amount equal to the purchase price of any qualified passenger vehicle placed in service by the taxpayer during the taxable year.

“(b) MAXIMUM CREDIT.—

“(1) NEW VEHICLES.—In the case of each qualified passenger vehicle the original use of which begins with the taxpayer, the credit allowed by subsection (a) shall not exceed—

“(A) \$5,000 in the case of a vehicle placed in service before January 1, 2010, and

“(B) \$2,500 in the case of a vehicle placed in service during 2010.

“(2) USED VEHICLES.—In the case of each qualified passenger vehicle the original use of which does not begin with the taxpayer, the credit allowed by subsection (a) shall not exceed—

“(A) \$2,000 in the case of a vehicle placed in service before January 1, 2010, and

“(B) \$1,000 in the case of a vehicle placed in service during 2010.

“(c) LIMITATION BASED ON ADJUSTED GROSS INCOME.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a natural person, the amount allowable as credit under this section (without regard to this subsection) for any taxable year shall be reduced (but not below zero) by the amount which bears the same ratio to the amount so allowable as—

“(A) the excess (if any) of—

“(i) the taxpayer's modified adjusted gross income for such taxable year, over

“(ii) \$125,000 (\$250,000 in the case of a joint return), bears to

“(B) \$10,000.

“(2) MODIFIED ADJUSTED GROSS INCOME.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the term ‘modified adjusted gross income’ means the adjusted gross income of the taxpayer for the taxable year increased by any amount excluded from gross income under section 911, 931, or 933.

“(d) QUALIFIED PASSENGER VEHICLE.—For purposes of this section—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘qualified passenger vehicle’ means any motor vehicle (as defined by section 30(c)(2)) if—

“(A) the model year of such vehicle is (at the time such vehicle is placed in service by the taxpayer) not more than 3 years earlier than the most recent model year of such vehicle which is available for purchase,

“(B) such vehicle is acquired for use by the taxpayer and not for resale,

“(C) the amount paid by the taxpayer for such vehicle does not exceed \$50,000, and

“(D) such vehicle has a gross vehicle weight rating of not more than 8,500 pounds.

“(2) DETERMINATION OF PRICE.—Rules similar to the rules of sections 4002(d) and 4003(c) shall apply.

“(e) APPLICATION WITH OTHER CREDITS.—

“(1) BUSINESS CREDIT TREATED AS PART OF GENERAL BUSINESS CREDIT.—So much of the credit which would be allowed under subsection (a) for any taxable year (determined without regard to this subsection) that is attributable to property of a character subject to an allowance for depreciation shall be treated as a credit listed in section 38(b) for such taxable year (and not allowed under subsection (a)).

“(2) PERSONAL CREDIT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this title, the credit allowed under subsection (a) for any taxable year (determined after application of paragraph (1)) shall be treated as a credit allowable under subpart A for such taxable year.

“(B) LIMITATION BASED ON AMOUNT OF TAX.—In the case of a taxable year to which section 26(a)(2) does not apply, the credit allowed under subsection (a) for any taxable year (determined after application of paragraph (1)) shall not exceed the excess of—

“(i) the sum of the regular tax liability (as defined in section 26(b)) plus the tax imposed by section 55, over

“(ii) the sum of the credits allowable under subpart A (other than this section and sections 23, 25D, and 30D) and section 27 for the taxable year.

“(f) SPECIAL RULES.—For purposes of this section—

“(1) BASIS REDUCTION.—The basis of any property for which is credit is allowed under this section shall be reduced by the amount of such credit.

“(2) PROPERTY USED OUTSIDE UNITED STATES, ETC., NOT QUALIFIED.—No credit shall be allowed under subsection (a) with respect to any property referred to in section 50(b) or with respect to the portion of the cost of any property taken into account under section 179.

“(g) APPLICATION OF SECTION.—This section shall apply to vehicles placed in service after the date of the enactment of this section and before January 1, 2011.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Paragraph (1) of section 26(a) is amended by striking “and 30D” and inserting “30D, and 30E”.

(2) Subsection (a) of section 1016 is amended by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (36), by striking the period at the end of paragraph (37) and inserting “, and”, and by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(g) APPLICATION OF SECTION.—This section shall apply to vehicles placed in service after the date of the enactment of this section and before January 1, 2011.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Paragraph (1) of section 26(a) is amended by striking “and 30D” and inserting “30D, and 30E”.

(2) Subsection (a) of section 1016 is amended by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (36), by striking the period at the end of paragraph (37) and inserting “, and”, and by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(38) to the extent provided by section 30E(f)(1).” amended by inserting after the item relating to section 30D the following new item: (c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years ending after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(3) The table of sections for subpart B of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 is “Sec. 30E. Temporary credit for purchase of passenger vehicles.”.