

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

(Mr. HOLT 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 New Jersey (Mr. SCHOCK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SCHOCK 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 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 gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

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.)

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

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

RUSH TO JUDGMENT ON STIMULUS BILL VOTE

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

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your indulgence this afternoon.

Earlier this afternoon, this House passed the single largest spending bill that has ever come across the work activity of this body. There was tepid applause on the other side of the aisle for the passage of this bill, I think in recognition that none of us really know if it will work. Most of us on our side of the aisle don't believe it will work, believe it was the wrong issue to do, the wrong way to address a very serious issue.

Americans all across this country are suffering: people losing their jobs, losing their homes, struggling to make ends meet. All of the things that go on during a recession. These are serious times.

My colleagues have been up here all day stating over and over ad nauseam

the lack of consideration given to our ideas on how we could have made this better, the overall lack of consideration considering the substantial size of this particular bill that was given over the last 2 weeks. You hate to use a phrase that's been worn out, but "rush to judgment" comes to mind when you look at the activity that went on.

This House voted earlier this week—it was a unanimous vote—which doesn't happen except on post office namings—a unanimous vote that we would have 48 hours to look at this bill, that our constituents would have 48 hours to look at this bill, that America would have a chance to see what we were voting on, and that was unanimous.

And, Mr. Speaker, it's totally within your prerogatives as to when things come to the House. That's one of the wonderful things about being Speaker, and it is great to be Speaker. But I'm disappointed that you didn't honor the wishes, the unanimous wishes of 403 of us, that thought we needed 48 hours to look at this bill.

□ 1530

The real losers in this bill—and there are lots of losers—but the real losers in this bill are our future children, future generations of Americans who will be forever saddled with the debt that is going to be borrowed to pay for this bill. Tucked away in the corner of one of these bills is an increase in the debt limit to \$12 trillion. That debt will never get paid back.

I had an interesting exchange with a young fifth grader in Fredericksburg, Texas, last October who asked me the single best question I've ever been asked during a town hall meeting. He said, Mr. Congressman, what's the plan to pay off the national debt? And I was rocked back on my heels because I had never been asked anything that straightforward important, and I had to say, well, young man, there is no plan to pay off the national debt. The money we borrow today is permanent debt. In order to pay debt off, you have to run a surplus. This Federal Government rarely ever runs a surplus, certainly never to the tune of \$12 trillion.

And so future generations will be paying interest not only on this \$800 billion but also the \$12 trillion that we've accumulated—and there's plenty of blame to go around for that—for the rest of their lives and the lives of their children and the lives of their children because this debt will not get paid off.

It is a sad day, Mr. Speaker, for the taxpayers and future generations of taxpayers that my generation, the one just ahead of me and the one just behind me, believe in our core that it is an appropriate way to address problems that we're having by taking money that we haven't earned, that has not even yet been earned by our grandkids and working on problems that we need to solve that are important to us. If the problems are impor-

tant enough that we need to spend money on them, then we clearly ought to be spending our own money on them and not future generations of Americans.

So, Mr. Speaker, just before I yield back, I appreciate the time. I just wanted to express how disappointed I am in the action of the House today in passing a monster of a bill that does not address the jobs that it was supposed to. It simply spends more money and is a legacy, generates higher spending on an annual year-after-year basis because of some of the floors that we've put under many of these problems that we couldn't afford before we did this, and we simply can't afford on a going-forward basis as well.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO U.S. GROUP OF THE NATO PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 1928a, and the order of the House of January 6, 2009, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Member of the House to the United States Group of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly:

Mr. TANNER, Tennessee, Chairman

THE ECONOMIC STIMULUS BILL

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

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure to have the hour—I probably won't take a full hour—but to have the opportunity to speak to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle and, in particular, follow my colleague from Texas, the gentleman who just spoke, the words of wisdom that he expressed, the gentleman, Mr. CONAWAY, who is a certified public accountant, as he described the problems with this bill that was passed on the floor today, Mr. Speaker, and no doubt will be passed by the Senate tomorrow and probably signed into law by President Obama on Monday.

The thing that I want to express, and I think that Mr. CONAWAY and some other speakers on our side of the aisle said as they spoke about this bill, was not that we on the Republican side are opposed to doing something. I mean, we don't want to just do nothing. Although, Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe that doing nothing would be better than the harm that's likely to be inflicted on our economy and, as Mr. CONAWAY said, on our children and grandchildren by the enactment of this legislation where we're spending almost \$1.2 trillion when you include the interest on the debt, that putting that burden on the backs of our future generations without an absolute assurance, without an absolute assurance, Mr. Speaker, that those 4 million jobs would be created and that this would

jump-start our economy and get us out of this deep recession.

Even with that, I would have some concerns, but Vice President BIDEN just said the other day that he thought that this bill had about a 30 percent chance of failure. Now, you think about that. We're going to take money, Federal money, that we really don't have in the Treasury. We hope that we can sell these bonds and this Federal paper, Treasury notes to people on the open market. Probably some foreign governments like China and others might buy some of this. But if they don't, then it's just simply a matter of running the printing press to come up with this money, and of course, as we all know that weakens our dollar. It leads to inflation. And so I'm not surprised when Vice President JOE BIDEN said, well, look, there was no guarantee, we're doing the best we can. We hope it works, but it's probably got about a 30 percent chance of failure.

For my money, Mr. Speaker, that is too great a chance of failure. It is just not worth that, and that's why I say that, in fact, doing nothing probably would be better. And although we would go through some tough times economically, as we are now, indeed people are suffering, and it may take 2 or 3 years to get out of this recession, but the Republican minority has a plan. We're not just standing in the doorway blocking any kind of meaningful, good legislation. We want something to work. We don't want it to take 3 or 4 years. We want to try to stimulate this.

And that's what our leader said on the floor this afternoon as we debated this issue, and finally, Madam Speaker spoke and our leader BOEHNER spoke, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee on the majority side, Mr. OBEY, spoke. But it's really the words of Mr. BOEHNER I think I would want my colleagues and anybody within shouting distance to remember what he said.

We who voted "no" on this bill are fully aware, fully cognizant of the fact that people in every single district in this country, all 435 of them, my 11th of Georgia absolutely—the State of Georgia is facing a \$3 billion deficit, and like most States, they have to balance their budget. So times are tough, and as JOHN BOEHNER said, and I would repeat here now, Mr. Speaker, we want to do something.

Unfortunately, the plan that the minority Republican party had was given no opportunity to be presented. There was no subcommittee hearings. There were no full committee hearings. There was no opportunity for amendments to be presented on the floor, so-called at least a modified open rule, where both Republicans and Democrats would have an opportunity to say, you know, we need to change this. There are some good in this bill. I think it's a 1,000-page bill. We had it on the floor earlier. Remember, it was about that high. It's probably six or eight Bibles thick. And

within that, yeah, there were some good things but a whole lot of things that are not good, and I will try to speak to some of that as we proceed.

But the idea of shutting out the minority and not letting them speak on behalf of the constituents that they represent, every one of us, 178 Republicans represent about 675,000 people in their respective districts. And quite honestly, 50 very conservative Democrats, they call themselves the Blue Dogs. Many of them are from Southern States, good Members, also representing 675,000 people, and fiscally conservative. They were shut out. They didn't get an opportunity. That's why this vote ended up being—even though the Democratic majority prevailed, the bipartisanship on the vote was on the "no" side. That means that every single Republican in this body, Mr. Speaker, all 178 of us voted no, and we were joined by six or eight Democrats who all voted "no," and all for the same reason.

The Republican Members are not all the same on every issue. We have conservative Members on social issues, like myself, and we have some Members who are socially moderate. But what you saw today is the coming together of the Republican minority on one thing that we absolutely always agree on and that we will always stand for and what I think defines us from the majority party. There's a difference. There's no question about it, and that difference is, we on the Republican side, Mr. Speaker, believe in limited Federal Government, and we believe in reduced spending and let the States do what they can for themselves and the people do what they can for themselves. Let them keep more of their own hard-earned money. That means individual employees. It also means employer—these small, mom-and-pop companies.

Most of the jobs in this country, as we all know, are created by those small, mom-and-pop companies, less than, far less than 50 employees. We're not talking about the Microsofts and the Home Depots and the Coca-Colas and the huge companies. We're talking about these small companies that would, if you gave them an opportunity to keep more of their own money—and that's basically what the Republican plan was, Mr. Speaker, as you know, that we felt like in this bill, that there should be some spending, and the amount of spending should be significant on infrastructure projects. After all, that's what was talked about for a month or 6 weeks ahead of time: we are going to put people back to work in this country on repairing bridges, rebuilding roads, putting more money into rapid transit across all 50 of the States.

And each State, Mr. Speaker, was asked to submit a list of projects called shovel ready—shovel-ready projects so that they could start turning dirt within 90 days. I think the bill finally extended to 120 days. We were in favor of

that. We are in favor of that. But in this final bill that was passed on the floor of this House today, about 7 percent of the money, about 7, not 70, Mr. Speaker, but 7 percent of the money goes to those infrastructure projects within our States. And I do believe that more money spent on those projects would indeed put people back to work and get the economy going, and I was very much in favor of that.

But the other thing that we felt very strongly about, though, was the opportunity to let people keep more of their own money, and that's why the Republican alternative had a 5 percent cut in the tax rate of everybody who pays taxes, no matter what your income. If you're paying at the 36 percent bracket, you'd pay 31 percent. If you're paying at the 28 percent bracket, you'd pay 23 percent. If you're paying at the 15 percent, 10, and the 10, 5. You get it. Everybody, across-the-board 5 percent cut in their Federal tax burden, and immediately start seeing that money in their paycheck, not going to Uncle Sam.

And also, you know, that the Republican alternative felt very strongly the way to create jobs in this country or to preserve jobs—President Obama said create 4 million or save 4 million. He's a little vague on that. But if you cut the corporate income tax rate from 35 to 25, and that's in the Republican alternative, the small businessmen and -women who usually pay as individuals, they're not S corporations or C corporations or LLCs or whatever you call it. But that would give them an opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to make more profit, to be able to expand their product line, add on to the size of their building, bring in more people, hire more people and get more people who are earning a paycheck and indeed paying taxes but at a lower rate.

□ 1545

And the final analysis, as we have proven under Presidents Kennedy in 1960, Reagan in 1980, and during the Bush administration in the early 2001, 2000, when you cut taxes and you let people keep more of their money, you do grow jobs. And we did that. Nobody can deny that. They could be critical of a lot of things. And mistakes are always made. And it's easy to be Monday morning quarterbacking.

But, without question, that type of economic philosophy and approach is what increases the Federal revenue because it grows jobs, it expands the job base.

So, these were some of the things that we had proposed but yet never saw the light of day. And it's sad because I truly believe that that would work.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, to the tax cuts, the other things of significance in the Republican alternative was to pledge—indeed, it's law, had we passed it—1 percent reduction. One percent. I know that doesn't sound like a lot but, believe me, up here inside the Beltway it's pretty hard to cut anything. But

we were talking about cutting 1 percent of spending across the board, except for our national defense. Preserve the spending on our national defense. Continue to keep this country safe and not pull the rug out from under the men and women who are doing the fighting and the suffering and the dying to keep us safe. But, across the board, every other spending category, 1 percent cut.

These are the kind of things that I wanted to talk about to my colleagues and make sure, on both sides of the aisle, but I am particularly talking to my friends on the majority side so that they do understand and your constituents understand that we're not in the minority hoping for failure, we're not hoping that President Obama is unsuccessful. Nothing could be further from the truth. We want President Obama to be successful. And I hope that he is successful.

But I don't want for some socialized program to be so successful that all of a sudden we get away from a market-driven economy and the democracy that we have all enjoyed and loved and what makes this country unique and wonderful. We don't want a European-type socialism.

And so if you hear someone say, Well, I hope this thing fails, please don't get the idea, my colleagues, that it's directed toward our new President. Of course not. Of course not. But we just want to make sure that our country succeeds in the right way. And this is for our children and our grandchildren.

I wanted to take a moment to paraphrase an article that I read in the newspaper today when I got up early this morning that I was looking at, Mr. Speaker. The Hill, the newspaper that we get daily when we're in session. And Hill and Roll Call and Politico, we all reads these things. There's some fine, fine writers on these newspapers. And this was an article penned by Cheri Jacobus. And here's what she said. I think it really cuts right to the chase in regard to \$1 trillion worth of spending. And I'm going to quote just parts of her article:

"Congress should throw this greasy pile of pork into the grinder. Instead," instead, "give every American household a \$10,000 stimulus check to spend as we please. With approximately 100 million households nationwide, we hit that magic number of \$1 trillion."

So you give \$10,000 to every one of 100 million households, that is spending the \$1 trillion. So you spend it in a different way. You give it, Mr. Speaker, to the families. And, along with that, we have a 2-year moratorium on capital gains taxes, and then we will get this economy off life support."

And I want to point out in the Republican alternative this idea of giving \$10,000 to each of 100 million families was not part of it, but the suspension of capital gains tax definitely was. And then you would see the stock market not go down 350 points when something like this passes, you would see it go up 350 points.

So, doing this now, instead of letting the government decide how we spend the \$1 trillion. Let the families decide how the \$1 trillion are spent. "Instead of condoms, green golf carts, mouse habitats, and government-run health care, Americans would spend based on individual priorities, thus spurring competition, resulting in higher-quality goods and services. Good banks succeed; bad banks fail. Well-priced, quality automobiles hit the streets; lemons fade away. Capitalism lives to fight another day and the greatest country on earth narrowly survives its near-death experience with socialism."

She goes on to say, "So here's a challenge for every Member of Congress." Mr. Speaker, that is us, me and you and our colleagues on both sides of the aisle. "So here's a challenge to every Member of Congress or, more accurately, a dare. Ask your constituents what they would do with \$10,000. Compare their list to what is in the stimulus bill. Then see who has the best ideas for spending \$1 trillion."

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to use a couple of posters to help my colleagues understand and put in perspective the amount of money we're spending because, you know, \$1,000 is a heck of a lot of money to me. You get up to a million, a billion, and a trillion, I don't even know how many zeroes we're talking about. But let's just use this poster to help us.

Sizing up the stimulus. Well, this proposed stimulus, as I said to my colleagues, is \$1.2 trillion, if we can focus on this first poster. \$1.2 trillion. Now, let's put that in perspective.

Back in the late sixties, and that terrible, terrible time of the Vietnam War. We lost almost 60,000 of our precious men and women in that battle, and \$111 billion was spent. Now if you adjust that for inflation in today's dollars, it's \$698 billion, compared to \$1.2 trillion. That is a few more zeroes.

The invasion of Iraq, inflation adjusted, \$597 billion. The money has gone up a little bit now, but it's certainly under \$1 trillion. Well under.

Now, let's go back. Let's back to the 1932 to the 1939, 1940 era. The era of the New Deal. \$32 billion adjusted for inflation—it's been a long time ago. \$500 billion. In comparison, this is the largest spending bill not just in the history, Mr. Speaker, of the United States. I believe, if I am not wrong on this, and I don't think I am, this is the largest spending bill that any government has enacted in the history of the world. In the history of the world.

We're talking about increasing our national debt, not the deficit, but the national debt, which today is about \$10.7 trillion, with a T. We're talking about increasing that by 10 percent in one snap of your finger. As soon as President Obama signs this bill into law Monday, all of a sudden we have increased the national debt 10 percent. Up to \$12.5 trillion.

How in the world, Mr. Speaker, are we ever going to pay that off? I mean,

it's downright depressing, is what it is. Not just scary, but it's downright depressing.

And speaking of that money that was spent on the New Deal, and I know people love to say, Well, FDR was one of our greatest Presidents, and no doubt he was a man of great courage; great personal courage. Overcame tremendous adversity physically and was our President during very difficult times of World War II, and did some wonderful things. And I commend him for that.

But I am not so sure the New Deal was such a good deal. In fact, it may very well have been a raw deal. Let me quote someone who should know better than I, because he was there. He lived through it. He advised President Roosevelt. He was President Roosevelt's Secretary of the Treasury, and his name was Henry Morgenthau.

And listen to what the Secretary of the Treasury under President Roosevelt said to a hearing before the Ways and Means Committee of this House in 1939. And I will quote, "We have tried spending money. We are spending more than we have ever spent before, and it does not work. I want to see this country prosperous. I want to see people get a job. I want to see people get enough to eat. We have never made good on our promises. I say, after 8 years of this administration, we have just as much unemployment as when we started, and an enormous debt to boot."

Secretary of Treasury Henry Morgenthau, under President Roosevelt, 1939, some 7 years into the New Deal. That is probably why Vice President BIDEN, Mr. Speaker, said that, Look, this thing has got a 30 percent chance of not being successful. And allowing this recession to be deeper and more prolonged than if we indeed did nothing.

Well, let me ask my colleagues to join with me in looking at a few more posters to just, again, put this spending in perspective. With this amount of money, the \$789 billion—and when I say \$1.2 trillion, that's the interest over 10 years on the debt. But when you do the math, fairly simple, and you say that you're going to create 4 million jobs, 4 million jobs with this, that means you're spending \$275,000 for every job.

That's \$275,000 for every job. That's what it's going to cost. And a lot of these jobs are going to pay \$30,000, \$35,000, maybe even \$20,000, \$25,000 a year. That is shocking when you think about it. That that much money to create one job, \$275,000 worth of spending.

Here's another chart that I think is real instructive that I wanted my colleagues to also look at. Those of you in the back of the Chamber, you may not be able to see this, or the far left or far right, but this says, Can you afford to pay for the Democratic spending bill? At \$825 billion, or \$789 billion, the economic stimulus plan sailing through Congress would cost each American family, each American family, more than \$10,000 on average.

□ 1600

Here is how that price tag compares with the typical family expenses in a year:

Stimulus spending: \$10,500.

What the family spends on food, clothing, and health care: \$10,400. What the family spends on shelter, whether they are renting or owning their own home: \$11,657.

So one-third of their expenditure in a year, that is what it is going to cost them in the final analysis, \$10,500, every year, every family, to pay for this \$1.1 trillion, \$1.2 trillion.

That is why, going back, remember when I said or read the article about, literally, why doesn't the Federal Government just write a \$10,000 check and give it to every family, and say: Look, I don't know your situation. You may have a mortgage past due, a car payment past due. You may need to pay down a credit card debt. You may have a child that wants to go back to college and you don't have the tuition for the next semester. Indeed, you may even have a family member that needs an operation or some dental work or something and you can't pay for it, and you can take money out of that \$10,000. Or maybe you just simply want to save it for a rainy day. Lord knows, we have got a rainy day now. Or you might, if your situation is such and you think the old clinker of a car is falling apart and we want to buy American, and General Motors or Ford Motor Company has got a great new car that gets good gas mileage and we will go ahead and buy a car, or whatever, a washing machine. And all of a sudden, the economy starts moving. And so this shows it, I think, Mr. Speaker, in a very vivid, vivid way.

Before I finish up, Mr. Speaker, and I didn't want to take the entire hour, but I wanted to talk just a little bit about some of the health care things that are in this bill.

There is money toward moving us as a Nation for complete electronic medical records. I am for that, Mr. Speaker. I think that would be a good thing. I think that would save lives and save money, and I clearly feel that that is something that we want to do. But there are a number of provisions, and I will just mention one that really, really concerns me, and that is this comparative effectiveness commission. Comparative effectiveness, where the Federal Government, and I think \$1 billion, if I am not mistaken, I think \$1 billion goes into creating this other layer of government bureaucracy called comparative effectiveness that would decide which medical procedures or medications were cost effective and in certain instances will just simply say that, "Well, we don't think that is cost effective," that MRI that mom had in the emergency room last week or the CAT scan or electroencephalogram because a child had a seizure.

To say that it is not effective, who are these bureaucrats that would have the ability to do that? Have they ever

had a stethoscope around their neck? Have they ever had a white lab coat on? No. They are just number crunchers, and all of a sudden they are going to come in between you, our constituents, men and women, and your health care provider, your physician, whether it is a pediatrician or obstetrician or general surgeon or a family doctor.

So as we look at this massive bill, what we are seeing is a lot of things in there, Mr. Speaker, that really don't have anything to do with putting people back to work. That 7 percent spending on infrastructure, that ought to be 25 percent of the spending. It ought to be much more than it is. But yet, there are things in there, and I could go through a list of them and it is almost appalling.

I mention that about that health care. It is just trying to set policy in this bill, moving us in a direction that I don't think, I do not think, the American people want. And I think, the American people, my colleagues, remember back in 1993, 1992, under President Clinton, when current Secretary of State Clinton now but first lady at that time was sort of put in charge of trying to develop a single payor national health care system just like they have in the United Kingdom or in Canada or other countries where it doesn't work so well and care is rationed.

My fear, and as you read this bill and you try to read through, the devil is in the details, and you see these things and you see what is happening in the health care provision, it is definitely trying to move us in that direction once again.

So again, our opposition to the bill is not that we don't want to help people and help them right now, that we don't have compassion. Indeed, there is no one more compassionate in this Chamber than the minority leader, Mr. BOEHNER. In fact, many times he is almost to the point of tears, he is so compassionate.

So we just want to look at this thing, as we have, and realize that so much of the money, Mr. Speaker, in this bill is all about pushing an agenda and spending money, some of which may be worthwhile, but it should go through the regular order. That is why we are up here, mainly, to authorize and appropriate spending. That is a major responsibility of the Members of Congress in the House and Senate. And we should do that under regular order. But it is like the chief of staff now, our former colleague here in the House, the chief of staff to President Obama, Rahm Emanuel, the gentleman from Illinois, the same State as the President, said it would be a tragedy to let any crisis go unused, or something to that effect. I am paraphrasing, but it would be a tragedy to let a crisis go to waste. In other words, take a crisis and try to do some good things and put people back to work; but, at the same time, pump all kind of other stuff in there

that you have been trying to get passed for years and have not been successful because the majority of the Congress doesn't want it, so you throw it in there as emergency spending and drag it along as we tug at heartstrings.

And that is just not right, Mr. Speaker. That is unfair. It is deceiving the American public, and it is putting a burden on them that I will have no part of. And my colleagues on this side of the aisle, 178 of us, Republicans, and six to eight conservative, fiscally conservative Democrats feel the same way.

I just feel that if we had an opportunity, Mr. Speaker, if we had had an opportunity to present an alternative, we could do that in a bipartisan way. We don't hate each other, as you know, Mr. Speaker. We respect each other, and in many cases best friends are on opposite sides of the aisle. We can do these things. But somehow this top down, my way or the highway, closed rules, no opportunity to go through committee, we are losing out, and it is not right, because the minority represents, what, 48 percent? A lot of people, a lot of people in this country, Mr. Speaker, elected Republican Members of this House and Senate.

So as I conclude, I just want to the say to all of my colleagues, on the Republican side we voted "no," and we voted no for a very good reason. We have great fear, just as Vice President BIDEN said, that this won't work. And it is not like, well, it just didn't work, and we lost that game and we will play another one. No. This is too big a risk. It puts too big a burden on our future generations, and it has the likelihood of leaving us in this recession for a long time to come.

We had an opportunity. My colleague, my Senate colleague from Georgia, JOHNNY ISAKSON, had an amendment on the Senate side that would give every person, every family that bought a new home a \$15,000 tax credit. It passed on the Senate side I think by a voice vote, unanimous consent, everybody. I heard Senator SCHUMER say what a wonderful, wonderful idea that the gentleman from Georgia, Senator JOHNNY ISAKSON, had, because this whole mess started with the downturn of the housing market; and until we get those houses moving and sold, that will get us out of this mess. And the Senate knew it. And yet, when they got to conference committee, what happened? They pulled that amendment out. Pulled that amendment out.

I really believe if that and maybe an opportunity for people to get a fixed-rate mortgage at 4 percent or 5 percent, 30-year fixed rate, let them have that opportunity over the next year or so, the Johnny Isakson amendment, maybe we can pass it as a stand-alone bill. The Republican alternative to this spendulous bill where we emphasize tax cuts and spending cuts and we spend more money on infrastructure, I think if we came back and did that, we would be out of this the recession in 12 months to 18 months.

And so that is why I am here this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, just to share those thoughts with my colleagues. And I hope and pray that President Obama will be successful; but when it is something that I have great fear of hurting the country, taking us down a road that our Founding Fathers never intended us to go, then I am going to stand up and I am going to say, "No, Mr. President," as I did today.

I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. LEE of New York (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of helping to coordinate the Federal response and to provide assistance to the families of the victims of the tragic crash of Continental Airlines Flight 3407 in his district.

Mr. CLYBURN (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today after 1:30 p.m. on account of his daughter's wedding in South Carolina.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

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

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHIFF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HOLT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. CASSIDY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHOCK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HERGER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCCOTTER, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. FOXX, for 5 minutes today.

Mr. FLEMING, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CONAWAY, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DREIER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MALONEY, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the order of the House of today, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 13 minutes

p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Tuesday, February 17, 2009, at 10 a.m., unless it sooner has received a message from the Senate transmitting its concurrence in House Concurrent Resolution 47, in which case the House shall stand adjourned pursuant to that concurrent resolution.

OATH OF OFFICE MEMBERS, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER, AND DELEGATES

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members, Resident Commissioner, and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in 5 U.S.C. 3331:

"I, AB, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me god."

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Member of the 111th Congress, pursuant to the provisions of 2 U.S.C. 25:

ALABAMA

1. Jo Bonner
2. Bobby Bright
3. Mike Rogers
4. Robert B. Aderholt
5. Parker Griffith
6. Spencer Bachus
7. Artur Davis

ALASKA

At Large, Don Young

AMERICAN SAMOA

Delegate, Eni F.H. Faleomavaega

ARIZONA

1. Ann Kirkpatrick
2. Trent Franks
3. John B. Shadegg
4. Ed Pastor
5. Harry E. Mitchell
6. Jeff Flake
7. Raúl M. Grijalva
8. Gabrielle Giffords

ARKANSAS

1. Marion Berry
2. Vic Snyder
3. John Boozman
4. Mike Ross

CALIFORNIA

1. Mike Thompson
2. Wally Herger
3. Daniel E. Lungren
4. Tom McClintock
5. Doris O. Matsui
6. Lynn C. Woolsey
7. George Miller
8. Nancy Pelosi
9. Barbara Lee
10. Ellen O. Tauscher
11. Jerry McNerney

12. Jackie Speier
13. Fortney Pete Stark
14. Anna G. Eshoo
15. Michael M. Honda
16. Zoe Lofgren
17. Sam Farr
18. Dennis A. Cardoza
19. George Radanovich
20. Jim Costa
21. Devin Nunes
22. Kevin McCarthy
23. Lois Capps
24. Elton Gallegly
25. Howard P. "Buck" McKeon
26. David Dreier
27. Brad Sherman
28. Howard L. Berman
29. Adam B. Schiff
30. Henry A. Waxman
31. Xavier Becerra
32. Hilda L. Solis
33. Diane E. Watson
34. Lucille Roybal-Allard
35. Maxine Waters
36. Jane Harman
37. Laura Richardson
38. Grace F. Napolitano
39. Linda T. Sánchez
40. Edward R. Royce
41. Jerry Lewis
42. Gary G. Miller
43. Joe Baca
44. Ken Calvert
45. Mary Bono Mack
46. Dana Rohrabacher
47. Loretta Sanchez
48. John Campbell
49. Darrell E. Issa
50. Brian P. Bilbray
51. Bob Filner
52. Duncan Hunter
53. Susan A. Davis

COLORADO

1. Diana DeGette
2. Jared Polis
3. John T. Salazar
4. Betsy Markey
5. Doug Lamborn
6. Mike Coffman
7. Ed Perlmutter

CONNECTICUT

1. John B. Larson
2. Joe Courtney
3. Rosa L. DeLauro
4. James A. Himes
5. Christopher S. Murphy

DELAWARE

At Large, Michael N. Castle

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Delegate, Eleanor Holmes Norton

FLORIDA

1. Jeff Miller
2. Allen Boyd
3. Corrine Brown
4. Ander Crenshaw
5. Ginny Brown-Waite
6. Cliff Stearns
7. John L. Mica
8. Alan Grayson
9. Gus M. Bilirakis
10. C.W. Bill Young
11. Kathy Castor
12. Adam H. Putnam
13. Vern Buchanan
14. Connie Mack
15. Bill Posey
16. Thomas J. Rooney
17. Kendrick B. Meek
18. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen
19. Robert Wexler
20. Debbie Wasserman Schultz
21. Lincoln Diaz-Balart
22. Ron Klein
23. Alcee L. Hastings
24. Suzanne M. Kosmas