



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 155

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 2009

No. 27

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,
February 10, 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.

FINDING A CREDIBLE APPROACH TO THE ECONOMIC CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) for 1 minute.

Mr. WOLF. Madam Speaker, this is an ad that appeared in newspapers around the country. It is an iceberg. We can see what is going to happen. It says:

“Today’s economic crisis is just the tip of the iceberg.

“\$56 trillion.

“We must focus on a much larger yet less visible threat: the \$56 trillion in liabilities and unfunded retirement and health care obligations (that’s \$483,000

per U.S. household), and the dangerous reliance on foreign lenders that threaten our ship of state.

“Fortunately, the Obama administration and a growing number of congressional leaders recognize the urgent need to address these challenges with entitlement, budget, spending, and tax reforms. We believe a capable and credible approach is necessary: an action-oriented, bipartisan commission that will engage the American people, that will consider all options and that will make sensible recommendations that will be guaranteed to be put to a vote in Congress.

“Meeting today’s challenges is very important, but addressing these structural challenges is crucial to navigating a better future for our children and grandchildren.”

The question is, Madam Speaker, will this Congress deal with the greatest economic crisis that we have faced for the last 50 years?

HONORING THE LIFE OF JOHN FETCHER

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

Mr. SALAZAR. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a true icon of Colorado, Mr. John R. Fetcher. John Fetcher passed away on Friday, February 6, 2009. He was 97 years old.

I saw John Fetcher just last week at the Colorado Water Congress meeting in Denver. He was a mentor to me, and he epitomized the phrase “the stuff that legends are made of.”

In 1949, John decided to move to northwest Colorado where he settled on the Elk River outside of Steamboat Springs. A Harvard-trained engineer and a rancher at heart, John Fetcher made his mark on Colorado by building reservoirs, by managing water districts and by bringing what is now the Steamboat Ski Area into the modern age.

Fetcher was a pioneer in the ski industry. He designed and tested the first metal ski; he revolutionized the building of ski jumps and ski areas, and he was elected to the Colorado Ski and Snowboard Hall of Fame.

However, it was John’s work of preserving the water of the Yampa Valley that he claimed as his most successful accomplishment. In a 2006 interview and at 96 years young, he explained, “If they take our water, we’re out of business. It’s that simple.” He understood, perhaps more than anyone I have ever met, that water truly is the lifeblood of the West.

In the 1970s, he led the effort to build the Yamcolo Reservoir, calling it a “godsend to the ranchers.” He followed his effort with the creation of Steamboat Lake and Stagecoach Reservoir, complete with a small hydro-powered plant.

Throughout his career, John Fetcher created, managed and continued to work with local water and sewer districts such as the Mount Werner Sewer and Water District and the Upper Yampa River Water Conservancy District. Fetcher also served two terms as a member of the Colorado Water Conservation Board from 1970 to 1980. A farmer and rancher himself, John was connected to the land and knew the value of a hard day’s work.

Last year, I was shocked to pick up the paper and see the headline blare “Fletcher to semi-retire.” He was 96 years old at the time. I guess he had the right to switch only to part-time work.

Colorado lost a legend on Friday—a lover of life, a caretaker of our precious land and water, a tireless worker, a pioneer in the ski industry, a rancher, a devoted public servant, and a loving father and grandfather. He was one of the finest men whom I have ever met. He will be missed but never forgotten, having left a legacy that will live on for generations to come.

□ 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.

H1083

Madam Speaker, my heart goes out to John's family.

HONORING WINSTON STRICKLAND

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) for 1 minute.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Madam Speaker, in celebration of Black History Month, I want to recognize African Americans from throughout Georgia's 11th Congressional District who have had a major impact on their community.

Today, I rise to honor Winston Strickland of Marietta, Georgia. Winston, known to most Cobb County residents as "Strick," has been a cornerstone of the business community for more than 40 years. Marietta residents have likely frequented one of Winston Strickland's establishments—including Strick's Barber Shop, Strick's Grill, as well as his successful Laundromat.

In addition to Winston Strickland's many accomplishments in the business world, he has also had a major impact on the youth of his community in helping to found the Cobb organization of Blacks United for Youth. This community organization builds positive relationships between young people and officials in the school system and in the business community through mentorship programs and the Leadership Academy. The organization has provided more than \$100,000 in college scholarships to local youth.

Last year, Blacks United for Youth honored Strickland by renaming their annual Making a Difference Award the "Winston M. Strickland 'Making a Difference' Award." Strickland has also been honored as the Citizen of the Year by the Alpha Phi Alpha and Omega Psi Phi fraternities.

Winston Strickland strives to be a man of peace who helps others, and he is a role model for the community. He is one who, through his commitment to God, family and community service, can help bridge the gap between those in need and those who are willing and able to provide assistance.

I ask that my colleagues join me in thanking Winston M. Strickland for his leadership and service to Cobb County and for his commitment to improving his community.

THE FAILURES OF TARP

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. I have concerns about the new plan by Treasury Secretary Geithner. Now, he is not explicitly asking the Congress for more TARP money. In fact, the Senate already gave him \$350 billion more of TARP money, but they are tapping the Federal Reserve, in addition to that \$350 billion, for hundreds of billions of dollars for his new plan.

As the New York Times says, "For all of its boldness, the plan largely re-

peats the Bush administration's approach of deferring to many of the same companies and executives who peddled risky loans and investments at the heart of the crisis." That's right. The people who have gotten us into this and who have enriched themselves are the people who are going to protect the taxpayers and who are going to get us out of this. I don't believe that.

Some of the most glaring deficiencies of his plan are the so-called restraints on the obscene executive compensations. They are a pale shadow of what they could be. There was one good provision in TARP that almost everybody missed. It said that, if Congress passes a law, all of the past TARP agreements—all of them—will have to be brought in compliance of that law. We could get back the money they paid out in bonuses if we pass a law to do that. I would suggest Mr. Geithner should ask, but if he will not ask, we should still pass the law and begin to make taxpayers whole.

Beyond that, instead of tapping the taxpayers and borrowing money, the other tremendous failure is to put in place a mechanism to pay for this in the names of the American taxpayers in this generation and in the two generations to come.

A modest imposition of a transfer tax—something we had from 1917, it was doubled during the Great Depression and only expired in the sixties—a transfer tax of up to one-quarter of 1 percent, something the British have on the London Exchange, would raise about \$150 billion a year.

Wall Street—those scions of "lift yourselves up by the bootstraps; we are capitalist types"—could pay for their own bailout. Now, there are a couple of things wrong with the proposal. One is it would hurt some speculators. Of course, people seem to think there is some value in speculators because some of them trade on one-tenth of 1 percent or less margin 100 or 1,000 times a day. It wouldn't hurt people whose 401(k)s have already been decimated. In fact, it would stabilize the markets, and it wouldn't put the taxpayers on the hook. It would be Wall Street on the hook. Now, I don't know what is wrong with that. I don't think Main Street America thinks there is anything wrong with that, but somehow, downtown at the Treasury, Mr. Geithner and, obviously, Wall Street think that's wrong.

So let's protect the taxpayers. Let's raise the money from Wall Street, itself, and let's put in meaningful and punitive restrictions on executive compensation, and if they want to go work somewhere else, good luck to them. Mr. Geithner said, "Oh, they'll all go work for foreign banks." Good. Maybe they'll ruin the foreign banks, too, and that will give us a competitive advantage in the future when we grow our small- and medium-sized banks that didn't gamble like these jerks on Wall Street.

THE CONTRASTING RESPONSE TO THE COLLAPSE OF THE JAPANESE AND SWEDISH FINANCIAL SYSTEMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Madam Speaker, in light of the announcement of the Treasury Secretary of a new version of the financial rescue package, I wish to consider a broader context, historical context, perhaps, to gain a better understanding of how we may best serve our efforts to stabilize our banking system and unlock credit for our path to economic recovery.

In a recent report by the IMF, there have been a number of financial crises in the postwar era indicated. However, two examples stand out as relevant to our own difficulties. During the past decade, Japan and Sweden suffered financial and economic trauma that involved substantial similarities to the current challenges facing us. However, it is the nature of the very distinct responses of these two nations which warrant our attention.

Charles Kindleberger, in his classic work "Manias, Panics, and Crashes," explains the situation confronting Japan in the early 1990s. The bubble in Japan reached its crescendo in 1989. Real estate prices had been skyrocketing, and the banks even developed new financial instruments like the 100-year, three-generation mortgage. In a story that sounds all too familiar, when the bubble burst, Japanese bank loans slowed, and as the availability of credit declined, distressed sales caused real estate prices to decline. By 1991, stock prices had fallen by 60 percent, and it was not until 2003 that the stock prices in Japan returned to the level that they had been 20 years earlier.

To put this into perspective, it will be remembered that seven out of 10 of the world's largest banks were Japanese at the beginning of the 1990s. Before the decade was over, these financial giants were insolvent. They remained in business only because of an understanding that the Japanese government would keep them afloat.

One of the reasons the comparison of the Japanese and Swedish financial bubbles is helpful to us is that it reflects the role of an increasingly intertwined global economy. As Kindleberger points out, the bubble in Sweden was largely affected by the offshore branches of banks headquartered in Tokyo and Osaka. The surge in the flow of loans from these banks led to the increase in real estate and stocks in Sweden. Before all was said and done, the price of real estate in Sweden was to rise even faster than it did in Japan.

In a presentation of the Kansas City Federal Reserve Bank, Sweden's former Central Bank chairman, Urban Backstrom, pointed to a number of factors which led to the Swedish bubble—

an expansionary monetary policy similar to pre-bubble Japan, a tax policy that favored borrowing, sizable current account deficits, and an explosion of Swedish debt.

Within 5 years, the rate of debt to the gross domestic product rose from 85 percent to 135 percent. This credit boom led to a resulting boom in real estate prices. The speculative bubble had been created, and the Swedish economy became vulnerable to an implosion.

□ 1245

In seeking to rectify policies that had led to high inflation and high nominal interest rates, asset prices began to fall and economic activity headed south. Between the summers of 1990 and 1993, Swedish GDP dropped by 6 percent, unemployment rose to 12 percent, and the banking sector had loan losses of 12 percent of the gross domestic product. What is perhaps most instructive is for us to consider how differently these two nations responded.

The response of the Japanese government was largely predicated on the "understanding" that it would keep the banks afloat. The absence of any systematic overarching policy framework led to what could be best characterized as an ad hoc approach. And as a consequence, the Japanese financial system consisted of a large number of "zombie banks" which had the effect of undermining the confidence in the banking system. Furthermore, this unwillingness to address the reality of insolvent institutions rendered the banking system as a whole insolvent.

The response of the Swedish government to its financial collapse contains noteworthy contrast. This was explained by Swedish Central Bank Chairman Urban Backstrom. Due to the serious nature of the Swedish financial crisis, efforts were made to maintain the bank system's liquidity. Significant emphasis was given to the need for transparency and a realistic disclosure of expected loan losses. Banks applying for support had their assets valued by the Bank Support Authority using uniform criteria. In order to minimize the problem of moral hazard, the bank guarantee provided protection from losses for all creditors except shareholders. A separate authority was set up to administer the bank guarantee and to manage the bank that faced solvency problems.

The clear distinction between the Swedish model and the Japanese model was an overarching set of rules rather than a series of ad hoc responses. In contrast to their Japanese counterparts, the Swedish government quickly wrote down the value of bad assets and did not prolong the agony for the economy. Sweden, unlike the Japanese government, did not have an understanding that insolvent banks would be forever protected. We ought to look at the Swedish model.

ECONOMIC STIMULUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise to emphasize the important responsibility that we have in this Congress, and the responsibility is now.

I am glad to have had the opportunity to listen to my good friend and colleague from California. I believe the emphasis of his remarks is that the re-ordering of our economy requires a multitask effort, particularly two direct tasks: the recapitalizing of our markets, particularly our banks, which Secretary Geithner has spoken to eloquently and forcefully this morning, and as well, spending; the economic stimulus package. I think where we need to have common agreement and bipartisanship is you can't do one without the other.

So I believe it is important that we answer the question of spending. The government is the spender of last resort, not the reckless spender, but the spender that will create jobs, create jobs in Indiana and Florida where the President is traveling, and create jobs in Texas.

Yesterday I traveled to one of our work source sites, our sites where individuals are able to get information about unemployment benefits. I was able to walk through and talk to those who have been unemployed for a year or more, and now even more recently. I listened to their descriptions and their hardships of trying to find work, listening to the construction worker who came from Florida who is well skilled, 17 years of using heavy equipment, but yet cannot find a job.

Madam Speaker, we need a stimulus package that is not nickel and diming but actually is fiscally responsible by spending the money where it needs to be spent. The mayor in the small town of Indiana where the President was yesterday said we need money spent. Republicans, Democrats, Independents, this is an American issue. We need jobs created for Americans.

So I would hope as we move to conference, we will ensure that the infrastructure mark of \$12 billion is in place because that will put people to work in my own city of Houston. It may create an opportunity for \$180 million for the Metro system, the mobility system, to begin work, and workers utilized for utility work. Remediation work is important. It will keep the money for school renovation and repair. That is important. Keep the \$10 billion for schools. We know that 598,000 jobs were lost. We now have a total of 21.6 million Americans who are unemployed or have gotten out of the system it is so bad. We need the stimulus package so 95 percent of working Americans can get tax cuts. We need it so that it creates and saves 3 to 4 million jobs, including the green energy jobs, the jobs that will allow us to green America, to produce alternative energy and be able to retrofit our buildings and save energy, the weatherization of our homes.

It will invest in renewable energy to create green jobs and promote health information technology to modernize our health system. We know how problematic it is for seniors and people with young children to go from doctor to doctor and not have those systems.

With 21.6 million Americans unemployed, we need a stimulus package that works. We also need language in the stimulus package. Do you recognize that there is no whistleblower protection for transit security offices, the TSA officers that you see that are airport screeners, they can't tell you when something wrong has happened that creates an unsafe situation, an insecure situation. We need to keep language in there that allow those individuals to be protected by whistleblower language. Why do we have people who are in security who can't tell us that the security system is failing? So I am going to argue vehemently that the language in the House bill remain to protect transit security officers at our Nation's airports so they can tell us what is wrong and what is right.

What we need most of all is to ensure that we have a stimulus package that complements the recapitalizing of our Nation's banks. We need to make sure that as the government takes some of these toxic assets, working with the private sector, we are spending money to create jobs, building highways, bridges, creating Metro systems, making sure our buildings are safe, and making sure that children can go to schools that are redone, repaired or built from the ground up.

What kind of America are we? We can put Texans back to work, and Houstonians back to work, and those from the Midwest and the East and the South. We can do it if we assure ourselves that we have the kind of effective program that is here.

What we want to do also is make work pay. We want that tax credit that provides money to the families. We want to increase the earned income tax credit and give tax relief for 60 million children through the expansion of the child tax credit. That puts money in America's hands. So today is an important day. Vote for the American people. Vote for the stimulus.

As a Representative of 18th Congressional District, I have made it a top priority to help Houstonians who have retained their jobs during this economic situation and bring jobs back to my district for those citizens who are still looking for work.

Just yesterday, I spoke to a man who lost his job in Florida and went to Houston because he heard there were jobs there. But a grim reality greeted him when he arrived. The job prospects in Houston were no better than what he faced in Florida.

In 2008, Houston's unemployment rate increased from 4.5 percent to 5.4 percent over the course of only a year. I toured an unemployment benefits office in Houston yesterday. It is understaffed and overwhelmed. On an average day, more than 100 people would visit that office. Unemployment experts expect even more job losses in Houston this year.

It is critical that Houston residents receive the tools they need to reverse the high rates of job loss and the skyrocketing mortgage foreclosure rates leaving many families helpless in our region.

Any economic stimulus bill will need to increase unemployment benefits by \$25 to seriously address the economic crisis and ensure that Americans have money to live and pay their creditors. It will help families survive and put food on the table while they look for work. It is also our duty to provide up to 33 weeks of additional unemployment benefits. It will buy our citizens more time to find employment during this grim economic climate.

Retaining the House version of the increased Earned Income Tax Credits, and increased credit for the refundable portion of the Child Credit will give families some much needed tax relief to make it through this economic climate.

Children are the forgotten victims of our economic times. The Economic Stimulus Bill will help create jobs for our educators. Schools in my district in Houston are old and in need of repair. Some are at risk of being shut down. Our children are our future. They not only deserve to learn in buildings that are up to standard, but the schools also need to be modernized with high tech tools to help them compete in 2009 and beyond. We cannot forget about our children.

The House version of the stimulus bill sets aside 79-billion dollars for our Nation's schools. The money will go towards repairing and modernizing the buildings that will shape the future leaders of this country. An additional amount was set aside for school construction. School construction is critically important because it will create jobs and allow Americans to invest in the future of our children. The Senate Stimulus Bill only provides 39-billion dollars for our schools. That is almost half of the funds proposed by the House Stimulus Bill. Our children deserve better.

The story of my constituents in Houston is also the story of Americans throughout the country who are desperately trying to care for their families and make ends meet.

Last month, the U.S. lost more than 500-thousand jobs, bringing the total to 21.6 million unemployed Americans. The economy is expected to hit record lows in 2009.

According to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, America's unemployment rate rose to 7.6 percent in January. Houston's unemployment rate is not as high yet, but any amount above 4 percent full employment is a bad sign. That is unacceptable.

The Economic Recovery and Reinvestment Act is critical to avoiding an economic disaster. The Senate Bill cuts additional funding to basic public safety such as Federal aid to firefighters, the Coast Guard and officers with the Transportation Safety Administration. These are hardworking men and women who watch over the security of our homeland. They keep our families safe.

The House Stimulus Bill provides additional dollars to programs such as Head Start and Violence Against Women. The Senate bill takes dollars away from women and children, by cutting funds to these programs. As Members of Congress, there is no justification for taking dollars away from our most vulnerable citizens—none.

The Senate bill cuts federal aid to NASA, one of Houston's main employers. That means

more loss of employment. We need to start creating jobs, not cut them.

This recovery package needs to become a reality with as much funding as we can spare to help our citizens. It should address the mortgage foreclosure crisis. We need to invest federal dollars into our country's infrastructure projects, particularly Houston Metro.

The Economic Stimulus Bill in both the House and Senate is not simply a wish list or an appropriations bill. It is a necessity. I am fighting to ensure that Texans get the Federal dollars needed to get citizens out of the unemployment office and back into the workforce.

HONORING DR. JEANA BRUNSON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize the life and work of Dr. Jeana Brunson. Dr. Brunson was born and raised in Mobile, Alabama, a city located on the resplendent coast of the Gulf of Mexico which is best known for being the home of the first and true Mardi Gras in the Americas.

Dr. Brunson would remain in Mobile until she earned her bachelor's degree in studio art from the University of South Alabama. She then moved from her beloved Mobile to the University of Texas in Austin where she earned her certification as a teacher. Her pursuit of academia then took her to Lubbock, Texas, where she would earn her master's degree in museum science from Texas Tech University while also serving as a research assistant for the costume and textile division for the Museum of Texas Tech.

Her work in Lubbock earned her a position of cataloger and curatorial assistant for the Kansas Museum of History in Topeka, Kansas, and then on to the curator for the Camden County Historical Society in Camden, New Jersey.

The position of registrar for the Museum of Science in Tallahassee, Florida, finally brought her to the place which she has been calling home for the past 20 years. She quickly moved up the ranks as she proceeded from registrar to curator to senior curator. During her time as head of research and collections, she earned her Ph.D. in historic costume and textiles. Finally in 2001, she was able to enjoy the fruition of her labor and the realization of her dreams when she became the director and chief curator for the Museum of Florida History in Tallahassee, Florida.

From this post in Tallahassee, Madam Speaker, she has been able to collect political materials, women's suffrage materials, garments, and assorted other pieces of historical significance for a new exhibit to be produced in 2013 honoring the accomplishments of the women of my home State of Florida.

Among the honorees will be another great woman of Florida and a person

whom I have always admired, a constituent of my congressional district but a person who belongs to our entire State and to our Nation, Roxcy Bolton. Roxcy Bolton is a pioneer among Florida's women. She was inducted into the Florida Women's Hall of Fame for forcing police and prosecutors to make rape crime a priority as well as illustrating to health departments the need for rape treatment centers. In fact, the rape treatment center in our public hospital in Miami-Dade Florida is named after Roxcy Bolton.

Dr. Brunson also has traveled across the country earning prestigious positions and meritorious accolades for her fine work. Each stop has had its pitfalls and its windfalls, but she has never succumbed to the temptation of acquiescence in the face of adversity. The lessons that the good doctor learned on this long road have been to the benefit of our entire Nation. As the director and chief curator for the Museum of Florida History, Dr. Brunson has become the steward of Floridian culture. She has worked tirelessly to preserve the work of courageous women, like Roxcy Bolton, so their stories can be preserved for the benefit of our next generation.

I pray that we may all learn from the examples set by Dr. Jeana Brunson, that we may never let our passions be eroded by our difficulties, and that we may persevere and never falter in the pursuit of our dreams.

Congratulations, Dr. Brunson.

A POLICY THAT DOESN'T WORK

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, Benjamin Franklin warned us that "Passion governs, but she never governs wisely."

As the Congress and the President rush to enact the latest in a long line of mega-spending bills, I think we would be well advised to spend a little more time on the dispassionate math of the matter.

The Congressional Budget Office issued a report last week that warns us, as reported by the Washington Times, that the spending bills may "help in the short term but result in so much government debt that within a few years they would crowd out private investment, actually leading to a lower gross domestic product over the next 10 years than if the government had done nothing."

We are already running a \$1.2 trillion national deficit this year with a spending bill racing back toward this House to add another \$800 billion on top of that.

Let's put that in perspective: a \$2 trillion deficit, that is 150 times the size of the annual deficit that has brought the State of California to the brink of bankruptcy. That is \$6,500 of new debt for every man, woman and

child in the United States, \$26,000 for an average family of four. And that is not a theoretical number. That family will have to repay that \$26,000 plus interest from their future taxes just as surely as if it appeared at the bottom of their credit card statement this month.

This is all being done in the name of stimulating the economy, but the supporters of this policy have not been able to cite a single example in all of recorded history where massive government spending has actually stimulated an economy. There are plenty of examples where it ruined economies and brought down great nations.

The supporters of this policy have not been able to explain how the government can inject a single dollar into the economy that it has not first taken out of that same economy. They have not been able to explain how we strengthen our economic future by leaving the next generation with an unprecedented debt that will take them decades to pay off.

What the President told us last night, and my friend from Texas said just a few moments ago, is that by spending another \$800 billion, they can create or save up to 4 million jobs. That sounds good until you realize that comes to more than \$200,000 a job by their own numbers. By their own numbers, we could literally send those 4 million lucky families a check for \$100,000 and save half of what they plan to spend.

□ 1300

If this policy worked, we would already be enjoying a period of unprecedented economic expansion. The bailouts and spending and loan guarantees already issued now total \$9.7 trillion. As Bloomberg pointed out this week, that is enough to pay off 90 percent of all of the home mortgages in America. Not 90 percent of the bad mortgages, 90 percent of all of the mortgages.

We have not seen prosperity from these policies because these policies don't work. They didn't work in Japan in the 1990s, as my friend from California just mentioned, they didn't work in America in the 1930s. The unemployment rate in 1939, after nearly a decade of New Deal spending, was the same as it was in 1931.

Madam Speaker, history tells us that bankrupt nations don't last very long. Before we can secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, the Nation's finances must first be solid. So I beg the majority to pause and consider carefully what they are doing. I beg the President to pause and consider what kind of legacy he wants to leave the Nation. And, I beg the American people, while there is still time, to rise up and to demand a return to fiscal sanity.

STIMULUS BILL

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

Mr. PENCE. Madam Speaker, we gather on this floor at a time just a few moments after the United States Senate has passed by a sufficient majority a spending bill, the intention of which is to stimulate this economy. But careful examination shows, and more Americans every day are realizing, that the only thing the Democrat stimulus bill will stimulate is more government and more debt.

Let me say emphatically: House Republicans know two things to a certainty. Number one, we are in a recession; American families are hurting; millions have lost their jobs, and millions more worry that they will be next. But, number two, Republicans also know this Congress must do something.

Despite the fact that the President of the United States last night told the Nation's media and the American people that he disagreed with some in Congress who believe we should do nothing, let me say, with great respect to our President, I know of no Republican member of the House or Senate who believes that in these difficult times we should do nothing. I would be prepared to stand corrected if the administration would like to provide names, but a casual survey of Republican members of the House and the Senate should instruct the American people that Republicans believe we should do something, but we also believe we should take time to get it right; that we should create a stimulus bill that is not, as the bills that have passed the House and Senate now are, a stimulus bill that actually is not a long laundry list of worn-out liberal spending priorities but actually is, at its center, a bill that will give working families and small businesses more of their hard-earned dollars to spend.

At the President's invitation, Republicans brought forward a Republican alternative which would give the average married couple a tax break this year of some \$3,400. We would let small businesses write off up to 20 percent of their profits this year. This kind of tax relief, Madam Speaker, is precisely the kind of tax relief that John F. Kennedy advanced to stave off an economic downturn in the 1960s; that is what Ronald Reagan did to turn back an even more serious recession in the 1980s; and, after the towers fell in New York City and the Pentagon was struck on 9/11, it was what this Congress did in a bipartisan way to turn around a downturn in our economy.

Tax relief, when combined with some modest investment in infrastructure that I believe Republicans in the main would support, is precisely the kind of stimulus that the American people want to see happen, and it is not what has passed out of the House or Senate.

But I rise today with a hopeful note that, after some tough partisan rhetoric in recent days, this Congress now with the conference committee will come together and will again embrace President Obama's call for bipartisan

input on this bill. Conference committees, for people looking in, are really the time when the House and Senate reconcile differences. But sometimes they can be a fresh start in legislation; and our hope is that now we will be able to bring forward these time-honored, time-tested efforts for growing our economy. And I believe the American people are with us.

Yesterday, in Indiana, I held a town hall meeting a little bit south of where the President was. Three hundred Hoosiers gathered at Donner Center in Columbus, Indiana yesterday. And I have to tell you, Madam Speaker, I sensed, as was reported in the local paper today, a tremendous amount of skepticism about the idea that we can borrow and spend and bail our way back to a growing economy. There was tremendous support in that room for tax relief for small businesses and working families.

But a little girl named Hillary rose and touched my heart. She said to me: Congressman PENCE, my dad is raising me and her sibling as a single parent. Little Hillary told me he just got his hours cut from 40 hours a week to 24. She said, "Is there anything in this bill that they just passed that will get my dad his hours back?" And I looked at her with no small amount of emotion and I said, "Hillary, because I can't answer yes to that question, because I can't tell you that something in the Democrat stimulus bill will help your dad get back to full time, I can't support this bill."

The American people are on to it. We need to come together in a bipartisan way and do what history teaches will get this economy growing again.

TARP: A TROUBLING INVESTMENT

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

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to address the troubling results of a report that was just released last Friday by the Congressional Oversight Panel on the Troubled Asset Relief Program, TARP.

In summary, the 50-page report indicates that our United States Treasury has overpaid by about \$78 billion in order to implement the largest private sector bailout in American history. In fact, the study directly states that, "Treasury paid substantially more for the assets it purchased than their current market value." How much more? Our Treasury purchased assets worth about \$178 billion for \$254 billion. That is a direct and unnecessary transfer of our taxpayer dollars to private financial institutions that utilize reckless investment strategies.

Thus, the Treasury has essentially shortchanged taxpayers to the tune of \$78 billion and has not acted as a good steward of our taxpayers' funds. To be sure, former Secretary Paulson looked the American people in the eye and assured us that the taxpayer investment

in the TARP program was sound, and we would be given full value in return for our investment. In a public statement to the American people in October, Paulson said of the TARP program, "This is an investment, not an expenditure, and there is no reason to expect the program will cost taxpayers anything." Unfortunately, Paulson's statement couldn't be further from the truth. The first \$350 billion in TARP funds was spent in haste, and we have nothing to show for it but waste.

And the reason for this waste? The use of standardized documents that hindered Treasury's ability to address differences in credit quality among the capital infusion recipients. Furthermore, our Treasury has also failed to explain its reasoning for subsidizing some banks more than others, leaving taxpayers and Congress in the dark.

To add more fuel to the fire, Neil Barofsky, the Special Inspector for the TARP program, came out last week and stated: The government needs to beef up its oversight and fraud prevention mechanism in regard to the TARP program. He stated, "The Troubled Asset Relief Program represents a massive and unprecedented investment of taxpayers' money, designed to stabilize the financial industry, but the long-term success of this program is not assured."

American taxpayers are rightly infuriated. Our Treasury has yet to even adopt baseline fraud prevention standards for the TARP program. Additionally, there is a noticeable lack of oversight language included with the TARP capital infusion contracts. Special Inspector Barofsky strongly cautions that oversight language is needed in all TARP contracts, particularly with big banks like Citicorp and Bank of America, and automobile companies like Chrysler and General Motors. Given this troubling investment situation, I am skeptical of how the next \$350 billion will be spent.

Looking back to October when former Secretary Paulson came to Congress with a 2½ page double-spaced document ceding himself total authority to spend \$700 billion in taxpayer dollars, I suppose it is not entirely surprising to find out that \$78 billion has been wasted. The bailout plan was weak from the very beginning. It was Congress that had to step in and demand oversight and transparency of Paulson's TARP program. And what we ended up getting was a proposal for self-regulation, with Paulson and former Fed Chairman Ben Bernanke as two of only five members of an oversight board charged with monitoring their own actions. What we really need is oversight by only those who are independent of the administration and that do not have ties to the Wall Street banking community.

So today on the House floor, I echo the sentiments of the Congressional Oversight Panel, which stated, "If TARP is to garner credibility and public support, a clear explanation of the

economic transaction and the reasoning behind any such expenditure of funds must be made clear to the public." Our Treasury has less than 30 days to act together before the next report is released, and hard-working taxpayers deserve to hear that their investment has not been made in vain.

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 1 o'clock and 12 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 (Mrs. TAUSCHER) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

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

Lord God, we bear witness to the prayer of Your servant, John. Not sure Psalm 71 is one of his favorites, it seems, however, to spring from his lips. A speech not thundered in this Chamber, not enforced by the Chairman's gavel. This prayer is more of an intimate whisper lingering longer than any other.

"O God, be not far from me, my God, make haste to help me. I will always hope and praise You, ever more and more. My mouth shall declare Your justice, though I know not its full extent. O God, you have taught me from my youth and till the present moment, I proclaim Your wondrous deeds."

Today, Lord, we reflect on the faithful service of the Dean of the House. Tomorrow, the Honorable JOHN DINGELL of Michigan will become the longest serving Member in history. So we add our Amen to the psalmist's prayer: "Lord, renew Your blessing upon me and comfort me over and over again." Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROSLEHTINEN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. ROSLEHTINEN led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Repub-

lic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1. An act 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.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 1) "An act 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," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. INOUE, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. REID, Mr. COCHRAN, and Mr. GRASSLEY, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 2761 of title 22, United States Code, as amended, the Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, and upon the recommendation of the Majority Leader, appoints the following Senator as Chairman of the Senate delegation to the British-American Interparliamentary Group conference during the One Hundred Eleventh Congress:

The Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY).

The message also announced that pursuant to section 2761 of title 22, United States Code, as amended, the Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, and upon the recommendation of the Republican Leader, appoints the following Senator as Vice Chairman of the British-American Interparliamentary Group conference during the One Hundred Eleventh Congress:

The Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN).

H.R. 1: AMERICAN RECOVERY AND REINVESTMENT ACT OF 2009

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

Mr. HOLT. Madam Speaker, I rise to highlight the importance of science in our American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. Research and innovation lie behind the long-term economic success of this country, and it's worth noting that science research creates jobs now. A report by the Information Technology and Innovation Foundation determined that for each additional \$1 billion invested in science in the economic recovery, 20,000 American jobs

are created. These jobs go not just to scientists but to research assistants, electricians, technicians and construction workers.

We need to provide a comprehensive set of jobs in this package so that our new roads and bridges built with the funds lead to research facilities and high tech start-up companies that will provide the foundation for the economy of the 21st century.

The ideal project is one that keeps on giving, and that is exactly what scientific research projects do. In his inaugural address, President Obama said, "We will restore science to its rightful place." The legislation we have been considering places science in an important place in short-term job creation and long-term economic growth.

HONORING THE WOMEN OF TOMORROW MENTOR AND SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I would like to commend a wonderful organization in my congressional district, the Women of Tomorrow Mentor and Scholarship Program. Founded in 1997 by veteran TV journalist, Jennifer Valoppi, and Telemundo President Don Browne, the program has been a pioneer institution for inspiring at-risk young women to achieve their fullest potential through education and job training.

The participants of the Women of Tomorrow program receive mentoring and guidance from highly accomplished professional women in our community. These women share their experiences and techniques for achieving academic and professional success, and their efforts bear fruit, as the high school graduation rate of Women of Tomorrow participants is 90 percent, well over the national average.

Thanks to the Women of Tomorrow organization, under the leadership of its executive director, Bianca Erickson, countless at-risk teenagers are given the encouragement to dream big for the future. Nearly all of the program's high school graduates pursue a college education.

I am grateful to all the individuals who have dedicated their time to this tremendous organization, and I ask that the names of the board of directors be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD: Dr. Diane Walder, Marisa Toccin, Donna Feldman, Jamie Byington, Judge Judith Kreeger, Betty Amos, Katherine Fernandez-Rundle, Don Browne and Jennifer Valoppi.

THE GOVERNMENT'S TRIPLE BOGEY

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, we are being told by the administra-

tion that unless America plays this stimulus package game, "the country may never recover." Once again the politics of fear and intimidation are on Capitol Hill.

If we open up this \$835 billion package and look inside, we see all types of goodies for special interest groups that is nothing more than government waste.

There are millions in the package for grant money for neighborhood electrical vehicles that go to government workers. Here's one of these \$7,500 vehicles right here. It looks like a golf cart to me. Why should the taxpayer be forced to buy these contraptions?

Does anyone really think this will help the economy?

Well, the taxpayers are yelling "fore" while being left out in the rough, and Congress keeps adding strokes to the scorecard.

This bill is supposed to get the economy back on the fairway, but it's just one bogey after another.

Want to stimulate the economy? Let Americans keep more of their own money.

No golf carts for government workers. The government is millions of strokes over par by playing this stimulus game.

And that's just the way it is.

WHAT THE AMERICAN PEOPLE SHOULD KNOW

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

Mr. KIRK. Madam Speaker, the American people should know the \$800 billion stimulus bill is not the only spending bill coming. In 2 weeks, we will consider a \$410 billion omnibus with 4,000 earmarks in it, followed by a \$100 billion supplemental. Americans should know that these three spending bills will trigger a need to borrow \$2.6 trillion in just the next few months. That's five times more than the United States has ever borrowed.

Each taxpayer now owes \$56,000 on this debt, and after these bills pass, you will owe \$76,000 each. The cost of this debt will rip the cost of a college education from each family.

Last week I was the first Member of Congress to bother even to visit the Bureau of Debt. They will attempt to borrow \$2.6 trillion over the next few months to try to pay for these three spending bills.

ASSISTANCE FOR THE UNEMPLOYED

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

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, America faces an unambiguously dramatic economic downturn. And Americans are hurting in this very difficult economic time.

But Republicans in the House are still waiting for an opportunity to

bring our ideas for economic recovery to the table. So far we've been shut out of negotiations. For instance, Republicans have proposed real assistance for the unemployed by slashing Federal taxes on unemployment benefits, but our suggestions for economic recovery have been ignored.

The result? A bill that does little to stimulate the economy and lots to stimulate the Federal Government and our national debt.

We must pass a bill that helps struggling workers get back on their feet, and that encourages entrepreneurs, the real engines for job creation, to take risks again.

Madam Speaker, we cannot borrow and spend our way back to prosperity.

SOMETHING MUST BE DONE TO STIMULATE OUR ECONOMY

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

Mr. SHUSTER. President Obama said that something must be done to stimulate our economy, and I wholeheartedly agree. Unfortunately, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle must have thought President Obama said spend \$1 trillion of our children's and grandchildren's money on programs that drive up the national debt and do little to stimulate the economy.

The fact is, little of the dollars spent in the Democratic stimulus actually creates jobs. But for every \$1 billion we spend on infrastructure, 30,000 jobs are created; however, the Democrat stimulus package has less than 10 percent that they are spending on a proven job creator.

Instead of accepting a bill that is long on waste and short on substance, House Republicans have an alternative that provides lasting long-term tax breaks to help hardworking families, home buyers and small businesses through these difficult times.

Basic economics teaches us that high Federal spending will dramatically increase inflation.

Madam Speaker, the American people do not need Congress to add to their list of economic problems. We must address the true problems at hand and fix our economic crisis, not quench the Democrats' thirst for more big government.

The Republican approach will work to pull our economy out of this recession. It's time to put politics aside and put Americans first. It's time to adopt the Republican alternative.

DEFICIT SPENDING

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, last night I sat here for much of an hour listening to Democratic colleagues across the aisle decrying how terrible deficit spending was. And the tax cuts brought us record revenue into the U.S.

Treasury. That wasn't the problem. The problem was that we were deficit spending. And that's a large reason why the Democrats won the majority in November of 2006, to cut out deficit spending.

So, after hearing my friends across the aisle last night talking about how bad deficit spending was, I went back, and as I thought about it last night, it could mean only one thing. Our Democratic colleagues, including the majority leader that spoke so eloquently last night here, are going to vote with us against this deficit monstrosity because parents, most parents, would do anything to make the life of their children better. But not here in Congress. We've got a bill that is going to allow us to live better at the expense of our children, and we should not do this to future generations if we care.

IT'S CRITICAL THAT CONGRESS ACT QUICKLY AND RESPONSIBLY

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

Mr. OLSON. Madam Speaker, with employment hitting unprecedented highs, it is critical that Congress act quickly and responsibly to turn the economy around. Unfortunately, many of my Democratic colleagues continue to play partisan politics with our children's and our grandchildren's future. Apparently the backers of the stimulus bill believe that any government spending can be justified as an economic stimulus. The result in both this Chamber and the Senate is a bill larded with spending on Democratic policy priorities that will not impact the economy for years, if at all.

Republicans have put forth a real solution, one that provides targeted tax relief to hardworking Americans, and provides economic relief to allow businesses to invest in themselves and rebuild our economy.

As the President has said, the decisions we make now will have long-term consequences on our future and future generations. At the very least, we owe those future generations a thoughtful debate and objective economic justifications for our actions.

PEOPLE ARE WORRIED BACK HOME

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

Mr. LATTA. Madam Speaker, last weekend I was home, and folks back home are worried. They're worried about what this Congress is doing. They're worried about their futures, they're worried about their kids, they're worried about their jobs.

One of the things when I was talking to a lot of the folks at home over the weekend was, first of all, they said what happened to that \$700 billion that

you all passed last year for the financial bailout? And they're worried about what's going to be going on right now with this \$838 billion that we've seen come out of the Senate. And, of course, that's not the correct figure because after you figure in your interest, you're over \$1 trillion.

And when you talk about that \$1 trillion, you know right now we owe \$3 trillion to foreign governments, with as of 2 months ago the Chinese owning \$682 billion of our debt. We watch this keep rising and rising, and the people want to know what's the future going to hold for them; where are the jobs going to be.

Well, the Republicans have offered a plan, especially one in which Ohio, under our plan, would create 246,000 jobs, compared to the 142,000 jobs offered under the current stimulus package.

I think that this Congress should examine what this Congress should be doing, making sure that we spend our dollars wisely.

□ 1415

WHERE WERE THE MEDIA . . . ?

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, sometimes media bias is most evident by the news that reporters choose not to cover.

For example, where were the media when the Congressional Budget Office announced last week that the economic stimulus package would reduce the long-term potential output of the economy? Almost every national media outlet ignored the CBO's negative report.

Where were the media when the White House announced last week that it would seize oversight of the Census Bureau and, thus, be able to politicize the nonpartisan census?

Where were the media when President Obama decided that an internal investigation by his own attorney was sufficient to clear his staff of any inappropriate dealings with the former Governor of Illinois?

Madam Speaker, can you imagine what the media would have done if a Republican President were involved?

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

WASHINGTON, DC,
February 9, 2009.

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

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI, This letter is to inform you that I will be taking a leave of absence from my position on the House Committee on Foreign Affairs (HCFA); however,

I reserve my right to retain my seniority on HCFA during my service on the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

Please do not hesitate to contact me or my Chief of Staff, Shana Chandler, with any questions or concerns.

Respectfully yours,

ADAM SMITH,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

MOTION TO GO TO CONFERENCE ON H.R. 1, AMERICAN RECOVERY AND REINVESTMENT ACT OF 2009

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, pursuant to clause 1 of rule XXII and by direction of the Committee on Appropriations, I move to take from the Speaker's table 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, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS). All time yielded during consideration of the motion is for debate only.

Madam Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

I think the need for this action is obvious. The country is in trouble economically. We need to put an economic recovery package in place just as soon as possible. Going to conference is the next step to making that happen, and I would urge support for the motion.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

It was less than 2 weeks ago that we debated the House version of the economic stimulus package. When we began this process, I was hopeful that the House and the Senate would heed the President's call for bipartisanship. Madam Speaker, clearly, that has not occurred. The House and Senate have now cleared their respective versions of the same legislation. To date, eleven Democrats have opposed the stimulus package in the House, and only three Republicans—that is three Republicans—have supported it in the Senate.

The manner in which this package was developed is the clearest demonstration to date that, while the President expresses his sincere interest in bipartisan collaboration, his own leadership in the House stubbornly clings to a top-down approach to governing. That top-down approach to governing that has dominated our politics

in the House these last 2 years is the single greatest impediment to bipartisanship and is the greatest threat to this institution that most of us love so much.

I am absolutely convinced that, given the opportunity, the chairmen and ranking members of each of the twelve appropriations subcommittees could have and would have worked together responsibly to develop a bipartisan piece of legislation that would stimulate the economy and would create millions and millions of American jobs. Given the opportunity, Republicans and Democrats would have produced a package that would have garnered the support of the House majority on both sides of the aisle. That, however, did not occur with this package.

The chairmen and ranking members of our Appropriations subcommittees were never given an opportunity to work in such a fashion. Not only were subcommittee chairmen and ranking members prevented from working constructively, but the majority staff of the Appropriations Committee was instructed on more than one occasion not to engage or to share information with their minority counterparts. Think about that, Madam Speaker. At the subcommittee level, we have very fine staff, very fine members who spend time concentrating in areas of expertise, and they were told by the top of the committee, "do not communicate at the staff level within the subcommittees," cutting off any sensible form or chance for compromise.

Bipartisanship is a pragmatic and constructive willingness on the part of both parties to engage in a beneficial give-and-take on various areas of disagreement to form consensus. Given this definition and approach and the manner in which critical legislation is now written, bipartisanship in this House really is no longer possible. It certainly does not even appear to be desired by the leadership.

I have said publicly and sincerely on several occasions that I want to see our President be successful. The urgency of the present economic situation demands that we work together in a constructive fashion, but that cannot occur when decisions are made solely by a handful of powerful leaders while the voices of other Members, who have much to contribute, are routinely disregarded and are summarily dismissed.

Spoken during our floor debate when he was discussing this process just 11 years ago, the words of Chairman OBEY ring particularly true when we consider my frustration at this moment. I quote my chairman, Mr. OBEY.

He said, "This is no way to establish bipartisan consensus. This is no way to establish a decent working relationship between the executive and legislative branches. We need to try to find common ground between the two parties."

We are proceeding with a motion to go to conference, but let us not for one moment believe this stimulus package is an example of bipartisan legislation,

because it is not now nor was it intended to be from the very beginning.

I reserve the balance of my time.
Mr. OBEY. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK).

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, before we continue with a stimulus policy that has consistently failed to stimulate anything other than the government, I think the supporters of this program need to answer some very simple questions.

For example, the President, himself, told us yesterday that this \$800 billion of new spending is going to produce 4 million new jobs. Well, that's great until you pull out a pocket calculator and realize that that comes to \$200,000 per job.

Question: Why don't we just send those 4 million lucky families a check for \$100,000 and save half of what the President wants to spend according to his own numbers?

The President, himself, told audiences this weekend that the spending bill would produce a renaissance of highway, road and bridge construction.

Question: If that is the object of this bill, why is only 3 percent of the funding going for that purpose?

The Congressional Budget Office last week noted that the current spending bill, although producing temporary relief, will incur so much long-term debt as to reduce overall GDP growth over the next decade.

Question: How do we strengthen our economic future by leaving the next generation with an unprecedented debt that will take decades to pay off?

We know of many cases where massive government spending and borrowing has destroyed economies and has brought down great nations. One need look no further than to the old Soviet Union.

Question: When in the recorded history of civilization has massive public spending ever stimulated an economy?

It did not work in Japan in the 1990s. The Japanese call that their lost decade. It did not work in America in the 1930s. The unemployment rate in 1939, after nearly a decade of New Deal spending, was the same as it was in 1931.

Madam Speaker, history warns us that bankrupt nations do not last very long. Before we continue with yet another round of massive spending and borrowing, I suggest we get some answers to these inconvenient questions.

Mr. OBEY. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Madam Speaker, I am privileged to yield 2 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM).

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Speaker, like many people, I have had a chance to at least look briefly at this bill. I have grave concerns about what it is going to do.

We are spending more than \$1 trillion in a hurried-up fashion here with very little oversight and with no hearings. Everything is just rushing forward. Everyone understands that we have got a real problem—an economic downturn in this country. We've got to do something, and we've got to act quickly to save those jobs, those opportunities for our families. We've got to get the country back on its feet again so it can prosper.

We had a proposal brought forth that was totally ignored—the idea of creating over 6 million new jobs at half the cost of what this bill costs—and it has been totally thrown aside. This would have put money immediately into people's pockets. It would have had them spending and getting this economy going and rolling again. That is exactly what we need to do, but we've never had an opportunity to put those into this bill.

It's not only what the bill does as far as spending over \$1 trillion. Some provisions in here make dramatic changes in the way our government operates. When we look at reversing welfare reform, the one great thing back from the Clinton administration, this is going to turn that on its head and allow people to stay on welfare for as long as they would like.

I think it also is very, very serious when we talk about a major change in health care reform in that this is going to put the government in charge of rationing health care, standing between you and your doctor. This is something that at least there should be some debate about. Somebody should have a chance to offer amendments to change these bills, these ideas that make massive changes in the fundamental way that we have welfare reform and the way our health care is delivered in this country.

Madam Speaker, to me, this is outrageous. We have got to step back. We have got to think about these things before we just jump into these major changes that are going to do great harm to our economy and to the future of our children and grandchildren.

Mr. OBEY. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE).

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of a meaningful solution to the economic challenges facing our Nation. The House Republican economic recovery plan, for example, would have created 6.2 million new jobs, and would have provided critical tax breaks for the small businesses that are the engine of our economy.

□ 1430

Unfortunately, today the Senate passed a borrow-and-spend bill that is full of wasteful spending and fails to provide the immediate relief the American people demand.

According to Rasmussen Reports, 62 percent of Americans want more tax cuts and less government spending in an economic stimulus plan. Yet only one-third of the Senate's bill focuses on that much-needed tax relief.

Madam Speaker, I've been contacted by hundreds and hundreds of Minnesotans who understand the need for meaningful relief. These men and women are frustrated with ineffective legislation that favors the creation of new government programs over new jobs—and saddles our children and grandchildren with more debt and bigger government.

One of these Minnesotans owns a trucking company. And he reported that he's had the worst quarter and the worst months in the history of his company, which is a second-generation company. They're having to lay off truckers. It's hard times. He does not support the Senate stimulus package.

One of those Minnesotans is another employer, a small businessman, had over 150 employees. They've had no new orders for systems since this summer. They, too, were having to lay off employees.

We understand that there are people hurting, but neither of these Minnesotans favors this non-stimulus plan.

Madam Speaker, let's listen to these American people. Let's listen to the Minnesotans. They deserve a stimulus that works.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve my time.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Madam Speaker, I am glad to yield 1 minute to Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

(Mr. ROE of Tennessee asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, this weekend the administration warned that our economic crisis could become a catastrophe if we failed to pass an economic stimulus package. Madam Speaker, avoiding a catastrophe is exactly why House Republicans are opposed to the package that the House considered just 2 weeks ago. The Senate bill, being hailed as a compromise by some, spends more money than the House bill did and still contains too much wasteful spending.

We strongly support a stimulus bill, but it must be a stimulus bill that grows our economy, creates jobs, and doesn't saddle our grandchildren with unnecessary debt. Purchasing golf carts for the Federal Government is not stimulative; neither is money designed to follow-up the census which doesn't even begin for 2 years.

We support reducing taxes for working families and small businesses and improving our roads and water and sewer infrastructure. All of this lays the groundwork for future growth and is a much wiser use for our precious tax dollars.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to recognize Mr. POE of Texas for 2 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, it's been said: "a billion dollars here, a

billion dollars there, eventually we're going to be talking about real money." Well, we're talking about real money in this stimulus package. Madam Speaker, let's make it clear. Spending money doesn't automatically stimulate the economy. That is a myth.

Now, this package is, oh, 800, \$900 billion. How much is that? Well, that means different things to different folks. Down in Australia, that is the entire cost of the Australian economy. Or looking at it another way, \$900 billion, if you take every junior and senior in high school in every high school in the United States, this money could give them a 4-year college education at a private university—now we're talking about real money—and still have \$150 billion left over.

Or looking at it another way, you could pay off 90 percent of the home mortgages in the United States.

This is serious business, Madam Speaker, and this bill does not stimulate the economy; it just spends a lot of taxpayer money.

What we should do is let Americans keep more of their own money. Cut taxes for those that pay taxes. Then they have their own money, they can spend it the way they want to, and they can stimulate our economy.

And that's just the way it is.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to recognize the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 2 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, I can't tell you how it warms my heart to hear the former chairman say he was pleased to yield me time. I appreciate that.

But one thing that isn't pleasing is this so-called stimulus bill. It's an abomination. We should not be doing this to future generations. I've got two pairs of words for you: One pair of words, tax holiday; another pair of words, American energy.

Our President went from promising all of these millions of jobs, three million, I believe, initially through this stimulus package to now saying we're going to create or save four million jobs. Why would we add "save"? Because there is no way to document saved jobs. So whatever happens, "Well, we lost four million jobs, but gee, we saved four million in the process." I guess that's what will be said at the end of it.

The problem is this is not going to stimulate the economy when over half of it, 60 percent of it, is not going to be spent for a couple of years or so.

The economy needs help now, and we need to do it without devastating our children and grandchildren. I used to sentence people for doing unconscionable things to their children or to children, and here now I'm a part of a body who wants to live better by taxing and hammering future generations. That's not right. There is nothing virtuous, there is nothing noble in loading down our future generations with this kind of debt.

And, in fact, my Democrat colleagues got in the majority by talking in 2005 and 2006 about the deficit spending, and they were right then. We shouldn't be doing it. Tax cuts got us record revenue in the Treasury; deficit spending got us in trouble. Greed got us in trouble. The immorality of people wanting it for themselves was just too much.

It is time to get back to morality and not loading up future generations, not making our children suffer for the sins of their parents. Let's don't sin any more by being immoral in the way we throw money. Let's do this the right way.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to recognize a member of the committee, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN), for 3 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Speaker, I strongly support an economic stimulus bill that will produce jobs that actually put people to work, especially in the private sector. H.R. 1 does not do that.

The notion that we need to expand State and Federal public employee rolls with a massive dollar increase in existing and entirely new domestic programs is not what my constituents back home want. My constituents are losing their jobs on Main Street and on Wall Street. The value of their homes has been reduced. Some teeter on the brink of forfeiture. Families' savings and investment accounts have been savaged.

And in this context, the House leadership proposes a bill that guarantees a burst of state and Federal hiring: bureaucracies that will undoubtedly handcuff small businesses with more rules and more regulation.

What's wrong with this picture?

As an illustration of what's wrong with the bill, let's look at the energy and water portfolio. Frankly, more funding has been proposed in H.R. 1 than could be possibly spent intelligently and effectively.

Under the bill, the budget for Department of Energy grants and loans explodes to \$30 billion. This sum alone is greater than the entire budget for the whole Department of Energy last year. Instead of being our premier R&D agency, DOE will become a grants-manager for tens of billions of borrowed money, much of it spent in expanding the Federal workforce. And what's left will expand State governments. Little will filter down to people who actually work with their hands, actually make things more efficiently, and advance technology.

This is all a recipe for more dysfunction for government acquisition systems that can barely handle their own workloads today. Are the State governments prepared? Their manpower is down, and those who might provide oversight and accountability are walking the unemployment lines as we speak.

My colleagues, remember Katrina: Poor planning, shoddy execution, non-competitive contract awards, abuse of

contractor flexibility, inadequate oversight, a climate for waste, an open invitation to fraud and corruption.

Madam Speaker, there are many reasons to oppose H.R. 1. Those who do not remember the lessons of Katrina are bound to repeat those mistakes. In the meantime, we're missing a precious opportunity to create real private sector jobs and prevent layoffs.

I've heard from my constituents in New Jersey. They want a stimulus package, but they don't want this one.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Madam Speaker, could I inquire about the time remaining on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) has 12 minutes remaining; the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has 29½ minutes remaining.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND).

Mr. WESTMORELAND. I want to thank the ranking member for recognizing me.

And I want to just say, you know, as I spent time at home this weekend, I would see the polls were 38 percent of the American people in favor of this stimulus bill. Evidently those 38 percent don't understand that this is a government-expansion spending bill and not really a stimulus bill. But I don't know who the 38 percent of those people were because everybody I talked to in my district was upset that we were trying to create new government spending programs and claim it to be a stimulus.

There are 20 new programs in this stimulus bill that have never been in the government before, 20 new programs. There needs to be some programs that we find that are inefficient. I can't believe that every program in our government is working to where it services the citizens.

But let me say this: The things that we are spending money on, such as car credits—a lot of people say, "Good. Car credits are great," but they're for two-wheel, three-wheel electric plug-ins; not for the cars that are sitting on these lots today that these dealers need to get rid of.

So we need to look at what the Republican plan did and actually give people money to keep in their own pocket. In fact, they wouldn't even have to give it. They could just keep it from what they're paying right now in their Federal taxes. This is a way to stimulate the economy. Spending other people's money does not stimulate. Spending other people's money does not stimulate. We are spending people's money that are the taxpayers. They need to spend that money. We're borrowing money from foreign countries to be able to do this. We're printing money at a very rapid rate.

What we need to be doing, Madam Speaker, is looking at ways to create the jobs that the average person that's standing in the unemployment line can

have right now, not create more government and create more government jobs, but create more jobs in the private sector.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Madam Speaker, I am proud to yield 1 minute to the Republican leader, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER).

Mr. BOEHNER. Madam Speaker, let me thank my colleague from California for yielding.

Today, earlier, President Obama held a town hall meeting in Fort Meyer, Florida. He discussed the need to create more jobs for Florida families and families across our country. This has been one of our shared goals since the outset of this process. And that's why House Republicans have crafted a plan that creates the most jobs in the shortest period of time. In fact, our plan would create 141,000 more jobs for Florida families than the package that's under consideration.

And overall, it would create twice as many jobs, some 6.2 million jobs in all, at half of the price of the bill that's moving through Congress.

And don't just take my word for it. This is based on the methodology used by President Obama's own nominee as chair of the White House Council of Economic Advisers, Dr. Christina Romer.

How? How do we create all of these jobs? We encourage investment and create jobs by letting families, small businesses, home buyers and job seekers keep more of what they earn. Unfortunately, the House and Senate bills take us in a different direction.

We already know that they rely on slow-moving, wasteful spending here in Washington, but there's more.

The plan that's currently on the table tries to take advantage of the crisis in our economy to enact a series of liberal policy proposals that have nothing to do with economic recovery. It discourages Americans from working, loosens welfare reform's work requirements, and encourages more Americans to become dependent on government programs. And through a proposal called Comparative Effectiveness, it aims to put the Federal Government in charge of some of the most important life and death decisions that families face.

The bill is supposed to be about creating jobs, not about reversing welfare reform or letting government ration out America's health care options.

There is still time for both parties to work together to craft a bill that puts job creation first and foremost. But I think it's up to the majority to help make that happen.

□ 1445

Republicans want to work in a constructive way to help families during this economic crisis, and we want to answer the President's call for bipartisanship and his call for a plan that creates jobs first and foremost. The bills being considered don't do that.

We do believe that our economy is in a crisis. Families and small businesses

are hurting, and the government must act, but we must act in a prudent way that does what we all want to do, and that's to preserve jobs in America and to create more jobs in America.

Unfortunately, the plans that we're seeing don't do that. The plan that we put on the table for consideration would, in fact, create 6.2 million jobs over the next 2 years, twice as many jobs as the bills being considered at half the price tag.

It's time to work in a bipartisan way to solve this crisis, and I would urge my colleagues to listen to our ideas and work with us on behalf of the American people.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS).

Mr. BURGESS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I would just urge my colleagues to take a second look before committing this bill to conference.

We're making some fundamental changes in the way health care is administered in this country as a result of this bill, which has nothing to do with the creation of jobs but everything to do with the government taking a greater and greater share of our personal liberties that pertains to health care.

Certainly the funding cliffs that are present in the funding for Medicaid and COBRA—COBRA extending medical benefits for 12 months, Medicaid an additional 18 months—but what happens at the end of that 12- or 18-month interval? Do those individuals just fall off a cliff or will Congress have to come back with yet more money?

Already we're talking about an \$800 billion bill. We don't include in that the cost of capital. If we were honest about this bill and included the cost of capital and the cost of funding past those funding cliffs, this, in reality, would be a \$3 trillion product.

And, Madam Speaker, I spent an hour today down at the Bureau of Debt and watched \$32 billion be auctioned off shortly before one o'clock today. That was the third time today that they've had an auction down there. This is an incredible amount of paper that we're selling on the worldwide market, and you have to wonder how long the market can sustain that.

And perhaps just as pernicious, we heard the minority leader mention the comparative effect of this statute, the health information technology statute, something that I support, that I believe in but really has no place in a stimulus bill. Look at the power, look at the power we're giving to the Office of the National Coordinator for Health Information Technology that provides medical decisions, sets the time and place of care. We're devolving an enormous amount of power to an individual that none of us, in fact, even know who that is at the present time.

We're politicizing health care in this country in a way that's never been

done before, and we at least ought to be honest with the American people about what we're doing and not do it under the cover of night.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) 2 minutes.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I stand in opposition to H.R. 1, and I can stand here and talk about specific line items in the bill that were first presented to us in the House, not a whole lot different from what's coming over from the Senate, but the bottom line is that we on this side of the aisle have an alternative that would do a whole lot better, and I don't think I can say it any better than comparing my own State of Georgia.

The Republican alternative would create 186,000 jobs in the State of Georgia. This bill would create 113,000. That's a difference of 73,000 jobs, and we do it, Madam Speaker, with much less spending, in fact less than half of the spending that's in this current bill. And we do it by making sure that the tax cuts are directed towards small businessmen and -women and, of course, lowering the capital gains and the tax on dividends.

So we get money in the hands of the people immediately, 5 percent cut in taxes across-the-board, every marginal rate, and last but not least, Madam Speaker, to cut spending 1 percent across the board, with the exception, of course, of national defense.

I've heard President Obama and others say, you know, we need to do something right now; don't just stand there, do something. But this clearly is a time that we need to take a deep breath and make sure that we do the right thing because the downside risk of adding \$1.2 trillion worth of debt to a 10.7 current debt, I don't know how our children and grandchildren will ever pay for this, and the chances of it being successful are slim and none in my opinion.

I'm opposed to it. I think we can do better.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Madam Speaker, I'm proud to yield 2 minutes to Mr. COLE from Oklahoma, a member of the committee.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak against going to conference on the stimulus bill, H.R. 1. However, I'm also rising in support of keeping the conference open.

The time has come to expose this legislation for what it is, a grab bag of special interest projects that will do little in the way of stimulating the economy and will significantly increase our deficit, literally risking our bond rating and triggering future tax increases.

Never in the history of our country has so much money been spent in so little time with, frankly, so little oversight.

As a new member of the Appropriations Committee, a gentleman asked me, well, what's it like? I said, I don't know. I showed up to one meeting. We spent \$358 billion in about 3 hours. It was an open process. There was full debate, but there hadn't been subcommittee meetings, and there wasn't time for genuine discussion and give-and-take, in my view.

This train is moving so fast down the tracks, it's hard to determine, frankly, what's in the legislative package from day-to-day, and unfortunately, in my opinion, the package has not been bipartisan in nature. It's not been developed through negotiation and discussion.

Madam Speaker, I trust the President when he says that this should be a bipartisan package, and frankly, I wish the Democratic leadership in the House had seen fit to make it so. But a bipartisan package generally requires the two sides to sit down and negotiate, and frankly, genuinely bipartisan legislation usually requires that some Members on each side vote "no."

What we have today is a package that's going to be rammed through on a largely partisan vote where, frankly, the minority feels like it hasn't had an opportunity to participate. Again, I have no problem with that because that's the legislative process. As our friends like to say, they won the election.

Of course, so did we. Everybody that's in this body won an election. Everybody has a point of view, and if you want to have genuine bipartisan legislation, then you have to involve the other side.

The route we're taking will end up, again, in virtually universal support by Democrats and universal opposition by Republicans. It doesn't have to be that way. We could have either debated the Republican alternative or done something else and found common ground.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time. May I inquire of the chairman if he has any additional speakers. I'm going to reserve and yield back my time.

Mr. OBEY. I have one speaker, myself.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, I don't intend to take a lot of time, but I do want to respond to some of the claims and comments made today in opposition to this legislation.

First of all, I do want to thank the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE). Like myself, he is a committed partisan, and I think, like myself, he is also an institutionalist, and while I recognize that he very much differs with the product that we have before us, I appreciate the fact that he did indicate that the committee consideration of this bill was an open process.

Let me simply respond to a few of the comments made by my friends on the other side of the aisle.

We're told by numerous speakers that this package is too large. In fact, I fear that it may be too small. We can't determine the proper size of any economic recovery package unless we have some understanding and some anticipation of the size of the problem that it is meant to alleviate.

My old friend Archie the Cockroach, for instance, in talking about the need for proportion said once, in life you always need proportion. "Of what use is it for a queen bee to fall in love with a bull?"

I think that if we have large and serious economic crisis coming at us, that response needs to be large, bold and aggressive, and that's what I believe the President's package is.

Now, this package is \$820 billion. It represents less than 6 percent of our total gross domestic product spread over several years. I would point out that when World War II hit us governmental spending went from 10 percent of GDP in 1940 to 44 percent in 1943 and 1944, a huge percentage, an increase of 34 percent. That was to save the country in time of war.

I would submit that the challenge to our economy today is every bit as large as the challenge of World War II was to this country in another time because we have been faced with the prospect of virtually total collapse of the financial sector of this economy.

Under the previous President, President Bush, when the crisis finally hit, this Congress gave him the benefit of the doubt, and even though we, many of us, had strong misgivings about the wisdom of the proposal, and even though many of us were frustrated by the fact that Secretary Paulson would not provide sufficient relief on the mortgage front, we nonetheless supported the President's request because we were told that the alternative was to see an absolute freeze up and collapse of the credit markets in this country, with disastrous results. Not just for those Wall Street wizards who helped cause the problem, but would also have resulted in the crushing of everybody else below them on the economic ladder as they fell from their Wall Street perches.

And now the President is asking us to do two additional things. His Secretary of the Treasury today is scheduled to explain to the country what their second step will be with respect to trying to stabilize the financial system in this country and, at the same time, trying to do something to deal with the horrendous collapse of housing prices and the horrendous collapse of people's equity in their homes. And then the next thing the President wants us to do is to pass this package.

Now, this package, as I've said, is a huge, huge endeavor. It is certainly of the size that would have been shocking just a few months ago, but it's responding to a problem just as large, and I want to show you what we're trying to respond to.

This chart shows projected unemployment levels from now through 2

years from today. It was presented by Mr. Mark Zandi, one of the principal economic advisers to Senator McCain in the last campaign. He represents Moody's Economy.com. The red bars indicate what he expects to happen to the unemployment levels if we do nothing. What he expects is that unemployment will rise from over 7 percent, slightly over 7 percent where it is today, to almost 11 percent and perhaps even higher 2 years from now.

□ 1500

In other words, he sees the economy sliding ever more deeply into the abyss over the next 2 years if we do nothing.

The blue bars represent what he thinks the unemployment levels will be if we do pass a \$750 billion economic recovery package. Even then, he projects that by the second quarter of—not this year, but next year—he projects that unemployment will still have risen to around 9 percent.

As the President said last night, what that means is that no matter what we do, we are going to have a very, very rough year. And it is his hope and it is the expectation of most economists that if we pass this package, or something close to it, then we will be able to mitigate the rise in unemployment, that we will be able to reduce the expected levels of unemployment by at least 2 percent. And we hope what that will do is to begin to bring additional revenues back into the Treasury and, at the same time, in combination with the other actions of the President, restore a modicum of public confidence in the economy. Between those two actions, get the economy moving again, slowly but surely.

So this package attempts to use the only tool that we have available to get the economy going again. Normally, when we run into economic trouble, what we would do is rely on monetary policy in order to get us out of it. The problem is we have already fired that gun. The Federal Reserve has already brought interest rates down to record low levels. So we don't have that bullet in the gun any more.

About the only bullet left that we can fire is one of fiscal stimulus. And that is what this bill tries to do. It tries to make up for the fact that over the next 2½ years we are expected to have a \$2.5 trillion hole in the economy because of the collapse of consumer purchasing power. And, as a result, what the President is trying to do is to partially fill that economic hole to mitigate the expected steep rise in unemployment.

And so the President is trying, in essence, to create or preserve about 4 million jobs by providing additional funding to produce clean, efficient energy alternatives. He wants to provide more jobs by trying to transform our economy through beefing up science and technology. He wants to provide more jobs by modernizing roads, bridges, transit, and waterways, to deal with the crumbling infrastructure of the last 30 years.

He wants to preserve hundreds of thousands of jobs by helping States to maintain their education budgets as their own revenue sources collapse so that we don't have to lay off school teachers; so we don't have to lay off janitors; so we don't have to lay off speech therapists and guidance counselors; so that we don't have to lay off cops; so that we don't have to lay off park workers.

In addition, he wants us to provide tax cuts in order to enable the middle class to finally get a little better deal on the tax side of the ledger. He wants to help workers hurt by the economy by providing additional help for those who have lost their jobs by way of an extension and an expansion of unemployment compensation. And he also wants to help those who have lost their health insurance by providing greater access to Medicaid and by providing some help to keep up with what is called their COBRA payments.

So that is what this package is all about. It is not perfect by any means. And we have substantial, but I hope not overpowering, differences between us and the Senate.

And so the purpose of this motion is to simply have us get on with it. To take the next step we know that we have to take if we are going to do something constructive to move this country forward. We can all debate the fine points of this package until the cows come home, as they say in my area of the country. But the fact is, sooner or later we need to take heed and remember what Franklin Roosevelt said in a not very different situation years ago when he said, "We need action, and action now."

This package is meant to begin that process. I would urge Members to support the motion.

Mr. OLVER. Madam Speaker, I support quickly moving forward with a recovery package to put America back to work.

The reckless actions of much of Wall Street, coupled with years of inadequate regulatory oversight, have led to a housing and financial crisis of enormous proportions. Spiraling foreclosure rates have put millions of families on the brink of disaster and infected the entire economy. We must stop an economic collapse and throw a life-line to the millions of people that are struggling to find work and support their families.

In the last four months alone, the economy has lost over 2 million jobs. By the end of 2009, an additional 3–5 million Americans could lose their jobs and without this package, the unemployment rate is likely to rise to 12 percent.

Any final bill must create new jobs by: repairing and improving our nation's roads, highways and bridges and improve and expand public transportation in urban and rural areas. Surface transportation funding in the House bill would create more than 1 million new jobs.

The House and Senate bills would also create jobs by investing in safety and capacity improvements at our Nation's airports; capital investments in Amtrak and intercity passenger rail; and energy retrofits in our Nation's public housing, HUD assisted housing and Indian reservation housing.

This is just some of the important job creating stimulus in this bill.

It is important that we act quickly to bolster the sagging economy.

I strongly support this investment package because it will help put America back to work and improve our transportation and housing infrastructure.

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to be here to support this motion to go to conference on the Recovery bill. It has been some time since we have had an actual conference on a tax bill. The purpose of conferences is to work out differences between the chambers and that give-and-take will usually result in a better bill.

I commend Chairman RANGEL for crafting a responsible tax title that will deliver substantial relief in tough economic times. This means 95 percent of all taxpayers will see tax cuts through the Making Work Pay credit, including 2 million families in Massachusetts. Working families will also benefit from improvements to the child tax credit, the earned income tax credit, and a new higher education tax credit.

Businesses across the country will benefit from bonus depreciation and small business expensing provisions, as well as relief for those businesses with net operating losses. And state and local governments will see substantial relief for infrastructure needs through greater bond authority and lowering the costs to borrow.

The Senate has worked its will and made a number of changes to our House bill, which our conferees should give due consideration. Twenty-six million families will be protected from the AMT under the Senate bill, and that is a provision I am hopeful we can include here. It is something we will enact this year, no doubt. But sooner is better than later.

However, some of the spending cuts, especially for education and higher education, could eliminate the possibility for many of our schools, colleges, and universities to pull out of this economic slump, where credit is tight and borrowing prohibitively expensive.

I am very optimistic and have great confidence in our conferees to craft a recovery package that lifts our economy out of the mire. As the President has directed, time is of the essence. So I urge my colleagues to support this motion.

Mr. CAPUANO. Madam Speaker, I supported H.R. 1, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, because we need to create and preserve jobs. In the final analysis I believe that this bill offers enough stimulus to earn a "Yes" vote from me. There is no question that help is needed. Each day seems to bring more sobering news about layoffs and business closings. This bill will serve as a boost for job creation and for our overall economy. It is estimated that the legislation, once enacted, will create or save millions of American jobs. I also believe, however, that this legislation relies too heavily on tax cuts to stimulate the economy and a fair amount of the spending, though generally desirable, does not offer a truly stimulative aspect. Nevertheless, on balance I felt that it was better to accept an imperfect bill than wait for a perfect measure that may never materialize. We simply cannot wait much longer to provide as much relief as possible to the American public.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

The motion was agreed to.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT

Mr. LEWIS of California. Madam Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. LEWIS of California moves to instruct the managers on the part of the House that they shall not record their approval of the final conference agreement (as such term is used in clause 12(a)(4) of rule XXII of the Rules of the House of Representatives) unless the text of such agreement has been available to the managers in an electronic, searchable, and downloadable form for at least 48 hours prior to the time described in such clause.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XXII, the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Thank you, Madam Speaker. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The debate over the Pelosi-Obey non-stimulus package has often focused on the nearly \$1 trillion it will spend, much of it in ways that will not stimulate our economy or create badly needed jobs. It will, however, stimulate tremendous growth in the size and scope of the Federal Government and our national debt.

Well-meaning people can disagree about this legislation, but the simple truth is that nearly 2 weeks after it passed the House, we are still discovering every day what exactly is in this package. The Senate just passed its own version this afternoon and I'm certain that Senators, too, will discover aspects of this bill in the coming days that they were simply unaware of when it came to a vote.

What is most troubling is how some of the Federal agencies will distribute the massive amounts of funding provided for in this bill. For instance, agencies will use funding in the House-passed bill for these endeavors: \$30 million for salt marsh harvest mouse habitation restoration in the San Francisco bay; \$8 to \$10 million for oyster restoration in the Gulf of Mexico; \$600 million for the acquisition of plug-in vehicles, which are not made or currently available in the United States. Sadly, the list goes on and on.

While these may be worthy endeavors, they certainly do not meet the test of being "timely, targeted, and temporary." And they certainly do not belong in an economic stimulus bill.

I had hoped when this process began that the House and Senate would embark on a bold new experiment—building a bipartisan consensus—to reflect not only the tone set forth by the President, but to live up to the expectations of the American people.

Let's face it—my voters and your voters are sick and tired of the typical

Washington finger pointing and want us to work together. The House leadership had a tremendous opportunity to use this legislation as a vehicle for bipartisanship. Much to my disappointment, the decision was made to forego bipartisanship in the name of expediency. I believe this expediency will prove costly over the long run.

As the House and Senate prepare to conference separate versions of the stimulus package, it is absolutely essential that House Members and Senators know exactly what is included in the final conference agreement.

It is for this reason that I am making this motion to instruct House conferees not to sign the final conference agreement unless the text of such agreement has been available to the conferees in an electronic, searchable, and downloadable form at least 48 hours prior to their approval.

If the House is about to cast its approval of the largest spending bill in history, the least we can do is to ensure that Members have 48 hours to review what is in it. That is not an unreasonable request. To the contrary, it is the reasonable and responsible thing to do.

While this motion limits public availability to conferees, I think any final agreement should, in practice, be available to the public in advance as well. Members have an obligation to their constituents to know the contents of the conference report before they cast their vote in what certainly will be one of the most important votes they will ever cast in this body. They should know—have a chance to know—what is in it. We ought not act in haste when spending almost \$1 trillion of our taxpayers' money.

I urge Democrats and Republicans alike to join me in supporting this motion to instruct conferees and provide that 48 hours I mentioned.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 4 minutes. Madam Speaker, we have often been accused of trying to push this bill rapidly through the Congress. In fact, we have been trying to push a recovery package through this Congress for the last 150 days.

We began this process in September when we tried to persuade the previous Bush administration of the necessity to support an economic recovery package. That White House would have none of it. Nonetheless, we put together a package—very modest in size compared to this one—trying to look for anything that President Bush would sign, and that product was well known.

It has evolved gradually since that time as the economy has descended further and further and further into a recessionary and deflationary spiral. We now have had this legislation in both the House and the Senate appear on the Web.

Our committee, as soon as we produced the final product in the House, placed the bill on the Web. And the Senate placed the Nelson amendment, which is the amendment that they are

now operating on, they placed it on the Web as well. So I think both Chambers have demonstrated that they are trying to do every bit that they can to provide transparency for the process.

I have no objection to what the language in this motion to instruct conferees says. I do have one caution: every day that we do not take action, an additional 20,000 Americans lose their jobs. And that is accelerating.

I don't intend to go anywhere. The Speaker has made it quite clear that this Congress is not going to go home for its Presidents Day recess until this package is finished. So we are scheduled to adjourn for that recess on Friday. But I have no problem sticking around for as long as it takes to get the job done.

I would point out that there's considerably less to this proposal than meets the eye because all it does is to require the text of the proposal to be available to the managers of the bill. And I suspect that the managers, who will be participating in these discussions, will know literally from moment to moment exactly what it is that they are doing.

□ 1515

I am sure that each and every person appointed to be managers on both sides of the aisle will be reasonably competent so that they can do that. So I would simply point out the effectiveness is simply to delay consideration of this legislation when it does come back from conference. If that is what Members want to go on record as supporting, I have no objection whether this passes or not. I will be around as long as it takes; and, frankly, I expect it is going to take a whole lot longer than just this week.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Madam Speaker, I am proud to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON), the ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

(Mr. BARTON of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTON of Texas. First, let me say I rise in support of the motion to instruct. But what I really want to talk about is President Obama's call for bipartisanship. We heard it last night in his press conference; we have heard it in every major speech that he has given. And, somehow, it is just the Republicans' fault that we are not being bipartisan. Well, I have had it up to here with the rhetoric. The reality is totally different.

We have before us a motion to go to conference in which not one Republican amendment was accepted on the House floor, in which there were no hearings in any of the committees in the House of Representatives, in which in the Energy and Commerce Committee of which I am the senior Republican we didn't have any hearings. We

did have a markup. We got five Republican amendments accepted in the markup in committee, but three of those were stripped when the bill came to the floor. We are apparently going to have five House conferees out of 435 Members; we are going to have nobody from the Energy and Commerce Committee, nobody from the Education and Workforce Committee, nobody from the Ag Committee, nobody from Homeland Security, nobody from Veterans', nobody from Financial Services. The list goes on and on. That is not bipartisanship. I don't know what it is; but if President Obama is listening, if you really want to be bipartisan, pick up the phone and call the Speaker and say: allow the 41 percent of the House that represents the Republicans to be a part of the process. It is not bipartisan where we are presented a bill and told "take it or leave it."

Now, I understand that if one side has 59 percent and the other side has 41 percent, the 59 percent can win every vote; but that doesn't mean that the 41 percent has no say. And we have a bill somewhere between \$820 billion and \$850 billion, which is more than the entire economy of the country of Australia, which is 20 years of state spending of the State of Texas, which is equal to almost the entire discretionary budget of United States of America, and we are going to pass it after a floor debate 2 weeks ago of 3 to 4 hours, and I don't know how many hours of debate we are going to have today and tomorrow, but it is 3 or 4 hours. Now, that to me is shameful.

The regular appropriation process, which Mr. OBEY is the chairman of, they have 12 subcommittees; they have hearings in every subcommittee; they have markup in every subcommittee. They take each bill to the full committee and have a markup. The bills, theoretically, come to the floor separately and under an open rule where any Member of the House can stand up and offer an amendment.

This process is a dictatorship. I could talk about the substance of the bill, but at least know, the American people, that the process that we are spending \$800 billion to \$900 billion is a closed system. I strongly oppose it.

Mr. OBEY. I yield myself 1 minute.

Madam Speaker, I yield myself this time to simply observe that my friend from Texas is wrong in one respect. The gentleman suggested that no Republican amendments were adopted on floor consideration of the bill. The Platts amendment was adopted; the Shuster amendment was adopted. The last time I looked, both of those gentlemen were Republicans.

I would also point out that in the committee consideration of the bill, more Republican amendments were adopted, much to my consternation, than were Democratic amendments. I would also point out, in our hearing in the full committee we did have a hearing on the need for an economic recovery package. When we held that hear-

ing, I am sorry that only three members of the minority attended because the minority members were asked by the ranking member of the committee to boycott the hearing.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding me this time. I support his motion to instruct and think he has done a very fine job of explaining part of the problems that we have with this bill.

President Obama I understand had promised that, before he would sign any bill, it would be available to the American public for at least 5 days. We are only asking for 48 hours, and yet we are getting excuses after excuses for why this bill cannot be made available for 48 hours. We all remember the rush to fund Katrina, what a debacle that was. And I remember the old saying: act in haste and repent at leisure. We don't know what is in this bill, and we need to know.

Much has been made of the Senate action to cut spending in the bill, but it doesn't show the full picture, because in many ways the Senate bill will lead to an even bigger expansion of the Federal Government and long-term Federal spending than the House bill. If all the new programs proposed by the House and Senate make it into the conference report, we will have created 42 new government programs, programs that the taxpayers likely are now on the hook to continue funding in the future. The Senate bill did nothing to cut the number of existing Federal programs that were included in the House. In fact, the House and Senate combined to propose to expand 87 existing Federal programs, 82 billion from the Senate bill and 93 billion in the House bill. This is not funding for one-time stimulative programs, but will go on to expand these programs, forcing Congress to maintain most, if not all, of these higher funding levels. The public doesn't understand that.

The final stimulus package can include as many as 129 new and expanded Federal programs. And my colleague, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, failed to mention that, in terms of amendments that were accepted by the committees, that after three amendments were accepted by the full Appropriations Committee they were taken out in the Speaker's office when the bill was rewritten in the Speaker's office.

Mr. OBEY. I yield myself 30 seconds to simply again correct the gentlewoman. The fact is that the amendment that related to the process by which highway projects were funded and approved was not taken out in the Speaker's office; it was taken out on the House floor when, on a bipartisan basis, Republican and Democratic members of the T&I Committee wanted to see that changed.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON), a member of the committee.

Mrs. EMERSON. Madam Speaker, first, I would like to say that I hope this bill can be vastly improved in the conference committee.

While much has been said about the Senate cuts, their version of the bill still costs \$838 billion, which is a \$20 billion increase over the House-passed bill of \$819 billion.

Also, with regard to the Financial Services section of the recovery bill, and particularly since I am a new ranking member, I am disappointed that neither I nor the minority's committee staff were given an opportunity to consult with the majority members or staff before the bill was produced and unveiled on the Internet. I hope that this practice won't continue as this stimulus bill is negotiated with the Senate and as the committee begins its work for fiscal year 2010.

With regard to the motion to instruct before us, it simply asks that the House conferees not approve of the final conference agreement until the text of the legislation has been available in an electronic, searchable, and downloadable form for at least 48 hours prior to voting on the final agreement. I think this is a simple request, and it is a simple request that ensures American people have an opportunity to review the bill and contact their representatives regarding its content. I believe, and I think all of us believe, that our constituents have a right to see the bill before it is voted out of conference and it is no longer amendable.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from the committee, Mr. KIRK of Illinois.

Mr. KIRK. Spending under this legislation totals over \$800 billion, requiring the Bureau of the Debt, we project, to attempt to borrow \$2.1 trillion to finance this legislation. And this legislation isn't the only big spending bill we will consider. Shortly, we will consider a \$410 billion omnibus appropriation reportedly containing 4,000 earmarks, followed by a \$100 billion supplemental.

I was just at the Bureau of the Public Debt today watching the Federal Government go \$32 billion in debt, one of three public auctions. We have an enormous requirement for borrowing money, five times more than in the history of the United States, totaling \$76,000 per taxpayer if this legislation passes. We have seen other sovereign debt issues fail. Recently, the government of Germany failed to auction its debt because so much was being offered.

Under this legislation, and with other legislation that is pending on the omnibus and on the supplemental, the Bureau of the Debt will be forced to auction \$150 billion per week of the

United States going into debt. We have never seen so much debt auctioned before, and this is not coordinated with other governments. Other governments, like the Government of China, the Government of the United Kingdom, France all have their own stimulus packages going into debt \$1.2 trillion themselves.

The question: With all of these governments borrowing over \$3 trillion, who has the money to pay this? Now we know our kids are going to pay for this long term, but who is going to pay for this next week? And the answer is: maybe debt markets, maybe not.

We have never seen the United States go this far into debt this quickly. It took 40 Presidents, from President Washington to President Reagan, to build up \$1 trillion in debt. The previous President doubled our debt to \$6 trillion. But now, we are going \$2.6 trillion more into debt in a month. In a month. Can we auction this much debt this quickly? It is a question that should be asked and answered before we pass this legislation.

Mr. OBEY. I yield myself 1 minute.

Madam Speaker, the last people in the world I will take lectures from on fiscal responsibility are those Members of this House who voted for the Bush economic programs that borrowed \$1.2 trillion and then took us into a war which, before it is over, will cost us another at least \$1.5 trillion.

Secondly, I would simply answer the gentleman's question when he asks who is going to pay. I would ask, who is going to pay if we do nothing and do not implement this package? I would submit the people who will pay will be every American who loses his or her job, every businessman who loses his ability to get credit because of the constriction of the economy; every student who will have to quit college because his family cannot afford to help him go.

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

Mr. OBEY. I yield myself an additional 1 minute.

And every person who loses one-third to one-half the value of their 401(k)s because of the continuing unraveling of the economy.

□ 1530

That is who will pay.

We need to stop the political rhetoric and recognize this problem is serious enough that we need to rise above our usual recitation of trivia and deal with the major problems facing this country. And we can't do that without taking action on this package.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Madam Speaker, how much time do we have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 17½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 23 minutes remaining.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana, our conference chairman, MICHAEL PENCE.

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

Mr. PENCE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I take a second chair to no one in this conference in my respect for the integrity of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee. Mr. OBEY is a man with whom I differ on a broad range of issues, but he is a man of integrity, Madam Speaker. And I come to this floor in part to acknowledge that.

Let me say also how much I appreciate that the chairman said that he has no objection to the motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 1 that is before the body today that would require that before the House shall record its final approval to the conference agreement that the text of the agreement should be made available to the managers in an electronic, searchable and downloadable form for at least 48 hours. I commend the chairman for that.

I would respectfully disagree with the statement that the chairman just made, Madam Speaker, and it's a statement that we heard the President of the United States make last night. And maybe it was inadvertent by the chairman, but it is this contrast that somehow this debate is between people that want to do something and people that want to do nothing. With great respect to the chairman, that is not an accurate articulation of the competing positions on this bill.

House Republicans know we are in a recession. This is a very serious time in the life of American families and in the life of our economy. At the President's invitation, House Republicans brought forward a series of proposals that would bring fast-acting tax relief to working families, small businesses and family farms. And despite President Obama's laudable call for bipartisanship, those House Republican proposals were completely excluded from this bill. And so to hear last night on national television and to hear today that there are those of us in the body that would do nothing, I would say respectfully to my Democratic colleagues and to this administration, who are you talking about? I know of no Republican in the House or the Senate who believes in these challenging economic times that we should do nothing. House Republicans believe simply that we should do the right thing. And millions of Americans stand with us that this massive spending bill that is nothing more than a tired wish list of leftover liberal spending priorities is not the answer. But we simply believe that we can do better. And by requiring that this legislation be on the Internet for 48 hours before final vote, we believe we're going to have a better opportunity to get the American people even more into that conversation than they are today.

I still believe that we can achieve a bipartisan result. I believe in the goodwill of the chairman of the Appropria-

tions Committee. And I believe in his integrity. I believe in the goodwill of a great number of my colleagues on the Democrat side of the aisle. And I believe our President is sincere in saying that in these difficult economic times, we ought to be coming together and bringing the best ideas from both sides of the aisle to confront this very serious recession. But let's bring the American people into this debate. Let's pass this motion and ensure that this bill is open to the public for 48 hours. And we will hear what they have to say.

Mr. OBEY. I yield myself 1 minute.

Let me simply say in response to the gentleman's comments, that indeed I believe that Republican ideas have been included. I have had dozens of conversations with members of the minority side of the aisle who would talk to me about this item or that item that they thought either ought to be in or be out of the package. And we've responded in numerous instances. I would also point out that the President himself has pointed out that when he first talked to Republican leadership about what ought to be in this package, they told him there ought to be a healthy dollop of tax cuts in the package, and that when he produced the package, which did contain significant tax cuts, a number of Republicans then indicated that they were, in fact, pleasantly surprised by the fact that the President had done that.

Apparently, however, since then, they have decided to move the goalpost. The President can't do much about that. And I can't do much about that. I suspect that the people moving the goalposts are the people who might consider moving it back again.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Madam Speaker, it is my honor to yield 1 minute to the whip on the Republican side of the aisle, Mr. CANTOR.

Mr. CANTOR. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

And let me respond to the last statement from my colleague on the other side of the aisle, Mr. OBEY, that that is not the way things happen. We were invited to the White House because the President felt it appropriate to reach out to us to take into consideration our proposals. We submitted to him in person a Republican economic recovery plan. Yes, it was more weighted for tax relief. Yes, it was, in a reduced way, a spending formula, because at the end of the day what any stimulus bill should be about is preserving, protecting and creating jobs, period. And as the President said last night, there is a lot in this bill that people may like. But do you know what? He also said the plan is not perfect because it was produced in Washington. This President came to this town and was elected because he said he was going to deliver on change.

Madam Speaker, I would say if we are serious about a true stimulus bill, let's get down to business. Let's provide small business tax relief because they create 70 percent of the jobs in

this country. Let's not embark on a spending spree that is the biggest spending spree in the history of this country.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, the saying everybody in here already knows is that "if you find yourself in a hole, it's time to stop digging." And there was far too much deficit spending for far too long.

This bill, clearly, with all its lack of transparency, is not about jobs. If it were just about jobs, then we could have the proposals by the Energy Committee and the Republicans in the Natural Resources Committee with some of the Blue Dogs, we could open up Alaska to oil and gas exploration where it has not been, open up the OCS, and we would get 3 million jobs without taking the future away from our children.

Now, the American people intuitively know this is not a good thing. Even though there is so much that is not transparent, they are not allowed to see it because of the opposition to the former chairman's motion here. But they know. The Dow knows. I just saw we are down 380 points even with this bill having passed the Senate and being brought in here now. People understand this is not a good thing. If it's something you're proud of, then go along with the motion to instruct and let the American people see this product you apparently are so proud of that is going to just auction off our children's future.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN).

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Speaker PELOSI, as well as President Obama, talked about wanting to have a new era of openness and transparency. And that is exactly what this motion to instruct is all about. It is to bring openness and transparency of this huge bill to the American public.

And I can't understand why my Democrat colleagues seem to be so bent on getting this bill to the floor and passed, because we don't even know what all is in there. I understand that the \$600 million that were originally slated in the House bill to prepare America for socialized medicine has been expanded to \$2 billion. And the American public has the possibility of having their health care decisions made by some health care czar and some bureaucracy here in the Federal Government, not by their doctor. And in fact, their doctor may be even chosen by this health care czar.

This is not right. This is not transparency. This is not fairness. The American people deserve better than this. So I encourage my Democratic colleagues to look at this motion to instruct and to support it so that the American people can see what is in this bill. We can come back next week or

some time or even through the weekend. We can put it online today. And we can vote on it on Friday evening or Thursday evening if you will just do that. So I encourage my Democratic colleagues to support this motion to instruct so that we can have the transparency that the American public deserves.

Mr. OBEY. I yield myself 1 minute.

Madam Speaker, I hope that the Thursday or Friday that the gentleman is talking about, I hope he recognizes that it's likely to be next Thursday or Friday, not this one. Secondly, I must say I am amused when I hear the reference to "socialized medicine." Does anybody really believe that it's socialized medicine if we are putting \$2 billion in this legislation in order to help change our medical records from paper records to computerized records so we can reduce the number of mistakes that are made in hospitals and create more efficiency and save money in the health care area? With the rising costs of health care nationwide, shouldn't we be looking for ways to make the system more efficient to save money? That is what that \$2 billion does, despite somebody's desire to look for ghosts.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN).

Mr. WITTMAN. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the ranking member for the opportunity to speak. And I do stand in favor of the motion to instruct requiring 48 hours for the information on this bill to be made available electronically in a readable, researchable and downloadable database. I think that is important to the American people.

And I want to stress that we have heard a lot of talk about what people stand for. I haven't heard anyone that says that we shouldn't be doing something. We absolutely need to be taking issue with where the American economy is today, to be making sure that we are working as hard as we can to provide solutions. There are American families out there that are hurting each and every day. I don't think any of us up here don't have that first and foremost on our mind.

Madam Speaker, it's not only important that we do something, but it's important that we do the right thing. This is such a monumental step for this government to take. It has been said that this is an historic precedent on the level of spending that we are taking to drive the economy. It really begs us to take the time to get it right. We need to take the time to focus on the right mix of tax cuts and spending that will truly stimulate the economy, dollars that make their way into the economy immediately. Over 60 percent of this bill doesn't make its way into the economy for more than 19 months. I don't know that anybody here would say that that is truly stimulative to the economy and things that are going to equate to jobs in a timely manner for folks that are suffering right now.

I think it's important to make sure that all the American people are heard on this. This is so important. There are members on this side that represent folks out there that want to make sure that ideas we hear from them are projected in this bill and they make their way into the final version that is to be considered here coming out of the conference report. I think that is incumbent upon this body to make sure that that happens. This bill is too important to make sure that we have the participation of everybody. We need to make sure that this information is available for the American public to understand, for their comments to come back to us, for us to have the opportunity to make sure that those comments make their way into this legislation. This is groundbreaking legislation, and it needs to happen now.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY).

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Well, I thank my fellow congressman from California (Mr. LEWIS) for the fine work he does for all Americans.

I rise today in support of the motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 1. I would argue that it should be retitled. It should be titled "People Before Politics." All it is asking is 48 hours to see the example of more than 800 pages spending more than \$800 billion. It is roughly \$1 billion a page. I think the American public has a right to know what is in the bill and what it is being spent on.

When I was watching television today and watching one of the interviews by one of our fellow Senators, one that helped negotiate where this bill currently was, when asked a question, he said, I only agreed to \$780 billion. But the score today says \$838 billion. When they asked him a question about what has gone in and what has been put in about health care, he said, I never agreed to that. So even the Senators themselves that have been negotiating this bill before it goes into conference are questioning what is in it. I think the American public has a right to know.

I would tell you that a little more than a week ago we sat on this floor and we had an debate about this bill. And unfortunately, there was a partisan vote and then a bipartisan vote about this bill. One side of the aisle almost all voted "yes." That bipartisan vote was a handful of Democrats and Republicans who said "no." And I think their voice has a right to be heard. And their voice of saying "no" is not "let's not do anything." We believe there is an ability to do something better. And on this side of the aisle, the Republicans have sat together, worked in a bipartisan group and worked together also in a working group and laid out to this President and have given him the ideas that said how can we improve, how can we move together in moving forward? And what

we are saying with the motion to instruct is let's continue the work, let's improve it and let's make the American people be first and foremost. Let's put people before politics.

□ 1545

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee.

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

Mr. RANGEL. Madam Speaker, there may be a lot of people that have objection to the process in which we have moved forward, but one thing is abundantly clear and that is, the President of the United States, and every economist from the left to the right, believes that if we don't do something and do it fast, that our economy would be in far worse shape than we find it today.

To think the number of people that are losing their jobs, losing their health insurance, losing their families and losing their hope are things that are not labeled Republican and Democrats. This is what the core of America is all about.

I cannot think of anything that's more American, even the American flag, than our middle class citizens, our middle class taxpayers. Whether we've been involved in war, whether we've been involved in depressions, it's been the guts of these people that's been able, with pride, with dignity, to be able to come back stronger than ever. And now we find that their demands have increased, but at the same time, their resources have decreased. These are people that work hard every day; that have families with kids in school, that want to protect their health. And the one thing they can't do is purchase.

I don't understand this word that you have to build the confidence of people in the market. But one thing is that if you're the working poor, \$500 or \$1,000 in the family, that's not confidence, that's filling a gap, that's filling a need. And it seems like it makes so much sense, no matter what town or village that you live in. If people can't afford to buy, if they can't afford to buy from the small businesses in their towns and villages, then these people have inventory that has built up, but they also have staff and clerks and employees that they can't afford to hire. Once these people are discharged, fired, laid off and go right back into the general economy, these are the middle class people. They're not the rich. They're not the poor, they're not the homeless, but there are people that believe that this country will never let them down.

And so the President says that 95 percent of people who work hard every day would be receiving some type of a tax cut. It would seem to me that, whatever objections you have, that time is not our friend. We find more small businesses closing, more people going into unemployment, losing their bene-

fits for health. And in this bill we try to ease the pain, to try to stop the hemorrhage that we have from job loss, to try to make certain that someone who wants to buy would believe that they can keep their kid in school, that they will be able to have a job the next day and they don't have to hold back.

I'm hoping that we try to break this partisan past that we have, because I don't see how anyone can explain to anyone that's in trouble as to what their party label would be.

Our country is involved in an intensive care unit, and it seems to me that they're saying that we need an infusion of resources, an infusion of health care, an infusion of economic assistance. If we don't help this patient, our great Nation, then most every economist has said that she could come to near death. And every day we hold back this care, every day we hold back this injection of having funds, whether it's the earned income tax credit that allows people to work, even though they may be below poverty, they still are able to work and have their dignity, to be able to have children that are deductible where we can receive an additional two or \$3,000 a year. It may not be much to people who are in the upper income, but to the people who have to count their salaries each and every week to see whether or not they can put food on the table, clothing on their children's back, or to be able to fulfill that dream, once the dream that Americans have, that they will not be able to succeed, to me, that's even more important than the economic loss that they would have.

To believe that in this great Nation of ours, no matter what the economic setbacks will be, that we can and we will recover, we've done it before, during bad times. We've come back after World War II stronger than ever. And I think this President, this new President has given hope to people, not only throughout our towns and villages, not only throughout the United States of America, but indeed throughout the world.

I don't see how any Democrat, having a Republican President, could not say during this time for our Nation that we'll put our party labels behind, we'll work together and try to save the economy of this great country. Now's the time, I really think, if you're talking about bipartisanship, that this is the time to see whether or not we can work together because this word "confidence" means not Democrats and not Republicans, but Americans working hard together.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Madam Speaker, I hate to inquire again, but I really need to know if I have enough time for my colleague.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) has 6 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has 16 minutes remaining.

Mr. LEWIS of California. In that event, Madam Speaker, I am happy to

yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I certainly agree with the previous speaker that we do need to have bipartisan cooperation on this. And of course, we got off on the wrong foot. This bill was passed in the House without having the beauty of subcommittee hearings. There was one general hearing back in December, before many of the Members who voted on it were even sworn in to be a Member of Congress. So I think we could go back and this week, maybe in a conference committee, open it up and allow some of the amendments that were left out of the Senate or the House side to be included in it, and maybe we could work in a bipartisan fashion.

This bill, as it is now, is more expensive as it comes out of the Senate than it was by the House, which had a bipartisan vote against it. There was a partisan vote for it, but a bipartisan vote against it.

Only 7 percent of the spending in the bill goes to public works projects. That's \$57 billion out of \$838 billion. And only 22 percent of the money could actually be spent this year. So much for urgency and shovel-ready projects.

The Senate bill actually increases spending \$19 billion over the House bill, which, on a bipartisan basis, so many of us voted against. It creates all kinds of new programs, 32 new programs. Now, some of them were being stripped out by the Senate that the House put in there. That was good. But I just found out about a new \$100 million program to get new lunchroom equipment into schools. Now, maybe that's a good idea, but why can't that be done where it's always been done, on a local level? \$100 million so that schools can buy new lunchroom equipment.

There's also funding in there for the Department of Energy that actually doubles their annual appropriation, in a stimulus package. There's even a grant in there to study privatization on American Samoa and the Northern Mariana Islands. What is that about? Have you read that language? I don't think anybody has. It's very peculiar. How did that get in there?

And you know, this bill the President brags about has no earmarks, let's be serious. It has \$200 billion worth of earmarks, but they will be made by State and local authorities. It won't be made by the Congress. At least when the U.S. Congress does earmarks it gets posted on the Web page and people can find out who requests it. But no, we're going to have phantom, ghost earmarks to the tune of \$200 billion.

Madam Speaker, the Republican alternative to this bill creates more jobs at a lower price tag. The Republican bill, through tax credits to small business, creates about six million jobs, and that's from the Congressional Budget Office, a nonpartisan analyst of this. The price of the Republican one is about \$400 billion.

We stand ready to work with the President and work with the Democrats on a good, bipartisan package because we think doing something is the right move. But this package deserves a "no."

Mr. OBEY. Has the gentleman from California yielded back his time?

Mr. LEWIS of California. I have not. I have no additional speakers, however and it's my intention to inquire of the chairman if he's got three or four speakers.

Mr. OBEY. Just one.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Okay, then I would yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. How much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 16 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. I yield myself 5 minutes.

Madam Speaker, this bill is more than 150 days late. And every day that we delay, if you take a look at what's happening in the economy, an additional 20,000 people are losing their jobs.

So we've had plenty of time to talk about our philosophical differences. We've had plenty of time to talk about our different views of the viability of the market. We've had plenty of time to talk about our views of the role of government.

But people back home are not interested in our theoretical or our philosophical views. They're interested in whether or not we have a clue about what is happening on Main Street America, what is happening in businesses all over this country, what is happening when metal working companies and paper mills and dozens of other businesses lay off workers every day, every hour. And they want to know whether we can end the speechifying long enough to actually do something that will help them. That's what this is about.

So we can argue about one-tenth of 1 percent of this bill, whether we like it or not. The fact is that some of the same people who were only too willing to vote for \$1.2 trillion worth of tax cuts paid for with borrowed money under President Bush, the same people who were willing to allow us to go to war and spend over \$1 trillion in a war that will plague us for years, these are the same people who supported economic policies that, essentially, resulted in the average working family having flat wages for the last 8 years. These same people are now telling us, "Oh, don't do this. We've got a better idea."

Well, we've tried those ideas for 8 years, and what has been the result? The result has been that, for the last 8 years, over 94 percent of the economic growth in this country, over 94 percent of the economic growth of this country went into the pockets of the wealthiest 10 percent of American families. And so, the other 90 percent were struggling to get table scraps.

And how did they respond? They responded by borrowing. They borrowed

more for their houses. They borrowed more to send their kids to college. They borrowed more to pay for health care and a lot of other things. And then, the housing bubble and the Wall Street bubble burst and they got hit with the results. And so, now they are suffering for the bubbles that we've had in the economy the past 8 years. And they're looking for somebody to recognize what's happened to them and looking for somebody who will help to actually do something about the fact that they're losing their health care, losing their homes, losing their jobs, losing their ability to send the kids to college, and losing hope.

This package, by itself, will not solve any of those problems. All it will do, if we can finally produce it, all it will do is to minimize the damage and to try to inject an additional source of consumer spending in the economy, in hopes that we can begin the process of eventually turning this economy around. That's what this is all about.

We've had our time for debates. It's been a long time now, over 150 days, as I said. The time to move is now.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the motions on H.R. 1 considered today.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1600

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Madam Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to instruct will be followed by 5-minute votes on motions to suspend the rules with regard to House Resolution 114, if ordered, and House Resolution 60, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 403, nays 0, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 54]

YEAS—403

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

Paul Ryan (WI) Sutton
 Paulsen Salazar Tanner
 Payne Sánchez, Linda Tauscher
 Pence T. Taylor
 Perlmutter Sanchez, Loretta Teague
 Perriello Sarbanes Terry
 Peters Scalise Thompson (CA)
 Peterson Schakowsky Thompson (MS)
 Petri Schauer Thompson (PA)
 Pingree (ME) Schiff Thornberry
 Pitts Schmidt Tiahrt
 Platts Schrader Tierney
 Poe (TX) Schwartz Titus
 Polis (CO) Scott (GA) Tonko
 Pomeroy Scott (VA) Towns
 Posey Sensenbrenner Tsongas
 Price (GA) Serrano Turner
 Price (NC) Sestak Upton
 Radanovich Shadegg Van Hollen
 Rahall Shea-Porter Velázquez
 Rangel Sherman Visclosky
 Rehberg Shimkus Walden
 Reichert Shuler Walz
 Reyes Shuster Wamp
 Richardson Simpson Waters
 Rodriguez Sires Watson
 Roe (TN) Skelton Watt
 Rogers (AL) Slaughter Waxman
 Rogers (KY) Smith (NE) Weiner
 Rogers (MI) Smith (NJ) Welch
 Rohrabacher Smith (TX) Westmoreland
 Rooney Smith (WA) Whitfield
 Ros-Lehtinen Snyder Wilson (OH)
 Roskam Solis (CA) Wilson (SC)
 Ross Space Wittman
 Rothman (NJ) Speier Wolf
 Roybal-Allard Spratt Wu
 Royce Stearns Yarmuth
 Ruppberger Stupak Young (AK)
 Ryan (OH) Sullivan Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—29

Berkley Grayson
 Bilbray Harman
 Boyd Hinchey
 Brown, Corrine Johnson (IL)
 Campbell Kind
 Castor (FL) Klein (FL)
 Davis (IL) Kosmas
 DeGette Meek (FL)
 Gallegly Miller, Gary
 Granger Putnam

□ 1630

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California and Mr. PAUL changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to instruct was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL GIRLS AND WOMEN IN SPORTS DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JACKSON of Illinois). The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 114.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 114.

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. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 398, nays 0, not voting 34, as follows:

[Roll No. 55]

YEAS—398

Abercrombie Davis (TN)
 Ackerman Deal (GA)
 Aderholt DeFazio
 Adler (NJ) Delahunt
 Akin DeLauro
 Alexander Dent
 Altmire Diaz-Balart, L.
 Andrews Diaz-Balart, M.
 Arcuri Dicks
 Austria Dingell
 Baca Doggett
 Bachmann Donnelly (IN)
 Bachus Doyle
 Baird Dreier
 Baldwin Driehaus
 Barrett (SC) Duncan
 Barrow Edwards (MD)
 Bartlett Edwards (TX)
 Barton (TX) Ehlers
 Bean Ellison
 Becerra Ellsworth
 Berman Emerson
 Berry Engel
 Biggett Eshoo
 Bilirakis Etheridge
 Bishop (GA) Fallin
 Bishop (NY) Farr
 Bishop (UT) Patah
 Blackburn Filner
 Blumenauer Flake
 Blunt Fleming
 Boccieri Forbes
 Boehner Fortenberry
 Bono Mack Poster
 Boozman Foy
 Boren Frank (MA)
 Boswell Franks (AZ)
 Boucher Frelinghuysen
 Brady (PA) Fudge
 Brady (TX) Garrett (NJ)
 Braley (IA) Gerlach
 Bright Giffords
 Broun (GA) Gingrey (GA)
 Brown (SC) Gohmert
 Brown-Waite, Gonzalez
 Ginny Goodlatte
 Buchanan Gordon (TN)
 Burgess Graves
 Burton (IN) Green, Al
 Butterfield Green, Gene
 Buyer Griffith
 Calvert Grijalva
 Camp Guthrie
 Cantor Guthrie
 Cao Gutierrez
 Capito Hall (NY)
 Capps Hall (TX)
 Capuano Halvorson
 Cardoza Hare
 Carnahan Harper
 Carney Hastings (FL)
 Carson (IN) Hastings (WA)
 Carter Heinrich
 Cassidy Heller
 Castle Hensarling
 Chaffetz Herger
 Chandler Herseth Sandlin
 Childers Higgins
 Clarke Hill
 Clay Himes
 Cleaver Hinchey
 Clyburn Hinojosa
 Coble Hirono
 Coffman (CO) Hodes
 Cohen Hoekstra
 Cole Holden
 Conaway Holt
 Connolly (VA) Honda
 Conyers Hoyer
 Cooper Hunter
 Costa Inglis
 Costello Inslee
 Courtney Issa
 Crenshaw Jackson (IL)
 Crowley Jackson-Lee
 Cuellar (TX)
 Culberson Jenkins
 Cummings Johnson (GA)
 Dahlkemper Johnson, E. B.
 Davis (AL) Johnson, Sam
 Davis (CA) Jones
 Davis (KY) Jordan (OH)

Oberstar Roybal-Allard Sullivan
 Obey Royce Sutton
 Olson Ruppberger Tanner
 Olver Ryan (OH) Tauscher
 Ortiz Ryan (WI) Taylor
 Pallone Salazar Teague
 Pascrell Sánchez, Linda Terry
 Pastor (AZ) T. Thompson (CA)
 Paul Sanchez, Loretta Thompson (MS)
 Paulsen Sarbanes Thompson (PA)
 Payne Scalise
 Pence Schakowsky Thornberry
 Perlmutter Schauer Tiahrt
 Perriello Schiff Tierney
 Peters Schmidt Titus
 Peterson Schrader Tonko
 Petri Schwartz Towns
 Pingree (ME) Scott (GA) Tsongas
 Platts Kirpatrick (AZ) Scott (VA)
 Poe (TX) Sensenbrenner Upton
 Polis (CO) Serrano Van Hollen
 Pomeroy Sestak Velázquez
 Posey Shadegg Visclosky
 Price (GA) Shea-Porter Walden
 Price (NC) Sherman Walz
 Radanovich Shimkus Wamp
 Rahall Shuler Waters
 Rangel Shuster Watson
 Rehberg Simpson Watt
 Reichert Sires Waxman
 Reyes Skelton Weiner
 Richardson Slaughter Welch
 Rodriguez Smith (NE) Westmoreland
 Roe (TN) Smith (NJ) Whitfield
 Rogers (AL) Smith (TX) Wilson (OH)
 Rogers (KY) Smith (WA) Wilson (SC)
 Rogers (MI) Snyder Wittman
 Rohrabacher Solis (CA) Wolf
 Rooney Space Wu
 Ros-Lehtinen Speier Yarmuth
 Roskam Spratt Young (AK)
 Ross Stearns Young (AK)
 Rothman (NJ) Stupak Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—34

Berkley Grayson Putnam
 Bilbray Harman Rush
 Bonner Johnson (IL) Schock
 Boustany Kind Sessions
 Boyd Kirk Souder
 Brown, Corrine Klein (FL) Stark
 Campbell Kosmas Tiberi
 Castor (FL) Linder Wasserman
 Davis (IL) Meek (FL) Schultz
 DeGette Miller, Gary Wexler
 Gallegly Moore (WI) Woolsey
 Granger Pitts

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1637

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.

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN REMEMBRANCE OF MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES AND THEIR FAMILIES

The SPEAKER. The Chair will ask all present to please rise for a moment of silence.

The Chair asks that the House now observe a moment of silence in remembrance of our brave men and women in uniform who have given their lives in the service of our Nation in Iraq and in Afghanistan and their families, and all who serve in our Armed Forces and their families.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JACKSON of Illinois). Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

RECOGNIZING AND COMMENDING
UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA
QUARTERBACK SAM BRADFORD
FOR WINNING THE 2008 HEISMAN
TROPHY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 60.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLAN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 60.

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. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 394, nays 0, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 56]

YEAS—394

Abercrombie	Buchanan	Davis (TN)
Ackerman	Burgess	Deal (GA)
Aderholt	Burton (IN)	DeFazio
Adler (NJ)	Butterfield	Delahunt
Akin	Buyer	DeLauro
Alexander	Calvert	Dent
Altmire	Camp	Diaz-Balart, L.
Andrews	Cantor	Diaz-Balart, M.
Arcuri	Cao	Dicks
Austria	Capito	Dingell
Baca	Capps	Doggett
Bachmann	Capuano	Donnelly (IN)
Baird	Cardoza	Doyle
Baldwin	Carnahan	Dreier
Barrett (SC)	Carney	Driehaus
Barrow	Carson (IN)	Duncan
Bartlett	Carter	Edwards (MD)
Barton (TX)	Cassidy	Edwards (TX)
Bean	Castle	Ehlers
Becerra	Chaffetz	Ellison
Berman	Chandler	Ellsworth
Berry	Childers	Emerson
Biggert	Clarke	Engel
Bilirakis	Clay	Eshoo
Bishop (GA)	Cleaver	Etheridge
Bishop (NY)	Clyburn	Fallin
Bishop (UT)	Coble	Farr
Blackburn	Coffman (CO)	Fattah
Blumenauer	Cohen	Filner
Blunt	Cole	Flake
Bocchieri	Conaway	Fleming
Boehner	Connolly (VA)	Forbes
Bonner	Conyers	Fortenberry
Bono Mack	Cooper	Foster
Boozman	Costa	Fox
Boren	Costello	Frank (MA)
Boswell	Courtney	Franks (AZ)
Boucher	Crenshaw	Frelinghuysen
Brady (PA)	Crowley	Fudge
Brady (TX)	Cuellar	Garrett (NJ)
Braley (IA)	Culberson	Gerlach
Bright	Cummings	Giffords
Brown (GA)	Dahlkemper	Gingrey (GA)
Brown (SC)	Davis (AL)	Gohmert
Brown-Waite,	Davis (CA)	Gonzalez
Ginny	Davis (KY)	Goodlatte

Gordon (TN)	Marchant	Ros-Lehtinen
Graves	Markey (CO)	Roskam
Green, Al	Marshall	Ross
Green, Gene	Massa	Rothman (NJ)
Griffith	Matheson	Roybal-Allard
Guthrie	Matsui	Royce
Gutiérrez	McCarthy (CA)	Ruppersberger
Hall (TX)	McCarthy (NY)	Ryan (OH)
Halvorson	McCaul	Ryan (WI)
Hare	McClintock	Salazar
Harper	McCollum	Sánchez, Linda
Hastings (FL)	McCotter	T.
Hastings (WA)	McDermott	Sanchez, Loretta
Heinrich	McGovern	Sarbanes
Heller	McHenry	Scalise
Hensarling	McHugh	Schakowsky
Herseth Sandlin	McIntyre	Schauer
Higgins	McKeon	Schiff
Hill	McMahon	Schmidt
Himes	McMorris	Schrader
Hinchee	Rodgers	Schwartz
Hinojosa	McNerney	Scott (GA)
Hirono	Meeks (NY)	Scott (VA)
Hodes	Melancon	Sensenbrenner
Hoekstra	Mica	Serrano
Holden	Michaud	Sestak
Holt	Miller (FL)	Shadegg
Honda	Miller (NC)	Shea-Porter
Hoyer	Miller, George	Sherman
Hunter	Minnick	Shimkus
Inglis	Mitchell	Shuler
Inslee	Mollohan	Shuster
Israel	Moore (KS)	Simpson
Issa	Moore (WI)	Sires
Jackson (IL)	Moran (KS)	Skelton
Jackson-Lee	Moran (VA)	Slaughter
(TX)	Murphy (CT)	Smith (NE)
Jenkins	Murphy, Patrick	Smith (NJ)
Johnson (GA)	Murphy, Tim	Smith (TX)
Johnson, E. B.	Murtha	Smith (WA)
Johnson, Sam	Myrick	Snyder
Jones	Nadler (NY)	Solis (CA)
Jordan (OH)	Napolitano	Space
Kagen	Neal (MA)	Speier
Kanjorski	Neugebauer	Spratt
Kaptur	Nunes	Stearns
Kennedy	Nye	Stupak
Kildee	Oberstar	Sullivan
Kilpatrick (MI)	Obey	Sutton
Kilroy	Olson	Tanner
Kind	Olver	Tauscher
King (IA)	Ortiz	Taylor
King (NY)	Pallone	Teague
Kingston	Pascrell	Terry
Kirk	Pastor (AZ)	Thompson (CA)
Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Paul	Thompson (MS)
Kissell	Paulsen	Thompson (PA)
Kline (MN)	Payne	Thornberry
Kratovil	Pence	Tiahrt
Kucinich	Perlmutter	Tierney
Lamborn	Perriello	Titus
Lance	Peters	Tonko
Langevin	Peterson	Towns
Larson (CT)	Petri	Tsongas
Latham	Pingree (ME)	Turner
LaTourette	Pitts	Upton
Latta	Platts	Van Hollen
Lee (CA)	Poe (TX)	Visclosky
Lee (NY)	Polis (CO)	Walden
Levin	Pomeroy	Walz
Lewis (CA)	Posey	Wamp
Lipinski	Price (GA)	Waters
LoBiondo	Price (NC)	Watson
Loeb sack	Radanovich	Watt
Lofgren, Zoe	Rahall	Waxman
Lowey	Rangel	Weiner
Lucas	Rehberg	Welch
Luetkemeyer	Reichert	Westmoreland
Luján	Reyes	Whitfield
Lummis	Richardson	Wilson (OH)
Lungren, Daniel	Rodriguez	Wilson (SC)
E.	Roe (TN)	Wittman
Lynch	Rogers (AL)	Wolf
Mack	Rogers (KY)	Wu
Maffei	Rogers (MI)	Yarmuth
Maloney	Rohrabacher	Young (AK)
Manzullo	Rooney	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—38

Bachus	Gallegly	Larsen (WA)
Berkley	Granger	Lewis (GA)
Bilbray	Grayson	Linder
Boustany	Grijalva	Markey (MA)
Boyd	Hall (NY)	Meek (FL)
Brown, Corrine	Harman	Miller (MI)
Campbell	Herger	Miller, Gary
Castor (FL)	Johnson (IL)	Putnam
Davis (IL)	Klein (FL)	Rush
DeGette	Kosmas	Schock

Sessions	Tiberi	Wasserman
Souder	Velázquez	Schultz
Stark		Wexler
		Woolsey

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Two minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1646

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. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to cast votes on the following legislative measures on February 10, 2009. If I were present for rollcall votes, I would have voted “yea” on each of the following:

Roll 54, February 10, 2009: On Motion to Instruct Conferees on H.R. 1: Making Supplemental Appropriations for Fiscal Year Ending 2009.

Roll 55, February 10, 2009: On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Agree: H. Res. 114, Supporting the goals and ideals of “National Girls and Women in Sports Day.”

Roll 56, February 10, 2009: On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Agree: H. Res. 60, Recognizing and commending University of Oklahoma quarterback Sam Bradford for winning the 2008 Heisman Trophy and for his academic and athletic accomplishments.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 54, 55 & 56, had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on all three.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON
H.R. 1, AMERICAN RECOVERY
AND REINVESTMENT ACT OF 2009

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees on H.R. 1: Messrs. OBEY, RANGEL, WAXMAN, LEWIS of California, and CAMP.

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR A JOINT SESSION
OF CONGRESS TO RECEIVE A
MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

Mr. MCMAHON. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a privileged concurrent resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 41

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Tuesday, February 24, 2009, at 9 p.m., for the purpose of receiving such communication as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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 later.

HONORING MIAMI UNIVERSITY FOR ITS 200 YEARS OF COMMITMENT TO EXTRAORDINARY HIGHER EDUCATION

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 128) honoring Miami University for its 200 years of commitment to extraordinary higher education, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 128

Whereas article III of the Northwest Ordinance states that "religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and its happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged";

Whereas Miami University was named for the Miami Indian Tribe that inhabited the area now known as the Miami Valley Region of Ohio;

Whereas Miami University is our Nation's 10th oldest public institution of higher learning;

Whereas Miami University's motto is *Prodesse Quam Conspici*, "to accomplish without being conspicuous";

Whereas Miami University is a student-centered public university deeply committed to student success, building great student and alumni loyalty, and empowering its students, faculty, and staff to become engaged citizens who use their knowledge and skills with integrity and compassion to improve the future of our society;

Whereas Poet Laureate Robert Frost once referred to Miami University as "the most beautiful college there is";

Whereas Miami University is the birthplace of the McGuffey Eclectic Readers written by William Holmes McGuffey, "School Master to the Nation", who wrote and compiled the first 4 Readers while a Miami University faculty member;

Whereas Miami University is cited annually by national college rankings as being one of the Nation's best values among public universities, and provides the opportunities of a major university while offering the personalized attention found in the best small colleges;

Whereas Miami University is named as one of the "Public Ivies", offering "an education comparable to that at Ivy League universities at a fraction of the price" in the book "The Public Ivies: America's Flagship Universities";

Whereas Miami University is among a select group of universities in the Nation that have produced a Rhodes Scholar, a Truman Scholar, and a Goldwater Scholar in the same academic year;

Whereas Miami University's faculty are nationally prominent scholars and artists who contribute to Miami, their own disciplines, and to society by the creation of new knowledge and art;

Whereas Miami University has its own campus in Luxembourg and consistently ranks among the top 25 colleges and universities in the Nation for the number of undergraduate students who study abroad, where more than 35 percent of students study abroad before they graduate;

Whereas in Business Week magazine's latest ranking of undergraduate business programs, Miami's Farmer School of Business appears among the Nation's top 5 percent, ranking 8th among public universities and colleges;

Whereas Miami University has a retention and graduation rate that exceeds the national average for undergraduates, students of color, and athletes, and has the highest graduation rate in Ohio;

Whereas Miami has first-rate facilities, has completed a number of new facilities in recent years, including an engineering building and the Goggin Ice Center, and is currently constructing a new business school facility and planning for a new student center;

Whereas the Miami Student, established in 1826, is the oldest university newspaper in the United States;

Whereas Miami University is known as the "Mother of Fraternities", as it is the Alpha Chapter for 5 national Greek organizations, Beta Theta Pi, Sigma Chi, Phi Delta Theta, Phi Kappa Tau, and the Delta Zeta sorority;

Whereas the University has over 150,000 living alumni who reside in every State of the union and numerous countries throughout the world, where they contribute significantly to their local and global communities;

Whereas Miami University is ranked 7th on the Peace Corps' Top 25 list for medium-sized schools, with 39 alumni currently serving as volunteers, and since the Peace Corps' inception in 1961, 809 Miami alumni have joined the ranks, making Miami the No. 44 producer of volunteers for all time;

Whereas Miami University's alumni have a history of service to the United States, including a President of the United States (The Honorable Benjamin Harrison), 9 United States Senators, including sitting Senator Maria Cantwell (WA), 31 United States Representatives, including sitting Members, Congressman Paul Ryan (WI) and Congressman Steve Driehaus (OH), a Speaker of the House, the parents of a United States First Lady and grandparents of a United States President, 6 governors, 11 United States generals, and 7 United States ministers to foreign governments;

Whereas Miami University's alumni include 27 college presidents;

Whereas Miami University has enriched our Nation in the arts, humanities, and sciences through students and alumni who have achieved the pillar of their professions such as a United States Poet Laureate, Pulitzer Prize winners, a National Teacher of the Year, National Institute of Health Fellows, National Science Foundation Recipients, National Endowment of the Arts Awardees, and renowned journalists;

Whereas Miami University is known as the "Cradle of Coaches" for the unparalleled number of nationally prominent collegiate and professional coaches it has produced, 18 of whom have been recognized as national "Coach of the Year" including Paul Brown (Cleveland Browns), Walter "Smokey" Alston (Brooklyn/Los Angeles Dodgers), Woody Hayes (Ohio State University), Bo Schembechler (University of Michigan), and Vicki Korn (Miami University);

Whereas Miami University has created a Culture of Champions, an environment that teaches student athletes to excel in their chosen endeavors as distinguished by a National Football League Rookie of the Year, National Football League Super Bowl Champions, National Basketball Association World Champions, National Hockey League Stanley Cup Champions, Major League Baseball World Series Champions, and Olympic gold medalists;

Whereas Miami University has contributed to the economic growth of this country through the education of men and women who have gone on to lead some of our most August corporations such as AT&T, Inc., Proctor & Gamble Co., the J.M. Smucker Company, and United Parcel Service of America; and

Whereas Miami University is the largest employer in Butler County, Ohio, and serves as an economic powerhouse for Southwest Ohio, the State of Ohio, and the Nation with an economic impact of over \$1,000,000,000 per year to the State of Ohio: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) congratulates Miami University on the momentous occasion of its 200th anniversary, and expresses its best wishes for continued success;

(2) recognizes Miami's profound achievements and unwavering commitment to liberal arts education and the active engagement of its students in both curricular and co-curricular life that has continually attracted and produced some of the Nation's brightest faculty, staff, and students; and

(3) directs the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make available enrolled copies of this resolution to Miami University for appropriate display.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have 5 legislative days during which Members may revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on House Resolution 128 into the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Ms. FUDGE. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of House Resolution 128, which congratulates Miami University for their 200 years of commitment to extraordinary higher education.

Founded in 1809, Miami University was named for the Miami Indian Tribe that inhabited the area known as the Miami Valley Region of Ohio. The university is our Nation's tenth oldest public institution of higher learning.

I want to congratulate Miami University for making their campus a student-centered public university, where students and alumni carry with them a strong sense of loyalty, integrity, and compassion. MU students graduate with the necessary skills and drive to improve the future of our society. The

university is among a prestigious group of schools to produce a Rhodes Scholar, a Truman Scholar, and a Goldwater Scholar in the same academic year.

Among MU's other achievements is their extensive study abroad program. In fact, the university has its own campus in Luxembourg, and 35 percent of Miami students study abroad before they graduate. Students graduate MU ready to solve global problems with the knowledge acquired during their time at Miami University.

Miami University's alumni have a history of service to the United States, including Benjamin Harrison, former U.S. President; many Members of Congress; as well as several governors, generals, and ministers to foreign governments. Additionally, MU is ranked seventh on the Peace Corps' Top 25 list for medium-sized schools, with 39 alumni currently serving as volunteers.

Congratulations are also in order for the university's unparalleled number of nationally prominent collegiate and professional coaches the school has produced. The extraordinary number of successful coaches who got their start at MU has earned the university the nickname "Cradle of Coaches." Furthermore, Miami boasts a distinguished list of professional and Olympic athletes.

This year, as the university community celebrates its 200th anniversary, Miami will reflect on two centuries of achievement and look ahead to many more years of learning, service, and athletic prowess.

Mr. Speaker, once again I express my support for Miami University, and I thank the minority leader for bringing this resolution to the floor. I encourage my colleagues to support this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. I yield such time as he may consume to my colleague, a distinguished alumnus of Miami University of Ohio, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I appreciate the gentleman for yielding, and you're wondering why a guy from Wisconsin is here to talk about Miami of Ohio—because this guy from Wisconsin is a graduate of Miami of Ohio. I graduated from Miami of Ohio in 1992.

I'd say one of the reasons why I am here, standing and talking in the well of the House of Representatives, is because of the lessons that I learned at Miami of Ohio. The things that shaped me there, the economics degree, the political science degree. In fact, one of my early involvements in politics was working as a college Republican, working door-to-door for a new person running for Congress by the name of JOHN BOEHNER. I have learned how to since pronounce that name BOEHNER. Back then, we didn't know how to pronounce it. But I did doors in Trenton, Ohio, on behalf of our now esteemed minority leader.

But, more to the point, Mr. Speaker, this is the bicentennial of Miami of

Ohio. Two-hundred years of history. Founded in 1809. It's a school with such a rich history and proud tradition of top academic and athletic achievement. The "Cradle of Coaches."

It's consistently ranked as one of the best schools in the country. It's a public university, referred to as one of the "public Ivys," ranking in the tops in business schools, arts and sciences, and architecture, and all other rounds of academic nature.

One of the great things about Miami is its beauty, its aesthetics. It's one of the most beautiful campuses in America. I think the poet Robert Frost called Miami of Ohio the most pleasant-looking campus there is.

Miami of Ohio has such a rich tradition. It has produced so many great, faithful servants here in the Capitol, in public, in private institutions. It's a real honor and privilege for me to be able to be here to be a part of this resolution, to be a cosponsor of it, and to honor this fantastic tradition. And I know that Miami's best days are yet ahead.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. I yield such time as he may consume to my distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER).

Mr. BOEHNER. I want to thank the Speaker and thank my colleagues who are here today to congratulate Miami University on their 200th anniversary. I have nine Miami grads that work for me on my staff. Clearly, you heard from Mr. RYAN, and Mr. DRIEHAUS, you will hear from soon, who are esteemed graduates of Miami of Ohio, as is Senator MARIA CANTWELL.

There will be a lot of nice things said about Miami, but it truly is quite an accomplishment for this university to have had such a successful run over the last 200 years. Miami of Ohio is in my district. It's probably the most difficult place to get to in my district. And I can only imagine how difficult it was in the early 1800s to find Oxford, Ohio.

But it is one of the most beautiful campuses in the country. They have a great record of achievement, and their graduates have gone on to do great things in all fields of endeavor.

And so I am proud to have Miami of Ohio in my district, and I am proud of my colleagues here who are Miami grads, and proud of my staff, who came from such an esteemed university.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DRIEHAUS).

Mr. DRIEHAUS. I'm proud today to join with the minority leader and my distinguished friends and colleagues to pay tribute to one of our finest universities, and a source of pride for all Ohioans. For two centuries, Miami has stood as a hallmark of what public higher education should be in this country.

Miami University boasts excellence in a wide range of programs; a faculty

amongst the best in the Nation; facilities and resources that allow Miami's academic community to realize its full potential; and an unparalleled commitment to student success. But Miami's achievement and legacy reach far beyond the confines of its classrooms.

Miami University was a product of the Northwest Ordinance. As Ohio's founders settled the lands west of the Appalachians, Miami stood as a beacon of learning in the untamed corners of a young Nation.

The many government leaders, artists, and scholars among Miami University's alumni have carried the school's message and tradition of excellence across the United States, and around the world. Their contributions to a range of disciplines and professions have left a lasting imprint on our laws and culture.

In the Freedom Summer of 1964, civil rights activists trained at Western College for Women, Miami's western campus. These young heroes brought their message of freedom and equality from Oxford, Ohio to Meridian, Mississippi. Three of them sacrificed their lives because they would not give up their commitment to the struggle against injustice and bigotry.

□ 1700

Their legacies and the achievements of so many others are part of Miami University's story and have become woven into the fabric of our Nation's history.

For me, Miami University holds a personal significance. I count myself, my wife Lucienne, and four of my siblings among Miami's proud alumni. Miami fostered my commitment to service, leading me to become one of the 809 Miami alumni to join the Peace Corps and to pursue a career working on behalf of my fellow citizens. Miami University opened doors of opportunity for me, as it has for thousands of others.

I add my voice to the many others congratulating Miami University on 200 years of distinguished service, and I wish the university an equally successful future.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) for such time as he may consume.

Mr. EHLERS. I thank the gentleman for yielding. And I suspect most of you are surprised to see me rise to join in the accolades for Miami University, because most of you know that I come from Grand Rapids, Michigan, where I taught at Calvin College, and before that was at the University of California at Berkeley where I got my doctorate and taught for 6 years. But yet I have a history in Ohio as a well.

I spent my high school years living in Willard, Ohio, and I recall hearing numerous references to Miami University. I was urged to consider attending Miami University because it was such an outstanding school, and that has been engraved on my mind. As I got

into higher education and became a professor myself, I began to appreciate even more the quality of Miami University as well as the quality of their faculty and their curriculum. So I am pleased to join everyone here in giving accolades to Miami University.

Surviving for 200 years as a university of that stature, with strong emphasis on academic studies and background, is not an easy task for a university, and very few American universities have achieved that other than those along the east coast. So I am very pleased to congratulate Miami on their 200th anniversary, and wish them very well for the next 100 or 200 years as well. If every university in this Nation were as dedicated to academic learning as Miami University, this would be an even more wonderful Nation than it is. I am pleased to support this resolution.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to recognize the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KILROY) for 2 minutes.

Ms. KILROY. Mr. Speaker, I also rise to congratulate Miami University on this occasion of its 200th anniversary.

Miami University is often referred to as the Harvard of the Midwest. We think of it as our “public school Ivy.” It is a public university that provides a world-class education to students from Ohio, around our country, and around the world. Miami University is an outstanding example of the kind of value that public institutions can provide, the strength of our public education system, and our public university system in Ohio.

I hope that all of us in this Chamber will recognize the strength of the programs at Miami University and the value of institutions like Miami to the strength of our democracy.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to rise today in support of House Resolution 128, honoring Miami University of Ohio on its bicentennial. This is a very agreeable discovery for me. I am a confirmed Orthodox Bruin, myself, but to discover the enormous contributions that Miami University has made to the Nation.

Its founding on February 17, 1809, marks its contributions to our Nation, developing into an institution with three campuses, over 20,000 students, and a rich history. The school is not only the 10th oldest public institution; it has the oldest school newspaper in America. Miami offers over 100 different areas of undergraduate study and over 50 areas of study for graduate work. This is the birthplace of the McGuffey’s Readers. It produced a level of literacy unsurpassed in this Nation before or since. BusinessWeek magazine ranked Miami’s Farmer School of Business as eighth among business schools found at public universities. Miami University was also named one of the best values in public colleges by Kiplinger’s magazine this year. And of

particular interest, I suspect, to this institution is the fact that Miami University has produced one President of the United States, seven United States Senators, 26 United States Congressmen, two of whom we have heard from today, a Speaker of the House, and six Governors.

I think we can learn a great deal from Miami University, which is annually cited as being one of the Nation’s best values among public universities, “offering an education comparable to that of Ivy League universities at a fraction of the price.” So says The Ivy Leaguers.

We need to deliver, I believe, the same value to American families, who are going to be paying for a lot of the spending bills we are currently considering, as Miami University has given to its alumni. I would encourage my colleagues to vote for this resolution.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 128 “Expressing the importance of honoring Miami University for its 200 years of commitment to extraordinary higher education.” Miami University has served its community and this nation for two centuries. The contributions continue to mount as the doors of this illustrious institution of higher education remain open.

Founded in 1809, Miami University was built on a commitment to liberal arts undergraduate education and the active engagement of its students in both curricular and civic life. Named for the Miami Indian Tribe that inhabited the area, Miami University opened its doors to 20 students in 1824 to provide the opportunity for students to develop and grow to become great members of society. It is deeply committed to student success, builds great student and alumni loyalty, and empowers its students, faculty, and staff to become engaged citizens who use their knowledge and skills with integrity and compassion to improve the future of our global community.

Miami University is comprised of a scholarly community whose members believe that a liberal education is grounded in qualities of character as well as of intellect. The University’s culture respects the dignity of other persons, the rights and property of others, and the right of others to hold and express disparate beliefs.

Miami University believes in honesty, integrity, and the importance of moral conduct. It defends the freedom of inquiry that is the heart of learning and combines that freedom with the exercise of judgment and the acceptance of personal responsibility.

Miami University provides the opportunities of a major university while offering the personalized attention found in the best small colleges. It values teaching and intense engagement of faculty with students through its teacher-scholar model, by inviting students into the excitement of research and discovery. Miami University’s faculty is comprised of nationally prominent scholars and artists who contribute to Miami University, their own disciplines and to society. The University supports students in a residential experience on the Oxford campus and provides access to students, including those who are time and place bound, on its regional campuses.

Miami University provides a strong foundation in the traditional liberal arts for all stu-

dents, and it offers nationally recognized majors in arts and sciences, business, education, engineering, and fine arts, as well as select graduate programs. As an inclusive community, Miami University strives to cultivate an environment where diversity and difference are appreciated and respected.

Miami University has a distinctive role among the nation’s 3,500 colleges and universities in the way it successfully blends teaching and scholarship. Nationally recognized as one of the most outstanding public undergraduate institutions, Miami University gives undergraduates many opportunities to work with senior faculty on research projects and to participate in strong international programs. Miami University also has selective graduate programs in areas of special strength. It has never lost sight of its focus on intellectual development. Retention and graduation rates are some of the highest in NCAA Division I schools.

More than 180,000 proud Miami University alumni are located around the globe, serving as professional and community leaders. Miami University instills in its students intellectual depth and curiosity, the importance of personal values as a measure of character, and a commitment to life-long learning. Miami University emphasizes critical thinking and independent thought, an appreciation of diverse views, and a sense of responsibility to our global future and more importantly the responsibility of making positive contributions to society.

As Miami University marks its 200th anniversary, we celebrate and embrace the long and proud tradition of fulfilling its public mission: to contribute to a better future through the students it educates, the scholarships and creativity it produces and the services it provides to the local communities and beyond.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the resolution honoring the importance of Miami University on the occasion of its 200 year commitment to higher education.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Miami University for its 200 years of commitment to extraordinary higher education. There are 9 Miami graduates currently working for me, so I can tell you firsthand how well educated Miami students are. Miami is a student-centered university deeply committed to student success, building great student and alumni loyalty, and empowering its students, faculty, and staff to become engaged citizens who use their knowledge and skills with integrity and compassion to improve the future of our society. Miami University is the 10th oldest public university in the nation, and is located in my district in Oxford, Ohio.

Poet Laureate Robert Frost once referred to Miami as “the most beautiful college there is.” In addition to distinctions for the campus’ beauty and first-rate facilities, Miami University is cited annually by national college rankings as being one of the nation’s best values among public universities. According to Business Week magazine, Miami’s Farmer School of Business is ranked among the nation’s top 5 percent of undergraduate business programs, ranking 8th among public universities and colleges. Miami is also named as one of the “Public Ivies,” offering “an education comparable to that at Ivy League universities at a fraction of the price.” Miami provides the opportunities of a major university while offering the personalized attention found in the best small colleges.

Furthermore, Miami has a retention and graduation rate that exceeds the national average for undergraduates, students of color, and athletes, and has the highest graduation rate in Ohio. Much of Miami's success is owed to its stellar faculty. As nationally prominent scholars and artists, Miami's faculty contribute to the university, their own disciplines, and to society. In fact, while a faculty member at Miami, William Holmes McGuffey, "School Master to the Nation," wrote and compiled the first 4 McGuffey Eclectic Readers.

Additionally, Miami recognizes the opportunities for personal and professional growth that living and studying internationally brings. With its own campus in Luxembourg, Miami consistently ranks among the top 25 universities and colleges in the nation for the number of undergraduate students who study abroad. These abroad opportunities have enabled countless Miami students to develop a broader perspective and keener understanding of the world as they contribute to society.

Miami alumni have a history of profound service to the United States, including a President of the United States (the Honorable Benjamin Harrison); 9 U.S. Senators, including sitting Senator MARIA CANTWELL (D-WA); and 31 U.S. Representatives, including sitting Members, Congressman PAUL RYAN (R-WI) and Congressman STEVE DRIEHAUS (D-OH). In addition, Miami students and alumni have achieved the pillar of their professions including a Poet Laureate, Pulitzer Prize winners, a National Teacher of the Year, and renowned journalists. As the nation's oldest university newspaper, the Miami Student has offered students the opportunity to develop their interests and skills in journalism since 1826.

Miami is also committed to creating an environment that teaches student-athletes to excel in their chosen endeavors. In fact, Miami is one of only 4 universities and colleges to generate both a United States President (the Honorable Benjamin Harrison) and a winning Super Bowl quarterback (Ben Roethlisberger). Miami alumni include a National Football League Rookie of the Year, National Football League Super Bowl Champions, National Basketball Association World Champions, National Health League Stanley Cup Champions, Major League Baseball World Series Champions, and Olympic gold medalists. Known as the "Cradle of Coaches," Miami has produced an unparalleled number of nationally prominent collegiate and professional coaches, 18 of whom have been recognized as national "Coach of the Year," including Paul Brown (Cleveland Browns), Walter "Smokey" Alston (Brooklyn/Los Angeles Dodgers), Woody Hayes (Ohio State University), Bo Schembechler (University of Michigan), and Vicki Korn (Miami University).

In addition to athletics, many Miami students also participate in Greek life. As the Alpha Chapter for 5 national Greek organizations (Beta Theta Pi, Sigma Chi, Phi Delta Theta, Phi Kappa Tau, and the Delta Zeta sorority), Miami University is known as the "Mother of Fraternities." Greek life at Miami offers students the ability to engage in philanthropic activities and offers leadership opportunities that help prepare the students for their future.

Miami alumni have gone on to lead some of our most august corporations such as AT&T, Inc., Proctor and Gamble Co., the J.M. Smucker Company, and the United Parcel Service of America. As the largest employer in

Butler County, Ohio, Miami University serves as an economic powerhouse Southwest Ohio, the state of Ohio, and the nation with an economic impact of over a billion dollars per year to the state of Ohio.

On February 17, 2009, Miami will celebrate its bicentennial. I congratulate Miami for the university's profound achievements and unwavering commitment to liberal arts education and the active engagement of its students in both curricular and co-curricular life that has continually attracted and produced some of the nation's brightest faculty, staff, and students. I wish Miami the very best in the future.

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

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 128, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. 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.

RECOGNIZING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR'S VISIT TO INDIA

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 134) recognizing the 50th Anniversary of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.'s visit to India, and the positive influence that the teachings of Mahatma Gandhi had on Dr. King's work during the Civil Rights Movement.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 134

Whereas Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. changed America forever in a few short years through his teaching of nonviolence and passive resistance to combat segregation, discrimination, and racial injustice;

Whereas, in 1950, during the pursuit of a Bachelor of Divinity degree at Crozer Theological Seminary in Upland, Pennsylvania, Dr. King first became aware of the success of nonviolent political action employed by India's Mahatma Gandhi in political campaigns against racial inequality in South Africa, and later against British colonial rule in India;

Whereas Dr. King began an extensive study of Gandhi's life and ideas, and became inspired to use Gandhi's theory of nonviolent civil disobedience to achieve social change in America;

Whereas, in 1955 and 1956, Dr. King led the Montgomery Bus Boycott to protest the arrest of Rosa Parks and the segregation of the bus system of Montgomery, Alabama, during which time Dr. King was arrested and his home bombed;

Whereas the Montgomery Bus Boycott was the first large-scale, nonviolent civil rights demonstration of contemporary times in the United States;

Whereas, following the success of nonviolent protest in the Montgomery Bus Boycott, Dr. King desired to travel to India to deepen his knowledge of Gandhi's teachings on nonviolent principles;

Whereas Dr. King, his wife Coretta Scott King, and Lawrence Reddick, then chairman of the history department at Alabama State College, arrived in Bombay, India, on February 10, 1959 and stayed until March 10, 1959;

Whereas Dr. King was warmly welcomed by members of Indian society throughout his visit, and met with Prime Minister Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, land reform leader Vinoba Bhave, and other influential Indian leaders to discuss issues of poverty, economic policy, and race relations;

Whereas, while in India, Dr. King spoke about race and equality at crowded universities and at public meetings;

Whereas followers of Gandhi's philosophy, known as satyagrahis, welcomed Dr. King and praised him for his nonviolent efforts during the Montgomery Bus Boycott, which they saw as a landmark success of principles of nonviolence outside of India;

Whereas the satyagrahis and Dr. King discussed Gandhi's philosophy, known as Satyagraha, which promotes nonviolence and civil disobedience as the most useful methods for obtaining political and social goals;

Whereas the satyagrahis reaffirmed and deepened Dr. King's commitment to nonviolence, and revealed to him the power that nonviolent resistance holds in political and social battles;

Whereas the trip to India impacted Dr. King in a profound way, and inspired him to use nonviolence as an instrument of social change to end segregation and racial discrimination in America throughout the rest of his work during the Civil Rights Movement;

Whereas Dr. King rose to be the preeminent civil rights advocate of his time, leading the Civil Rights Movement in the United States during the 1950s and 1960s and earning world-wide recognition as an eloquent and articulate spokesperson for equality;

Whereas Dr. King became a champion of nonviolence, and in 1964, at the age of 35, he became the youngest man to be awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in recognition of his efforts;

Whereas through his leadership in nonviolent protest, Dr. King was instrumental in the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965;

Whereas, between 1957 and 1968, Dr. King traveled more than 6,000,000 miles, spoke more than 2,500 times, and wrote five books and numerous articles supporting efforts around the country to end injustice and bring about social change and desegregation through civil disobedience; and

Whereas the work of Dr. King created a basis of understanding and respect, and helped communities and the United States as a whole to act peacefully, cooperatively, and courageously to restore tolerance, justice, and equality between people: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives encourages all Americans to—

(1) pause and remember the 50th Anniversary of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.'s visit to India;

(2) commemorate Dr. King's legacy of nonviolence, a principle that—

(A) Dr. King encountered during his study of India's Mahatma Gandhi;

(B) further inspired him during his first trip to India; and

(C) he successfully used in the struggle for civil rights and voting rights;

(3) commemorate the impact that Dr. King's trip to India and his study of the philosophy of Mahatma Gandhi had in shaping the Civil Rights Movement and creating the political climate necessary to pass legislation to expand civil rights and voting rights for all Americans; and

(4) rededicate themselves to Dr. King's belief that "nonviolence is the answer to the crucial political and moral question of our time" and to his goal of a free and just United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago today, on February 10, 1959, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., arrived in Bombay, India, to study the principles of nonviolence developed and used so skillfully by Mahatma Gandhi, which Dr. King himself employed to become this Nation's greatest civil rights leader.

I commend my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia, Congressman JOHN LEWIS, for introducing this bipartisan resolution that calls upon all Americans to rededicate ourselves to Dr. King's belief that nonviolence is the answer to the crucial political and moral questions of our time. I would also like to acknowledge the many members of the Judiciary Committee that join in this resolution and, in particular, the gentleman from Texas, our ranking member, Mr. LAMAR SMITH.

During his month-long travel to India from February 10 to March 10, 1959, Dr. King gained a deeper appreciation for the power of nonviolent civil disobedience, a practice that Dr. King first discovered reading Henry David Thoreau's essay, "On Civil Disobedience," while a student at Morehouse College.

Just as Gandhi had used it successfully in resistance to oppressive British colonial rule in India, Dr. King adopted it as a cornerstone of the American Civil Rights Movement, holding firmly and faithfully to it even when the peaceful demonstrations were met by dogs and fire hoses, and worse.

Nonviolence had already proven successful in the Montgomery bus boycott, and so it would be used later successfully in sit-ins used to protest segregated lunch counters, and in the free-

dom rides used to challenge segregated public transportation facilities.

In Memphis, Tennessee, on April 3, 1968, the eve of his assassination, Dr. King told us that "it is no longer a choice between violence and nonviolence in this world; it is nonviolence or nonexistence." This remains his challenge to us as we confront the evils of our own time, from the police brutality and hate crimes here at home, to the threats to freedom emanating from around the world.

Can we always meet this challenge? Given our human frailties, that would be exceedingly difficult. But keeping that challenge in our hearts will help us always to look for the peaceful solution whenever possible, and to maintain our faith that we will sometimes be able to find it even in the most uncompromising situations.

As Dr. King observed in February of 1967 against the backdrop of the Vietnam War: "Wars are poor chisels for carving out peaceful tomorrows." That statement speaks to us as loudly today as it did to those who heard it more than 40 years ago.

Standing on the shoulders of Gandhi, Dr. King called on us to promote equality and justice through steadfast nonviolence, and it is on the shoulders of Dr. King that we now stand to do our best to live up to his dream for us. I ask my colleagues to support this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I support House Resolution 134, which commemorates the 50th anniversary of Dr. Martin Luther King's trip to India, in which he paid his respects to the methods of nonviolent protest pioneered by Mahatma Gandhi.

Dr. King studied Gandhi's philosophy of nonviolent change at seminary, and in 1959 he had the honor of visiting the land in which the seeds of peaceful protest had been successfully sown by Gandhi.

Gandhi was the first to employ nonviolent protest on a mass political scale. This opposition resulted in national change. Dr. King, inspired by Gandhi's organized peaceful action, launched a similar effort to fight for racial equality under the law in the United States. That inspiration eventually materialized in the Nobel Peace Prize that was awarded to Dr. King in 1964, and a year earlier in a 250,000 person peaceful march Dr. King led through the streets of Washington, D.C. Dr. King was the leader of an historic nonviolent revolution in the U.S. Over the course of his life, he fought for equal justice and led the Nation towards racial harmony.

While advancing this great movement, Dr. King's home was bombed and he was subjected to relentless personal and physical abuse. Despite this violence, Dr. King responded in peace and with strong conviction and sound rea-

soning. As a pastor, Dr. King's religious beliefs were essential to the success of his nonviolent efforts.

□ 1715

Just as Mahatma Gandhi was a deeply religious man, so too was Dr. King. It is doubtful that such a long and enduring movement could have survived in either man's country without the power of religious inspiration behind it.

While Gandhi and Dr. King convinced millions of both the morality and the effectiveness of nonviolent change, their message, unfortunately, was not accepted by all. On the evening of April 4, 1968, while standing on the balcony of his hotel room in Memphis, Tennessee, Dr. King was assassinated. But a single vicious act could not extinguish Dr. King's legacy which endures to this day. And Dr. King's legacy is due in large part to the inspiration of Mahatma Gandhi, whose success helped endow Dr. King with the courage to lift voices, not weapons, in the struggle for equality here in the United States.

America is a better, freer nation today in large part due to the philosophical fellowship of Gandhi and Dr. King.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution. And let me also point out that I know that the two gentlemen from Georgia to my left, one who has spoken and one is getting ready to speak, as well as the Speaker himself, the gentleman from Illinois, have all been leaders in the Civil Rights Movement. And we certainly appreciate their leadership, their contributions and their success.

And I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I will yield as much time as he may consume to the sponsor of this resolution, the Honorable JOHN LEWIS of Georgia.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago today, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. and his wife, Coretta Scott King, took a historic trip to India to travel and study the path of Mahatma Gandhi. Dr. King was deeply influenced by the teachings of Gandhi and what he attempted to do in South Africa and what he did to liberate and free the people of India from the colonial rule of the British.

It was on Gandhi's preaching of the philosophy and the discipline of nonviolence that Dr. King patterned the nonviolent struggle in America to tear down the walls of segregation and racial discrimination. The great teacher gave us the philosophy of nonviolence, and Gandhi gave us the message and showed us the way. So it is fitting for the United States Congress to pause and recognize the 50th anniversary of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.'s trip to India and the impact that trip had on our Nation's struggle for civil rights and voting rights.

In a few days, Mr. Speaker, a group of Members of Congress will travel to India to walk the path that Dr. King walked. I am hopeful that we will have the opportunity to be inspired by this one man to carry the message of peace, hope and love to the rest of the world. Gandhi once said "nonviolence is the first article of my faith. It is also the last article of my creed." He said that our choice was between nonviolence and nonexistence.

Dr. King said that we must learn to live together as brothers and sisters or perish as fools. The message of Gandhi and Dr. King still speaks to us today.

I call on all Members of the House to support this resolution.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. I certainly thank the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. Speaker, today's resolution marks the 50th anniversary of the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King's visit to India and the positive influence that the teachings of Mahatma Gandhi had on Reverend King's work during the Civil Rights Movement. Likewise, later this month, we will also celebrate President Lincoln's birthday because of his work to lay the foundation for what would become the greatest of American achievements, the recognition of the God-given equal value of all individuals regardless of their race, and the consequent and natural equal protection of the law for everyone.

Reverend King and President Lincoln had many things in common. But most prominently of all was their life's work to humanize the dehumanized, to give value to a human life that the law had previously regarded as being lesser than other more politically powerful persons.

Reverend King reminded us in his 1963 Letter From the Birmingham Jail that "injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere. We are caught in an inescapable network of mutuality, tied in a single garment of destiny. Whatever affects one directly, affects all indirectly." Like Gandhi, Reverend King looked to his faith to transform society. Reverend King ultimately paid with his life the price for working to extend the equal protection of the law to all.

Mr. Speaker, those were the struggles of the past centuries. And those were the heroes of the past centuries. But their work is not done. The 21st century has its own civil rights struggle, Mr. Speaker. As Day Gardner, president of the National Black Pro-Life Union, has said, "The biggest struggle for civil rights today is for the civil rights of the unborn child."

Last year I joined black activists and black mothers from around the country at the corner of 16th Street Northwest in D.C. to protest what has been the deadliest form of discrimination in our country's history, the systematic elimination of millions, fully one-half

of all black Americans conceived in this country, primarily at government-funded family planning clinics placed in our inner cities. Every day, Mr. Speaker, almost 1,500 unborn black children are aborted. Black babies are aborted at between four and five times the rate of that of white babies. Mr. Speaker, this equates to a genocide against black America. And yet our U.S. Government continues to increase the annual appropriation to Planned Parenthood and to other abortion providers every year.

Mr. Speaker, I have every conviction that if he were alive today, that Reverend Martin Luther King would not be silent in the face of such an outrage. Dr. King noted in his Letter From Birmingham Jail that the early church "by their effort and example, brought an end to such ancient evils as infanticide." He didn't know that in 1973, 10 years after he wrote those words, that the U.S. Supreme Court would revive the practice of killing the innocent and that the black community would pay a higher price in blood than any other. Abortion on demand is called sometimes the exercise of hard-won rights. But in reality, Mr. Speaker, it is the extinguishing of a legacy.

The greatest failure of human government is the failure to recognize the inherent value of every human life. Unborn children in America are the greatest example of that today. It is the civil rights struggle before America in this century. Reverend King once said that "The law cannot change a heart, but it can restrain the heartless. The law cannot make a man love me, but it can restrain him from lynching me." This Congress, I will introduce the PreNDA bill, the Prenatal Non-discrimination Act, to end sex-selection abortion and race-selection abortion in America.

It is time to reject the discriminatory disgrace of aborting a child based on race or sex. Doing so might remind us all it is also time for the equal protection clause to realize its full meaning finally, that every human being is a child of God, with the God-given rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of their dreams. Nothing, Mr. Speaker, nothing, would honor the work of Reverend Martin Luther King or Mahatma Gandhi or President Abraham Lincoln more.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the fine gentleman from the great State of Washington, Mr. JIM McDERMOTT.

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I'm honored to join my friend and colleague, Representative JOHN LEWIS, himself a legendary civil rights leader, in strongly supporting H. Res. 134 and in carrying a message of hope to an upcoming trip to India.

There is so much that we can learn from the lives of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. and Mahatma Gandhi.

Gandhi's principle of "satyagraha," nonviolent resistance, inspired change for the better throughout the world and particularly in the United States. As Dr. King said in a radio address in India in 1959 on this trip, "the spirit of Gandhi is so much stronger today than some people believe." That statement is even truer today.

These two people changed their countries and the world for the better. And the world today would benefit from a new Dr. King or a new Gandhi. They taught us that violence begets violence. As Gandhi once said, "An eye for an eye makes the whole world blind." No one doubts that there are serious problems in the world today, violence in the Middle East and many other places, the AIDS pandemic and extreme poverty where 1 billion people in the world live on less than a dollar a day. Missiles will not solve these crises. But people can, people of good will with courage and character, people like Dr. Martin Luther King and Mahatma Gandhi. We need them now more than ever. And this resolution and this upcoming trip by the Congress to India will honor their contributions to mankind and rekindle their spirit to seek peace by living in peace.

I urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 134.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is left for each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia has 12 minutes. The gentleman from Texas has 12½ minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we don't have any other speakers at this time.

I would like to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I would yield 3 minutes to the honorable Representative from the great State of Texas, Ms. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. It is a privilege, Mr. Speaker, to have the opportunity to come to the floor today for such an important recognition of two iconic movers of change, individuals who laid the underpinnings of the reformation of nations that already had a good heart. Let me thank the manager, Mr. JOHNSON, for his leadership, and of course our ranking member, Mr. SMITH, my colleague from Texas, and the author of this legislation, JOHN LEWIS. I know that he wrote this legislation from the heart.

We will be recognizing this historic journey in a few days, the 50th anniversary of Martin Luther King's visit to India and the recognition of the intertwining of their spirits and their intellect between Martin King and Mahatma Gandhi. I had the opportunity to view the years-old film that was done on his life. Certainly we know that fictional aspects may have been

included. But the underpinnings of the film was the willingness to sacrifice for the greater good.

And as I reflect upon Martin King's life, having had the opportunity to be a student worker of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference and absorbing the spirit of nonviolence that had been left by Dr. King, I know how much he was influenced by the life-changing attitude of Gandhi. Gandhi was willing to sacrifice life and limb in order to move mountains of change. And what you saw in his determination for freedom for the people of India were two things: One, the people of diverse faiths and beliefs in this then very large country could come together around the idea of freedom, and then at the same time, he was willing to sacrifice the times that he spent in the fasts where he was near death to show those that violence does not engender anything but violence.

□ 1730

And Martin King, in the various periods of his life, where the younger generation challenged this seemingly hapless and helpless method of nonviolence; you weren't accomplishing anything; they were taking advantage of you; they weren't respecting you. But he was willing to hold his ground and, in that, he was the masterful teacher to all of us who looked upon this young man who was willing to lead a country into freedom without violence. And so the intertwining of the two is a special moment. And I'm so very gratified that JOHN LEWIS saw fit to allow us to come to the floor of the House and acknowledge that we are in partnership with the largest democracy.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. I yield an additional 1 minute to Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON-LEE.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. We are in partnership with the largest democracy, India, and the longest democracy, the United States. And I hope we will take a lesson from this partnership of two men, now celebrating 50 years of that coming together, that determination and a way of handling people can garner us so much.

And this new President, who has claimed development and diplomacy as key elements to his foreign policy, gets it; that you can work as partnerships with those who you would think would be hostile to your beliefs.

I am very gratified to support this legislation, H. Res. 134, recognizing the 50th anniversary of the trip of Dr. Martin Luther King to India and the work that he did with Mahatma Gandhi, and the two of them, peace for ever and for everlasting.

Mr. Speaker, I rose today in strong support of H. Res. 134 "Recognizing the 50th anniversary of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.'s visit to India and the point of influence that the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi had on Dr. King's work during the civil rights movement." I would

like to thank Representative JOHN LEWIS, from Georgia, for his leadership in bringing this resolution to the floor. I urge my colleagues to support this important resolution. Because of the importance of the importance of Gandhi's life teachings on non-violence, I am participating in a historic CODEL to India, where members of Congress will sojourn in the land of Gandhi during the recess on next week.

It was through this experience that Dr. King, with a heart of servitude, was transitioned to become the greatest civil rights advocate of our century and possibly the greatest leader of our time. Mahatma Gandhi was a formative influence upon Dr. King's political civil disobedience. Dr. King and Gandhi believed that change would occur once Americans acknowledged the humanity of the oppressed in America.

Gandhi became a leader in a complex struggle. Following World War I, Gandhi launched his movement of non-violent resistance to Great Britain. Satyagraha, which involves utilization of non-violent measures to undermine the opponent, and ideally to convert him rather than to coerce him into submission, spread throughout India, gaining millions of followers. A demonstration against the Rowlatt Acts, which allowed certain political cases to be tried without juries and internment of suspects without trial, but resulted in a massacre of Indians at Amritsar by British soldiers. When the British government failed to make amends, Gandhi proclaimed an organized campaign of non-cooperation. Indians in public office resigned, government agencies such as courts of law were boycotted, and Indian children were withdrawn from government schools. Throughout India, streets were blocked by squatting Indians who refused to rise even when beaten by police. Gandhi was arrested, but the British were soon forced to release him. His non-violent movement set a new precedent for dealing with oppression and violence, not just in India, but the world over.

Dr. King and Gandhi journey's ironically began in the same fashion. It was a train ride in South Africa that created Gandhi. It was a bus boycott in Alabama that made Dr. Martin Luther King. They were ordinary men only seeking to heighten the moral conscience of the time. These men were the spokesmen for the oppressed, unjustly treated, and those denied their God given privileges to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Institutionalized racism and bigotry sought to keep the people of India, African Americans, and others from achieving those God given virtues.

Dr. King's journey to India came at a vital time in American history. The Montgomery boycott had ended and had proven to be a great success. The nation's leaders were now dealing with a new challenge, one it had not seen before, non-violent social disobedience. People, both black and white, were looking to the newly famed leader from Georgia as the conscience of the nation. While they looked to Dr. King, he looked to the east for inspiration. It was Mahatma Gandhi's teachings of non-violence that helped achieve success in Alabama. He knew that it would be Gandhi's teachings that would help the movement to achieve greater success in his quest for civil equality in the United States.

On the trip to India, Dr. King was surprised to find the extent to which the bus boycott was covered in India and throughout the world. King recalled, "We were looked upon as

brothers, with the color of our skins as something of an asset. But the strongest bond of fraternity was the common cause of minority and colonial peoples in America, Africa, and Asia struggling to throw off racism and imperialism."

Dr. King's meetings with satyagrahis deepened his commitment to nonviolent resistance. His interactions with the Gandhi family ingrained in him the power of nonviolent resistance and its potential usefulness throughout the world, even against totalitarian regimes.

While discussing non-violence to a group of students in India, Dr. King said, "True non-violent resistance is not unrealistic submission to evil power. It is rather a courageous confrontation of evil by the power of love, in the faith that it is better to be the recipient of violence than the inflictor of it, since the latter only multiplies the existence of violence and bitterness in the universe, while the former may develop a sense of shame in the opponent, and thereby bring about a transformation and change of heart."

The trip to India affected Dr. King in a profound way, deepening his understanding of nonviolent resistance and his commitment to America's struggle for civil rights. "Since being in India, I am more convinced than ever before that the method of nonviolent resistance is the most potent weapon available to oppressed people in their struggle for justice and human dignity. In a real sense, Mahatma Gandhi embodied certain universal principles that are inherent in the moral structure of the universe, and these principles are as inescapable as the law of gravitation," Dr. King said.

The contributions of Gandhi and Dr. King are many. The roles that these two humanitarians traveled to arrive at their respective destinations in history were long and difficult, but they deserve all the respect and admiration that history can bestow upon them. As Members of Congress, we have to respect and acknowledge the work of Gandhi and the teachings he left behind that greatly influenced and changed Dr. Martin Luther King.

Dr. King's trip to India further solidified his belief in nonviolence and peaceful resistance. Gandhi and Dr. King embodied the belief of doing unto others as you would have them to do unto you. They also believed in becoming the visible change you want to see in the world. They believed that men could live together peacefully despite their religious, racial, and cultural differences. Mohandas changed the way Indians were treated in South Africa and in India. Overthrowing the imperial British rule was no easy task, but Gandhi was able to do it. Through his Satyagraha teachings and non-violent protest, Gandhi put forth an example that vicariously aided in the liberation of African Americans in the United States.

It is imperative that we commemorate Dr. King's trip to India. It would be shameful of this Congress to pass on an opportunity to acknowledge the contributions of Gandhi and Dr. King to America's history.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct honor to join my friend and colleague Representative JOHN LEWIS in support of H. Res. 134. This resolution commemorates the fiftieth anniversary of the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.'s visit to India, and the role played by the revered leader of Indian independence Mahatma Gandhi—and those who followed in his footsteps—in influencing Dr. King's non-violent approach to achieving

social and political justice. I embrace this opportunity to look back at the men and the movement which pressed this nation forward in its journey towards the fulfillment of our founders' creed, and look forward as the march toward opportunity, justice, and freedom for all continues.

When Dr. King left for India in February 1959, he was just beginning to make his mark as a leader of the national movement for civil rights. He had organized the successful boycott of Montgomery, Alabama's public transportation system in 1955, and founded the Southern Christian Leadership Conference two years later. His burgeoning success had provided his non-violent movement with the momentum and potential to become a truly powerful force in the pursuit of equal rights for all Americans. This momentum became entrenched during Dr. King's trip to India, where his immersion in the world of Mahatma Gandhi's own non-violent success led King to commit himself in his philosophical entirety to the principle of meeting hate and injustice with persistent non-violence.

Though Gandhi had passed away eleven years prior to Dr. King's journey, King was no less attentive to the followers of the great shanti sena—the "non-violent army" that Gandhi led in his successful effort to free his country from the grasp of colonialism. He encountered those who had stood with Gandhi through the long, arduous struggle for India's sovereignty, and came to deeply understand the necessary commitment and purpose of which believers in non-violence must never lose sight. Dr. King came to believe that if India can assert its independence from the bonds of the British Empire without violence, then the United States of America can achieve racial equality with the same approach. He took the lessons of a people half a world away and applied them to the struggle of his own nation, illustrating that a righteous cause pursued by means which justify its ends holds universal promise. Perhaps it is best articulated by Dr. King himself: "As I delved deeper into the philosophy of Gandhi, my skepticism concerning the power of love gradually diminished, and I came to see for the first time its potency in the area of social reform."

Now, with the passage of five decades, let us commemorate this historic journey of our beloved Dr. King, focusing on the lessons it taught him and the strength it provided him as he met the challenges of his day. Let us not only remember the past, but rather carry its lessons into a brighter future of promise and freedom. I once again express my heartfelt appreciation for Congressman LEWIS, a man whose own journey and career follow closely the principles and vision laid out by these two men, and urge all my colleagues to take this opportunity to honor those who refuse to allow the forces of hate and oppression to provoke them to lose sight of their vision for justice by embracing the nonviolent path.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 134, which recognizes the 50th Anniversary of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.'s visit to India.

It will be my honor to co-chair a delegation led by Congressman JOHN LEWIS, a colleague of Dr. King and true hero of the civil rights movement, that is going to New Delhi to commemorate his historic trip.

The lessons that Dr. King drew from Mahatma Gandhi's teachings of nonviolence came at a pivotal time in American history.

A century earlier, the issue of race and equality tore the United States apart. President Abraham Lincoln, whose 200th birthday we celebrate this year, prophetically said, "I believe this government cannot endure permanently half-slave and half-free." Unable to resolve this fundamental issue of human rights either politically or peacefully, the United States descended into an awful Civil War. After four bitter and bloody years, slavery was abolished and America's soul saved, but the undressed wounds of injustice and intolerance were deep and raw.

Several lifetimes later, amid a crescendo for full civil rights from millions still denied, leaders like Dr. King faced a choice. Was the way again through armed conflict, with all of its suffering, or through nonviolent resistance relying on the power of morality over mortar?

The principles of Gandhi helped show the way.

We know that Dr. King's gracious welcome and textured experiences in India served to guide him more surely down the path he had chosen for his people and country. He said, "Since being in India, I am more convinced than ever before that the method of nonviolent resistance is the most potent weapon available to oppressed people in their struggle for justice and human dignity."

Those beliefs would be put to the test during the civil rights struggles of the 1960s, including in my home state in Alabama. Sometimes, the challenges were visible and shocking, as they were with the church bombings in Birmingham and beatings at the Pettus Bridge in Selma. More often, there were the subtle slights born of fear and prejudice.

But whatever the indignity or assault suffered, the response was never hate. In his Letter from a Birmingham Jail, Dr. King set the direction: "I have consistently preached that nonviolence demands that the means we use must be as pure as the ends we seek."

It is now 2009, 50 years since Dr. King's visit to India. I believe the U.S. has come farther in these last 50 years than in the preceding 100 years.

Providing all of our citizens with true equal protection under the law has made us a better, stronger nation. We will recognize the lasting legacy of the movement for nonviolent change next month when the Faith and Politics Institute holds its biennial Civil Rights Pilgrimage to Alabama. It has been my privilege to be associated with the Institute and this event, which brings citizens of all ages and races together to reflect on the lessons of the civil rights movement and retrace the steps of its courageous pioneers.

One mark of how far we've come is the creation of the Birmingham Civil Rights Institute, which overlooks the same park where fire hoses and police dogs were unleashed against peaceful citizens in 1963.

But what will be remembered in American history for all time is the inauguration of President Barack Obama. There is a small vignette from that day that perfectly illustrates the healing that has transpired in America and gives hope for the future. About 30 constituents from Congressman DANNY DAVIS's Chicago District was in the hallway where my office is located, unable to squeeze into a hearing room to view the President's speech on television. My staff invited them in and they all watched the speech together, a group of African-American constituents in the office of a Southern con-

servative. That is a mighty transformation since the racial turmoil in Birmingham.

We were united in celebration of the hope and promise that is America. Hope and faith is what inspired Dr. King during his mission and it is what brings us together today.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time as well.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 134.

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. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. 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 NAACP ON ITS 100TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 35) honoring and praising the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, NAACP, on the occasion of its 100th anniversary.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 35

Whereas the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (referred to in this resolution as the "NAACP"), originally known as the National Negro Committee, was founded in New York City on February 12, 1909, the centennial of Abraham Lincoln's birth, by a multiracial group of activists who met in a national conference to discuss the civil and political rights of African-Americans;

Whereas the NAACP was founded by a distinguished group of leaders in the struggle for civil and political liberty, including Ida Wells-Barnett, W.E.B. DuBois, Henry Moscowitz, Mary White Ovington, Oswald Garrison Villard, and William English Walling;

Whereas the NAACP is the oldest and largest civil rights organization in the United States;

Whereas the mission of the NAACP is to ensure the political, educational, social, and economic equality of rights of all persons and to eliminate racial hatred and racial discrimination;

Whereas the NAACP is committed to achieving its goals through nonviolence;

Whereas the NAACP advances its mission through reliance upon the press, the petition, the ballot, and the courts, and has been persistent in the use of legal and moral persuasion, even in the face of overt and violent racial hostility;

Whereas the NAACP has used political pressure, marches, demonstrations, and effective lobbying to serve as the voice, as well as the shield, for minority Americans;

Whereas after years of fighting segregation in public schools, the NAACP, under the

leadership of Special Counsel Thurgood Marshall, won one of its greatest legal victories in the Supreme Court's decision in *Brown v. Board of Education*, 374 U.S. 483 (1954);

Whereas in 1955, NAACP member Rosa Parks was arrested and fined for refusing to give up her seat on a segregated bus in Montgomery, Alabama—an act of courage that would serve as the catalyst for the largest grassroots civil rights movement in the history of the United States;

Whereas the NAACP was prominent in lobbying for the passage of the Civil Rights Acts of 1957, 1960, and 1964, the Voting Rights Act of 1965, the Fannie Lou Hamer, Rosa Parks, Coretta Scott King, César E. Chávez, Barbara C. Jordan, William C. Velásquez, and Dr. Hector P. Garcia Voting Rights Act Reauthorization and Amendments Act of 2006, and the Fair Housing Act, laws that ensured Government protection for legal victories achieved;

Whereas in 2005, the NAACP launched the Disaster Relief Fund to help survivors in Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas, Florida, and Alabama to rebuild their lives;

Whereas in the 110th Congress, the NAACP was prominent in lobbying for the passage of H. Res. 826, whose resolved clause expresses that: (1) the hanging of nooses is a horrible act when used for the purpose of intimidation and which under certain circumstances can be criminal; (2) this conduct should be investigated thoroughly by Federal authorities; and (3) any criminal violations should be vigorously prosecuted; and

Whereas in 2008 the NAACP vigorously supported the passage of the Emmett Till Unsolved Civil Rights Crime Act of 2007 (28 U.S.C. 509 note), a law that puts additional Federal resources into solving the heinous crimes that occurred in the early days of the civil rights struggle that remain unsolved and bringing those who perpetrated such crimes to justice: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress—

(1) recognizes the 100th anniversary of the historic founding of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; and

(2) honors and praises the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People on the occasion of its anniversary for its work to ensure the political, educational, social, and economic equality of all persons.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today we honor the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the Nation's oldest and largest civil rights organization, on the occasion of its 100th anniversary, for a century of unwavering commitment to justice and equality for all.

The NAACP, founded on February 12, 1909, by Ida Wells-Barnett, W.E.B. DuBois, Henry Moscowitz, Mary White Ovington, Oswald Garrison Villiard and William English Walling was indeed a labor of diversity.

Since its inception, the NAACP has united students, laborers, professionals, scholars, officials and others of all races to advance its vision of a society in which all individuals have equal rights and there is no racial hatred or racial discrimination.

Historically, the NAACP may be best known for Thurgood Marshall's successful advocacy leading to the watershed 1954 *Brown v. Board of Education* decision, in which the Supreme Court held that separate educational facilities are inherently unequal.

The NAACP is also known for the work of its chief advocate for more than 30 years, Clarence Mitchell, who worked to secure the 1957, 1960 and 1964 Civil Rights Acts, as well as the 1965 Voting Rights Act and the 1968 Fair Housing Act.

But we salute the NAACP not only for these better-known accomplishments, but for all of its efforts to promote justice and equality for every American, throughout the past 100 years.

And the NAACP spoke out against lynching, challenged racially biased Supreme Court justice nominees as early as 1930, and pursued non-discrimination policies in the military, in war-related industries, and the rest of the Federal Government during the world wars. At the height of the Civil Rights era, NAACP fought battles everywhere, on the ground, in the courtroom, and in the United States Congress.

Finally, in commemorating the 100th anniversary of the NAACP, we draw inspiration as we look to the continued work that lies ahead. From Dr. King and Coretta Scott King, from Rosa Parks, from Medgar Evers and Melie Evers-Williams, from Julian Bond, from Kweisi Mfume and from so many others who have gone before, and from the current leadership of President Benjamin Todd Jealous, Washington Bureau Directory, Hilary Shelton, and Legal Defense Fund President John Payton, through whom the NAACP has been promoting African American graduation and college readiness, protecting and advancing voting rights and identifying solutions to our current fiscal crisis.

As we celebrate the NAACP's centennial anniversary, I am confident that the organization will remain an integral part of our Nation's efforts to protect and promote civil rights for all Americans.

I urge my colleagues to support H. Con. Res. 35.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I support House Concurrent Resolution 35 which recognizes the

100th anniversary of the NAACP. For a century now, the NAACP has fought to bring justice and racial equality to all of America.

In 1917, the NAACP won a legal victory in the Supreme Court which held that States could not restrict and officially segregate black Americans into residential districts. The same year the NAACP fought for the right of black Americans to be commissioned as officers in World War I.

In 1935, NAACP lawyers Charles Houston and Thurgood Marshall won a legal battle to admit a black student to the University of Maryland.

During World War II, the NAACP led the effort that resulted in President Franklin Roosevelt's ordering a non-discrimination policy in war-related industries and Federal employment.

And in 1948, the NAACP convinced President Harry Truman to sign an executive order banning discrimination by the Federal Government.

In 1954, under the leadership of Special Counsel Thurgood Marshall, the NAACP won one of its greatest legal victories in *Brown v. Board of Education*, which found segregated schools and other educational facilities in the United States to be unlawful.

In 1960, in Greensboro, North Carolina, members of the NAACP Youth Council launched a series of nonviolent sit-ins at segregated lunch counters. The segregation ended.

The history of America's modern struggle to live up to our constitutional principles includes a major role by the NAACP, and it continues to champion the cause of social justice today.

It is with pleasure that I join in supporting this concurrent resolution, which I hope raises even greater awareness of this organization's historic contributions to the cause of civil rights.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE), also a member of the Judiciary Committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas will control the balance of the time.

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas, Congressman AL GREEN.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in the inner sanctum of my soul, I believe that although the arc of the moral universe is long, as Dr. King put it, it bends toward justice. However, I must confess that in the cognitive confines of my cranium, I know that it does so because of organizations like the NAACP.

For 100 years, the NAACP has been there bending the arc of the moral universe toward justice for all. From anti-lynching legislation to *Brown v. Board of Education*, to the election of the 44th President of this Nation, the NAACP has been there.

For 100 years, it's been there because of brave and noble Americans who

made great sacrifice that all may have a better life. Brave and noble Americans like NAACP Rosa Parks, who took a stand by taking a seat and ignited a spark as a result that enhanced the Civil Rights Movement; brave and noble Americans like NAACP Medgar Evers, who sacrificed his life in an effort to bring justice to all; brave and noble Americans like white NAACP John Shalady, who was beaten by a mob and eventually died in his effort to secure rights for blacks.

For 100 years, it's been there demonstrating at the White House, negotiating and litigating at the courthouse. Hence, it is indeed most appropriate that the Congress of the United States of America honor the NAACP on this, its 100th anniversary.

To this end, Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman CONYERS and Ranking Member LAMAR SMITH, subcommittee chair BOBBY SCOTT, floor leader HANK JOHNSON, and also now floor leader Judge TED POE. I also thank the 105 U.S. House cosponsors of this legislation. I thank Senator DODD and his 20 cosponsors of the companion legislation in the U.S. Senate.

And, in closing, at the risk of being both redundant and superfluous, I beg, beseech and entreat my colleagues to support this resolution because, in so doing, you are voting for liberty and justice for all, as pronounced in the Pledge of Allegiance. In so doing, you are voting for government of the people by the people for the people, as proclaimed in the Constitution. In so doing, you are voting for the equality of all, as promulgated in the Declaration of Independence. By voting for this resolution, you are continuing to bend the arc of the moral universe toward justice.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS).

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, today I stand here to honor the NAACP. We all honor the NAACP in this House. It has been at the forefront of the civil rights struggle in this country for 100 years, and though 100 years have passed since the founding of the NAACP, there still remains great work to be done.

Mr. Speaker, last summer dozens of black pastors and black mothers attended the 99th annual NAACP conference in Cincinnati to call on the NAACP to help expose one of the least known and yet one of the most pervasive forms of racism at work still in this country, the targeting of the black community by abortion providers. Many of these advocates who gathered at the NAACP I have the privilege to call precious friends. Dr. Alveda King, who leads King for America, is the niece of Dr. Martin Luther King.

□ 1745

Bishop Harry Jackson; Reverend Johnny Hunter, the founder of LEARN, America's largest African American pro-life organization; the Reverend

Clenard Childress of LEARN Northeast; Catherine Davis with the Georgia Right to Life; Lawson Lipford-Cruz, the president of Black Students for Life; and David Owens, among many, many others. Their goal was simply to fulfill the mission of the NAACP, and that is to ensure equality and, most importantly, equal protection of the law for all.

Mr. Speaker, I want to quote Dr. Alveda King, the niece of Dr. Martin Luther King, who helped lead the rally outside the NAACP conference.

"Racism lives at Planned Parenthood. I say to my fellow NAACP members: It's time to tell the government to stop funding racism. Planned Parenthood will gladly accept donations for the specific purpose of aborting only black babies," King said. "It locates its clinics in or near minority neighborhoods. It has led the way in eliminating African Americans to the point where one quarter of the black population is now missing because of abortion."

King called on the Nation's oldest civil rights organization to remember its mission statement: "To ensure the political, educational, social, and economic equality of rights of all persons and to eliminate racial hatred and racial discrimination."

Day Gardner, the president of the National Black Pro-Life Union, said, "As a child, I thought the NAACP to be a superhero organization, an organization that would fight racism right down to its very core." She stressed that the NAACP leaders need to have their eyes opened to the agenda of government-supported abortion providers and to what she believes is their strategic marketing to the black community.

According to reported statistics, Mr. Speaker, a black child is nearly five times more likely to be aborted than a white child.

Gardner continued. "We are here to rally the NAACP, to make our voices heard as we shout in unison 'all across this great Nation the struggle is not yet over. The evil hand of racism is still at work.'"

Gardner also spoke about the Federal tax dollars that go to Planned Parenthood. She said it was time for Congress to end that funding. She asked, "Why are we forced to pay well over \$300 million to an organization that is overtly racist? We are calling on the NAACP to stand boldly with us to defund Planned Parenthood and even lead the way in this, the greatest struggle for civil rights."

Mr. Speaker, I just want to echo and agree with the words of Dr. King and of Day Gardner, that for the NAACP to fully advance the cause of the black community, it must take a stand and fight on behalf of the most helpless, voiceless, politically unempowered members of the black community—those being the unborn.

Today, one out of every two black babies conceived in this country is lost to

abortion. That is an astonishing reality that I cannot find the words to describe. I just want to thank those courageous members of the NAACP for their fight against this unspeakable tragedy. We must all open our eyes to the racist history of abortion-on-demand movements in this country and its devastating impact on black America. It is past time to defund such a movement in this country.

To that end, I will also be reintroducing the PreNDA bill, the Prenatal Nondiscrimination Act, to end sex-selection abortion and race-selection abortion in this country. It is the duty of all of us to come together and to eliminate this deadly form of discrimination in this generation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee—the Chair of the Commercial and Administrative Law Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee, my good friend, Mr. STEVE COHEN.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I am a life member of the NAACP. In my lifetime, in the city of Memphis, there have been all kinds of activists involved in civil rights work or in political work, and the people who have always stood out as the champions have been the members of the NAACP. They have been the people who have been involved in looking out for human rights, voting rights, and civil rights for people, regardless of their color, because it was the right thing to do and not because of any political advantage to themselves.

For those particular individuals of which Maxine Vasco Smith, Russell Sugarman, A.W. Willis, Jesse Turner, and others have been leaders, I commend them and thank them for their efforts before me.

This is the 100th anniversary of the NAACP. In the African American community, there are only two other organizations that are renowned and that have celebrated 100 years of existence. The others are the Alphas, a distinguished fraternity; Alpha Phi Alpha; and the AKA sorority, Alpha Kappa Alpha. Each has celebrated its 100th anniversaries most recently.

The NAACP today is headed up by Julian Bond, one of the heroes of the Civil Rights Movement. He is a distinguished gentleman who has done a phenomenal job for 50 years in leading people toward the rights of free conscience as well as civil rights and other rights. Those are the types of activities that the NAACP has been involved in.

It was started 100 years ago by a biracial group of people who thought it was time that America lived up to its promise. It had been approximately 40-some-odd years since the end of the Civil War, and yet we still had Jim Crow laws. This country had not advanced greatly from the time of the Civil War. We had the period of reconstruction, and then after that there was a step back in civil rights. These people decided there should be a change, and they have worked assiduously to see that that happens. They

are often known or thought about with Thurgood Marshall and the work done for the Brown versus Board of Education in 1954 in bringing about that landmark decision. The NAACP Legal Defense Fund, which does so much, is a separate arm from the NAACP, but it was founded by it, and their activities in the courts have yielded great benefits to Americans throughout the years.

When it comes to hate crimes, the NAACP has been on the front lines. With voting rights, they're on the front lines. So those leaders, such as Dr. Martin Luther King, Coretta Scott King, Rosa Parks, Medgar Evers, Myrlie Evers-Williams, Benjamin Hooks from my hometown of Memphis, Jesse Turner, Jr., from my hometown of Memphis, who served as national treasurer of the late Jesse Turner, Sr., and others have fought the good fight for the NAACP, and they continue to do so as the moral conscience of this Congress in lobbying for legislation that this Congress needs to pass.

They published a report card on the work of this Congress, and it does hold people up to account for the works that they have done in these years. They helped me in passing a policy for slavery in Jim Crow. I appreciate their work. I am proud, and I ask my colleagues to join with me in voting for the resolution.

Mr. POE of Texas. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I would yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I am a proud lifelong member of the NAACP, and today, I join my colleagues in celebrating this 100th anniversary. I am especially proud of my local moderate county branch of the NAACP where our chapter was created in 1932, and I believe this chapter ranks as one of the largest per capita branches in the United States, and has been active in education and law for all of these many years. I can tell you we are all better off for it.

Our chapter's proudest member is Ben Jealous, now the youngest and, in my opinion, the most dynamic president of the NAACP. As we recognize the great achievements of one of America's best organizations, let us not forget that the struggle continues. We still face discrimination in our communities, in our schools and in the workplace. It is a struggle that requires continuing education and legal action.

The NAACP offers us many examples as we continue on our path towards solving our racial troubles. Even the founders of the NAACP offer an important lesson on how such a diverse group can accomplish so much. The men and women—black and white, from different backgrounds and from different careers and from different religions—these people came together to create a force for good.

I want to thank the NAACP for 100 years of hard work. God bless your

president and his family as he leads us into the next century of fighting for human and civil rights. We congratulate you on this historic day.

I'm a proud lifelong member of the NAACP, and today I join my colleagues in celebrating its 100th anniversary.

I am especially proud of my local Monterey County Branch of the NAACP, where our chapter was created in 1932. My chapter ranks as one of the largest per capita branches in the United States and has been active in education and law—and we're all better for it.

The Fort Ord Army training base in Seaside, Calif., was the first military base in the United States to be integrated in 1947. It was one of the largest bases in the United States to conduct training for Korea, Vietnam and many other conflicts. Now that base is closed, it's site is home to the newest campus of the California State University system—due in part to the fine work of the NAACP.

And our chapter's proudest member is Ben Jealous, now the youngest—and in my opinion the most dynamic—national president of the NAACP.

As we recognize the great achievements of one of America's best organizations, let us not forget that the struggle continues. We still have discrimination in our communities, in our schools and in the workplace. It's a struggle that requires continuing education and legal action.

Luckily, we have the rich history of the NAACP that offers us so many examples of how to proceed. One of the best is the group of individuals who founded the group. It shows us how such a diverse group can accomplish so much.

Along with a life of activism, W. E. B. Du Bois was a noted professor and writer. Archibald Grimké, the son of a slave owner and slave, was a journalist and lawyer. Henry Moskowitz was a Jewish physician. Mary White Ovington and Oswald Garrison Villard spent their lives writing. William English Walling, born into a former slaveholding family, once served as a factory inspector. And Ida B. Wells was also a noted women's rights activist.

America is the country where dreams come true. Certainly the world has seen such with the election of Barack Obama. But the work will never end until peace and justice are available to everyone.

I want to thank the NAACP for 100 years of hard work. You've made America a stronger and better nation.

And your work continues. God bless your president, Ben Jealous, as he leads us into the next century of fighting for human and civil rights. We congratulate you on this historic day.

Mr. POE of Texas. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I would yield 4 minutes to the honorable gentleman from the great State of Virginia, Mr. BOBBY SCOTT, who is also the Chair of the Crime Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to recognize the NAACP on its 100th anniversary. The NAACP holds a very special meaning to me because I have been a long-time active

member of the group. I have had the honor of being Virginia's first individual Golden Heritage Life Member and Virginia's first Diamond Life Member, the organization's highest individual membership level. In addition, I have had the honor of serving as president of the Newport News, Virginia branch of the NAACP.

The NAACP is an organization that has made a difference from the very beginning. In 1909, 60 prominent Americans, including Ida B. Wells-Barnett and W.E.B. Du Bois, met on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln to discuss racial violence and social justice. Out of that meeting, the NAACP was born with the goal of securing rights, liberties and protections for all Americans as guaranteed by the Constitution.

Since its inception, the NAACP has worked tirelessly to continuing looking for ways to improve the democratic process and by seeking the enactment and the enforcement of Federal, State and local laws that secure civil rights. The NAACP furthers its mission by making the public aware of adverse effects of racial discrimination and by seeking its elimination. The NAACP also seeks to educate the public about their constitutional rights, and it goes to court to enforce those rights when necessary.

The NAACP has a long and impressive history of activism. It has contributed greatly to shaping America as we know it today. One of its first legislative initiatives was anti-lynching legislation in the early 1900s. In the 1940s, the NAACP was influential in President Roosevelt's decision to issue an executive order prohibiting discrimination in contracts with the Department of Defense. The NAACP was very instrumental in President Truman's decision to issue an executive order ending all discrimination in the military. In 1946, the NAACP won the *Morgan v. Virginia* case where the Supreme Court banned States from having segregated facilities on buses and trains that crossed State borders. In 1948, the NAACP pressured President Truman into signing an executive order banning all discrimination in the Armed Forces. In 1954, the NAACP won its landmark case of *Brown v. Board of Education*, declaring separate but equal unconstitutional.

The NAACP is what the late Bishop Stephen Gill Spotswood, the former national board chairman, has called "the oldest, largest, most effective, most consulted, most militant, most feared, and most loved of all civil rights organizations in the world." Bishop Spotswood's statement remains true today.

Even in the 21st century, the NAACP continues to be a strong advocate for fairness and equality. Recently, the NAACP was deeply involved in protesting the Jena 6 controversy where the efforts of the NAACP and others provided justice for the students in

that case. The NAACP continues their work on eliminating racial injustice. It continues to act as a watchdog to protect the civil rights of all people, and it educates the public about civil rights so that future generations will know that tolerance and equality are the norm rather than the exception.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the NAACP and its people on 100 years of service to our great country, and I wish them another successful century of service.

Mr. POE of Texas. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 13 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Georgia has 4½ minutes remaining.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I will yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois, the honorable DANNY DAVIS.

□ 1800

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding, and I also want to commend the gentleman from Texas, Representative GREEN, for his introduction of this resolution.

I rise to be in agreement with all of those who have edified the examples of tremendous leadership provided by the NAACP.

On a personal note, though, I want to commend my wife, Vera, who is the chairman of our local Westside Branch NAACP, and Mr. Karl Brinson, who is the president. They do outstanding work and have continued to do so. I also want to commend Hilary Shelton for the tremendous job that he has done over the years keeping us informed.

And so I commend the NAACP on its 100th anniversary.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I would yield 1 minute at this time to the honorable gentleman from the State of Virginia, Mr. TOM PERRIELLO.

Mr. PERRIELLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 100th anniversary of the NAACP as it celebrates its centennial.

Since its founding in 1909, the NAACP has been a tireless crusader against racial discrimination, and it has continuously called our great Nation towards an ever-expanding horizon of liberty and justice for all.

Often with support and protection from the NAACP, countless brave citizens of my district joined the great American struggle for civil rights. From slavery and segregation, through massive resistance and Bloody Monday marches, our area has passed through dark nights always to emerge at the dawn of a new era of equality.

I thank the NAACP, its staff, and its members for remaining true to our Nation's highest ideals. As it embarks on its second century with new leadership and a renewed commitment to human

rights, I congratulate the NAACP on this landmark year in its history and extend our deep appreciation for victories won and those that remain before us.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, we have no additional speakers at this time, and if the gentleman yields back the balance of his time, I will do the same.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate my good friend and fellow judge from Texas (Mr. GREEN) for introducing this legislation, an individual I've known for now over 30 years and have been through a lot together back in the State of Texas and proud to see that he has introduced this legislation.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to commend Congressman GREEN for his efforts in introducing this legislation, and I look forward to its passage.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, this historic year marks both the inauguration of this country's first African-American president, Barack Obama, and the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People's (N.A.A.C.P.) 100th anniversary. February 12, 1909 was chosen as the founding date of the N.A.A.C.P. to commemorate President Abraham Lincoln's 100th birthday, with the hopes of realizing his vision of a unified nation overcoming racial and ethnic hatred and discrimination.

The following decades have seen the emergence of new challenges along America's journey towards equality. Yet the N.A.A.C.P. has persisted and has overcome these obstacles. It currently bears witness to numerous advancements that may have never taken place had it not been for the collective will of the many N.A.A.C.P. members who were willing to fight for what they believed was right.

Without the N.A.A.C.P., it is hard to say where this country would be if it never fought for African-Americans to have increased access to the ballot box.

Without the N.A.A.C.P., it is hard to say where this country would be if it never fought against discrimination—from schooling to housing, and from marriage to employment. After all, the NAACP's Legal department, headed by Charles Hamilton Houston and Thurgood Marshall, undertook a campaign spanning several decades to bring about the reversal of the "separate but equal" doctrine enshrined in the Supreme Court's decision in *Plessy v. Ferguson*.

Without the N.A.A.C.P., it is hard to say where this great country would be if it were not for the courageous men and women who risked their lives and livelihoods in order to promote the rights of everyone, regardless of the color of their skin.

In fact, it is hard to imagine such an America without the N.A.A.C.P. My life and the life of this nation would be much different if it were not for the organization's efforts to tear down the barriers of racial discrimination and hatred. The N.A.A.C.P.'s work, however, is not yet finished. If the last century is any indica-

tion though, as long as there is an N.A.A.C.P., all Americans will continue to have a powerful advocate for fairness, equality, and justice.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support H. Con. Res 35 "Honoring and praising the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People on the occasion of its 100th anniversary."

Mr. Speaker, H. Con. Res 35 recognizes the 100th anniversary of the historic founding of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) and honors and praises the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People on the occasion of its anniversary for its work to ensure the political, educational, social, and economic equality of all persons. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H. Con. Res 35 because of the impact that the NAACP has had on me and other minorities across this great nation.

First organized in 1905, the group came to be known as the Niagara Movement when it began meeting at hotel situated on the Canadian side of the Niagara Falls. The group first met in Canada because the U.S. hotels were segregated. Under the leadership of Harvard scholar W.E.B. DuBois, the group later went on to become known as the National Negro Committee. It was not the date of the organization's second conference in 1910 that it formally adopted the name the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

The mission of the association was clearly delineated in its charter:

To promote equality of rights and to eradicate caste or race prejudice among the citizens of the United States; to advance the interest of colored citizens; to secure for them impartial suffrage; and to increase their opportunities for securing justice in the courts, education for the children, employment according to their ability and complete equality before law.

Since its inception, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) has upheld its mission to fight social injustice and give a voice to the voiceless. The NAACP is among the largest and most prominent mass-membership, civil rights organizations in America.

Founded with a mandate to secure equal political, economic and social rights for African Americans, the NAACP has been in the forefront of every major civil rights struggle of the twentieth century. Using a combination of tactics including legal challenges, demonstrations and economic boycotts, the NAACP played an important role in helping end segregation in the United States.

The NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc., (NAACP LDF) a leading civil rights organization based in New York City, began as the legal wing of the NAACP under the leadership of Charles Hamilton Houston, a former professor at Howard University Law School. In 1938, Thurgood Marshall, Houston's student and future Supreme Court justice, succeeded him as NAACP LDF counsel.

Marshall further developed the strategies and goals of the legal department, establishing the Legal Defense Fund as an organization totally independent of the NAACP.

Among its most significant achievements was the NAACP LDF's challenge to end segregation in public schools. In the landmark Supreme Court case *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954), the Justices unanimously ruled that separate educational facilities for black

and white students were “inherently unequal.” That ruling and the Court’s subsequent order that public schools be desegregated with “all deliberate speed” touched off a firestorm of protest in the South and contributed substantially to the growth of the modern-day civil rights movement. Today, the NAACP has over 500,000 members standing in unity with all who support protecting our constitutionally guaranteed civil rights against all who would oppose protecting these freedoms.

Even in my district in Houston, the NAACP seeks to be a voice against injustice for all minorities. The NAACP Houston Branch has a long and rich history championing civil rights in Houston on vital issues such as the desegregation of Houston schools, combating the spread of HIV/AIDS, and improved access to education and information technology.

The NAACP Houston Branch has played an instrumental role in breaking new ground on the path to freedom and equality for Houston’s minority community. The branch has been experiencing tremendous growth in recent years while serving the Harris County area through its programs and myriad committees made up of its dedicated staff and volunteer members. Led by an Executive Committee of approximately 25 volunteers, there are approximately 800 members in the Houston Branch.

Some of the Houston Branch’s programs include collaborations with the City of Houston Health Department in STD prevention and awareness programs, legal assistance in the form of legal consultation and educational seminars, a year-long enrichment program designed to recruit, stimulate, improve and encourage high academic and cultural achievement among African American high school students, and other programs beneficial to minorities across the city of Houston.

As a member of the Judiciary Committee, I truly appreciate the support from the NAACP in fighting for the reauthorization of the Voting Rights Act. We all know that without the reauthorization of the Voting Rights Act, the voting rights of many U.S. citizens would be in jeopardy. When I authored H.R. 745 in the 110th Congress, I am proud to say that with the NAACP’s support, my colleagues and I were able to rename the Fannie Lou Hamer, Rosa Parks, Cesar E. Chavez, Barbara C. Jordan, William C. Velasquez, and Dr. Hector P. Garcia Voting Rights Act Reauthorization and Amendments Act of 2006. This bill renamed the Voting Rights Act to demonstrate the many faces of the Civil Rights Movement. The bill was renamed to recognize the Hispanics and other persons of color who labored in the vineyards to insure that all receive equal treatment in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, H. Con. Res 35 provides for a tribute to celebrate the impact and achievements of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People in their efforts to better the lives of minorities and the community. There is still a need for justice and equal treatment for minorities in our country. I am grateful for the many fights for equality that he organization has won, and thankful that the NAACP will be there in the future to champion the cause of justice wherever and whenever it needs a spokesman.

The struggles of the NAACP have helped pave the way for the election this country’s first African-American President Barack Obama. During a speech celebrating the NAACP, President Obama declared that

“serving as . . . [P]resident, 100 years after the founding of the NAACP, I will stand up for you the same way that earlier generations of Americans stood up for me—by fighting to ensure that every single one of us has the chance to make it if we try.”

I thank my colleague, Representative AL GREEN, of Texas, for introducing this important legislation, to ensure that we celebrate, treasure and recognize the African American spiritual as a national treasure and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Con. Res. 35.

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. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

HONORING GRIFFIN BELL

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 71) acknowledging the lifelong service of Griffin Boyette Bell to the State of Georgia and the United States as a legal icon.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 71

Whereas Griffin Boyette Bell was born on October 31, 1918, in Americus, Georgia, to Thelma Leola Pilcher and Adlai Cleveland Bell, a cotton farmer;

Whereas Griffin Boyette Bell died on January, 5, 2009, at Piedmont Hospital in Atlanta, Georgia, after enduring long-term kidney disease and a battle with pancreatic cancer;

Whereas Griffin Boyette Bell was raised in the Shiloh community outside of Americus until his family moved into Americus to establish a tire retail store;

Whereas Griffin Boyette Bell proved himself a superior student in the Americus public schools and later at Georgia Southwestern College also in Americus;

Whereas in 1942, Griffin Boyette Bell was drafted into the Army, where he served in the Quartermaster Corps and Transportation Corps;

Whereas Griffin Boyette Bell, while stationed at Fort Lee, Virginia, met and married Mary Powell, who also had family ties in Americus, Georgia, and they later had one son, Griffin Jr.;

Whereas in 1946, Griffin Boyette Bell, after being discharged from active duty in the Army with the rank of Major, enrolled in the Walter F. George School of Law at Mercer University in Macon, Georgia;

Whereas Griffin Boyette Bell worked at the firm Anderson, Anderson, and Walker while in law school;

Whereas Griffin Boyette Bell, while still a law student, passed the Georgia bar examination and was appointed city attorney of Warner Robins, Georgia;

Whereas Griffin Boyette Bell, after graduating Mercer University law school with honors in 1948, practiced law in Savannah, Georgia, and Rome, Georgia;

Whereas in 1953, Griffin Boyette Bell accepted an offer to join the Atlanta law firm of Spalding Sibley Troutman and Kelley, later renamed King and Spalding;

Whereas in 1958, Griffin Boyette Bell was appointed chief of staff to Governor Ernest Vandiver and while serving in that capacity was influential in organizing the Sibley Commission, which mapped Georgia’s approach to school desegregation;

Whereas Griffin Boyette Bell, while as chief of staff to Governor Ernest Vandiver, also helped moderate State policy concerning civil rights and was instrumental in keeping Georgia’s schools open during that turbulent period;

Whereas in 1961, Griffin Boyette Bell was appointed by President Kennedy to the 5th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals where he served for 14 years and often played an instrumental role in mediating disputes during the peak of the United States Civil Rights Movement;

Whereas in 1976, President Jimmy Carter nominated Griffin Boyette Bell to be the 72nd Attorney General of the United States and he was confirmed to that position on January 25, 1977;

Whereas Griffin Boyette Bell brought independence and professionalism to the Department of Justice during his tenure as Attorney General by daily posting of his third-party contacts, including meetings and calls with the White House, Members of Congress, or other non-Justice Department individuals;

Whereas Griffin Boyette Bell in his capacity as Attorney General, advised the Carter administration and helped to increase the number of women and minorities serving on the Federal bench by recruiting Wade McCree, an African-American Eighth Circuit judge, to serve as Solicitor General of the United States and Drew S. Days III, an African-American lawyer for the NAACP Legal Defense Fund, to head the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice;

Whereas Griffin Boyette Bell also led negotiations to divide his former appellate court, the 5th Circuit spanning from Georgia to Texas, into two courts: a new 5th Circuit based in New Orleans and an 11th Circuit based in Atlanta;

Whereas Griffin Boyette Bell, upon resignation as Attorney General in August 1979, was appointed by President Carter as the Special Ambassador to the Helsinki Convention;

Whereas Griffin Boyette Bell served as a member of the Secretary of State’s Advisory Committee on South Africa from 1985 to 1987;

Whereas in 1989, Griffin Boyette Bell was appointed Vice Chairman of President George H. W. Bush’s Commission on Federal Ethics Law Reform;

Whereas Griffin Boyette Bell served as counsel to President George H. W. Bush during the Iran Contra Affair investigation;

Whereas in September of 2004, Griffin Boyette Bell was appointed the Chief Judge of the United States Court of Military Commission Review; and

Whereas during Griffin Boyette Bell’s career as a lawyer, he specialized in corporate internal investigations, and many that were high profile, including E.F. Hutton following

Federal indictments for its cash management practices, Exxon Valdez after an oil spill in Alaska, and Procter and Gamble after rumors circulated that the company's moon-and-stars logo was a satanic symbol: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) acknowledges the lifelong service of Griffin Boyette Bell to the State of Georgia and the United States as a legal icon; and

(2) commends Griffin Boyette Bell for his tenure as Attorney General of the United States and his commitment to the American Civil Rights Movement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I will yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today we honor the lifelong service of Griffin Boyette Bell to the legal profession and to the American civil rights movement. I want to thank Representative JACK KINGSTON of Georgia for introducing this fitting tribute to one of Georgia's native sons.

Griffin Bell was born in 1918 in rural Sumter County, the son of a cotton farmer. His family relocated to Americus, the county seat, when the advance of the boll weevil devastated cotton crops.

Griffin Bell excelled at school and for a while attended Georgia Southwestern College and worked in his father's successful tire shop. When duty called in 1942, Griffin enlisted in the U.S. Army serving in the Quartermaster Corps, the Transportation Corps, where he rose to the rank of Major.

After the Army, he attended Walter F. George School of Law at Mercer University in Macon, Georgia, graduating with honors. While still in law school, he was appointed city attorney of Warner Robins, Georgia. He practiced law in both Savannah and Rome, Georgia, eventually joining the Atlanta law firm now known as King and Spalding.

In 1959, he returned to public service as chief of staff to Governor Ernest Vandiver. One of his responsibilities was helping guide the State of Georgia in implementing the Supreme Court's Brown versus Board of Education decision requiring that public schools be desegregated—which was a matter that was creating public and political tensions throughout the South.

Working with the blue-ribbon Sibley Commission that he organized, he navi-

gated a steady but incremental approach which helped Georgia implement the Brown decision without the school closings and other public rancor experienced elsewhere.

Griffin Bell's handling of this and other matters for Governor Vandiver brought him to the attention of President Kennedy, who appointed him in 1961 to the Fifth U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals, which used to incorporate the State of Georgia, but now Georgia is in the 11th Circuit.

In addition, among the many cases he dealt with during his 14 years on the bench were numerous school desegregation cases throughout the States from Texas to Georgia and Florida where he worked with a great deal of success to ensure that the Brown mandate was carried forward resolutely, but also with the cooperation and support of school boards and local communities whenever possible.

I had the opportunity to practice before the Fifth Circuit to promote civil rights on many occasions, including one case where I represented the NAACP in a voting rights case. In that case, the NAACP was denied an application to conduct voter registration drives. The court decided that the city could not prevent the NAACP from conducting voter registration drives if this would have a discriminatory effect, a decision which might not have been possible had lawyers and judges like Griffin Bell not had the courage to stand up for civil rights over the course of decades.

Judge Bell retired from the bench in March of 1976 only to be called back to public service soon thereafter by President-elect Jimmy Carter, who nominated him to be Attorney General of the United States. He was instrumental in restoring morale and public confidence at a Justice Department whose reputation had been severely damaged by Watergate. And he helped greatly increase the representation of women and minorities on the Federal bench.

Judge Bell returned to King and Spalding in 1979, but he remained active in public affairs not only in his community, but in national and international affairs as well.

He had barely left the Justice Department when President Carter appointed him to lead the U.S. delegation to the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

Two years later, he served as co-Chair of the Attorney General's National Task Force on Violent Crime, and in 1985, he accepted the position on the Secretary of State's advisory committee on South Africa. In 1989, the first President Bush appointed him to be vice chairman on the Commission on Federal Ethics Law Reform. In 2004 at age 86, he was commissioned as a Major General in the United States Army to serve as chief judge on the appeals court for reviewing military commission trials of enemy combatants.

To fully list the many positions Judge Bell held and the many ways he

served his community and his country and the world would take more time than we have here today. Last fall, his historical essays were published in a book called "Footnotes to History."

Griffin Bell was anything but a footnote to history. His advancement of civil rights and commitment to the rule of the law will continue to be an inspiration to the many who worked with him, who knew him, and who will read about him in years to come.

I am proud that today we celebrate his many accomplishments and honor his life.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume

Mr. Speaker, I support House Resolution 71 which acknowledges the lifelong service of Griffin Bell to the State of Georgia and, of course, to the United States.

Griffin Bell was the son of a cotton farmer, and he rose to become one of the most respected legal counselors in the whole United States. He was appointed by President Kennedy to serve as a judge on the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals. He left the court after 14 years of service on that bench to rejoin the law firm of King and Spalding.

In 1986, President Jimmy Carter nominated him to become the Attorney General of the United States. In that role, Judge Bell operated in a remarkably open manner that has not been duplicated since.

Every day, he would publicly post his contacts with third parties, including meetings and calls from the White House, Members of Congress, and others outside the Justice Department. His efforts to strengthen transparency of his office did much to rebuild confidence in the Justice Department after the Watergate scandal.

As Attorney General, Judge Bell led the effort to pass the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978. At the time, he gave testimony to Congress in which he made clear that the legislation "does not take away the power of the President under the Constitution."

Judge Bell also led negotiations that resulted in dividing his former appellate courts into two circuits: the Fifth Circuit, based in New Orleans, and the 11th Circuit, based in Atlanta.

Judge Bell was known for his love of rooster pepper sausage and for his wide and bold-colored ties. He was a figure full of personality as he was wise, and greatly respected by Members of both sides of the political aisle.

Judge Bell passed away earlier this year on January 5, 2009. He and his sage advice and his opinions will be missed.

As a former judge and prosecutor, I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution to honor the life of Judge Bell, a man committed to justice because, Mr. Speaker, justice is what we do in America.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER).

□ 1815

Mr. LINDER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Griffin Bell was a friend of mine for maybe 20 years and a decent human being. I'm not going to go back and reflect on his contributions to his city, his State or his Nation. Mr. JOHNSON and Mr. POE have already done that.

He served in many capacities in a decent way, but I just want to get something in the record. You never, ever will understand Griffin Bell until you understand what a wonderful sense of humor he had.

I moved to Georgia from Minnesota in 1969, almost 40 years ago, and one of the things we have in the South is respect for story telling and great good humor. And I have never heard a better one than Griffin Bell. And some of the stories he told me about he and Charlie Kirbo, who was another of President Carter's close personal advisers, as partners representing companies and individuals were just hilarious.

I want you to know that the Nation is going to miss a great man, and those of us who knew him are missing a great humorist.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time, and I have no more speakers.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this H. Res. and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I can think of no man who deserves these accolades who is greater than the late Judge Griffin Bell, and I look forward to this measure passing.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my friend and colleague Representative JACK KINGSTON for introducing this resolution to commemorate the life of one of the giants in the legal community of Georgia and the Nation—Griffin Boyette Bell. His passing is a great loss to me, his family, and the country he proudly served. We have lost a true friend and a prominent leader. Mr. Bell's distinguished service as a civil rights advocate, U.S. attorney general, World War II veteran, and Federal judge reflects his lifelong commitment to public service and the American people.

Born in Americus Georgia, Mr. Bell, the only son of a farmer, dedicated his life to helping others. Following his Army service in the Quartermaster and Transportation Corps during World War II, Griffin Bell attended the Georgia Southwestern College and went on to law school at Mercer College. Even before graduating, he passed the Georgia Bar and served as city attorney of Warner Robins, Georgia.

Following law school, he set up a successful practice in Savannah and Rome and soon was invited to become a partner at the prominent law firm of King & Spalding. Griffin Bell could not stay out of public service for long. Shortly after the election of President Kennedy, he accepted an appointment to the Fifth U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals.

As a judge on the Fifth U.S. Circuit, Griffin Bell acted as a guardian of our constitutional

rights and stood in strong opposition to segregation and discrimination. Later, as President Carter's Attorney General, he was an independent advocate of justice. Watergate was still fresh in people's minds, and Griffin Bell focused on eliminating official corruption. After his work as attorney general, he returned to King & Spalding, but still continued to be active in the public sphere. He served on the State's Advisory Committee on South Africa, President George H.W. Bush's Commission on Federal Ethics Law Reform, and was appointed the Chief Judge of the United States Court of Military Commission Review.

Throughout his career in public service, people from all walks of life—rich and poor, black and white, Democrat and Republican—benefited from his insight and wise counsel. He strove to bring people together and resolve differences in a fair and pragmatic manner. Put simply, he was a model of integrity. He was a strong influence in my own life and was an inspiring mentor to countless numbers of young people over the years. Griffin Bell was looked up to and loved by everyone, and he will be greatly missed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 71.

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. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

MISSING ALZHEIMER'S DISEASE PATIENT ALERT PROGRAM RE-AUTHORIZATION OF 2009

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 908) to amend the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 to reauthorize the Missing Alzheimer's Disease Patient Alert Program.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 908

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Missing Alzheimer's Disease Patient Alert Program Reauthorization of 2009".

SEC. 2. REAUTHORIZATION OF THE MISSING ALZHEIMER'S DISEASE PATIENT ALERT PROGRAM.

Section 240001 of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 14181) is amended—

(1) by amending subsection (a) to read as follows:

“(a) GRANT.—Subject to the availability of appropriations to carry out this section, the Attorney General, through the Bureau of Justice Assistance and in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, shall award competitive grants to nonprofit organizations to assist such organizations in paying for the costs of planning, designing, establishing, and operating locally based, proactive programs to protect and locate missing patients with Alzheimer's disease and related dementias and other missing elderly individuals.”;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by inserting “competitive” after “to receive a”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new sentence: “The Attorney General shall periodically solicit applications for grants under this section by publishing a request for applications in the Federal Register and by posting such a request on the website of the Department of Justice.”;

(3) by amending subsection (c) to read as follows:

“(c) PREFERENCE.—In awarding grants under subsection (a), the Attorney General shall give preference to national nonprofit organizations that have a direct link to patients, and families of patients, with Alzheimer's disease and related dementias.”; and

(4) by amending subsection (d) to read as follows:

“(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$5,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2010 through 2016.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we come to the floor with three elder justice bills, each with bipartisan support, and each addressing, in different ways, serious problems faced by our ever-expanding aging population. These problems range from dementia, and elders who “go missing,” to neglect, financial exploitation, and physical abuse. The three bills we are considering today address these critical problems.

The bill before us now, H.R. 908, the Missing Alzheimer's Disease Patient Alert Program Reauthorization of 2009, addresses the serious problem of seniors who go missing each year as a result of dementia. It passed the House on suspension last September, but Congress adjourned before the Senate could consider it.

The Missing Alzheimer's Disease Patient Alert Program was created in 1994, and while Congress has continued to support and fund it, its formal authorization expired in 1998.

This legislation, Mr. Speaker, sponsored by the gentlewoman from California, the Honorable MAXINE WATERS, will formally reauthorize the program.

H.R. 908 authorizes the Attorney General to award competitive grants to nonprofit organizations for planning, establishing, and operating locally-based programs to protect and locate missing persons with Alzheimer's disease, dementia, or other problems.

This is an excellent measure that responds to a critical problem, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time that I may consume.

I'm pleased to support H.R. 908, the Missing Alzheimer's Disease Patient Alert Program Reauthorization of 2009.

Roughly 5 million Americans suffer from Alzheimer's disease or dementia. Of these, 60 percent will become lost from their families or their caretakers. If they're not found within 24 hours, up to half of them become seriously ill or even die.

H.R. 908 increases the chance of locating missing persons suffering from these diseases within the critical first 24 hours. Specifically, the bill provides grants to nonprofit organizations to help create and maintain programs to assist in locating missing patients and family members with Alzheimer's.

We passed similar legislation in the last session of Congress, sent it to the Senate, and the Senate made a few changes and sent it back to us for our approval here in the House, but we did not have enough to consider the bill before Congress adjourned at the end of last year. H.R. 908 contains compromise language from the Senate version of the last session of Congress.

These programs and organizations this legislation aims to help are often significantly useful to local law enforcement when a person suffering from these mind-altering diseases goes missing. Because these patients are often disoriented and confused, tips and information from family, friends, and doctors are very critical.

H.R. 908 provides support to these organizations, indirect assistance to local law enforcement, protection to patients, and some peace of mind to the families and loved ones.

I urge all my colleagues to support this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlelady from California, the great Maxine Waters.

Ms. WATERS. I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me and for his very warm compliments. Thank you.

Approximately 5 million Americans have Alzheimer's disease, and the majority of them live at home under the care of family and friends. It is estimated that 60 percent of Alzheimer's patients are likely to wander away from their homes. Wanderers are vulnerable to dehydration, weather condi-

tions, traffic hazards, and individuals who prey on those who are defenseless. Up to 50 percent of wandering Alzheimer's patients will become seriously injured or die if they are not found within 24 hours of their departure from home.

The Missing Alzheimer's Disease Patient Alert Program is a Department of Justice program that helps local communities and law enforcement officials quickly identify persons with Alzheimer's disease who wander or who are missing and reunite them with their families.

Since its inception more than 10 years ago, this program has funded a national registry of more than 172,000 individuals at risk of wandering and has reunited over 12,000 wanderers with their families. It is a highly successful program whereby 88 percent of registrants who wander are found within the first 4 hours of being reported missing. A total of 1,288 wandering incidents were reported to the program in 2007. The program has a 98 percent success rate in recovering enrollees who are reported missing.

There are also technology-based options to address wandering that should be considered for funding under the Missing Alzheimer's Patient Program. For example, personalized wristbands that emit a tracking signal can be used to locate wanderers. These wristbands, when combined with specially trained search-and-rescue teams, can reduce search times from hours and days to minutes.

Congress originally authorized \$900,000 in appropriations for the Missing Alzheimer's Patient Program for 3 years, that is, 1996 through 1998, but never reauthorized or updated the program. Since then, the program has continued to receive funding on a year-to-year basis, but funding has remained virtually flat since its inception.

H.R. 908 reauthorizes, updates and expands the Missing Alzheimer's Patient Program.

The bill authorizes up to \$5 million per year in appropriations for fiscal years 2010 through 2016, a modest increase over the \$1 million appropriation in fiscal year 2008.

The bill expands the program so as to allow the Department of Justice to award multiple competitive grants to nonprofit organizations. Preference will be given to national nonprofit organizations that have a direct link to patients, and families of patients, with Alzheimer's disease and related dementias.

And finally, the bill specifies that the program will be operated under the Department of Justice's Bureau of Justice Assistance. Currently, the program is operated under the Office of Juvenile Justice, which is obviously not the most appropriate agency for a program serving the mostly elderly.

H.R. 908 has 21 bipartisan cosponsors, including the co-chairs of the Congressional Alzheimer's Task Force, Congressman EDWARD MARKEY and Con-

gressman CHRISTOPHER SMITH. The bill has been endorsed by more than 85 national, State, and local organizations, including the Alzheimer's Association and the Alzheimer's Foundation of America.

The Missing Alzheimer's Patient Program is a critical resource for first responders. It saves local law enforcement officials valuable time and allows them to focus on other national and local security concerns. It is critical that we reauthorize and expand this small, but very effective, program.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 908.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlelady from Oklahoma (Ms. FALLIN).

Ms. FALLIN. Mr. Speaker, we have an opportunity today to take a very important step in protecting some of our most vulnerable elderly citizens who suffer from Alzheimer's disease and other forms of dementia.

One American in 10 over the age of 65 suffers from Alzheimer's disease. For those over 85, it is one in two. Alzheimer's patients now number as many as 4.5 million in the United States, and as we baby boomers continue to age, those numbers will only continue to grow.

One of the great dangers for Alzheimer's patients is the tendency to become disoriented and to wander away from home. In fact, some 60 percent of those with Alzheimer's will do so at some point, and half of them will be seriously injured or even possibly die.

We've all heard stories in our local news networks, in our local communities: an elderly person goes missing, perhaps just going on a simple trip to the grocery store. Local search efforts are launched, and there are some great programs around our Nation to have those search efforts. The family will post notices somewhere and pleas for help for that missing person goes out. And the media certainly can help sound the alarm.

But sometimes these stories don't end happily and sometimes they do. The person that has wandered beyond the reach of local search efforts can be in serious trouble. If the weather is bad, or if that person should run across some dangerous individual, and they cross that Alzheimer's patient's path, it can end in tragedy.

In the fall of 2007, a member of my church, a lady named Betty Ledgerwood, left home one day and got into her car, had gas in her car, and ended up driving, not knowing where she was, who she was, and actually was missing for almost a full day. And her family even called me here, frantically trying to get some help with the media to find her. Her family did do all they could to sound the alarm.

Local officials searched for her, but she was eventually found, and she had died from exposure to the weather, just right outside her car, not in my home State of Oklahoma, but actually clear in Missouri. And she didn't know where

she was, and unfortunately, her family didn't know where she was.

It's a story that we hear all too often, that a loved one is confused with dementia or Alzheimer's can be missing.

And that's why the Missing Alzheimer's Disease Patient Alert Program today that we're talking about will help protect our most vulnerable at-risk seniors.

□ 1830

This is a program that has potential, saving and preserving the lives of some of our most vulnerable and threatened elderly citizens. It enlists the capacities of many different agencies, private-public sector. It does not seek to create new agencies. It simply focuses attention and effort on a growing problem.

So, Mr. Speaker, today, I'd like to urge the passage of this measure so we can bring the next Betty Ledgerwood home to her family safely. Thank you so much.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

Mr. COHEN. I want to thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding the time, and the gentlelady, Ms. WATERS from California, for bringing this important legislation.

My father had Alzheimer's and my mother has some form of dementia now. My father passed away at age 80, and there was a day when he disappeared from the nursing home and they couldn't find him. It took a couple of hours. They did find him walking in the neighborhood. He had no idea where he was going. I was amazed that he was not hurt or hit by a car or anything. He obviously had no idea where he was going.

This type of program is so prescient because there are so many people who have been talked about who are either suffering from this illness or will be suffering from this illness, and the needs of the police departments to identify them and to have an opportunity to maintain contact and save them before something bad happens to them.

There was a lady in Memphis named Elizabeth Ferguson. She was 86 years old. In May 2008 she went missing. She suffered from dementia. She drove away from her Memphis home after heading to a doctor's appointment. Her daughter went around and posted signs and tried to find her mother. Seven months later, she was found in a car, 24 miles away from her house. She had died in the elements. Her remains were near the car. She wandered out in some vacant fields.

So this bill is very important to people's lives. I commend Congresswoman WATERS for bringing it. It's the type of activity that sometimes people don't recognize that Congress does to help people in their everyday lives. I thank you for bringing this proposal and for the time offered me.

Mr. POE of Texas. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. I will, Mr. Speaker, say that I can't think of any legislation that is more timely than this, and more needed, to protect our elderly from all sorts of harm. These are people who have worked productively, given their lives, and now have fallen victim to a disease that we are still searching for cures for. And they need special protection, especially as our aged population increases.

And so I look forward to this measure passing, and I want to thank Congresswoman WATERS for her thoughtfulness in producing this legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 908.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELDER ABUSE VICTIMS ACT OF 2009

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 448) to protect seniors in the United States from elder abuse by establishing specialized elder abuse prosecution and research programs and activities to aid victims of elder abuse, to provide training to prosecutors and other law enforcement related to elder abuse prevention and protection, to establish programs that provide for emergency crisis response teams to combat elder abuse, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 448

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Elder Abuse Victims Act of 2009".

TITLE I—ELDER ABUSE VICTIMS

SEC. 101. ANALYSIS, REPORT, AND RECOMMENDATIONS RELATED TO ELDER JUSTICE PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the availability of appropriations to carry out this section, the Attorney General, in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, shall carry out the following:

(1) STUDY.—Conduct a study of laws and practices relating to elder abuse, neglect, and exploitation, which shall include—

(A) a comprehensive description of State laws and practices relating to elder abuse, neglect, and exploitation;

(B) a comprehensive analysis of the effectiveness of such State laws and practices; and

(C) an examination of State laws and practices relating to specific elder abuse, neglect, and exploitation issues, including—

(i) the definition of—

(I) "elder";

(II) "abuse";

(III) "neglect";

(IV) "exploitation"; and

(V) such related terms the Attorney General determines to be appropriate;

(ii) mandatory reporting laws, with respect to—

(I) who is a mandated reporter;

(II) to whom must they report and within what time frame; and

(III) any consequences for not reporting;

(iii) evidentiary, procedural, sentencing, choice of remedies, and data retention issues relating to pursuing cases relating to elder abuse, neglect, and exploitation;

(iv) laws requiring reporting of all nursing home deaths to the county coroner or to some other individual or entity;

(v) fiduciary laws, including guardianship and power of attorney laws;

(vi) laws that permit or encourage banks and bank employees to prevent and report suspected elder abuse, neglect, and exploitation;

(vii) laws relating to fraud and related activities in connection with mail, telemarketing, or the Internet;

(viii) laws that may impede research on elder abuse, neglect, and exploitation;

(ix) practices relating to the enforcement of laws relating to elder abuse, neglect, and exploitation; and

(x) practices relating to other aspects of elder justice.

(2) DEVELOPMENT OF PLAN.—Develop objectives, priorities, policies, and a long-term plan for elder justice programs and activities relating to—

(A) prevention and detection of elder abuse, neglect, and exploitation;

(B) intervention and treatment for victims of elder abuse, neglect, and exploitation;

(C) training, evaluation, and research related to elder justice programs and activities; and

(D) improvement of the elder justice system in the United States.

(3) REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, submit to the chairman and ranking member of the Special Committee on Aging of the Senate, and the Speaker and minority leader of the House of Representatives, and the Secretary of Health and Human Services, and make available to the States, a report that contains—

(A) the findings of the study conducted under paragraph (1);

(B) a description of the objectives, priorities, policies, and a long-term plan developed under paragraph (2); and

(C) a list, description, and analysis of the best practices used by States to develop, implement, maintain, and improve elder justice systems, based on such findings.

(b) GAO RECOMMENDATIONS.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall review existing Federal programs and initiatives in the Federal criminal justice system relevant to elder justice and shall submit to Congress—

(1) a report on such programs and initiatives; and

(2) any recommendations the Comptroller General determines are appropriate to improve elder justice in the United States.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$6,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2009 through 2015.

SEC. 102. VICTIM ADVOCACY GRANTS.

(a) GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—The Attorney General, after consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, may award grants to eligible entities to study the special needs of victims of elder abuse, neglect, and exploitation.

(b) AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES.—Funds awarded pursuant to subsection (a) shall be used for pilot programs that—

(1) develop programs for and provide training to health care, social, and protective services providers, law enforcement, fiduciaries (including guardians), judges and court personnel, and victim advocates; and

(2) examine special approaches designed to meet the needs of victims of elder abuse, neglect, and exploitation.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$3,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2009 through 2015.

SEC. 103. SUPPORTING LOCAL PROSECUTORS AND COURTS IN ELDER JUSTICE MATTERS.

(a) GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—Subject to the availability of appropriations under this section, the Attorney General, after consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, shall award grants to eligible entities to provide training, technical assistance, policy development, multidisciplinary coordination, and other types of support to local prosecutors and courts handling elder justice-related cases, including—

(1) funding specially designated elder justice positions or units in local prosecutors' offices and local courts; and

(2) funding the creation of a Center for the Prosecution of Elder Abuse, Neglect, and Exploitation to advise and support local prosecutors and courts nationwide in the pursuit of cases involving elder abuse, neglect, and exploitation.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$6,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2009 through 2015.

SEC. 104. SUPPORTING STATE PROSECUTORS AND COURTS IN ELDER JUSTICE MATTERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the availability of appropriations under this section, the Attorney General, after consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, shall award grants to eligible entities to provide training, technical assistance, multidisciplinary coordination, policy development, and other types of support to State prosecutors and courts, employees of State Attorneys General, and Medicaid Fraud Control Units handling elder justice-related matters.

(b) CREATING SPECIALIZED POSITIONS.—Grants under this section may be made for—

(1) the establishment of specially designated elder justice positions or units in State prosecutors' offices and State courts; and

(2) the creation of a position to coordinate elder justice-related cases, training, technical assistance, and policy development for State prosecutors and courts.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$6,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2009 through 2015.

SEC. 105. SUPPORTING LAW ENFORCEMENT IN ELDER JUSTICE MATTERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the availability of appropriations under this section, the Attorney General, after consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, the Postmaster General, and the Chief Postal Inspector for the United States Postal Inspection Service, shall award grants to eligible entities to provide training, technical assistance, multidisciplinary coordination, policy development, and other types of support to police, sheriffs, detectives, public safety officers, corrections personnel, and other first responders who handle elder justice-related matters, to fund specially designated elder justice positions or units designed to support first responders in elder justice matters.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$8,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2009 through 2015.

SEC. 106. EVALUATIONS.

(a) GRANTS UNDER THIS TITLE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the grant programs under this title, the Attorney General shall—

(A) require each recipient of a grant to use a portion of the funds made available through the grant to conduct a validated evaluation of the effectiveness of the activities carried out through the grant by such recipient; or

(B) as the Attorney General considers appropriate, use a portion of the funds available under this title for a grant program under this title to provide assistance to an eligible entity to conduct a validated evaluation of the effectiveness of the activities carried out through such grant program by each of the grant recipients.

(2) APPLICATIONS.—

(A) SUBMISSION.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this title, an entity shall submit an application to the Attorney General at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Attorney General may require, which shall include—

(i) a proposal for the evaluation required in accordance with paragraph (1)(A); and

(ii) the amount of assistance under paragraph (1)(B) the entity is requesting, if any.

(B) REVIEW AND ASSISTANCE.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—An employee of the Department of Justice, after consultation with an employee of the Department of Health and Human Services with expertise in evaluation methodology, shall review each application described in subparagraph (A) and determine whether the methodology described in the proposal under subparagraph (A)(i) is adequate to gather meaningful information.

(ii) DENIAL.—If the reviewing employee determines the methodology described in such proposal is inadequate, the reviewing employee shall recommend that the Attorney General deny the application for the grant, or make recommendations for how the application should be amended.

(iii) NOTICE TO APPLICANT.—If the Attorney General denies the application on the basis of such proposal, the Attorney General shall inform the applicant of the reasons the application was denied, and offer assistance to the applicant in modifying the proposal.

(b) OTHER GRANTS.—Subject to the availability of appropriations under this section, the Attorney General shall award grants to appropriate entities to conduct validated evaluations of grant activities that are funded by Federal funds not provided under this title, or other funds, to reduce elder abuse, neglect, and exploitation.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$7,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2009 through 2015.

SEC. 107. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) ELDER.—The term “elder” means an individual age 60 or older.

(2) ELDER JUSTICE.—The term “elder justice” means—

(A) from a societal perspective, efforts to—

(i) prevent, detect, treat, intervene in, and prosecute elder abuse, neglect, and exploitation; and

(ii) protect elders with diminished capacity while maximizing their autonomy; and

(B) from an individual perspective, the recognition of an elder's rights, including the right to be free of abuse, neglect, and exploitation.

(3) ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—The term “eligible entity” means a State or local government

agency, Indian tribe or tribal organization, or any other public or nonpublic private entity that is engaged in and has expertise in issues relating to elder justice or a field necessary to promote elder justice efforts.

TITLE II—ELDER SERVE VICTIM GRANT PROGRAMS

SEC. 201. ESTABLISHMENT OF ELDER SERVE VICTIM GRANT PROGRAMS.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Attorney General, acting through the Director of the Office of Victims of Crime of the Department of Justice (in this section referred to as the “Director”), shall, subject to appropriations, carry out a three-year grant program to be known as the Elder Serve Victim grant program (in this section referred to as the “Program”) to provide grants to eligible entities to establish programs to facilitate and coordinate programs described in subsection (e) for victims of elder abuse.

(b) ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS FOR GRANTEES.—To be eligible to receive a grant under the Program, an entity must meet the following criteria:

(1) ELIGIBLE CRIME VICTIM ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.—The entity is a crime victim assistance program receiving a grant under the Victims of Crime Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 1401 et seq.) for the period described in subsection (c)(2) with respect to the grant sought under this section.

(2) COORDINATION WITH LOCAL COMMUNITY BASED AGENCIES AND SERVICES.—The entity shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Director that such entity has a record of community coordination or established contacts with other county and local services that serve elderly individuals.

(3) ABILITY TO CREATE ECRT ON TIMELY BASIS.—The entity shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Director the ability of the entity to create, not later than 6 months after receiving such grant, an Emergency Crisis Response Team program described in subsection (e)(1) and the programs described in subsection (e)(2).

For purposes of meeting the criteria described in paragraph (2), for each year an entity receives a grant under this section the entity shall provide a record of community coordination or established contacts described in such paragraph through memoranda of understanding, contracts, subcontracts, and other such documentation.

(c) ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS.—

(1) CONSULTATION.—Each program established pursuant to this section shall be developed and carried out in consultation with the following entities, as appropriate:

(A) Relevant Federal, State, and local public and private agencies and entities, relating to elder abuse, neglect, and exploitation and other crimes against elderly individuals.

(B) Local law enforcement including police, sheriffs, detectives, public safety officers, corrections personnel, prosecutors, medical examiners, investigators, and coroners.

(C) Long-term care and nursing facilities.

(2) GRANT PERIOD.—Grants under the Program shall be issued for a three-year period.

(3) LOCATIONS.—The Program shall be carried out in six geographically and demographically diverse locations, taking into account—

(A) the number of elderly individuals residing in or near an area; and

(B) the difficulty of access to immediate short-term housing and health services for victims of elder abuse.

(d) PERSONNEL.—In providing care and services, each program established pursuant to this section may employ a staff to assist in creating an Emergency Crisis Response Teams under subsection (e)(1).

(e) USE OF GRANTS.—

(1) EMERGENCY CRISIS RESPONSE TEAM.—Each entity that receives a grant under this section shall use such grant to establish an Emergency Crisis Response Team program by not later than the date that is six months after the entity receives the grant. Under such program the following shall apply:

(A) Such program shall include immediate, short-term emergency services, including shelter, care services, food, clothing, transportation to medical or legal appointment as appropriate, and any other life services deemed necessary by the entity for victims of elder abuse.

(B) Such program shall provide services to victims of elder abuse, including those who have been referred to the program through the adult protective services agency of the local law enforcement or any other relevant law enforcement or referral agency.

(C) A victim of elder abuse may not receive short-term housing under the program for more than 30 consecutive days.

(D) The entity that established the program shall enter into arrangements with the relevant local law enforcement agencies so that the program receives quarterly reports from such agencies on elder abuse.

(2) ADDITIONAL SERVICES REQUIRED TO BE PROVIDED.—Not later than one year after the date an entity receives a grant under this section, such entity shall have established the following programs (and community collaborations to support such programs):

(A) COUNSELING.—A program that provides counseling and assistance for victims of elder abuse accessing health care, educational, pension, or other benefits for which seniors may be eligible under Federal or applicable State law.

(B) MENTAL HEALTH SCREENING.—A program that provides mental health screenings for victims of elder abuse to identify and seek assistance for potential mental health disorders such as depression or substance abuse.

(C) EMERGENCY LEGAL ADVOCACY.—A program that provides legal advocacy for victims of elder abuse and, as appropriate, their families.

(D) JOB PLACEMENT ASSISTANCE.—A program that provides job placement assistance and information on employment, training, or volunteer opportunities for victims of elder abuse.

(E) BEREAVEMENT COUNSELING.—A program that provides bereavement counseling for families of victims of elder abuse.

(F) OTHER SERVICES.—A program that provides such other care, services, and assistance as the entity considers appropriate for purposes of the program.

(f) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Director shall enter into contracts with private entities with experience in elder abuse coordination or victim services to provide such technical assistance to grantees under this section as the entity determines appropriate.

(g) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 12 months after the commencement of the Program, and annually thereafter, the entity shall submit a report to the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, and the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Special Committee on Aging of the Senate. Each report shall include the following:

(1) A description and assessment of the implementation of the Program.

(2) An assessment of the effectiveness of the Program in providing care and services to seniors, including a comparative assessment of effectiveness for each of the locations designated under subsection (c)(3) for the Program.

(3) An assessment of the effectiveness of the coordination for programs described in

subsection (e) in contributing toward the effectiveness of the Program.

(4) Such recommendations as the entity considers appropriate for modifications of the Program in order to better provide care and services to seniors.

(h) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:

(1) ELDER ABUSE.—The term “elder abuse” means any type of violence or abuse, whether mental or physical, inflicted upon an elderly individual, and any type of criminal financial exploitation of an elderly individual.

(2) ELDERLY INDIVIDUAL.—The term “elderly individual” means an individual who is age 60 or older.

(i) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Justice to carry out this section \$3,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2009 through 2011.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the second elder justice bill we are considering today is the Elder Abuse Victims Act of 2009. The House passed this bill on suspension last September by a vote of 387–28, but the Senate did not have time to consider it before adjournment.

It is estimated that each year, as many as 5 million elders are abused, neglected, or exploited. And the incidence of elder abuse is likely to only get worse in coming years, as 76 million baby boomers reach retirement age.

The legal protections against elder abuse vary significantly from State to State. The problem of elder abuse is especially problematic as many abuse cases remain secret and are never reported. The National Center on Elder Abuse has estimated that only one in six cases is reported.

H.R. 448, the Elder Abuse Victims Act of 2009, sponsored by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. SESTAK, will help provide training, technical assistance, and other support, to State and local law enforcement officials to help them catch and prosecute those who would prey on our elders.

The bill will authorize funding for specialized elder justice police officers and units, as well as for special elder justice positions and units within State and local prosecutors' offices and courts.

It will also provide other services to elders who are victimized. In addition to training for health care, social, and

protective service providers, it establishes the Elder Serve Victim Grant Program with regional emergency crisis response teams. These teams will provide short-term emergency services to elder victims, including shelter, care services, food, clothing, transportation to medical or legal appointments, and other life services as warranted.

Finally, the bill requires the Attorney General and the GAO to examine State and Federal laws, practices, and initiatives, and to recommend ways to more effectively address this problem. This bill comes to the floor amended to more clearly define the role of the Comptroller General in conducting its study and reporting to Congress.

In addition to JOE SESTAK, I want to commend the gentleman from New York, PETER KING, for his leadership in making this a bipartisan initiative. I would also like to acknowledge our former colleague from Illinois, Rahm Emanuel, for his work on this issue.

I would like to insert in the RECORD at this point a letter from the American Bar Association supporting this legislation as a “significant step in addressing the inexcusable and growing national problem of elder abuse, neglect, and exploitation.”

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, February 9, 2009.

Re the Elder Abuse Victims Act of 2009.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The American Bar Association urges you to vote “yes” on H.R. 448, the Elder Abuse Victims Act of 2009, legislation that we understand will be brought to the floor of the House under Suspension of the Rules tomorrow. The ABA supports enactment of the legislation as a significant step in addressing the inexcusable and growing national problem of elder abuse, neglect and exploitation—a tragedy that is estimated to cause serious harm to as many as two million people each year. That estimate does not reflect abuse of residents of long-term care facilities and thus is likely quite low. Additionally, the problem is estimated to grow as the older population burgeons.

Elder justice is central to any viable notion of the rule of law and social justice. The serious problems faced daily by victims of elder abuse cannot be remedied unless the justice system is given the resources to address those problems effectively. Elder abuse is a criminal violation, yet historically the justice system has handed the issue off to social services personnel who cannot adequately address the problem on their own. Currently there are very limited resources and expertise available to prosecutors to address elder abuse. H.R. 448 would establish vitally necessary specialized elder abuse prosecution and research programs and activities to aid victims of elder abuse and to provide relevant training to prosecutors and others who work in law enforcement.

Thank you for your support.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS M. SUSMAN,

Director, Governmental Affairs Office.

I urge my colleagues to support this, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POE of Texas. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support H.R. 448, the Elder Abuse Victims Act of 2009. As founder and co-Chair of the Congressional Victims Rights Caucus, I

believe it's important to advocate on behalf of all victims, especially our seniors. This is why I am a cosponsor of this important piece of legislation to protect our elders.

Elder abuse is a serious issue facing the country, and whether abuse is happening in homes or senior care facilities, we must do what we can as a Nation to protect these seniors. I believe that because seniors are often unable to defend themselves from mistreatment and abuse, that we must work together to prevent violence from occurring in the first place.

Currently, people over the age of 50 make up 12 percent of the Nation's murder victims and 7 percent of other serious and violent crime. Our eldest seniors, 80 years of age and over, are abused and neglected at three times the rate of all other senior citizens.

H.R. 448, the Elder Abuse Victims Act, sponsored by Representative SESTAK, helps protect our older Americans from this type of abuse. Specifically, the bill authorizes the Department of Justice to provide grants to State and local law enforcement agencies, prosecutors, and courts, to assist in the investigation and prosecution of elder victimization.

In addition to physical abuse, these grants also include identity theft, mail fraud, and telemarketing fraud as types of elder abuse. H.R. 448 authorizes the Department of Justice to also award grant funding to local law enforcement agencies and first responders that assist in locating the elderly that are missing. These grants will support programs that monitor older Americans in an effort to prevent them from facing future harm.

In addition, the bill instructs the Justice Department to carry out a study of State laws and procedures regarding elder abuse and neglect and exploitation. The study will give us a better idea of where we stand and what more we can do as a Nation to address this serious problem.

H.R. 448 also directs the Department to create a long-term plan on how to better prevent and detect elder abuse. The plan is also to focus on the treatment of victims, as well as to evaluate current elder abuse programs.

Mr. Speaker, everyone has a grandmother, and the thought of our grandmothers being neglected and abused is outrageous. Nothing made my blood boil more as a judge to see a case where some elderly person has been assaulted and their case was on trial.

Older Americans, whether they are our parents, our grandparents, or our neighbors, hold an important place in our society. They have lived long lives and given much to their communities and their families. The acts of abuse against them are intolerable, and they deserve the protection that we can give them under H.R. 448.

We passed a similar bill under suspension in the last Congress, and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the sponsor of this legislation, a former admiral, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SESTAK).

Mr. SESTAK. The previous bill was on Alzheimer's. And, in my district, I had one of those patients. A few years ago, he was beat six times with a belt buckle. One of his neighbors had dementia, and he was defrauded of \$84,000 four months before he passed away. It's why I submitted the Elder Abuse Victims Act.

This incidence of elder abuse, whether it's physical, financial, moral, degrading—and I mean sexual—or these types of exploitations are only growing in numbers. In my State of Pennsylvania, the third oldest in the Nation, between 2006 and 2007, and then 2007 and 2008, the incidences increased 39 percent.

Yet, we are really not sure how many incidents there are. My colleague from Georgia cited numbers may be more than 5½ million. But we don't know. At least 84 percent of them are reported to be unreported.

The issue is that we truly need to step back and have a look, a comprehensive review of all the States and the agencies that are intent upon addressing this issue to some degree and come up with one uniform type of definition and standard by which we could begin to build up the correct reporting requirements we need in order to properly address this issue. Then we need to step over and recognize that we do well, and need to do even better, for our women.

We appropriate \$540 million towards violence against women, and \$6.9 billion for child abuse, but then recognize it's only a bit over \$100 million for senior abuse. And while we need to do more in those areas, we need to bring this one up to a higher level for our seniors.

I speak in support of this growing population of ours. I do so because it was well laid out by both sides of the aisle here that in addition to this one uniform comprehensive set of definitions and standards, that we then need the proper grants given to the law enforcement, as well as the prosecution, as well as the victim advocacy citizens that are trying to do their best to address this.

So, in conclusion, I speak in support of this bill because I think Hubert Humphrey probably had it best: The moral test of a government is how well it does not only for those in the dawn of life—the children—and those in the shadows of life—the sick and the disabled, the handicapped—but also those in the twilight of life, our seniors.

And so I request the support of all on this bill.

□ 1845

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As a Nation, we are not judged by the way we treat the rich, the famous, the powerful, the important folks that live among us; but we as a community in this Nation are judged by the way we treat the most vulnerable among us, the weak, the innocent, the children, and the elderly. That is how we will be judged as a Nation. It is important that we then pass this legislation to help protect those innocent among us, and in this bill it happens to be the elderly. I urge adoption of this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, prior to yielding back, I would like to glance over at the other side of the aisle and recognize my good friend, Judge POE, who is probably well familiar with elder abuse and this general topic, he having been a trial court judge down in Beaumont, Texas. Mr. Speaker, I strongly emphasize my support of this legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 448, as amended.

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. SESTAK. Mr. 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.

NATIONAL SILVER ALERT ACT OF 2009

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 632) to encourage, enhance, and integrate Silver Alert plans throughout the United States, to authorize grants for the assistance of organizations to find missing adults, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 632

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I—SILVER ALERT COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK

SECTION 101. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "National Silver Alert Act 2009".

SEC. 102. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this title:

(1) STATE.—The term "State" means each of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the United States Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

(2) MISSING SENIOR.—The term "missing senior" refers to any individual who—

(A) is reported to, or identified by, a law enforcement agency as a missing person; and

(B) meets the requirements to be designated as a missing senior, as determined

by the State in which the individual is reported or identified as a missing person.

SEC. 103. SILVER ALERT COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK.

The Attorney General shall, subject to the availability of appropriations under section 107, establish a national Silver Alert communications network within the Department of Justice to provide assistance to regional and local search efforts for missing seniors through the initiation, facilitation, and promotion of local elements of the network (known as Silver Alert plans) in coordination with States, units of local government, law enforcement agencies, and other concerned entities with expertise in providing services to seniors.

SEC. 104. SILVER ALERT COORDINATOR.

(a) **NATIONAL COORDINATOR WITHIN DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE.**—The Attorney General shall designate an individual of the Department of Justice to act as the national coordinator of the Silver Alert communications network. The individual so designated shall be known as the Silver Alert Coordinator of the Department of Justice (referred to in this title as the “Coordinator”).

(b) **DUTIES OF THE COORDINATOR.**—In acting as the national coordinator of the Silver Alert communications network, the Coordinator shall—

(1) work with States to encourage the development of additional Silver Alert plans in the network;

(2) establish voluntary guidelines for States to use in developing Silver Alert plans that will promote compatible and integrated Silver Alert plans throughout the United States, including—

(A) a list of the resources necessary to establish a Silver Alert plan;

(B) criteria for evaluating whether a situation warrants issuing a Silver Alert, taking into consideration the need for the use of such Alerts to be limited in scope because the effectiveness of the Silver Alert communications network may be affected by overuse, including criteria to determine—

(i) whether the mental capacity of a senior who is missing, and the circumstances of his or her disappearance, warrant the issuance a Silver Alert; and

(ii) whether the individual who reports that a senior is missing is an appropriate and credible source on which to base the issuance of a Silver Alert;

(C) a description of the appropriate uses of the Silver Alert name to readily identify the nature of search efforts for missing seniors; and

(D) recommendations on how to protect the privacy, dignity, independence, and autonomy of any missing senior who may be the subject of a Silver Alert;

(3) develop proposed protocols for efforts to recover missing seniors and to reduce the number of seniors who are reported missing, including protocols for procedures that are needed from the time of initial notification of a law enforcement agency that the senior is missing through the time of the return of the senior to family, guardian, or domicile, as appropriate, including—

(A) public safety communications protocol;

(B) case management protocol;

(C) command center operations;

(D) reunification protocol; and

(E) incident review, evaluation, debriefing, and public information procedures;

(4) work with States to ensure appropriate regional coordination of various elements of the network;

(5) establish an advisory group to assist States, units of local government, law enforcement agencies, and other entities involved in the Silver Alert communications network with initiating, facilitating, and

promoting Silver Alert plans, which shall include—

(A) to the maximum extent practicable, representation from the various geographic regions of the United States; and

(B) members who are—

(i) representatives of senior citizen advocacy groups, law enforcement agencies, and public safety communications;

(ii) broadcasters, first responders, dispatchers, and radio station personnel; and

(iii) representatives of any other individuals or organizations that the Coordinator determines are necessary to the success of the Silver Alert communications network; and

(6) act as the nationwide point of contact for—

(A) the development of the network; and

(B) regional coordination of alerts for missing seniors through the network.

(c) **COORDINATION.**—

(1) **COORDINATION WITH OTHER AGENCIES.**—The Coordinator shall coordinate and consult with the Secretary of Transportation, the Federal Communications Commission, the Assistant Secretary for Aging of the Department of Health and Human Services, the head of the Missing Alzheimer’s Disease Patient Alert Program, and other appropriate offices of the Department of Justice in carrying out activities under this title.

(2) **STATE AND LOCAL COORDINATION.**—The Coordinator shall consult with local broadcasters and State and local law enforcement agencies in establishing minimum standards under section 105 and in carrying out other activities under this title, as appropriate.

(d) **ANNUAL REPORTS.**—Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Coordinator shall submit to Congress a report on the activities of the Coordinator and the effectiveness and status of the Silver Alert plans of each State that has established or is in the process of establishing such a plan. Each such report shall include—

(1) a list of States that have established Silver Alert plans;

(2) a list of States that are in the process of establishing Silver Alert plans;

(3) for each State that has established such a plan, to the extent the data is available—

(A) the number of Silver Alerts issued;

(B) the number of individuals located successfully;

(C) the average period of time between the issuance of a Silver Alert and the location of the individual for whom such Alert was issued;

(D) the State agency or authority issuing Silver Alerts, and the process by which Silver Alerts are disseminated;

(E) the cost of establishing and operating such a plan;

(F) the criteria used by the State to determine whether to issue a Silver Alert; and

(G) the extent to which missing individuals for whom Silver Alerts were issued crossed State lines;

(4) actions States have taken to protect the privacy and dignity of the individuals for whom Silver Alerts are issued;

(5) ways that States have facilitated and improved communication about missing individuals between families, caregivers, law enforcement officials, and other authorities; and

(6) any other information the Coordinator determines to be appropriate.

SEC. 105. MINIMUM STANDARDS FOR ISSUANCE AND DISSEMINATION OF ALERTS THROUGH SILVER ALERT COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT OF MINIMUM STANDARDS.**—Subject to subsection (b), the Coordinator shall establish minimum standards for—

(1) the issuance of alerts through the Silver Alert communications network; and

(2) the extent of the dissemination of alerts issued through the network.

(b) **LIMITATIONS.**—

(1) **VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION.**—The minimum standards established under subsection (a) of this section, and any other guidelines and programs established under section 104, shall be adoptable on a voluntary basis only.

(2) **DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION.**—The minimum standards shall, to the maximum extent practicable (as determined by the Coordinator in consultation with State and local law enforcement agencies), provide that appropriate information relating to the special needs of a missing senior (including health care needs) are disseminated to the appropriate law enforcement, public health, and other public officials.

(3) **GEOGRAPHIC AREAS.**—The minimum standards shall, to the maximum extent practicable (as determined by the Coordinator in consultation with State and local law enforcement agencies), provide that the dissemination of an alert through the Silver Alert communications network be limited to the geographic areas which the missing senior could reasonably reach, considering the missing senior’s circumstances and physical and mental condition, the modes of transportation available to the missing senior, and the circumstances of the disappearance.

(4) **AGE REQUIREMENTS.**—The minimum standards shall not include any specific age requirement for an individual to be classified as a missing senior for purposes of the Silver Alert communication network. Age requirements for determinations of whether an individual is a missing senior shall be determined by each State, and may vary from State to State.

(5) **PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES PROTECTIONS.**—The minimum standards shall—

(A) ensure that alerts issued through the Silver Alert communications network comply with all applicable Federal, State, and local privacy laws and regulations; and

(B) include standards that specifically provide for the protection of the civil liberties and sensitive medical information of missing seniors.

(6) **STATE AND LOCAL VOLUNTARY COORDINATION.**—In carrying out the activities under subsection (a), the Coordinator may not interfere with the current system of voluntary coordination between local broadcasters and State and local law enforcement agencies for purposes of the Silver Alert communications network.

SEC. 106. TRAINING AND OTHER RESOURCES.

(a) **TRAINING AND EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS.**—The Coordinator shall make available to States, units of local government, law enforcement agencies, and other concerned entities that are involved in initiating, facilitating, or promoting Silver Alert plans, including broadcasters, first responders, dispatchers, public safety communications personnel, and radio station personnel—

(1) training and educational programs related to the Silver Alert communication network and the capabilities, limitations, and anticipated behaviors of missing seniors, which shall be updated regularly to encourage the use of new tools, technologies, and resources in Silver Alert plans; and

(2) informational materials, including brochures, videos, posters, and websites to support and supplement such training and educational programs.

(b) **COORDINATION.**—The Coordinator shall coordinate—

(1) with the Assistant Secretary for Aging of the Department of Health and Human

Services in developing the training and educational programs and materials under subsection (a); and

(2) with the head of the Missing Alzheimer's Disease Patient Alert Program within the Department of Justice, to determine if any existing material with respect to training programs or educational materials developed or used as part of such Patient Alert Program are appropriate and may be used for the programs under subsection (a).

SEC. 107. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE SILVER ALERT COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Justice such sums as may be necessary to carry out the Silver Alert communications network as authorized under this title.

SEC. 108. GRANT PROGRAM FOR SUPPORT OF SILVER ALERT PLANS.

(a) GRANT PROGRAM.—Subject to the availability of appropriations to carry out this section, the Attorney General shall carry out a program to provide grants to States for the development and enhancement of programs and activities for the support of Silver Alert plans and the Silver Alert communications network.

(b) ACTIVITIES.—Activities funded by grants under the program under subsection (a) may include—

(1) the development and implementation of education and training programs, and associated materials, relating to Silver Alert plans;

(2) the development and implementation of law enforcement programs, and associated equipment, relating to Silver Alert plans;

(3) the development and implementation of new technologies to improve Silver Alert communications; and

(4) such other activities as the Attorney General considers appropriate for supporting the Silver Alert communications network.

(c) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the cost of any activities funded by a grant under the program under subsection (a) may not exceed 50 percent.

(d) DISTRIBUTION OF GRANTS ON GEOGRAPHIC BASIS.—The Attorney General shall, to the maximum extent practicable, ensure the distribution of grants under the program under subsection (a) on an equitable basis throughout the various regions of the United States.

(e) ADMINISTRATION.—The Attorney General shall prescribe requirements, including application requirements, for grants under the program under subsection (a).

(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) There is authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Justice \$5,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2009 through 2013 to carry out this section and, in addition, \$5,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2009 through 2013 to carry out subsection (b)(3).

(2) Amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in paragraph (1) shall remain available until expended.

**TITLE II—KRISTEN'S ACT
REAUTHORIZATION**

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as "Kristen's Act Reauthorization of 2009".

SEC. 202. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Every year thousands of adults become missing due to advanced age, diminished mental capacity, or foul play. Often there is no information regarding the whereabouts of these adults and many of them are never reunited with their families.

(2) Missing adults are at great risk of both physical harm and sexual exploitation.

(3) In most cases, families and local law enforcement officials have neither the resources nor the expertise to undertake appropriate search efforts for a missing adult.

(4) The search for a missing adult requires cooperation and coordination among Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies and assistance from distant communities where the adult may be located.

(5) Federal assistance is urgently needed to help with coordination among such agencies.

SEC. 203. GRANTS FOR THE ASSISTANCE OF ORGANIZATIONS TO FIND MISSING ADULTS.

(a) GRANTS.—

(1) GRANT PROGRAM.—Subject to the availability of appropriations to carry out this section, the Attorney General shall make competitive grants to public agencies or nonprofit private organizations, or combinations thereof, to—

(A) maintain a national resource center and information clearinghouse for missing and unidentified adults;

(B) maintain a national, interconnected database for the purpose of tracking missing adults who are determined by law enforcement to be endangered due to age, diminished mental capacity, or the circumstances of disappearance, when foul play is suspected or circumstances are unknown;

(C) coordinate public and private programs that locate or recover missing adults or reunite missing adults with their families;

(D) provide assistance and training to law enforcement agencies, State and local governments, elements of the criminal justice system, nonprofit organizations, and individuals in the prevention, investigation, prosecution, and treatment of cases involving missing adults;

(E) provide assistance to families in locating and recovering missing adults; and

(F) assist in public notification and victim advocacy related to missing adults.

(2) APPLICATIONS.—The Attorney General shall periodically solicit applications for grants under this section by publishing a request for applications in the Federal Register and by posting such a request on the website of the Department of Justice.

(b) OTHER DUTIES.—The Attorney General shall—

(1) coordinate programs relating to missing adults that are funded by the Federal Government; and

(2) encourage coordination between State and local law enforcement and public agencies and nonprofit private organizations receiving a grant pursuant to subsection (a).

SEC. 204. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this title \$4,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2010 through 2020.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is the third elder justice bill that we present to date. Like the previous two elder justice bills, this bill also passed the House

last September on suspension but was not able to be considered by the Senate before adjournment.

Thousands of vulnerable older adults go missing each year as a result of dementia, diminished capacity, foul play, and other unusual circumstances. For example, the Alzheimer's Foundation of America estimates that more than 5 million Americans suffer from Alzheimer's disease; and, according to the foundation, approximately 60 percent of these men and women are likely to wander from their homes. If they do, the disorientation and confusion that is a part of this illness keeps many from finding their way back home. Their safe return then often depends on being found quickly. If not found within 24 hours, roughly half risk serious illness, injury, or death.

When the House passed the bill last Congress, 11 States had Silver Alert programs. As we again consider this bill, there are now 13 States with the Silver Alert programs.

The need for Silver Alert programs and for appropriate assistance from Congress continue to grow. Last Congress, three Members of Congress, LLOYD DOGGETT of Texas, SUE MYRICK of North Carolina, and GUS BILIRAKIS of Florida, individually introduced legislation to address this serious problem in separate bills. H.R. 632 combines these three bills into one.

Title I, the National Silver Alert Act of 2009, establishes a national program patterned after the successful Amber Alert program for children. It creates a national Silver Alert coordinator responsible for developing voluntary guidelines, standards, and protocols for States to consider in the creation of their own local Silver Alert plans. It establishes a Department of Justice grant program to help States develop and implement local Silver Alert programs. And, finally, the program requires the coordinator to submit annual reports on the status and activities of the State Silver Alert plans.

Title II reauthorizes Kristen's Act, which expired in 2005. Kristen's Act provides for competitive grants to both public agencies and nonprofit private organizations for a national resource center, information clearinghouse, and database for tracking missing adults, training, and other related activities. I commend Congressman DOGGETT, Congresswoman MYRICK, and Congressman BILIRAKIS for their hard work and bipartisan efforts to address the critical problem of missing elders. I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POE of Texas. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support H.R. 632, the National Silver Alert Act of 2009, to help protect the elderly, particularly those suffering from Alzheimer's or other forms of dementia. This legislation is the work of three bills sponsored by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), the gentleman

from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS), and the gentlelady from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK). Last year, the House passed similar legislation with overwhelming bipartisan support.

By creating a structure similar to the Amber Alert system used to locate missing children, H.R. 632, the National Silver Alert Act, will help assist States in their efforts to protect our elderly. The Amber Alert system was created by the Dallas Police in 1996, after the kidnapping and murder of a 9-year-old girl from Arlington, Texas.

In 2003, Congress created the national Amber Alert program. As co-chair of the Victims Rights Caucus, I have seen firsthand the huge success of the Amber Alert program in locating missing children. Just as the Amber Alert program, which is currently now used in all 50 States, was designed to notify the public when a child was missing, the Silver Alert will also notify the public when an elderly adult is missing.

Mr. Speaker, we have all seen the big freeway signs that have Amber Alert, give the name of the child and the license number of the car that the child was taken in, and now we will see that also occur with the elderly in our community. Citizens can now offer any information they have on the missing person which will aid law enforcement officials in their search. Currently, the Silver Alert is used in 13 of our States. These States have reported nominal costs associated with operating the system, since they are able to utilize existing Amber Alert infrastructure to issue Silver Alerts.

H.R. 632 establishes a nationwide communication structure to coordinate State and local search efforts, and expand the system to those States not participating and authorizes a grant to support State Silver Alert systems and communication networks. The bill directs the Attorney General to assign an officer of the Department of Justice to act as the national director of the Silver Alert program. The director will develop voluntary guidelines that States can use in implementing the alert system and provide training and other resources to State law enforcement agencies.

The Amber Alert system has proven successful in locating missing children throughout the country; so too has the Silver Alert system in States currently using it. By establishing the Silver Alert system nationwide, H.R. 632 will help coordinate State efforts in protecting older Americans the same way the Amber Alert system has for missing children. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my good friend from Texas, Congressman LLOYD DOGGETT, such time as he may consume.

Mr. DOGGETT. I thank the gentleman, and I thank my colleague from Texas. It is great that the House is tonight considering a package of elder

justice legislation. These bills, of which I am a sponsor of both of the earlier bills by Ms. WATERS and Mr. SESTAK, are complementary. There is really no silver bullet when it comes to trying to help our elderly citizens, but we think that Silver Alert is one component. And, as my colleague from Texas pointed out, Amber Alert became a national program because of something that happened in Texas. I am pleased that Texas also has taken a leadership with Silver Alert.

Just a couple of examples of what has happened with our State Silver Alert program. I had a constituent who began driving south of Austin about 80 miles to San Antonio, then drove another couple hundred miles up to Dallas going back through Austin, and was finally found there. If he had been here in the North, he would have gone through about seven States. And he was clearly lost. They found him in a shopping center parking lot as a result of Silver Alert, and the Austin Police Department was notified.

More recently, we had an example from the Texas hill country in Kerrville, where a fellow ended up driving to San Marcos. Our San Marcos Police Department dispatchers were helpful because of the Silver Alert program, described just as my colleague from Texas mentioned, using the existing billboards and existing resources, was really valuable in finding it.

As Mr. JOHNSON pointed out, since this bill was passed here last fall, two more States have joined the effort; I believe there are about another 10 that have it under consideration. All we are trying to do through the Silver Alert initiative here at the national level is to provide them a clearinghouse of best practices, just as we did with Amber Alert earlier, where we will coordinate federal resources from several agencies that have responsibilities, and also reward best practices of the States, try to see that these are replicated so that we can find these people.

This legislation is also related to the legislation we were just considering. As the Elder Justice Coalition pointed out in a statement that they had today endorsing the Silver Alert bill, they say, "A missing elder person can be the next victim of elder abuse. It is critical that all appropriate resources are utilized at the local level to assist in the safe locating of missing older persons."

This legislation has been endorsed by a large number of organizations. There is a recognition, we have talked a lot about Alzheimer's tonight and other forms of dementia, that about 60 percent of the people who are afflicted with Alzheimer's at sometime during their disease will wander off from their caregiver. If they are not found within 24 hours, up to half will suffer serious injury or death. Only 4 percent of those who leave home alone are able to find their way back. And so there is a big gap here, a serious problem, if they leave home in not being able to get back. We hope to use what the States

have done, what the Amber Alert success has been to link everyone up.

There are many organizations, as I mentioned, that have joined in supporting this effort; but it came to my attention as a Texas idea because of a constituent, Bill Cummings, who is really a model citizen in his involvement and concern for the community. Bill and Carlos Higgins, who is also a devoted member of the Texas Silver-Haired Legislature, brought this to the attention of the Silver-Haired Congress, as seniors from all over the country came together here in Washington, came over to the office, told me of the success of the program, and asked that we take this initiative. We have now been joined by the American Health Care Association, the Assisted Living Federation of America, the National Citizens Coalition for Nursing Home Reform, the Child Alert Foundation, the Alzheimer's Association, and the Alzheimer's Foundation of America, all offering their support for this legislation.

Finally, as both of you have noted, this has been a bipartisan effort. I salute Mr. BILIRAKIS and Mrs. MYRICK, who I believe is not able to join us on the floor tonight. Hers is not a Silver Alert bill, but it is again a companion measure that we have incorporated into this.

□ 1900

Mr. BILIRAKIS had a very similar idea based on an unfortunate experience in his district. Working together, tonight we can take a positive step forward to keep our seniors safe.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the cosponsor of this bill, Mr. BILIRAKIS from Florida.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 632, the National Silver Alert Act, sponsored by my colleague from Texas, Congressman LLOYD DOGGETT.

I first became involved in this issue of finding missing seniors last year when one of my constituents, Mary Lallucci, lost her mother, who had left her care-giving facility and could not be located. She had driven her car into the Gulf of Mexico and drowned. This tragedy, unfortunately, highlighted the very real problem of older individuals who suffer from diseases which leave them easily confused and disoriented, wandering away from their homes or care-giving facilities and meeting harm because family, friends and authorities could not find them in time. The inability to find missing elderly is a problem State and Federal policymakers should address before something like this happens again. That is why I support this bill before us today, which includes provisions from silver alert legislation that I introduced last year.

The National Silver Alert Act is a bipartisan bill developed by Congressman DOGGETT, myself and Congresswoman SUE MYRICK. It combines portions of missing persons bills that each of us

previously introduced. The National Silver Alert Act includes language from legislation I introduced last Congress to create a grant program to help States establish and operate silver alert notification systems to help find missing individuals who suffer from Alzheimer's disease and other dementia-related illnesses. The measure we are considering today also establishes a national silver alert communications network to assist regional and local missing persons search efforts and requires an annual report to determine the effectiveness of State silver alert plans to help guide their establishment in other States.

I was honored to work with these two fine Members last year and am pleased that we were able to combine these complementary bills. I want to thank them for their work as well as the willingness of the majority and minority on the Judiciary Committee to allow this to come to the floor on suspension so early in this session. The House passed this bill, as you know, unanimously last September. But the Senate was unable to act on it before Congress adjourned. I hope that our timely action here today will help facilitate its passage through the Senate and enactment into law.

I believe that all States should establish systems similar to the highly successful Amber Alert program to help find those suffering from dementia-related illnesses and prevent tragedies like the one that occurred in my community. An Amber Alert system has a remarkable track record of success because necessary information is filtered so that the relevant details are transmitted to appropriate authorities as quickly as possible. The experiences of States that already have developed such silver alert systems suggest that these programs save lives. States have found that timely notification and dissemination of appropriate information about missing seniors greatly improves the chances that they will be found before they harm themselves. I believe that the Federal Government can and should help States develop notification systems to prevent these all-too-frequent tragedies.

This is especially important in Florida, which has more residents aged 65 and older than any other State in the Nation. My State implemented silver alert last year with spectacular results. Florida's statewide silver alert system has led to the successful location of all 37 people, I repeat, all 37 people for whom the State has issued bulletins. More than 4.3 million Floridians are aged 60 and older, and there are about 501,000 probable Alzheimer's cases in the State.

The silver alert program in my State will help prevent tragedy among one of Florida's largest potentially vulnerable groups. Passage of this bill today will help bring other States without these lifesaving systems one step closer to improving their ability to find missing seniors and the crucial few hours after

they go missing. It also will provide critical resources, guidance and coordination, which is very important for States like mine, that already have such systems. We have many people to thank for that, including Mary Lallucci, one of my constituents whose determined advocacy for the silver alert has inspired me and serves as a loving tribute to her mother's memory.

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

Mr. POE of Texas. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Lallucci was asked whether she thought a silver alert system in Florida could have saved her mother. "Who knows?" She said. "Unfortunately, I will never know."

I urge my colleagues to support the National Silver Alert Act to prevent another family from being forced to struggle with the same uncertainty.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair reminds Members to not traffic the well while another Member is speaking.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. I will reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. POE of Texas. I yield 3 minutes to the cosponsor of this bill, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK).

Mrs. MYRICK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Today is an important day for anyone who has ever lived through the nightmare of an adult loved one who has gone missing. The National Silver Alert Act will reauthorize Kristen's Act as part of that and give these people hope. Kristen Modafferi disappeared shortly after her 18th birthday. And after visiting her family and hearing the detailed account of their nightmare, I introduced Kristen's Act in 1999, and it was successfully signed into law in 2000. It reauthorizes funding to maintain a national clearinghouse for missing adults whose disappearance is determined by law enforcement to be foul play. It expired in 2005 and then was reintroduced in the 110th and the 109th Congress. But the efforts weren't successful. Today with the help of my friends on both sides of the aisle, we honor the efforts of so many and pay tribute to mournful families by ratifying this bill.

Kristen Modafferi disappeared in 1997. She was a bright, hardworking young college student, and she attended North Carolina State. She had just finished her freshman year. And like so many young people, she decided she wanted to go to another city to spend the summer, work and have a new experience. So she moved to San Francisco and had just enrolled in classes at Berkeley and got a job at a local coffee shop. She began settling in and making friends. On Monday, June 23, when she was just a mere 3 weeks short of her 18th birthday, she left her job at the coffee shop, headed to the beach for the

afternoon, and has not been seen since. When her panicked parents called the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, they heard these unbelievable words, "I'm sorry, we can't help." They were shocked to discover that because Kristen was 18, the center could not place her picture or story into its national database or offer any assistance whatsoever. In fact, there is no national agency to help locate missing adults.

Unfortunately, the Modafferris are not alone. The families of thousands of missing adults, almost 51,000 as of last year, have found that law enforcement and other agencies respond very differently when the person who has disappeared is not a child. It's a very traumatic experience which I know personally in dealing with the Modafferris. But having to do a search on your own without any skills or resources is very unjust. Kristen's Act sends a message to these families. They deserve help in locating endangered and involuntarily missing loved ones.

Endangered adults, no matter what their age, should receive not only the benefit of a search effort by local law enforcement, but also an experienced national organization. With this bill, families will never again have to hear they cannot be assisted because a loved one is too old.

I urge my colleagues to support the act.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 632, the National Silver Alert Act, which I cosponsored in the 110th Congress.

At the outset, let me congratulate my neighboring colleague from Florida GUS BILIRAKIS for his leadership on this legislation to create a nationwide communications network to help locate missing senior citizens. GUS was the original author of this legislation last year in response to the tragic death of 86-year-old Mary Zelter, who drove away from her assisted living facility in Pinellas County, Florida, which GUS and I both represent, and drowned when her car crashed into a local waterway.

With GUS leading the way, our community responded by calling attention to the lack of an alert system for missing senior citizens. Mary Zelter's daughter Mary Lallucci became a vocal advocate for the need for such a system and Largo Police Chief Lester Aradi personally undertook a system to establish a local Silver Alert system for our area. GUS and I attended the kick-off for this network when Chief Aradi activated our county-wide system September 30th. He was also the chairman of the committee that coordinated the establishment of a Florida-wide Silver Alert system, which was activated by Governor Charlie Crist and the Florida Department of Law Enforcement last October.

The local model we developed under the leadership of GUS BILIRAKIS, Chief Aradi, State Representative Tom Anderson, Mary Lallucci, Gloria Smith, the president our local chapter of the Alzheimer's Association, and Sallie Parks, the past president and board member of our local Area Agency on Aging, can be taken nationwide to save the lives of senior citizens who wander off in their vehicles. As with the Amber Alert system for children and youth, it

makes those critical first minutes and hours when someone is found to be missing count and increases the chances of a happy ending. In the four months since the enactment of our state-wide program, there have been 41 Florida Silver Alerts including nine last month.

The legislation we consider today will take the Florida model nationwide so that all States can have the benefit of a Silver Alert system and so that we can track missing senior citizens who drive off in their cars should they cross state boundaries. It will establish a national coordinator to bring together State efforts and authorize the appropriation of \$10 million a year for State activities in support of the Silver Alert program. Finally, it will provide an annual report to Congress and the States on the program so that we can share lessons learned to improve the effectiveness of state-wide and nationwide Silver Alert networks.

Mr. Speaker, this is good legislation and I again want to commend my colleague from Florida GUS BILIRAKIS for his tireless work to keep the issue alive. Senior citizens and their families all across our nation will directly benefit from that action we take today.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 632, the National Silver Alert Act of 2009. I thank Mr. DOGGETT for his leadership on this issue. This bill allows for the creation and enhancement of alert plans for missing adults across the nation and is an important step toward ensuring the safe return of missing adults nationwide.

According to the Connecticut Chapter of the Alzheimer's Association, nearly 70,000 Connecticut residents have Alzheimer's disease or a related dementia. Six out of every ten people diagnosed with Alzheimer's will wander from their homes or care giving facilities at some stage of their disease. Of those who wander, 50 percent risk serious injury or death if not found within the first 24 hours. For this reason, it is necessary that systems for timely, local search responses are put into place.

The National Silver Alert Act of 2009 provides for the coordination of resources needed by families and law enforcement officials to undertake appropriate search efforts for a missing adult. The bill acknowledges the need to protect the privacy, dignity, independence and autonomy of any missing adult who may be the subject of a Silver Alert, making this bill a truly comprehensive approach.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of the National Silver Alert Act of 2009 and to continue to push for legislation that seeks to protect missing adults.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, if the other side decides to relinquish its remaining time, I will do the same. We have no other speakers.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time. I urge adoption of this resolution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. I will yield back the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 632.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privileges of the House and offer the resolution as noticed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 143

Whereas, the gentleman from New York, Charles B. Rangel, the fourth most senior Member of the House of Representatives, serves as chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, a position of considerable power and influence within the House of Representatives; and,

Whereas, clause one of rule 23 of the Rules of the House of Representatives provides, "A Member, Delegate, Resident Commissioner, officer, or employee of the House shall conduct himself at all times in a manner that shall reflect creditably on the House;"

Whereas, The New York Times reported on September 5, 2008, that, "Representative Charles B. Rangel has earned more than \$75,000 in rental income from a villa he has owned in the Dominican Republic since 1988, but never reported it on his federal or state tax returns, according to a lawyer for the congressman and documents from the resort"; and,

Whereas, in an article in the September 5, 2008 edition of The New York Times, his attorney confirmed that Representative Rangel's annual congressional Financial Disclosure statements failed to disclose the rental income from his resort villa; and,

Whereas, The New York Times reported on September 6, 2008 that, "Representative Charles B. Rangel paid no interest for more than a decade on a mortgage extended to him to buy a villa at a beachfront resort in the Dominican Republic, according to Mr. Rangel's lawyer and records from the resort. The loan, which was extended to Mr. Rangel in 1988, was originally to be paid back over seven years at a rate of 10.5 percent. But within two years, interest on the loan was waived for Mr. Rangel,"; and,

Whereas, clause 5(a)(2)(A) of House Rule 25 defines a gift as, "... a gratuity, favor, discount entertainment, hospitality, loan, forbearance, or other item having monetary value" and prohibits the acceptance of such gifts except in limited circumstances; and,

Whereas, Representative Rangel's acceptance of thousands of dollars in interest forgiveness is a violation of the House gift ban; and,

Whereas, Representative Rangel's failure to disclose the aforementioned gifts and income on his Personal Financial Disclosure Statements violates House rules and federal law; and,

Whereas, Representative Rangel's failure to report the aforementioned gifts and income on federal, state and local tax returns is a violation of the tax laws of those jurisdictions; and,

Whereas, the Committee on Ways and Means, which Representative Rangel chairs, has jurisdiction over the United States Tax Code; and,

Whereas, the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct first announced on July 31, 2008 that it was reviewing allegations of misconduct by Representative Rangel; and,

Whereas, The House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct announced on September 24, 2008 that it had established an investigative subcommittee in the matter of Representative Rangel; and,

Whereas, The New York Times reported on November 24, 2008 that, "Congressional records and interviews show that Mr. Rangel

was instrumental in preserving a lucrative tax loophole that benefited [Nabors Industries] an oil drilling company last year, while at the same time its chief executive was pledging \$1 million to the Charles B. Rangel School of Public Service at C.C.N.Y."; and,

Whereas, the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct announced on December 9, 2008 that it had expanded the jurisdiction of the aforementioned investigative subcommittee to examine the allegations related to Representative Rangel's involvement with Nabors Industries; and,

Whereas, Roll Call newspaper reported on September 15, 2008 that, "The inconsistent reports are among myriad errors, discrepancies and unexplained entries on Rangel's personal disclosure forms over the past eight years that make it almost impossible to get a clear picture of the Ways and Means chairman's financial dealings,"; and,

Whereas, Roll Call newspaper reported on September 16, 2008 that, "Rangel said he would hire a 'forensic accountant' to review all of his disclosure forms going back 20 years, and to provide a report to the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, which Rangel said will then make public,"; and,

Whereas, nearly five months after Representative Rangel pledged to provide a public forensic accounting of his tax and federal financial disclosure records, he has failed to do so; and,

Whereas, an editorial in The New York Times on September 15, 2008 stated, "Mounting embarrassment for taxpayers and Congress makes it imperative that Representative Charles Rangel step aside as chairman of the Ways and Means Committee while his ethical problems are investigated,"; and,

Whereas, on May 24, 2006, then Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi cited "high ethical standards" in a letter to Representative William Jefferson asking that he resign his seat on the Committee on Ways and Means in light of ongoing investigations into alleged financial impropriety by Representative Jefferson,

Whereas, by the conduct giving rise to this resolution, Representative Charles B. Rangel has dishonored himself and brought discredit to the House; and,

Therefore, be it Resolved, Upon adoption of this resolution and pending completion of the investigation into his affairs by the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, Representative Rangel is hereby removed as chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

□ 1915

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution qualifies.

MOTION TO TABLE

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay the resolution on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to lay on the table.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. 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, this 15-minute vote on the motion to lay on the table will be followed by 5-minute votes on motions to suspend the rules with regard to House Resolution 128, by the yeas and nays, and House Resolution 134, by the yeas and nays.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 242, nays 157, answered “present” 16, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 57]
YEAS—242

Abercrombie	Halvorson	Nye
Ackerman	Hare	Oberstar
Adler (NJ)	Hastings (FL)	Obey
Altmire	Heinrich	Olver
Andrews	Herseth Sandlin	Ortiz
Arcuri	Higgins	Pallone
Baca	Hill	Pascarell
Baird	Himes	Pastor (AZ)
Baldwin	Hinchev	Paul
Barrow	Hirono	Payne
Bean	Hodes	Perlmutter
Becerra	Holden	Perriello
Berman	Holt	Peters
Berry	Honda	Peterson
Bishop (GA)	Hoyer	Pingree (ME)
Bishop (NY)	Inslee	Polis (CO)
Blumenauer	Israel	Pomeroy
Bocieri	Jackson (IL)	Price (NC)
Boren	Jackson-Lee	Rahall
Boswell	(TX)	Rangel
Boucher	Johnson (GA)	Reyes
Boyd	Johnson, E. B.	Richardson
Brady (PA)	Jones	Rodriguez
Braley (IA)	Kagen	Rohrabacher
Bright	Kanjorski	Ross
Brown, Corrine	Kaptur	Rothman (NJ)
Capps	Kennedy	Roybal-Allard
Capuano	Kildee	Ruppersberger
Cardoza	Kilpatrick (MI)	Rush
Carnahan	Kilroy	Ryan (OH)
Carney	Kind	Salazar
Carson (IN)	King (NY)	Sánchez, Linda
Childers	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	T.
Clarke	Kissell	Sanchez, Loretta
Clay	Klein (FL)	Sarbanes
Cleaver	Kosmas	Schauer
Clyburn	Kratovil	Schiff
Cohen	Kucinich	Schrader
Connolly (VA)	Langevin	Schwartz
Conyers	Larsen (WA)	Scott (GA)
Cooper	Larson (CT)	Serrano
Costa	Lee (CA)	Sestak
Costello	Levin	Shea-Porter
Courtney	Lewis (GA)	Sherman
Crowley	Lipinski	Shuler
Cuellar	Loeb sack	Sires
Cummings	Lowe y	Skelton
Dahlkemper	Lujan	Slaughter
Davis (AL)	Lynch	Smith (WA)
Davis (CA)	Maffei	Snyder
Davis (IL)	Maloney	Space
Davis (TN)	Markey (CO)	Speier
DeFazio	Markey (MA)	Spratt
DeGette	Marshall	Stupak
Delahunt	Massa	Tanner
DeLauro	Matheson	Tauscher
Dicks	Matsui	Taylor
Dingell	McCarthy (NY)	Teague
Doggett	McCollum	Thompson (CA)
Donnelly (IN)	McDermott	Thompson (MS)
Doyle	McGovern	Tierney
Driehaus	McIntyre	Titus
Edwards (MD)	McMahon	Tonko
Edwards (TX)	McNerney	Towns
Ellison	Meek (FL)	Tsongas
Ellsworth	Meeks (NY)	Van Hollen
Engel	Melancon	Velázquez
Eshoo	Michaud	Visclosky
Etheridge	Miller (NC)	Walz
Farr	Miller, George	Wasserman
Fattah	Minnick	Schultz
Filner	Mitchell	Waters
Foster	Mollohan	Watson
Fudge	Moore (KS)	Watt
Giffords	Moore (WI)	Waxman
Gonzalez	Moran (VA)	Weiner
Gordon (TN)	Murphy (CT)	Wilson (OH)
Grayson	Murphy, Patrick	Woolsey
Green, Al	Murtha	Wu
Griffith	Nadler (NY)	Yarmuth
Gutierrez	Napolitano	Young (AK)
Hall (NY)	Neal (MA)	

NAYS—157

Aderholt	Bilbray	Boustany
Akin	Bilirakis	Brady (TX)
Alexander	Bishop (UT)	Broun (GA)
Austria	Blackburn	Brown (SC)
Bachus	Boehner	Brown-Waite,
Barton (TX)	Bono Mack	Ginny
Biggett	Boozman	Buchanan

Burgess	Inglis	Pitts
Buyer	Issa	Platts
Calvert	Jenkins	Posey
Camp	Johnson, Sam	Price (GA)
Cantor	Jordan (OH)	Radanovich
Cao	King (IA)	Rehberg
Capito	Kingston	Reichert
Carter	Kirk	Roe (TN)
Cassidy	Lamborn	Rogers (AL)
Castle	Lance	Rogers (KY)
Chaffetz	Latham	Rogers (MI)
Coble	LaTourette	Rooney
Coffman (CO)	Latta	Ros-Lehtinen
Cole	Lee (NY)	Roskam
Crenshaw	Lewis (CA)	Royce
Culberson	Linder	Ryan (WI)
Davis (KY)	LoBiondo	Scalise
Deal (GA)	Lucas	Schmidt
Diaz-Balart, L.	Luetkemeyer	Schock
Diaz-Balart, M.	Lummis	Sensenbrenner
Dreier	Lungren, Daniel	Sessions
Duncan	E.	Shadegg
Ehlers	Mack	Shimkus
Emerson	Manzullo	Shuster
Fallin	Marchant	Simpson
Flake	McCarthy (CA)	Smith (NE)
Fleming	McCaul	Smith (NJ)
Forbes	McClintock	Smith (TX)
Fortenberry	McCotter	Souder
Fox	McHenry	Stearns
Franks (AZ)	McHugh	Sullivan
Frelinghuysen	McKeon	Terry
Gallegly	McMorris	Thompson (PA)
Garrett (NJ)	Rodgers	Thornberry
Gerlach	Mica	Tiahrt
Gingrey (GA)	Miller (FL)	Turner
Gohmert	Miller (MI)	Upton
Goodlatte	Miller, Gary	Walden
Graves	Moran (KS)	Wamp
Guthrie	Murphy, Tim	Westmoreland
Hall (TX)	Myrick	Whitfield
Harper	Neugebauer	Wilson (SC)
Heller	Nunes	Wittman
Hensarling	Olson	Wolf
Hergert	Paulsen	Young (FL)
Hoekstra	Pence	
Hunter	Petri	

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—16

Barrett (SC)	Chandler	Lofgren, Zoe
Bartlett	Conaway	Poe (TX)
Bonner	Dent	Scott (VA)
Burton (IN)	Green, Gene	Welch
Butterfield	Hastings (WA)	
Castor (FL)	Kline (MN)	

NOT VOTING—17

Bachmann	Grijalva	Solis (CA)
Berkley	Harman	Stark
Blunt	Hinojosa	Sutton
Campbell	Johnson (IL)	Tiberi
Frank (MA)	Putnam	Wexler
Granger	Schakowsky	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Two minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1938

Mr. PAUL changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas changed his vote from “yea” to “present.”

Messrs. CONAWAY, BURTON of Indiana and POE of Texas changed their vote from “nay” to “present.”

So the motion to table was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HONORING MIAMI UNIVERSITY FOR ITS 200 YEARS OF COMMITMENT TO EXTRAORDINARY HIGHER EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCINTYRE). The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H.

Res. 128, as amended, 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 gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 128, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 413, nays 0, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 58]
YEAS—413

Abercrombie	Cohen	Hastings (FL)
Ackerman	Cole	Hastings (WA)
Adler (NJ)	Conaway	Heinrich
Akin	Adler (NJ)	Heller
Alexander	Conyers	Hensarling
Altmire	Cooper	Herger
Andrews	Costa	Herseth Sandlin
Arcuri	Costello	Higgins
Austria	Courtney	Hill
Baca	Crenshaw	Himes
Bachmann	Crowley	Hinchev
Bachus	Cuellar	Hirono
Baldwin	Culberson	Hodes
Barrett (SC)	Cummings	Hoekstra
Barrow	Dahlkemper	Holden
Bartlett	Davis (AL)	Holt
Barton (TX)	Davis (CA)	Honda
Bean	Davis (IL)	Hoyer
Becerra	Davis (KY)	Hunter
Berman	Davis (TN)	Inglis
Berry	Deal (GA)	Inslee
Biggett	DeFazio	Israel
Bilbray	DeGette	Issa
Bilirakis	Delahunt	Jackson (IL)
Bishop (GA)	DeLauro	Jackson-Lee
Bishop (NY)	Dent	(TX)
Bishop (UT)	Diaz-Balart, L.	Jenkins
Blackburn	Diaz-Balart, M.	Johnson (GA)
Blumenauer	Dicks	Johnson, E. B.
Bocieri	Dingell	Johnson, Sam
Boehner	Doggett	Jones
Bonner	Donnelly (IN)	Jordan (OH)
Bono Mack	Doyle	Kagen
Boozman	Dreier	Kanjorski
Boren	Driehaus	Kaptur
Boswell	Duncan	Kennedy
Boucher	Edwards (MD)	Kildee
Boustany	Edwards (TX)	Kilpatrick (MI)
Boyd	Ehlers	Kilroy
Brady (PA)	Ellison	Kind
Brady (TX)	Ellsworth	King (IA)
Braley (IA)	Emerson	King (NY)
Bright	Engel	Kingston
Broun (GA)	Eshoo	Kirk
Brown (SC)	Etheridge	Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Brown, Corrine	Fallin	Kissell
Brown-Waite,	Farr	Klein (FL)
Ginny	Fattah	Kline (MN)
Buchanan	Filner	Kosmas
Burgess	Flake	Kratovil
Burton (IN)	Flake	Kucich
Butterfield	Fleming	Lamborn
Buyer	Forbes	Lance
Calvert	Fortenberry	Langevin
Camp	Foster	Langevin
Cantor	Fox	Larsen (WA)
Cao	Franks (AZ)	Larson (CT)
Capito	Frelinghuysen	Latham
Capps	Fudge	LaTourette
Capuano	Gallegly	Latta
Cardoza	Gerlach	Lee (CA)
Carnahan	Giffords	Lee (NY)
Carney	Gingrey (GA)	Levin
Carson (IN)	Gohmert	Lewis (CA)
Carter	Gonzalez	Lewis (GA)
Cassidy	Goodlatte	Linder
Castle	Gordon (TN)	Lipinski
Castor (FL)	Graves	LoBiondo
Chaffetz	Grayson	Loeb sack
Chandler	Green, Al	Lofgren, Zoe
Childers	Green, Gene	Lowe y
Clarke	Griffith	Lucas
Clay	Guthrie	Luetkemeyer
Cleaver	Gutierrez	Lujan
Clyburn	Hall (NY)	Lummis
Coble	Hall (TX)	Lungren, Daniel
Coffman (CO)	Halvorson	E.
	Hare	Lynch
	Harper	Mack

Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olson
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul

Paulsen
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHN-SON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 134.
This is a 5-minute vote.
The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 406, nays 0, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 59]
YEAS—406

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Becerra
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bocciari
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cassidy
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chandler
Childers
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper

McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy

Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)

Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiaahrt
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wamp
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—19

Baird
Berkley
Blunt
Campbell
Frank (MA)
Garrett (NJ)
Granger

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members have 2 minutes to vote.

□ 1947

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECOGNIZING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.'S VISIT TO INDIA
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 134, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Boyd
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Fleming
Fortenberry
Foster
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Fudge
Galleghy
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Graves
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgin
Himes
Hinche
Hirono
Hodes
Hoekstra

NOT VOTING—26

Baird
Bean
Berkley
Blunt
Campbell
Carter
Davis (KY)
Forbes
Frank (MA)

Frelinghuysen
Garrett (NJ)
Granger
Grijalva
Harman
Hill
Hinojosa
Johnson (IL)
McGovern

Olson
Pence
Putnam
Ryan (OH)
Solis (CA)
Stark
Tiberi
Wexler

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Two minutes are left in this vote.

□ 1954

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.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 123
Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of House Resolution 123.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

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.

PUBLICATION OF THE RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES, 111TH CONGRESS

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, pursuant to clause 2 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Financial Services in open session on January 27, 2009, adopted the following rules by voice vote, a quorum being present:

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES

U.S. House of Representatives

111th Congress

First Session

RULE 1

GENERAL PROVISIONS

(a) The rules of the House are the rules of the Committee on Financial Services (hereinafter in these rules referred to as the "Committee") and its subcommittees so far as applicable, except that a motion to recess from day to day, and a motion to dispense with the first reading (in full) of a bill or resolution, if printed copies are available, are privileged motions in the Committee and shall be considered without debate. A proposed investigative or oversight report shall be considered as read if it has been available to the members of the Committee for at least 24 hours (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, or legal holidays except when the House is in session on such day).

(b) Each subcommittee is a part of the Committee, and is subject to the authority and direction of the Committee and to its rules so far as applicable.

(c) The provisions of clause 2 of rule XI of the Rules of the House are incorporated by reference as the rules of the Committee to the extent applicable.

RULE 2

MEETINGS

Calling of Meetings

(a)(1) The Committee shall regularly meet on the first Tuesday of each month when the House is in session.

(2) A regular meeting of the Committee may be dispensed with if, in the judgment of the Chairman of the Committee (hereinafter in these rules referred to as the "Chair"), there is no need for the meeting.

(3) Additional regular meetings and hearings of the Committee may be called by the Chair, in accordance with clause 2(g)(3) of rule XI of the rules of the House.

(4) Special meetings shall be called and convened by the Chair as provided in clause 2(c)(2) of rule XI of the Rules of the House.

Notice for Meetings

(b)(1) The Chair shall notify each member of the Committee of the agenda of each regular meeting of the Committee at least two calendar days before the time of the meeting.

(2) The Chair shall provide to each member of the Committee, at least two calendar days

before the time of each regular meeting for each measure or matter on the agenda a copy of—

(A) the measure or materials relating to the matter in question; and

(B) an explanation of the measure or matter to be considered, which, in the case of an explanation of a bill, resolution, or similar measure, shall include a summary of the major provisions of the legislation, an explanation of the relationship of the measure to present law, and a summary of the need for the legislation.

(3) The agenda and materials required under this subsection shall be provided to each member of the Committee at least three calendar days before the time of the meeting where the measure or matter to be considered was not approved for full Committee consideration by a subcommittee of jurisdiction.

(4) The provisions of this subsection may be waived by a two-thirds vote of the Committee, or by the Chair with the concurrence of the ranking minority member.

RULE 3

MEETING AND HEARING PROCEDURES

In General

(a)(1) Meetings and hearings of the Committee shall be called to order and presided over by the Chair or, in the Chair's absence, by the member designated by the Chair as the Vice Chair of the Committee, or by the ranking majority member of the Committee present as Acting Chair.

(2) Meetings and hearings of the committee shall be open to the public unless closed in accordance with clause 2(g) of rule XI of the Rules of the House.

(3) Any meeting or hearing of the Committee that is open to the public shall be open to coverage by television broadcast, radio broadcast, and still photography in accordance with the provisions of clause 4 of rule XI of the Rules of the House (which are incorporated by reference as part of these rules). Operation and use of any Committee operated broadcast system shall be fair and nonpartisan and in accordance with clause 4(b) of rule XI and all other applicable rules of the Committee and the House.

(4) Opening statements by members at the beginning of any hearing or meeting of the Committee shall be limited to 5 minutes each for the Chair or ranking minority member, or their respective designee, and 3 minutes each for all other members.

(5) No person, other than a Member of Congress, Committee staff, or an employee of a Member when that Member has an amendment under consideration, may stand in or be seated at the rostrum area of the Committee rooms unless the Chair determines otherwise.

Quorum

(b)(1) For the purpose of taking testimony and receiving evidence, two members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum.

(2) A majority of the members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum for the purposes of reporting any measure or matter, of authorizing a subpoena, of closing a meeting or hearing pursuant to clause 2(g) of rule XI of the rules of the House (except as provided in clause 2(g)(2)(A) and (B)) or of releasing executive session material pursuant to clause 2(k)(7) of rule XI of the rules of the House.

(3) For the purpose of taking any action other than those specified in paragraph (2) one-third of the members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum.

Voting

(c)(1) No vote may be conducted on any measure or matter pending before the Committee unless the requisite number of mem-

bers of the Committee is actually present for such purpose.

(2) A record vote of the Committee shall be provided on any question before the Committee upon the request of one-fifth of the members present.

(3) No vote by any member of the Committee on any measure or matter may be cast by proxy.

(4) In addition to any other requirement of these rules or the Rules of the House, the Chair shall make the record of the votes on any question on which a record vote is demanded available on the Committee's Web site not later than 2 business days after such vote is taken. Such record shall include a description of the amendment, motion, order, or other proposition, the name of each member voting for and each member voting against such amendment, motion, order, or proposition, and the names of those members of the committee present but not voting.

(5) In accordance with clause 2(e)(1)(B) of rule XI, a record of the vote of each member of the Committee on each record vote on any measure or matter before the Committee shall be available for public inspection at the offices of the Committee, and, with respect to any record vote on any motion to report or on any amendment, shall be included in the report of the Committee showing the total number of votes cast for and against and the names of those members voting for and against.

(6) POSTPONED RECORD VOTES.—(A) Subject to subparagraph (B), the Chairman may postpone further proceedings when a record vote is ordered on the question of approving any measure or matter or adopting an amendment. The Chairman may resume proceedings on a postponed request at any time, but no later than the next meeting day.

(B) In exercising postponement authority under subparagraph (A), the Chairman shall take all reasonable steps necessary to notify members on the resumption of proceedings on any postponed record vote.

(C) When proceedings resume on a postponed question, notwithstanding any intervening order for the previous question, an underlying proposition shall remain subject to further debate or amendment to the same extent as when the question was postponed.

Hearing Procedures

(d)(1)(A) The Chair shall make public announcement of the date, place, and subject matter of any committee hearing at least one week before the commencement of the hearing, unless the Chair, with the concurrence of the ranking minority member, or the Committee by majority vote with a quorum present for the transaction of business, determines there is good cause to begin the hearing sooner, in which case the Chair shall make the announcement at the earliest possible date.

(B) Not less than three days before the commencement of a hearing announced under this paragraph, the Chair shall provide to the members of the Committee a concise summary of the subject of the hearing, or, in the case of a hearing on a measure or matter, a copy of the measure or materials relating to the matter in question and a concise explanation of the measure or matter to be considered. At the same time the Chair provides the information required by the preceding sentence, the Chair shall also provide to the members of the Committee a final list consisting of the names of each witness who is to appear before the Committee at that hearing. The witness list may not be modified within 24 hours of a hearing, unless the Chair, with the concurrence of the ranking minority member, determines there is good cause for such modification.

(2) To the greatest extent practicable—

(A) each witness who is to appear before the Committee shall file with the Committee two business days in advance of the appearance sufficient copies (including a copy in electronic form), as determined by the Chair, of a written statement of proposed testimony and shall limit the oral presentation to the Committee to brief summary thereof; and

(B) each witness appearing in a non-governmental capacity shall include with the written statement of proposed testimony a curriculum vitae and a disclosure of the amount and source (by agency and program) of any Federal grant (or subgrant thereof) or contract (or subcontract thereof) received during the current fiscal year or either of the two preceding fiscal years.

(3) The requirements of paragraph (2)(A) may be modified or waived by the Chair when the Chair determines it to be in the best interest of the Committee.

(4) The five-minute rule shall be observed in the interrogation of witnesses before the Committee until each member of the Committee has had an opportunity to question the witnesses. No member shall be recognized for a second period of 5 minutes to interrogate witnesses until each member of the Committee present has been recognized once for that purpose.

(5) Whenever any hearing is conducted by the Committee on any measure or matter, the minority party members of the Committee shall be entitled, upon the request of a majority of them before the completion of the hearing, to call witnesses with respect to that measure or matter during at least one day of hearing thereon.

Subpoenas and Oaths

(e)(1) Pursuant to clause 2(m) of rule XI of the Rules of the House, a subpoena may be authorized and issued by the Committee or a subcommittee in the conduct of any investigation or series of investigations or activities, only when authorized by a majority of the members voting, a majority being present, or pursuant to paragraph (2).

(2) The Chair, with the concurrence of the ranking minority member, may authorize and issue subpoenas under such clause during any period for which the House has adjourned for a period in excess of 3 days when, in the opinion of the Chair, authorization and issuance of the subpoena is necessary to obtain the material or testimony set forth in the subpoena. The Chair shall report to the members of the Committee on the authorization and issuance of a subpoena during the recess period as soon as practicable, but in no event later than one week after service of such subpoena.

(3) Authorized subpoenas shall be signed by the Chair or by any member designated by the Committee, and may be served by any person designated by the Chair or such member.

(4) The Chair, or any member of the Committee designated by the Chair, may administer oaths to witnesses before the Committee.

Special Procedures

(f)(1)(A) **COMMEMORATIVE MEDALS AND COINS.**—It shall not be in order for the Subcommittee on Domestic Monetary Policy and Technology to hold a hearing on any commemorative medal or commemorative coin legislation unless the legislation is cosponsored by at least two-thirds of the members of the House.

(B) It shall not be in order for the subcommittee to approve a bill or measure authorizing commemorative coins for consideration by the full Committee which does not conform with the mintage restrictions established by section 5112 of title 31, United States Code.

(C) In considering legislation authorizing Congressional gold medals, the subcommittee shall apply the following standards—

(i) the recipient shall be a natural person;

(ii) the recipient shall have performed an achievement that has an impact on American history and culture that is likely to be recognized as a major achievement in the recipient's field long after the achievement;

(iii) the recipient shall not have received a medal previously for the same or substantially the same achievement;

(iv) the recipient shall be living or, if deceased, shall have been deceased for not less than 5 years and not more than 25 years;

(v) the achievements were performed in the recipient's field of endeavor, and represent either a lifetime of continuous superior achievements or a single achievement so significant that the recipient is recognized and acclaimed by others in the same field, as evidenced by the recipient having received the highest honors in the field.

(2) **TESTIMONY OF CERTAIN OFFICIALS.**—

(A) Notwithstanding subsection (a)(4), when the Chair announces a hearing of the Committee for the purpose of receiving—

(i) testimony from the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board pursuant to section 2B of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 221 et seq.), or

(ii) testimony from the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board or a member of the President's cabinet at the invitation of the Chair, the Chair may, in consultation with the ranking minority member, limit the number and duration of opening statements to be delivered at such hearing. The limitation shall be included in the announcement made pursuant to subsection (d)(1)(A), and shall provide that the opening statements of all members of the Committee shall be made a part of the hearing record.

(B) Notwithstanding subsection (a)(4), at any hearing of the Committee for the purpose of receiving testimony (other than testimony described in clause (i) or (ii) of subparagraph (A)), the Chair may, after consultation with the ranking minority member, limit the duration of opening statements to ten minutes, to be divided between the Chair and Chair of the pertinent subcommittee, or the Chair's designees, and ten minutes, to be controlled by the ranking minority member, or the ranking minority member's designees. Following such time, the duration for opening statements may be extended by agreement between the Chairman and ranking minority member, to be divided at the discretion of the Chair or ranking minority member. The Chair shall provide that the opening statements for all members of the Committee shall be made a part of the hearing record.

(C) At any hearing of a subcommittee, the Chair of the subcommittee may, in consultation with the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, limit the duration of opening statements to ten minutes, to be divided between the majority and minority. Following such time, the duration for opening statements may be extended by either the Chair of the subcommittee or ranking minority member of the subcommittee for an additional ten minutes each, to be divided at the discretion of the Chair of the subcommittee or ranking minority member of the subcommittee. The Chair of the subcommittee shall ensure that opening statements for all members be made part of the hearing record.

(D) If the Chair and ranking minority member acting jointly determine that extraordinary circumstances exist necessitating allowing members to make opening statements, subparagraphs (B) or (C), as the case may be, shall not apply to such hearing.

RULE 4

PROCEDURES FOR REPORTING MEASURES OR MATTERS

(a) No measure or matter shall be reported from the Committee unless a majority of the Committee is actually present.

(b) The Chair of the Committee shall report or cause to be reported promptly to the House any measure approved by the Committee and take necessary steps to bring a matter to a vote.

(c) The report of the Committee on a measure which has been approved by the Committee shall be filed within seven calendar days (exclusive of days on which the House is not in session) after the day on which there has been filed with the clerk of the Committee a written request, signed by a majority of the members of the Committee, for the reporting of that measure pursuant to the provisions of clause 2(b)(2) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House.

(d) All reports printed by the Committee pursuant to a legislative study or investigation and not approved by a majority vote of the Committee shall contain the following disclaimer on the cover of such report: "This report has not been officially adopted by the Committee on Financial Services and may not necessarily reflect the views of its Members."

(e) The Chair is directed to offer a motion under clause 1 of rule XXII of the Rules of the House whenever the Chair considers it appropriate.

RULE 5

SUBCOMMITTEES

Establishment and Responsibilities of Subcommittees

(a)(1) There shall be 6 subcommittees of the Committee as follows:

(A) **SUBCOMMITTEE ON CAPITAL MARKETS, INSURANCE, AND GOVERNMENT SPONSORED ENTERPRISES.**—The jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Capital Markets, Insurance, and Government Sponsored Enterprises includes—

(i) securities, exchanges, and finance;

(ii) capital markets activities, including business capital formation and venture capital;

(iii) activities involving futures, forwards, options, and other types of derivative instruments;

(iv) the Securities and Exchange Commission;

(v) secondary market organizations for home mortgages, including the Federal National Mortgage Association, the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation, and the Federal Agricultural Mortgage Corporation;

(vi) the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight;

(vii) the Federal Home Loan Banks;

(viii) the Federal Housing Finance Board;

(ix) terrorism risk insurance; and

(x) insurance generally.

(B) **SUBCOMMITTEE ON DOMESTIC MONETARY POLICY AND TECHNOLOGY.**—The jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Domestic Monetary Policy and Technology includes—

(i) financial aid to all sectors and elements within the economy;

(ii) economic growth and stabilization;

(iii) defense production matters as contained in the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended;

(iv) domestic monetary policy, and agencies which directly or indirectly affect domestic monetary policy, including the effect of such policy and other financial actions on interest rates, the allocation of credit, and the structure and functioning of domestic financial institutions;

(v) coins, coinage, currency, and medals, including commemorative coins and medals,

proof and mint sets and other special coins, the Coinage Act of 1965, gold and silver, including the coinage thereof (but not the par value of gold), gold medals, counterfeiting, currency denominations and design, the distribution of coins, and the operations of the Bureau of the Mint and the Bureau of Engraving and Printing; and

(vi) development of new or alternative forms of currency.

(C) SUBCOMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS AND CONSUMER CREDIT.—The jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit includes—

(i) all agencies, including the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal Reserve System, the Office of Thrift Supervision, and the National Credit Union Administration, which directly or indirectly exercise supervisory or regulatory authority in connection with, or provide deposit insurance for, financial institutions, and the establishment of interest rate ceilings on deposits;

(ii) the chartering, branching, merger, acquisition, consolidation, or conversion of financial institutions;

(iii) consumer credit, including the provision of consumer credit by insurance companies, and further including those matters in the Consumer Credit Protection Act dealing with truth in lending, extortionate credit transactions, restrictions on garnishments, fair credit reporting and the use of credit information by credit bureaus and credit providers, equal credit opportunity, debt collection practices, and electronic funds transfers;

(iv) creditor remedies and debtor defenses, Federal aspects of the Uniform Consumer Credit Code, credit and debit cards, and the preemption of State usury laws;

(v) consumer access to financial services, including the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act and the Community Reinvestment Act;

(vi) the terms and rules of disclosure of financial services, including the advertisement, promotion and pricing of financial services, and availability of government check cashing services;

(vii) deposit insurance; and

(viii) consumer access to savings accounts and checking accounts in financial institutions, including lifeline banking and other consumer accounts.

(D) SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING AND COMMUNITY OPPORTUNITY.—The jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity includes—

(i) housing (except programs administered by the Department of Veterans Affairs), including mortgage and loan insurance pursuant to the National Housing Act; rural housing; housing and homeless assistance programs; all activities of the Government National Mortgage Association; private mortgage insurance; housing construction and design and safety standards; housing-related energy conservation; housing research and demonstration programs; financial and technical assistance for nonprofit housing sponsors; housing counseling and technical assistance; regulation of the housing industry (including landlord/tenant relations); and real estate lending including regulation of settlement procedures;

(ii) community development and community and neighborhood planning, training and research; national urban growth policies; urban/rural research and technologies; and regulation of interstate land sales;

(iii) government sponsored insurance programs, including those offering protection against crime, fire, flood (and related land use controls), earthquake and other natural

hazards, but not including terrorism risk insurance; and

(iv) the qualifications for and designation of Empowerment Zones and Enterprise Communities (other than matters relating to tax benefits).

(E) SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL MONETARY POLICY AND TRADE.—The jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on International Monetary Policy and Trade includes—

(i) multilateral development lending institutions, including activities of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Policies as related thereto, and monetary and financial developments as they relate to the activities and objectives of such institutions;

(ii) international trade, including but not limited to the activities of the Export-Import Bank;

(iii) the International Monetary Fund, its permanent and temporary agencies, and all matters related thereto; and

(iv) international investment policies, both as they relate to United States investments for trade purposes by citizens of the United States and investments made by all foreign entities in the United States.

(F) SUBCOMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND INVESTIGATIONS.—The jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations includes—

(i) the oversight of all agencies, departments, programs, and matters within the jurisdiction of the Committee, including the development of recommendations with regard to the necessity or desirability of enacting, changing, or repealing any legislation within the jurisdiction of the Committee, and for conducting investigations within such jurisdiction; and

(ii) research and analysis regarding matters within the jurisdiction of the Committee, including the impact or probable impact of tax policies affecting matters within the jurisdiction of the Committee.

(2) In addition, each such subcommittee shall have specific responsibility for such other measures or matters as the Chair refers to it.

(3) Each subcommittee of the Committee shall review and study, on a continuing basis, the application, administration, execution, and effectiveness of those laws, or parts of laws, the subject matter of which is within its general responsibility.

Referral of Measures and Matters to Subcommittees

(b)(1) The Chair shall regularly refer to one or more subcommittees such measures and matters as the Chair deems appropriate given its jurisdiction and responsibilities. In making such a referral, the Chair may designate a subcommittee of primary jurisdiction and subcommittees of additional or sequential jurisdiction.

(2) All other measures or matters shall be subject to consideration by the full Committee.

(3) In referring any measure or matter to a subcommittee, the Chair may specify a date by which the subcommittee shall report thereon to the Committee.

(4) The Committee by motion may discharge a subcommittee from consideration of any measure or matter referred to a subcommittee of the Committee.

Composition of Subcommittees

(c)(1) Members shall be elected to each subcommittee and to the positions of chair and ranking minority member thereof, in accordance with the rules of the respective party caucuses. The Chair of the Committee shall designate a member of the majority party on each subcommittee as its vice chair.

(2) The Chair and ranking minority member of the Committee shall be ex officio

members with voting privileges of each subcommittee of which they are not assigned as members and may be counted for purposes of establishing a quorum in such subcommittees.

(3) The subcommittees shall be comprised as follows:

(A) The Subcommittee on Capital Markets, Insurance, and Government Sponsored Enterprises shall be comprised of 50 members, 30 elected by the majority caucus and 20 elected by the minority caucus.

(B) The Subcommittee on Domestic Monetary Policy and Technology shall be comprised of 17 members, 10 elected by the majority caucus and 7 elected by the minority caucus.

(C) The Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit shall be comprised of 45 members, 27 elected by the majority caucus and 18 elected by the minority caucus.

(D) The Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity shall be comprised of 25 members, 15 elected by the majority caucus and 10 elected by the minority caucus.

(E) The Subcommittee on International Monetary Policy and Trade shall be comprised of 15 members, 9 elected by the majority caucus and 6 elected by the minority caucus.

(F) The Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations shall be comprised of 15 members, 9 elected by the majority caucus and 6 elected by the minority caucus.

Subcommittee Meetings and Hearings

(d)(1) Each subcommittee of the Committee is authorized to meet, hold hearings, receive testimony, mark up legislation, and report to the full Committee on any measure or matter referred to it, consistent with subsection (a).

(2) No subcommittee of the Committee may meet or hold a hearing at the same time as a meeting or hearing of the Committee.

(3) The chair of each subcommittee shall set hearing and meeting dates only with the approval of the Chair with a view toward assuring the availability of meeting rooms and avoiding simultaneous scheduling of Committee and subcommittee meetings or hearings.

Effect of a Vacancy

(e) Any vacancy in the membership of a subcommittee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the subcommittee as long as the required quorum is present.

Records

(f) Each subcommittee of the Committee shall provide the full Committee with copies of such records of votes taken in the subcommittee and such other records with respect to the subcommittee as the Chair deems necessary for the Committee to comply with all rules and regulations of the House.

RULE 6

STAFF

In General

(a)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), the professional and other staff of the Committee shall be appointed, and may be removed by the Chair, and shall work under the general supervision and direction of the Chair.

(2) All professional and other staff provided to the minority party members of the Committee shall be appointed, and may be removed, by the ranking minority member of the Committee, and shall work under the general supervision and direction of such member.

(3) It is intended that the skills and experience of all members of the Committee staff

be available to all members of the Committee.

Subcommittee Staff

(b) From funds made available for the appointment of staff, the Chair of the Committee shall, pursuant to clause 6(d) of rule X of the Rules of the House, ensure that sufficient staff is made available so that each subcommittee can carry out its responsibilities under the rules of the Committee and that the minority party is treated fairly in the appointment of such staff.

Compensation of Staff

(c)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), the Chair shall fix the compensation of all professional and other staff of the Committee.

(2) The ranking minority member shall fix the compensation of all professional and other staff provided to the minority party members of the Committee.

RULE 7

BUDGET AND TRAVEL

Budget

(a)(1) The Chair, in consultation with other members of the Committee, shall prepare for each Congress a budget providing amounts for staff, necessary travel, investigation, and other expenses of the Committee and its subcommittees.

(2) From the amount provided to the Committee in the primary expense resolution adopted by the House of Representatives, the Chair, after consultation with the ranking minority member, shall designate an amount to be under the direction of the ranking minority member for the compensation of the minority staff, travel expenses of minority members and staff, and minority office expenses. All expenses of minority members and staff shall be paid for out of the amount so set aside.

Travel

(b)(1) The Chair may authorize travel for any member and any staff member of the Committee in connection with activities or subject matters under the general jurisdiction of the Committee. Before such authorization is granted, there shall be submitted to the Chair in writing the following:

(A) The purpose of the travel.

(B) The dates during which the travel is to occur.

(C) The names of the States or countries to be visited and the length of time to be spent in each.

(D) The names of members and staff of the Committee for whom the authorization is sought.

(2) Members and staff of the Committee shall make a written report to the Chair on any travel they have conducted under this subsection, including a description of their itinerary, expenses, and activities, and of pertinent information gained as a result of such travel.

(3) Members and staff of the Committee performing authorized travel on official business shall be governed by applicable laws, resolutions, and regulations of the House and of the Committee on House Administration.

RULE 8

COMMITTEE ADMINISTRATION

Records

(a)(1) There shall be a transcript made of each regular meeting and hearing of the Committee, and the transcript may be printed if the Chair decides it is appropriate or if a majority of the members of the Committee requests such printing. Any such transcripts shall be a substantially verbatim account of remarks actually made during the proceedings, subject only to technical, grammatical, and typographical corrections au-

thorized by the person making the remarks. Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to require that all such transcripts be subject to correction and publication.

(2) The Committee shall keep a record of all actions of the Committee and of its subcommittees. The record shall contain all information required by clause 2(e)(1) of rule XI of the Rules of the House and shall be available for public inspection at reasonable times in the offices of the Committee.

(3) All Committee hearings, records, data, charts, and files shall be kept separate and distinct from the congressional office records of the Chair, shall be the property of the House, and all Members of the House shall have access thereto as provided in clause 2(e)(2) of rule XI of the Rules of the House.

(4) The records of the Committee at the National Archives and Records Administration shall be made available for public use in accordance with rule VII of the Rules of the House of Representatives. The Chair shall notify the ranking minority member of any decision, pursuant to clause 3(b)(3) or clause 4(b) of the rule, to withhold a record otherwise available, and the matter shall be presented to the Committee for a determination on written request of any member of the Committee.

Committee Publications on the Internet

(b) To the maximum extent feasible, the Committee shall make its publications available in electronic form.

THE SPENDULOUS BILL

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. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I want to talk about the spendulous bill that is coming before the House once again.

If you add up all of the money it's going to cost us in this spendulous bill, it's going to total \$9.7 trillion. Now, I had to put it on two poster boards here, Mr. Speaker, so we could see how long a number that is. That includes, of course, the big bailout bills that were passed, and, of course, the debt on the spendulous bill and future debt that we're going to require because of agreements to provide aid in this new bill.

Now, just to give you—I mean, nobody understands what \$9.7 trillion means. So let me try to explain it in terms maybe we can understand.

□ 2000

If you take all the home mortgages in the United States, every one of them, this will pay off 90 percent of them by this bill that we're getting ready to pass. It's also enough to give every person on the face of the earth \$1,500, every one of them, no matter where they are. That's how much \$9.7 trillion is. That means everybody could get some money from the United States on this bill.

Putting it another way, if you add up the cost of the wars in Afghanistan and the war in Iraq, this is 13 times that amount. And it's been figured that if you add up in current 2009 dollars the cost of all the wars that the United

States has fought in, the Revolutionary War, the War Between the States, World War I, World War II, Korea, Vietnam, the Iraqi wars and the Afghanistan wars, it still is less than \$9.7 trillion. If you add up the wars and if you then figure out how much it cost us in 2009 dollars for the Louisiana Purchase, the Gadsden Purchase, and the whole State of Alaska, that's still less than \$9.7 trillion.

So we're talking about real money here, Mr. Speaker, on this so-called "spendulous" bill that the House will get to vote on again at the end of this week.

This House stimulus bill, as it is properly called, is bigger than 168 of 180 national economies that are measured by the World Bank. Let me say that again. If you take 180 countries and their national economy, this bill is bigger than 168 of them.

So we're talking about money that, first of all, probably will not even work to stimulate the economy. We've been told that spending equals stimulus. That is just not true. Government spending on government programs doesn't mean that the economy is going to be better. All it means is the government, our government, is going to get bigger.

Many economists argue that there's no historical precedent for a stimulus spending driven economy, and they base that on history. You see, we've done this stimulus package before. Since 1948, there have been eight stimulus packages that have come to the House of Representatives, that have passed, and history has shown none of those really stimulated the economy at all. They had no effect on the economy, but we don't pay any attention to history. We just think we can make it happen by spending a lot of government money.

And of course, we're not convinced, those of us who don't want to spend this kind of money, that it will stimulate the economy, and besides all that, we don't have the money, Mr. Speaker. We're just flat broke. We've got to borrow the money. We've got to borrow it from somebody else in the world like China and pay interest to China, of all countries, so that we can take this money from Americans yet to be born and give it to different interest groups in the United States, all under the pretext of we're going to stimulate the economy. It doesn't make much sense to me to be spending this kind of money, which is real money, on this so-called fake stimulus package.

Maybe we should not spend any money at all. Maybe we should think about letting Americans, who pay taxes, and do report their taxes to the IRS, let them keep more of their money, an across-the-board tax cut for everybody that pays taxes. They would have more of their own money to begin with. Government wouldn't be taking it from them and deciding what to do with it. Let them keep their own money, and they can spend it how they

see fit. And maybe they will stimulate the economy by the way they choose to spend it rather than wasteful spending by the Federal Government, the government growing bigger, the government getting more involved in everything from the banking industry to the how-to-make-a-Federal-car, and all of these other programs where we're getting the nationalization of this.

It's not the answer, Mr. Speaker, and that's just the way it is.

WE CAN'T HAVE GUNS AND BUTTER

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, last night I attended the 10th anniversary celebration of Safe House in San Francisco. Safe House is a unique service. It provides services and support to homeless women and to women who are leaving prostitution. Safe House empowers these women to turn their lives around, and, Mr. Speaker, they do.

The Reverend Glenda Hope, one of the founders of Safe House, also helped establish San Francisco Network Ministries which helps the poorest of the poor on the streets of San Francisco. She has been a beacon of hope for decades, helping many people who have been forgotten and discarded by society so that they could find their way back.

I have been proud to call Glenda Hope my close friend, my inspiration, and my hero for over 40 years. Her commitment to human dignity and to social justice is an example for all of us.

Reverend Hope has also been a tireless champion of peace. She refused to remain silent about the previous administration's disastrous policies in Iraq and demanded that Congress cut off funding for the occupation. To Glenda, Iraq isn't something you see on television because Glenda sees the tragic results of the fighting with her own eyes on the streets of San Francisco. She sees veterans suffering from post-traumatic stress syndrome, homelessness, and mental illness caused by combat. When the so-called "surge" began in 2007, Glenda warned that there will be a "surge of additional vets onto our streets with similar afflictions, and the longer we stay in Iraq the more there will be."

Mr. Speaker, we now know that over 300,000 veterans of the Iraq War are suffering from PTSD. Many veterans across the country are homeless, jobless, and suffering from depression and other mental problems. Many are dealing with family problems caused by their long and frequent deployments away from home. In addition, Mr. Speaker, many others have been caught up in the foreclosure crisis, and just the other day, we received the tragic news that the suicide rate among soldiers in 2008 was the highest in nearly 30 years.

The human cost of war is the greatest cost of all, and our country has a moral obligation to provide the very best care to our veterans. But the financial costs should also concern us, especially in these hard times.

We continue to spend over \$12 billion a month to keep our troops in Iraq and Afghanistan. We'll also be spending countless billions of dollars to provide help for our veterans, many of whom will require extensive health care for decades to come.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation cannot afford to fight two wars at a time when our economy is on the brink of collapse. We tried to have guns and butter back in the Vietnam War. It didn't work and it won't work now.

It is obvious that we're overextended. That's why I've called for the redeployment of our troops out of Iraq and Afghanistan and for a bold, aggressive recovery plan to save our economy here at home.

On January 20, Mr. Speaker, I sent a letter to our brand new President Obama calling for a worldwide ceasefire, or a timeout, from war. This would allow us to work with the world community to use diplomacy, reconciliation, and humanitarian assistance to resolve disputes and to fight terrorism.

This approach would be especially effective in Afghanistan where war has never worked. As a matter of fact, war hasn't worked for any invader of Afghanistan down through history. Building schools, building hospitals, building roads is the best way to fight the Taliban.

Mr. Speaker, it's time to rebuild our country and rethink our foreign policy. The old ways have failed, and we must take bold, new action. It means an economic recovery package big enough to do the job and a new commitment to peace around the world. It means we should follow the example of Reverend Glenda Hope because she would invest in the neediest among us, and that would be the way to get started in this world of ours.

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

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

ENERGY

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

Mr. INGLIS. Mr. Speaker, I understand that the word "crisis" in Chinese is written with two characters. The first means danger and the second means opportunity.

It occurs to me that that's really where we are in our country today when it comes to energy. We've got

both a danger and an opportunity. Of course, this may sound a little bit dated because, you know, 6 months, 8 months ago on this House floor we were talking about prices of gasoline at \$4 a gallon or something. Now, gas at \$1.60 a gallon is a sleeper cell waiting to detonate, and it will eventually detonate. So we get this enormous danger.

We saw the danger this summer. It became real and present, and we saw what happened when gas hit \$4 a gallon. Now, it's going to get a little bit of a sleeper cell action going on here where it's \$1.50, \$1.60, \$1.70. But what we've got there is a huge danger looming for us in the future.

We've also got, though, this incredible opportunity. In this midst of this economic downturn, we're looking for jobs. We're looking for a way to create productivity for the future and to get beyond just stimulus and into long-term growth.

So, in that regard, I had an opportunity to visit with the wind unit of General Electric Company in Greenville, South Carolina, recently, and they told me that 1 percent of the world's electricity is made from the wind. If it goes to 2 percent, just from 1 percent to 2 percent of the world's electricity coming from wind, it's \$100 billion in sales, \$100 billion. That's an opportunity.

So we've got this danger in our precarious position with energy, dependent on foreign Nations, some of them that really don't like us very much. But we have also got this tremendous opportunity, which is the job creation opportunity by these fuels of the future.

So the question is why don't we move quickly to those fuels of the future, and here's where I think folks from my side of the aisle can really add to this discussion because, you know, one of the strengths of Republicans is understanding free enterprise, how to make a profit, how to make things work, how to create things, build things, grow things, make things work. That's our strength.

And so when you're thinking about wind, for example, why isn't wind used more? Why isn't nuclear used more? Well, the answer is the price signals aren't there. It isn't cost-effective in a lot of cases to pursue those new technologies. What's cheaper? Well, the things we know: burn coal, burn natural gas, burn oil, gasoline. Those things are the incumbent technologies that have a market distortion going on. And the market distortion, which is something again that we Republicans understand very well, we understand about markets, the market distortion we've got going on is a free good in the air. That means I can belch and burn on my property 24/7 without any accountability for what it does on somebody else's property when it comes to greenhouse gas emissions.

And so if you start attaching that accountability and saying to me, INGLIS, listen, you're going to have to keep

your stuff on your property—this is a biblical concept. It's an English common law concept. It's American common law, and it's part of our EPA regulatory regime. The idea is to be accountable for what you do on your property and hold those incidents on your property and not have the opportunity to belch and burn and dump on somebody else's because that creates a market distortion.

Over the weeks to come, Mr. Speaker, I look forward to talking more about that market distortion and how it is we might change that and how we might use the power of free enterprise to create these jobs, to solve the environmental challenge and to address this national security risk. In my view, it's the triple play opportunity of this American century. It's something we should be very excited about, and it's a terrific bipartisan opportunity. I look forward to talking more about that.

□ 2015

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.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

TRIBUTE TO LAKE ERIE RESCUERS

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, I rise to commend the exemplary efforts of the United States Coast Guard, along with many State and local agencies, for their rapid response and flawless execution in rescuing 134 ice fishermen from an ice floe off the coast of Lake Erie on Saturday.

The call for help came in to the Coast Guard at approximately 10:45 a.m. By early afternoon, everyone was rescued. One man, sadly, who had fallen into the water, later suffered a fatal heart attack, and our sympathy goes out to his family.

Saturday's heroic rescue is a testament to the cooperation of various units: The Coast Guard stations in Toledo and Marblehead, Ohio; Detroit, Traverse City, Belle Isle, and St. Clair Shores, Michigan; and even Elizabeth City, North Carolina.

The Coast Guard cutter Mackinaw; the Ottawa, Ohio Sheriff's Department; the Ohio State Highway Patrol; Monroe County, Michigan Sheriff's Department; Jervis, Carol, and Washington townships; Toledo Life Flight; the Ca-

nadian Coast Guard; and, yes, countless local citizens.

I wanted to take this opportunity to call attention to their heroism and outstanding deeds. Hundreds of families, thousands of people, are grateful to them for their actions that prevented a real catastrophe.

My constituents rely on the tireless efforts of the Coast Guard and law enforcement to protect America's fourth sea coast along our Great Lakes. The partnership between all levels of law enforcement and seamless communication between these agencies are critical for my constituents who know that, in difficult times like this, there's a team of agencies that they can rely upon.

Each year, hundreds of thousands of Americans and Canadians venture into Lake Erie to participate in the region's rich sports fishing industry. Estimates show each year, the sports fishing industry on Lake Erie alone contributes up to \$700 million toward our local economy. This backbone to the local economy would not exist without the capable support of first responders.

I would like to commend in particular Ottawa County Sheriff Robert Bratton, Lucas County Sheriff James Telb, the Coast Guard, and other local law enforcement officials, for their vigilance in protecting our fishermen from this danger.

In addition, I would like to commend local officials on efforts to develop a system in quantifying the dangers related to ice floes and educate fishermen on the dangers of ice fishing.

As our country faces the challenges of updating law enforcement to confront the challenges of the 21st century, we should look inward at the expertise of these local officials. For generations, it has been the Coast Guard and local law enforcement that has protected sailors, fishermen, and boaters from our region from these dangers.

I will submit for the RECORD the activities of a number of Coast Guard employees for their work in coordinating rescue operations. Their expertise and heroism must be properly commended.

And it is a tribute at the highest order to read into the RECORD the names of those who participated in this rescue effort: Petty Officer Jason Rice, Sector Detroit; Petty Officer Chad Pietszak, Station Marblehead, coxswain; Petty Officer Jason Venema, Station Marblehead, crewman; Petty Officer Aaron Pitney, Station Toledo, rescue swimmer; Coleman Selm, Air Station Detroit; and Public Affairs Chief Robert Lanier.

It is a tribute of the highest order to recognize these exceptional service members whose devotion to duty exemplifies America's real homeland security.

Thank you.

1. OS1 Jason Rice, Sector Detroit, Command Center: As the lead Operational Controller, Petty Officer Rice initiated a Safety Broadcast prior to the event to warn fishermen. He received notification of the event, dispatched initial resources, and provided ac-

curate and quick notifications up the chain of command including detailed log entries throughout the event. His recommendations, calm demeanor and professional knowledge ensured the CG dispatched the correct resources and relayed critical information to other first responder agencies. Petty Officer Rice ensured the CG helo was immediately tasked to assist with Person In Water (PIW) & coordinated information flow on medical evacuation to the Fireland Hospital.

2. BM2 Chad Pietszak, Station Marblehead: coxswain on airboat that provided organization, communication and safe transportation during ferry operations. Petty Officer Pietszak's skilled operation of the airboat ensured 94 fishermen were safely transferred from the ice floe to the staging area with no injuries during the evolution.

3. BM2 Jason Venema, Station Marblehead: crewman on airboat that provided organization, communication and safe transportation during ferry operations. Petty Officer Venema ensured 94 passengers were safely embarked, comfortable and delivered from the ice floe to the staging area.

4. BM1 Aaron Pitney, Station Toledo: Station Executive Petty Officer and ice rescue team leader from STA Toledo. Petty Officer Pitney dispatched to scene and liaison with other first responders and law enforcement agencies. He assisted with dragging fire department's 21 feet boat hundreds of yards offshore, assisted with directing and receiving fishermen being ferried off the ice. Assisted MSU Toledo with tracking down details of sunken four-wheeler and air boat.

5. AST3 Coleman Selm, Air Station Detroit: rescue swimmer onboard Coast Guard helicopter CG6553 that participated in the medical evacuation. He performed a direct deployment double lift recovery of the PIW, and then performed CPR with the flight mechanic assisting until PIW was delivered to awaiting medical personnel at Firelands Hospital helipad. He also participated in the extensive aerial search effort, locating several stranded fishermen.

6. PAC Robert Lanier, D9 Public Affairs Chief. Within minutes of the initial report, Chief Lanier recognized the gravity of the situation and mobilized the entire external affairs division. He sent a team to the Incident Cmd Post at the scene, and personally supervised a team at the D9 office. His group aggressively released info and imagery to the media in a timely manner, and conducted numerous national media interviews, garnering extensive coverage.

It is a tribute of the highest order to recognize these exceptional service members whose devotion to duty exemplifies America's real homeland security.

RUIN YOUR HEALTH WITH THE OBAMA STIMULUS PLAN: BETSY MCCAUGHEY

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, the so-called economic stimulus bill involves itself in health care. And, Mr. Speaker, if the seniors in this country and the AARP take a real close look at this bill, I believe seniors would not only be calling the Capitol, raising cane about what's in it, but they'll be marching on the Capitol.

What it's going to do is it's going to require that there will be rationing, and it will be based upon some formulas that will say if you only have an

expectation of another 8 or 9 years of life left, or 4 or 5 years, that they will ration the care that you get based upon the life expectancy. It's unbelievable.

Let me just read to you some things that Mr. Daschle had put in the bill before he was removed as the potential head of HHS. Daschle proposed an appointed body with vast powers to make the tough decisions elected politicians won't make.

The stimulus bill does that, and calls it the Federal Coordinating Council for Comparative Effective Research. Pages 190–192 in the bill. The goal, Daschle's book explained, is to slow the development and use of new medications and technologies because they're driving up costs. He praises Europeans for being more willing to accept "hopeless diagnoses" and "forego experimental treatments," and he chastises Americans for expecting too much from our health care system. The elderly are hit the hardest.

Daschle says health care reform "will not be pain-free." Seniors should be more accepting of the conditions that come with age, instead of treating them. That means the elderly will bear the brunt of what is in this bill.

Medicare now pays for treatments deemed safe and effective. The stimulus bill would change that and apply a cost effectiveness standard set by the Federal Council. The Federal Council is modeled after a United Kingdom board discussed in Daschle's book. This board approves or rejects treatments using a formula that divides the cost of the treatment by the number of years the patient is likely to benefit.

So they are going to figure out how many years you're supposed to live and then they're going to divide the treatment based upon the years. Treatments for younger patients are more often approved than treatments for diseases that affect the elderly, such as osteoporosis.

In 2006, a UK health board decreed that elderly patients with macular degeneration had to wait until they went blind in one eye before you could get a costly new drug to save the other eye. It took almost 3 years of public protests before the board reversed its decision.

There are hidden provisions in this bill. If the Obama administration's economic stimulus bill passes in its current form, seniors in the U.S. will face similar rationing of health care. Defenders of the system say that individuals benefit in younger years and sacrifice later. Let me say that gain. Seniors in the U.S. will face similar rationing of health care as they have in the UK.

The stimulus bill will affect every part of health care, from the medical and nursing education, to how patients are treated and how much hospitals get paid. The bill allocates more funding for this bureaucracy than for the Army, Navy, Marines, and Air Force combined.

Hiding health legislation in a stimulus bill is intentional. Daschle sup-

ported the Clinton administration's health care overhaul in 1994, and attributed its failure to debate and delay. A year ago, Daschle wrote that the next President should act quickly before critics mount opposition. "If that means attaching a health care plan," and this is a quote now, "If that means attaching a health care plan to the Federal budget, so be it," he said. "The issue is too important to be stalled by Senate protocol."

If I were talking to the seniors of this country, I'd say you really ought to read this bill. You ought to look at pages 445, 454, 479, 442, 446, 511, 518, 540, 541, 190, 192, and 464. I know I went through those fast, but I am going to put this in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and it will be on my Web site.

But every senior American and the AARP ought to be very concerned about this, Mr. Speaker, because it will result in rationing health care for seniors, and it will minimize health care for a lot of other people as well, even because they are younger.

And the doctors in this country and the nurses and health care officials ought to be very concerned because it's going to impose penalties on them if they don't follow the government's requirements. It's in the bill. This isn't baloney. And I hope my colleagues and everybody will take a hard look at it.

Mr. Speaker, if the seniors across this country are paying attention, I hope they will read the bill as well.

RUIN YOUR HEALTH WITH THE OBAMA STIMULUS PLAN

(Commentary by Betsy McCaughey)

Feb. 9 (Bloomberg)—Republican Senators are questioning whether President Barack Obama's stimulus bill contains the right mix of tax breaks and cash infusions to jumpstart the economy.

Tragically, no one from either party is objecting to the health provisions slipped in without discussion. These provisions reflect the handiwork of Tom Daschle, until recently the nominee to head the Health and Human Services Department.

Senators should read these provisions and vote against them because they are dangerous to your health. (Page numbers refer to H.R. 1 EH, pdf version).

The bill's health rules will affect "every individual in the United States" (445, 454, 479). Your medical treatments will be tracked electronically by a federal system. Having electronic medical records at your fingertips, easily transferred to a hospital, is beneficial. It will help avoid duplicate tests and errors.

But the bill goes further. One new bureaucracy, the National Coordinator of Health Information Technology, will monitor treatments to make sure your doctor is doing what the federal government deems appropriate and cost effective. The goal is to reduce costs and "guide" your doctor's decisions (442, 446). These provisions in the stimulus bill are virtually identical to what Daschle prescribed in his 2008 book, "Critical: What We Can Do About the Health-Care Crisis." According to Daschle, doctors have to give up autonomy and "learn to operate less like solo practitioners."

Keeping doctors informed of the newest medical findings is important, but enforcing uniformity goes too far.

NEW PENALTIES

Hospitals and doctors that are not "meaningful users" of the new system will face

penalties. "Meaningful user" isn't defined in the bill. That will be left to the HHS secretary, who will be empowered to impose "more stringent measures of meaningful use over time" (511, 518, 540–541).

What penalties will deter your doctor from going beyond the electronically delivered protocols when your condition is atypical or you need an experimental treatment? The vagueness is intentional. In his book, Daschle proposed an appointed body with vast powers to make the "tough" decisions elected politicians won't make.

The stimulus bill does that, and calls it the Federal Coordinating Council for Comparative Effectiveness Research (190–192). The goal, Daschle's book explained, is to slow the development and use of new medications and technologies because they are driving up costs. He praises Europeans for being more willing to accept "hopeless diagnoses" and "forgo experimental treatments," and he chastises Americans for expecting too much from the healthcare system.

ELDERLY HARDEST HIT

Daschle says health-care reform "will not be pain free." Seniors should be more accepting of the conditions that come with age instead of treating them. That means the elderly will bear the brunt.

Medicare now pays for treatments deemed safe and effective. The stimulus bill would change that and apply a cost-effectiveness standard set by the Federal Council (464).

The Federal Council is modeled after a U.K. board discussed in Daschle's book. This board approves or rejects treatments using a formula that divides the cost of the treatment by the number of years the patient is likely to benefit. Treatments for younger patients are more often approved than treatments for diseases that affect the elderly, such as osteoporosis.

In 2006, a U.K. health board decreed that elderly patients with macular degeneration had to wait until they went blind in one eye before they could get a costly new drug to save the other eye. It took almost three years of public protests before the board reversed its decision.

HIDDEN PROVISIONS

If the Obama administration's economic stimulus bill passes the Senate in its current form, seniors in the U.S. will face similar rationing. Defenders of the system say that individuals benefit in younger years and sacrifice later.

The stimulus bill will affect every part of health care, from medical and nursing education, to how patients are treated and how much hospitals get paid. The bill allocates more funding for this bureaucracy than for the Army, Navy, Marines, and Air Force combined (90–92, 174–177, 181).

Hiding health legislation in a stimulus bill is intentional. Daschle supported the Clinton administration's health-care overhaul in 1994, and attributed its failure to debate and delay. A year ago, Daschle wrote that the next president should act quickly before critics mount an opposition. "If that means attaching a health-care plan to the federal budget, so be it," he said. "The issue is too important to be stalled by Senate protocol."

MORE SCRUTINY NEEDED

On Friday, President Obama called it "inexcusable and irresponsible" for senators to delay passing the stimulus bill. In truth, this bill needs more scrutiny.

The health-care industry is the largest employer in the U.S. It produces almost 17 percent of the nation's gross domestic product. Yet the bill treats health care the way European governments do: as a cost problem instead of a growth industry. Imagine limiting growth and innovation in the electronics or

auto industry during this downturn. This stimulus is dangerous to your health and the economy.

ECONOMIC RECOVERY BILL

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

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, the January job numbers told Americans something they already knew. Things are bad. They are bad all over in almost every sector of the economy and almost every section of the country.

In a hearing before the Joint Economic Committee, I asked the commissioner of the Bureau of Labor Statistics if there was any bright spots in the labor report. And he said, and I quote, "No. No good news comes to mind."

These latest job losses add to the overwhelming evidence that we must get a recovery package to the President's desk fast. People are hurting and crying out all across the country for help from the people in this Chamber.

More than 3.6 million jobs have been lost since the recession began in 2007, including the nearly 600,000 jobs shed in January alone. Six hundred thousand jobs is equivalent to all the workers in the State of Maine.

My home State of New York has been especially hard hit. Almost 48,000 jobs were slashed. Familiar and storied names, such as Macy's, Estee Lauder, Time Warner, Bloomberg News, and many others, have laid off employees.

We are now hearing that seven States have already exhausted their unemployment insurance, and another 11 States may see their funds exhausted by the end of 2009.

More than 2 million homes have gone into foreclosure, and millions of other homeowners find themselves owing more to the bank than their homes are worth. Because of lost jobs, millions also lost their health insurance. Many have lost their savings. An estimated \$6 trillion in personal wealth has simply evaporated.

A solution to this crisis requires a bold action and addresses the magnitude of our economic woes, and the American Recovery and Reinvestment Plan will do just that. The recovery package will create or save an estimated 4 million jobs across a variety of sectors. It will soften the downturn and foster a solid economic recovery that benefits all Americans.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce has called for the passage of the Recovery Act. The National Governors Association says that they support the bill. The bill even has the support of most GOP Governors.

The latest Gallup poll shows that 80 percent of Americans believe that passing a new stimulus plan is either "important," or "critically important." Even 66 percent of Republicans told the Gallup pollsters that it is either important or critically important to pass the

bill. Perhaps because they know that America's schools, roads, bridges, and water systems are in disrepair, and this creates a drag on economic growth.

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

Yes, there are conflicting visions of the perfect bill. Some Nobel Laureates in economics say the stimulus is not big enough. Some would have us do less. But now is the time to put aside whatever differences we might have in our economic theories and put the needs of our country first.

The building where the Joint Economic Committee holds its hearings is dedicated to the memory of Senator Everett Dirksen. On the plaque we pass every day, it reads, and I quote, "His unerring sense of the possible enabled him to know when to compromise, by such men are our freedoms retained. His greatness will forever be an inspiration."

President Obama and the Democrats are ready to embark on a bold, commonsense plan to turn this economy around, to address the fierce urgency of now, and to get this country back on its feet. We urge you to stand with us shoulder to shoulder as we act to put America back to work.

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

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

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

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

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

(Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

□ 2030

OSCAR ELIAS BISCET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. This last December 6, 2 years ago, was the ninth anniversary of the imprisonment—the cruel and unjust imprisonment in a cold and damp cell in the most inhuman of condi-

tions—of the great Cuban leader in the fight for democracy and human rights in that enslaved island, Dr. Oscar Elias Biscet. Dr. Biscet is prohibited from even walking in the prison's yard, and he is incarcerated along with common criminals.

Dr. Biscet was released from prison in 2003, for a few weeks, before being rearrested and subsequently sentenced to 25 years in the gulag due to his peaceful pro-democracy activities.

Biscet personifies the opposition to the brutal totalitarian regime Fidel Castro and his brother, who the dictator has now given some additional titles to because of the ailing tyrant's failing health.

Dr. Biscet is an admirer of Gandhi and Martin Luther King.

A physician by training, he began his opposition to the totalitarian regime by speaking out against the regime's forced abortion when there is any indication whatsoever that a pregnancy may have an abnormality policy. Biscet described that policy as inhuman. He was immediately fired from his job at the hospital, prohibited from practicing his profession as a physician, and his wife Elsa Morejon was also fired from her job as a practicing nurse. Within hours, the couple and their son were summarily evicted from their apartment and their physical possessions thrown into the street.

Fortunately, an elderly patient of Elsa allowed the family to move into her house. Dr. Biscet continued peacefully denouncing the totalitarian regime's absolute denial of human rights to the Cuban people; and, because of that, he has been unjustly and cruelly imprisoned for 9 years and counting.

Hundreds of other brave human rights activists are also suffering in the political prisons of the Cuban totalitarian dictatorship for the crime of supporting democracy and liberty and opposing tyranny, including 23 known journalists thrown into dungeons because of articles they wrote that bothered the dictator. No regime in the world has more journalists in prison, with the possible exception of another totalitarian dictatorship in an obviously much larger nation, communist China.

A few weeks ago, the respected international organization, Reporters Without Borders, gave one of those Cuban journalists in the gulag, Ricardo Gonzalez Alfonso, sentenced by the Cuban tyrant to 20 years in prison in 2003, and currently in very poor health, the Reporters Without Borders Journalist of the Year Award. Reporters Without Border is to be commended, Mr. Speaker.

Three other Cuban prisoners of conscience, Aldolfo Fernandez Sainz, Pedro Arguelles Moran, and Antonio Diaz Sanchez, are known to have begun a hunger strike due to brutal conditions they are subjected to. Where is the outrage, Mr. Speaker? Where is the international solidarity? Where is there one word of coverage of this in the world's press?

The reality is that for too many in the world today Cubans are supposed to be content with their lot, to be quiet; to, in the words of one of our colleagues in this Congress recently, to move on. The regime that enslaves a Nation and imprisons hundreds of heroes simply for their beliefs deserves unilateral rewards and concessions, many argue, such as more travel or dollars. But Dr. Biscet and the many other heroes imprisoned in the Castro brothers' gulag will not be able to be ignored forever. They must be freed. And political parties must be legalized, as well as independent press agencies, and labor unions. And free and fair elections must take place in Cuba.

Many of those imprisoned today, Mr. Speaker, will be democratically elected leaders tomorrow. That is what is going to happen in Cuba tomorrow. Today, as they suffer the most unjust of cruel imprisonment, we here remember and honor them and, once again, demand the immediate release of all prisoners of conscience in the Castro brothers' infernal gulag.

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

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

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

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

CARTER PRIVILEGED RESOLUTION

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

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, today, in fact less than 1 hour to 1½ hours ago, I rose on the floor of this House to bring forward a privileged resolution asking for the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee to step down or be removed until such time as the ethical problems that have been raised about Mr. RANGEL could be addressed by the Ethics Committee and resolved. I did this out of no malice for Mr. RANGEL; but, rather, I did this and have stated publicly that it is important that we raise the level of the ethics standards of this House to a level that was inspired to us by our Speaker. And, if we raise our level of ethics and each individual in this House takes on themselves to stand up for an ethical Congress, we will have an ethical Congress, and maybe the people of the United States will have a greater respect for the individual Members of Congress.

It should be embarrassing and disheartening to every hard-working man

and woman in this House, and the House is full of hard-working men and women on both sides of the aisle, that the American public view us as unethical and maybe worse.

Our approval rating at one time during the last Congress was at 8 percent. They say if your approval rating is below 20 percent, the only people that still like you are your friends and your relatives. Well, at 8 percent, you have got to worry about your relatives. You may not even have them liking you anymore. To me, I looked at that, and I have been in this Congress now for 6 years, starting my 7th year, I know that there are a lot of really fine people in this Congress on both sides of the aisle and I don't think that they deserve that kind of rating. But, quite frankly, the atmosphere that has been created over the last several years has created an atmosphere where people think that we are evil people. And I don't believe that we are evil people, but I do believe that sometimes somebody has to stand up and say, if it isn't right, it isn't right. And I have decided that I am going to do that. And I think I am going to be joined by others who are going to do it, and I hope eventually we are all going to stand up and say: If it isn't right, it isn't right, and I don't care who did it.

But I want to start off by telling you that what happened in this privileged resolution that I brought forward today, which, if it had gone forward in the privileged resolution, we would have had 1 hour of debate on each side to discuss this issue and come to a resolution, just like maybe a jury would come to a resolution in a courtroom back home, where we would hear what is out there, what has been said on this House floor by Mr. RANGEL, what the evidence seems to be; that we would learn about what is going on, and what would be best for the House under these circumstances. But, unfortunately, a procedural occurrence interfered or intervened.

The majority made a motion to table that resolution. The majority prevailed, as they would be expected to with the sizeable majority count that they have in this House, and so that resolution was laid upon the table; which basically means to the average guy that they stuck it aside and we won't take it up. And that is where it is going to stay, I suppose, just as previous resolutions have been tabled and they don't get taken up.

So I have this hour, and hopefully some of my friends will be by as we go through this hour, and we are going to talk about ethics. And I want to first point out this poster right here, which I would hope can be seen.

The Speaker of this House, NANCY PELOSI, on November 8, 2006, made this statement, which was quoted by the Washington Post: "The American people voted to restore integrity and honesty in Washington, D.C., and the Democrats intend to lead the most honest, most open, and most ethical

Congress in history." That is a 200-plus year history of this United States, and the goal of the 110th Congress, the standards set by our Speaker was to be the most open, most ethical Congress, and the most honest Congress in the history of the United States. That is a big package to carry, there is no doubt about that, but it is a goal that we ought to have. I would argue that, since this speech was made, we have made very little progress down that line.

But something else much more recent to what we are doing right now is what the President of the United States said basically just last week: "I campaigned on changing Washington and bottom-up politics. I don't want to send the message to the American people that there are two sets of standards, one for the powerful people, and one for the ordinary folks who are working every day and paying their taxes." That is a quote to CNN by President Barack Obama, February 3, 2009, just last week. I honor our President for that kind of standard that he sets for his administration and for this government.

There are people who would say: Mr. CARTER, you raised these issues about the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, about CHARLIE RANGEL, for political purposes. You did this because you wanted to attack a powerful leader in the House of Representatives, and this is all about politics.

I will point out that I stated when this all started that I first wrote a letter to Chairman RANGEL and asked Chairman RANGEL if he would address the issue of having paid his taxes, if he would address paying his penalties and interest so this would all go away, so he wouldn't be treated by two standards, one standard for the powerful and one standard for the ordinary person. But I got no response from that letter. A copy of that letter was sent to the Speaker of the House, and I got no response there.

And then you ask, why would I stand up and start talking about this stuff? The New York Times on September 14, 2008 pointed out: "Mounting embarrassment for taxpayers and Congress makes it imperative that Representative Charles Rangel step aside as chairman of the Ways and Means Committee while his ethical problems are investigated."

Now, this is one of the most liberal, Democrat leaning newspapers in the country who is saying there are issues in Mr. RANGEL's past that, in their opinion, the editorial page's opinion, would require that he step down while he is being investigated. And that is all I have ever really asked that he do. It might be for just 2 days, 3 days. Who knows how quickly the Ethics Committee will come out with a resolution. It might be a few weeks. But it would look a standard to the American people that would say: You are right, this is not behind closed doors. This is heads up. They are talking about stuff that is

important. And that is why we raise this. So I am going to put those two things out here to start this conversation.

Our President and our Speaker, Democrats both, have made the point that they want to make sure that there is no one standard for the powerful and one standard for the ordinary, but each will be treated fairly. They have set a standard that they will be the most honest, open, ethical Congress in history. They have set a standard, and it has been pointed out by the New York Times that that standard is not being met when it comes to the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee.

Now, all I am trying to do here tonight, and I am asking others to help me with, is just say to Mr. RANGEL: Mr. RANGEL, I highly respect you. I hope that you would realize what the American people perceive of us as a body because of issues that are being raised by allegedly the most important newspaper in the land. And we think that, for the good of this House, you would step aside, however briefly, until these issues are resolved.

And, quite frankly, that is what this resolution was about today. And I certainly didn't do it in any spirit of meanness. I thought it was the right and the proper thing to do. And so I basically am pleading my case to the American people and to this House in saying that it is important that you understand, I have no ill will against Mr. RANGEL, but I do have ill will about bringing down the ethical responsibility of this House.

□ 2045

I have my friend, Mr. KING from Iowa, who has joined me here. He may have some things to say about the subject of ethics. And we are going to just ride along here. I recognize you for the amount of time you wish to consume.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I very much thank Judge CARTER for bringing up the issue of ethics in this Congress, Mr. Speaker. And it is not an easy thing to raise these issues on the floor of this House. There are pressures in this place that push a person who serves here to conform, to not make waves and to not expose themselves to legislative retaliation. So, there are many Members of this Congress who would think about those things instead of thinking about the standards that we need to uphold in this great deliberative body.

And we are going into the 220th year since the ratification of our Constitution. And it has been a long history in this Chamber with high standards. Of course, there have been disagreements and squabbles along the way. And there have been times back in those days of old when Members came to blows.

We have a different way of approaching things today. And if we look back upon previous Congresses, there have been standards that have been brought forth. I remember a Speaker of the House who saw 74 sets of ethical

charges brought against him, and all in an effort to bring down the Speaker. Finally, to get away from that all, he accepted one of them that could have crossed the line, which melded the whole thing down.

And here we sit today with a dysfunctional Ethics Committee, an Ethics Committee that doesn't take up the issues that come before them. They are there deadlocked. And so, since we have a dysfunctional Ethics Committee, we have a place, Mr. Speaker, to appeal to. And that becomes you, Mr. Speaker, and the echo that comes from here to the American people.

And Judge CARTER has brought this privileged resolution today. It has laid out a whole line of facts as we know them with regard to the activities of the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL). And he has spoken, I think well, to the standards that have been put up by the New York Times, which I previously haven't looked to for a standard, but by the President of the United States, who has said there will be only one set of standards, whether you're powerful or whether you're unpowerful, you have to live to the same ethical standard. And when you see the quote that comes from Speaker PELOSI, November 8, 2006, where she says "the American people voted to restore integrity and honesty in Washington, D.C., and the Democrats intend to lead the most honest, most open and most ethical Congress in history," it's not bearing up very well considering that the Ethics Committee is not taking up issues, and the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee still presides in a time of economic crisis, we all agree, when important bills like the stimulus bill have to be written, and they have to be written in cooperation, and they should be written in a bipartisan fashion, which we missed that train entirely over here, Mr. Speaker. There was no bipartisanship that applied to the bill that came to the floor. And we shall see if there is a conference committee that shows that bipartisanship. But if there is a question, if there is a question of whether it sheds light in an ill way upon this Congress, then it is incumbent upon those who wield some of the most power in this Chamber to step down and allow their name to be cleared or allow the charges to stick, whichever the case may be.

This privileged resolution raises this issue. One might note that there was no debate on the floor of this privileged resolution. There was a motion to table the privileged resolution, and so the only voice to it was the Clerk reading the resolution and the motion to table, which is an undebatable motion. And it was voted down on party lines, Mr. Speaker. I think the public will recognize that when you see ethical questions that are decided upon party lines, especially ethical questions that are difficult to raise because of the relationships, the collegial relationships

that we have between Members here across the aisle, I think they will understand that politics is part of this. And the Ethics Committee is supposed to be above it.

And when it comes time to pay your taxes and report your income, no one should be above that. I agree with Tom Daschle on that point, and I agree with President Obama on that point. I would like to think that the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee agrees as well. But when the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee doesn't understand the convoluted taxes that he has helped to contrive over the years and so therefore can presumably take a pass for failure to pay those taxes, if there is an excuse for the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, then, Mr. Speaker, I would submit who in America is it not an excuse for? If the Ways and Means Chair doesn't understand the taxes and responsibilities well enough, if it was inadvertent, then say so. Bring this out. If it is not inadvertent, I think that also needs to be brought out. I suspect it was inadvertent. But it is still a responsibility.

It is a responsibility of the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, a responsibility of the Secretary of the Treasury, the boss of the IRS, to use TurboTax. And he couldn't get his taxes right, even though he cashed the checks that were reimbursement for the taxes he was to pay. And we are to overlook this because there is only one man in America big enough or smart enough to get us out of this economic crisis that we are in. That would be the Secretary of the Treasury. Apparently there is only one person in America that can wield the gavel over the Ways and Means Committee while we muddle through this economic crisis without having the confidence that all the best interests of the American people are in mind.

These are some of the things that flow into my mind as I watch this, Mr. Speaker. And I yield back to the gentleman from Texas. I thank you for the bringing this to the floor, and I thank you for the privileged resolution.

Mr. CARTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding back. This all started when I raised an issue about Mr. RANGEL's failure to pay his taxes and then his announcing that he had paid his taxes and he will pay penalties and interest if penalties and interest were assessed. That jumped off the page at me, because I'm from one of the best towns in America, Round Rock, Texas. I grew up with Round Rock. It started off with 2,500 people. And now it's a little over 100,000, I guess. I practiced law in Round Rock and was a judge in the community that oversaw Round Rock as part of that Williamson County community. And for more times than I can count, I have been involved in situations where people have had to deal with issues that deal with the IRS.

When I was a judge, we had lots of family cases where we had to resolve

IRS liens and other things that were a part of the division of the property between parties. I used to represent clients. I had one in particular who was constantly having issues with the IRS. And they were putting padlocks on his doors and seizing his bank accounts. And he was calling his CPA, who was a good friend of mine who used to office with me. And we would try to keep him out of trouble.

Now, one of the things that was onerous that came up on every one of these people were the penalties that are assessed by the IRS. And when you fail to pay your taxes for long periods of times, you will have penalties. But let me point out to you, if you don't pay your taxes on April 15, and you choose to pay your taxes on August 15 or October 15, you're going to immediately receive a bill from the IRS for the interest difference between April 15 and October 15 and a penalty for failure to pay on time. That is what happens. That is just as regular as clockwork. And I think all Americans know that that is the way they get treated when they're dealing with the mighty IRS.

So the first question that came to my mind was that he claimed to have paid his taxes way back in I believe August or July, and yet no penalties and interest had been assessed. That I didn't understand. So that is why I wrote him a letter and said, why don't you contact them so we can get this out of the way and ask them to assess penalties and interest? And I received no reply.

And then what I was trying to point out in that by saying that this was not right, as I said, okay, if it's good enough for the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, then it's good enough for every American citizen. And I introduced a bill called the Rangel Rule, which said that if you have missed your taxes and you pay them and you don't want to be assessed penalties and interest for failing to pay on time, write on your form, "Rangel Rule," and you will be excused those penalties and interest. You will have the ability to claim the same kind of treatment that the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, CHARLES RANGEL, seems to be getting from the IRS.

And why would I want to do this? Because look what our President of the United States says. "I don't want to send a message to the American people that there are two sets of standards, one for powerful people, and one for ordinary folks who are working every day and paying their taxes." That is exactly what I have been trying to say with the Rangel Rule. There shouldn't be two standards, one for someone who has been elected and sent up here by the people, and he gets a bigger break than the guy back in his district who runs a garage and doesn't pay his taxes on time, and somebody padlocks his garage and seizes his bank account.

So this is a fairness issue. And it is an ethical issue. But when we had the

statement by NANCY PELOSI about the most honest, open and ethical Congress in history, then we all of a sudden had a lot of things that occurred. I want to go through some of those with you. And the first one I suppose is now almost old news.

"Federal investigators are targeting the Democratic Congressman, 58, for allegedly demanding cash and other favors for himself and relatives, in exchange for using his congressional clout for arranging African business deals." It goes on to talk about Congressman Jefferson of New Orleans and the \$90,000 in cash that was found in his freezer. This was in the Washington Post way back on February 16, 2006.

That popped up just shortly after the Speaker had talked to us about honest, open and ethical. That issue was already up in the previous election. Ultimately, that has never been resolved, although it is in the courts right now. And it certainly will be resolved by the courts, but the people of New Orleans resolved it this year in the election process. Mr. Jefferson was defeated. But he still has the right to be heard in court. And as far as this judge is concerned, he is innocent until proven guilty beyond a reasonable doubt, and the State has the burden of proof of making that proof. I stand behind the standards that the Constitution set for all innocent people. And I stand behind it for Mr. Jefferson. That is the first piece of news we have got.

Here is one from January 4, 2009, last month. A grand jury is investigating how a company that contributed to Richardson's campaign won a lucrative New Mexico State contract. Richardson says he and his administration acted properly, but that the investigation would force a delay in the confirmation process. He was being nominated for Secretary of Commerce. He says he could not, in good conscience, ask the President-elect to delay important Commerce Department work in the face of the economic situation the Nation is facing. And so he withdrew his name for the Commerce Secretary, which was the right thing to do.

But I point out that as we set a standard, reinforced by our new President, bless his heart, I appreciate him for that, and yet these issues pop up today. And we could go on and on. But let's just stop right there. That is two. We got 20 down here, or close to it. Mr. KING, those issues are issues that we've seen and we've known about, and one of them is old and one of them is new. I will yield to you if you would like to make a comment.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Well, yes, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding. And I point out that according to the law, we're innocent until proven guilty. That is according to the law. We have a different set of standards here in the House. It's an ethical standard here in the House. And the House makes its own rules, and the House determines those standards that we must all be upheld to as Members. And I

would point out that even though there was \$90,000 discovered in the gentleman from Louisiana's freezer, the Ethics Committee couldn't quite get to that issue. Apparently it was a little vague for the Ethics Committee. That is a committee that should be able to act quickly, and they should see to it that these kind of things are headed off at the pass, so to speak, and dealt with in an early fashion. But we went through two elections before the voters of Louisiana came around and sent a new individual here to this Congress to represent them. They finally had enough. And I applaud them for that, for making that decision. Sometimes you will find constituents that will conclude that maybe they don't have that much confidence in their Member of Congress, but it's their district, and they see that there are resources coming back to the district, and sometimes they don't want to vote someone out of office. This must have been just enough down there, because it took two elections to end the issue. The Ethics Committee still hadn't acted. The Ethics Committee hasn't acted on Mr. RANGEL. The Ethics Committee is immobilized at this point, Mr. Speaker.

And as the weight of these issues come up, one after another after another, I will submit that it sounds to me as I listen to the echoes through the national media and through the media in this town that we haven't heard the end of this. There are more posters there I know. And I'm of the understanding that there are a number of other individuals who have their own concerns that might have to do with warrants and perhaps subpoenas.

□ 2100

And, again, we've got to clean up this House. If we're going to have the confidence of the American people, then we have to stand on high ethical standards. And justice has to be swift and sure. It doesn't need to be played out until the end, till it becomes such a political liability that your own colleagues on your own side of the aisle will finally say, I'm tired of being associated. It's making me vulnerable. Why don't you please give up the gavel and sit down. That is one way that it does happen. But it becomes a political question instead of an ethical question. It becomes a political question instead of a legal question.

Again, we are held to the highest standards here. And I'll agree with the statement made by the Speaker, and I ask her to hold to this standard, that this be and becomes as honest, as open and as ethical as any Congress in history. That's the standard that we should have. It's not working out quite that way. It was good language when it was used for political purposes in order to win elections. But it's not such good language today when you have this many Members on one side of the aisle with this many national questions hanging out there and so many issues that are challenging us to hold a high

standard here in this House of Representatives.

I appreciate the Rangel rule. I'm a cosponsor of Judge CARTER's bill, the Rangel rule, where if you don't get around to paying your taxes and you decide that your conscience kicks in or you find some money and you want to sign on the return, then the penalty or the interest can be waived, according to the same standards that were there and made available to the Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee.

I looked at the Tim Geithner case, spoke to a few moments earlier, about how he was reimbursed for taxes that he was advised that he owed, and that advice came four times a year. I don't know how often the check came. But he cashed the checks but didn't pay the taxes. And now we have him heading up the Internal Revenue Service.

Now I would think that most of us, Mr. Speaker, have a constituent or two or three that might find themselves in a Federal penitentiary because of failure to pay Federal taxes. That would probably be willful failure to pay Federal taxes. And of those constituents, American people that are in prison, I'm wondering if there's a pass for the Secretary of the Treasury, and if there's a pass for the Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, then why wouldn't President Obama pardon everybody that's in the Federal penitentiaries for tax violations?

It seems to me that would be an open, honest, ethical thing to do. If there's going to be only one standard, and if the standard is that if you cheat on your taxes you can hold a government job, why would it not be that same kind of standard that would require, out of the sense of conformity, only one standard, a pardon for all those folks who have violated the same laws that some of the top officials of the administration have essentially admitted to in the public arena?

So let's have one standard. I think the standard should be, enforce the law, as Tom Daschle said about 15 years ago from the floor of the United States Senate. He didn't comply so well with it, but he did say enforce it. So let's follow that. Let's enforce the law. Let's enforce the ethical standards here in the Congress. And if we do that, however painful, however bitter the pills might be, we put it behind us and we can move on and we can do the right thing for the American people.

But this anchor is clattering as it is drug across the floor of this House of Representatives, it's an anchor being drug by the Speaker of the House. It's an anchor that's being drug by the majority leader in the House of Representatives, and it certainly is an albatross around the neck. We need to get to the bottom of this.

The American people need sunlight on all that we do. And let me further submit, Mr. Speaker, that we don't have sunlight on our own finances, not in the fashion that the public can track it. We need to have sunlight on what

we do. We report our income and we report our assets and our liabilities. But there's a gap there. We report in a range. And the ranges, Mr. Speaker, are narrow if it's a little bit of money, but if it's a lot of money then the ranges are wide. Now, I'm going from memory a little bit, but it seems to me there's zero to \$150,000. That might be one category of real estate assets. And then it goes on up, maybe \$150,000 to 350 or \$400,000. Those I am not so clear on. But I am clear on this; once you get over the \$5 million category, then you report your assets or liabilities within a range of between 5 and \$25 million, so there's a \$20 million range. And then you have several categories, so you can stack those categories together. If you're on the low side you might be \$5,000,001 and you might have five different categories of assets like that. So you'd have maybe a minimum of \$25 million in assets in five different categories, or it could be \$25 million in five different categories, \$125 million.

We have seen a Member's net worth go, in a matter of 3 years, from the low six figures to about \$6.5 million dollars. But no one can really track that because we are not required to report the direct dollar amount, and that gives a place for everybody to hide that wants to hide. And I think out of this needs to come a real requirement that we report real assets and real liabilities to the best dollar as we know it and to the best dates that we can produce, and then post it, as we did on the motion to instruct conferees today for the stimulus bill. All of our records, if they're going to be public records, need to be posted in a searchable, sortable, downloadable database so that the public can look in and have sunlight on these kind of finances that raise these kind of questions and maybe, just maybe there would be some good advice coming from somebody across America that would say, hey, Mr. Geithner, pay your taxes, Mr. RANGEL, pay your taxes. That's the message that I think the public would deliver here if we gave them an opportunity to look over our shoulder. We can't even look over our own shoulder because there's protection built into the financial reporting requirements; and it was wrong from the beginning; it's wrong today.

And I'd just say, one standard for all people. I agree with the President, whether you're powerful or whether you aren't powerful, everybody should live by the same standard, and that is enforce the law to the letter, as Tom Daschle said from the floor of the United States Senate.

I yield back to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CARTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. The best of all worlds would be, in my opinion, if we who are Members of this House, would step up and say, if there's issues raised that cast impropriety upon the House or the individual Member, that they say I'm going to step back until this issue is resolved.

And then I think the conscience of this House should be the Ethics Committee. And I think the conscience of this House, even though that Ethics Committee is exactly equally divided between Republicans and Democrats, I think the world that we would hope this honest, ethical House would live in would be a world where, when you get that heavy responsibility on being on the Ethics Committee, you're willing to say, I'm going to do what we ask juries to do. I'm going to look at and listen to the evidence, and I'm going to make a decision. I'm going to try my dead level best not to deadlock and put off issues, but to resolve issues as they come before me.

It's a heavy burden. I'm not saying it's not. I would admit that. But, you know, when you choose to police yourself, then each individual Member has a duty, to some extent, to police their own personal self.

I will point out that we had two Members, Republicans in the last Congress, John Doolittle and Rick Renzi, both of whom have allegations against them that had not been resolved and, to my knowledge have not been resolved. Both of them chose to step down from their respective committees until the allegations were resolved for the good of the House of Representatives. Now, I'm not saying they're noble and wonderful. I personally think the world of both of them. But the bottom line is, they did what was good for this body. And we've got issues that are getting raised.

It's not my goal in life to tear down this House. I'm telling you, and I tell the American people that might be watching tonight, the people that serve in the House of Representatives are hardworking folks. Right now, here, it's 10 minutes after 8, 10 minutes after 9, excuse me, and there's plenty of people that are working right now, and they started this morning, probably at 6.

So don't think that these aren't hardworking, honest, trying-to-do-the-very-best-they-can people that serve in this House.

And we owe a responsibility to each other not to bring down this House. We have been doing that, by my knowledge, the last 4 years. We have run campaigns, the purpose being to paint the whole House, or at least the whole party in the House, as criminals, as corrupt people, when you're only talking about individuals. Each of these instances we talk about are individual issues, with that individual Member or that individual cabinet appointee or cabinet member. They are not issues of the government as a whole. But the responsibility lies upon those who lead.

Mr. KING was pointing out just a few minutes ago about Timothy Geithner. I have here a copy of the International Monetary Fund receipt that Mr. Geithner signed when he received the money from the International Monetary Fund that he was supposed to pay in taxes. At the bottom it has an admonition and roughly an oath which says,

in accordance with the General Administrative Order Number 5, Revision 7, section 703, I wish to apply for tax allowance of U.S. Federal and State income taxes, and the difference between the self-employed and employed obligations of the U.S. Social Security tax which I will pay on my fund income. I authorize the fund or any of its staff members designated by it for the purpose to ascertain to the appropriate tax authorities whether tax returns were received. I certify that information contained herein is true to the best of my knowledge and belief, and that I will pay the taxes for which I have received tax allowance payments from the fund. I certify that if any data provided on this application changes, I will immediately report such changes to the fund; and it's signed by the gentleman, Mr. Geithner.

I bring that up because he signed a pledge to this fund that, give me the money and I'll pay my taxes. They gave him the money. It's been reported that one payment was \$32,000. That was reported in the newspapers, and you can take them as a valid source or not take them as a valid source. But back where I come from, \$32,000 is a real pocketful of money and you don't forget \$32,000.

So the issue that was raised is a serious one when the man who is taking us, hopefully, safely down the path to resolve our economic crisis for I believe it's four consecutive years, received the tax money he was supposed to submit to the various taxing entities and he did not do so, and only did so when he was about to be confirmed before the Senate as Secretary of the Treasury.

You know what? That just don't smell right. And I think that's what the folks back home are saying. And I think the President needs to, he has to think about his statement; no difference between the powerful and the ordinary working folks, because it certainly looks like there's a difference in that case.

I don't know the man. I haven't got any reason to be mad at him or to even want him to—I want him to succeed. Why wouldn't we? He's practically got our whole Nation sitting here in the palm of his hands, and we want him to succeed.

But if we're going to talk about what's right, what's ethical and honest and open, we've got to raise these issues. We've got to put sunlight on these issues. And that's what we are doing and what we're going to be doing now and forever, until we get this back to being a Congress that is recognized by the American people as honest and ethical.

□ 2115

I see that my friend Mr. BURGESS is here. He's a good friend from Texas, one of my classmates. We came into this body together. He is a man whom I highly respect. He has a great amount of knowledge about our health care

issues and about health care problems, and I believe that MIKE BURGESS and others will be the people who come up with the solutions.

I will yield whatever time the gentleman wishes to consume.

Mr. BURGESS. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I certainly thank him for his diligence and for his passion on this, and I do understand that he respects and honors the institution of the House of Representatives, and it is that respect and honor that lead him on this journey that sometimes could be difficult and where sometimes people might try to dissuade him, but I am so encouraged by the fact that he has taken up this cause. It is extremely important.

I have constituents who come into my office all the time. Constituent service is a big part of what we do as Members of Congress. Yes, we can help with a lot of things with regard to Federal agencies, but I always tell constituents who come in with tax difficulties that there is nothing that I as a Member of Congress can do to discharge an obligation to the IRS. It is just not within my power to do so.

Well, how does it make me feel when it turns out that that, in fact, is not right?

We have the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee and now the Secretary of the Treasury who have told us otherwise, that we can discharge those debts if we just choose to ignore them or, when we're caught, that we can just pay what we owe, and we don't have to pay a fine. We don't have to go back and deal with what other citizens have to deal with when they're caught in this type of difficulty.

I really applaud the judge for bringing forward the Rangel Rule. I know it has achieved a great deal of popularity out in the middle part of the country. It certainly has in my district. People understand that there do seem to be two sets of standards—one for those in charge and one for the rest of us. It has gotten to the point where people are not wanting to put up with that type of mentality any longer, and they look to us in this House to restore the credibility of the institution. That's why I think it is so important what you are doing.

Mr. Speaker, I know that we are to speak to the Chair and that we are not to address our comments to the country as a whole, but I would encourage people, Mr. Speaker, if they are so moved, to call the Democratic leadership of this House and ask if the judge's simple request—the continuing chairmanship of the Ways and Means—might not be addressed by House leadership. Then perhaps we could have more than just a tabling of the motion. When the gentleman from Texas has gone to a great deal of difficulty to bring this privileged motion to the floor, then all we do is table a motion with no debate and with no actual discussion as to the merits of that motion.

I think the gentleman made a great point last week, and he made a great point again today when the motion was read on the floor. It is institutionally important that we establish credibility here on the floor of this House. We don't have it in the country, and we've got a number of big problems to get past, and it only makes that work that much harder.

So we have the chairman of the Ways and Means—the largest tax-writing body in the free world—who cannot do his own taxes because they're too complicated. I'll tell you what. There was a day back in Texas in the mid-'90s when my predecessor in my congressional seat introduced a bill called a flat tax, and I thought that was a great idea. Why do taxes have to be so hard? It turns out they're too hard for the chairman of the Ways and Means, and they're too hard for the Secretary of the Treasury. Well, yes. Then it's no great news that they're too hard for the rest of us as well.

I think we should do fundamental tax reform. I, frankly, don't understand why that has been so difficult to get through this House under both Republican and now Democratic leadership. We should do that. We should take on that fundamental work because the American people want us to do so.

Again, I commend the gentleman from Texas for bringing this issue to the floor of the House. I know it wasn't easy for him to do so, and he does attract a certain amount of attention that might be unwanted by doing this, but it was so important, and it is so important to the credibility of the institution. Therefore, it is so important to every one of us who serves in this body during this 111th session of Congress.

I think that the words of the President that are up on the poster just could not be clearer, which is that there is one standard for the powerful and one standard for the ordinary folks who are working every day and who are paying their taxes. That is wrong. It has to change. The place to change would be that of the chairman of the Ways and Means, and the time to change would be first thing tomorrow morning.

I yield back.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time we have left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ADLER of New Jersey). The gentleman from Texas has 11 minutes remaining.

Mr. CARTER. Thank you very much, and I thank my friend for coming in and for joining me in this hour as we discuss this matter.

In my lifetime, I have had to make a lot of tough decisions and have had to do a lot of tough things. I was telling one of my colleagues on the floor of the House today that I can remember the first time that I had to look a person in the eye and sentence him to death under Texas law. My heart was beating 100 beats a minute, and my blood pressure was probably through the roof. It

was a very difficult situation to face. It's just as difficult a situation for me when I respect the Members of this House to raise these issues, but I've spent all of my adult life in the business of trying to just bring fairness and truth to the forefront in whatever I've done, both as a judge and now as a Congressman.

I am no saint. Anybody who thinks I'm standing up here saying I've not made mistakes in my life doesn't know me or doesn't know Texas or doesn't know the life we live. We've all made mistakes in our lives, and mistakes can be honest mistakes, but this is an institution.

It pains me to think that little boys and little girls who might be in elementary school are hearing on television and at their breakfast tables comments from their parents: "Everybody in Washington is a crook. Everybody in Washington is lazy and gets special treatment. They're all a bunch of 'no goods.' We ought to throw every one of them out." They hear those things about Members of Congress, and maybe it applies to some, but it doesn't apply to the vast majority on both sides of the aisle. I can say that. So we're being painted with a brush, and that brush is full of paint because the media continually keeps it full of paint, and it's out there, painting us, until we're the black-hearted people of this world.

Yet, when I was a little boy many, many, many years ago, you know, we revered Members of Congress. When I went to school, all I heard was what a wonderful, great, democratic institution it was, the most revered institution on Earth—the United States Congress—and what wonderful, great men and women served. Do you know what? They were the same kind of men and women who serve today. They weren't any different. They weren't any more dedicated than the people who serve here today. They were the same kind of people.

I, that little boy in the first grade, was hearing Congress discussed at my mama and daddy's breakfast table. Even when my mother and father disagreed with something that Congress was doing, they still acknowledged them as special people—giving to the democracy that we hold dear, giving of their time and their talent and, quite frankly, giving of their lives, some of them, their very lives.

I know that, today, we celebrated 50 years of Chairman DINGELL's service to this House—the longest serving Member in the history of the Congress. So you can clearly say that JOHN DINGELL gave his entire adult life to this institution. That should be revered in the eyes of everybody, and that should not be tainted with somebody's saying, "dirty deeds are done by every Member of Congress; they're all evil and no good," because my colleagues and friends everywhere, that is not true, and that is why we have to raise issues on ourselves.

We are a body that has chosen as part of its governing unit a committee whose sole purpose is to judge ourselves. There are other institutions that do this. The bar associations in most cities of most States have bar committees that judge members of the bar, who are the lawyers. I may be mistaken, but I believe that the medical community judges itself and raises ethical issues on the medical community. I believe, in the accounting community, the accountants judge the ethics of the accounting community. So we're not unusual by setting up a group of our Members to judge our Members, but we have more of a standard to live with than that.

Our standard should be that we judge ourselves, that we try not to even appear to have committed some kind of impropriety. Avoid the appearance of impropriety. That is where we need to go. That is where we need to be. When things arise, we need to raise these issues, and we need to talk about them and talk about them not out of hate or out of politics. We need to talk about them out of love for the institution and say to ourselves, "What is my part of this, and what should I do?"

When I wrote the letter to Chairman RANGEL, I think that's kind of what I was saying. Mr. Chairman, this is the way ordinary folks get treated. You're not getting treated that way. Why don't you ask them to treat you that way? That's all I asked. I didn't say, "Resign." I didn't say, "Support the Rangel Rule." I said that. Then I said, "If you can't, then will you support my Rangel Rule?" That was the purpose. That was to remind him that we have an issue here, an issue of unfairness.

I think I'm going to be willing to give back some time tonight because I don't want to go off on another position that we can't complete, but we'll be back, and we'll be talking some more about ethics.

I would remind this body as a group that we all have a duty and a responsibility to try to live up to the standards that have been pronounced by the Speaker and now by the President of the United States that we be the most open, honest and ethical Congress in history and that we not have one standard for the powerful and another standard for the ordinary folks. Those are good goals to accomplish. I am going to step forward during this period of time in my life and try to get this body to accomplish those goals. If I can do that, I will go home and smile to my folks back home and say, "I did the best I could."

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

THE PROGRESSIVE CAUCUS

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

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, my name is KEITH ELLISON, and I am here once again to help represent the progressive message of the Progressive Caucus.

We are really, really pleased to be joined tonight by an absolutely stellar leader in our great country, none other than the chairwoman of the Progressive Caucus, the co-chairperson, LYNN WOOLSEY of California. Let me yield a little bit of time to the honorable chairwoman because, when she is on the floor, representing our great caucus in this great body in this great country, it is always fun to listen to what she shares with us. Actually, she is going to share a little bit about a letter that the Progressive Caucus wrote, among other things. I am just going to yield the floor to Congresswoman LYNN WOOLSEY for a moment so she can get us started off right.

Congresswoman LYNN WOOLSEY, how are you today?

Ms. WOOLSEY. I'm fine, KEITH. Thank you again for pulling together a Progressive Caucus Special Order and for making it something that we want to come down here and talk from our perspectives about as to what's going on in our Congress and in our country and overall in our world.

Right now, this country of ours, this Congress of ours and certainly every single person I saw in my district—Marin and Sonoma Counties—over the weekend are all talking about one thing, and that is the stimulus package, the recovery package, that we are debating between the House and the Senate. Now, after 1 week and 1 day of electing a new President, the House passed the President's recovery package, and we are proud of it. The Senate has changed it slightly—considerably. Really and truly, 90 percent is overlap in one way or another, but there are some misses that our leadership will have to deal with in conference.

I don't know how many people understand what happens when the House passes a piece of legislation on an issue and then when the Senate passes a different piece of legislation on the same issue. In order to have a law, we have to have conferencing between the House and the Senate. It's bipartisan with Republicans and Democrats. The conferees go into a room, and they start working out the differences. The only thing they talk about is where the two pieces of legislation differ and where they can come together and agree.

So now, what does this have to do with the Progressive Caucus?

□ 2130

Well, your Chairs of the Progressive Caucus, myself and RAÚL GRIJALVA, wrote a letter to the conferees asking for four important issues to be strengthened in conference between the House and the Senate.

And maybe what you would like to do, KEITH—I will talk about the first section and then hand it over to you to comment on, and then we'll go to the

second, and third, and fourth; and then by then, we will be pretty much out of here.

Mr. ELLISON. You bet.

Ms. WOOLSEY. So I'm not going to go through all of the introduction that we said in the letter except we said, "As the co-Chairs of the Progressive Caucus, we write to you today to express our great concern about H.R. 1, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Bill of 2009. And we would like our leadership in conference to pay attention to four major issues."

The first one, investing in America's future. Our children. And then we went on to say that in the Senate bill, almost half of the funding cuts come from education. We consider this irresponsible, we consider it shortsighted. Eliminating funding for school construction not only hurts our Nation's children, but it also impedes job growth. What perfect growth for jobs is building schools for our kids that they need, and at the same time, providing jobs that pay a liveable wage.

Additionally, the Senate cut funding for Head Start, Head Start and early Head Start, from 2.1 billion to 1.05 billion. And in our letter we said that this chips away at our Nation's future and places an overwhelming burden on families already feeling the strain of a bleak economy and that we requested that our leadership return the funding to the House-passed levels.

Mr. ELLISON. Well, Chairwoman, thank you for yielding back.

I want to say—and just to agree with you—that investing in our young people, young people going to Head Start is one of the very best investments that any society can make. And you can get conservative economists, you can get liberal economists, any kind of economists you want; they can tell you that the biggest bang for the buck is investing in early childhood education, programs like Head Start.

You're right to point out as well, Madam Chair, that we have about 90 percent of the House and Senate bill is overlapping, but there's that 10 percent that we're here to advocate about. And I think it's important that the American people know that the Progressive Caucus is going to be in there fighting for an inclusive version that embraces all Americans.

And I want to thank you and Chairman RAÚL GRIJALVA for writing that letter. That's the kind of leadership that the American people expect from you.

And I just want to also add that education is a critical point. The House bill allocated 2.1 billion for funding for programs to prepare children. And that was cut to about 1 billion in the Senate side.

But let me also talk about higher education.

The House voted to provide about 6 billion for higher education while the Senate compromised, ultimately eliminated 3.5 billion for higher education facility modernization and purchase of instructional equipment.

Right now, as you know, Madam Chair, when a recession like the kind we're in right now, what do people do as they try to figure out what to do as they've been unemployed? They often go to school to try to upgrade their skills. And the opportunity to do this, the investment in that, has been not as fully there as it could be as it is in the House version.

So we want folks to know that they can do something about this. The conferees are confereeing, and, you know, this is something that Americans don't have to sit back. It's not over yet. It's not done yet. This cake is still baking. So it's a time to try to be back involved.

I yield back.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Well, and now, KEITH, the second issue we addressed is investing in America's States and local communities. Recognizing the squeeze being put on State and local governments, the House, rightfully, set aside assistance—assistance to ease the financial crisis right here at home. That was slashed in the Senate's bill. It was slashed to \$39 billion, which was a \$49 billion reduction. States are seeing crises within education, within health care, job training, welfare programs; and it's really unclear, right now, how many States and localities will be able to function without the above-mentioned funding streams.

And we requested that our conferees returned funding to the House-passed levels.

Mr. ELLISON. Well, you know, I'm glad you mentioned that because Mark Zandy, who, again, was an adviser to JOHN MCCAIN, a Republican, said that the way to really stimulate the economy is to put it in certain areas and not so much in others.

And if you look on this chart right here, Zandy's Estimates For a Multiplier Effect For Various Policy Proposals, what you find is that spending money for States has a pretty good stimulative effect. Right down here, "revenue transfers to State governments." For every dollar we put into that, that will generate \$1.36. That's an important expenditure right there that we could use to really stimulate the economy.

This will bring back good benefits to the economy. So for the Senate to shortchange us by \$40 billion is a mistake.

Let me also say, too, that these are good jobs, these are—we're talking about cops, fire fighters, we're talking about people who are really out there filling potholes, doing important jobs, making sure that people are getting workforce training and development. These are critical functions.

And you know what? I read, Madam Chair, that if you were to add up all of the State budget deficits that are current right now, it would amount to about \$350 billion. I know my own State of Minnesota has about a \$5 billion deficit. I know California, your State, is in need.

So the thing is that what we're trying to do is make sure that we don't have layoffs at the State, that we don't have service cuts at the State, and that we're continuing to bolster and pump our economy up.

So I'm glad you brought the aid to States out because it's very critical, very important.

And I might add that temporary increase in food stamps has a very stimulative effect. For every \$1, \$1.73 is going to come back; increasing infrastructure, for every \$1, \$1.59 comes back.

Now, I might add, Madam Chair, that certain things do not have a very stimulative effect. Things that don't really do much good in the situation we're in right now would be making income taxes that are expiring in 2010 permanent. That would not help. That has a very minimal stimulative effect. These kinds of things won't help. Making expiring capital gains tax cuts permanent has less—we put \$1 in, we get less than \$1 out. These kinds of things are important to keep in mind as we look at the stimulus proposal.

Thank you. Let me yield back to you.

Ms. WOOLSEY. The other thing we have to remember, Congressman ELLISON, every single economist has told us you have to spend the right amount enough, otherwise it doesn't matter what you spend because it won't do the job.

Mr. ELLISON. That's right.

Ms. WOOLSEY. And we have lobbied for a really bold stimulus package. I personally would have had a package that had the tax cuts on top of the spending, and it probably would have totaled over \$1.2 billion.

Mr. ELLISON. Trillion.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Trillion dollars. Thank you. I still have a hard time saying "trillion" when I'm talking numbers.

And that, I believe, would have been what we needed. Because, you see, we're only going to have one bite at this apple. I don't believe we're going to get a second chance. So I think it should be as bold as it can possibly be.

And the third "ask" in our letter to the conferees was regarding investing in America's future, home ownership. We see this as one of the key elements in the Bush recession, the housing crisis that can be felt from Wall Street to Main Street. And that's why we think that the Senate action was actually wrongheaded.

The Senate bill zeroes out \$2.25 billion in funding for the Neighborhood Stabilization Program, which would have provided funds to States and localities to purchase and rehabilitate abandoned and foreclosed homes.

The House allocated \$4.19 billion for that program. We requested that our leadership return the funding to the House-passed levels so that we would then make a statement about how important housing and neighborhoods are and that we shore up the neighborhoods that are suffering the most.

Mr. ELLISON. You know, Madam Chair, no one has to tell you. You've been a parent. You've raised a family. You know how it is.

Ms. WOOLSEY. If you will yield a minute.

Mr. ELLISON. Well, let me yield.

Ms. WOOLSEY. I've been on welfare. I've moved—man, I can really relate to what's happening with people right now.

My children, they were one, three, and five years old. Their father was emotionally ill, and he left us; and I went to work, of course. I mean, they were my babies. I wanted to take care of them and did. But I couldn't make ends meet. So I kept my work and kept my job. This was 40 years ago, remember that.

But we had to go on Aid For Dependent Children to round off childcare and health care. And we got so much more in aid and help then, 40 years ago, than poor people do now, poor moms. And I just don't know how they're making ends meet.

We moved from a really nice home. We had two cars. I was 29 years old. We were the ideal family. And it just turned inside out.

And my kids and I moved to a little two-bedroom cottage. I bought a little beat up Volkswagen, drove it to work every day. It had a flower on the side—this was in the 1960s, of course. But it was so hard. And we got so much help, more help than families get today.

And that's why we want families in the stimulus recovery package to recover along with others that are going to get helped.

Mr. ELLISON. You know, Madam Chairwoman, it's so important that you share that personal experience because there might be people watching this broadcast right now thinking, "Man, you know, am I just like a bad luck accident? Am I just like somebody who can't make it? Is it my fault that I am unemployed? Is it my fault that something happened? We had mental illness in the family," through no fault of their own. They're feeling like, "Wow, you know, it's not working for me."

So when you stand up here on this House floor as a Member of Congress saying, "I have been there myself," it gives them great courage, and it makes them feel like there is a tomorrow; and it makes them feel like there are some people in this body who care and who understand what they're going through. Because, you know, I got charts and graphs up here with numbers; and, you know, you're choking on the world "trillion," and of course it's all ridiculous.

But the point is that it is people who we're here fighting for. That's why the Progressive Caucus was formed. That's why we exist. Because the story that you just told, there are, unfortunately, too many stories like that being told. And there has got to be somebody in this body who will stand up for folks who are fighting, who are trying to

make it, who are trying to take care of those three kids.

I am so proud of our Nation that there was, at one time in our history, when we understood that welfare wasn't anything to be ashamed of. It was what we did for our neighbors because we, ourselves, could be in a tough situation. It was saying we're going to step up for our neighbors; we're not going to let them go without because we all know that we're one accident, one medical problem, one job loss away from being in that situation ourselves.

So this is what a caring Nation does. It says that yeah, you may be living that middle class dream, but you don't know what's going to happen to you next year. And we are here for you because we're all Americans and we care about each other. This is the kind of thing the Progressive Caucus stands for, and it's why I'm so proud that you are our chairperson.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Thank you, KEITH.

And, you know, I'm going to go into our fourth "ask" of the conferees, but I think it's important to say because this is probably why we're fighting so hard. When I was on welfare, I used to say to my friends—I was on welfare for 3 years, working the whole time. I would say to my friends, "Well, I don't know how other women do this." They think, "Are you crazy? What do you care about other women? You're working. You're going to be off of it pretty soon."

But, you know, I always knew that I was educated. I had college—hadn't graduated but I had several years of college. I had great job skills, I was as healthy as a horse, my kids were really healthy. And, you know, I was assertive so I could make things happen. And I always worried that other women with children didn't have those same privileges that I had, actually, in growing up.

□ 2145

And it's never left me. It has never entered my mind that I made it; so why can't you? I know how important that help was.

Mr. ELLISON. That's right.

Ms. WOOLSEY. The Federal Government was there for me and my family, and you have to believe I've paid back.

Mr. ELLISON. Reclaiming my time, you know, the Federal Government has been there for so many of us, even those of us who are under the mad delusion that we did it all ourselves. You know, you may be a big successful businessperson, but you get out of the bed in the morning knowing that if somehow you had a medical problem, 911, you could call them, and the EMS truck—that's the government—would come take care of you and take you to the hospital.

If you do manage to get all banged up and clean, the water coming out of the shower, somebody's inspected it to make sure that it wasn't going to poison you.

You get in your car and you get out on the road, that's the government,

too, buddy, making sure that you have a decent road to go on.

And then because people aren't driving a gazillion miles an hour driving crazy, there's a cop out there making sure that people obey traffic rules. That's the government as well.

And there is a light that's properly regulating the traffic flow, the government. And then you drive to work and you see your employees, and you know what, they were educated in public school, the government again.

And after all of that help you turn around and said I did it all myself, and I don't want to pay these taxes because they're reaching in my back pocket, wait a minute; we've been helping you every single step of the way. Maybe the invention that you sell was on a government research grant.

So many opportunities are afforded us because we come together, because we are a society that operates for the common good, and yet, we have some people who only want to say that it's all me, I did everything, it's just me, I don't want to pay any taxes, I don't want to help anybody out, I don't care about any poor people. I don't care if a husband had a mental health issue, couldn't maintain his livelihood; she ends up having to turn to a welfare system which really is a caring society. I don't care about them. I don't care about those three kids. I don't care about those homeless people.

That kind of psychology is why we exist to try to tell people that we're better off together than we are apart. We're not trying to stop you from being able to do your own thing, but don't forget about the rest of us as you do your own thing.

The taxes are what we pay to live in a civilized society. The taxes are what we pay if we want good roads, good water, clean meat, if you want to be able to eat a peanut and not fall out from salmonella poisoning. This is what it's all about.

If you want to make sure that some of those women who were not as lucky as you, maybe who didn't have those job skills, maybe just weren't as fortunate as you, but we do have a system in place to do workforce training so they can get these skills and take care of themselves because we all want to be able to take care of ourselves. This is why the Progressive Caucus exists.

So let me yield back to you again.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Well, just to finish this thought, every person we help who gets back on his or her feet pays back to the community and to the greater good.

Mr. ELLISON. That's right.

Ms. WOOLSEY. And that's what happens to most people who get help; some, not, but most do.

So, knowing that, the fourth issue we have of asking of our conferees in our Progressive Caucus letter that our two co-chairs signed is investing in America's health care.

Mr. ELLISON. Very important.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Fewer Americans have access to insurance and health

care. The House appropriately invested in immediate and preventive care. The Senate bill cuts \$5.8 billion that was directed towards grants and contracts to prevent illness through health screenings, through education; malnutrition, immunization, nutrition counseling; media campaigns and other activities related to health.

The House actually had set aside \$3 billion for prevention and wellness, and furthermore, the Senate version cut \$5 billion that is intended to help unemployed workers pay for health insurance, reducing the Federal subsidy under COBRA coverage to 50 percent from 66 percent. That's something I have no idea how somebody can be out of work, living on unemployment, and afford COBRA. I mean that would eat up one whole person's unemployment or both family members that are working.

So, practically speaking, the Senate bill ignores the fact that many States who have unemployment insurance benefits that are covering or need to cover the newly unemployed workers will receive less money for the unemployed workers and for pay for food or housing, and that's going to really wipe out our States. And then individuals who have to pay COBRA health coverage, that wipes them out, and we're not going to help them if you don't change that in the conference.

So that's health care that's not going to be supported like it should.

Mr. ELLISON. So let's look over the four things. Number one, the Progressive Caucus is in there pitching hard for education; two, for aid to the States; three, for homeownership; four, health care. The Progressive Caucus is fighting for America's people. I'm so proud of the leadership that you and Congressman GRIJALVA offer to us.

Let me also add on this health care front, the pandemic food preparedness. That's a serious health care issue, and the House version included \$900 million for food and the original Senate proposal only had \$870 million. That could be a big difference for people who really need the help.

I also want to just add on a few other items if I may. You mentioned the neighborhood stabilization program, very important program, and I want to mention that which I believe was the third item that we asked for in the Progressive Caucus letter.

The neighborhood stabilization program helps local communities say that, look, if you have a bunch of foreclosures on a block, we're going to try to go in there and do something with that abandoned house because you know that if you have never missed a payment on your mortgage, you up-keep your property, you do a great job with your house, the second you get a foreclosed property next to you, your property value has just dropped. If somebody doesn't move into that house, and oftentimes they don't, the lawn may not get cut, the pipes may burst, people might steal the copper

out of them, and it just creates a real nuisance to the whole neighborhood and drags the whole neighborhood down.

Again, back to this idea of some people believe, well, I don't want to help anybody out of foreclosure because I paid all my bills. Well, look, if you can have the value of your home protected by making sure that people don't get foreclosed upon or that if they do, the foreclosed property doesn't just go down, that is helping you. That is helping you. But it's helping you in a way that recognizes you're a member of the community and not out there all by yourself.

I also wanted to mention, as you mentioned, as we talked, there are other things like infrastructure development we've got to keep fighting for. Rural broadband access. In the Senate compromise, funding to increase broadband access in rural areas and other underserved parts of the country was reduced from \$9 billion to \$7 billion. That's more than twice as much as the House has offered.

Also Byrne Justice Assistance Grants, let me tell you these help fund a lot of the police departments around the country. The fact is that we cannot stop protecting the public just because we have a recession. A lot of police departments, local governments as we talked about before, are under a lot of pressure, and the Senate proposal trims additions to the Byrne Justice Assistance Grant Program which provides formula funding to State and local police. And the compromise would cut \$450 million from Byrne grants, reducing funding from \$1.5 billion to just about \$1 billion, and that's not a good thing. We need to be able to stick out there.

And I also can't neglect home weatherization services, where the House bill allows for a Federal program that provides funding to increase energy efficiency for low-income families. The Senate allocates only \$2.9 billion for the program, while the House had 6.2. And of course, LIHEAP, I know that's a favorite program of everybody. Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program, unlike the House bill, the Senate version does not include additional funds for LIHEAP, which help low-income families pay utility bills.

So, again, the House bill is much better, and we hope that the conferees fight for the House version of the bill because that is what would help America much better.

Ms. WOOLSEY. And if the gentleman will yield, nine-tenths of the list that you read off creates jobs. I mean, it doesn't just upgrade the home and keep and make it energy efficient, which is so important, but the people doing the work are employed, and they're employed in jobs that pay a livable wage, and that is so important.

And one of the things we asked, not as one of the four key areas of the conferees, but that we let them know that we're concerned about the Senate's

package in their investment in jobs because we wanted them to focus on green technology, and we wanted them to focus on veterans, and we absolutely are insisting that they maintain the prevailing wage. I mean, if we're going to have Federal funds, if we're going to be creating jobs, we do not want to create jobs for slave labor, and we want jobs that can make the worker independent and able to take care of his or her family.

Mr. ELLISON. A good, livable wage, green jobs.

Let me say that the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, which is moving its way through Congress at this time, different House and Senate version, 90 percent of it overlaps but there are some important differences we just talked about.

The bill, the Democrat bill quite frankly, H.R. 1, which passed through the House, would create about 3.7 million jobs. That's a lot of jobs. The House Republican plan would only create 1.3 million jobs.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Still a lot of jobs but we can do better.

Mr. ELLISON. We can do more than twice as better. So we can't just do as the little we can do. We've got to do as much as we can do because unemployment is a serious issue.

It's important to understand that jobs lost in the last 13 months is we've lost 3.6 million jobs. So, if we want to recover what we've lost in the last 13 months, we've got to have a bill like the House plan, and if we don't, we're going to be in a real situation.

And folks need to understand—and I know you understand this very well—you know, if I lose my job, then I'm not going to get that haircut because I really cannot afford it. That's a 20 bucks I'm not going to spend. So now the barber didn't get that 20 bucks. Maybe there's a few other people who can't get their hair cut. So now maybe the barber's not making enough money to make his rent. So now he has got to say maybe I can't do barbering, maybe I've got to close down my little shop now because I don't have the volume of traffic coming in. So now this is a person out of work. So now maybe the barber would go to the diner across the street and eat lunch every day. They're not buying meals.

So this thing has a ripple effect. So that's why it's important for us to pass a jobs and stimulus bill but a smart bill that invests in long-term recovery.

You know what, I want to show you another jobs chart up here, and again, you very clearly pointed out the individual human toll. But just to do a little numbers for a moment, Job Losses in Recent Recessions. Now, if you look at that blue line, this is the recession of 1990. This is the 1990 recession. We were coming out of George Bush, the First, and that was the 1990 recession with the first George Bush. And so we had a recession then, and that was a Republican time and we had a recession, and those things seem to go together for some reason. But anyway,

we had another recession in 2001 when Bush came into office. You know, Bill Clinton left America with a budget surplus.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Right.

Mr. ELLISON. And you know, the other party got in and they took care of that surplus real quick. But the 2001 recession dipped us down. We lost the volume job loss relative to the peak month. This is way down.

□ 2200

Now, the current recession is off the chart. That is the green line. Pow. We are not even measuring how far down. We don't know how far down we are going to go.

Ms. WOOLSEY. This is not finished.

Mr. ELLISON. This is not finished. And the fact is that the job losses that we are looking at—3.6 since when the recession started in December, 2007. Something must be done. We have to act now. Anybody who knows anything about economics knows that.

And I will say this: while I really want the Senate version to improve, and I really am going to fight for that and encourage people to get on those conferees and have a better bill come out, I know that we have to do something. No action is no option.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Right. We need to pass the stimulus. The other thing the economists tell us, and they are absolutely right, we know that, besides—the first thing they tell us is, It's got to be big enough to make a difference. The second thing they tell us is, It's got to be done quickly.

So we really have to come to agreement this week and get on with taking care of the recovery that people need in this country. We need to be making people first, we need to have people in need—we need to help them. We need to create jobs, we need to spur innovation, and this economy can and must get back on track.

Mr. ELLISON. Now, I want to say, if the gentlady yields back, that the American people are behind us here. Sixty-seven percent approved of President Obama's efforts to pass the stimulus. Only 25 percent disapproved. The Democrats in Congress scored a 48 percent approval rating. That is way up from before.

And we had 42 percent of those disapprove of actions in Congress' majority. Unfortunately, the party on the other side of the aisle, the Republicans in Congress, have an approval rating of only 31 percent. But I think they could do better if they support the bill. I would love to see them improve their popularity by supporting the bill.

It will be great to have a bipartisan bill. The first time it went through, we couldn't get one Republican vote, even though President Obama came to talk with them, even though he reached his hand out, even though he extended himself to try to get to this post-partisan world that we all really, really want. But he put his hand out and they left him hanging.

Maybe it's going to come back around, and we can get a few Republican votes next time. But I just want to make clear that the American people are on the side of a stimulus package that will help them get back to work, and they believe that the President's doing the right thing by pushing this bill.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Also, Congressman, they knew who dug this hole. I mean, this is a deep, deep hole that our new President, Barack Obama, inherited. And expectations are that he dig us out of it and go forward at the same time. Now that is going to be very hard. But we are going to do our part in working with him to make sure this can happen. But it cannot happen overnight. We have to know that that hole is so deep that we don't know where the bottom is yet.

So it seems so odd to me that the same people who dug the hole are the ones who are saying, We want to keep doing it the way we did it all along. The only way to solve this problem is to cut taxes some more.

Mr. ELLISON. If the gentlady would yield back, you know the definition of insanity, right?

Ms. WOOLSEY. Doing the same thing over and over.

Mr. ELLISON. And expecting a different result. Deregulation and tax cuts got us into this mess. But fair regulation and shared prosperity is going to get us out. And that's why the Progressive Caucus is here tonight, talking about the progressive message.

Here's the Web site right down here. Congressional Progressive Caucus. Here's the Web site.

If the gentlady from California feels that we made our point tonight, what we are going to do is hand it over. But I think before we do, any parting comments you would like to make?

Ms. WOOLSEY. I would just like to thank you, Congressman ELLISON, for what you're doing here to help the country see what the progressive "ask" is. We have a progressive promise that will go over with them one of these days soon. But right now the most important thing we can do is stabilize the economy for those in this country. And it's going to affect everybody.

I believe you're totally right. People are with us because they get it. If they are not hurting themselves yet, they certainly know many people who are.

Mr. ELLISON. That's right. So this is the progressive message, this 1-hour Special Order that the Progressive Caucus comes to the American people to talk about what is really happening, Mr. Speaker. We have been fortunate to have the chairperson of the Progressive Caucus, who's been offering tremendous leadership, not only on economics, not only on an inclusive economics system, but also on war and peace. That's another thing that you have done such a great job on.

How many 5-minute speeches have you given on the issue of peace?

Ms. WOOLSEY. Over 290.

Mr. ELLISON. I don't think there's anyone who's done nearly as many. I think you probably have, like, broken a record somewhere along the line.

Ms. WOOLSEY. People say to me, Why do you do that? You're just talking to an empty room. First of all, it's not an empty room because people are watching us. But that 5 minutes is the only 5 minutes I have every day that I can control my subject without it having to be part of what everybody else's agenda is. And, I am telling you, I said I was going to keep talking until our troops were home from Iraq. And, guess what? They aren't home yet.

Mr. ELLISON. So you're going to keep talking.

Ms. WOOLSEY. I am.

Mr. ELLISON. Let me say, just like you have been there day in and day out, talking about peace, bringing our veterans home, we are going to be here week after week doing a Special Order with the progressive message. We are going to be encouraging people to get involved. It's not just about an outcome, it's also about a process.

We want to encourage people to get involved. What can you do? You can write, you can call. You can raise your voice and let your voice be heard.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairwoman of the Progressive Caucus, and we will yield back our time.

HOW TO DEAL WITH THE ECONOMIC CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. It's an honor and a privilege to be recognized to address you here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives. It's interesting and intriguing for me to listen to the dialog that flows forth from earlier this evening, the gentleman from Texas, and now the voices of the Congressional Progressive Caucus as they put their poster up on the floor that directs people to their Web site and make their argument as to the things that are in this stimulus package that they believe should stay and the things that are not in and may have been taken out that they believe should have stayed in or be put back in.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that this debate that we have is much deeper and much more profound than the components that have been discussed here in the previous hour. I think it goes to our vision of America itself. And the question that is before this country is, in some sense, What will we do in the middle of this economic crisis, this one that came tumbling down upon us on September 19, the date that Secretary of the Treasury Paulson came to the Capitol and very intensely insisted that we provide \$700 billion for him to spend at his discretion, without a lot of oversight, perhaps with no oversight,

and provided that bailout money in two different increments, \$350 billion in the first increment, and then congressional disapproval would have been required in order to block the second \$350 billion.

So the entire \$700 billion of the bailout money has been advanced into the hands of the Secretary of the Treasury who has some problems of his own. Those would be of his own intent to pay his taxes, et cetera, Mr. Speaker.

This discussion that is being led by the President of the United States and his position that we must do something, we must do it fast, we can't do it half-way, we must do it all the way, and his insistence that we not flag and that we not fail, and that we come forward and support this stimulus plan has galvanized its support in the House of Representatives and in the Senate behind a single simple philosophy that seems to justify the capitulation of the responsibility to each of us Members to draw a reason and informed judgment and do the right thing for our country, for our State, for our district.

And this decision is this. Pulling back in behind this logic, which is, President Obama has called for a stimulus plan. It shall spend \$800 billion, or more, plus the interest, which will be about \$350 billion in addition to that, and it will have a mix that has some small business stimulation in it, some infrastructure in it, and a lot of other things, which are the bells and whistles and wish list to the left, Mr. Speaker. It's all packed in there.

And the Members, especially the Members on the Democrat side of the aisle here, and the U.S. Senators of the same political party, they will argue and defend component by component. But the rationale that's going on in the minds of the Members and the caucus is this: Well, we must do something. We know we have an economic crisis. This is the only thing that we can choose from because that is what has been served up to this Congress by the Speaker of the House, by the majority leader in the United States Senate, and by the President of the United States, who happened to be, not coincidentally, the three people in the United States that could come together in one room and set the direction for this entire country and not have to go outside that room and ask anybody for their input, for their knowledge, their wisdom base, that of their constituents.

A lesson from history, a look through the looking glass into the future? Sometimes it feels like we have gone through the looking glass here, Mr. Speaker.

But here's the question that is before us. In an economic crisis, with a crisis of confidence in our financial institutions, a crisis of capital that arises more out of that lack of confidence than it does out of a slowdown of production or slowdown in the markets—it's the other way around. It's the crisis in the capital that is backing up and causing these slowdowns.

But to look through the history of the economy of the United States, or the free world, for that matter, and for an economist to ask themselves, and all of us should be at least amateur economists here. We're making decisions for the people of the United States of America.

But they ask themselves, What has happened historically and economically that we have addressed from this Congress that has been improved, and how did we do so? So, we take ourselves back through this history, and I can think of the economic crisis we had in the eighties. I saw the charts, Mr. Speaker, that were put up here on the floor that show—well, what shall I call them? Bush 41's recession and then Bush 43's recession. That seems that's how it was presented by the Congressional Progressive Caucus.

No. We have had some real economic crises in our past. One of them was what we called in the Midwest the farm crisis, which was not limited to the farm crisis but it also was a real estate and an energy crisis. And during those years of the eighties, when things were very tough economically and statistically worse than they are today, although I won't argue that things today will not get that bad, Mr. Speaker.

But in the eighties we lost 3,000 banks. Many, many farms went under. We lost a lot of oil rigs out there that they were producing and tapping into our energy. The crisis in the real estate was a big piece of it too. Three thousand banks. The FDIC came in and closed a lot of them. In fact, they shut my bank down on April 26, Friday afternoon, three o'clock, 1985. I remember the red tag on the door. Closed by order of the banking commissioner. Highway patrol guarding the door, Mr. Speaker.

Those were some tough times. And what did we do then? Well, we didn't do a lot of the things that are being proposed today. There was some plans that came out. One of the things we did was we provided net worth certificates to shore up some of the banks that needed some collateral. They accepted a look over their shoulder from the FDIC and asked them to shore up their operations. Those banks that received that kind of collateralization, all came out of it. Every one of them was part of that. All succeeded.

We found a way through this, and we sold some real estate down to the value of the real estate. New buyers came in that could borrow the money or had the cash to make the purchases because there were some bargains out there. When those bargains got picked up, the markets came up. Real estate prices stabilized. Banks became stable again. The confidence was back in our economy again.

That was a long decades of the eighties. A lot was wrong. A lot was more wrong going into the eighties than we are seeing today. We had high unemployment then. We had high inflation then—inflation that ran up to-

wards 20 percent. And I personally paid 22 percent interest for operating capital to keep my business running through a tough, tough decade of economic times.

□ 2215

We are not seeing 22 percent interest today, Mr. Speaker. And our employment rates, yes, they are going up, and we have over 10 million people in America that are at least statistically looking for jobs. It is not as bad as it was then, yet. And the eighties were not as bad as they were in the thirties. And when we look at the thirties, there should be some lessons there for us. And I sat in classroom after classroom getting my classical education; and one historian, government teacher, economist after another would fill our little brains full of the knowledge base that has been learned from history, that we had an economic calamity in 1929 and the stock market crashed and people jumped out of the windows to their death because they couldn't sustain the grief of watching their net worth go down. Well, if you look historically, it is pretty hard to find anybody that jumped out of the window. It wasn't as bad as they said, from that standpoint of Wall Street suicides, at least.

Then, through those times Herbert Hoover was President, and he had great confidence in his ability to manage. And so he came forward with the Smoot-Hawley Act, which was trade protectionism, and there was global retaliation. And then our industry and our manufacturing and our exports lost a lot of their markets because of the trade protectionism. Each country around the world did a lot of the same thing; they pulled back within themselves, and the economies began to shut down in that fashion. They opened up the legislation so that unions had a little more powerful leverage when it came to striking. They passed the Davis-Bacon Wage Act; that followed.

But as this economy went down, Herbert Hoover believed that he could manage his way through that. He didn't trust the marketplaces like Calvin Coolidge did, but he trusted his ability to manage, and he lost his reelect. My only Iowa President lost his reelect in 1932 to Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt came in, and he had been influenced by the famous economist Keynes, who advocated that if government just spends enough money, it will create an economy that will have apparently its own inertia, and it will bring us out of this great depression.

So FDR's programs came in one after another, the WTPA, the PWA, the CCC, on and on and on, the TVA. And each time that the Federal Government stepped in and started another program, they competed with the private sector; they competed with the private sector for capital and they competed with the private sector for labor.

Now, if you go back and look at wealthy nations and see what Adam

Smith has to say about the value of any product, he will say and he has written there very extensively that the value of any product is the sum total of the capital and the labor that it takes to produce it, deliver it, market it, and get it into the hands of the consumer. So if you buy a gallon of milk, you add up so many ounces of milk is for the capital that it took, and the balance of it is for the labor that it took for it to deliver. And that is how Adam Smith analyzed it.

But the capital and the labor in the United States was being swallowed up in government. And capital, when it comes in significant quantities in the private sector, the productive sector of the economy, smart money goes to the sidelines rather than compete with government. And that is what happened in the thirties during the great depression: The smart money went to the sidelines, our economy stagnated, and we had soup lines and we had make-work projects and we had hand labor, stoop labor building dams and roads and parks. We commissioned and paid people to go out into the cemeteries and write down everything that they could read off of the stones in the cemeteries so there would be a record. We paid writers to write; we paid painters to paint, because we wanted to pay people to do something, or nothing, so that the borrowed money and those tax dollars could flow out into the economy, into the hands of the people that would spend it.

Sounding pretty familiar right now, Mr. Speaker, this idea of taking dollars and putting it into the hands of people so that they spend it to stimulate the economy. In fact, Keynes himself had I think some fairly radical ideas: Spending money would stimulate the economy. In fact, his approach was that the worse utility that a project had, the more useful it was from a government perspective, from the standpoint that if the government spent money on something that was completely ridiculous, at least they weren't competing with the private sector. So Keynes understood some of the argument that I have just made. He went so far to make the argument that he could solve the unemployment problem during the thirties if we would just take those good old Treasury notes or Federal bills, greenbacks, U.S. cash, put them in jars and take them out to a big old abandoned coal mine and bury those jars around there in that old abandoned coal mine—this is Keynes talking—and then fill the old coal mine up with garbage and turn the laissez faire loose, the free enterprise loose. Let the entrepreneurs go out and dig through the garbage to dig up the money, and that would solve, through the competition of digging up this money that had been buried by the Federal Government, that would solve unemployment.

Now, he may have been a little facetious in that description, I don't know his personality, so I can only speculate that. I hope he was a little facetious.

But I think his point that he wanted to make, that it didn't need to be useful work, it didn't need to be productive work.

President Obama said, "Well, we are not just going to pay people to dig a hole and fill it back up." I thought that was my vernacular; I am the person who spent my life in that business of moving dirt, and on one occasion actually did dig a hole and fill it back up with nothing in it, only one occasion. The man changed his mind in the middle of that operation. But for the President to say we are not just going to dig a hole and fill it back up, but he is modeling his economic model, the President's "new" new deal off of Franklin Delano Roosevelt's "old" new deal, which really was dig a hole and fill it back up sometimes.

And here is the point that I intend to make, Mr. Speaker; and that is, however one would analyze the "old" new deal in the thirties, it is not possible to look at the numbers and come to the conclusion that the new deal solved the depression, the great depression for America. In fact, the best conclusion that one can come to, the most charitable conclusion is that it may have, may have, Mr. Speaker, diminished the depths to which we might have fallen without the new deal in place. Maybe the economy would have gone into a complete straightjacket and tanked and gone forever downward and waited another decade or two to get its confidence back. Maybe. Maybe. I don't believe it would have, but that is the best that one can say. And the trade-off is, if a new deal, a huge massive spending gets poured into the economy for make-work projects, if that diminishes the depths to which we might otherwise fall, the trade-off is certainly it delays the recovery as well. It delays the recovery, because smart money sits on the sidelines. Entrepreneurs have been hired by the government to dig a hole and fill it back up, and smart money always goes where there is some profit, and right now smart money is pulled back to the sidelines. That is why we had some bonds that actually went into the red for just a little bit, for a little while.

There are two sectors of this economy, Mr. Speaker, that we don't talk about very often. The one that is being stimulated and is attempted to be stimulated by the President's proposal, by the components of it that are the Speaker's proposal, or the Senate's proposal, in its aggregate, that one seeks to spend money for the sake of getting it in the hands of consumers. We did that with the rebate program not quite a year ago; and you can look back on the charts for that, Mr. Speaker, and you will not see a blip that that money was spent and injected as stimulus into the economy. \$150 billion in the hands of the American people, and about 30 percent of it actually got spent on new goods and about 70 percent of it went to pay off credit card bills or went into savings. So only 30

percent of the overall proposal, less than \$50 billion, actually went into the economy. It doesn't even show up as a little tick on the line.

Now, \$150 billion I understand, Mr. Speaker, is chump change compared to this massive piece that the Senate has now passed that we expect will be before us very soon. And this piece, when you add it all together, is over \$1 trillion, but it is not much of it money spent that is going into the productive sector of the economy.

The productive sector of the economy is the private sector of the economy; it is the sector that actually produces goods and services that have value. And I have said from this microphone many times, Mr. Speaker, all new wealth comes from the land. You either raise it out of the soil, or you mine it out of the earth. You can seine some fish out of the ocean. That is about the end of it. Otherwise, it comes out of the land. And it has to start there. And out of it comes food and fiber, and from the food and fiber comes the thing we need to live. And as we add on to that, the services that come from the food and the fiber, then you get your insurance man and your doctors and your lawyers and your teachers, and all of the facets of our economy flow from the new wealth that comes from the land. But the things that we need in order to live, the housing, the clothing, the food, the necessities of life and then the niceties of life, they come from the productive sector of the economy.

Then, we have this nonproductive sector of the economy that I sometimes call the parasitic of the economy; and that is the sector that looks over the shoulder of the productive sector and decides: Well, I am going to regulate you and I am going to tax you, and I am going to justify my existence by making it harder for the productive sector to produce. That is what government often does. Government overdoes the overseeing, the overregulating, the taxation, and inhibits production.

So, on the one hand we have the productive sector of the economy that has to carry the entire burden of government, the entire burden of, let me say, the nonproductive sector of the economy in my charitable moments, and we are loading up on the nonproductive sector of the economy and we are not giving enough relief to the productive sector of the economy.

That is what this argument is about: Are you going to have an economy that is stimulated by producing more things that have value, and building the kind of infrastructure that supports commerce and trade, and reducing the kind of taxes that allow smart money to make investments with the confidence that they won't be punished for their success by a Congress or a President that has the idea that a windfall profits tax, for example, is a good way to punish someone who turns a resource

into value and puts it into our economy and pays their share of taxes as it is.

We are heading down this wrong road, this road that the President has identified as: We have to construct the leg of a stool. He didn't say how many legs, but generally, if it is a three-legged stool, they will say so. If it is a two-legged stool, they will say so. It is not a milking stool, I wish it were, Mr. Speaker. But this single leg of this multi-legged stool that the President announces we have to construct and we are going to do it one leg at a time without an idea of what the stool looks like or what the other legs look like or what they are made out of except money. We have one leg that may be back to the floor of this Congress tomorrow and likely this week that cost \$150 billion for a rebate plan not quite a year ago, \$700 billion-plus for the bailout last fall, and 830 or so billion dollars plus \$350 billion in interest on that that is sitting here now waiting to land on the floor of this House. Just add it up in round terms, Mr. Speaker, let's just call it \$2 trillion: \$2 trillion to construct a single leg, and I am tracking the President's words, of a stool that is supposedly going to get us out of this mess that we are in; \$2 trillion. And no one will stand up and say: Here is the effect of this money? Here is what you can expect with the economic indicators? Here is how you will see jobs in the productive sector of the economy grow or investment increase or capital be freed up for entrepreneurs? None of that is there, except to say that we are going to create or save, well, 2.5 million, 3 million, then 4 million jobs. And sometimes they get a little lazy and forget to say create or save, and they just say create 4 million jobs, but in their lucid moments they revert back to the create or save.

Now, I would like to be the one who would announce that I am here, Mr. Speaker, and I am going to create or save 10 million jobs. And 10 years from now you can go back and look, and even if I didn't point to a single job that I created, I can easily point to 10 million jobs that have been saved.

□ 2230

A saved job is not a measurable, quantifiable means of determining any level of success. But it's a word that lets you slip away from being held accountable for a policy that is utterly destined to fail. The New Deal failed. It was a mistake. Historians looking back on it and economists looking back on it can only point to high employment numbers, low economic activity and a stock market that crashed in October of 1929. And in spite of all of the billions of dollars in new Federal spending in the New Deal program, the stock market still didn't reach the peak that it was at in 1929 until 1954.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the President says that World War II was the best, the largest economic stimulus plan ever. Now I don't exactly quibble with those

words on their face. I would just add to that, that it makes it clear that the New Deal didn't solve the Great Depression. He understands that. He argues that FDR should have spent more money, not less, that he lost his nerve, he shouldn't have worried about a balanced budget, and if he had just done enough, if he had just doubled down two or three more times, he would have come out of there as a winner. But World War II came along as the largest economic stimulus plan ever. I won't disagree with that statement.

But I will say this: It didn't quite solve our economic problems. But I believe it did start us on the path to recovery. And by the end of World War II, we hadn't yet recovered. The stock market was still 9 years away from reaching its former apex that it was at in 1929. But I believe that the post-World War II industrial might of the United States, because we were the only industrialized nation in the world that hadn't seen our industry devastated in World War II, gave us a comparative advantage. The greenback was good currency all over the world. We built products for everybody because we could. And many of them had to put back their entire infrastructure in order to be up and running again.

So, yes, World War II was a stimulus plan. But the aftermath of World War II gave a marketplace for America's industrial might to continue, to switch from making tanks to making cars and making other products and exporting them around the world. So a quarter of a century later, after the stock market crashed in 1929, we reached the previous apex and Dow Jones Industrial Average, if that is our measure of recovery, in 25 years.

So here we are today, Mr. Speaker, with an economy that has had its ups and downs. And I could take you back through the short-term history of this. We have created a lot of capital, trillions of dollars worth of capital. Some of it was false. Some of it didn't represent the actual, real value of the assets underneath it. Some of it was because Wall Street had run amok, and they were betting on a long run of a bull market. And the checks and balances weren't in place. And AIG was not calculating the risk and didn't have the capital underneath them in order to back up the insurance that they were providing.

So this has tumbled. But in the end, we need to come back to what is the real estate worth that is underneath this? What are the businesses worth that are part of the shares that are there in our stock market? Let's get down to some real values. And the \$2 trillion leg on a multi-legged stool and not knowing what the stool looks like or how many legs there are, but we just know the idea is spend money, spend money, spend money, and spend it over here, and spending brings us back out of this economic situation that we are in. Production will do that.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that we need to suspend capital gains taxes and do

so for 2 years. Let that smart money find a place to go without being penalized for coming back into this economy. The smart money that is on the sidelines, the \$13 trillion or so that are overseas that are invested in the economy in other parts of the world that are faced with a capital gains tax, if it is corporate, if it comes back into the United States, we can free that up, Mr. Speaker. And that \$13 trillion is a number as of last September. So chances are that today it's not quite \$13 trillion any more. And we won't get it all back. But we will get back 1 or 2 or \$3 trillion. We will get back more money that is stranded outside the U.S. economy because of the impediment of facing capital gains tax that we're going to be able to put into this economy with this so-called stimulus plan that is before us, this Congress, as we speak. We will get more money into the economy.

And then the groan goes up on this side of the aisle because if we suspended capital gains tax, we will be giving up an opportunity to tax one of these greedy capitalists. How could you live with yourself if you passed up a chance to tax somebody and you let their money come in and get invested in our economy? Well, I can live with myself to do that. If you have a good argument, I will be happy to yield and hear that argument. But I don't think you have one. We need to bring this capital back into the United States and get it into this economy. But the lost revenue for an immediate suspension of capital gains if we did so for the year 2009 would be, Mr. Speaker, \$68 billion. Now I'm going to say this: Only \$68 billion as compared to a couple of trillion dollars in bailout money, \$68 billion in lost revenue for suspending capital gains taxes to bring in \$1 or \$2 or \$3 trillion from overseas, maybe more, into this economy to find its way to where it would do the most good, because smart investors will do that. If we suspend capital gains tax on picking up the toxic debt that is there, those were Secretary Paulson's words, suspend capital gains tax on the income off of those investments, smart money would go pick up these mortgage-backed securities. They would take them off the marketplace. Smart money would then go out into the communities and work with the people that have been evicted, or I should say about to be evicted, from their homes, find a way to renegotiate some of those terms or sell the home, turn around and remarket it to somebody that can make some reasonable payments.

But we've got to go through this. We've got to bite the bullet. We've got to take the pain. We've got to make the adjustments. And it is not going to work for us to borrow from our children, our grandchildren and our grandchildren's children trillions of dollars with no idea of how to pay them back and no way to even move towards a balanced budget, but to put all that demand out there in the world market for capital, borrowed money from the United States Government.

And where will we borrow that money from, Mr. Speaker? Do we borrow that money, then, from China with their economy going south? Because when we catch a cold, the Chinese get sick, as well. They're tied to our economy. Are the Saudis going to have that kind of cash that they will loan to us? Perhaps. But the interest rates are going to go up. To borrow that kind of money and put it into the economy in that fashion is irresponsible. It denies the very values of the economic lessons that we know. It denies that we need to produce something that has value.

Now, if Keynes is right and we can go out, borrow the money and then bury it in the coal mine, cover it up with garbage and turn people loose to dig it up and that would solve the unemployment problem, then I think he is way off, Mr. Speaker. I'm of the other side, of the supply side of this economy.

Let me take this to another step. Immediately, I would suspend capital gains tax for 2 years. I would lock it in in stone so smart money would know they had 2 years to find a place to settle it. And maybe I would back it up even and look at the numbers, perhaps even 1 year. But if it's 2 years, we will be giving up \$68 billion worth of revenue for not collecting any capital gains tax for 2009, \$61 billion for 2010, that's it, \$129 billion, that would be the total cost of putting 3 to 5 or more trillion dollars into this U.S. economy in the right place where smart money would go.

Now that is one of the things we could do. We can go down through the list. We ought to be talking about reform. We ought to be talking about repealing the Community Reinvestment Act and about privatizing Fannie and Freddie and requiring them to be capitalized and regulated like the other banks are. And we need to be talking about amending the mark-to-market accounting rules, the credit-default-swap rules, putting these trades up on the Internet so that there is sunlight on all of them so they can be tracked and they can have oversight.

All of those things need to happen, Mr. Speaker, and all of those things are things that should be done immediately, along with having a commission to examine the situation of the finances in this country and the economy in this country to come to a conclusion as to where we went wrong and to make some more of those changes. I have listed some. What we need to do is build a structure so it doesn't happen again. It's unlikely to happen, Mr. Speaker, when we have the chairs of the committees that have been part of the problem in the first place. Albert Einstein once said that you never solve a problem with the same mindset that created it. And we're dealing with people that have gavels that have the same mindset that created this problem.

All of these things I have talked about need to be done in the short term and in the temporary. There is a broad-

er solution that needs to come, Mr. Speaker, and that is to set up our taxes so that we can be free of these kind of burdens for all time. I have many times come to this floor and spoken about the need to eliminate the IRS, to move to a national sales tax and to understand a principle which is this, that what you tax you get less of. The Federal Government and the United States has the first lien on all productivity in America. If you're going to earn, Mr. Speaker, Uncle Sam is there with his hand out to tax. If you're going to save, he taxes the earnings off the savings. He taxes your proceeds off your investment. Uncle Sam is there with his hand out to tax it, earnings, savings and investment. If you're a producer, you're punished by being taxed. If you're a consumer, that's fine. Some of the States, many of the States have a sales tax. Beyond that, consumers consume without being taxed except for an additional excise tax that exists in some places as well.

What you tax you get less of. But we tax all of the productivity in America. And taxing all the productivity in America virtually ensures that there won't be as much productivity in this country as there would be if we passed a national sales tax. The Fair Tax, Mr. Speaker, took the tax off of our production and put it over on consumption. If we do that, we will allow the American producers an unlimited amount that they can produce, they can earn, save and invest all they want to earn, save and invest.

When I think about people that are working a job and they're working the angles on that job and they're thinking, well, let me see, I have got my 40 hours in this week, now when I start working overtime, I go into a different bracket, my withholding is a little different, I don't know, my payroll per hour isn't as good as I would like to have it, I'm going to limit the overtime hours I'm going to work. Or it might be somebody in sales that gets paid on commission. And they do a calculation on the taxes that they would pay the IRS. And they reach a certain point, and they realize how big a chunk Uncle Sam is taking out of them, and they decide, I'm just not going to produce any more than that. I can live comfortably enough down here without having to work twice as hard to get half again more out of that labor because the tax rate swallows up that much.

Now that is just an individual working sometimes on commission or on overtime. But think about the calculus when it's an investment for a small business, maybe a small business that employs six or eight or ten people, and a business that gets to the point where it's kind of comfortable. They can see some new market opportunities. But the owner of the business understands that the tax burden is such that it's not worth the risk. And so they don't invest the capital. They don't create that extra three or four or five or 10

new jobs. And the business sits there and stagnates. And the real estate that is there that perhaps is paid for gets tied up because there is a capital tax gains tax that will be paid if he sells his real estate and he hands that over so that maybe a new entrepreneur can take that location and take it up to the next level.

We have all kinds of property in America that is tied up because of tax reasons, not business reasons. Every single business calculation that you make in the United States of America is impacted by Federal taxes. And every calculation has to take into account the tax ramifications. When that happens, then our smart people are using their brains to figure out how to minimize or avoid their income taxes rather than figure out how to maximize their productions and their profits to create more wealth in this country.

Mr. Speaker, believe me, if we had more wealth in this country and that wealth doesn't fear the government, that wealth will create more jobs and there will be more wealthy people. You cannot help the poor by punishing the rich. Moving to a national sales tax just totally revolutionizes this economy. It opens up our production and makes unlimited production. Unlimited wealth can be created, and then the taxes are paid voluntarily by the people when they decide that they're going to consume. So we have voluntary taxpayers. We have voluntary producers. We have an economy that is virtually unleashed.

And here is one of the ways to draw a comparison. We have to rebuild U.S. manufacturing in the United States. We have watched a lot of our manufacturing go overseas because the price of labor has gotten low enough in comparison to U.S. labor that those factories would shut down and relocate overseas. The difference is also the taxes that are embedded. Now we tax corporations. We tax payroll taxes. When you add up the embedded taxes in a retail product in the United States, say on this ink pen, on average it is 22 percent. Let's say it's a \$1 ink pen. Twenty-two percent of that would be built into the price, embedded taxes, so that the company that is producing them can pay their business income tax, likely their corporate income tax and their payroll tax. That puts us at a competitive disadvantage, Mr. Speaker.

And so here is an example. If we pass the Fair Tax, then the embedded Federal income tax comes right out of that price. Competition will drive it out of the price. So here would be an example. If there is a Mazda that is made 100 percent in Japan, and there are at least \$800 million dollars worth of those Mazdas coming into the United States every year, and it's sitting on the dealers' lot at \$30 thousand sticker price, that price is set by competition, what you can market at. And across the street on the other dealers' lot is a

Chevy, or a Ford, but let's say a Chevy. That would happen to be built 100 percent of it in the United States.

□ 2245

It has also a \$30,000 price tag on it. And that's because competition now, two comparatively valued vehicles, selling for identical price, competing directly against each other, \$30,000 each. Now, we pass the FAIR tax and over time, and not a very long period of time, perhaps some would be immediate, some would be longer, but about 18 months we'd see most of these adjustments. You pass the FAIR tax and your \$30,000 Chevy price will go down to \$24,600. That's the 22 percent embedded Federal tax. It's part of that price that General Motors has to have in order to recover the taxes that they're paying. Your \$30,000 Mazda stays at \$30,000 because the embedded Federal tax isn't part of their price. That machine, that car is made in Japan. So now you pull into the dealer's lot and here's a Chevy for \$24,600 and a Mazda for \$30,000 and they're of comparable value.

What do you buy, Mr. Speaker?

Does this lower the price of the Mazda too? Maybe. But the consumer is going to look and say I'm going to go for the \$24,600 Chevy. I like that that much better. I like it 28 percent better than the \$30,000 Mazda. And then we have to add back in the sales tax on these cars and that's an embedded tax of 23 percent that covers your corporate income tax, a rebate, so that we untax everybody to the poverty level, and the payroll tax that's associated with the labor that goes in. So your \$24,600 Chevy goes up to \$30,400. That's with the sales tax added on. You would write the check to drive the Chevy off the lot for \$30,400. But to drive the Mazda off the lot you'd have to write the check for \$39,000. That's the difference. It is a 28 percent marketing advantage, \$8,600 advantage, American car over Japanese-made car or Korean or any other car.

What's that tell us, Mr. Speaker? I'll submit that it tells us that there would be many more American automobiles built and sold here in the United States because they would be competitive again. Imagine being able to take 28 percent off the price of every American-made vehicle today, at least for the components of them that are made in the United States. That's what the FAIR tax would do. Our auto manufacturers in Detroit can't seem to get to this conclusion, and neither can they carry a cogent argument against it. But they're stuck in their ways. They're negotiating with the unions who haven't made any concessions that I can see at this point. And we have a simple solution to a complex problem, that, like a Rubik's cube, and I've turned this over and looked at it every way I can for 29 years, Mr. Speaker, and every time I turn the Rubik's cube of a national sales tax again and look at it another way it looks better and

better and better, not worse, not weaker, not something that has a flaw, better and better and better. And it always wins the debate, it always wins the argument if given an opportunity to match up against any other idea out there on tax reform. In fact, the FAIR tax, the national sales tax does everything good that anybody's tax proposal does, it does all of them and it does them better. And I'd put it up against anybody else's tax proposal. If you take the tax off of production and you put on it consumption, you also provide an incentive for savings and an incentive for investment. But you have more production. You will have a slight diminishment in consumption because there's a tax there, but over time there's more money in a person's pocket, a worker will get 56 percent more take home pay, and then they decide when they pay those taxes. This is where America needs to go, and in a short period of time, if we suspend the capital gains taxes and do that on a 2-year period and pass the FAIR tax, even just suspending the capital gains tax, we will see the Dow Jones industrial average jump up 30 percent or more, and it will be in a matter of weeks or months, not a long term, a short-term, you see immediate reaction and this thing would start to come around. If we pass the FAIR tax and on the night that the ball drops in Times Square, I'd set it up for December 31, 2009, midnight, and end the IRS as we know it. Abolish them and the Federal income Tax Code, set it over up as a national sales tax and we will see a dynamic economy role again, Mr. Speaker.

We have the solutions here. Republicans have the solutions here. Spending trillions of dollars for a leg of a stool that we have no idea what it looks like or what kind of results we're going to get is folly. And it's the kind of folly that Einstein was talking about when he said you can't solve a problem with the same mindset that created it.

So, I'll be opposed, Mr. Speaker, to this stimulus package because I think it has an oxymoronic name. I don't think it's a stimulus at all. I think it's a burden, an albatross that's hung around the neck. I think it is, as Michelle Malkin says, intergenerational theft, to put the burden up against our children and grandchildren and great grandchildren. We can't balance the budget today. We couldn't balance the budget 5 years ago, and if we can't do that in the environment that we were in, how in the world do we think that we're going to pay off a debt that's multiple trillions of dollars and a national debt that maybe ends up doubling during the Obama term? No, that's folly, Mr. Speaker.

And let me just cap off one more thing here, before I close, and that is that there has been a significant achievement that's been reached in the nation of Iraq. I've made six trips over there. I know our leader just arrived

back from there over the weekend. The reports I get from that delegation that visited Iraq and Afghanistan is that things look pretty good in Iraq. I had a long conversation with Ambassador Crocker last week on Wednesday morning, and we talked about many of the accomplishments that have been reached there; and how though, it is still delicate and there are political solutions that need to be provided, and there still are some military tactical things that have to happen, specially up in the Mosul region.

But here are some things that we know. The Iraqi people have had three successful elections. They have ratified a constitution. They are distributing their oil wealth from Baghdad out into the provinces and into the cities. They are producing more sewer, water and lights than they have ever have. The hours of electricity across the country are significantly greater than there's ever been. There are girls that have gone to school in the last 6 years for the first time. More Iraqi kids in school as well. The stability and the safety in the streets is significant. I've gone shopping in Ramadi, it's a place that a year earlier I couldn't even set foot because it was too dangerous. And I met with the mayor of Fallujah who said Fallujah is a city of peace and we're going to rebuild this city to where there's not a sign of war in this entire city. And I believe him and they're working on it and they're working on it hard.

This Congress imposed a series of benchmarks on Iraq and the President of the United States, 18 different benchmarks, Mr. Speaker. I've gone back and reviewed those benchmarks. And of those benchmarks, 17 of the 18 benchmarks have been wholly or substantially completed.

I thought it was inappropriate for this Congress to set those standards because that was definition of victory in Iraq, and those who voted for those standards believed that they were unachievable. They believed that the war was lost. They argued that it was a civil war that couldn't be won, that it was sectarian violence that could never be controlled, that al Qaeda was uncontrollable in Iraq. And sometimes they argued that al Qaeda didn't exist in Iraq until we attracted them there. I think that was the bug light theory.

But what's been accomplished in Iraq today is phenomenal. Three successful elections, the ratification of a constitution, Iraqi military forces that have been stood up and trained and deployed, 613,000 strong, Mr. Speaker, and a security and a stability to the point where they pulled off an election a weekend ago in Iraq without a single significant security incident, with the Iraqi people taking their children to the polls so they could experience with them what it's like to go and vote and be a free people. It's been phenomenal progress. 17 of 18 benchmarks reached. The 18th benchmark, by the way, that is not wholly or substantially reached

is the one that requires the Iraqi security forces to be completely independent of American forces, and that would mean logistics, intelligence, communication, supply, training, all of those things would have to be Iraqi. They're not going to be that independent, not this year or next year or the year after. You don't stand up a military like that in no time. It takes years to do that. But 17 of 18 benchmarks have been reached. The casualties in Iraq, and we had a tough time in Iraq here a little over a day ago. We lost four soldiers up by Mosul in a bombing. Regardless, as precious as those lives are and all of them that have been lost, since the first day of July, we've lost more Americans to accidents than we have to the enemy. Another measure of a definable victory in Iraq, achieved, Mr. Speaker, by our noble military under the leadership of Commander in Chief, President Bush, who had the clarity of vision and the courage and the leadership skills to order a surge when his advisors told him don't go there, Mr. President, this war can't be won. It's a definable victory today, by all of the metrics that I can identify, including a more than 90 percent reduction in civilian violence and sectarian deaths, so that they're almost immeasurable. The list goes on and on and on of the accomplishments in Iraq. And I charge and I challenge our current President of the United States to sustain the achievements of his predecessor or be judged by history as to have failed. That, Mr. Speaker, is an important message for the American people to understand tonight, that level of success in Iraq.

We need to also understand what made this a great country; that's the free enterprise system and the accountability that's in. There has to be successes and failures for our system to adjust itself. That will not happen with trillions of dollars of borrowed money and this huge debt to resolve itself.

And I would point out, as a matter of an example, that when Bill Clinton was elected President in 1992, he came to this Congress in 1993 and he said, I want a \$30 billion economic stimulus plan because we have this recession that was brought about by Bush 41. I notice these new Democrat presidents always have a Bush recession to blame their economy on. But in any case, he asked for \$30 billion. And that \$30 billion was negotiated down to \$17 billion. I think that ended up over in the Senate, and finally they decided well that's not enough money to make any difference so we're just not going to do a \$17 billion economic stimulus plan. But \$30 billion was a lot of money to this Congress then. And that's why they debated it. And \$17 billion wasn't enough to make a difference. But today \$17 billion isn't even loose change in a \$2 trillion bailout/stimulus plan. That's how far we have come in a matter of two presidential terms, two different presidents, Mr. Speaker, to the point where \$17 billion, \$30 billion is loose

change in the maw of it all. And it will swallow us up.

And then, reverting back, Mr. Speaker, to the subject matter of Iraq, I'm a little disturbed that there's such a standard that has been raised that we should honor our troops and we should honor their families for the price that they paid, and a moment of silence on this floor is appropriate, an hour of silence would be appropriate, a long and enduring prayer every day for what they have done for our freedom and all of us would also be appropriate, Mr. Speaker. But that, brought out today by the same person that brought 45 different votes to the floor of the House of Representatives, those votes designed to underfund, unfund or undermine our troops is disturbing to me.

In the 110th Congress, we had brought by the Speaker of the House, these 45 votes to the floor that I said, underfunded, undermined or unfunded our troops. Some of those that I have in mind, supplemental appropriations H.R. 2642 that would prohibit establishing a permanent base in Iraq, among other things and reduce some funding.

We have another one, which is H.R. 5658, require the President to submit a report within 90 days of the bill's enactment for the long-term costs in Iraq and Afghanistan, including the cost of operations, reconstruction and health care benefits for how long, Mr. Speaker? Through at least fiscal year 2068 is what this report says.

□ 2300

That can't be constructive to tie the Commander in Chief up to produce a report that predicts costs until 2068. That undermines our troops, Mr. Speaker.

Here is another one. It followed along H.R. 5658, and it said that the United States Defender Act would have to be authorized by Congress in order to enter into any kind of an agreement with Iraq from a military perspective. Congress would have to authorize it. I don't think the Speaker of the House was going to allow the congressional authorization of those kinds of agreements. That undermined our troops again, Mr. Speaker.

Here I have H.R. 2082, which is to authorize funds for the intelligence portion of fiscal year 2008. It defines how we can interrogate prisoners. It's another way to handcuff the President of the United States and our military, whose lives have been in harm's way and remain in harm's way.

Here is another one on the same subject—on interrogation techniques and micromanagement. This Congress should not be trying to operate a war by micromanagement. The Continental Congress tried to do that. It's one of the reasons we have a stronger central government today.

The list of these kinds of transgressions goes on, Mr. Speaker. Here is another one.

The State-Foreign Operations Appropriations—Iraq Study Group estab-

lishes that. We know what came out of that. There is another one that reduces the spending, and it identifies the 18 benchmarks which I mentioned. On and on and on.

There were 45 different votes, Mr. Speaker, on the floor of this House of Representatives, 45 of those votes aside from the seven that were brought by Republicans, to recommit, defend or seek to overturn those. They all underfunded, unfunded or undermined our troops.

So a moment of silence is appropriate, but I cannot break from the thought that American lives have been put at risk and that we have lost some lives because of the actions on the floor of this Congress. These actions, Mr. Speaker, encouraged our enemy. In spite of all of this, we have a definable victory in Iraq today, and it is a definable victory that needs to be maintained by the current President of the United States and enhanced with a prudent utilization of the forces that are there and with a prudent transfer as the direction it is going over to the Iraqi security forces with a political, economic and military solution in Iraq so that they can sustain and defend themselves and can remain our ally in the Middle East to inspire the other moderate Muslim nations that are there.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I would yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MEEK of Florida (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today until 5 p.m.

Ms. HARMAN (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today and February 11.

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 Ms. WOOLSEY) 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.

Mrs. MALONEY, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GOODLATTE, for 5 minutes, February 11.

Mr. FLEMING, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, for 5 minutes, today.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE
PRESIDENT

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House reports that on February 5, 2009 she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill.

H.R. 2. To amend title XXI of the Social Security Act to extend and improve the Children's Health Insurance Program, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 11, 2009, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

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

505. A letter from the Chief, Retailer Management Branch, Benefit Redemption Division, FNS, USDA, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Food Stamp Program: Revisions to Bonding Requirements for Violating Retail and Wholesale Food Concerns (RIN: 0584-AD44) received February 4, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

506. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Mgmt. Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Listing of Color Additives Exempt From Certification; Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Labeling: Cochineal Extract and Carmine Declaration [Docket No.: FDA-1998-P-0032 (formerly Docket No.: 1998P-0724)] (RIN: 0910-AF12) received February 4, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

507. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulation Division, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule — Prohibition on Use of Indian Community Development Block Grant Assistance for Employment Relocation Activities; Final Rule [Docket No.: FR-5115-F-02] (RIN: 2577-AC78) received February 4, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

508. A letter from the Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule — Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act (RESPA): Rule To Simplify and Improve the Process of Obtaining Mortgages and Reduce Consumer Settlement Costs; Deferred Applicability Date for the Revised Definition of "Required Use" [Docket No.: FR-5180-F-04] (RIN: 2502-AI61) received February 4, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

509. 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.

510. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's fiscal

year 2008 report on U.S. Government Assistance to and Cooperative Activities with Eurasia, pursuant to Public Law 102-511, section 104; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

511. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to Paragraph (5)(D) of the Senate's May 1997 resolution; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

512. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 17-717, "Local Rent Supplement Program Second Temporary Amendment Act of 2009," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

513. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 17-718, "HPAP Temporary Act of 2009," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

514. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 17-719, "Employment of Returning Veteran's Tax Credit Temporary Act of 2009," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

515. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 17-720, "Public Service Commission Holdover Temporary Amendment Act of 2009," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

516. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 17-721, "District Employee Protection Temporary Act of 2009," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

517. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 17-722, "Lead-Hazard Prevention and Elimination Act of 2008," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

518. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 17-723, "Paramedic and Emergency Medical Technician Transition Amendment Act of 2008," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

519. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 17-708, "Firearms Registration Amendment Act of 2008," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

520. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 17-709, "14W and the YMCA Anthony Bowen Project Real Property Tax Exemption and Real Property Tax Relief Temporary Act of 2009," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

521. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 17-711, "Get DC Residents Training for Jobs Now Temporary Act of 2009," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

522. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 17-710, "The Urban Institute Real Property Tax Abatement Temporary Act of 2009," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

523. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a

copy of D.C. ACT 17-712, "GPS Anti-Tampering Temporary Act of 2009," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

524. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 17-713, "Equitable Parking Meter Rates Temporary Amendment Act of 2009," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

525. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 17-714, "Taxi Zone Operating Hours Temporary Amendment Act of 2009," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

526. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 17-715, "Reimbursable Details Clarification Temporary Act of 2009," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

527. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 17-716, "Uniform Child Abduction Prevention Act of 2008," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

528. A letter from the White House Liaison, Department of Education, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

529. A letter from the Senior Associate General Counsel, Office of the Director of National Intelligence, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

530. A letter from the Senior Associate General Counsel, Office of the Director of National Intelligence, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

531. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Election Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Extension of Administrative Fines Program [Notice 2008-12] received January 26, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on House Administration.

532. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Inseason Adjustment to the 2009 Gulf of Alaska Pollock and Pacific Cod Total Allowable Catch Amounts [Docket No.: 071106671-8010-02] (RIN: 0648-XM48) received February 4, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

533. A letter from the Chairman, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Rules of Practice and Procedure; Adjusting Civil Money Penalties for Inflation (RIN: 3052-AC47) received February 4, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

534. A letter from the Attorney — Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Willamette River, Portland, OR, Schedule Change [Docket No.: USCG-2008-0721] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received February 2, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

535. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Wabash River;

Activity Identifier; Permanent change to operating schedule [Docket No.: USCG-2008-0100] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received February 2, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

536. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Anchorage Area "A," Boston Harbor, MA [Docket No.: USCG-2008-0497] (RIN: 1625-AA01) received February 2, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

537. A letter from the Assistant Chief Counsel for Hazardous Materials Safety, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Hazardous Materials: Miscellaneous Cargo Tank Motor Vehicle and Cylinder Issues; Petitions for Rule-making [Docket No. PHMSA-2006-25910 (HM-218E)] (RIN: 2137-AE23) received January 30, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

538. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Washington, DC Metropolitan Area Special Flight Rules Area [Docket No. FAA-2004-17005; Amdt. Nos. 1-63 and 93-90] (RIN: 2120-A117) received January 26, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

539. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — IFR Altitudes; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30644; Amdt. No. 478] received January 14, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

540. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30642; Amdt. No. 3300] received January 14, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

541. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class D and E Airspace; Brunswick, ME [Docket No. FAA-2008-0203; Airspace Docket No. 08-ANE-99] received January 14, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

542. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; CFM International, S.A. CFM56-5B Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. FAA-2008-1353; Directorate Identifier 2008-NE-46-AD; Amendment 39-15779; AD 2009-01-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 26, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

543. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30643; Amdt. No. 3301] received January 26, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

544. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Clarification for Submitting Petitions for Rulemaking or Exemption [Docket No. FAA-199-6622; Amendment No. 11-55] (RIN: 2120-AG95) re-

ceived January 26, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

545. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Small Business Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Small Business Energy Efficiency Program (RIN: 3245-AF75) received February 4, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Small Business.

546. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Small Business Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Lender Oversight Program (RIN: 3245-AE14) received February 4, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Small Business.

547. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Small Business Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Debt Collection; Clarification of Administrative Wage Garnishment Regulation and Reassignment of Hearing Official (RIN: 3245-AF72) received February 4, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Small Business.

548. A letter from the Chief, Trade and Commercial Regulations Branch, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Import Restrictions Imposed on Certain Archaeological Material from China [CBP Dec. 09-03] (RIN: 1505-AC08) received January 26, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

549. A letter from the Assistant Secretary Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's first quarterly report for fiscal year 2009 from the Office of Security and Privacy, pursuant to Public Law 110-53 121 Stat. 266, 360; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

550. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's Annual Report from the Office for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 2000ee-1; jointly to the Committees on Homeland Security and 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. FRANK: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 787. A bill to make improvements in the Hope for Homeowners Program, and for other purposes, with an amendment (Rept. 111-12). Referred to the committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FRANK: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 788. A bill to provide a safe harbor for mortgage servicers who engage in specified mortgage loan modifications, and for other purposes, with an amendment (Rept. 111-13). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

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. WU (for himself, Mr. GERLACH, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. ZOE LOFGREEN of California, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. GENE GREEN of

Texas, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. BACA):

H.R. 930. A bill to strengthen the Nation's research efforts to identify the causes and cure of psoriasis and psoriatic arthritis, expand psoriasis and psoriatic arthritis data collection, and study access to and quality of care for people with psoriasis and psoriatic arthritis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. NYE:

H.R. 931. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the work opportunity credit with respect to certain unemployed veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio (for himself and Mr. HIGGINS):

H.R. 932. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to make grants and offer technical assistance to local governments and others to design and implement innovative policies, programs, and projects that address widespread property vacancy and abandonment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS (for herself, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. PAUL, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. KIRK, Mr. JORDAN of Ohio, Mr. LATTA, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, and Mr. SOUDER):

H.R. 933. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide compensatory time for employees in the private sector; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SABLAN (for himself, Mr. FLAKE, and Ms. BORDALLO):

H.R. 934. A bill to convey certain submerged lands to the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands in order to give that territory the same benefits in its submerged lands as Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa have in their submerged lands; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SABLAN (for himself and Mr. FALCOMA VAEGA):

H.R. 935. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to increase the number of persons appointed to the military service academies from the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands and American Samoa from nominations made by the Delegates in Congress from the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands and American Samoa; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TOWNS (for himself, Mr. BURGESS, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. HONDA, Mr. WU, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 936. A bill to ensure the continued and future availability of lifesaving trauma health care in the United States and to prevent further trauma center closures and downgrades by assisting trauma centers with uncompensated care costs, core mission services, emergency needs, and information technology; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 937. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to permit certain Mexican children, and accompanying adults, to obtain a waiver of the documentation requirements otherwise required to enter the United States as a temporary visitor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 938. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to restore certain provisions relating to the definition of aggravated

felony and other provisions as they were before the enactment of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN (for himself, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. PAUL, Mr. BONNER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. JONES, Mr. COBLE, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. DENT, Mr. WOLF, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. MCHUGH, and Mrs. MYRICK):

H.R. 939. A bill to permit 2008 required minimum distributions from certain retirement plans to be repaid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ALEXANDER:

H.R. 940. A bill to provide for the conveyance of National Forest System land in the State of Louisiana; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ALEXANDER:

H.R. 941. A bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to provide for disaster assistance for electric utility companies serving low-income households, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ALEXANDER:

H.R. 942. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to conduct a pilot project on the use of educational assistance under programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs to defray training costs associated with the purchase of certain franchise enterprises; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, 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 Mrs. BACHMANN (for herself, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. COOPER, Mr. KIRK, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. COLE, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. POSEY, Mr. LATTA, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Ms. FOXX, and Mr. HOEKSTRA):

H.R. 943. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to require certain additional calculations to be included in the annual financial statement submitted under section 331(e) of that title, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, 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 Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 944. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide improved benefits for veterans who are former prisoners of war; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas (for himself and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 945. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow additional expenses for purposes of determining the Hope Scholarship Credit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 946. A bill to enhance citizen access to Government information and services by establishing that Government documents issued to the public must be written clearly, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CALVERT (for himself and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois):

H.R. 947. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to establish and collect a fee based on the fair market value of articles imported into the United States and articles exported from the United States in commerce and to use amounts collected from the fee to make grants to carry out certain transportation projects in the transportation trade corridors for which the fee is collected, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Foreign Affairs, 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 Mrs. CAPPS (for herself, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. HARE, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. ROSLEHTINEN, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. SCHIFF, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. SHULER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. FILNER, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MICHAUD, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. ROSS, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. WOLF, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. TERRY, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. FARR, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. MCINTYRE, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. GORDON of Tennessee, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. CLAY, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. HOLT, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. NYE, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BACA, and Mr. KAGEN):

H.R. 948. A bill to amend chapter 81 of title 5, United States Code, to create a presumption that a disability or death of a Federal employee in fire protection activities caused by any of certain diseases is the result of the performance of such employee's duty; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 949. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the collective bargaining rights and procedures for review of adverse actions of certain employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 950. A bill to amend chapter 33 of title 38, United States Code, to increase educational assistance for certain veterans pursuing a program of education offered through distance learning; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona:

H.R. 951. A bill to prohibit the use of funds to transfer enemy combatants detained at

Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to facilities in Arizona or to build, modify, or enhance any facility in Arizona to house such enemy combatants; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HALL of New York (for himself, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HARE, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, and Mr. NYE):

H.R. 952. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify the meaning of "combat with the enemy" for purposes of service-connection of disabilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HELLER (for himself and Mr. HASTINGS of Washington):

H.R. 953. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a deduction for travel expenses to medical centers of the Department of Veterans Affairs in connection with examinations or treatments relating to service-connected disabilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLDEN (for himself and Mr. PLATTS):

H.R. 954. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a monthly insurance benefit thereunder shall be paid for the month in which the recipient dies, subject to a reduction of 50 percent if the recipient dies during the first 15 days of such month, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. INSLEE (for himself, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. REICHERT, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. DICKS, and Mr. BAIRD):

H.R. 955. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 10355 Northeast Valley Road in Rollingbay, Washington, as the "John 'Bud' Hawk Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. KAPTUR (for herself and Mr. LATOURETTE):

H.R. 956. A bill to expand the number of individuals and families with health insurance coverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Education and Labor, and Rules, 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. MCCAUL (for himself, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana):

H.R. 957. A bill to authorize higher education curriculum development and graduate training in advanced energy and green building technologies; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

By Mr. MORAN of Virginia (for himself, Mr. WOLF, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. PETRI, and Mr. HOLT):

H.R. 958. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to make unused sick leave creditable, for purposes of the Federal Employees' Retirement System, in the same manner as provided for under the Civil Service Retirement System; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. PLATTS):

H.R. 959. A bill to increase Federal Pell Grants for the children of fallen public safety officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor, 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 Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 960. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Home Rule Act to eliminate Congressional review of newly-passed District laws; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, 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. PAUL:

H.R. 961. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on phosphoric acid, lanthanum salt, cerium terbium-doped; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 962. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on lutetium oxide; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina (for himself, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. McDERMOTT, Ms. LEE of California, and Mr. MILLER of North Carolina):

H.R. 963. A bill to enhance transparency and accountability within the intelligence community for activities performed under Federal contracts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, and 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. ROHRBACHER (for himself, Mr. JONES, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Ms. FOXX, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. LATTA, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mrs. MYRICK, and Mr. BILBRAY):

H.R. 964. A bill to amend the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 to exempt any solar energy project on lands managed by the Bureau of Land Management from an environmental impact statement requirement; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SARBANES (for himself, Mr. HOYER, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. KRATOVIL, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. NYE, and Mr. PLATTS):

H.R. 965. A bill to amend the Chesapeake Bay Initiative Act of 1998 to provide for the continuing authorization of the Chesapeake Bay Gateways and Watertrails Network; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. SCHMIDT:

H.R. 966. A bill to require certain air carriers of foreign air transportation to disclose the nature and source of delays and cancellations experienced by air travelers; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mrs. SCHMIDT:

H.R. 967. A bill to enhance airline passenger protection when the Secretary of Transportation issues a rule to require airline emergency contingency plans; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SHADEGG (for himself and Mr. BARTLETT):

H.R. 968. A bill to amend the Consumer Product Safety Act to provide regulatory re-

lief to small and family-owned businesses; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SIMPSON (for himself and Mr. MINNICK):

H.R. 969. A bill to permit commercial vehicles at weights up to 129,000 pounds to use certain highways of the Interstate System in the State of Idaho which would provide significant savings in the transportation of goods throughout the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. WEINER:

H.R. 970. A bill to encourage the entry of felony warrants into the NCIC database by States and to provide additional resources for extradition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEINER (for himself, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER):

H.R. 971. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide commuter flexible spending arrangements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina (for himself and Mr. KLINE of Minnesota):

H.R. 972. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to eliminate the requirement that certain former members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces be at least 60 years of age in order to be eligible to receive health care benefits; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. YARMUTH:

H.R. 973. A bill to establish pilot programs that provide for emergency crisis response teams to combat elder abuse; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BACA:

H.J. Res. 20. A joint resolution to honor the achievements and contributions of Native Americans to the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. McMAHON:

H. Con. Res. 41. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint session of Congress to receive a message from the President; considered and agreed to, considered and agreed to.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H. Con. Res. 42. Concurrent resolution recognizing the contributions of the New York Public Library's Schomburg Center for Research in Black Culture in educating the people of the United States about the African-American migration experience, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H. Con. Res. 43. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that Arthur Schomburg should be recognized for his leadership and contributions in documenting, recording, and researching the historical contributions to society of peoples of African descent and for his efforts to combat racial and ethnic discrimination in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H. Con. Res. 44. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should grant a pardon to Marcus Mosiah Garvey to clear his name and affirm his innocence of crimes for which he was unjustly prosecuted and convicted; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H. Con. Res. 45. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the United States Postal Service should issue a postage stamp in commemoration of Congressman Adam Clayton Powell, Jr; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H. Con. Res. 46. Concurrent resolution honoring the life of Betty Shabazz; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. WAXMAN:

H. Res. 141. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Energy and Commerce in the One Hundred Eleventh Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ISSA:

H. Res. 142. A resolution honoring the life, service, and accomplishments of General Robert H. Barrow, United States Marine Corps; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CARTER:

H. Res. 143. A resolution raising a question of the privileges of the House.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself and Mr. SMITH of Texas):

H. Res. 144. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on the Judiciary in the One Hundred Eleventh Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California:

H. Res. 145. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct in the One Hundred Eleventh Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. MARKEY of Colorado (for herself and Mr. EHLERS):

H. Res. 146. A resolution designating March 2, 2009, as "Read Across America Day"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts:

H. Res. 147. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Select Committee on Energy Independence and Global Warming in the One Hundred Eleventh Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H. Res. 148. A resolution recognizing and honoring the life and achievements of Constance Baker Motley, a judge for the United States District Court, Southern District of New York; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H. Res. 149. A resolution honoring Dick Brown: New York's greatest ambassador to Washington; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H. Res. 150. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that A. Philip Randolph should be recognized for his lifelong leadership and work to end discrimination and secure equal employment and labor opportunities for all Americans; to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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 Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin (for himself, Mr. TIAHRT, Ms. FALLIN, Mr. PITTS, Mr. HARPER, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. PENCE, Mr. COLE, Mr. BROWN of Georgia, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. JORDAN of Ohio, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. AKIN, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. POSEY, Mr. WOLF, Mr. PETRI, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER):

H. Res. 151. A resolution honoring the life and expressing condolences of the House of Representatives on the passing of Paul M. Weyrich; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. TANNER (for himself, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. ROSS, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. BOOZMAN,

Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Mr. MEEK of Florida):

H. Res. 152. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States remains committed to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. WATSON (for herself, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. BOREN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. WATERS, Mr. ISSA, Ms. SOLIS of California, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. FARR, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. WATT):

H. Res. 153. A resolution commending the University of Southern California Trojan football team for its victory in the 2009 Rose Bowl; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida:

H.R. 974. A bill for the relief of Alejandro Gomez and Juan Sebastian Gomez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 975. A bill for the relief of Terence George; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UPTON:

H.R. 976. A bill for the relief of Ibrahim Parlak; 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: Mr. MEEKS of New York.
 H.R. 17: Mr. LATA and Mr. MICA.
 H.R. 22: Mr. BISHOP of New York.
 H.R. 23: Mr. WEXLER, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. BISHOP of New York.
 H.R. 31: Mr. LEVIN, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. MARCHANT, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. BERRY, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. DICKS, and Mr. THOMPSON of California.
 H.R. 49: Mr. COLE, Mr. WAMP, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. WOLF, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. FLEMING, and Mr. CRENSHAW.
 H.R. 81: Ms. BERKLEY.
 H.R. 85: Mr. POSEY.
 H.R. 131: Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. MACK, Mr. CAMP, and Mr. MCHUGH.
 H.R. 135: Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 148: Mr. CALVERT.
 H.R. 155: Mr. CULBERSON.
 H.R. 159: Mr. HINOJOSA and Mr. MCCOTTER.
 H.R. 179: Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, and Ms. WATSON.
 H.R. 182: Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. NADLER of New York, and Mr. HONDA.
 H.R. 205: Mr. BLUNT, Mr. ROONEY, and Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 206: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
 H.R. 207: Mr. KISSELL and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
 H.R. 208: Mr. HOLT, Mr. OLSON, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. MICHAUD, and Mr. HARPER.
 H.R. 213: Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
 H.R. 215: Mr. MARCHANT and Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina.
 H.R. 216: Mr. HILL.
 H.R. 226: Mr. LANCE and Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado.
 H.R. 233: Mr. BERRY.
 H.R. 235: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. TERRY, Mr. OLVER, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SCALISE, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.
 H.R. 265: Mr. CLAY.
 H.R. 292: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
 H.R. 295: Mr. LAMBORN.
 H.R. 303: Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. CARTER, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. CARNEY.
 H.R. 305: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mrs. CAPPS.
 H.R. 327: Mr. YOUNG of Florida.
 H.R. 336: Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, and Mr. MOORE of Kansas.
 H.R. 347: Mr. WU, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. HODES, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. SHULER, Mr. REYES, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Ms. LEE of California.
 H.R. 381: Mr. HARPER.
 H.R. 391: Mr. MCKEON, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. POSEY, and Mr. ROHRBACHER.
 H.R. 411: Mr. GERLACH.
 H.R. 442: Mr. JONES and Mr. SIMPSON.
 H.R. 448: Mr. POE of Texas.
 H.R. 469: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
 H.R. 470: Mr. MCKEON.
 H.R. 500: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
 H.R. 502: Mr. MANZULLO.
 H.R. 507: Mr. MCCAUL.
 H.R. 508: Mr. CULBERSON.
 H.R. 517: Mr. SERRANO, Mr. MASSA, and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
 H.R. 528: Mr. KAGEN.
 H.R. 536: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
 H.R. 557: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. KIRK, Mr. POSEY, and Ms. FALLIN.
 H.R. 571: Mr. ARCURI.
 H.R. 577: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
 H.R. 578: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
 H.R. 591: Ms. HIRONO.
 H.R. 593: Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
 H.R. 610: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, and Ms. FUDGE.
 H.R. 615: Ms. DEGETTE.
 H.R. 618: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. MEEKS of New York.
 H.R. 620: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
 H.R. 621: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. MCCOTTER, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. SIRES, and Mr. KISSELL.
 H.R. 624: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania and Mr. ENGEL.
 H.R. 628: Mr. COBLE and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
 H.R. 630: Mr. HENSARLING.
 H.R. 631: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
 H.R. 632: Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. NADLER of New York, Ms. WATERS, Mr. HODES, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. FILLNER, and Ms. LEE of California.
 H.R. 636: Mr. RADANOVICH and Mr. MANZULLO.
 H.R. 664: Mr. PAUL, Mr. MCCOTTER, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 666: Mr. MCCOTTER.
 H.R. 671: Mr. BISHOP of New York.
 H.R. 672: Mr. HONDA.
 H.R. 673: Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. PLATTS, and Mr. HOLT.
 H.R. 678: Ms. DEGETTE and Mr. NADLER of New York.
 H.R. 702: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. MEEKS of New York.
 H.R. 704: Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GORDON of Tennessee, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Ms. CLARKE.
 H.R. 705: Mr. UPTON and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
 H.R. 707: Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. LANCE, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. HARPER, Mr. WATT, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. WAMP, Ms. TITUS, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. ESHOO, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana.
 H.R. 716: Mr. KING of New York.
 H.R. 723: Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. MASSA, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. COBLE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LATOURETTE, and Mr. PAUL.
 H.R. 734: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. PIERLUISI, and Mr. RANGEL.
 H.R. 746: Mr. NYE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Ms. KOSMAS.
 H.R. 752: Mr. BILBRAY.
 H.R. 764: Mr. SOUDER, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, and Mr. CALVERT.
 H.R. 774: Mr. MEEKS of New York.
 H.R. 775: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. GORDON of Tennessee, Mr. COSTA, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. MEEK of Florida.
 H.R. 795: Mr. NADLER of New York, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. MEEKS of New York.
 H.R. 804: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
 H.R. 805: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H.R. 808: Mr. BOSWELL and Mr. FATTAH.
 H.R. 812: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.
 H.R. 819: Mr. CARNEY, Mr. MICHAUD, and Mr. MURTHA.
 H.R. 823: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
 H.R. 824: Mr. BISHOP of New York.
 H.R. 847: Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
 H.R. 848: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
 H.R. 857: Ms. TITUS, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, and Ms. SUTTON.
 H.R. 866: Mr. WAMP and Mr. HERGER.
 H.R. 870: Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. GORDON of Tennessee, Mr. MASSA, and Mr. CUMMINGS.
 H.R. 875: Mr. FARR and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
 H.R. 877: Mr. LAMBORN.
 H.R. 881: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska and Mr. MANZULLO.
 H.R. 896: Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. FLEMING, and Mr. WAMP.
 H.R. 899: Mr. MANZULLO and Mr. MCKEON.
 H.R. 908: Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California and Mr. COHEN.
 H.R. 927: Mr. HINCHEY and Mr. CONAWAY.
 H. Con. Res. 14: Mr. MASSA, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. ELLISON.
 H. Con. Res. 22: Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. MCCOTTER, and Mr. LINDER.
 H. Con. Res. 29: Mr. KING of New York and Mr. WOLF.
 H. Con. Res. 30: Mr. GRIJALVA and Ms. BORDALLO.
 H. Con. Res. 31: Ms. BORDALLO and Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H. Con. Res. 35: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. ETHERIDGE, and Ms. DELAURO.
 H. Con. Res. 40: Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. DRIEHAUS, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. BISHOP of New York.

H. Res. 22: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. HARE, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H. Res. 42: Mr. PENCE.

H. Res. 47: Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. BILBRAY, and Mr. MCHUGH.

H. Res. 64: Mr. MARCHANT.

H. Res. 77: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. LATTA, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. BILLRAKIS, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. FORBES, Mr. MANZULLO, Mrs. CAPITO, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. TERRY, Mr. FORTENBERRY, and Mr. SCALISE.

H. Res. 81: Mr. HARPER, Mr. SHUSTER, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H. Res. 89: Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland.

H. Res. 91: Mr. HOEKSTRA and Mr. UPTON.

H. Res. 109: Mr. SHADEGG and Mr. SESTAK.

H. Res. 111: Mr. ADERHOLT, Ms. FOXX, and Mr. GORDON of Tennessee.

H. Res. 116: Mr. ROSS.

H. Res. 117: Mr. BARTON of Texas.

H. Res. 130: Ms. LEE of California, Ms.

MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. HONDA, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. HILL, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MASSA, and Mr. WALZ.

H. Res. 134: Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. WATT, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, and Mr. MOORE of Kansas.

H. Res. 139: Mr. PASCARELL, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CARNAHAN, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. HOLT, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SPACE, and Ms. SUTTON.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

H. Res. 123: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.