

and taking them off the plate, but rather having it be a part of a logical program of how we are going to become energy self-sufficient in this country first and then deal with these land issues.

Why do we not establish a heritage criteria so that before any other group decides to create this area of getting more Federal money so they can promote their own tourism at the cost of other taxpayers elsewhere, there is a criteria of what is and what is not a true heritage area?

And why don't we help kids with the program that we once introduced called "Apple" which simply said in all those Western States whose land is now controlled by the Federal Government and was never intended to be, if you read the enabling acts of every Western State except Hawaii and California, and California's was done by a law 2 years later, that land was supposed to be given to the Federal Government until such time as the Federal Government shall dispose of it, and five percent of the proceeds of those disposals was supposed to go to the State for a permanent education trust fund.

□ 1915

And I have a bill called the Apple Bill, which simply says, look, if the Federal Government isn't going to live up to what they said in law, let the States pick 5 percent of their public lands to be used for the sole purpose of funding education in the States. And then the disparity between public land States and nonpublic land States will not be so glowing, and that my kids will have a chance at a decent education, and my colleges in my State will be funded. And since I'm an old public school teacher, so that my retirement will actually be there when I need it. I have some selfish motivations as well because, you see, in all these bills going through here, if you ask who are the losers, I am. My State is harmed. My kids are harmed. My education system is harmed. And why, for heavens sake, the rush to judgment?

Now, Mr. Speaker, unless the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) would desire a postscript—can I ask, can I inquire just how much time is left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PERRIELLO). The gentleman has 27 minutes remaining.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I have talked longer than I have ever done in my life, and hope never to top that record again. But I do have a moment if the gentleman from Texas would like to add a postscript.

Mr. GOHMERT. I appreciate the gentleman yielding. One of the things that's been so troubling with all the promises in 2006 that, if the Democrats were put back in the majority, then they would be the most open House, this would be the most open House, everything would go through committee, everything would go through regular

order. It has turned out that those have been completely hollow promises. This has been, from the best I can determine from the history of this place, perhaps the most totalitarian in the last 2 years, and it's certainly shaping up that way now. There's no chance for input.

We saw in the last Congress, they even found a way around conference committees by just cutting House Republicans out completely, finding some Republicans in the Senate willing to go along, agreeing to a bill without the conference rule being followed, and then being sent back over and over and over.

There's amendments not being allowed. The rules are being changed this time, stripping out so much that is proper process. All of those people represented by people in the minority should have a chance to have their vote in this House, but we're rapidly building into a situation of taxation without representation because we're not being allowed—we can come to the floor and talk like this, but we're not being allowed to have input in these bills, and they're being rammed down the throats of Americans who deserve better. They deserve the transparency that has not happened.

And I just appreciate so much my friend from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) pointing out the problems with the process that has created such a terrible monstrosity as this bill ultimately, with some good ingredients in there, but ultimately a terrible monstrosity. And I appreciate my friend for yielding.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Reclaiming my time, I appreciate the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT). Once again, I think we need to—in fact, the gentleman from Texas probably knows there is a new word in our vocabulary now called "ping-ponging" which is the process of eliminating conference committee and just pinging the bill back and forth between Houses, without ever having to involve the minority in any of those messy discussions. That's a new term.

But, once again, I would just like to conclude by asking the Speaker to do what her spokesman said when she said both the Speaker and leadership agree, it is preferable to use regular order, especially in non-emergency cases, and that has always been the intent.

Putting this bill on the floor without going through regular order, without allowing a committee to look at it, without allowing, if it comes on a closed rule, comes under suspension, that's a violation of the process.

And once again, I don't mind losing quite as much if the process is open and fair. And that's what we're asking for.

This is not an emergency bill. We're asking for an open, fair process.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I know the staff will be very happy since I appear to be the last speaker of the day, and a chance for you to actually get home at a reasonable hour.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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. BISHOP of New York) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today, February 10, 11, 12 and 13.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today, February 12 and 13.

Mr. GOHMERT, for 5 minutes, February 10 and 11.

Mr. PAUL, for 5 minutes, February 10 and 11.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, today, February 12 and 13.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California for 5 minutes, February 10.

(The following Members (at their own request) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GUTHRIE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 383. An act to amend the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008 (division A of Public Law 110-343) to provide the Special Inspector General with additional authorities and responsibilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services; in addition, to the Committee on 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.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced her signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 352. An act to postpone the DTV transition date.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 10, 2009, at 12:30 p.m., for morning-hour debate.