

Whitfield Wittman Young (AK)
Wilson (SC) Wolf Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—4

Campbell Solis (CA)
Lee (NY) Stark

□ 1107

Messrs. SHADEGG, BLUNT, MARSHALL and MCINTYRE changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 231, nays 194, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 67]

YEAS—231

Abercrombie Edwards (TX) Lofgren, Zoe
Ackerman Ellison Lowey
Adler (NJ) Engel Luján
Altmire Eshoo Lynch
Andrews Etheridge Maffei
Arcuri Farr Maloney
Baca Fattah Markey (CO)
Baldwin Filner Markey (MA)
Barrow Foster Massa
Bean Frank (MA) Matheson
Becerra Fudge Matsui
Berkley Gonzalez McCarthy (NY)
Berman Gordon (TN) McCollum
Berry Grayson McDermott
Bishop (GA) Green, Al McGovern
Bishop (NY) Green, Gene McIntyre
Blumenauer Grijalva McMahan
Bocieri Gutierrez McNerney
Boren Hall (NY) Meek (FL)
Boswell Halvorson Meeks (NY)
Boucher Hare Miller (NC)
Brady (PA) Harman Miller, George
Braley (IA) Hastings (FL) Mollohan
Brown, Corrine Heinrich Moore (KS)
Butterfield Herseth Sandlin Moore (WI)
Capps Higgins Moran (VA)
Capuano Himes Murphy (CT)
Cardoza Hinchey Murphy, Patrick
Carnahan Hinojosa Murtha
Carson (IN) Hirono Nadler (NY)
Castor (FL) Hodes Napolitano
Chandler Holden Neal (MA)
Clarke Holt Oberstar
Clay Honda Obey
Cleaver Hoyer Olver
Clyburn Insee Ortiz
Cohen Jackson (IL) Pallone
Connolly (VA) Jackson-Lee Pastorell
Conyers (TX) Johnson (GA) Pastor (AZ)
Cooper Johnson (GA) Payne
Costa Johnson, E. B. Perlmutter
Costello Kagen Perriello
Courtney Kanjorski Peters
Crowley Kaptur Peterson
Cuellar Kennedy Pingree (ME)
Cummins Kildee Polis (CO)
Dahlkemper Kilpatrick (MI) Pomeroy
Davis (AL) Kilroy Price (NC)
Davis (CA) Kind Rahall
Davis (IL) Kissell Rangel
Davis (TN) Klein (FL) Rangel
DeGette Kosmas Richardson
Delahunt Kucinich Rodriguez
DeLauro Langevin Ross
Dicks Larsen (WA) Rothman (NJ)
Dingell Larson (CT) Roybal-Allard
Doggett Lee (CA) Ruppberger
Donnelly (IN) Levin Rush
Doyle Lewis (GA) Ryan (OH)
Driehaus Lipinski Salazar
Edwards (MD) Loebsock

Sánchez, Linda Smith (WA)
T. Snyder
Sanchez, Loretta Solis (CA)
Sarbanes Space
Schakowsky Speier
Schauer Spratt
Schiff Stupak
Schrader Sutton
Schwartz Tauscher
Scott (GA) Teague
Scott (VA) Thompson (CA)
Serrano Thompson (MS)
Sestak Tierney
Shea-Porter Titus
Sherman Tonko
Sires Towns
Skelton Tsongas
Slaughter Van Hollen

NAYS—194

Aderholt Frelinghuysen Minnick
Akin Gallegly Mitchell
Alexander Garrett (NJ) Moran (KS)
Austria Gerlach Murphy, Tim
Bachmann Giffords Myrick
Bachus Gingrey (GA) Neugebauer
Baird Gohmert Nunes
Barrett (SC) Goodlatte Nye
Bartlett Granger Olson
Barton (TX) Graves Paul
Biggart Griffith Paulsen
Bilbray Guthrie Pence
Bilirakis Hall (TX) Petri
Bishop (UT) Harper Pitts
Blackburn Hastings (WA) Platts
Blunt Heller Poe (TX)
Boehner Hensarling Posey
Bonner Herger Price (GA)
Bono Mack Hill Putnam
Boozman Hoekstra Rehberg
Boustany Hunter Reichert
Boyd Inglis Roe (TN)
Brady (TX) Issa Rogers (AL)
Bright Jenkins Rogers (KY)
Broun (GA) Johnson (IL) Rogers (MI)
Brown (SC) Johnson, Sam Rohrabacher
Brown-Waite, Jones Rooney
Ginny Jordan (OH) Ros-Lehtinen
Buchanan King (IA) Roskam
Burgess King (NY) Royce
Burton (IN) Kingston Ryan (WI)
Buyer Kirk Scalise
Calvert Kirkpatrick (AZ) Schmidt
Camp Kline (MN) Schock
Cantwell Kratovil Sensenbrenner
Capito Lance Sessions
Carney Latham Shadegg
Carter LaTourrette Shimkus
Cassidy Latta Shuler
Castle Lewis (CA) Shuster
Chaffetz Linder Simpson
Childers LoBiondo Smith (NE)
Coble Lucas Smith (NJ)
Coffman (CO) Luetkemeyer Smith (TX)
Cole Lummis Souder
Conaway Lungren, Daniel Stearns
Crenshaw E. Sullivan
Culberson Mack Tanner
Davis (KY) Manzullo
Deal (GA) Marchant Taylor
DeFazio Marshall Terry
Dent McCarthy (CA) Thompson (PA)
Diaz-Balart, L. McCaul Thornberry
Diaz-Balart, M. McClintock Tiahrt
Dreier McCotter Tiberi
Duncan McHenry Turner
Ehlers McHugh Upton
Ellsworth McKeon Walden
Emerson McMorris Wamp
Fallin Rodgers Westmoreland
Flake Melancon Whitfield
Fleming Mica Wilson (SC)
Forbes Michaud Wittman
Fortenberry Miller (FL) Wolf
Foxy Miller (MI) Young (AK)
Franks (AZ) Miller, Gary Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—7

Campbell Lamborn Stark
Cao Lee (NY)
Israel Radanovich

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1114

So the resolution was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:
Mr. CAO. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 67, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

□ 1115

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from North Carolina will state her parliamentary inquiry.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, on February 10, 2009, the House adopted a motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 1 by a vote of 403 yeas and no nays. That motion directed the managers on the part of the House to withhold their signatures on the final conference agreement until that agreement had been available electronically for at least 48 hours.

Madam Speaker, it is a matter of public record that the three majority House conferees affixed their signatures to the conference agreement while the hard copy had been available for less than 1 hour and the electronic copy was as yet unavailable. In fact, a correct electronic copy was not made available until after midnight last night. So it is uncontroverted that the majority House conferees acted in direct opposition to the unanimous instructions of the House.

Madam Speaker, my inquiry is this: Given that the majority managers on the part of the House ignored the instructions given them by 403 of their colleagues, without a single dissenting vote, what remedy do we have against the managers who disregarded the instruction to make the conference report available for 48 hours?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members may illuminate such questions by their remarks in debate.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman will state her inquiry.

Ms. FOXX. Just to clarify then, there is no point of order or other remedy available to address this flagrant violation of the instructions of the House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is not the province of the Chair to render advisory opinions or rule on questions of order not actually presented.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1, AMERICAN RECOVERY AND REINVESTMENT ACT OF 2009

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 168, I call up the conference report on 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 fiscal year ending September 30, 2009, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 1) contains an emergency designation for purposes of pay-as-you-go principles. Accordingly, the Chair must put the question of consideration under clause 10(c)(3) of rule XXI.

The question is, Will the House now consider the conference report?

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

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 232, nays 195, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 68]

YEAS—232

Abercrombie	Fattah	Matheson
Ackerman	Filner	Matsui
Adler (NJ)	Foster	McCarthy (NY)
Altmire	Frank (MA)	McColum
Andrews	Fudge	McDermott
Arcuri	Gonzalez	McGovern
Baca	Grayson	McIntyre
Baldwin	Green, Al	McMahon
Barrow	Green, Gene	McNerney
Becerra	Grijalva	Meek (FL)
Berkley	Gutierrez	Meeks (NY)
Berman	Hall (NY)	Melancon
Berry	Halvorson	Miller (NC)
Bishop (GA)	Hare	Miller, George
Bishop (NY)	Harman	Mitchell
Blumenauer	Hastings (FL)	Mollohan
Boccheri	Heinrich	Moore (KS)
Boren	Herse	Moore (WI)
Boswell	Higgins	Moran (VA)
Boucher	Hill	Murphy (CT)
Boyd	Himes	Murphy, Patrick
Brady (PA)	Hinche	Murtha
Braley (IA)	Hinojosa	Nadler (NY)
Brown, Corrine	Hirono	Napolitano
Butterfield	Hodes	Neal (MA)
Capps	Holden	Nye
Capuano	Holt	Oberstar
Cardoza	Honda	Obey
Carnahan	Hoyer	Oliver
Carson (IN)	Inslee	Ortiz
Castor (FL)	Israel	Pallone
Chandler	Jackson (IL)	Pascarell
Childers	Jackson-Lee	Pastor (AZ)
Clarke	(TX)	Payne
Clay	Johnson (GA)	Perlmutter
Cleaver	Johnson, E. B.	Peters
Clyburn	Kagen	Peterson
Connolly (VA)	Kanjorski	Pingree (ME)
Conyers	Kaptur	Polis (CO)
Costa	Kennedy	Pomeroy
Costello	Kildee	Price (NC)
Courtney	Kilpatrick (MI)	Rahall
Crowley	Kilroy	Rangel
Cuellar	Kind	Reyes
Cummings	Kissell	Richardson
Dahlkemper	Klein (FL)	Rodriguez
Davis (AL)	Kosmas	Ross
Davis (CA)	Kucinich	Rothman (NJ)
Davis (IL)	Langevin	Roybal-Allard
DeGette	Larsen (WA)	Ruppersberger
Delahunt	Larson (CT)	Rush
DeLauro	Lee (CA)	Ryan (OH)
Dicks	Levin	Salazar
Dingell	Lewis (GA)	Sánchez, Linda
Donnelly (IN)	Lipinski	T.
Doyle	Loeb	Sánchez, Loretta
Driehaus	Lofgren, Zoe	Sarbanes
Edwards (MD)	Lowe	Schakowsky
Edwards (TX)	Luján	Schauer
Ellison	Lynch	Schiff
Ellsworth	Maffei	Schrader
Engel	Maloney	Schwartz
Eshoo	Markey (CO)	Scott (GA)
Etheridge	Markey (MA)	Scott (VA)
Farr	Massa	Serrano

Sestak	Tauscher
Shea-Porter	Teague
Sherman	Thompson (CA)
Sires	Thompson (MS)
Skelton	Tierney
Slaughter	Titus
Snyder	Tonko
Solis (CA)	Towns
Space	Tsongas
Speier	Van Hollen
Spratt	Velázquez
Stupak	Visclosky
Sutton	Walz
Tanner	

Wasserman	Schultz
Waters	Watt
Watson	Waxman
Watt	Weiner
Welch	Wilson (OH)
Wexler	Woolsey
Wilson (OH)	Wu
Woolsey	Yarmuth
Wu	
Yarmuth	

NAYS—195

Aderholt	Fox
Akin	Franks (AZ)
Alexander	Frelinghuysen
Austria	Galle
Bachmann	Garrett (NJ)
Bachus	Gerlach
Baird	Giffords
Barrett (SC)	Gingrey (GA)
Bartlett	Gohmert
Barton (TX)	Goodlatte
Bean	Granger
Biggart	Graves
Bilbray	Griffith
Bilirakis	Guthrie
Bishop (UT)	Hall (TX)
Blackburn	Harper
Blunt	Hastings (WA)
Boehner	Heller
Bonner	Hensarling
Bono Mack	Herger
Boozman	Hoekstra
Boustany	Hunter
Brady (TX)	Inglis
Bright	Issa
Broun (GA)	Jenkins
Brown (SC)	Johnson (IL)
Brown-Waite,	Johnson, Sam
Ginny	Jones
Buchanan	Jordan (OH)
Burgess	King (IA)
Burton (IN)	King (NY)
Buyer	Kingston
Calvert	Kirk
Camp	Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Cantor	Kline (MN)
Cao	Kratovil
Capito	Lamborn
Carney	Lance
Carter	Latham
Cassidy	LaTourette
Castle	Latta
Chaffetz	Lewis (CA)
Coble	Linder
Coffman (CO)	LoBiondo
Cohen	Lucas
Cole	Luetkemeyer
Conaway	Lummis
Cooper	Lungren, Daniel
Crenshaw	E.
Culberson	Mack
Davis (KY)	Manullo
Deal (GA)	Marchant
DeFazio	Marshall
Dent	McCarthy (CA)
Diaz-Balart, L.	McCaul
Diaz-Balart, M.	McClintock
Doggett	McCotter
Dreier	McHenry
Duncan	McHugh
Ehlers	McKeon
Emerson	McMorris
Fallin	Rodgers
Flake	Mica
Fleming	Michaud
Forbes	Miller (FL)
Fortenberry	Miller (MI)

NOT VOTING—5

Campbell	Gordon (TN)	Stark
Davis (TN)	Lee (NY)	

□ 1137

So the question of consideration was decided in the affirmative.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TIERNEY). The gentleman may state his inquiry.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the rule has allowed for 90 minutes of debate on this \$800 billion package; is that correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Ninety minutes is correct.

Does the gentleman have a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. LEWIS of California. It is my understanding that many Members who wish to debate this matter, thereby, will not be allowed time because of the limited time. I further understand that I am not allowed to ask for an extension of time under the rule; is that correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair cannot anticipate what request will be made.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Then let me further say it is my understanding that an extension of time, which would be the request, can only be made by the gentleman from Wisconsin; is that correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will deal with the unanimous consent requests as they may occur.

Mr. LEWIS of California. You are forcing me to do that which we really should not have to do.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Well, the Chair thinks the gentleman can read the rule and can understand it, but if he wishes to proceed, he may go ahead.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I hope the gentleman from Wisconsin will respond, but I would ask unanimous consent that we extend debate time by 1 hour.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would look to the gentleman from Wisconsin to propound such a request.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Then let me ask the gentleman from Wisconsin: Would you consider such a request?

Mr. OBEY. If the gentleman would yield, I would simply note the House has already voted on how it intends to proceed, and I see no reason to depart from that.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I believe the gentleman could initiate it by unanimous consent, and he has the authority for that. I urge the gentleman to do so. All of our people want more time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman stating a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. LEWIS of California. I very much appreciate the Speaker for his time.

Mr. OBEY. If the gentleman is asking, would the gentleman yield for a response?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California no longer seeks recognition.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I have a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Please state the inquiry.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, the House passed a unanimous motion to instruct which directed the conferees to make the text of this report available for 48 hours before being considered.

Under House rules, what is the effect of a motion to instruct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Instructions by the House to its conferees are advisory in nature and are not binding as a limitation on their authority.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. A further inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Then a unanimous motion to instruct adopted by this House is not binding at all and, therefore, is of no consequence; is that correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will repeat: Instructions by the House to its conferees are advisory in nature and are not binding as a limitation on their authority.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. A further inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Under House rules, isn't it true that a conference report cannot be made in order and considered on the floor unless it has been available for 3 calendar days?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This question is hypothetical as any such point of order has been waived.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order under rule XXII, clause 8 whereby the conference report shall not be in order and will be considered as read unless it has been available for 3 calendar days.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The point of order has been waived.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, a further inquiry then.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Is there an opportunity under the rules to allow for a reading of the over 1,000-page bill that is being considered currently?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The order of the House provides that the conference report is considered as read.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. A further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. As the ruling of the Chair, as the ruling of the Speaker, it is my understanding then, in having this bill of over 1,000 pages made available to the Members of the House after 11 or 12 o'clock last night, that this is to have been considered read even though it is physically impossible for any Member to have read this bill; is that correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. House Resolution 168 provides that the conference report is considered as read.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I thank the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 168, the conference report is considered read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of February 12, 2009, at page H1307.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) each will control 45 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. OBEY. Mr. 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 conference report accompanying H.R. 1, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds.

As Senator COCHRAN said, the time for talk is over. It is time to vote. The country needs this package. I urge support. I think we ought to get on with it.

ECONOMIC ANALYSIS OF THE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1, THE AMERICAN RECOVERY AND REINVESTMENT ACT

Economists generally agree that the Nation is facing one of the most dire economic crises in our history. Over the past three months 1.8 million jobs have been lost after falling the same amount in the prior ten months. Other economic data also point to an ever-faster sinking U.S. economy:

Unemployment has soared by 4.1 million, an increase of more than 50 percent from 7.5 million to 11.6 million since December 2007 when the recession began.

Full time employment dropped 3.5 million over the last three months, much faster than at any time since the data began in 1967.

Consumer demand for goods fell at an 11 percent rate in the second half of 2008, faster than at any time in the 62 years of data.

Only five months in six decades of data saw lower use of our manufacturing capacity than the 70.2 percent recorded in December.

Exports fell at a 19.7 percent annual rate in the most recent quarter.

Nothing indicates that these trends will not continue unless the federal government acts. While forecasters differ on specifics, many believe that without quick and decisive action the Nation could suffer another 5 million job losses over the coming year.

The U.S. economy is caught in a vicious downward spiral with self-reinforcing declines in spending, sales, jobs, income, profits, government revenues, state and local services, investment, and global trade. The federal government is the only major actor in the U.S. economy with the capacity to stop the downward spiral.

The current downturn looks a lot more like the early stages of the Great Depression than any episode since the 1930s:

Rapid shrinkage in private credit, with crisis in every major financial sector;

The favorite tool of the Federal Reserve (the short term rate to banks) already lowered to virtually zero;

Evaporating household wealth with plunging values of homes and financial assets;

Record high supplies of vacant homes and declines in home values with no end in sight;

The fewest cars sold relative to the population since the 1940s; and

Inflation is verging on negative territory or deflation, a condition that discourages

consumption, as people wait to buy at lower prices, and investment, as sales become more problematic and effective borrowing costs rise. Deflation also undermines monetary policy because interest rates cannot go negative.

Opponents of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act often argue that "spending is not stimulus" because spending by government just reduces spending by others. That argument effectively assumes that total spending in the economy cannot be raised. That would make sense if either (1) we were at full employment or (2) increased government borrowing came from lenders who would otherwise spend the money on U.S. goods and services. Neither condition applies today. We have high rates of unemployed labor and capital equipment. We also find lenders eager to fund federal borrowing rather than to spend, as evidenced by exceptionally low interest rates on U.S. Treasury Bills. These are textbook conditions justifying federal government borrowing to boost the economy.

Some critics of this legislation have misinterpreted Congressional Budget Office (CBO) analysis of the effects of this legislation on jobs and Gross Domestic Product (GDP) over the next ten years. CBO found that bills like those passed in the House and Senate would increase job-years by 3.1 million to 9.0 million over the next six years and would not lower jobs thereafter. CBO also found that GDP would be raised over the next ten years. GDP would be boosted 3 to 10 percent over the next several years. If only this bill is enacted and nothing is done to raise saving, the bill would have a zero to 0.2 percent annual reduction of GDP in the long run.

Other opponents of this legislation have proposed as an alternative measures intended to boost housing production or prices. With 2.9 percent of homes still vacant, half again as much as at any time prior to 2005, we could fritter away hundreds of billions of dollars of additional deficit with a negligible boost to the economy or jobs.

The Congressional Budget Office and private economic forecasters have evaluated various options for boosting national spending from an additional dollar of federal deficit. They have consistently found that the highest "bang for the buck" occurs with either direct federal spending or transferring funds to those with tight budget constraints such as cash-strapped households and state and local governments with falling revenues and balanced budget requirements. In contrast, they find that much less additional spending would result from making more money available to those with high incomes or to companies with excess capacity. In recent testimony, CBO Director Elmendorf stated, "In CBO's judgment, H.R. 1 would provide a substantial boost to economic activity over the next several years relative to what would occur without any legislation."

The bill's \$789 billion price tag sounds large, but it is more likely to be too little than too much. The CBO director has testified that, if nothing is done, our economic output will fall below its potential by close to a trillion dollars this year and next and by another \$600 billion in 2011. He noted that this would be the largest gap relative to the size of potential output since the Great Depression. It would represent a loss in Americans' income and output of \$2.5 trillion, or about \$8,000 per person, that will be lost forever.

The forecasters at the Congressional Budget Office, Moody's Economy.com, Macroeconomic Advisers, and the Obama Administration have all estimated that enactment of this legislation could create or save 3 to 4 million jobs. If we can gainfully employ

those millions of people, as opposed to having them be unemployed, they can create a stronger economy for the future by building

infrastructure, creating technologies, and improving their education and skills.

The following table summarizes the funding levels in division A of the conference report:

AMERICAN RECOVERY AND REINVESTMENT ACT OF 2009
(Amounts in thousands)

	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. House	Conference vs Senate
TITLE I - AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT					
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE					
Office of the Secretary.....	---	200,000	---	---	-200,000
Office of Inspector General.....	22,500	22,500	22,500	---	---
Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service, research and education activities.....	---	50,000	---	---	-50,000
Agriculture buildings and facilities and rental payments.....	44,000	---	24,000	-20,000	+24,000
Agricultural Research Service: Buildings and facilities.....	209,000	---	176,000	-33,000	+176,000
Farm Service Agency: Salaries and expenses.....	245,000	---	50,000	-195,000	+50,000
Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund Program Account:					
Loan authorizations:					
Farm ownership loans:					
Direct.....	---	(300,000)	---	---	(-300,000)
Unsubsidized guaranteed.....	---	(100,000)	---	---	(-100,000)
Subtotal.....	---	(400,000)	---	---	(-400,000)
Farm operating loans:					
Direct.....	---	(200,000)	---	---	(-200,000)
Unsubsidized guaranteed.....	---	(50,000)	---	---	(-50,000)
Subtotal.....	---	(250,000)	---	---	(-250,000)
Loan subsidies:					
Farm ownership loans:					
Direct.....	---	17,200	---	---	-17,200
Unsubsidized guaranteed.....	---	330	---	---	-330
Subtotal.....	---	(17,530)	---	---	(-17,530)
Farm operating loans:					
Direct.....	---	23,600	---	---	-23,600
Unsubsidized guaranteed.....	---	1,300	---	---	-1,300
Subtotal.....	---	(24,900)	---	---	(-24,900)
Total, Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund Program Account.....					
(Loan authorizations).....	---	42,430	---	---	-42,430
(Loan authorizations).....	---	(650,000)	---	---	(-650,000)
Total, Farm Service Agency.....	245,000	42,430	50,000	-195,000	+7,570
Natural Resources Conservation Service:					
Watershed and flood prevention operations.....	350,000	275,000	290,000	-60,000	+15,000
Watershed rehabilitation program.....	50,000	65,000	50,000	---	-15,000
Total, Natural Resources Conservation Service.....	400,000	340,000	340,000	-60,000	---
Rural Development Programs					
Rural development salaries and expenses.....	---	80,000	---	---	-80,000
Rural Community Advancement Program:					
Loan authorizations:					
Rural community facilities direct loans.....	(1,102,000)	---	---	(-1,102,000)	---
Business and industry guaranteed loans.....	(2,000,000)	---	---	(-2,000,000)	---
Rural water and waste disposal direct loans.....	(2,736,000)	---	---	(-2,736,000)	---
Subtotal.....	(5,838,000)	---	---	(-5,838,000)	---

AMERICAN RECOVERY AND REINVESTMENT ACT OF 2009
(Amounts in thousands)

	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. House	Conference vs Senate
Loan subsidies:					
Rural community facilities direct loans.....	63,000	---	---	-63,000	---
Rural community facilities guaranteed loans...	---	---	---	---	---
Rural community facilities grants.....	137,000	---	---	-137,000	---
Business and industry guaranteed loans.....	87,000	---	---	-87,000	---
Rural business enterprise grants.....	13,000	---	---	-13,000	---
Rural water and waste disposal direct loans...	400,000	---	---	-400,000	---
Rural water and waste disposal grants.....	1,100,000	---	---	-1,100,000	---
Subtotal.....	(1,800,000)	---	---	(-1,800,000)	---
Total, Rural Community Advancement Program....					
(Loan authorizations).....	(5,838,000)	---	---	(-5,838,000)	---
Rural Housing Service:					
Rural Housing Insurance Fund Program Account.					
Loan authorizations:					
Single family (sec. 502):					
Direct loans.....	(4,018,000)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(-3,018,000)	---
Unsubsidized guaranteed loans.....	(18,111,000)	(10,472,000)	(10,472,000)	(-7,639,000)	---
Subtotal.....	(22,129,000)	(11,472,000)	(11,472,000)	(-10,657,000)	---
Loan subsidies:					
Single family (sec. 502):					
Direct loans.....	270,000	67,000	67,000	-203,000	---
Unsubsidized guaranteed loans.....	230,000	133,000	133,000	-97,000	---
Subtotal.....	(500,000)	(200,000)	(200,000)	(-300,000)	---
Rural community facilities program account:					
Loan subsidies and grants:					
Direct.....	---	67,000	67,000	+67,000	---
Guaranteed.....	---	10,000	---	---	-10,000
Grants.....	---	50,000	63,000	+63,000	+13,000
Subtotal.....	---	127,000	130,000	+130,000	+3,000
Total, Rural Housing Service.....					
(Loan authorizations).....	(22,129,000)	(11,472,000)	(11,472,000)	(-10,657,000)	---
Rural Business-Cooperative Service:					
Rural Business Program Account.					
Loan subsidies and grants:					
Guaranteed business and industry subsidy..	---	130,000	130,000	+130,000	---
Rural business enterprise grants.....	---	20,000	20,000	+20,000	---
Subtotal.....	---	150,000	150,000	+150,000	---
Biorefinery assistance.....	---	200,000	---	---	-200,000
Rural energy for America program.....	---	50,000	---	---	-50,000
Total, Rural Business-Cooperative Service...					
---	---	400,000	150,000	+150,000	-250,000
Rural Utilities Service:					
Rural water and waste disposal program account:					
Direct loans subsidy.....	---	412,000	412,000	+412,000	---
Grants.....	---	963,000	968,000	+968,000	+5,000
Subtotal.....	---	1,375,000	1,380,000	+1,380,000	+5,000
Distance learning, telemedicine, and broadband program:					
Distance learning and telemedicine loans....	---	10,000	---	---	-10,000
Distance learning and telemedicine grants...	---	90,000	---	---	-90,000
Broadband subsidies and grants.....	2,825,000	---	2,500,000	-325,000	+2,500,000
Total, Rural Development Programs.....					
(Loan Authorizations).....	(27,967,000)	(11,472,000)	(11,472,000)	(-16,495,000)	---
Food and Nutrition Service					
Child nutrition programs.....	---	100,000	100,000	+100,000	---
Special supplemental nutrition program for women, infants, and children (WIC).....	100,000	120,000	100,000	---	-20,000
Contingency fund.....	---	380,000	400,000	+400,000	+20,000
Subtotal.....	100,000	500,000	500,000	+400,000	---

AMERICAN RECOVERY AND REINVESTMENT ACT OF 2009
(Amounts in thousands)

	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. House	Conference vs Senate
Emergency food assistance program (emergency).....	150,000	150,000	150,000	---	---
Total, Food and nutrition service.....	250,000	750,000	750,000	+500,000	---
General Provisions					
Supplemental nutrition assistance program benefits increase (H. Sec. 2001)(S. Sec. 102).....	4,859,000	8,231,000	4,859,000	---	-3,372,000
FY 2010.....	6,056,000	4,864,000	6,056,000	---	+1,192,000
FY 2011-2014.....	9,076,000	3,467,000	9,076,000	---	+5,609,000
Subtotal.....	(19,991,000)	(16,562,000)	(19,991,000)	---	(+3,429,000)
Afterschool feeding program (Sec. 2002).....	15,000	---	---	-15,000	---
FY 2010.....	38,000	---	---	-38,000	---
FY 2011-2019.....	673,000	---	---	-673,000	---
Subtotal.....	(726,000)	---	---	(-726,000)	---
Agricultural disaster assistance (S. Sec 103)	---	806,000	744,000	+744,000	-62,000
Farm Bill administration (S. Sec. 106).....	---	4,000	4,000	+4,000	---
FY 2010.....	---	4,000	4,000	+4,000	---
FY 2011-2019.....	---	26,000	---	---	-26,000
Subtotal.....	---	(34,000)	(8,000)	(+8,000)	(-26,000)
Total, General Provisions.....	20,717,000	17,402,000	20,743,000	+26,000	+3,341,000
FY 2009.....	(4,874,000)	(9,041,000)	(5,807,000)	(+733,000)	(-3,434,000)
FY 2010.....	(6,094,000)	(4,868,000)	(6,060,000)	(-34,000)	(+1,192,000)
FY 2011 through FY 2019.....	(9,749,000)	(3,493,000)	(9,076,000)	(-673,000)	(+5,583,000)
Total, title I.....	27,012,500	21,088,930	26,465,500	-547,000	+5,376,570
FY 2009.....	(11,169,500)	(12,727,930)	(11,329,500)	(+160,000)	(-1,398,430)
FY 2010.....	(6,094,000)	(4,868,000)	(6,060,000)	(-34,000)	(+1,192,000)
FY 2011 through FY 2019.....	(9,749,000)	(3,493,000)	(9,076,000)	(-673,000)	(+5,583,000)
(Loan Authorizations).....	(27,967,000)	(12,122,000)	(11,472,000)	(-16,495,000)	(-650,000)

TITLE II - COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND SCIENCE

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Bureau of Industry and Security

Operations and administration.....	---	20,000	---	---	-20,000
------------------------------------	-----	--------	-----	-----	---------

Economic Development Administration

Economic development assistance programs.....	250,000	150,000	150,000	-100,000	---
---	---------	---------	---------	----------	-----

Bureau of the Census

Periodic censuses and programs.....	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	---	---
-------------------------------------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----	-----

National Telecommunications and Information Administration

Salaries and expenses.....	350,000	350,000	---	-350,000	-350,000
Wireless and broadband deployment grant programs.....	2,825,000	---	---	-2,825,000	---
Broadband technology opportunities program.....	---	6,650,000	4,700,000	+4,700,000	-1,950,000
Digital-to-analog converter box program.....	650,000	650,000	650,000	---	---

Total, National Telecommunications and Information Administration.....	3,825,000	7,650,000	5,350,000	+1,525,000	-2,300,000
--	-----------	-----------	-----------	------------	------------

National Institute of Standards and Technology

Scientific and technical research and services.....	100,000	168,000	220,000	+120,000	+52,000
Industrial technology services.....	100,000	---	---	-100,000	---
Technology Innovation Program.....	(70,000)	---	---	(-70,000)	---
Manufacturing Extension Partnership.....	(30,000)	---	---	(-30,000)	---
Construction of research facilities.....	300,000	307,000	360,000	+60,000	+53,000

Total, National Institute of Standards and Technology.....	500,000	475,000	580,000	+80,000	+105,000
--	---------	---------	---------	---------	----------

AMERICAN RECOVERY AND REINVESTMENT ACT OF 2009
(Amounts in thousands)

	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. House	Conference vs Senate
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration					
Operations, research, and facilities.....	400,000	377,000	230,000	-170,000	-147,000
Procurement, acquisition and construction.....	600,000	645,000	600,000	---	-45,000
Total, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.....	1,000,000	1,022,000	830,000	-170,000	-192,000
Departmental Management					
Office of Inspector General.....	10,000	6,000	6,000	-4,000	---
Total, Department of Commerce.....	6,585,000	10,323,000	7,916,000	+1,331,000	-2,407,000
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE					
General Administration					
Tactical law enforcement wireless communications.....	---	100,000	---	---	-100,000
Detention trustee.....	---	100,000	---	---	-100,000
Office of Inspector General.....	2,000	2,000	2,000	---	---
Total, General Administration.....	2,000	202,000	2,000	---	-200,000
United States Marshals Service					
Salaries and expenses.....	---	50,000	---	---	-50,000
Construction.....	---	100,000	---	---	-100,000
Total, United States Marshals Service.....	---	150,000	---	---	-150,000
Federal Bureau of Investigation					
Salaries and expenses.....	---	75,000	---	---	-75,000
Construction.....	---	300,000	---	---	-300,000
Total, Federal Bureau of Investigation.....	---	375,000	---	---	-375,000
Federal Prison System					
Buildings and facilities.....	---	800,000	---	---	-800,000
State and Local Law Enforcement Activities					
Office on Violence Against Women:					
Prevention and prosecution programs.....	---	300,000	225,000	+225,000	-75,000
Office of Justice Programs:					
State and local law enforcement assistance.....	3,000,000	2,190,000	2,765,000	-235,000	+575,000
Community oriented policing services.....	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	---	---
Salaries and expenses.....	---	10,000	10,000	+10,000	---
Total, State and Local Law Enforcement Activities.....	4,000,000	3,500,000	4,000,000	---	+500,000
Total, Department of Justice.....	4,002,000	5,027,000	4,002,000	---	-1,025,000
NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION					
Science.....	400,000	450,000	400,000	---	-50,000
Aeronautics.....	150,000	200,000	150,000	---	-50,000
Exploration.....	---	450,000	400,000	+400,000	-50,000
Cross agency support.....	50,000	200,000	50,000	---	-150,000
Office of Inspector General.....	2,000	2,000	2,000	---	---
Total, National Aeronautics and Space Administration.....	602,000	1,302,000	1,002,000	+400,000	-300,000
NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION					
Research and related activities.....	2,500,000	1,000,000	2,500,000	---	+1,500,000
Education and human resources.....	100,000	50,000	100,000	---	+50,000
Major research equipment and facilities construction..	400,000	150,000	400,000	---	+250,000
Office of Inspector General.....	2,000	2,000	2,000	---	---
Total, National Science Foundation.....	3,002,000	1,202,000	3,002,000	---	+1,800,000
Total, title II.....	14,191,000	17,854,000	15,922,000	+1,731,000	-1,932,000

AMERICAN RECOVERY AND REINVESTMENT ACT OF 2009
(Amounts in thousands)

	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. House	Conference vs Senate
TITLE III - DEFENSE					
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE					
Facility Infrastructure Investments, Defense					
Operation and Maintenance, Army.....	1,490,804	1,169,291	1,474,525	-16,279	+305,234
Operation and Maintenance, Navy.....	624,380	571,843	657,051	+32,671	+85,208
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps.....	128,499	112,167	113,865	-14,634	+1,698
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force.....	1,236,810	927,113	1,095,959	-140,851	+168,846
Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve.....	110,899	79,543	98,269	-12,630	+18,726
Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve.....	62,162	44,586	55,083	-7,079	+10,497
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve.....	45,038	32,304	39,909	-5,129	+7,605
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve.....	14,881	10,674	13,187	-1,694	+2,513
Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard.....	302,700	215,557	266,304	-36,396	+50,747
Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard.....	29,169	20,922	25,848	-3,321	+4,926
Total, Facility Infrastructure Investments.....	4,045,342	3,184,000	3,840,000	-205,342	+656,000
Procurement					
Defense Production Act Purchases.....	---	100,000	---	---	-100,000
Energy Research and Development, Defense					
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army.....	87,500	---	75,000	-12,500	+75,000
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy.....	87,500	---	75,000	-12,500	+75,000
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force.....	87,500	---	75,000	-12,500	+75,000
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-wide.....	87,500	200,000	75,000	-12,500	-125,000
Total, Energy Research and Development.....	350,000	200,000	300,000	-50,000	+100,000
Other Department of Defense Programs					
Defense Health Program:					
Operations and maintenance.....	454,658	250,000	400,000	-54,658	+150,000
Office of the Inspector General.....	15,000	15,000	15,000	---	---
Total, Other Department of Defense Programs.....	469,658	265,000	415,000	-54,658	+150,000
Total, title III.....	4,865,000	3,749,000	4,555,000	-310,000	+806,000
TITLE IV - ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT					
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - CIVIL					
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY					
Corps of Engineers - Civil					
Investigations.....	---	25,000	25,000	+25,000	---
Construction.....	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	---	---
Mississippi River and tributaries.....	250,000	500,000	375,000	+125,000	-125,000
Operation and Maintenance.....	2,225,000	1,900,000	2,075,000	-150,000	+175,000
Regulatory program.....	25,000	25,000	25,000	---	---
Formerly utilized sites remedial action program.....	---	100,000	100,000	+100,000	---
Flood control and coastal emergencies.....	---	50,000	---	---	-50,000
Total, Department of Defense - Civil.....	4,500,000	4,600,000	4,600,000	+100,000	---
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR					
Bureau of Reclamation					
Water and related resources.....	500,000	1,400,000	1,000,000	+500,000	-400,000
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY					
Energy Programs					
Energy efficiency and renewable energy.....	18,500,000	14,398,000	16,800,000	-1,700,000	+2,402,000
Electricity delivery and energy reliability.....	4,500,000	4,500,000	4,500,000	---	---
Advanced Battery Loan Guarantee Program.....	1,000,000	---	---	-1,000,000	---
Institutional Loan Guarantee Program.....	500,000	---	---	-500,000	---
Innovative Technology Loan Guarantee Program.....	8,000,000	9,000,000	6,000,000	-2,000,000	-3,000,000
Fossil Energy.....	2,400,000	4,600,000	3,400,000	+1,000,000	-1,200,000
Science.....	2,000,000	330,000	1,600,000	-400,000	+1,270,000
Advanced Research Projects Agency-Energy.....	---	---	400,000	+400,000	+400,000
Non-defense environmental cleanup.....	---	483,000	483,000	+483,000	---

AMERICAN RECOVERY AND REINVESTMENT ACT OF 2009
(Amounts in thousands)

	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. House	Conference vs Senate
Uranium enrichment decontamination and decommissioning Office of the Inspector General.....	---	390,000	390,000	+390,000	---
	15,000	15,000	15,000	---	---
Total, Energy Programs.....	36,915,000	33,716,000	33,588,000	-3,327,000	-128,000
Atomic Energy Defense Activities					
National Nuclear Security Administration:					
Weapons activities.....	---	1,000,000	---	---	-1,000,000
Environmental and Other Defense Activities					
Defense environmental cleanup.....	500,000	5,527,000	5,127,000	+4,627,000	-400,000
Construction, rehabilitation, operation and maintenance: Western Area Power Administration.....	---	10,000	10,000	+10,000	---
Total, Environmental and Other Defense Activities	500,000	5,537,000	5,137,000	+4,637,000	-400,000
Total, Department of Energy.....	37,415,000	40,253,000	38,725,000	+1,310,000	-1,528,000
General Provisions					
Western Area Power Administration					
(borrowing authority) (H. Sec. 5004)(S. Sec. 402)...	10,000	10,000	10,000	---	---
FY 2010.....	125,000	125,000	125,000	---	---
FY 2011-2018.....	3,115,000	3,115,000	3,115,000	---	---
Subtotal.....	(3,250,000)	(3,250,000)	(3,250,000)	---	---
Bonneville Power Administration (borrowing authority)					
(H. Sec. 5006) (S. Sec. 402) FY 2010.....	50,000	50,000	50,000	---	---
FY 2011-2018.....	3,200,000	3,200,000	3,200,000	---	---
Subtotal.....	(3,250,000)	(3,250,000)	(3,250,000)	---	---
Total, General provisions.....	6,500,000	6,500,000	6,500,000	---	---
FY 2009.....	(10,000)	(10,000)	(10,000)	---	---
FY 2010.....	(175,000)	(175,000)	(175,000)	---	---
FY 2011 through FY 2019.....	(6,315,000)	(6,315,000)	(6,315,000)	---	---
Total, title IV.....	48,915,000	52,753,000	50,825,000	+1,910,000	-1,928,000
FY 2009.....	(42,425,000)	(46,263,000)	(44,335,000)	(+1,910,000)	(-1,928,000)
FY 2010.....	(175,000)	(175,000)	(175,000)	---	---
FY 2011 through FY 2019.....	(6,315,000)	(6,315,000)	(6,315,000)	---	---

TITLE V - FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Departmental Offices

Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration.....	---	7,000	7,000	+7,000	---
Community development financial institutions fund program account.....	---	250,000	100,000	+100,000	-150,000

Internal Revenue Service

Health Insurance Tax Credit Administration.....	---	---	80,000	+80,000	+80,000
Total, Department of the Treasury.....	---	257,000	187,000	+187,000	-70,000

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Federal payment to the District of Columbia Water and Sewer Authority.....	---	125,000	---	---	-125,000
--	-----	---------	-----	-----	----------

General Services Administration

Federal Buildings Fund:					
Construction, repairs and alterations.....	7,700,000	5,548,000	5,550,000	-2,150,000	+2,000
Energy efficient federal motor vehicle fleet procurement.....	600,000	300,000	300,000	-300,000	---
Office of Inspector General.....	15,000	7,000	7,000	-8,000	---
Total, General Services Administration.....	8,315,000	5,855,000	5,857,000	-2,458,000	+2,000
Recovery Act Accountability and Transparency Board....	14,000	7,000	84,000	+70,000	+77,000

AMERICAN RECOVERY AND REINVESTMENT ACT OF 2009
(Amounts in thousands)

	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. House	Conference vs Senate
Small Business Administration					
Salaries and expenses.....	---	84,000	69,000	+69,000	-15,000
Office of Inspector General.....	10,000	10,000	10,000	---	---
Surety bond guarantees revolving fund.....	---	15,000	15,000	+15,000	---
Business Loans Program Account:					
Direct and guaranteed loans subsidy.....	426,000	621,000	636,000	+210,000	+15,000
Administrative expenses.....	4,000	---	---	-4,000	---
Total, Small Business Administration.....	440,000	730,000	730,000	+290,000	---
Total, title V.....	8,769,000	6,974,000	6,858,000	-1,911,000	-116,000
TITLE VI - HOMELAND SECURITY					
DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY					
Departmental Management and Operations					
Office of the Under Secretary for Management.....	---	198,000	200,000	+200,000	+2,000
Office of Inspector General.....	2,000	5,000	5,000	+3,000	---
Total, Departmental Management and Operations...	2,000	203,000	205,000	+203,000	+2,000
U.S. Customs and Border Protection					
Salaries and expenses.....	100,000	198,000	160,000	+60,000	-38,000
Border security fencing, infrastructure, and technology.....	---	200,000	100,000	+100,000	-100,000
Construction.....	150,000	800,000	420,000	+270,000	-380,000
Total, U.S. Customs and Border Protection.....	250,000	1,198,000	680,000	+430,000	-518,000
Immigration and Customs Enforcement					
Automation modernization.....	---	27,800	20,000	+20,000	-7,800
Transportation Security Administration					
Aviation security.....	500,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	+500,000	---
Coast Guard					
Acquisition, construction and improvements.....	---	450,000	98,000	+98,000	-352,000
Alteration of bridges.....	150,000	240,400	142,000	-8,000	-98,400
Total, Coast Guard.....	150,000	690,400	240,000	+90,000	-450,400
Federal Emergency Management Agency					
Management and administration.....	---	6,000	---	---	-6,000
State and local programs.....	---	950,000	300,000	+300,000	-650,000
Firefighter assistance grants.....	---	500,000	210,000	+210,000	-290,000
Emergency food and shelter.....	200,000	100,000	100,000	-100,000	---
Total, Federal Emergency Management Agency.....	200,000	1,556,000	610,000	+410,000	-946,000
Federal Law Enforcement Training Center					
Acquisitions, construction, improvements, and related expenses.....	---	15,000	---	---	-15,000
Total, title VI.....	1,102,000	4,690,200	2,755,000	+1,653,000	-1,935,200
TITLE VII - INTERIOR AND ENVIRONMENT					
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR					
Bureau of Land Management					
Management of lands and resources.....	---	135,000	125,000	+125,000	-10,000
Construction.....	325,000	180,000	180,000	-145,000	---
Wildland fire management.....	---	15,000	15,000	+15,000	---
Total, Bureau of Land Management.....	325,000	330,000	320,000	-5,000	-10,000

AMERICAN RECOVERY AND REINVESTMENT ACT OF 2009
(Amounts in thousands)

	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. House	Conference vs Senate
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service					
Resource management.....	---	165,000	165,000	+165,000	---
Construction.....	300,000	110,000	115,000	-185,000	+5,000
Total, United States Fish and Wildlife Service..	300,000	275,000	280,000	-20,000	+5,000
National Park Service					
Operation of the National Park System.....	---	158,000	146,000	+146,000	-12,000
Historic Preservation Fund.....	---	---	---	---	---
(transfer from construction).....	(15,000)	---	---	(-15,000)	---
Historically Black Colleges and Universities.....	---	---	15,000	+15,000	+15,000
Construction.....	1,700,000	589,000	589,000	-1,111,000	---
Centennial Challenge.....	100,000	---	---	-100,000	---
Total, National Park Service.....	1,800,000	747,000	750,000	-1,050,000	+3,000
United States Geological Survey					
Surveys, investigations, and research.....	200,000	135,000	140,000	-60,000	+5,000
Bureau of Indian Affairs					
Operation of Indian programs.....	---	40,000	40,000	+40,000	---
Construction.....	500,000	522,000	450,000	-50,000	-72,000
Indian guaranteed loan program account.....	---	10,000	10,000	+10,000	---
Total, Bureau of Indian Affairs.....	500,000	572,000	500,000	---	-72,000
Insular Affairs					
Assistance to Territories.....	---	62,000	---	---	-62,000
Office of Inspector General.....	15,000	15,000	15,000	---	---
Central Hazardous Materials Fund.....	---	20,000	---	---	-20,000
Total, Department of the Interior.....	3,140,000	2,156,000	2,005,000	-1,135,000	-151,000
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY					
Hazardous substance superfund.....	800,000	600,000	600,000	-200,000	---
Leaking Underground Storage Tank Trust Fund.....	200,000	200,000	200,000	---	---
State and tribal assistance grants.....	8,400,000	6,400,000	6,400,000	-2,000,000	---
Office of Inspector General.....	20,000	---	20,000	---	+20,000
Total, Environmental Protection Agency.....	9,420,000	7,200,000	7,220,000	-2,200,000	+20,000
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE					
Forest Service					
Capital improvement and maintenance.....	650,000	650,000	650,000	---	---
Wildland fire management.....	850,000	485,000	500,000	-350,000	+15,000
Total, Department of Agriculture.....	1,500,000	1,135,000	1,150,000	-350,000	+15,000
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES					
Indian Health Service					
Indian health services.....	---	135,000	85,000	+85,000	-50,000
Indian health facilities.....	550,000	410,000	415,000	-135,000	+5,000
Total, Indian Health Service.....	550,000	545,000	500,000	-50,000	-45,000
OTHER RELATED AGENCIES					
Smithsonian Institution					
Facilities capital.....	150,000	75,000	25,000	-125,000	-50,000

AMERICAN RECOVERY AND REINVESTMENT ACT OF 2009
(Amounts in thousands)

	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. House	Conference vs Senate
National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities					
National Endowment for the Arts					
Grants and administration.....	50,000	---	50,000	---	+50,000
Total, Other Related Agencies.....	200,000	75,000	75,000	-125,000	---
Total, title VII.....	14,810,000	11,111,000	10,950,000	-3,860,000	-161,000
TITLE VIII - LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION					
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR					
Employment and Training Administration					
Training and employment services.....	4,000,000	3,250,000	3,950,000	-50,000	+700,000
Community service employment for older Americans.....	120,000	120,000	120,000	---	---
State unemployment insurance and employment service operations (trust funds).....	500,000	400,000	400,000	-100,000	---
Total, Employment and Training Administration...	4,620,000	3,770,000	4,470,000	-150,000	+700,000
Departmental Management					
Salaries and expenses.....	80,000	---	80,000	---	+80,000
Office of Job Corps.....	300,000	160,000	250,000	-50,000	+90,000
Office of Inspector General.....	6,000	3,000	6,000	---	+3,000
Total, Departmental Management.....	386,000	163,000	336,000	-50,000	+173,000
Total, Department of Labor.....	5,006,000	3,933,000	4,806,000	-200,000	+873,000
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES					
Health Resources and Services Administration					
Health resources and services.....	1,638,000	1,958,000	2,500,000	+882,000	+542,000
FY 2010.....	550,000	---	---	-550,000	---
Subtotal.....	(2,188,000)	(1,958,000)	(2,500,000)	(+312,000)	(+542,000)
Centers for Disease Control and Prevention					
Disease control, research, and training.....	462,000	---	---	-462,000	---
Buildings and facilities.....	---	412,000	---	---	-412,000
National Institutes of Health					
National Center for Research Resources.....	1,500,000	300,000	1,300,000	-200,000	+1,000,000
Office of the Director.....	750,000	9,200,000	8,200,000	+7,450,000	-1,000,000
FY 2010.....	750,000	---	---	-750,000	---
Subtotal.....	(1,500,000)	(9,200,000)	(8,200,000)	(+6,700,000)	(-1,000,000)
Buildings and facilities.....	500,000	500,000	500,000	---	---
Total, National Institutes of Health.....	3,500,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	+6,500,000	---
FY 2009.....	(2,750,000)	(10,000,000)	(10,000,000)	(+7,250,000)	---
FY 2010.....	(750,000)	---	---	(-750,000)	---
Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality					
Healthcare research and quality.....	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	---	---
Administration for Children and Families					
Low-income home energy assistance: FY 2010.....	1,000,000	---	---	-1,000,000	---
Payments to States for the Child Care and Development Block Grant.....	1,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	+1,000,000	---
FY 2010.....	1,000,000	---	---	-1,000,000	---
Subtotal.....	(2,000,000)	(2,000,000)	(2,000,000)	---	---

AMERICAN RECOVERY AND REINVESTMENT ACT OF 2009
(Amounts in thousands)

	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. House	Conference vs Senate
Social services block grant.....	---	400,000	---	---	-400,000
Children and families services programs.....	1,600,000	1,250,000	3,150,000	+1,550,000	+1,900,000
FY 2010.....	1,600,000	---	---	-1,600,000	---
Subtotal.....	(3,200,000)	(1,250,000)	(3,150,000)	(-50,000)	(+1,900,000)
Total, Administration for Children and Families.	8,200,000	3,650,000	5,150,000	-1,050,000	+1,500,000
FY 2009.....	(2,600,000)	(3,650,000)	(5,150,000)	(+2,550,000)	(+1,500,000)
FY 2010.....	(3,600,000)	---	---	(-3,600,000)	---
Administration on Aging					
Aging services programs.....	100,000	100,000	100,000	---	---
FY 2010.....	100,000	---	---	-100,000	---
Subtotal.....	(200,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)	(-100,000)	---
Office of the Secretary					
Office of the National Coordinator for Health Information Technology.....					
Information Technology.....	2,000,000	3,000,000	2,000,000	---	-1,000,000
Office of Inspector General.....					
Public Health and Social Services Emergency Fund.....	19,000	19,000	17,000	-2,000	-2,000
Prevention and wellness fund.....					
Fund.....	900,000	---	50,000	-850,000	+50,000
FY 2010.....	2,202,100	---	1,000,000	-1,202,100	+1,000,000
FY 2010.....	797,900	---	---	-797,900	---
Subtotal.....	(3,000,000)	---	(1,000,000)	(-2,000,000)	(+1,000,000)
Total, Office of the Secretary.....	5,919,000	3,019,000	3,087,000	-2,852,000	+48,000
FY 2009.....	(5,121,100)	(3,019,000)	(3,067,000)	(-2,054,100)	(+48,000)
FY 2010.....	(797,900)	---	---	(-797,900)	---
Total, Department of Health and Human Services	19,589,000	20,239,000	21,917,000	+2,348,000	+1,678,000
FY 2009.....	(13,771,100)	(20,239,000)	(21,917,000)	(+8,145,900)	(+1,678,000)
FY 2010.....	(5,797,900)	---	---	(-5,797,900)	---
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION					
Education for the disadvantaged.....	6,500,000	12,400,000	13,000,000	+6,500,000	+600,000
FY 2010.....	6,500,000	---	---	-6,500,000	---
Subtotal.....	(13,000,000)	(12,400,000)	(13,000,000)	---	(+600,000)
Impact aid.....	100,000	---	100,000	---	+100,000
School improvement programs.....	533,000	1,070,000	720,000	+187,000	-350,000
FY 2010.....	533,000	---	---	-533,000	---
Subtotal.....	(1,066,000)	(1,070,000)	(720,000)	(-346,000)	(-350,000)
Innovation and improvement.....	225,000	---	200,000	-25,000	+200,000
Special education.....	6,300,000	13,500,000	12,200,000	+5,900,000	-1,300,000
FY 2010.....	7,300,000	---	---	-7,300,000	---
Subtotal.....	(13,600,000)	(13,500,000)	(12,200,000)	(-1,400,000)	(-1,300,000)
Rehabilitation services and disability research.....	350,000	610,000	680,000	+330,000	+70,000
FY 2010.....	350,000	---	---	-350,000	---
Subtotal.....	(700,000)	(610,000)	(680,000)	(-20,000)	(+70,000)
Student financial assistance.....	15,881,000	13,930,000	15,840,000	-41,000	+1,910,000
FY 2010.....	245,000	---	---	-245,000	---
Subtotal.....	(16,126,000)	(13,930,000)	(15,840,000)	(-286,000)	(+1,910,000)
Pell Grants--maximum grant (NA).....	(4,860)	(4,760)	(4,860)	---	(+100)
Student aid administration.....	50,000	---	60,000	+10,000	+60,000
Higher education.....	100,000	50,000	100,000	---	+50,000
Institute of Education Sciences.....	250,000	---	250,000	---	+250,000
School modernization, renovation, and repair.....	14,000,000	---	---	-14,000,000	---
Higher education modernization, renovation and repair (Sec. 9302).....	6,000,000	---	---	-6,000,000	---
Office of Inspector General.....	14,000	14,000	14,000	---	---

AMERICAN RECOVERY AND REINVESTMENT ACT OF 2009
(Amounts in thousands)

	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. House	Conference vs Senate
General Provisions					
Mandatory Pell Grants (Sec. 9303).....	643,000	---	643,000	---	+643,000
FY 2010.....	831,000	---	831,000	---	+831,000
Subtotal.....	(1,474,000)	---	(1,474,000)	---	(+1,474,000)
Increase student loan limits (Sec. 9304).....	-730,000	---	---	+730,000	---
FY 2010.....	-810,000	---	---	+810,000	---
FY 2011-2018.....	1,510,000	---	---	-1,510,000	---
Subtotal.....	(-30,000)	---	---	(+30,000)	---
Student lender special allowance (Sec. 9305).....	10,000	---	---	-10,000	---
Total, Department of Education.....	66,685,000	41,574,000	44,638,000	-22,047,000	+3,064,000
FY 2009.....	(50,226,000)	(41,574,000)	(43,807,000)	(-6,419,000)	(+2,233,000)
FY 2010.....	(14,949,000)	---	(831,000)	(-14,118,000)	(+831,000)
FY 2011 through FY 2019.....	(1,510,000)	---	---	(-1,510,000)	---
RELATED AGENCIES					
Corporation for National and Community Service					
Operating expenses.....	160,000	160,000	160,000	---	---
Office of Inspector General.....	1,000	1,000	1,000	---	---
National service trust.....	40,000	40,000	40,000	---	---
Total, Corporation for National and Community Service.....	201,000	201,000	201,000	---	---
Social Security Administration					
Limitation on administrative expenses.....	900,000	890,000	1,000,000	+100,000	+110,000
Office of Inspector General.....	2,000	3,000	2,000	---	-1,000
Total, Social Security Administration.....	902,000	893,000	1,002,000	+100,000	+109,000
Total, Related Agencies.....	1,103,000	1,094,000	1,203,000	+100,000	+109,000
Total, title VIII.....	92,383,000	66,840,000	72,564,000	-19,799,000	+5,724,000
FY 2009.....	(70,106,100)	(66,840,000)	(71,733,000)	(+1,626,900)	(+4,893,000)
FY 2010.....	(20,746,900)	---	(831,000)	(-19,915,900)	(+831,000)
FY 2011 through FY 2019.....	(1,510,000)	---	---	(-1,510,000)	---
TITLE IX - LEGISLATIVE BRANCH					
Government Accountability Office: Salaries and expenses.....	25,000	20,000	25,000	---	+5,000
TITLE X - MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND VETERANS AFFAIRS					
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE					
Military construction, Army.....	920,000	637,875	180,000	-740,000	-457,875
Military construction, Navy and Marine Corps.....	350,000	990,092	280,000	-70,000	-710,092
Military construction, Air Force.....	280,000	871,332	180,000	-100,000	-691,332
Military construction, Defense-Wide.....	3,750,000	118,560	1,450,000	-2,300,000	+1,331,440
Military construction, Army National Guard.....	140,000	150,000	50,000	-90,000	-100,000
Military construction, Air National Guard.....	70,000	110,000	50,000	-20,000	-60,000
Military construction, Army Reserve.....	100,000	---	---	-100,000	---
Military construction, Navy Reserve.....	30,000	---	---	-30,000	---
Military construction, Air Force Reserve.....	60,000	---	---	-60,000	---
Subtotal.....	5,700,000	2,877,859	2,190,000	-3,510,000	-687,859
Family housing construction, Army.....	---	34,570	34,507	+34,507	-63
Family housing operation and maintenance, Army.....	---	3,932	3,932	+3,932	---
Family housing construction, Air Force.....	---	80,100	80,100	+80,100	---
Family housing operation and maintenance, Air Force.....	---	16,461	16,461	+16,461	---
Homeowners assistance fund.....	---	410,973	555,000	+555,000	+144,027
Subtotal.....	---	546,036	690,000	+690,000	+143,964
Base realignment and closure account 1990.....	300,000	---	---	-300,000	---
Total, Department of Defense.....	6,000,000	3,423,895	2,880,000	-3,120,000	-543,895

AMERICAN RECOVERY AND REINVESTMENT ACT OF 2009
(Amounts in thousands)

	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. House	Conference vs Senate
DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS					
Veterans Health Administration					
Medical support and compliance.....	---	5,000	---	---	-5,000
Medical facilities.....	950,000	1,370,459	1,000,000	+50,000	-370,459
Subtotal.....	950,000	1,375,459	1,000,000	+50,000	-375,459
National Cemetery Administration.....	50,000	64,961	50,000	---	-14,961
Departmental Administration					
General operating expenses.....	---	1,125	150,000	+150,000	+148,875
Information technology systems.....	---	195,000	50,000	+50,000	-145,000
Office of Inspector General.....	1,000	4,400	1,000	---	-3,400
Construction, major projects.....	---	1,105,333	---	---	-1,105,333
Construction, minor projects.....	---	939,836	---	---	-939,836
Grants for construction of State extended care facilities.....	---	257,986	150,000	+150,000	-107,986
Total, Departmental Administration.....	1,000	2,503,680	351,000	+350,000	-2,152,680
Total, Department of Veterans Affairs.....	1,001,000	3,944,100	1,401,000	+400,000	-2,543,100
RELATED AGENCY					
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - CIVIL					
Cemeterial Expenses, Army					
Salaries and expenses.....	---	60,300	---	---	-60,300
Total, title X.....	7,001,000	7,428,295	4,281,000	-2,720,000	-3,147,295
TITLE XI - DEPARTMENT OF STATE					
DEPARTMENT OF STATE					
Administration of Foreign Affairs					
Diplomatic and consular programs.....	---	90,000	90,000	+90,000	---
Capital investment fund.....	276,000	228,000	290,000	+14,000	+62,000
(transfer to USAID capital investment fund).....	---	---	(38,000)	(+38,000)	(+38,000)
Office of Inspector General.....	---	1,500	2,000	+2,000	+500
Total, Administration of Foreign Affairs.....	276,000	319,500	382,000	+106,000	+62,500
International Commissions					
International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico.....	224,000	224,000	220,000	-4,000	-4,000
Administration of Foreign Assistance					
Funds Appropriated to the President					
U.S. Agency for International Development					
Capital Investment Fund.....	---	58,000	---	---	-58,000
(by transfer).....	---	---	(38,000)	(+38,000)	(+38,000)
Office of Inspector General.....	---	500	---	---	-500
Total, U.S. Agency for International Development.....	---	58,500	---	---	-58,500
Total, title XI.....	500,000	602,000	602,000	+102,000	---

AMERICAN RECOVERY AND REINVESTMENT ACT OF 2009
(Amounts in thousands)

	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. House	Conference vs Senate
TITLE XII - TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT					
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION					
Office of the Secretary					
Supplemental discretionary grants for a National Surface Transportation system.....	---	5,500,000	1,500,000	+1,500,000	-4,000,000
Federal Aviation Administration					
Supplemental funding for facilities and equipment.....	---	200,000	200,000	+200,000	---
Supplemental discretionary grants for airport investment.....	---	1,100,000	1,100,000	+1,100,000	---
Grants-in-aid for airports.....	3,000,000	---	---	-3,000,000	---
Total, Federal Aviation Administration.....	3,000,000	1,300,000	1,300,000	-1,700,000	---
Federal Highway Administration					
Highway infrastructure investment.....	30,000,000	27,060,000	27,500,000	-2,500,000	+440,000
Federal Railroad Administration					
Capital assistance for high-speed rail and intercity passenger rail service.....	300,000	250,000	8,000,000	+7,700,000	+7,750,000
Capital and debt service grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation.....	800,000	850,000	1,300,000	+500,000	+450,000
High-speed rail corridor program.....	---	2,000,000	---	---	-2,000,000
Total, Federal Railroad Administration.....	1,100,000	3,100,000	9,300,000	+8,200,000	+6,200,000
Federal Transit Administration					
Transit capital assistance.....	7,500,000	---	6,900,000	-600,000	+6,900,000
Fixed guideway infrastructure investment.....	2,000,000	---	750,000	-1,250,000	+750,000
Capital investment grants.....	2,500,000	---	750,000	-1,750,000	+750,000
Supplemental grants for public transit investment....	---	8,400,000	---	---	-8,400,000
Total, Federal Transit Administration.....	12,000,000	8,400,000	8,400,000	-3,600,000	---
Maritime Administration					
Supplemental grants for assistance to small shipyards.	---	100,000	100,000	+100,000	---
Office of Inspector General					
Salaries and expenses.....	20,000	20,000	20,000	---	---
Total, Department of Transportation.....	46,120,000	45,480,000	48,120,000	+2,000,000	+2,640,000
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT					
Public and Indian Housing					
Public Housing Capital Fund.....	5,000,000	5,000,000	4,000,000	-1,000,000	-1,000,000
Native American housing block grants.....	500,000	510,000	510,000	+10,000	---
Total, Public and Indian Housing.....	5,500,000	5,510,000	4,510,000	-990,000	-1,000,000
Community Planning and Development					
Community Development Fund.....	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---	+1,000,000
Neighborhood Stabilization Program.....	4,190,000	---	2,000,000	-2,190,000	+2,000,000
Subtotal.....	(5,190,000)	---	(3,000,000)	(-2,190,000)	(+3,000,000)
HOME investments partnerships program.....	1,500,000	250,000	---	-1,500,000	-250,000
Gap funding for low income tax credit program.....	---	2,000,000	2,250,000	+2,250,000	+250,000
Subtotal.....	(1,500,000)	(2,250,000)	(2,250,000)	(+750,000)	---
Self-help and assisted homeownership opportunity program.....	10,000	---	---	-10,000	---
Homeless assistance grants.....	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	---	---
Total, Community Planning and Development.....	8,200,000	3,750,000	6,750,000	-1,450,000	+3,000,000

AMERICAN RECOVERY AND REINVESTMENT ACT OF 2009
(Amounts in thousands)

	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. House	Conference vs Senate
Housing Programs					
Assisted housing stability and energy and green retrofit investments.....	---	2,250,000	2,250,000	+2,250,000	---
Elderly, disabled and Section 8 assisted housing energy retrofit.....	2,500,000	---	---	-2,500,000	---
Office of Healthy Homes and Lead Hazard Control					
Lead hazard reduction.....	100,000	100,000	100,000	---	---
Office of Inspector General					
Salaries and expenses.....	15,000	15,000	15,000	---	---
General Provisions					
GSE conforming loan limits (Sec. 12003).....	37,000	---	37,000	---	+37,000
FY 2010.....	13,000	---	13,000	---	+13,000
Subtotal.....	50,000	---	50,000	---	+50,000
FHA Hope for Homeowners (S. Sec. 1211).....	---	260,000	---	---	-260,000
FY 2010.....	---	193,000	---	---	-193,000
FY 2011.....	---	126,000	---	---	-126,000
Subtotal.....	---	579,000	---	---	-579,000
Total, General Provisions.....	50,000	579,000	50,000	---	-529,000
FY 2009.....	37,000	260,000	37,000	---	-223,000
FY 2010.....	13,000	193,000	13,000	---	-180,000
FY 2011.....	---	126,000	---	---	-126,000
Total, Department of Housing and Urban Development.....					
FY 2009.....	16,352,000	11,885,000	13,662,000	-2,690,000	+1,777,000
FY 2010.....	13,000	193,000	13,000	---	-180,000
FY 2011.....	---	126,000	---	---	-126,000
Total, title XII.....	62,485,000	57,884,000	61,795,000	-890,000	+4,111,000
FY 2009.....	(62,472,000)	(57,365,000)	(61,782,000)	(-690,000)	(+4,417,000)
FY 2010.....	(13,000)	(193,000)	(13,000)	---	(-180,000)
FY 2011.....	---	(126,000)	---	---	(-126,000)
TITLE XIII - STATE FISCAL STABILIZATION FUND					
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION					
State Fiscal Stabilization Fund.....	39,500,000	39,000,000	53,600,000	+14,100,000	+14,600,000
FY 2010.....	39,500,000	---	---	-39,500,000	---
Total, title XIII.....	79,000,000	39,000,000	53,600,000	-25,400,000	+14,600,000
Grand total.....	361,038,500	289,794,425	311,197,500	-49,841,000	+21,403,075
FY 2009.....	(276,935,600)	(274,624,425)	(288,727,500)	(+11,791,900)	(+14,103,075)
FY 2010.....	(66,528,900)	(5,236,000)	(7,079,000)	(-59,449,900)	(+1,843,000)
FY 2011 through FY 2019.....	(17,574,000)	(9,934,000)	(15,391,000)	(-2,183,000)	(+5,457,000)

Note: Each amount in this Act is designated as an emergency requirement.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, in just a short while, the House will be voting on the President's \$790 billion economic stimulus package. It is by far the most expensive piece of legislation ever considered by this legislative body in its more than 200 years. I will be voting "no" on this legislation. Over the next few minutes, I would like to share my concerns about this bill as it is currently written.

The President, whom I respect a great deal, is a fine salesman. But as I have said on more than one occasion, facts are stubborn things. The fact is that this stimulus package does more to promote the growth of the Federal Government than it does to create jobs or to stimulate our economy. The fact is there are 104 government programs in this legislation that are being permanently expanded.

□ 1145

This includes 31 new government programs and permanent expansions to 73 existing programs. Taxpayers will pay for these programs well into the future. Of the total funding in this package, \$190 billion—or 61 percent—is devoted to increasing the size of government. Only \$122 billion—or 39 percent—is for a temporary one-time infusion of money into 98 Federal programs to stimulate the economy.

Again, these are the facts.

The interest on this new spending alone will cost no less than \$350 billion. And, if all of the new spending in this bill is carried forward in the future years, Federal nondefense budgets will have to increase by at least 42 percent each year. One more time, these are the facts.

My colleagues, is there anyone in Congress who really believes that this spending can be sustained?

Let's not kid ourselves. When it comes to Washington spending taxpayers' money, a trillion has become the new million.

So how did we get to this point today?

Two nights ago, the President's chief of staff came to Capitol Hill under the cover of darkness and presented the framework of a final deal to Senator REID and Speaker PELOSI. The only negotiation that took place occurred in the middle of the night in several back rooms of the U.S. Capitol between the White House and these two leaders.

There are hundreds of billions of dollars of spending in this legislation, and yet not one member of the House Appropriations Committee—not even Chairman OBEY—was in sight when the final deal was cut.

There are hundreds of billions of dollars of tax provisions in this legislation, and yet not one member of the House Ways and Means committee—not even Chairman RANGEL—was in sight when the final deal was cut.

The purpose of a conference committee is to negotiate differences between competing versions of the House

and Senate bills. Amendments are usually offered, debated, and considered. But there were no negotiations between Republicans and Democrats at Wednesday's conference. The negotiations had taken place the night before.

Outside of the Speaker and Senate Majority Leader REID, no one in the Congress has any idea what is really in this legislation. It was filed in the House as it was negotiated—in the darkness of night. And it became available to Members and the public on a Web site at 12:30 a.m. this morning, less than 12 hours ago.

This is precisely why every single Member present on Tuesday, more than 400 Members of the House, voted to have the conference report available 48 hours before House consideration. But the Speaker and the Senate Majority Leader are clearly afraid that the more Members and taxpayers learn about this bill, the more Members will walk away from it.

The House should not vote on the largest spending bill in the history of the United States when no one on either side of the aisle has any real idea of what's in it. There is no doubt that urgent action is needed to stimulate the economy and create jobs. Had the President and congressional leaders focused and put their attention on the real need for job creation, with an emphasis on infrastructure jobs, this package would be sailing through the House and Senate with broad bipartisan support. There are Members on both sides of the aisle who would support reasonable transportation and infrastructure projects as well as reasonable tax reform, but that is not what is before us today.

In the end, funding for roads, highways, flood control measures, and other job creating infrastructure projects were downsized in order to increase the size and scope of government programs.

Mr. Speaker, that's not stimulus. That's not job creation, and it certainly isn't what the country needs or deserves.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. RANGEL.

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

Mr. RANGEL. Let me thank you for the tremendous job that you and the leadership have done during this historic period in our Nation's history.

There is a common expression that we have in our committees, and that is, "How is the gentelady and gentleman recorded?" You don't have an opportunity to say you were confused, you didn't know what you were doing, or you wish there was another way.

And I gather when you get back home, people will be asking, "And how were you recorded?"

How were you recorded when you had an opportunity to give some assistance

to the working people in this country, where 95 percent of them will be receiving a tax cut so that they will be able to assist them in keeping their kids in school, paying their rents, their mortgages, keeping up their health insurance?

How were you recorded when we said that this Nation should take care of those people who unfortunately lost their job, lost their dignity, lost their health insurance?

Are we going to explain that we thought there was a better idea?

How were you recorded when there comes a time that we're saying that we have to find alternative ways in order to fuel the country's energy needs?

How were you recorded when the bridges and the tunnels and the hospitals and the schools are in trouble, when the mayors and the governors are asking and screaming for help?

How is history going to record what you have done at a time when everyone is screaming out, every economist is asking us to come to our Nation's economic savior?

And how are we recorded when it comes time to make certain that there is hope for those people who are not only jobless but hopeless?

I do hope that people recognize that we're not talking about a Presidential plan, a Republican plan, or a Democratic plan. We're talking about the heart of America, just as patriotic as the flag is, is the energy of people who want to be middle class. Are we going to give them an opportunity or are we going to ask the question how were you recorded because we didn't know what the right thing to do was.

Well, I suggest to you, just as people talk about how they voted in support of Roosevelt, how they went and tried to give assistance not just to the big-time CEOs who were hardly embarrassed and never even inconvenienced—these are people that are our constituents. To put them back to work means that we're helping small businesses out. To put them back to work means that we're talking about their dreams and the aspirations that we have. To restore our schools mean that we're going to, once again, become imaginative, be able to go to the international market with the genius that this great Nation always had.

These are hard times, and we have an opportunity to say how were you recorded and to be proud of our vote, or to try to do the worst thing that any legislator can do, whether it's local, whether it's State, or whether it is a Member of this august body, and that is trying to explain your vote if you don't support this effort.

I think that it's a rough time for the Nation, but we've always responded with ways that we can show that we will persevere and come out of this stronger than ever. And your kids and your grandkids who know that you've been privileged to serve here, historians are going to look to see one thing that's going to be so important to all

of us, and that is, how were you recorded.

So we can't talk about the process, we can't talk about what we wish will happen; but we can talk about how are you recorded in this vote that would long-time be remembered.

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

Mr. OBEY. I yield the gentleman 1 minute.

Mr. RANGEL. At this time at the request of the chair, I'd like to yield to the chairlady of the Small Business Committee and thank her for the great work that she has been doing.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, today, small businesses are finally getting their stimulus. It is about time. This act marks the first step towards economic recovery for our country's entrepreneurs. In fact, this bill will result in nearly \$21 billion in new investments and lending for small firms and the creation of more than 630,000 new jobs.

In terms of accessing loans from the Small Business Administration, the legislation clearly puts borrower first. It does this by mandating that no funds provided for fee relief can go to lenders unless the SBA has reduced fees charged to borrowers to the maximum extent possible.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP), the ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee.

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

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, every Member of this House believes we should and must act to get this economy moving again to help struggling families and employers through this global economic crisis. But action for the sake of acting will mean little to families if it is not accompanied with positive results.

This morning we awake to a spate of headlines that the deal made behind closed doors, and what we've still not been able to fully review, given its \$1.1 million price tag will do more harm than good.

From the McClatchy News Service: "Will the stimulus actually stimulate? Economists say no."

From the Associated Press: "Analysis: Stimulus won't jump-start the economy."

From the Congressional Budget Office—and there's a chart behind me that shows it—"This partisan stimulus package ends up harming our economy."

And, again, while it's clear we must act, we must ensure the action we take actually stimulates the economy and lays the foundation for real sustained job creation in the private sector.

There's a smarter, simpler way to stimulate the economy. It's not by running up the deficit by funding pet projects that are often wasteful. As

you well know, we produced an alternative to both the Senate and House versions that would create twice the jobs at half the cost. Let me repeat that. Republicans developed a plan that would create twice the jobs at half the cost. And that isn't my analysis or some conservative think tank. That fact is based on the data and methodology of Dr. Christina Romer, the Chair of the President's Council on Economic Advisers.

Now, I'd be remiss if I didn't point out to my Republican and Democrat colleagues exactly how they were treated in this process. As one of five Members of this House who was appointed to the conference committee, I think it's my obligation to tell you this story.

As I walked from the House to the Senate for our first meeting of the conferees, I passed a press conference being held by the Senate majority leader announcing a final deal that had been struck by Senators and only by Senators. This is the first conference I've ever been on where the press conference announcing the results happened before the actual meeting. So I can understand why Speaker PELOSI was reportedly incensed.

The people's House should not be trampled on. We were frozen out. And as Chairman RANGEL noted, many Democrats were frozen out. But most importantly, the American people were frozen out.

This is what happens when a few select people negotiate behind closed doors. You end up with flawed legislation that better reflects the priorities of a few, rather than those of the entire country.

And under this deal we're bring presented with this morning, the so-called middle class tax cut, the signature tax cut has been reduced to 20 cents an hour for a full-time worker. One of the few provisions to help struggling businesses was more than cut in half by shortening the length of the relief and making thousands of employers ineligible for help.

The work requirements within the historic 1996 Welfare Reform Law—the hallmark legislation of President Clinton and the Republican Congress—has been eroded. And the stealth health provisions will drive up costs and have the government making more health care decisions instead of doctors and patients.

□ 1200

Given the severity of the crisis American families are facing, to conduct the people's business in this fashion may be the grossest violation of our constitutional duties and the oath of office we swore to uphold that I have seen in my 18 years in the House.

Record me as a "no" on this legislation.

Mr. OBEY. I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

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

Mr. LEVIN. This is what is in the recovery package for Michigan families: Creating jobs for 519,000 unemployed in Michigan. I spoke to the electrical workers this morning, 40 percent of whom are unemployed, 2,000 individuals; 50 percent of iron workers, 1,200, are unemployed. This package has \$1 billion for Michigan transportation and water infrastructure. This is just one example of the recovery package putting people to work.

For the unemployed, an extension of unemployment benefits to an additional 161,000 unemployed workers and the historic expansion of TAA.

For individuals in Michigan losing health care for the first time, some help to purchase health insurance.

For Michigan schools, \$2 billion to help make up for reduced State assistance.

And for the State of Michigan, under immense budget strain, over \$2 billion to shore up our Medicaid program.

For the restructuring auto industry, \$2 billion in grants to help develop and manufacture advanced batteries here in the U.S., incentives to buy new cars and a tax credit for the purchase of plug-in hybrid electric vehicles.

Families in Michigan and everywhere are fearful for their jobs, for their health care, education, and the stability of their local communities.

For the minority, they say they acknowledge the pain but they have no prescription, only wornout ideology.

I will head home and look families straight in the eye and say the Federal Government is on your side, providing support during this downturn and making key investments for the future.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to HAL ROGERS, the gentleman from Kentucky, and the ranking member of the Homeland Security Subcommittee.

(Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I want to thank the ranking member for this time.

Mr. Speaker, throughout our country's storied history, we've witnessed some truly extraordinary efforts from the floor of this hallowed Chamber to address our country's most dire needs. We've stood united, setting geographic and party labels aside, to pass legislation that pushed our country forward.

In the aftermath of Pearl Harbor, in the shadow of 9/11, in the wake of numerous natural disasters, this body has traditionally responded by pulling together to produce results for the American people.

But today, Mr. Speaker, sadly, is not one of those extraordinary moments.

Thousands of pages of text, given to us at midnight last night, the Speaker even preventing it from being read to us by the House Clerk, 90 minutes of debate only—some Members will not even be allowed to speak a word for or against this monstrosity—and \$790 billion of spending, the largest bill ever to pass through this body.

Hardly any Member, Republican or Democrat, was allowed to help work and write up this bill. This bill was written by the Speaker of the House, with absolutely no collaboration with the Republican side of the aisle and, frankly, little with even Democrats. The principles of democracy are being compromised here today, now.

The American people deserve better. The Members of this Chamber deserve better. And our Founding Fathers expected better.

At best, all you're going to do here today, Mr. Speaker, is ram through this Congress an ill-conceived, wrong-headed, misdirected spending spree. This bill is not targeted toward creating jobs like we wanted. It's just spending a borrowed trillion dollars that our children, grandkids, even great-grandkids are going to have to pay.

When all is said and done with today, and the balloons are put away and the champagne toasts are over, we will leave a whopping and record-breaking \$12.1 trillion debt for our children to try to mop up. Even worse, leading experts tell us more every day, the results of this bill will not jump-start our economy or create real high-wage jobs.

Reject the bill.

Mr. Speaker, they say just the exact opposite. That the inflation this spree will cause will only further our fragile economy. The world markets are bracing for the worst as our nation tries to sell a record level of Treasury notes. At the same time, foreign nations are posting huge deficits of their own and selling their own bonds. This competition only impedes the very businesses you and I want to see grow, prosper and expand.

Mr. Speaker, as a result, I fear that interest rates will soar, inflation will rise, and the value of the dollar will plummet.

The President has spoken correctly of our need for immediate action. However, the American people would be better off with a thoughtful, comprehensive bill that creates jobs by keeping taxes low, incentives for our small businesses to expand, and reigns in wasteful spending. We offered such a bill. It was refused. Instead, we have a hasty product that will actually do our country harm.

Let us rise to the occasion and pass a bill that brings this Chamber together with a plan for genuine stimulus, rather than political gain. I urge rejection of this Conference Report.

Mr. OBEY. I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA).

Mr. BECERRA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, jobs, jobs, jobs—that is job number one for this Congress. That is the job that President Obama said is the first order of business this year for this body.

Let me amend that. Not just jobs, jobs, jobs. Good paying jobs, 21st century jobs, jobs that invest in and build America tomorrow for our kids. When you are hemorrhaging 5- to 600,000 jobs a month, that means by the time I finish my remarks, 28 Americans will have lost their job in 2 minutes. Jobs,

jobs, jobs. We need to do something now.

President Obama has said we need bold, swift action to move us into 21st century jobs and using the technology of this century. We can't continue to live with 20th century technology.

This bill invests close to \$20 billion to help our doctors who today communicate with a more obsolete technology than our kids do every day as they communicate with each other. Today, our children are talking to each other during their breaks in school; yet, most doctors can't communicate with each other about what their patients need.

This bill lets us have our doctors invest in that technology so that while today only one of every 20 doctors' offices uses high technology to communicate with other health providers, within the decade we will have 90 percent of our health care providers, doctors, and hospitals being able to communicate instantaneously. Jobs, jobs, jobs, but for the 21st century and do it now.

We can quibble. We all have proposals. We've all made compromises, but we all know the task is before us today. You want to complain, you want to debate—let's do that. But every day that we don't do something, 20,000 American jobs are lost. Let's move today.

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

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding and want to say, the Republican Party is in absolute agreement. This is about jobs. This is about immediate action. That's why we have offered a plan that gives twice the jobs at half the cost. We believe it should be also debated today, but instead, the Democrats have chosen to pass the largest appropriation bill in the history of the United States.

Now, I don't think they've read it. We all know this bill hasn't been read but by a mere handful of people, but part of this bill actually increases the debt ceiling to \$12 trillion. And you know what, if deficit spending worked, we would be in great shape.

Last March, \$29 billion to Bear Stearns; in May, \$168 million for another stimulus package; in July, \$200 billion for Fannie Mae; in September, \$85 billion for AIG; in October, \$700 billion for Wall Street. My goodness, we would be in great shape if deficit spending stimulus bills like this and bailouts worked.

But instead, what we're doing here today is just one more of the same. This is a bill that has 17 percent tax cuts, a big 20 cents an hour for the workers out there. It has a mere 7 percent in shovel-ready projects, dams, roads, bridges that need to be rebuilt.

But the Democrats have instead decided to increase the Federal Government spending: 31 new Federal programs; \$200 billion in phantom earmarks that will be decided where the

money is spent by State and local governments, even though the Federal legislative branch should be deciding where Federal money goes; \$2 billion for groups like ACORN; \$500 billion in a non-earmark bill for the NIH headquarters in Maryland. Isn't that interesting? \$600 billion for DTV; \$30 million for a rat in San Francisco. Mickey Mouse is going to be envious. He's no longer the mouse with the greatest net worth in California. Now, there's a San Francisco rat that has edged him out.

While people are being foreclosed and unemployed, the Democrats are spending \$30 million for a rat.

Mr. OBEY. I yield myself 10 seconds.

I wish the other side would make up their mind whether it's mice or rats, neither of which are in this bill if they will read it. Got it right here. Find it and show it to me. Show it to me. Show it to me.

I now yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT).

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, this is not the first time America has faced an economic crisis, but it may be the first time that one entire political party will sit on the sidelines with their arms crossed, their fists clenched, and their rhetoric numb to the suffering being experienced by millions of Americans who have lost their jobs through no fault of their own.

The American people are waiting and watching, and we will be judged not by the volume of the rhetoric but by the boldness of our actions. And we have plan, and it's rooted in one fundamental tenet: America once again belongs to Americans.

And this Congress and this President will respond to the needs of the people with programs and promises that can and will get America moving again.

Another 600,000 Americans lost their jobs in January. Overall, 4 million Americans have lost their jobs in the last year, the last year of the Bush administration.

This legislation extends unemployment benefits to keep people with their heads above water while they look for a job, and this legislation provides incentives for States to modernize their unemployment system to meet the demands of the American people in the 21st century.

FDR included unemployment insurance in the New Deal 70 years ago, at a time when women typically stayed at home to raise a family and part-time jobs didn't exist. We are offering a new deal for a new century. This legislation will help working moms and dads. It will help States make the adjustments that one would like them to make to better respond to their people.

This legislation adds \$100 a month to the UI benefit, but before some on the other side jump up and shout "moral hazard," know this. The average UI benefit check does not even reach the

poverty level. We offer a helping hand while you offer rhetoric. For instance, every dollar we provide in UI provides \$1.64 in economic impact.

I urge you to vote for H.R. 1.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN).

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this agreement. People back home want us to work together to do something to save their jobs, make up their lost savings, and restore the value of their homes.

Quite correctly, Americans are asking for help, and we had—I repeat, Mr. Speaker, had—the opportunity to respond by passing a bill that actually created jobs. Unfortunately, the House-Senate agreement, to the extent that we've been allowed to see its contents, does little to help their cause.

Most of this massive domestic spending will be sucked up by an enlarged government bureaucracy, hiring more Federal and State public workers, not helping small businesses and families survive.

□ 1215

The majority “markets” this measure as a transportation infrastructure package. But a mere 17 percent of the funding is directed towards the road, highway, and Army Corps of Engineers programs that would immediately create real jobs.

In fact, H.R. 1 creates over 33 entirely new government programs, at a cost to the taxpayers of over \$97 billion, and adds 600,000 new government jobs. And when will Americans see the effects of this spending? Probably not any time soon.

According to the CBO, less than half of the spending in this nonstimulus package will be paid out in the next 2 years. At that rate, an economic recovery will probably outrun most of the spending in this expensive legislation.

And while the agreement does contain some tax relief, it's not targeted to small businesses, which employ half of all of us. And if that weren't enough, the package before us weakens the work requirements of successful welfare programs we enacted years ago. And it may lay the groundwork for a government takeover of American's health care system by creating a Federal bureaucracy that will decide how to ration health care.

Mr. Speaker, Congress had the opportunity to “jump-start” our economy, and failed in that responsibility.

Mr. OBEY. I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL).

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Let me first commend the conferees for putting this legislation together and then to remind our friends on the other side that the operative word here today is “necessary.” That is the most important word as we move this legislation forward today, “necessary.”

Mr. RANGEL did a good job negotiating the tax title to provide hundreds of billions of dollars in immediate fiscal stimulus, starting with The Making Work Pay credit, which will cut taxes for 95 percent of all taxpayers, including 2 million families in Massachusetts.

Working families will also benefit from improvements in 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 allowance and small business expensing provisions, as well as relief for small and medium-sized businesses with net operating losses. Incidentally, I pushed for a larger number there, as the other side knows. And State and local government will see substantial relief for infrastructure and other critical needs through the Recovery Zone bonds and Build America bonds.

As a former mayor, I was happy to lead and take the lead on changes to the bond rules that will allow cities and towns to borrow at lower costs at a time when credit is tight.

The compromise also includes AMT protection for 26 million American families—70,000 families in my district alone.

Now, we're going to hear criticism from some that this legislation is too much, it's too little; it's too fast or it's too slow. By definition, by definition, fiscal stimulus means spending. And with an economy as great as ours, it needs to be significant.

We did move at a very quick pace, and we needed to. There are 10,000 families a day in America slipping into foreclosure. That's 10,000 families a day. Clearly, the policies of the last 8 years did not work, and we need a change.

I hope support for this legislation will move today.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I yield 3 minutes to the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations that gets the vast percentage of increase in spending in this bill, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT).

Mr. TIAHRT. I thank the gentleman from California. Today, another Kansan is going to get laid off, and they will struggle to pay their bills. Our economy needs help and our people need help. But this bill isn't help. This bill will only place a drag on our economy because it does nothing to solve the underlying problems that hamper our economy.

The Federal Government has a role to help ensure American workers are free to prosper. But borrowing money for massive government spending is not the answer.

The reality is, this bill, some nearly \$800 billion in spending and tax cuts, consists entirely of money we do not have. So how are we going to get this money?

There's only three ways to get it. We can ask the Treasury Department to print more money. But we know from

the 1970s that causes inflation. The second is we can raise taxes. We'd have to raise taxes \$2,600 per American. And we know that higher taxes create higher unemployment. I'm not interested in raising taxes.

The third way is to borrow money from investors. But our investors here in America don't have the money. We'd have to go to other countries, like the United Arab Emirates or Saudi Arabia, because China and the United Kingdom have their own economic problems. They can't raise the money themselves.

So, to attract this money, we're going to have to raise interest rates, and higher interest rates—some 4 percent, according to the Congressional Budget Office—causes higher credit card rates, higher car loan rates, and higher home mortgage rates.

We are following the legacy of Paul Volcker from the 1970s. Back then, they called it the misery index. During the 1970s, the media added inflation, unemployment, and interest rates together to get the misery index. And it's coming back. Back then, it was 21.98. Today's, it's 7.92.

There's a better plan than the misery index. We could give every American money by giving them a payroll tax holiday for several years. That would be a 10 to 20 percent pay increase for working Americans, and they would know best how to spend the money for their families. With the money they will buy goods or they will save their money or they will invest their money. All of that creates jobs. Because making more money available for new ideas in the marketplace does create jobs.

Vote “no” on this legislation. Vote “no” to the misery index. This package will get more money to hardworking Americans by giving it directly to them with a payroll tax holiday, because that is the best plan.

We can stop the return to the misery index by getting people back to work, by getting more money in their pocket. Let's go for a payroll tax holiday. Vote “no.” Let's go back to conference. Cut the government spending, add back a payroll tax holiday for working Americans, and return the economy to the strength it once had.

Mr. OBEY. I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE).

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

Mr. ETHERIDGE. I thank the gentleman for the time to speak in support of this bill. I thank you for your leadership and for this economic recovery bill, on the issues that are in it, but also on school construction.

I thank Mr. RANGEL, who's been a tireless advocate for investment in our future economy. He and I have been proud to be able to be partners in authorizing the America's Better Classroom Act, which we are finally going to enact into law in this piece of legislation.

For more than 12 years we have been working to improve our Nation's schools and opportunities for the future. The idea that we created, to put the Federal Government into partnership with our local school districts to create private sector jobs and improve schools, was a perfect fit for the needs of our troubled economy. And I am proud that it is included in this final piece of legislation.

I strongly support the conference report for H.R. 1, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009, which takes needed steps to restore our economy. This bill provides urgently needed relief to struggling individuals and businesses, and will create or save 3.5 million jobs in this country.

Hundreds of thousands of these jobs will be created by the \$25 billion in school construction bond tax credits in this piece of legislation. And they will be created quickly. Hundreds of school building projects have been stalled or delayed in this economic downturn. Chairman RANGEL and I have introduced the ABC Act to help school districts get the funding that they need.

Everything I have achieved in life is due to my educational opportunities, the ones that I was given by my friends and neighbors. I want today's generation to have similar opportunities. High-quality schools, with strong teachers and modern facilities, are the key to the future.

Students can't prepare for the 21st century economy in schools from the 20th century that are crumbling, deteriorated, and overcrowded. In today's economic downturn, we have a chance to change this. I urge your vote on this.

In today's economic downturn, we must give our students every tool we can to compete in the global economy. The new school construction enabled by this bill is a good step in that direction. School construction creates jobs today, and provides the foundation for jobs for the future. I am proud that the tax credits in this bill will give local school districts support to improve their schools and the education they provide.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this conference agreement.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield \$8.8 billion to the gentleman from Tennessee for 1 minute. That's the cost of the minute I'm yielding him on this bill, to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP).

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Speaker, we know there's a problem. Republicans have great empathy with the people that are hurting. Our constituents are your constituents. But there's little faith that the Federal Government is going to make things better.

The financial rescue didn't work, the TARP was mismanaged grossly, the auto bailout didn't work. They're looking and seeing home budgets being cut to get through hard times. Local government is being cut, State governments' budgets being cut. But only in Washington can we spend our way into prosperity.

It's an ill-conceived thought. Confidence is lost. It's a wrong approach. If ever there was a massive bill where the devil is in the details, it is this bill. And there are many devils in the details of this bill.

The government is ill-equipped to ramp up and do these things. We're going to be disappointed over time. There's going to be waste, fraud, and abuse everywhere you look.

Just because Republicans spent too much money after September 11th and lost our way on financial matters doesn't mean the Democratic Party should be allowed to wreck our ship of State. This has taken us very quickly down the wrong road. Vote "no."

Mr. OBEY. I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee, Mr. WAXMAN.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to speak in favor of this conference report. Our Nation's economy is foundering. We need to respond. We're in a deep and long recession. Our unemployment rate is over 7 percent, and growing. And we urgently need an economic recovery package to set the Nation on the proper course to rebound.

I am pleased the House and the Senate moved rapidly to resolve the differences between the two bills and to get this bill to the President so it can finally take action.

The final conference agreement retains provisions that were passed out of the Committee on Energy and Commerce in January in three critical areas that will accelerate economic recovery and protect American families: Broadband, energy, and health.

The first piece is an investment in expanding broadband Internet access so businesses and households in rural and other underserved areas can link to the global balance economy.

Broadband networks are as important to the Nation's economic success as the postal roads, canals, rail lines, and interstate highways of the past. Unfortunately, the United States has fallen behind other nations in terms of broadband deployment and adoption.

This legislation would authorize approximately \$4.7 billion for grants to be administered by the Commerce Department and another \$2.5 billion in grants to be administered by the Agriculture Department to put people to work building new broadband infrastructure.

The second piece we're considering is a major investment in the Nation's energy future. The conference agreement will accelerate deployment of smart grid technology throughout the country, offer loan guarantees for renewable energy and transmission projects, and promote energy efficiency throughout the country.

I am pleased that we were able to adopt these provisions. We also will support economic recovery through the creation of thousands of jobs, especially for low- and middle-income Americans, as the Nation dramatically

increases the efficiency in which it uses energy and relies upon renewable sources of energy.

And the final and biggest piece involves investments in health. And there are three sections. First, the bill would help people who lose their jobs and have no health insurance. It provides temporary subsidies for COBRA premiums to enable workers who had insurance, to hold on to that insurance.

The bill would protect health insurance for an additional 7 million Americans. It will also provide an 18-month extension of the health insurance program that helps families transitioning from welfare to work to keep their Medicaid coverage.

Second, the bill would provide \$19 billion in funding to accelerate the nationwide adoption of health information technology.

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

Mr. OBEY. I yield 1 additional minute.

Mr. WAXMAN. This will expedite the development of nationwide health information infrastructure that will enhance real-time communication between providers and improve the coordination of care.

Finally, the bill would provide \$87 billion in temporary funding to assist State Medicaid programs facing surges in caseloads and State revenue shortfalls. The bill would provide a temporary increase in the Federal Medicaid matching rate, FMAP. It balances an across-the-board increase of 6.2 percentage points, with an additional increase targeted at those States with high unemployment.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is necessary to set the course to turn the economy around and deliver on our promise and duty to assist our constituents in this difficult time. I urge my colleagues to approve the conference report.

□ 1230

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM).

Mr. LATHAM. I thank the ranking member.

I just want folks to step back for just a second here. You know, last year at the end of the year we spent \$700 billion on the TARP. Who knows if it has had any effect. No one knows for sure. This Tuesday, the Secretary of the Treasury said we are going to spend another \$2 trillion. Today, we are going to spend \$890 billion; with interest, well over another \$1 trillion. In another couple weeks, we are going to spend another \$400 billion on the omnibus bill. Then there is going to be a war supplement. We are talking about over \$4 trillion here in less than 3 months.

This is the most selfish bill I have ever seen generationally. We are saying to our children and grandchildren: We don't care about you, because we just want self-gratification now. We want

to feel better today. We can't take any pain ourselves.

Our kids and grandchildren are paying for this, and it is going to limit their opportunities for the future for the next generations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished dean of the House, the longest-serving Member in the House of Representatives of any Member in history, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL).

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

Mr. DINGELL. I thank my good friend for yielding time.

As a boy, I was a page in this body during the Depression. My father was a Member of Congress. A third of the Americans were out of work. People were losing their homes and their farms, businesses were closing. Hardship was terrifying. It was the worst economic experience in the history of this country. Let's learn from history, my dear friends and colleagues, and let's do something about this so that it doesn't happen.

Herbert Hoover became the most reviled President in the history of the United States because he didn't do anything about the recession which was coming. Those who have studied that Depression tell us that had Congress acted and had the administration acted with vigor, that the Depression would have been much shorter and much less severe.

We have a chance to learn from that experience and to do something about it, and to see to it that this generation doesn't leave a depression to the next generation. It is not just about spending money; it is about doing something right about a terrifying problem that faces this country. I urge us to learn from history so that we don't repeat it. Support this legislation.

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

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I feel like I went to bed a couple weeks ago and woke up in bizarro-world. We are about to spend over \$1 trillion for a stimulus bill which will do little, if anything, to stimulate the economy. What it will stimulate is the growth of government.

I have no doubt that those on the other side of the aisle feel that this is the right thing to do to help the economy, but sincerity does not make something right which is fundamentally wrong, and this bill is fundamentally wrong.

We were just told a few minutes ago that the key word here is "necessary."

Millions of dollars for mouse habitat? Yes, it is not specifically put in the bill. What they have done is put in a fund for habitat restoration, which the agency says they will spend up to \$30 million on mouse habitat restoration. That is beautiful. Necessary? I don't know.

Fifty million dollars for the NEA. I love the NEA. Necessary in a stimulus bill?

Billions of dollars for a sin express train from Los Angeles to Las Vegas. Necessary? I don't think so.

And, of course, we have got the infamous Frisbee golf course. And if you are going to have a Frisbee golf course, you had better have green golf carts. So we put money in for green golf carts. That is good, too. Necessary? I don't think so.

The list is too long to complete when you look at this bill; but, fundamentally, the problem is the process that created this bill. None of this stuff would have been in here had we gone through a process which allowed Members to have input and debate and so forth on this bill. Instead, this has been created in the Speaker's office, in the President's office, and handed to us and said, "We have got to pass this bill."

This process stinks. There is no other word for it. And for the first time in my public life, 4 years on a local city council, 14 years in the Idaho legislature, and 10 years in this body, for the first time in my life I am embarrassed to be a Member of this body.

Mr. OBEY. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I am embarrassed, frankly, from the comments I hear from the other side of the aisle about mouse traps, Frisbees, golf carts. The economy is in terrible shape, it is getting worse every day, and we are trying to address it in a bold way. That is what is necessary here, not talking about these trivial things that the other side is bringing up.

At a time when States are facing fiscal problems and more people are in need of health care services, we provide in this bill critical financial assistance so that States can maintain their Medicaid programs, health care. It would provide access to health coverage for those who recently lost their jobs by making COBRA coverage more affordable. And, finally, the package would modernize our Nation's health care system by investing nearly \$20 billion in health information technology.

These are the important things that we face right now. People are losing their health care. We are addressing this. We are giving money back to the States. We are helping people with their health care so that they can stay insured.

Mr. Speaker, I appeal to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, now is the time for bold action. This package is a good package. Vote "yes."

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, could I inquire as to the time remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 20½ minutes remaining; the gentleman from Wisconsin has 24 minutes remaining.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, in 1996, I created the E-Verify program, and I will not idly stand by while a coalition of pro-amnesty groups and their allies in big business kill this program in the dead of night. The American people have repeatedly voiced their support for employment verification; yet, we find that, once again, special interests win out.

While nearly 1 trillion taxpayer dollars are going to be spent in this Reid/Pelosi stimulus plan, there is no assurance that the job it created will go to American workers. Amendments to reauthorize the E-Verify program, which expires on March 6 and requires any entity receiving stimulus funds to participate in E-Verify, both of which had been accepted in the House Appropriations Committee, were stripped out of the bill without discussion or debate.

The one candle in the darkness of this disastrous bill was the reauthorization requirements to use E-Verify. Now, we are left with legislation that places the interests of illegal immigrants above those of hard-working American families and leaves this bill at the foot of future generations.

Mr. OBEY. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH).

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman WAXMAN, Chairman OBEY, and Chairman RANGEL for their hard work on the compromise legislation that we have before us today. In a time when so many Americans are in the grips of economic hardship and despair, now is the time for all of us to come together and act on the part of those who are in need.

Mr. Speaker, our people need jobs. Our people need jobs and our Nation needs jobs. And we need to invest in our infrastructure, invest in our communities, and invest in the next generation of Americans. This package includes all the tools and all the money to make our dream of a better tomorrow for all Americans a reality.

With the passing of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, we will act by deeds, not just words. The Bible tells us that a tree will be known by the fruit it bears. This bill has good fruit in it.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 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. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this conference report.

I want to start out by talking a little bit about the process. I know that is not very sexy. But when the President and people complain that Republicans are not being bipartisan, they need to know that we haven't been given much of a chance, if any of a chance, to be bipartisan.

As this bill started in the House, there were no hearings in the House of

Representatives. There was a markup in Ways and Means and a markup in the Approps Committee and a markup in the Energy and Commerce Committee. The Energy and Commerce Committee that I am on, Mr. WAXMAN, to his credit, had a 12-hour markup, and five Republican amendments were accepted. Three of those were stripped out before the bill came to the floor; one was kept in as is, and one was materially changed.

When we went to conference with the other body, our chairman Mr. WAXMAN was appointed a conferee, as he should have been, because it is about \$200 billion of the bill is in the Energy and Commerce jurisdiction; but no Republican, no minority member was appointed. So we had no Republican input into the conference. Of course, that is probably okay, because it really wasn't a conference. There were five House conferees and five Senate conferees. The majority party Members, three on the House and three on the Senate, signed the conference report without anybody actually on the Republican side being given a copy to look at. So it was kind of a done deal.

So on process alone, when the President asks why Republicans tend to be appositive of the bill, it is because we really were not given any input into the finished project.

On the policy, the Energy and Commerce Committee has jurisdiction over energy, over telecommunication, and over health care. The energy section, they took out all the energy grants for things like clean coal technology. They left in a little thing called electricity decoupling; which means, in order to get some of these green energy grants, the Governor of a State has to certify to the Department of Energy's Secretary that they are going to do this decoupling. That means that you can allow the PUC to decouple the price you pay from the amount of electricity that you use. So it is a revenue guarantee for the utility; so as the utility gets the green grant and goes out and educates you on how to use less electricity, you use less electricity, your bill stays the same or goes up. It is the most anticompetitive, anticonsumer, antifree-market piece of legislation I have ever seen on the House floor and it is in this bill.

On health care, my friends on the other side have made a big point of talking about all the things they are doing on health care. Well, you have the health IT grants, which some of that may be good, but do you really need to give every doctor in America \$44,000 to switch to electronic records? And, oh, by the way, a lot of that money is not available in 2011, until 2012? I am not sure that is very stimulative of the economy.

We give the States more FMAP money for Medicaid. It doesn't have to be spent on Medicaid. Fifty percent or 65 percent is allocated on the standard formula package, and the rest is allocated on high unemployment. But the

once the State gets that Medicaid money, they can use it for other purposes. And, oh, by the way, that is theoretically temporary. But do you really believe that adding \$90 billion to the baseline for Medicaid is going to be temporary? It is going to go into the permanent baseline, and it is going to raise the cost over time to the U.S. taxpayer.

I could go on and on, Mr. Speaker. But the point of the subject is those of us on our side, we understand that people are hurting, we understand that we need to do things to help the economy. Shouldn't we start by keeping the people that have a job, let them keep a little bit more of their money by doing some tax cuts? A lot of those got diluted in this bill. Shouldn't we require that, if you are going to spend money, it has a long-term effect, it helps basic infrastructure? This bill doesn't do that. Vote "no."

Mr. OBEY. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California (Ms. ESHOO).

Ms. ESHOO. I thank the distinguished chairman.

Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago a Presidential candidate, John Kennedy, said the following: The Chinese use two brush strokes to write the word "crisis." One brush stroke stands for danger; the other stands for opportunity. In a crisis, be aware of the danger, but recognize the opportunity.

That is what we are doing today. We recognize the full danger that faces America, the greatest danger since the great depression. But we also recognize the opportunity for the people of our great Nation that we love so much, and what we are doing is building for the future: Health care for the unemployed, extension of unemployment benefits for those that find themselves unemployed. The building blocks not only for today, but the opportunities for tomorrow by making investments in technology, broadband, the sciences.

I urge all of my colleagues to consider this opportunity for America.

Mr. Speaker, America has been shaken to its core by an economic disruption unlike anything we've seen since the Great Depression. For too many Americans it seems that nothing is certain or secure—not our jobs, not our homes, not the very businesses our economy stands upon.

Today the American people and people around the world can take heart that our Nation is acting to reverse course and begin the difficult work of rebuilding our economy, our infrastructure, and our confidence in our country's future.

This legislation responds to the pressing needs of today, creating and saving 3.5 million jobs by rebuilding America through new investments in roads, bridges, mass transit, energy efficient buildings, flood control, clean water projects, school construction, and other infrastructure projects. 95 percent of American workers will receive an immediate tax cut to ease the impact of the harsh economic conditions and jumpstart consumer spending on goods and services.

Just as importantly, this final bill makes critical investments in science, technology and in-

novation which will ensure that our recovery is strong and that the United States continues its leadership in the competitive global economy.

To secure America's technology leadership in the 21st Century we are renewing America's investments in basic science and research, providing \$15 billion for scientific research, including \$3 billion for the National Science Foundation, \$1.6 billion for the Department of Energy's Office of Science, and \$10 billion for the National Institutes of Health.

To achieve energy independence, we have invested \$30 billion in energy programs such as a new, smart power grid, advanced battery technology, and energy efficiency measures, plus another \$20 billion in tax incentives for renewable energy and energy efficiency.

To provide all Americans an 'on-ramp' to the Information Superhighway, we are investing \$7 billion for extending broadband services to underserved communities across the country.

Fifty years ago John Kennedy said "the Chinese use two brush strokes to write the word 'crisis.' One brush stroke stands for danger; the other for opportunity. In a crisis, be aware of the danger—but recognize the opportunity."

This economic recovery package is a bill filled with hope and belief—hope that the danger of the current crisis will be averted, new jobs will be created, and old jobs will be restored so that people will once again enjoy the dignity of a day's work, and a belief that we recognize this opportunity to reinvigorate the great innovative spirit of our country that we love so much.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 2 minutes to the partner of our chairman, Mr. OBEY, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN).

□ 1245

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, the President said, "We don't want any tired old ideas." I agree. One-time rebate checks, special interest pork and runaway spending, those tired old ideas didn't work in the past administration. They won't work now. This is just more of the same. Both parties have messed this thing up. So the question is, are we going to come together and fix this?

The crown jewel of the American economy is the risk-taker, the entrepreneur, the small businessmen and women, the person who put it all on the line and created jobs. That is the way out. That is not what this bill does. This bill says, let's take money out of the economy and away from the private sector through higher borrowing and higher taxes, ultimately so that government bureaucrats can spend money and try and re-micro-manage the economy back to prosperity.

This bill, which will lead to higher costs and higher taxes, will be not a road to prosperity, but a road to stagnation. The priorities are just all wrong. There is more money in this legislation for the National Endowment for the Arts, for the National Endowment for the Arts, than there is to helping small businesses keep and create jobs. We can do better than this.

Mr. Speaker, please, if you want bipartisan, that means collaboration,

working with us. You have all the rights. The majority can do whatever they want. But when you look at the minority's alternative, a plan to create jobs, to help families and small businesses keep and create jobs using the administration's own methodology, you will see that our plan creates twice the jobs for half the cost. This bill sends us on a worldwide borrowing binge. We're going to go out and borrow four times as much money this year than we ever have in the history of this country in a single year. This is not just a road to stagnation, it is a road to stagflation.

Mr. OBEY. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. I thank my colleague.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this bill, which will reinvest in America's future and which will create jobs. Do you know that there are still sectors of our economy that are hiring? And one of those is health care. I'm so proud to see that this legislation recognizes the need to educate new nurses, physicians and dentists and responds by investing \$500 million for professional education. In 2008, over 27,000 qualified applicants were turned away from nursing schools because we don't have enough faculty to train them. The programs that will be funded through this bill will help train more faculty and also entry-level nursing students so that we can shore up our health care workforce.

If we continue simply at the pace we are today, we will have a shortage of 1 million nurses by the year 2020. This bill makes an excellent investment to alleviate that shortage, to create jobs for nurses, for doctors and for health care professionals.

So I urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Nobody knows the pain of a bad economy like us fellow Michiganders, and we're suffering worse than any other State in the Nation. And if this bill even came close to providing hope or a job, I would be for it, but this bill is dangerous. And this is the kind of thing that happens when you rush it and you don't let people in to see it.

Think about it. They do say, listen, it gives credits for hybrid plug-ins. But what they don't tell you is that in this bill, for every dollar the average family saves by going green, the electric companies charge you \$1. Your electric bill is going up with this piece of legislation. They say, do you know what? There is business relief in this bill for small businesses. They don't tell you that less than 1 percent of this bill goes to small businesses.

As was said before, we spend more on arts than we do on small business, which is 80 percent of our job providers. They say this bill spends money on roads and bridges. But they don't tell

you it is less than 7 percent, and only about \$10 billion in the first year over 50 States. That is hardly an investment in our roads and our bridges.

They say there is no mouse in this bill. But there is, sir. What they don't tell you is that in the EPA projects, it cites for sure and for certain they will spend money on the salt marsh habitat for the mouse in San Francisco. Certainly, the Speaker is getting her cheese. The people in Michigan are waiting for theirs. I will tell you this. Do you know what? We spend money in this bill. True enough. And what they don't tell you is that this is one of the most massive, massive transfers of debt to our children in the history of this country. There are lots of IOUs, but not much for jobs in this bill.

Mr. OBEY. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. I stand in strong support of the economic recovery legislation before us today. We cannot stand idly by like our Republican friends are doing and let our economy sink any further. The cost of inaction is far too great. The American people are hurting, and we're trying to do something about it.

Our Republican friends, unfortunately, are becoming the party of "no." Well, while they are saying "no," we are saying "yes," yes to creating 3½ million jobs, yes to providing tax breaks to the middle class, yes to providing AMT relief, yes to improving our infrastructure to be more energy efficient, yes in providing health care coverage for millions of Americans during this recession, providing an estimated \$87 billion in additional Federal matching funds.

This will help States like mine, like New York, maintain their Medicaid programs in the face of massive State budget shortfalls over the next 2 years. We say "yes" to reduce our dependence on foreign oil. FMAP funds are important. I have long fought hard for more FMAP funds. The stimulus will provide much-needed relief to our States. We say "yes" for energy-efficient programs. Say "yes" for this bill. This is a good bill.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY), a member of the committee.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Thank you, Chairman.

It is sad that this House has imposed a gag rule so that the American public can't hear today what's in this bill. The special interests know what's in this bill. They certainly do. Congress is going to rain billions of dollars of cash across this land, and special interests and lobbyists have big buckets out to catch it.

We all want this President to succeed. We want this economy to get going because people are hurting. But when the economy is drowning, you throw it a life preserver. You don't build a 40-foot yacht for it. This bill is

too big. It is too expensive. It is way too slow. And at the end of the day, it is not going to rescue this economy. And at the end of a couple of years, it's middle-class families and small businesses that are going to have to pay for all this cash.

Taxpayers just aren't willing to spend one-quarter of \$1 million to trade a new job. They're not willing to spend more money on art than on small businesses. They're not willing to buy Frisbee golf courses and gambling trains. That is a bad use of our dollars. We can do better.

Mr. OBEY. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN).

Ms. HARMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Let me highlight two issues. First, temporary increases in COBRA, FMAP and DSH coverage, a lifeline for hard-hit families and communities. Mr. WAXMAN played the critical role in the conference on these issues, and constituents in our adjoining congressional districts are very grateful. Harbor-UCLA Medical Center is the only level 1 trauma center near top terror targets, like LAX and the Ports of LA and Long Beach. Without DSH, Harbor will have no surge capacity to treat victims of terror and natural disasters.

Second, energy innovation and efficiency. This is a stimulus bill, and the smart grid and transportation projects it funds are a jobs engine. It sets the framework for future climate change legislation.

Mr. Chairman, enhanced safety net and clean energy jobs are good reasons to vote "aye."

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM).

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

So I was at a birthday party for some young kids not too long ago, and everybody is playing the normal games that all little kids play. But there is one kid—and this is typical at every kid's birthday party—that sees the cake and starts scraping the icing off the cake, and he leaves the grubby mess for everybody else. That's exactly what this bill does.

According to the CBO, an entity that everybody pauses and recognizes as authoritative, the CBO says, yeah, you may get a short-term sugar buzz off this. But in 2013, because of the passage of this bill, you're going to have negative growth. From 2013 to 2019, what we're basically going to be foisting on this economy is that grubby, nasty birthday cake without any of the icing. We can do much better than this. I think the President expects us to do much better than this. And I urge a "no" vote.

Mr. OBEY. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts. For millions of Americans, after 8 years of laissez-faire economics, they know it is

just a fancy word for “left behind.” Fixing the economy is not a spectator sport. That’s what has been going on for 8 years. And that’s what’s going on with the Republicans here today.

This bill creates or saves 3.5 million jobs. It provides tax cuts for 95 percent of Americans. It spurs a green jobs revolution. It has health IT that will revolutionize medicine with privacy and security built in that I requested and the majority has placed in this bill. There’s more money in this bill after 5 years of cutting the NIH budget, there’s a dramatic increase in the NIH budget to find a cure for cancer, for heart disease, for Parkinson’s and for Alzheimer’s. This is a revolution in health care, in energy and in job creation.

This bill must be passed today and break with the 8 years of laissez-faire, which has hurt every single American family. Vote “yes” on this bill.

Today we’re responding with determination and bold action to combat the most severe economic crisis our country has faced since the Great Depression.

For years, as hardworking American families struggled to make ends meet and the economy shed millions of jobs, Republicans told us not to worry—we are in the midst of a “jobless recovery”, they said. But “jobless recovery” is an oxymoron, a contradiction in terms, like jumbo shrimp or Salt Lake City nightlife—it just doesn’t exist.

The failed “laissez-faire” approach of the past 8 years has now been discredited by rising unemployment, loss of confidence in our financial markets, and the economic hardships suffered by families across the country.

For millions of Americans, “laissez-faire” is just a fancy name for “left behind.”

With this economic recovery package, we are taking the bold action that is needed by creating or saving 3-and-a-half million jobs, rebuilding America, making us more globally competitive and energy independent, and transforming our economy.

I say to my Republican friends: “fixing the economy is not a spectator sport.”

While our country is facing enormous challenges, we also have a once-in-a-generation opportunity to create millions of new jobs, invest in vital priorities, and position our economy for future growth. Today we are seizing this historic opportunity and setting our country on a new direction.

This is about greenbacks and green energy.

This urgently-needed economic recovery package funds infrastructure projects that are “shovel-ready”, while also supporting future-oriented projects that are “circuit-ready”: broadband, electronic medical records, smart grid, advanced battery technologies, and other vital priorities.

The massive investments in weatherization, state energy efficiency grants, and federal building efficiency are some of the safest and smartest investments our country can make right now. They put money into the pockets of American workers and pay for themselves in the form of energy savings and lower energy prices. This energy efficiency “double dividend” is a proven, reliable phenomenon that our current weak economy must capitalize.

The bill provides \$19 billion for a new health IT infrastructure to improve care, lower costs and reduce medical errors. I am pleased that

the conference report includes patient privacy safeguards that I have long advocated, including a provision that I offered at the Energy and Commerce Committee markup to ensure that patients’ medical records are made unreadable to unauthorized individuals.

This balanced, well-thought out package provides tax relief for 95 percent of Americans and targets investments in key areas to turn around the American economy. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 1, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009. 3.5 million jobs created or saved.

Tax cuts for 95 percent of Americans.

Green job revolution.

Health IT, with privacy.

NIH increase—cure Alzheimer’s.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlelady fighting for jobs in Michigan, CANDICE MILLER, for 1 minute.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I come from Macomb County, Michigan, which is the proud home of the Reagan Democrats. And it is a community that has been impacted as much as anybody in this Nation by the economic downturn. And I do not need to be lectured by anyone about the challenges we are facing, because we live with it every single day. I understand. Believe me, I understand.

So when President Obama talked about an economic stimulus plan that was focused on tax cuts or massive infrastructure investment, I was there. But what we are about to vote on today is unrecognizable from what he talked about. Michigan is a State of about 10 million people, and we are the hardest hit, as I said, by this economy. And yet we are expected to get approximately \$7 billion from this bill. And apparently the Senate majority leader has earmarked \$8 billion for a rail system from Las Vegas to Los Angeles? You have got to be kidding. You have got to be kidding.

As everyone knows, Michigan is dependent on the auto industry, which is on its knees right now. So I was incredibly disappointed to see an \$11 billion auto incentive to spur auto sales reduced to \$2 billion in the conference report.

Please vote “no” against this bill.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD).

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank personally Congressman WAXMAN, Congressman RANGEL, Congressman OBEY and particularly their staffs for their hard work on this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, no one disputes that we’re in an economic crisis. It continues to deepen. Families are hurting. In my home State of North Carolina, more than one-third of our 100 counties are now suffering from double-digit unemployment, including 10 of those counties in the First Congressional District.

Without question, we need to quickly pass this stimulus bill this afternoon which will put people back to work,

provide relief for the people who need it the most and make investments in our future. Americans demanded change last November. And we must answer that call today. I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on this conference report.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, President Obama understands something that every Vermonter knows, and that is that this economy faces the biggest challenge since the Great Depression. We have a very simple choice in Congress. It is to do nothing, as Herbert Hoover did, or it is to act boldly, as Franklin Roosevelt did.

□ 1300

This bill embraces the philosophy of Franklin Roosevelt that when the economy is deteriorating, people are losing their jobs, Congress must act to save jobs and rebuild our economy.

This bill is well-balanced and can provide 8,000 jobs in Vermont. It helps our taxpayers, property taxpayers and State taxpayers. It provides a safety net to the people who, through absolutely no fault of their own, lost their jobs. We owe it to them. And it provides investments in the future. Green jobs, health care information technology.

This is essential as a step to start revitalizing our economy and putting it in a growth path for the future.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, people want to know how did we get into this painful economy. Too many of our fellow citizens borrowed too much. They spent too much, and they couldn’t pay it back. And now the mistakes of individuals, the Democrats want to force upon us collectively.

Mr. Speaker, you cannot borrow and spend your way into prosperity. Even the Democrats’ own Congressional Budget Office says H.R. 1 is the single greatest spending bill in the history of America, will leave us the greatest debt in the history of America, and ultimately, will hurt our economy, leaving a legacy of debt, crushing debt for future generations.

The Republicans want to stimulate the economy by helping small business. The Democrats want to stimulate big government. The Democrats want to spend millions on urban canals. The Republicans want to spend millions on small businesses like Williams Paint and Body, to preserve and grow 21 jobs. Democrats want to spend \$300 million to buy government bureaucrats new cars. Republicans want to spend money on Terry Manufacturing, to preserve and secure 20 new jobs. Big government or small business? Choose small business.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished majority leader, Mr. HOYER.

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

Mr. HOYER. We are coming close to the end of this debate. America and Americans are in trouble. They're hurting. Millions of our constituents are in great pain. They've lost their homes, they've lost their jobs. Their salaries are not keeping up with the costs that confront them.

And so we come here, 435 of us, and five representing the territories and the District of Columbia. We come here to act, to act on their behalf, to try to make a difference, to try to ease the pain that this economy has visited upon them.

Those of us who have been here for many years have heard this debate very often. And I tell my friends, I'm sure that had I been here in 1929 and 1930, I would have heard much the same representation.

And we were told, frankly, in the last of the 1980s, stick with us on this economic program. And it didn't work. And we were told in 2001 and 2003, stick with us on this economic program, and it didn't work.

And like the failed program of the 1920s that brought our economy so low, the failed policies of the early part of this century have brought this economy to the lowest point it has been since the policies of the late 1920s.

And so we hear the debate. We hear the debate about investing in our people. We hear the debate about trying to build up our economy, create jobs. And we hear one argument, do it our way, do it our way and you'll create those jobs. Well, my friends, we did it your way. In 2001, in 2002, in 2003, in 2004, in 2005, 2006, 2007 and in 2008. And we had the worst job performance of any administration since the late 1920s and early 1930s.

I would hope that every Member on this floor, of whatever party, of whatever ideological persuasion, would pray that this bill works; not for political purposes, because if this bill works, we will create those 3½ million jobs. Am I absolutely assured that it will? I am not. I regret that I'm not.

But the best advice and counsel that I have received over the last 5 months that we've been working on this bill, September, October, November, December, January, as we hemorrhaged jobs in this greatest economy on the face of the earth, as a million people lost their jobs over the last 60 days, as 65,000 Americans lost their jobs in 1 day 2 weeks ago. And so America expects us to act.

And none of us can guarantee that we have all the answers. But economist after economist after economist, including one of JOHN MCCAIN's economic advisers, says that we have to act, we have to act with speed, and we have to act substantively, and we have to act with large investment.

On the tax side, in cutting taxes, millions and millions and millions of Americans will receive a tax cut when we pass this bill and President Obama signs it. Millions and millions and millions of people will be helped as they've lost their jobs and can't put food on the table of their families, will be helped by this bill. Millions of families who know that their children are going to have to compete in a global marketplace will be able to send their children to college because of this bill. And in addition to that, we will invest billions of dollars in making sure that we are no longer subject to being held hostage by the oil barons who wish us no good will.

And so, my friends, we come pretty close to the end of this debate. And we ought to vote, not as Republicans, not as Democrats. We ought to vote recognizing the policies that we've been pursuing have not worked, demonstrably, statistically, obviously. There's no argument on that. Millions of people unemployed. Millions lost their jobs under the economic policies we've been pursuing.

And so, yes, President Obama said to the American public, we need to change. This is our moment. We need to move in a new direction. And that's what this bill does.

Some would like to stay on the same path, pursuing the same failed policies. The sign of a good person and a good legislator is to say, I moved in this direction and it didn't work, and so I'll change directions. That's what this bill does.

Every American prays that this bill will work. I think all of us pray that this bill will work. I hope that we come together, not because this bill is perfect, but because it is a substantial investment of America's money in resuscitating its economy that is causing it such great pain.

My friends, it is time for us to act. Vote for this bill to restore, to recover, to invest in a better future for all those who sent us here, hoping that we would act in their best interests and the best interest of their children, their family and their country. I believe voting "yes" is doing just that. And I urge my colleagues to do just that.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the newest Member of the House, AARON SCHOCK of Illinois.

Mr. SCHOCK. Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege yesterday of traveling with the President to my hometown of Peoria, Illinois, to visit a company that has made the news recently, Caterpillar Corporation. And during that speech, the President had me stand up in front of the hundreds of my constituents and Caterpillar workers and urged them to call on me to support this bill, and asked them to approach me after his speech to put pressure on me to vote for this bill.

I found it very interesting that after the President finished his speech and I stayed around, not one employee at

that facility approached me and asked me to vote for this bill. In fact, I have received over 1,400 phone calls, e-mails and letters from Caterpillar employees alone asking me to oppose this legislation. Why? Because they get it. They know that this bill is not stimulus. They know that this bill will not do anything to create long-term sustained economic growth. This bill is too big to get it wrong.

I hail from a district that once had Everett Dirksen, who is famous for a billion here, a billion there.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. I yield the gentleman 30 additional seconds.

Mr. SCHOCK. Everett Dirksen once said, a billion here, a billion there. Unfortunately, ladies and gentlemen, we're now a trillion here, a trillion there. We cannot afford to get this wrong. It is too important to get it wrong.

My district also had a man by the name of Abraham Lincoln who served in this seat for 2 years. We celebrated his 200th birthday yesterday. I'm reminded of his quote: "What kills a skunk is the publicity it brings itself." Perhaps that is the haste by which this bill is being brought forward.

I urge a "no" vote.

Mr. OBEY. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN).

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, today we stand shoulder to shoulder with President Obama to say to the American people, help is on the way. This package packs a punch where it's needed most: ready-to-go infrastructure projects, tax relief for middle America and small businesses, essential forward-looking investments in areas like clean energy, health IT, scientific research and education, priorities that will create or save millions of jobs in this country.

Now, throughout this debate we've heard from those who, for a variety of reasons, think we should do nothing. While those voices may be sincere, inaction is not an option. Just say no is not an answer to the American people at this time.

And if our colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to define themselves as the party of "Nobama" I think that the American people will call them and say it's time for us to work together.

There are also those that say we should do this through tax cuts alone. And they propose substituting a middle class tax cut package with a tax package that once again benefited those who are relatively well off.

We don't need more of the same. We need to put this country to work. I urge adoption of this legislation.

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

Mr. Speaker, we just received official scoring of the \$792 billion bill at 12:04 p.m. Unfortunately, we didn't receive

this critical information until one-third of our very limited debate time was over.

While portions of the bill were scored by CBO earlier, in the case of the appropriations section, 40 percent of this entire package, the Members have not had the benefit of knowing what effects this bill would have. Now that we have this information, let me tell you what the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office concedes.

In the case of the more than \$311 billion in spending, CBO estimates that less than half of this spending will occur over the next 2 years, the time frame that many economists say such spending must occur to have the stimulative effect.

CBO estimates that only 11 percent of the money will spend out this year. It begs the question why has the majority decided to include this in this bill rather than through the regular appropriations process? Why have they decided to create 33 new programs and permanently expand 73 programs?

□ 1315

By growing the Federal Government now in this bill, the majority knows that they have a much better chance of permanently increasing government.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. I rise in support of this economic recovery package—a bold, urgent plan to create American jobs and to move to long-term economic growth. Every day reminds us of why this recovery package is so critical and urgent, and it reminds me of why we serve in this institution.

Last month, the economy lost 600,000 jobs. States are facing major midyear budget shortfalls. They have already begun to furlough employees. This week, we worked with President Obama and with the Senate to create 3.5 million jobs to get our economy moving—putting resources in the hands of people who need relief and who will spend it quickly, giving 95 percent of working Americans an immediate tax cut, expanding the eligibility of the child tax credit, benefiting over 16 million children, \$20 billion to increase the food stamp benefit, which will reach 14 million families immediately, putting Americans back to work with \$100 billion for building roads, bridges, mass transit, energy-efficient buildings, and clean water projects.

No investments are more critical than those that we make on our human capital. We got this right. Let's get it right today and support this bill.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Could I inquire of the gentleman how many speakers he has remaining?

Mr. LEWIS of California. I believe I have two.

Mr. OBEY. Then I would ask the gentleman to proceed. We have only two left—the Speaker, and I will be closing.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I have been told, since the Speaker wants to close, then our leader ought to precede her, we will have three.

Mr. OBEY. Then I would suggest the gentleman proceed.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Could I inquire as to how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 5 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 13 minutes remaining.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the Republican whip, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR).

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, outside the walls of Congress, America is paralyzed by a suffocating crisis of confidence. A virus that began in the credit and housing markets has spread to infect the broader economy. Small businesses are hunkered down. The promise of retaining or of finding a solid job slips further out of reach for America's workers.

With this stimulus package, Congress has a responsibility to re-instill lost confidence, and it has an obligation to focus our efforts like a laser on the creation, preservation and protection of sustainable jobs. That is why the bill we are voting on today represents a fundamental dereliction of duty on the part of this majority. This legislation will not put people to work right away, nor does it contain the time-honored incentives for work, investment, innovation, and job creation that are proven to stimulate growth.

This week, I spoke with a struggling business owner in my district. How could I tell him I am voting for a bill that gives more money to projects like Federal Government cars than it gives to businesses like his. This bill is loaded with wasteful deficit spending on the majority's favorite government programs. We need jobs, not mountains of debt to be paid by our children. We can do better. We proposed a plan on our side that did do better. It created twice as many jobs at half the cost.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Michigan.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am going to be offering the motion to recommit momentarily, which will be offering to restore the tax credit for car purchases to the full \$11.5 billion, which was reported by the Senate to the conference committee. Unfortunately, it was stripped out of there. The Democrats watered down this proposal to \$1.6 billion, which will have almost no impact on the auto industry. Of course, my being from Michigan and as we all know, the auto industry is on its knees.

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

Mr. OBEY. Could I inquire of the gentleman how many speakers he has remaining?

Mr. LEWIS of California. I have one speaker remaining.

Mr. OBEY. Then I would yield 1 minute to the distinguished Speaker of the House.

Ms. PELOSI. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I thank the gentleman for yielding. I thank him, Mr. OBEY, the distinguished chair of the Appropriations Committee; Mr. RANGEL, the chair of Ways and Means; Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. MILLER, Mr. GORDON, Mr. OBERSTAR, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ—the chairs of the committees which had the most to do with putting this legislation together. I thank them for their great work on behalf of the American people.

My colleagues, as we gather here today, the American people are watching and are waiting. They want to see if we can act on their behalf. They want to know if we have heard their pleas. They are concerned about their jobs—whether they can hold them—and those who have lost their jobs are concerned about how they are going to be able to have any economic stability for their families. They are concerned about their health care. They are concerned about putting food on the table.

There is a great deal of apprehension in our country about our economy. What we need now, though, is not fear. We need confidence. We need confidence in our economy, in our markets. We need consumer confidence. We need to do the job for the American people.

Mr. Speaker, a little more than 3 weeks ago, in his very inspirational inaugural address, President Obama pledged “action—bold and swift—not only to create new jobs but to lay a foundation for growth.” Today, only a little more than 3 weeks later, Congress is boldly and swiftly delivering on the President's promise of new jobs, new hope and a new direction for the American people.

I said on this floor that the ship of state is difficult to turn. Yet the American people know and historians will judge that this is a remarkable achievement for President Barack Obama. Never before has a President passed his first major economic proposal so boldly and so swiftly.

It is also a remarkable achievement for this Congress that we dubbed 2 years ago the “New Direction Congress.” With the extraordinary articulation of the President's vision and our own represented in this legislation, the name “New Direction Congress” rings more true now than ever. It is in sharp contrast to the “do nothing” approach that some want us to take here, and certainly, it is in very sharp contrast to the approach taken when our country was in big economic trouble leading into the Depression.

My colleague, Mr. MILLER, has already told you some of this, but I want to revisit it.

When President Hoover was faced with the Depression, he said, “What the country needs is a big laugh,” he said in 1931. “If someone could get off a good joke every day, I think our troubles would be over.”

In 1932, Hoover asked Will Rogers to think of a joke that would stop hoarding. He told Rudy Vallee, "If you could sing a song that will make people forget the Depression, I will give you a medal." President Hoover told Christopher Morley, "Perhaps what this country needs is a good poem . . . Sometimes a good poem can do more than legislation."

Sometimes it can. But not this legislation.

What President Hoover was saying then was not funny then, and it is not funny now. The American people need action, and they need action now. They have a right, as they listen to this debate, to ask about this legislation: What is in it for me?

After all of the debate, this legislation can be summed up in one word, "jobs"—new jobs for the 3.6 million Americans who were put out of work since the recession began in December 2007, new jobs and an economy transformed by this legislation's new investments in health, education, science, innovation, and in clean, efficient American energy, new jobs created through modernizing America's roads, bridges, transit systems, and waterways. It is the first such large-scale effort in half a century since the creation of the Interstate Highway System under President Eisenhower. The jobs that the American people care about most—their own—will be dramatically safer the day that President Obama signs this into law.

While we jump-start and then transform our economy for years to come, we must also lift those harmed by the economy we inherit—the workers and families who have been hurt in the recession. What is in it for them?

More than 35 percent of this package will provide direct tax relief to 95 percent of American workers through the Making Work Pay Tax Credit. We provide the most significant expansion of tax cuts for low- and moderate-income Americans ever, which will lift more than 2 million Americans out of poverty.

College will be made more affordable for 7 million American college students who will see an increase in their Pell grants. Four million students will benefit from a new \$2,500 American Opportunity Tax Credit that is partially refundable.

We will also help workers and families make ends meet by extending unemployment benefits, COBRA for unemployed workers, by investing in job training and by increasing nutrition assistance. Economists tell us that every dollar invested in food stamps and in unemployment insurance creates \$1.73 or \$1.63 respectively, making the right thing to do for the American people the right thing to do for the economy. We get the biggest bang for the buck on those initiatives that address the needs of our working families.

The historic scope of this bill is matched by an unprecedented account-

ability in our tax dollars and transparency so that the American people can see where each dollar is invested and can contact by name those responsible for how those dollars are spent, ensuring a strong result for our economy.

Just yesterday, the President and leaders of Congress came together in the Rotunda of the Capitol to honor the legacy and courage of our Nation's greatest President, Abraham Lincoln. Lincoln's stirring words captured the very heart of our democracy and representative government. A few years after his sole term in the House of Representatives—and aren't we proud to call him "colleague," one who has served in our House—Lincoln offered his thoughts on the aims of government:

"The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done but cannot do at all or cannot do so well for themselves in their separate and individual capacities." Abraham Lincoln.

More simply put, we are all in this together.

As you cast your vote today, I think I feel this more than on any occasion when we have had a very important vote, and this vote today is, indeed, historic. When we put our cards in to register our support for this important legislation or not, let us think that our hands are being held and that our hands are being pushed by all of the American people who want us to vote for them—for their health, for the education of their children, for their jobs, for the economic security of their families, for a better future built on innovation, science and technology, and on a future that will give them hope.

Their expectations are high. Our opportunity is great. This legislation helps fulfill the promises that President Obama not only made in his inaugural address but that many of us have been working over the years in a bipartisan way to achieve. I never thought I would see the day when we would have an opportunity so great to do so much for so many people in our country.

I urge a strong and resounding "yes" for the American people.

□ 1330

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, as I prepare to call upon my last speaker, I want to remind my colleagues that according to the Congressional Budget Office, only 11 percent of the appropriations in this bill will be spent by the end of 2009; 47 percent would be spent by fiscal year 2010; 53 percent would not be spent until after October of 2011.

It is my pleasure to call upon, for 1 minute, the Republican leader of the House, JOHN BOEHNER.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, the American economy needs help. Our neighbors, our friends, our constituents, they're hurting. And there's not a Member in this body on

either side of the aisle that doesn't understand that. And I think everyone in this Chamber on both sides of the aisle understands that Congress needs to act and we need to act now to help American families and help small businesses and to help bring more confidence back to our economy.

The question is, how do you do that?

The President, when he outlined his desires for this bill, summed it up pretty simply when he said, "This bill needs to be about jobs." I don't think there is anybody in this Chamber that disagrees that this bill needs to be about jobs, preserving jobs in America, and helping to create new jobs and helping to get our economy rolling again.

But the bill that was supposed to be about jobs, jobs, jobs has turned into a bill that's all about spending, spending, and spending.

This is disappointing. The American people expect more of us. They expect to have something that's going to work for them. And my opposition to this bill isn't the fact that we're doing a bill—we need to act. But how?

When you look at some of the spending of this bill, it will do nothing about creating jobs in America. Tell me how spending \$50 million for some salt marsh mouse in San Francisco is going to help a struggling auto worker in Ohio. Tell me how spending \$8 billion in this bill to have a high-speed rail line between Los Angeles and Las Vegas is going to help the construction worker in my district. Or how about the family who called me about the fact that the bread winner in the family's hours are going to be cut from 40 hours to 20 hours. Can't hardly make his payment. What's it do for him? Absolutely nothing.

And so, my concern about this is that we have to have a plan that will work for the American people, work for families, work for small businesses, and help get our economy going again. I don't think this bill does it.

I hope this bill works, I really do, for the good of our country. But my concern is that the plan that's outlined will not do what we want it to do.

That's why Republicans came to the table with what we thought was a better idea, a plan that would create twice as many jobs as the bill that we're debating at exactly half the cost. But our ideas weren't considered. We weren't allowed in the room, we weren't allowed to participate at all. And all of the talk about bipartisanship that we've heard over the last several months went down the drain.

Now, my Democrat colleagues know I know how to be bipartisan, even when we were in the majority. I've worked with many Members on the other side of the aisle to bring bills to this floor that truly were done together. But we would usually start at the beginning of the process.

Not only were we not included at the beginning of the process, we weren't even included at the end of the process.

And it's not about us being excluded. It's about our ideas to help make this economy better, our ideas about how to give American families and small businesses the ability to keep more of what they earn to help their families, to help their businesses, to create more jobs. That's what the American people want. They don't want more spending on a couple hundred million dollars to get the country ready for some national health plan, money that's going to go to the bureaucracy. They want to know how their budgets are going to be helped. And unfortunately, they're not.

If all of that wasn't enough, here we are with 1,100 pages—1,100 pages—not one Member of this body has read. Not one. There may be some staffer over in the Appropriations Committee that read all of this last night—I don't know how you could read 1,100 pages between midnight and now. Not one Member has read this.

What happened to the promise that we're going to let the American people see what's in this bill for 48 hours? But no, we don't have time to do that.

We owe it to the American people to get this bill right. We owe it to American families, we owe it to small businesses, and we owe it to ourselves to get this right so that we can, in fact, help our economy. I don't believe this is the way to do it.

It's disappointing the way this process has worked and the outcome that we've got. And I'm a big believer that we shouldn't come to the floor and talk about process, but bad process leads to bad policy. And that's what we have here, in my view. Bad policy that will drive up, drive up the debt and put all of this cost on the back of our kids and our grandkids and their kids.

I hope it works, but I surely have my doubts.

So I'm going to vote "no." I'm going to vote "no," and I'm going to hope, I'm going to hope that the next time that we get into a major piece of legislation on this floor, that you will include us. You will include our ideas.

I said on the opening day that Republicans would not be the party of "no," that we would be the party of better ideas. And I'm committed to bringing better ideas to the floor, and let's debate those better ideas.

Our tax policy, fast-acting tax policy that helps American families and small businesses does, in fact, create twice as many jobs. Twice as many jobs. Because we want the American people to keep their money to invest in their family and their small business. We're not interested in growing the size of government.

I asked my colleagues yesterday in our conference, "Think about the first time you ran for Congress." The freshman Members, they can remember this because they just did it. For me, it was 18 years ago. But I can tell you what I said 18 years ago: that I would come here to fight for a smaller, less costly, and more accountable Federal Government. This is the epitome—the epitome—of what I came here to stop.

And I don't think there is one Member of Congress who came here to pass an \$890 billion bill—if you add interest on it, about \$1.1 trillion—of spending to help grow the size of the Federal Government and to do very little to help American families and small businesses.

I'd suggest that you vote "no."

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, could I inquire how many more speakers the gentleman has.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Assuming that you're the last speaker, I'm ready to yield back the balance of my time, and I do yield back.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of the time.

Mr. Speaker, this country faces the greatest crisis that we've seen in terms of our economy since the 1930s. Unemployment is expected by many people to hit 12 percent. We're told if we do nothing, we're likely to see unemployment at least around 12 percent; and we hope that with the passage of this proposal, we can mitigate that disaster to a significant degree.

Why are we in this trouble? Because we have had a virtual collapse and a freeze-up of the financial system and the credit markets; we've had a collapse of the housing sector of the economy and the auto sector of the economy.

In normal circumstances in a normal recession, we are usually led out of that recession by housing and by automobiles. This time, those two sectors are in shambles. They're not going to lead us out of anything for the moment.

The other tool normally available to us is monetary policy in the form of low interest rates through action of the Federal Reserve. We've already fired that bullet.

The only bullet left is fiscal policy. And so what we are trying to do with this bill is to save and create several million jobs, we're trying to help the victims of the recession who are losing their jobs, losing their health, losing their pensions, losing their ability to send their kids to college; and at the same time, we're trying to invest in new portions of the economy through science, technology, new energy initiatives to try to modernize the economy and make it stronger as we come out of this recession, as we most certainly eventually will.

And we are also, despite the objections of some on the minority, trying to put a quite significant amount of money into the health care system. What on earth is wrong with trying to save money in the health care system and at the same time making it more efficient by transferring our medical records to computerized records to reduce errors, and to save money at the same time?

Guess what? This bill isn't perfect. Guess what? I've never seen a perfect bill produced by this or any other legislative body.

You know, the worst thing that people can do in this town is to believe

their own baloney. And I think what the likelihood is on this bill, frankly, is that supporters of the bill are inclined to overstate its possibilities and opponents, as we've seen here today, are certainly inclined to trash it.

I was criticized in the Rules Committee last night and again on the floor today because I frankly said, "I do not know how many jobs this bill is likely to produce."

What I do know is that the consensus of reputable economists around the country is that this bill will save or create several million jobs. Exactly how many will be determined by history.

Now, the critics say a number of things. They say the bill is too big, and then they announce they're going to produce a recommit motion which adds \$9 billion to the cost. That's what I call falling off both sides of the same horse at the same time.

I would suggest that this bill is big, all right, but I'll make you a deal: You show me a smaller problem that we have to confront, and I will be happy to produce a smaller bill.

The fact is, we face, over the next 2½ years, a hole in the economy of approaching \$2.5 to \$3 trillion.

This is an \$800 billion package over 2½ years. That means the annual fiscal thrust without the economic multipliers is about \$300 billion. I personally think that it is smaller than it needs to be, but it has been downsized since it left the House to some degree in order to try to pick up Republican support in the Senate, and I understand that.

The critics have another technique: They trash by trivializing. They follow the guidelines laid out by one of the Members of their leadership a few months ago when he said in *The Post* that the way they ought to deal with the Democratic majority is to behave like a thousand mosquitos inflicting mosquito bites and tormenting the majority.

And so what do they say? They tell us, for instance, that there's an earmark in here for rail under "high-speed rail." The fact is, there is not. All of the funding in that account is discretionary. It will be awarded competitively, and the decisions will be made entirely by the Department of Transportation. And the last time I looked, the new Cabinet Secretary was a Republican.

□ 1345

Secondly, they tell us that we're spending more money on the arts than we are on small business. We're putting \$750 million in this bill for small business. There's \$50 million in here for the arts. And you know what, there are 5 million people who work in the arts industry, and right now, they've got 12½ percent unemployment. Or are you suggesting that somehow if you work in that field, it isn't real when you lose your job, it isn't real when you lose your mortgage, it isn't real when you

lose your health insurance? We're trying to treat people who work in the arts the same way as anybody else.

And then they tell us there are mice, except when they say they're rats. Well, I would simply urge you to read *The Mercury News* because *The Mercury News* points out that that is a fallacious attack.

They say that we're spending \$30 million on mice. Where did the \$30 million figure come from? According to *The Mercury News*, and I will read this, "It turns out that \$30 million is the total amount that the California Coastal Conservancy, a State agency, recommended more than a month ago to numerous Federal agencies looking for lists of 'shovel ready' projects as part of the stimulus bill planning." And the staff director for the minority leader himself told the press yesterday that he had to admit there was no specific reference to any mice or rats in this bill.

There is one place in this budget, however, where you do have mice. It's at NIH. One of the Members of this House told me today, "I'd be happy to talk about mice because research projects at NIH saved my life". Cancer research, the research is done on mice. Would you rather have the experimentation done on human beings? I don't think so.

If you look at what this bill does, it provides an \$800 tax break for middle American couples. It provides \$120 billion in infrastructure to create hundreds of thousands of jobs. It shows some mercy to people who are unemployed by extending and expanding unemployment benefits. It tries to modernize the economy to create new jobs through science and technology. It provides \$170 billion to help States avoid catastrophic tax increases that would be counterproductive during this kind of a recession. And it also helps them to avoid drastic cutbacks in education, in law enforcement, so that they don't have to fire cops, they don't have to fire teachers, they don't have to fire prison guards and all of the other people who are paid for out of State budgets. Those are some of the "terrible" things the bill does.

Now, this bill does have one problem. It is estimated that it creates about 1 million fewer jobs than it did when it left the House earlier. It does that in an effort to be bipartisan because the President reached out to try to get Republican support in the Senate, and he makes no apology for that and neither do I. But the fact remains, we still have 86 percent of the House bill that we had when the bill left the House. That is a pretty doggone good ratio.

I think we need to appreciate that this bill is the largest change in domestic policy since the 1930s. Think of what has happened.

One month ago, we had a President who insisted on holding up the entire domestic appropriation part of the budget because he wanted to impose \$30 billion in cuts in education, in health

care, science and the rest. In contrast today, we have a President who is willing to invest \$800 billion to attack this recession and to turn this economy into a stronger and better economy for every American, not just the top 10 percent who have benefited by Republican policies.

One month ago, we had a President who resisted raising the minimum wage and resisted providing expanded unemployment insurance. Today, we've got a President who's reversing that policy and says "Go to it, help those people, they need it."

And we've also got a President who is willing to put \$90 billion into States to preserve our society's ability to see to it that poor families and kids don't get knocked off the Medicaid rolls.

One month ago, we had a President who asked us to pass No Child Left Behind and then for the next 8 years reneged on the promise to provide additional funding to pay for the cost of those mandates. We had a vote today on the issue of mandates. The mother of all mandates has been No Child Left Behind, which I voted for, but I expected the President not to welch on the deal, and financially, he did. This changes that. This reverses that policy.

I would ask Members to vote for this bill. It will change this country for the better.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to reestablish 30 seconds of my time to speak out of order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, it goes without saying that all of us appreciate Members and staff who are willing to work around here. There's no Member in the House who puts in more energy and time and hours than my friend, Chairman OBEY. I do not necessarily have to agree with everything that he might suggest, but in the meantime, you certainly cannot discount his commitment to this effort.

And to the staff on both sides of the aisle who spent endless nights, weekends and otherwise trying to evaluate and work through this package and help each other where we can, I want them all to know that they have our thanks, the entire House's thanks, for that effort.

Mr. OBEY. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEWIS of California. I'd be happy to yield.

Mr. OBEY. Let me simply thank the gentleman for his comments and say that I appreciate the fact that we can debate these issues and still remain personal friends.

And I also want to thank, as the gentleman has, I want to thank profoundly the staff of this committee and all the committees who worked so hard. So often these people go 1 and 2 and 3 days in a row with little or no sleep. That certainly has been the case this week,

and I'm profoundly grateful to the staff, certainly on our side of the aisle, especially Beverly Pheto who has become staff director because the White House stole our previous staff director.

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009.

I want to commend House Leadership and President Barack Obama for ushering this legislation through a tricky process. Though this may not be the perfect bill, we cannot let the perfect be the enemy of the good. Frankly, our economy is in uncharted territory. At a time when unemployment is pushing 7.6 percent and key economic indicators show a downward spiral, Congress has a duty to come together and act on behalf of the people. I worked in conjunction with my Blue Dog colleagues to ensure that the final version of this bill was better than the original House version and was streamlined towards effective spending and tax provisions that are temporary, targeted, and timely.

Stimulative spending including the funding for transportation and education infrastructure projects, job training and workforce development, and critical investments in rural communities like broadband services and wastewater projects will be extremely beneficial to communities in Northwest Florida. The temporary tax provisions, such as the expansion of the Earned Income Tax Credit and the increase of the refundable portion of the child credit, are also critical to bolstering the economy by ensuring that money will quickly get into the hands of Americans who are going to spend it. Additionally, H.R. 1 increases unemployment benefits, provides more funding for food stamps and a one-time payment to recipients of Social Security and veterans receiving disability compensation and pension benefits. Finally, this bill helps small businesses quickly recover costs of new capital investments by extending the bonus depreciation for making investments in plants and equipment. In the end, these combined provisions are our best bet for a shot in the arm of this economy. H.R. 1 will create or save over 8,300 jobs alone in the 2nd district of Florida which I represent and over 200,000 jobs statewide.

Despite the positive aspects of the bill, I do have concerns with the bill and even more serious concerns with our long-term economic problems.

For one, billions of dollars to fix the Alternative Minimum Tax are included in this bill. Though this prevents many middle-class families from tax increases, it does so in the most fiscally irresponsible way possible. It is not justifiable emergency spending. We need a long term, sustainable solution to this problem and I have consistently voted to support a paid-for, offset Alternative Minimum Tax over the years.

Furthermore, I would have chosen a better, more inclusive process in considering this bill. I would have preferred more time to study the major incentives for health information technology, increased federal assistance for higher education programs, and alternative energy investments, even if they are provisions that will make our economy stronger and more innovative. My Blue Dog colleagues and I appreciate the recent commitment of the Leadership of the House to have a return to regular order and process in this body.

I was also concerned that the House voted on this bill before having two days to review

the final text. I voted against the Previous Question and the Rule for the bill to make this point.

Finally, I am very concerned about the unprecedented federal deficits and burden to future generations that the levels of spending in this bill will create. We are living in unparalleled economic times with regards to loss of jobs, houses, and credit throughout the country and I firmly believe that only by tackling long-term fiscal issues can we ensure a prosperous nation today, tomorrow, and well into the future. I will continue to work with my colleagues in Congress to balance our annual budgets and address the entitlement spending issue that threatens our future.

I am heartened that President Obama committed to a "Fiscal Summit" later this year to tackle the issues of long-term fiscal responsibility. These actions, coupled with a commitment to address the underlying causes in the housing and financial markets at the root of our economies woes, are encouraging.

Despite the concerns I have outlined, I stand in support of H.R. 1 and I will continue to work with fellow elected officials at all levels of government to oversee accountability and transparency during the spending of the stimulus funding provided by this bill.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, the speed at which both chambers and both parties have come together on this recovery package shows how committed Congress and the Administration are to shoring up our troubled economy.

The landmark legislation that we will pass today will create millions of jobs, provide cut taxes for hard working families, provide basic necessities to families in need and make investments necessary to transform our economy for the 21st Century.

Economists, business leaders, and labor unions across the political spectrum know that decisive action is the only way to jolt our economy out of its intensifying tailspin.

Everyone in the process has compromised, except for House Republicans. It's time for the House Republicans to stop saying "no" to everything and start saying "yes" to bipartisan ship and "yes" to recovery.

The current economic crisis requires bold solutions that address the magnitude of our economic woes, and the American Recovery and Reinvestment plan will do just that.

We will blunt the effects of the recession for families by increasing food stamps benefits, expanding unemployment benefits, and preserving health care benefits.

The recovery plan also invests in America's school, roads, bridges, water systems that are in disrepair and creating a drag on our economy.

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

Our plan also supports working families by providing a tax cut for 95 percent of workers and their families.

By spreading job creation out over the next couple of years and across a variety of sectors, we will soften the downturn and foster a solid economic recovery.

It's time to get our economy back on track. Furthermore Mr. Speaker, in writing about the American Reinvestment and Recovery Act, the front page of the Wall Street Journal said it well.

This historic bill will spur road building, give businesses tax breaks, and expand broadband access.

Yes, it will do all that, and so much more. It will help our country avoid a recession so dark and deep that the pain and economic dislocation it would produce for the vast majority of people would be terrible to contemplate.

According to a broad consensus of the brightest minds in the field, this economic stimulus bill will help put Americans back to work now, and get us back to doing what we do best—lighting the way to the future.

It will provide more than \$150 billion in public works projects for transportation, energy and technology.

We will begin to develop the clean energy sources and smart transmission lines that the whole world will demand tomorrow.

There is \$10 billion for medical research to help America retain its vaunted leadership.

The bill also provides for the urgent needs of today, with \$87 billion to help states meet rising Medicaid costs.

There is money to help state unemployment offices that are overwhelmed by the numbers and funds to help those who have been thrown out of a job through no fault of their own, and are struggling desperately to keep health insurance coverage for their families.

And it addresses the three most important issues facing us today. Jobs, jobs, and more jobs. This bill is expected to create about 3.5 million jobs.

The total impact on my state is expected to be the creation of 215,000 jobs with almost 8,000 jobs in my district alone.

Across the country the bill is expected to produce over a million jobs in construction and manufacturing, and 345,000 jobs in professional and business services. And 90 percent of these jobs will be in the private sector.

There is a tax cut for 95 percent of working American and the bill protects millions of middle income taxpayers from having to pay the Alternative Minimum tax in 2009.

The aid that will flow directly to states should also help to ease some of the most painful service cuts that were looming, and may even provide more tax relief.

According to Governor David Paterson, New York state might be able to use some of the federal stimulus funds to avoid some of the 137 business and consumer tax increases now planned for next year.

In the coming days, you will hear 1,001 different opinions about this bill. And I hope you will keep in mind that Congress listened to a wide range of opinions on just what to do to get America working again.

There were many, including Nobel Laureates in the field of Economics who felt we should be spending considerably more. There were some who said we should spend less. And even a few who said we should do nothing. But sitting still and doing nothing was never an option. Inaction is simply not in the American DNA.

Some made a case for spending more on infrastructure while others pushed for bigger tax cuts. But politics is the art of the possible—and tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans are what helped to pave the way to the hole we find ourselves in now.

And our critics must admit that tax cuts alone never built a school, fixed a bridge or paved a road.

With the passage of this bill, our crumbling infrastructure will be repaired, our dependence

of foreign oil will begin to be addressed, our healthcare system improved, and our economic well-being restored. This is the plan. This is the time. And "yes" is the answer.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Conference Report to H.R. 1, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, which addresses the unprecedented economic crisis we are currently facing. This measure will put our economy back on track and will also transform our economy for the 21st Century through much needed investments in our health care system, infrastructure, education, and energy independence, while saving and creating millions of jobs during the next two years.

We are facing dire economic times. Every week, we are faced with new reports on job losses across our country. In my home state of Rhode Island, we have the country's second highest unemployment rate at ten percent and last December, we were ranked sixth nationally in foreclosure rates. These harsh realities have made it increasingly clear that our economy will face an even sharper downturn if we do not act soon.

The compromise between the House, Senate and White House is not perfect, but it contains the right formula of spending and tax relief to stimulate our economy and increase new job opportunities. With that in mind, I support taking action to rebuild our nation's economy and put Rhode Island families first. H.R. 1 will appropriate spending for transportation and infrastructure upgrades and construction, health care programs, education assistance, housing assistance and energy efficiency upgrades, and includes personal and business tax breaks, tax provisions intended to assist state and local governments, and energy-related tax incentives for a total of \$787 billion to be expended over Fiscal Years 2009 and 2010. This measure helps those hit hardest by the economic downturn by extending unemployment benefits, providing job training to get people back to work quickly, increasing food stamp benefits, and extending health benefits.

The recovery plan provides funding to modernize our crumbling roads and bridges, increase transit and rail funding to reduce traffic congestion and gas consumption, and invest in clean water and other environmental restoration projects. These investments will immediately create jobs in my state, as projects will only receive funding if they are "ready to go" within 90 days of the enactment of this bill. This legislation also includes additional infrastructure funding that will improve our national security by modernizing our electric grid, upgrading our airport, port, transit and rail security, and updating Department of Defense facilities.

One of the best ways to grow our economy is by investing in our future workforce. The inclusion of robust education initiatives that will build 21st Century classrooms, labs and libraries is also very important to me as we prepare the next generation of workers to support and strengthen our economy. I am pleased that funding to modernize, renovate and repair school buildings is included in the final language. It also contains funding for Title I programs, which serve disadvantaged children, and IDEA, which serves disabled children, ensuring that all children, regardless of where they live or their disability, receive a quality and equal education. Moreover, this level of funding for IDEA increases the Federal share

of special education services to its highest level ever and brings much needed relief to school systems. H.R. 1 also provides \$15.6 billion for Pell grants, and it is estimated that Rhode Island will receive \$97.5 million in aid for 28,217 recipients for an average award for the academic year 2009–10 of \$3,456. Investing in our children's education not only has long-term benefits to our economy, but it also delivers on our nation's promise to ensure that all individuals have an equal opportunity to succeed.

Investments in American health care also represent a vital component of our nation's economic recovery and long term fiscal sustainability. This package contains several provisions that will stimulate job growth and improve health care quality and efficiency through \$10 billion investments in biomedical research and \$19 billion for the further development and implementation of health information technology.

This bill bolsters crucial safety net programs that provide invaluable health and social services to our nation's low-income and disabled citizens with the inclusion of \$87 billion in enhanced funding for state Medicaid programs that have been stretched to the breaking point under increased unemployment and skyrocketing health costs. This package also includes a provision to assist recently unemployed individuals and their families by helping them maintain their health coverage through a 65% subsidy for health insurance premiums under COBRA for up to nine months.

One of the greatest challenges we face with this effort is ensuring that we do not repeat the mistakes of the past. This bill makes great strides by investing in the transformation of our national energy policy, which will lead to greater technological advancements in renewable technologies, job creation, and energy independence. Now is the time to make the commitment to our children and our grandchildren that we will leave a safer, cleaner, and healthier environment than we have now. As a co-founder of the Sustainable Energy and Environment Coalition, I fought for several provisions in H.R. 1 that promote energy efficiency and renewable energy production and development, including tax provisions for families and businesses, in addition to funding that will drive the creation of new, "green-collar" jobs. More importantly than tax incentives alone, this measure sets forth a long-term energy policy that puts our nation on the path towards energy independence.

Individuals and families will also receive relief through the "Making work pay" tax credit, which will provide up to \$400 for an individual or \$800 for married couples filing jointly. Parents will also benefit from an increase in the earned income tax credit for families with three or more children and the bill allows additional low-income families to receive the child tax credit. The measure will also provide a tax credit up to \$8,000 for first time home buyers if they purchase a home between January 1st, 2009 and December 31st, 2009, injecting a much needed financial incentive into the housing market.

I also urge my colleagues to join me in my support for H.R. 1 because it includes unprecedented accountability and strong oversight by creating the Recovery Act Accountability and Transparency Board, which will coordinate and conduct oversight of federal spending under the bill. A public website will also contain the

board's reports, show exactly how funds are spent and will list announcements of contract and grant competitions and awards.

Mr. Speaker, it is important to understand that this funding is not a silver bullet, but that our economy will continue to decline without this immediate action. The Recovery package will slow our downward economic trend and allow us to regain our footing as we begin to make much-needed long term investments to transform our economy for the 21st Century. American prosperity depends on individual economic security. It is only when Americans do not have to worry about losing their job, keeping their home or paying their bills that our economy will truly flourish. I am committed to improving the economic outlook for the millions who are struggling, and I will continue working with my colleagues in Congress on this vital and urgent goal.

Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, today we're responding with determination and bold action to combat the most severe economic crisis our country has faced since the Great Depression.

For years, as hardworking American families struggled to make ends meet and the economy shed millions of jobs, Republicans told us not to worry—we are in the midst of a "jobless recovery", they said. But "jobless recovery" is an oxymoron, a contradiction in terms, like jumbo shrimp or Salt Lake City nightlife—it just doesn't exist!

The failed "laissez-faire" approach of the past 8 years has now been discredited by rising unemployment, loss of confidence in our financial markets and the economic hardships suffered by families across the country.

For millions of Americans, "laissez-faire" is just a fancy name for "left behind."

With this economic recovery package, we are taking the bold action that is needed by creating or saving 3-and-a-half million jobs, rebuilding America, making us more globally competitive and energy independent, and transforming our economy.

While our country is facing enormous challenges, we also have a once-in-a-generation opportunity to create millions of new jobs, invest in vital priorities and position our economy for future growth. Today we are seizing this historic opportunity and setting our country on a new direction.

This urgently-needed economic recovery package funds infrastructure projects that are "shovel-ready", while also supporting future-oriented projects that are "circuit-ready": broadband, electronic medical records, smart grid, advanced battery technologies and other vital priorities.

The massive investments in weatherization, state energy efficiency grants, and federal building efficiency are some of the safest and smartest investments our country can make right now. They put money into the pockets of American workers and pay for themselves in the form of energy savings and lower energy prices. This energy efficiency "double dividend" is a proven, reliable phenomenon that our current weak economy must capitalize.

In addition, I am pleased that the conference report will provide \$6 billion in new loan guarantees for renewable projects such as solar and wind and for upgrading our nation's transmission system to a smarter electricity grid. Section 1705 of the bill supports a program authorized in the 2007 Energy Independence and Security Act that permits the

Department of Energy to issue grants for developing electric power transmission systems, including upgrading and reconductoring projects. This provision would allow for the development of a smart transmission and distribution grid, which would include support for technologies such as underground superconductor transmission cables that can increase the efficiency of our grid and facilitate the delivery of renewable power from the heartland of our country to the hearts of our cities.

The bill provides \$19 billion for a new health IT infrastructure to improve care, lower costs and reduce medical errors. I am pleased that the conference report includes patient privacy safeguards that I have long advocated, including a provision that I offered at the Energy and Commerce Committee markup to ensure that patients' medical records are made unreadable to unauthorized individuals.

This balanced, well-thought out package provides tax relief for 95% of Americans and targets investments in key areas to turn around the American economy. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 1, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009.

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, all across the country, Americans are hurting. I held three telephone town halls this week and I heard firsthand how difficult things are for people. These are people willing to work; people looking to keep their small business afloat; people looking to feed their families. But they are not looking for a handout and they know that we can not spend and borrow our way back to prosperity.

Unfortunately, Congressional Democrats have chosen to use this bill to achieve an eight year long wish list. How does billions of dollars for ACORN help a small business owner keep people employed? How will funding for the NEA grow our economy?

Instead of making health care more affordable, they are pushing policies that will quietly set the stage for government takeover of health care, resulting in bureaucrats making decisions for patients and doctors.

Congressional Democrats wrote much of this bill secretly, negotiated it behind closed doors, and released late last night, giving only a few hours to review it. And the reason that they are trying to ram this bill through is simple—it won't stimulate our economy.

That's why we should scrap this bill and pass the alternative measure proposed by House Republicans, one based on fast-acting tax relief for working families and small businesses. We need a bill that will get to the heart of the matter and put our economy back on its feet.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my thoughts about H.R. 1, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act.

While the final recovery bill is not perfect, nor does it address all my concerns, I strongly believe that we must take quick action to help Americans who are struggling and help spur job creation. We are in a time of crisis, and doing nothing is not an option. I agree with President Obama—time is of the essence, and we must act quickly to pass a recovery package. Though no bill is perfect, I have reconciled my problems with the initial bill for the sake of helping Americans and the economy.

Just last week, the U.S. Department of Labor announced recent increases in the number of unemployed Americans. These statistics

were incredibly troubling. Sadly, they showed a twenty-six year high in unemployment filings. Additionally, part of my own Congressional District in Northeastern Pennsylvania, faces a 7.7 percent unemployment rate, higher than the state and national averages. Clearly the increase in the number of people unemployed in the country and in Northeastern Pennsylvania reflects the need for the federal government to immediately provide greater assistance to those out of work and struggling.

While I wanted the recovery bill to focus more on job creation through infrastructure in the short term, which was the original focus of the bill, it does address these issues to an extent. The bill is estimated to create or save 3.5 million jobs throughout the country, including 143,000 jobs in Pennsylvania and 7,700 jobs in my Congressional District. The bill includes \$64 billion for infrastructure development that is estimated to create or sustain 1.8 million jobs nationally and generate \$322 billion of economic activity. Additionally, to help individuals get back to work in good jobs, almost \$4 billion is allocated for job training programs.

I also previously expressed the need for the recovery package to focus on helping those who are out of work or retired. While many people are struggling, we must help those without jobs feed their families immediately. Though I encourage a larger focus on this for future legislation, this bill extends unemployment insurance through December 2009 and it increases benefit payments by \$25 per week, so that jobless workers will now receive \$325 per week in tax-free benefits. It also includes a one time \$250 payment to retirees, disabled individuals, and for Supplemental Security Income to help more people without jobs.

Finally, I had strongly advocated for the inclusion of a General Revenue Sharing program through an amendment to the recovery package that would provide localities with a needed source of revenue for undertaking job-creating infrastructure projects and maintaining public safety networks. This would be critical to helping localities across the country that are facing significant funding shortfalls as a result of the ongoing economic downturn. While I was disappointed that this amendment was not included in the legislation, I applaud provisions in the current bill that will improve state and local government bonds, allowing states and localities to afford needed infrastructure projects. The recovery package also creates a competitive grant program exclusively for state and local surface transportation projects. Additionally, I will introduce a stand alone General Revenue Sharing bill in the near future.

My strongest objection to the initial recovery package dealt with the fact that many Members, both Democrats and Republicans, were not involved in the discussions on the bill. As I have continued to say, open door policies regarding Congress' legislation are essential. All Members of Congress must have a voice and the opportunity to debate bills, especially the recovery package which is the most significant and certainly the most expensive undertaking in our nation's history. I voiced my concerns to House leadership, and they were noted. I hope these actions will be changed in the future.

Additionally, the public must have an informed voice as well. In order to let the American public truly understand the need for the recovery bill, and other legislation going forward, we need to allow them to fully under-

stand it. I am a firm believer in that we must determine the problem before addressing the possible solutions. We must effectively communicate to the public the full extent of the problems we face so that they also understand why we are taking such action.

I applaud President Obama for his determination and willingness to jump on such a daunting project in his first month in office. While this is not a final solution to our economic problems, as we will likely need another recovery package in the future, it is an important step forward. Fixing our economy will not happen overnight, but I have faith that we will emerge from these tough times stronger than ever.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, there is not a person in this country that is sheltered from the economic challenges we face. I agree steps should be taken to stabilize the economy and get people to work. However, I feel that the plan presented today is not the right one to boost our beleaguered financial condition.

Spending vast amounts of borrowed money does not work in our households and it does not work in government. These habits are what brought us to this current situation. Individuals, businesses, and especially government have simply borrowed too much. Living beyond our means has consequences. We cannot borrow our way out into prosperity. More importantly, we cannot spend our children's future. It will not work economically and it is wrong morally.

Bundling a large collection of spending projects and calling it a stimulus does not make it stimulative. The purpose of the stimulus should be to spend a dollar in a way that will create greater than a dollar's worth of economic benefits. Spending a dollar in certain ways that have stimulating effects or reducing tax burdens on workers and small businesses is what we need to be doing.

I will again vote "no." I do so as a taxpayer, a father and a public official entrusted to do the best he can for his fellow Kansans. Political posturing has no place in this debate. We need to get the country moving. Unfortunately, this is the wrong plan that will add billions of dollars of frivolous spending to our national debt without stimulating our economy.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, in the past few weeks there has been a concerted media campaign to spread misinformation about the Comparative Effectiveness Research (CER) provisions in H.R. 1.

To set the record straight, I submit for the RECORD the following summary of the comparative effectiveness research provisions and a list of organizations that have written us in support.

This investment is an important first step in efforts to develop a robust CER program in this Congress. In the near future, I will introduce a comprehensive CER proposal, based on the provisions that previously passed the House in the CHAMP Act, H.R. 3162, in the 110th Congress.

AMERICAN RECOVERY AND REINVESTMENT ACT
OF 2009 (ARRA)
PROVISIONS ON COMPARATIVE EFFECTIVENESS
RESEARCH

The conference agreement on H.R. 1 includes provisions to promote and expand research that compares the effectiveness of alternative treatments or strategies for a medical condition.

Doctors today urgently need better evidence to improve the quality of health care that patients receive. Some estimates indicate that less than half of all therapies patients receive are actually supported by firm evidence of effectiveness.

There is widespread agreement on the need for better information on the comparative effectiveness of different interventions for health conditions. In an October 2008 joint editorial, Newt Gingrich, JOHN KERRY and Billy Beane said that "a health care system that is driven by robust comparative clinical evidence will save lives and money."

Some of the oldest and most important studies in medicine have been comparative effectiveness studies. For example, the Diabetes Control and Complications Trial revolutionized the treatment of patients with type 1 diabetes. This landmark trial found that aggressive use of insulin to control blood sugar was clearly better than standard care in preventing damage to the eyes, kidneys, and nerves of patients with diabetes.

But more must be done. In December 2008, the Institute of Medicine called for further comparative effectiveness efforts, stating that "this type of research would provide information that patients and physicians need to make choices that offer them the greatest value, as they define it." The National Institutes of Health (NIH) and the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ) both have planned to expand their research efforts, but these expansions have proceeded slowly due to a lack of funding.

An investment in this research infrastructure will provide doctors and patients with critically important information. Arming physicians with the best available evidence about treatment alternatives and their effects in different patient populations will help doctors and patients make better choices.

SUMMARY OF PROVISIONS

The conference agreement provides \$1.1 billion for comparative effectiveness research with \$300 million to be administered by AHRQ, \$400 million to be administered by NIH, and \$400 million to be allocated at the discretion of the Secretary of Health and Human Services. These funds are to be used to accelerate the development and dissemination of comparative effectiveness research. The agreement ensures that the use of these research dollars will be consistent with governmental policies relating to the inclusion of women and minorities in research.

The conference agreement also establishes a Federal Coordinating Council for Comparative Effectiveness Research. The purpose of the Council is to reduce duplication and coordinate these research activities within the federal government. Because its purpose is the coordination of federal research efforts, the Council is made up of representatives of a variety of experts from within the federal agencies. The conference agreement clearly states that the Council cannot mandate coverage, reimbursement, or other policies for any public or private payer.

SUPPORTERS FOR THESE PROVISIONS

Widespread Support for Provisions on Comparative Effectiveness Research. Experts, physicians, legislators, and advocates from across the political spectrum supported provisions in the stimulus package for comparative effectiveness research because this research is crucial.

"The current limited availability of valid data to supplement the physician's clinical experience and professional knowledge . . . makes it difficult to ensure that an effective treatment choice is made."—Letter to Congress from the American College of Physicians, January 29, 2009

“Opponents—like some drug companies and medical device makers—don’t want this research. They fear it will cut the profits they make on ineffective drugs and equipment. But they won’t tell you that this research could save your life by giving your doctors better information so they can prescribe the best treatments available to you.”—AARP CEO Bill Novelli, February 10, 2009

“Independent, objective comparative effectiveness research (CER) is urgently needed to improve health care quality and patient outcomes by ensuring consumers always receive the best care.”—Letter to Congress, signed by the Alliance for Better Health Care, (a broad coalition of over 30 organizations representing consumers, employers, health care providers, health plans, pharmacists, researchers, unions, pharmaceutical benefit managers, and others), February 11, 2009

“We are concerned that some believe that comparative effectiveness could lead to the rationing of health care. This is simply not true. The bill would fund independent, objective, comparative effectiveness research that would greatly benefit providers and patients in making informed health care decisions.”—Letter to Congress signed by AARP, AFL-CIO, American College of Physicians, America’s Health Insurance Plans, Blue Cross Blue Shield Association, Families USA, National Business Group on Health, National Partnership for Women and Families and joined by Consumers Union, February 12, 2009

“Strong federal support for comparative effectiveness research is vital to both public and private efforts to improve health care quality for patients and to give physicians and other health care providers the independent, objective information they need to identify the best treatments options for their patients.”—Letter to Congress from the National Business Group on Health, February 11, 2009.

LIST OF ORGANIZATIONS SUPPORTING COMPARATIVE EFFECTIVENESS RESEARCH IN H.R. 1

Aetna, Academy of Managed Care Pharmacy, AFL-CIO, Alliance of Community Health Plans, Alliance for Better Healthcare, AARP, American College of Physicians, America’s Health Insurance Plans, American Pharmacists Association, American Academy of Family Physicians, American Society of Health-System Pharmacists, Blue Cross Blue Shield Association, Blue Shield of California, Coalition for Health Services Research, Consumers Union, and CVS Caremark.

DiamlerChrysler Corporation, Families USA, Ford Motor Company, General Motors Company, Group Health Cooperative, Honeywell, Kaiser Permanente, Marshfield Clinic, Medco Health Solutions, National Business Group on Health, National Partnership for Women and Families, Pharmaceutical Care Management Association, Prime Therapeutics, Service Employees International Union, The Dow Chemical Company, The Joint Commission, UnitedHealth Group, and Wellpoint, Inc.

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Speaker, we have before us the largest spending bill in the history of the Congress. The price tag on this bill is \$800 billion—over \$1.1 trillion when you add in the interest needed to fund it. Sadly, this 1200-page bill was completed just a few hours ago in the darkness of night. No one knows what is in the bill. No one has read it. This bill is being rushed to the House floor and to the President before Members of Congress or the American people have an opportunity to even know what is in it.

Just how much is this bill going to cost? How much is a trillion dollars? One way to look at it is that it amounts to deficit spending of over \$7,000 for every family in America. Looked at another way, this is enough money to pay for four years of college tuition to a private college for every senior graduating from high school this year and next and still have nearly \$150 billion left over.

The non-partisan Congressional Budget Office (CBO) projected a few weeks ago that the federal government will have a \$1.2 trillion deficit this year. This amounts to 8.3 percent of the Gross Domestic Product (GDP), which is far higher than the previous record of 5.9 percent set in 1934 at the height of the Great Depression. In 2009, one out of every three dollars that the federal government will spend will be borrowed and our grandchildren will be stuck with the bill. Now, the bill before us—negotiated by Speaker PELOSI, Senate Democrat Leader REID and President Obama—will add another \$1.1 trillion to this debt. No country has ever borrowed and spent its way into prosperity, which is what this bill proposes to do. Adding further to this deficit as this bill does is unthinkable.

The non-partisan CBO released an analysis earlier this week finding that the bill may provide a small increase in the nation’s economy in the first few years, but then this bill will drag the economy down for the better part of the decade.

Less than 20 percent of the cost of this bill is associated with tax relief. There is virtually nothing in this bill to stimulate small businesses—the driving force in creating jobs in America. Furthermore, the signature item of the bill—working American tax cut—was the first tax cut put on the chopping block. The final bill will allow the average worker to keep an additional 20 cents an hour (\$1.60 per day).

This bill also classifies as a tax cut billions of dollars in payments to those who do not pay federal income taxes. I thought a tax cut was a reduction in someone’s taxes not simply a check from the government.

With regard to infrastructure spending, which is what we were all promised would be the focus at the outset of this process, only 17 percent of the funding in the bill is for infrastructure. Less than one of every five dollars will go to job-creating stimulus programs.

Rather than focus on job-creating stimulus and tax relief for small businesses that create new jobs, the final bill written by liberals in the Congress focuses on permanently expanding unaffordable entitlement programs and creating new federal programs under the guise of “stimulating the economy.” The bill creates 33 new federal programs at a cost of \$90 billion. It also expands 73 existing federal programs at a cost of \$92 billion. There will be tremendous pressures in future years to continue funding these \$182 billion in new programs at these new higher levels. The bill also spends \$123 billion for one-time infusion of spending for 98 existing programs.

This bill includes billions of dollars for the Public Housing Capital Fund. Yet, this fund already has an unspent balance of \$7 billion. Also included is \$1 billion for Community Development Block Grant program, yet this program currently has \$23 billion in unspent funds. Why is the Congress adding spending to these cash rich accounts? If they were serious about stimulating the economy, Congress

should simply make them spend the money they already have. Also, troubling is the fact that this bill opens up the federal Treasury coffers to groups like ACORN—a group charged with voter fraud.

Do the provisions relating to the creation of Federal Coordinating Council in health care research move us in the direction of a national health board that would encourage federal policies that determine what medical services Americans can and cannot have? What does that have to do with stimulating the economy? How many tens of billions of dollars more will the welfare law changes end up costing the taxpayers down the road? What will be the long-term unforeseen costs associated with this bill due to the unprecedented deficit spending. Over the coming weeks as the American people have more time to read this bill we will learn more about the provisions and intentions of this bill? Sadly, the bill has been rushed to the floor without giving the Congress or the American people a chance to know what is in it.

Let me also say that I appreciate all of the talk about the need to work together in a bipartisan fashion. While I was pleased that several Republican amendments were adopted when portions of this bill were considered in several Congressional Committees last month, I was deeply disappointed that most of these amendments disappeared from the bill between the time it was passed in committee and when it came to the House floor for a vote. Bipartisanship is supposed to be a two-way street, not simply a demand to show bipartisanship by accepting the Speaker’s bill.

The only hand of bipartisanship that has been extended to Republicans in the House has been two opportunities to vote for a bill that we were given no hand in writing. Is that the type of bipartisanship that the American people want and expect? I thought bipartisanship meant working together, having an open deliberative legislative process and combining ideas. That simply was not permitted by the liberal majority.

If we really want to stimulate the economy, we should focus on what actually creates jobs—small businesses. Small businesses create 70 percent of the new jobs in America. Unfortunately, this bill does virtually nothing to help small businesses.

I have voted for and will continue to advocate for an alternative that would produce many more jobs for half the cost. The bill that I voted for lowers the 10 percent tax rate to 5 percent, and the 15 percent tax rate to 10 percent. This would give all taxpaying Americans a tax cut. It leaves money in their pockets that they can use to meet their own family expenses. We provide small business tax relief, including a provision allowing small businesses to write off up to \$250,000 in capital expenditures. We extend unemployment benefits through 2009 and we exempt these payments from income taxes. We also include other job-creating provisions and we do so without raising anyone’s taxes. I have also cosponsored legislation that would reduce the 28 percent tax rate to 23 percent. This will cut taxes for individual and job-creating small businesses.

Lower taxes, not higher borrowing, spending, and debt, will put our economy back on track. I urge my colleagues to vote for lower taxes and against higher spending and debt.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (H.R. 1). We are told that America is in the midst of the worst economic storm since the Great Depression. Millions of people are hurting across the United States and in my home state of New Jersey, New Jersey's unemployment rate has risen to 7.1 percent from 4.2 percent just a year ago. Our nation's economy is in recession, and we must respond with every tool in our toolbox to put Americans back to work and rebuild our struggling economy. Economists have predicted that the unemployment rate may exceed 12 percent this year.

What to do? We could let the free market continue to spiral downward or we could pass a bill with a smaller price tag, ignoring the lessons learned from Congress's previous attempt at stimulating the economy through rebate sent out in spring of 2008, last year's so-called check in the mail. The time has come for a bold, national response. Economists, business leaders, financial experts, almost everyone says that the federal government—and only the federal government—can inject into the economy a stimulus of sufficient size to make up for the frozen, collapsing economy. The package we are considering today has the potential to create 3.5 million much needed new jobs in the short term.

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, is designed to help the United States climb out of the current recession through targeted, job-creating spending, responsible investments in the nation's social safety net to help Americans weather the difficult months ahead, and tax cuts for 95 percent of Americans. Importantly, this bill includes critical investments in research and development, which lay the ground work for innovation and sustainable, long-term economic growth. The political process to this point has been torturous. However, the President, the Speaker, and the Committee chairs have produced promptly what the President has called for and what the country needs. Agreed, not all parts of the bill are going to be equally stimulative. But we want a broad approach; we want our stimulative eggs in various baskets. This Act is huge and hugely important.

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act would help to put our economy on the right track by quickly creating up to 3.5 million new jobs for Americans suffering during this depression. Some of these jobs, more than 1.2 million, would be created in the construction industry through a strong investment in improving our nation's transportation and water infrastructure. The Act will inject \$29 billion to repair our nation's crumbling roads and bridges, including funding for ready-to-go road and bridge modernization projects in my home state of New Jersey. This investment would create 835,000 jobs in the next two years. Additionally, this bill would invest \$16.4 billion in public transportation, helping transit agencies such as NJ Transit that are struggling to meet increased demand and \$18 billion for clean water, environmental restoration, and flood control projects creating another 375,000 jobs.

H.R. 1 would invest in additional projects that my Central New Jersey constituents refer to as "green stimulus." These investments would create good American jobs that cannot be outsourced, while reducing our reliance on fossil fuels and protecting our environment. These jobs will be the kind of jobs that will be

in demand for many years, once the economy gets going again and as we make the transition to a sustainable energy system; as we must and as we surely will. The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act would provide \$30 billion to transform the nation's energy transmission, distribution, and production system so they can handle decentralized renewable energy sources. This legislation includes more than \$23.2 billion in incentives to promote renewable energy, help low and middle income Americans weatherize their homes, and decrease energy consumption by the federal government. It will also provide \$20 billion in tax incentives such as the renewable energy production tax credit, the advanced energy manufacturing tax credit, and the consumer energy-efficiency tax credits.

Responding to the nation's rising unemployment rate, this bill would devote \$4 billion to job training programs and would extend unemployment benefits through December 31, 2009, increasing benefits by \$25 per week for individuals looking for work.

The current economic downturn has forced painful cuts in services. The American Recovery and Reinvestment Plan would make sound investments in public education. This legislation would provide \$13 billion to help disadvantaged students reach high academic standards and \$12 billion for special education. While the bill includes a \$54 billion state stabilization fund to prevent teacher layoffs and cutbacks in education, I regret that it no longer contains the \$20 billion provided in the House version to help states rebuild our nation's crumbling schools. Still, there is much here to cheer for our local school boards and the taxpayers who support the schools through our property taxes. These school bonds can be used for construction.

Additionally, to ensure that families can send their children to college, this bill would increase the maximum Pell Grant by \$500, to \$5,350 and would help 4 million more students attend college with a new \$2,500 college tuition tax credit for families.

What pleases me most is the commitment in this legislation to science. I am deeply gratified that this bill reflects a profound commitment to renewing our nation's innovation infrastructure. Research not merely luxury to be undertaken only in times of economic prosperity. The truth is that scientific research is perhaps the most powerful economic engine, creating jobs in the short-term and building our economy for the long-term.

All together, the recovery package includes nearly \$23 billion to support scientific research and facilities, including \$3 billion for the National Science Foundation, \$2 billion for the Department of Energy's Office of Science, and \$10 billion for the National Institutes of Health. There is no doubt that these funds will create jobs. Lab technicians will be hired to carry out projects that previously went unfunded. Electricians will be put to work wiring new laboratory work. And construction workers will begin refurbishing our neglected laboratories and building the facilities that will transform science for the twenty-first century.

Of course, the ideal project is one that keeps on giving, and that is exactly what scientific research does. The innovation and discoveries that come from research form the roots from which our economy grows and prospers. For too long, we have underinvested in science, and we will never know the result-

ing costs to our prosperity. But we know that science will be the foundation of our nation's future economic vitality. In his inaugural address, President Obama said, "We will restore science to its rightful place." That place is at the very heart of our nation's progress. The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act acknowledges this fact and provides an important first step toward the sustained investment that will prevent the need for future recovery packages.

As American workers lose their jobs, more and more face losing their health insurance coverage as well. Job losses have caused Medicaid and SCHIP rolls rise by 1.0 million, further straining state budgets already stretched thin due to lower tax revenues. This bill would increase temporarily the federal government's contribution to Medicaid, giving New Jersey an additional \$2 billion. For workers able to continue their health coverage through COBRA, the bill would subsidize COBRA premiums by 65 percent for nine months. This two-prong approach will provide health care for millions of newly unemployed workers and their families.

In addition to helping families maintain their health insurance coverage, this bill seeks to improve health care quality and its value. This bill would promote Health Information Technology systems, which could help reduce medical errors while lowering administrative costs by accelerating their adoption and usage among doctors and hospitals. This bill provides additional funding for prevention, which improves health at a good value by treating problems at the earliest stage before they become costly health care crises. Finally, this bill includes \$1.1 billion for medical research to improve the value of health care spending by identifying the most effective treatments for given health conditions.

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act would address the struggling economy by putting money back in the pockets of American families, workers, students and businesses through \$276.5 billion worth of tax cuts. Ninety-five percent of working Americans would receive a tax cut through a refundable tax credit of up to \$400 per worker that will be quickly distributed by reducing tax withholding from workers' paychecks. It would prevent 26 million Americans from getting hit by the Alternative Minimum Tax and lower the taxes of more than 16 million families by increasing the child tax credit and expanding the earned income tax credit.

This bill includes a number of provisions that would help businesses create new jobs in this difficult economy. It would allow businesses to improve cash flow by allowing businesses to write off 90 percent of losses incurred in 2008 and 2009 against taxes assessed over the previous five years. In addition, it would help businesses expand by extending the increased bonus depreciation for businesses making investments in new plants and equipment in 2009. Finally, this legislation would double the amount of money businesses can deduct on their taxes for capital investments and new equipment.

Through this comprehensive approach, we can begin to put the American economy back on the right track. We must approve the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, we all recognize the need to get the people of our country back

to work. Americans are hurting and they are looking to Washington for leadership.

Borrowing and spending got us into this problem, and more borrowing and spending will not solve it. Presidents Kennedy and Reagan cut taxes across-the-board, allowing families and small businesses to decide how to spend their money, instead of government. President Carter used this spending approach, and it didn't work.

This bill will cost every American household at least \$7,000. Some constituents have told me, "I might get a thousand dollars back." However, creating \$7,000 in debt for \$1,000 now is a bad deal at best.

This is twice as big as the New Deal, and that was over ten years. This is one bill. Every dollar in this bill is borrowed, adding more than a trillion dollars to our national debt at a time when we are already overloaded with the financial bailout and our long-term Social Security and Medicare obligations. This spending will ultimately be paid by our children and grandchildren, and that is generational theft.

I desperately wanted to support a bipartisan bill that will help put Americans back to work. But this bill has turned into a grab-bag that will not stimulate anything but government. There's \$2 billion in this bill for a wasteful pro-foreclosure program, rewarding partisan action groups like ACORN. In the meantime, my governor, Bob Riley, told me yesterday that health and education programs in small states like Alabama are being shortchanged by billions. The American people deserve better.

The federal government has never been able to borrow and spend our way to prosperity. The strength of our country is the innovation and ingenuity of our people—not our government. When we put capital in their hands, they put it to use, supporting their families, building their businesses, and creating jobs. That is what has always kept our economy going through good times and bad. And I am confident we will be seeing good times again—most likely before much of this trillion dollar bill is actually spent.

The decisions we make today have long-term consequences. Today we are being rushed to make a trillion-dollar decision that will affect every American taxpayer for decades.

As a member of the Republican Economic Working Group, led by Whip CANTOR, we have offered a better plan to help struggling Americans immediately. Our alternative would create twice as many jobs at half the cost through across-the-board tax relief for working American families and small businesses.

We must remember that government has no money of its own to give away. It all comes from the taxpayer.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise with today with great expectations and hope for a brighter economic future.

I rise in support of H.R. 1, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act also known as the "Economic Stimulus." I want to especially thank our House and Senate conferees for coming together on one of the most important pieces of economic legislation of our time; Congressman OBEY, Congressman RANGEL, Congressman WAXMAN, Congressman LEWIS, Congressman CAMP, Senator REID, Senator INOUE, Senator BAUCUS, Senator COCHRAN, and Senator GRASSLEY.

INTRODUCTION

Critical times call for critical measures. Over the last 13 months, our economy has lost a

total of 3.6 million jobs—and continuing job losses in the next few months are predicted. The national unemployment rate is at 7.6 percent, with the great state of Texas seeing an unemployment rate of 6.0 percent and my district of Houston fairs only slightly better at approximately 6 percent. Right now, those unemployed, which represent over 1 million Texans, await with bated breath to see our pledge to enact change. That change is in the form of this stimulus measure.

"The harvest is past, the summer is ended, and we are not saved" as is stated in Jeremiah in the Bible. The summer has indeed ended. This stimulus provides a piece of America's salvation. Spring is on the horizon and today we will have a stimulus!

Our schoolhouses are badly in need of repair and modernization in order for our students to participate in, and be competitive in the global marketplace. Indeed in Texas the number of persons who have obtained graduate education trails the national average by one whole percentage point. It is critical that we encourage our students to attend graduate programs in important subjects such as mathematics, engineering, law, medicine, the building trades, and foreign languages.

The education provisions in this legislation are all about preparing our nation's children for the future. Our students in Houston are not competing with just students in Abilene, San Antonio, Houston and Grand Prairie; the competition is global which is why H.R. 1 must not be delayed!

Our healthcare system needs to be upgraded to allow for more Americans to receive coverage without going bankrupt. Our workforce needs to be retooled to keep up with innovative and new technologies; and our transportation systems need to be expanded. These are only a fraction of the many needs our nation is facing today.

I am proud to say that Congress heard the call of not only Main Street, but of mothers, and children, the working poor, the aged, and the sick. We heard your cry for help and we have done our best to answer that call.

This comprehensive legislation is designed to save and create jobs, get our economy moving again, and transform it for long-term growth and stability. The landmark legislation is the first dramatic new investment in the future since the creation of the interstate highway system a half century ago. It will spend nearly \$800 billion and would provide billions in job creation and stimulus in city of Houston, the State of Texas, and the entire country.

HEALTHCARE

This legislation includes a number of provisions that will help aid in the nation's economic recovery, provide badly needed protections for people losing health coverage when they lose employment, and provide temporary assistance to states to preserve critical Medicaid coverage for low income families.

Specifically, in Texas Medicaid recipients will receive \$5 million in assistance. Food Stamp Assistance in Texas will increase by \$1,812 for each participant under the stimulus.

Other benefits include:

Premium Subsidies for COBRA Continuation Coverage for Unemployed Workers. To help people maintain coverage, the bill provides a 65 percent subsidy for COBRA continuation premiums for up to 9 months for workers and their families who have been involuntarily terminated. The Joint Committee on Taxation es-

timates that this provision would help 7 million people maintain their health insurance by providing a vital bridge for workers who have been forced out of their jobs in this recession. (Estimated cost \$24.7 billion.)

Medicare Payments for Teaching Hospitals. The bill blocks a FY09 Medicare payment reduction to teaching hospitals related to capital payments for indirect medical education (IME). (Estimated cost \$191 million.)

Medicare Payments to Hospice. The bill blocks FY09 Medicare payment cut to Hospice providers related to a wage index payment add-on. (Estimated cost \$134 million.)

Medicare, Medicaid and SCHIP Payments to Long Term Care Hospitals. The bill makes technical corrections related to Medicare payments for long-term care hospitals. (Estimated cost \$13 million.)

Temporary Federal Medical Assistance Percentage Increase. The bill increases FMAP funding for a 27-month period with an across-the-board increase to all states of 6.2 percent. (Estimated cost \$86.6 billion.)

Temporary Increase in Disproportionate Share Hospital (DSH) Payments. (Estimated cost \$460 million.)

Extension of Moratoria on Medicaid Regulations. The bill extends moratoria on Medicaid regulations for targeted case management, provider taxes, and school-based administration and transportation services through June 30, 2009. (Estimated cost \$105 million.)

Extension of Transitional Medical Assistance (TMA). The bill extends TMA to December 31, 2010. (Estimated cost \$1.3 billion.)

Extension of the Qualified Individual Program. The bill extends the QIP, which assists certain low-income individuals with Medicare Part B premiums, through December 31, 2010. (Estimated cost \$550 million.)

Protections for American Indian Health Care. (Estimated cost \$134 million.)

Prompt Payment Requirements for Nursing Facilities and Hospitals. The temporarily provides Medicaid prompt pay requirements to nursing facilities and hospitals. (Estimated cost \$680 million.)

Promoting the adoption and use of health information technology. This bill promotes the use of health information technology (health IT), such as electronic health records, to protect identifiable health information from misuse and abuse as the health care sector increases use of health IT. (Estimated savings to the government more than \$12 billion.)

\$1 billion for prevention and wellness programs to fight preventable diseases and conditions with evidence-based strategies.

\$10 billion to conduct biomedical research in areas such as cancer, Alzheimer's, heart disease and stem cells, and to improve NIH facilities.

\$1.1 billion to the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, NIH and the HHS Office of the Secretary to evaluate the relative effectiveness of different health care services and treatment options.

EDUCATION

There are several key investments to education at the early childhood/Head Start, K-12, and higher education levels. On February 2, 2009, I met with eleven school superintendents and university presidents in my district of Houston, Texas. I convened this meeting to better understand the needs of the students, their families, and the schools administrators. Collectively, they arrived at five distinct priorities: maintaining and increasing Pell Grant

monies in order to keep access to higher education affordable; retention of funding for school construction, modernization, and repair; retention of formula funding on school construction; retention of the State Fiscal Stabilization Fund; and no decrease in the amount of funding for Head Start and Early Childhood.

My school superintendents and administrators were concerned about Section 1413 in the Senate amendment which granted the Secretary of Education the authority to waive the maintenance of effort and "supplement, not supplant" requirements placed on Title I money. Since the purpose of Title I is to provide additional financial assistance to states and school districts to meet the needs of educating economically disadvantaged children, allowing the waiver of these requirements would have undermined the fundamental purpose of this funding.

In promoting this economic stimulus, President Obama indicated that the government's investments must not only create jobs in the short-term but must spur economic growth and competitiveness in the long-term. Investments in education can accomplish both ends. In fiscal year 2008, states spent over \$424 billion on elementary, secondary, and higher education. Elementary, secondary, and higher education represent nearly 40 percent of total state spending and comprise the first, second, or third largest spending categories for almost all states. Federal investment in education is essential to creating a new and retooled workforce.

That is why I am pleased to see a heavy investment in education and workforce training including:

\$53.6 billion for the State Fiscal Stabilization Fund, including \$39.5 billion to local school districts using existing funding formulas, which can be used for preventing cutbacks, preventing layoffs, school modernization, or other purposes; \$5 billion to states as bonus grants for meeting key performance measures in education; and \$8.8 billion to states for high priority needs such as public safety and other critical services, which may include education and for modernization, renovation and repairs of public school facilities and institutions of higher education facilities.

\$13 billion for Title 1 to help close the achievement gap and enable disadvantaged students to reach their potential.

\$12.2 billion for Special Education/IDEA to improve educational outcomes for disabled children. This level of funding will increase the Federal share of special education services to its highest level ever.

\$15.6 billion to increase the maximum Pell Grant by \$500. This aid will help 7 million students pursue postsecondary education.

\$3.95 billion for job training including State formula grants for adult, dislocated worker, and youth programs (including \$1.2 billion to create up to 1 million summer jobs for youth).

JOBS/WORKFORCE

As we dive more deeply into a hard hit recession, it is important that this body take aggressive action, along with President Obama, to help right the ship. Our gross domestic product, (GDP) increased the United States budget deficit by 1 percent upon passage of the first stimulus measure in October. That is an astounding number when put into context. In a healthy year, the U.S. economy grows by 3 percent. Nothing resonates as loudly with

the American people as being gainfully employed.

The unemployment rate in Texas is 6.0 percent. The National average is at 7.6 percent. The agreement does much in the way of helping Americans put food on their tables while reeling from the depressed economy and struggling to look for jobs.

Importantly, the agreement would continue to provide up to 33 weeks of extended unemployment benefits through the end of the year, as well as temporarily increase the amount of both regular and extended unemployment benefits by \$25 a week. In addition, the legislation would provide up to a total of \$7 billion to States modernizing their unemployment programs to provide improved coverage for low-wage, part-time and other workers. The measure would provide temporary emergency funds for States with rising caseloads in their Temporary Assistance for Needy Families program, and temporarily restore child support funding reduced in 2006. Finally, this section of the bill would provide a one-time payment of \$250 to recipients of Social Security, Supplemental Security Income, Railroad Retirement benefits, VA disability and pension benefits, as well as to certain local, State and Federal government retirees.

TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS

The United States is facing its deepest recession and economic crisis since the Great Depression. Consequently, the goal of this legislation is to strengthen the economy and invest in America's future.

The legislation is intended to create and save jobs. Transportation and infrastructure development play a pivotal role in job creation.

The bill provides \$1 billion for Community Development Block Grant programs for community and economic development projects including housing and services for those hit hard by tough economic times.

I am pleased that the Compromise Agreement that we are debating today retains significant amounts of funding for transportation. Specifically, it contains \$27.5 billion for highway investments; \$8.4 billion for investments in public transportation and \$9.3 billion for investments in rail transportation, including Inter-city Rail.

Indeed, this is good news for Houston. In the previous version of the bill, there was language that the Federal Transit Authority would give priority to transportation projects that were ready to go, meaning that they would be able to begin construction within 90 days of enactment or those projects would lose the money allowed under the stimulus.

I have been meeting with METRO since December 2008, and it has indicated that it can complete construction of the Northeast and South RAIL lines. METRO has indicated that it only requires \$183 million to complete this rail line. I have worked to help METRO complete its rail line for over 20 years.

Houstonians need this infrastructure to relieve congestion and provide adequate public transportation, and an investment means jobs for our constituents through the transportation sector in our communities. Creating this critical infrastructure in Houston will allow Houstonians to work and will provide a tremendous boost to community development and mobility.

I have engaged Chairman OBERSTAR and his staff on the funds that might be made available to METRO. I was pleased that the

Chairman indicated that METRO would be able to receive the funds it needs under this stimulus to complete its New Start transit project in Houston, Texas. Such funding is critical for the regional mobility of the citizens of the vast communities in and around the 18th Congressional District of Texas.

Cities around the country are struggling with a backlog of transportation projects and have difficulty in securing federal, state, and local resources in light of the struggling economy. At the same time, we are facing growing unemployment, particularly in our cities.

Houston has \$1.5 billion in transit projects that could be under contract within 90 days of enactment of the legislation. Not only do we need this infrastructure to relieve congestion and provide adequate public transportation, but an investment in Houston's New Start Transit Project means jobs for our constituents through the transportation sector in our communities and around the nation.

Other salient provisions of the bill include the following:

Modernize Roads, Bridges, Transit and Waterways: To build a 21st century economy, we must create jobs rebuilding our crumbling roads and bridges, modernizing public buildings, and putting people to work cleaning up our air, water and land.

Prioritizing Clean Water/Flood Control/Environmental Restoration

Provides \$18 billion for clean water, flood control, and environmental restoration investments, which will create more than 375,000 jobs.

Experts note that \$16 billion in water projects could be quickly obligated.

Modernizing Public Infrastructure, Including To Achieve Major Energy Cost Savings

Provides billions to modernize federal and other public infrastructure with investments that lead to long-term energy cost savings, including about \$5 billion to make improvements in DOD facilities, including housing for our troops and about \$4.5 billion to make federal office buildings more energy-efficient in order to achieve long-term savings for taxpayers.

INFRASTRUCTURAL IMPROVEMENTS

Modernizing Roads and Bridges

Provides \$29 billion for modernizing roads and bridges, which will create 835,000 jobs. This investment creates jobs in the short term while saving commuters time and money in the long term.

Requires states to obligate at least half of the highway/bridge funding within 120 days.

States have over 6,100 projects totaling over \$64 billion that could be under contract within 180 days.

Improving Public Transit and Rail

Provides \$8.4 billion for investments in transit and \$8 billion for investment in high-speed rail. These investments will reduce traffic congestion and our dependence on foreign oil.

Includes funds for new construction of commuter and light rail, modernizing existing transit systems, and purchasing buses and equipment to needed to increase public transportation and improve intermodal and transit facilities.

States have 787 ready-to-go transit projects totaling about \$16 billion.

PUBLIC HOUSING

Provides a total of \$6.3 billion for increasing energy efficiency in federally-supported housing programs.

Specifically, establishes a new program to upgrade HUD-sponsored low-income housing (elderly, disabled, and Section 8) to increase energy efficiency, including new insulation, windows, and frames.

Also invests in energy efficiency upgrades in public housing, including new windows, furnaces, and insulation to improve living conditions for residents and lower the cost of operating these facilities.

ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENT

Tax Incentives to Spur Energy Savings and Green Jobs

Provides \$20 billion in tax incentives for renewable energy and energy efficiency over the next 10 years.

Includes a three-year extension of the production tax credit (PTC) for electricity derived from wind (through 2012) and for electricity derived from biomass, geothermal, hydro-power, landfill gas, waste-to-energy, and marine facilities (through 2013).

Provides grants of up to 30 percent of the cost of building a new renewable energy facility to address current renewable energy credit market concerns.

Promotes energy-efficient investments in homes by extending and expanding tax credits through 2010 for purchases such as new furnaces, energy-efficient windows and doors, or insulation.

Provides a tax credit for families that purchase plug-in hybrid vehicles of up to \$7,500 to spur the next generation of American cars.

Includes clean renewable energy bonds for State and local governments.

Establishes a new manufacturing investment tax credit for investment in advanced energy facilities, such as facilities that manufacture components for the production of renewable energy, advanced battery technology, and other innovative next-generation green technologies.

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Restore science and innovation as the keys to new American-made technology, preventing and treating disease, and tackling urgent national challenges like climate change and dependence on foreign oil. The bill provides \$600 million to NASA, including 4400 million to put more scientists to work doing climate change research including Earth science research recommended by the National Academies, satellite sensors that measure solar radiation critical to understanding climate change, and thermal infrared sensors necessary for water management. The bill also includes \$150 million for research and development to improve air traffic control and \$50 million to repair NASA centers damaged by hurricanes and floods in the last year.

TAX RELIEF

The economic stimulus legislation will help give \$13 million more children access to the child tax credit. The use of this credit will likely provide the most immediate stimulus which is the ultimate goal of this package. Trends show that low-to-moderate income families are more likely to spend the stimulus monies and accelerate the much-needed rebound in our economy.

The city of Houston has over 73,000 families below the federal poverty level and a per

capita income that is \$1,500 dollars below the federal level. The extra boost that the child tax credit provides is in many cases critical to lower income families in my district. Any legislation that would help over 100,000 children in Texas has got to be labeled a winner. Based on estimates from the center on budget and policy priorities, there is a dollar-for-dollar reduction in poverty levels.

OTHER PROVISIONS FOR WORKERS AND FAMILIES

The earned income tax credit provides a tax incentive for families to continue working hard. Because it is refundable, it helps the lower bracket taxpayer, often the ones most in need. The credit has also been modified to be more "family-friendly."

The dreaded marriage-penalty has been modified substantially, thereby acknowledging the institution of marriage as opposed to making it a fiscal encumbrance.

TRANSPARENCY AND OVERSIGHT OF FUNDS

The compromise bill before us today provides unprecedented oversight, accountability, and transparency to ensure that taxpayer dollars are invested effectively, efficiently, and as quickly as possible to infuse the economy with the strongest stimulus.

Funds are distributed through existing formulas and numerous provisions provide for expedited relief so that much needed funds are invested as quickly as possible into the economy.

The Government Accountability Office and the Inspector General are provided with additional funding for auditing and investigating recovery spending. Moreover, a new Recovery Act Accountability and Transparency Board will coordinate and conduct oversight of recovery spending and provide early warning signs of problems.

WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTIONS

The act retains significant whistleblower protections. This is something that I care a tremendous amount about and is something that I actively fought to ensure that the language protecting whistleblowers was retained.

As chairwoman of the Subcommittee on Transportation Security and Infrastructure Protection, I urged the conferees to retain the whistleblower language in the bill. This language was included in the bill to encourage government and contract workers to come forward in the face of wrongdoing, fraud and corruption.

Specifically, the language in H.R. 1 provides: ". . . an employee of any non-federal employee receiving funds made available in this Act may not be discharged, demoted or otherwise discriminated against as a reprisal for disclosing to the Board, an inspector general, the Comptroller General, a member of Congress, or a federal agency head, or their representatives, information that the employee reasonably believes is evidence of . . . a substantial and specific danger to public health and safety . . ."

This language is important because public safety is at stake and the American people need to be reassured that they will be safe and secure while traveling. The function of the whistleblower is in many respects similar to that of a canary in a coal mine. They are there to warn of us of impending dangers.

An historic level of transparency, oversight and accountability will help guarantee taxpayer dollars are spent wisely and ensure that Americans can see the results of their investment. No wasteful spending will be tolerated in this.

In many cases, funds are distributed to existing initiatives with proven track records and with tough accountability measures already in place.

How funds are spent, all announcements of contract and grant competitions and awards, and formula grant allocations must be posted on a special website created by the President. It must also include the names of agency personnel to contact with concerns about infrastructure projects.

Public notice of funding must include a description of the investment funded, the purpose, the total cost, and why recovery dollars should be used. Governors, mayors, or others making funding decisions must personally certify that the investment has been fully vetted and is an appropriate use of taxpayer dollars. This information will also be placed on the internet.

The Council of Economic Advisors must report quarterly on the results for the American economy.

A Recovery Act Accountability and Transparency Board will be created to review management of recovery dollars and provide early warning of problems. The board is made up largely of Inspectors General.

The Government Accountability Office and the Inspectors General are provided additional funding and access for special review of recovery funding.

IN CONCLUSION

As Thomas Wolfe once wrote in his book *You Can't Go Home Again*, "We have been lost during the past here in America, but I believe that we shall be found." I believe this bill allows America to return to its rightful place and put our economy back on track.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1, "The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009" and get this country moving again. I firmly believe that this bill creates jobs, stimulates the economy, and provides the oil, grease, and machinery to get the economic engine in this great country, operating and churning again. I have faith in our economic system and our country. I know that a brighter day is upon the horizon. I urge my colleagues to support this bill and look forward to real change and direction in this country.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the stimulus bill we're voting on today is supposed to stimulate business and create jobs. However, one provision of the bill will do just the opposite. Title II of the Conference Report on H.R. 1, under the Office of Justice Programs, State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance, provides \$2 billion in Byrne Justice Assistance Grants (JAG). This funding is frequently used by local government agencies to fund pretrial release for criminal defendants. The problem is that it's at taxpayer expense.

When a defendant is given a pre-trial release bond or personal recognizance bond, he is released on his own recognizance. For example, a bond may be set at \$10,000, and the defendant is released on his promise to return based on his "word" alone. If the defendant does not return, the sheriff has to go find him. The taxpayers are usually out \$10,000 because judgments are seldom obtained from defendants for failure to appear.

On the other hand, when a surety bond is used, the court enters into a contractual agreement with a bonding company. The defendant also makes an agreement with the bonding company, and pays the company 10

percent. Then the defendant is released with the understanding that the bonding company will pay the court \$10,000 if the defendant does not show up. Plus the bonding company is obligated to go and look for the defendant if the defendant does not appear in court. This form of free enterprise takes taxpayers off the financial hook.

Mr. Speaker, by allowing taxpayer money to go to pretrial release, the free enterprise system is greatly hindered. Instead of providing jobs, jobs are taken away from the private sector—namely the bonding and insurance community.

As a former judge, I found that defendants released on pretrial bonds seldom reappeared in court. With surety bonds, however, they were much more likely to show up because they had a vested financial interest in appearing. Plus, the bondsman looks for defendants who fail to appear.

During my 22 years as a criminal court judge, I saw how if left alone, the free enterprise system guarantees the best result. By allowing private enterprise to take part in the process, people are held accountable, and taxpayers are protected.

Mr. Speaker, this so-called “stimulus” bill will not stimulate the economy with jobs. It will only further stifle the free enterprise system, take jobs, and will leave taxpayers with the bill. This is just one of many examples of flaws in this bill.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, 8 years of the Bush Administration’s failed policies have left our economy in a deep and cavernous hole. The climb out will be steep. With the strength and courage of President Obama, this Congress and the American people it will be steady. Today we are voting on one bold and historic step out of this hole. The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act offers the short term help and long term solutions that this country needs. It invests quickly in our economy to create or save at least 3.5 million jobs nationally—41,000 in my home state of Connecticut, and provide tax cuts for the middle class. And, it puts us on a path towards economic strength and stability for the future with bold reforms and new priorities.

This legislation makes a critical investment in our country’s greatest resource: our children. We are helping local school districts in the short-term with over \$53 billion in aid, to keep our teachers in the classroom. We are also making a down-payment on our country’s future. With this legislation, we are helping to build the workforce of the future with funding for Head Start programs and Pell Grants, and modernizing our schools to give our students the tools they need to succeed.

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act recognizes the important role our infrastructure will play in our economic recovery. Our roads and bridges are in serious need of repair and our public transportation desperately needs modernization. The funding provided in this legislation for infrastructure will create good paying jobs—many within the next few months. It also invests in the transportation of tomorrow with over \$8 billion in funding for high speed rail—taking cars off the road, and improving our environment.

With this legislation we will begin to make the tough choices to create a new American energy industry that will create jobs now and decrease our dependence on foreign oil. This investment will help families reduce their en-

ergy bills and create “green jobs” while advancing American ingenuity and innovation.

Our work will not end when this bill is signed into law. As President Obama has said, it will take time and a lot of hard work to get this economy moving. This President, this Congress and the American people have the courage and fortitude to rebuild and recover. Today we begin that journey.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Conference Report.

Two weeks ago, I stood on the House floor and listed the top ten reasons to support this bill. Here we are today and the only thing that has changed is that more Americans are losing their jobs, homes and healthcare. We have to stop the economy from continuing to spiral out of control before it is too late.

Our country is facing the worst economic crisis since the Great Depression—we lost 2.6 million jobs last year—the largest job loss since 1945. In Illinois, the unemployment rate increased by 40 percent in one year. We are seeing job losses at iconic American companies like Kodak and Ford, and at major Illinois companies like Caterpillar.

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act will help get our economy back on track and put America back to work. The bill will create 3.5 million jobs, cut taxes for working families, rebuild our infrastructure, prevent state and local cuts to crucial services and programs, and invest in the long-term health of our economy.

Under this bill, Illinois will receive billions of dollars and it is estimated that this bill would save or create over 148,000 jobs in Illinois. This bill isn’t a hand out to Wall Street fat cats and corporate CEOs; this is a hand up for the American people. The bill helps working families in Illinois, and across the country, by providing income tax credits, making college and health insurance more affordable, giving first-time homebuyers a tax credit and providing assistance to low-income families to make their homes more energy efficient and lower their energy costs.

As President Obama has said, this bill is not perfect, but it provides immediate and targeted relief to American families and will help lead our country out of the greatest economic crisis we have faced since the Great Depression. American families are depending on us to act—not tomorrow, not next week—but today.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act.

When we return home for our district work period, we do not have to look far to see the impact this recession has had—workers are being laid off, consumer confidence is down, and people are spending less because they have less to spend. Despite my opposition, we voted last year to give \$750 billion to Wall Street to try to slow this recession; that did not work. I supported the House version of the American Recovery and Investment Act, and I am supporting the Conference Report because it is time we invest in Main Street, not just Wall Street.

The White House Council of Economic Advisers, along with the Departments of Labor and Commerce have estimated this bill will create nearly 270,000 jobs in my home state of Texas—more than in any other state besides California—and 7,400 of those jobs will be in our 29th Congressional District.

Unlike the \$750 billion Troubled Asset Relief Program, this isn’t just a bill for white collar workers—the H.R. 1 is a bill for teachers, construction workers, medical professionals, electrical workers and engineers, police and firefighters, as well as those who may not be working because of the dire state of our economy. This bill will create and save jobs by re-investing in roads, highways, public transportation, schools, education, the electrical grid, health technology and services, communications infrastructure, and numerous other areas of our economy. For the last eight years, too many of these areas have been neglected. Today, we have the opportunity to invest in these areas to stimulate the economy and create jobs to get our economy started back in the right direction.

The bedrock of America’s competitiveness is a well-educated and skilled workforce and we must prepare our students for our globalized economy. This bill takes key steps towards ensuring that we do just that. Starting with our youngest generation, H.R. 1 provides \$2.1 billion for Head Start and Early Head Start to allow an additional 124,000 children to participate in these programs.

Harris County, where our district lies, serves a combined total of 6,649 Head Start children per year through four direct Head Start grantees. In fact, Houston in 2003 served the lowest percentage of eligible children compared to other cities in Texas.

Harris County is the third most populous county in the nation and in review of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Biennial Reports to Congress on Head Start, Los Angeles County served 29,703 eligible children, Cook County served 20,406 children, and the New York boroughs served 24,260. Funding Head Start grantees is based on the number of children under the age of 5 years whose family income is below the federal poverty line.

According to U.S. Census figures for 2005, not only is the poverty rate for Harris County’s population under age 5 higher than the national average in 2005 of 21 percent, but Harris County represented the highest percentage of children below the poverty line for all above listed counties. The poverty rates for 2005 are: Los Angeles County 23.8 percent, Cook County 22.5 percent, NYC boroughs 27.3 percent and Harris County 28.7 percent. I look forward to working with the Department of Health and Human Services to address this disparity in funding now that new monies will be available to serve more eligible children.

Additionally, this bill will provide much-needed investments in our elementary and secondary schools including \$13 billion for Title I grants to help disadvantaged kids reach high academic standards and \$39.5 billion to local school districts that can be used for preventing teacher cutbacks and layoffs and make key investments in things like modernizing our schools.

Finally, this bill will invest in preparing our younger generations for our globalized economy by providing \$15.6 billion to increase the maximum Pell Grant by \$500. By doing this, we will help seven million students pursue postsecondary education and take the steps they need to get the certification or degree necessary to pursue and keep a job in these difficult times. Additionally, H.R. 1 provides students with a new “American Opportunity” tax credit of up to \$2,500 of the cost of tuition

and related expenses paid during the taxable year. Combined with the increase in the Pell Grant, this tax credit will give our lower and middle income students additional peace of mind in taking on the financial costs of pursuing a college degree or certificate.

Another way to build a 21st century economy is to engage contractors across the nation to create jobs rebuilding our crumbling roads and bridges and building transit and rail lines. The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act will do this by providing funds to modernize our roads and bridges and invest in transit and rail projects to reduce traffic congestion and gas consumption. I strongly supported the inclusion of these funds as this investment would create or sustain more than 2.4 million jobs and \$439 billion of economic activity.

I am pleased to see that H.R. 1 provides for \$1.5 billion in supplemental discretionary grants that will be awarded to state or local governments or transit agencies on a competitive basis for projects that will have a significant impact on the country, metropolitan area, or region. This bill reads that this money includes investing in projects already participating in New Starts or those ready for entry into revenue service. While I would like to have seen a lot more money dedicated to these type projects, I am glad that transit agencies will be able to compete for entry into revenue service.

We have two critical transit projects in the greater Houston area, the North and Southeast light rail corridors. Both projects are near completion of the New Starts process in the Federal Transit Administration. While the final details on the projects are being addressed to prepare the projects for entry into Final Design and for Full Funding Grant Agreements, the projects are ready to begin construction in less than 90 days, have environmental clearances, and have received favorable cost effectiveness ratings. By investing in these two projects, work can begin quickly, creating thousands of jobs in a region that suffers not only from the current economic conditions but also from the lasting effects of Hurricane Ike. I look forward to working with the Department of Transportation to see that these two projects receive the attention they deserve.

I am also pleased H.R. 1 includes valuable health related provisions including COBRA subsidies, health IT funding, an FMAP increase, temporary DSH allotments, a temporary extension of transitional Medical Assistance, and funding for community health centers.

However, the final version of the bill does not include the temporary option for states to provide Medicaid coverage to unemployed or uninsured individuals. Instead, H.R. 1 relies on COBRA subsidies to provide health insurance coverage to the unemployed. The House passed version of H.R. 1 gave states the option to provide Medicaid coverage to the unemployed or uninsured and this provision should be in the final version of the bill.

In our district, most individuals work low wage jobs that often do not provide health insurance and therefore they are not eligible for COBRA coverage. This leaves a large portion of individuals without health insurance or access to Medicaid. More and more lower wage individuals, who never had health insurance, are losing their jobs. They are delaying their health care because they cannot afford to go

to the doctor and often end up in the emergency room with more costly medical problems because they delay medical care. It makes sense to give states the option to extend Medicaid coverage to these individuals because it saves money in the long run and provides these individuals with health care coverage.

The legislation also makes critical improvements to the smart grid provisions established in the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 by eliminating the cap on the allowable number of smart grid demonstration projects and increasing the grant funding available for these efforts. Houston is a leader in moving toward smart grid solutions. Center Point Energy, a leading energy delivery company in Texas, will invest over \$600 million in automatic metering systems, or AMS, over the next five years to support smart grid infrastructure. AMS technology is the first step in moving towards an automatic grid which will allow consumers to manage and monitor the electric use in real-time, reduce energy consumption, and improve grid reliability.

I am also pleased with the changes to the Weatherization Assistance Program which will help low-income families make their homes more energy efficient. This will decrease the amount of fossil fuels needed to heat and cool homes, reduce home energy bills and create jobs in the home weatherization industry: a win-win for everyone.

It creates a temporary \$6 billion Department of Energy loan guarantee program for renewable energy and electric transmission projects, up to \$500 million of which can be used for the development of leading edge biofuels, including biodiesel.

I applaud the inclusion of \$4.6 billion in funding for the Army Corps of Engineers, although the Corps needs much more funding to address its backlog of critical projects. While the funding is not distributed to specific projects, it is my hope the Corps will fund worthy projects by the Port of Houston and the Harris County Flood Control District. I also support the \$1.2 billion for EPA's nationwide environmental cleanup programs, including Superfund, which I hope can be utilized to clean up the San Jacinto River Waste Pits.

Mr. Speaker, our economy is crumbling, workers are being laid off, people are losing their health insurance, and families are finding it harder and harder to make ends meet. This legislation will start us back on the right track by looking out for those who have been most affected, and by broadly investing in multiple sectors of our economy. We cannot stand by and do nothing, and for those reasons, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the conference report to the economic stimulus legislation.

I understand that Americans are hurting. Many have lost their jobs, are unable to pay their mortgage, don't have health insurance and are struggling to make ends meet. Small businesses have especially felt the brunt of the recession.

Congress needs to come together with the president to restore confidence in the economy and create a climate conducive to job growth. But instead of a narrowly focused effort to stimulate the economy through targeted programs to put more money in the hands of taxpayers and create jobs, this massive

spending bill—the largest in our Nation's history—creates new programs and bolsters others, many of which have nothing to do with economic recovery. I don't question the urgency of congressional action to stimulate the economy, but I do question the priorities in this package and its price tag.

I have never been more concerned about the future of our country. The unprecedented amount of borrowing and spending in this package will place a tremendous burden of debt on present and future generations. This economic stimulus package was not only an opportunity to look at short-term solutions to help jump-start the economy and assist struggling taxpayers and homeowners, but also a historic opportunity for Congress to address the long-term financial plan for our country.

I have been speaking out for several years about getting mandatory spending under control. Congressman JIM COOPER and I have authored bipartisan legislation, which I first introduced in 2006, to set up a national commission to review our nation's long-term economy, including entitlement spending, discretionary spending and tax policy, and recommend a plan to Congress to get America on a sustainable financial path. The Securing America's Future Economy (SAFE) Act would address this financial crisis and solve it with bipartisanship. The SAFE effort differs from others because it requires an up or down vote in Congress on the commission's proposal, similar to the process for closing military bases enacted in 1988.

As the piece of the budget pie continues to grow to pay for entitlements, spending for discretionary programs shrinks. That means fewer dollars for education, for medical research, for investment in technology, for national security, for transportation, and a myriad of other programs on which Americans rely. Not only is it unacceptable to shoulder our children and grandchildren with a crushing debt burden, I believe it raises serious moral questions. Is it right for one generation to live very well knowing that its debts will be left to be paid for by others?

I reached out to both Democrats and Republicans to push for a bipartisan entitlement reform commission to be considered as part of the stimulus package. The SAFE idea has garnered growing support. I offered the SAFE Commission as an amendment when the stimulus legislation was marked up in the House Appropriations Committee, and again when the Rules Committee decided which amendments would be made in order for consideration on the House floor as a part of House legislative package. I was disappointed that my amendment was not even allowed to be debated by the House.

I am deeply concerned about the divisiveness in Congress and believe that a bipartisan commission may well be the only way to mandate action on long-term budget controls. President Obama has indicated his willingness to reach across the aisle to find bipartisan solutions. I have always believed that working together in a bipartisan manner is what the American people expect of their leaders.

The Congress had the chance in this measure to take a bold step for America's future financial security and instead we are going down the same road of adding to the deficit and national debt with questionable programs that are touted to create jobs and stimulate the economy. We can do better and we must

do better—for our children and our grandchildren's future.

Mr. Speaker, I insert with my statement an op-ed from yesterday's Washington Times by Stuart Butler of the Heritage Foundation who understands the urgency of Congress and the administration coming together to stop the financial tsunami that threatens the financial future of our country.

[From the Washington Times, Feb. 12, 2009]

BUTLER: CONGRESS NEEDS COVER TO REFORM ENTITLEMENTS

(By Stuart Butler)

The price tag is stunning. Pegged at nearly \$800 billion—a figure that doesn't even include interest payments—the so-called "stimulus" bill sets an all-time record for deficit spending by a single bill.

Congress has gotten away with deficit spending in the past, because foreign investors were willing to buy U.S. bonds to cover the debt. But the size of this bill will send our deficits sky-rocketing, to the point where overseas investors may have second thoughts about lending us more.

And that's the good news!

The bad news is there's a far bigger problem threatening to undermine overseas confidence in America's finances. That's the looming fiscal tsunami due to wash over us as baby boomers start retiring in ever-growing numbers and start claiming Social Security and Medicare benefits Congress has promised them. They are promises even the most robust economy could not afford to keep.

Some lawmakers fear that Congress is incapable of addressing this problem, given the way it currently does business. They say the entitlement tsunami needs a very different approach. They are right.

Let's understand the situation. Over the next 10 years, Congress says the stimulus will cost about \$800 billion we don't have. In its single most expensive year—2010—Congress will borrow just over \$350 billion to create "energy-efficient visitors centers" and otherwise "stimulate" the economy. That's a lot of money.

But let's look at what Medicare alone must borrow—every year—to cover the gap between what it spends and takes in through premiums and payroll taxes. It's already costing taxpayers almost \$200 billion this year. Within 10 years, yearly borrowing will hit the equivalent of \$285 billion in today's economy. In 20 years it will be close to \$600 billion, with hundreds of billions more from red-ink saturated Social Security and Medicaid spending.

And we are worrying about a peak of \$350 billion for the stimulus?!

Two congressmen, Rep. Frank R. Wolf, Virginia Republican, and Rep. Jim Cooper, Tennessee Democrat, don't believe Congress has the stomach to rein in such staggering shortfalls in these politically sensitive programs.

To give weak-kneed politicians the cover they need, Mr. Wolf and Mr. Cooper propose a bipartisan commission to recommend long-term structural changes in entitlement programs. Commission proposals would be sent to Congress for an up-or-down vote.

Mr. Wolf and Mr. Cooper reckon their commission would get members off the hook of voting line-by-line for unpopular changes. And a bipartisan commission means both parties get the political pain and gain of taking tough action.

Now, we've had budget commissions before. Sometimes they consist of top congressional leaders who meet behind closed doors and produce few real program changes but more real taxes. Or they produce a report that goes nowhere.

But the Wolf-Cooper plan has two stages that may change the political dynamic.

Before the commission even meets to talk turkey, for several months it would hold a national conversation across the country, with town meetings and other ways to gauge public sentiment. Only then would the commission begin its work. Armed with this public support, Mr. Wolf and Mr. Cooper reason, lawmakers could vote "aye" with political protection.

This "public mandate" stage is modeled after something called the Fiscal Wake-Up Tour. The tour consists of representatives from the Concord Coalition, a budget watchdog group, as well as the Heritage Foundation and the Brookings Institution, together with former U.S. Comptroller General David Walker.

This left-right panel has held dozens of large meetings around the country, talking with tens of thousands of Americans. As a "made member" of the tour, I can tell you how Americans are likely to react to a commission seeking their views:

People want the truth about our fiscal future. If they get the facts in a nonpartisan way, first they are stunned and then they want action.

The elderly, as well as young Americans, are willing to support tough steps on Medicare and other programs—if they are first brought into a serious conversation.

And they doubt that more money sent to Washington would be used to avoid future deficits. They are sure it will be spent.

Here's a thought. Let's say President Obama were to back the Wolf-Cooper two-stage commission. Imagine if he and congressional leaders from both parties were to hold their own tour. They would jointly give Americans the full picture of the future tsunami and an honest description of the major options from all sides. And imagine they asked the American people what to do. Then, say, a commission put together a package of reforms based on the people's mandate and sent it to Congress for a vote.

That's the kind of commission report that could work. The kind of change you can believe in.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Conference Report for H.R. 1, American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009. This legislation will start to address the most critical needs of our flagging economy by providing relief to struggling individuals and small businesses, while creating and saving 3.5 million jobs across America.

These are challenging times for families in North Carolina and across the nation. Each month it seems that we get more bad news, or hit a new record on an economic indicator. On Friday, the U.S. Department of Labor announced the unemployment rate was at a 34-year high of 7.6 percent. The increase in the last quarter is the largest since the end of World War II. This increase in the jobless rate is hitting every region, and every state, but North Carolina is particularly hard-hit. We are one of the top five states in terms of month-over-month increases, and one of the top three in increases since last year. Here in North Carolina, unemployment is 8.7 percent. In addition to the unemployed, there are many more workers who are seeing their hours and wages cut.

I have heard from North Carolinians from across the Second District about the need for swift action. H.R. 1 addresses the need by making investments in our economy that will produce new jobs while providing tax relief for 95 percent of Americans. With 3.6 million jobs lost in the past year, the 3.5 million jobs created by this bill will put us on track to an economic recovery.

Some of these jobs will be created, and created quickly, by the \$25 billion in school construction bond tax credits in this bill which I have worked on with Ways and Means Chairman CHARLIE RANGEL for more than 12 years. The tax credits will create more than 11,000 jobs in North Carolina alone. This funding will allow work to start on stalled and delayed school building projects and address overcrowding and deteriorating schools. The jobs created by making these investments in our future will invigorate our economy today, and provide a strong foundation for the working families of the future. I am proud that the tax credits in this bill will give local school districts support to improve their schools and the education they provide.

As the former Superintendent of Schools in North Carolina, I have a special understanding of the needs of our students, and I am pleased that H.R. 1 includes significant investments in education. In addition to the ABCs Act tax credits, the bill includes \$39.5 billion to help schools modernize their facilities and prevent layoffs or cutbacks to essential educational services. It provides \$25 billion to support our most vulnerable students through Title I and IDEA, and \$4 billion for early childhood education to ensure that kids have the right start on the path to learning. This package also invests in higher education with a new tax credit for individuals seeking a college education and a \$500 increase to Pell Grants. We must give the next generation the tools to support learning throughout their lives, to enable them to compete in our 21st Century economy.

To jump start our economy and turn the tide on unemployment, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 makes investments to create or save 3.5 million jobs. At the same time, it provides a down payment on our most important national priorities. H.R. 1 will also get the stagnant economy moving again supporting targeted infrastructure investments to improve bridges and roads, modernize public buildings, and expand mass transit. H.R. 1 also strategically invests in America's "green sector," supporting alternative and environmentally-friendly energy, like the biofuels we grow and produce in North Carolina, and new technology that creates energy from waste products. It also expands energy tax provisions like the Production Tax Credit and Clean Renewable Energy Bonds while providing the funds we need to transform our energy distribution system and weatherize and modernize our homes and public buildings to increase efficiency.

Millions of Americans will see their taxes reduced by H.R. 1, and others will receive support in making purchases that help our economy. More than 95 percent of the nation's taxpayers will see an increase in their take-home pay through the "Making Work Pay" tax credit, \$400 for individuals and \$800 for working families. H.R. 1 will prevent 26 million families from being subjected to the Alternative Minimum Tax. It also includes relief for Americans that will spur our economy by providing an \$8,000 tax credit for first-time home-buyers.

In addition, the small businesses that form the backbone of our economy will get relief under the recovery package. H.R. 1 includes bonus depreciation to help them invest in new equipment, loss carry back to help them weather reduced sales, a delay of the 3% withholding tax on payments to businesses

that sell goods or services to governments, and a cut in the capital gains tax cut for investors in small businesses who hold stock for more than five years. It also provides incentives for businesses that create new jobs.

For those suffering in the economic downturn, this bill provides temporary support to help struggling families make ends meet and help workers train and find jobs. It extends and improves unemployment benefits, increases food stamps and food support, and provides aid to seniors, disabled veterans, and Social Security recipients. It extends Trade Adjustment Assistance for displaced workers, and extends and improves local job training, job placement, and vocational rehabilitation initiatives. This spending quickly makes its way into the economy, and will help those most in need.

Our country is facing difficult times, and though we have many challenges to meet, this package is a bold step in the right direction. I support H.R. 1, American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009, and I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for its passage.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this Economic Recovery bill that will put America back to work and throw a life-line to the millions of people that are struggling to 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.

Mr. Speaker, the transportation and housing investments in this bill will create jobs, generate economic growth, and significantly improve our transportation and housing infrastructure.

The bill appropriates over \$48 billion for surface transportation and aviation and over \$13 billion for housing investment.

Within the \$48 billion for transportation over 75 percent of that money will quickly go to the states through existing authorized formula programs for ready to go highway and transit projects. This funding will create over 1 million new jobs.

Among discretionary transportation initiatives, \$8 billion is provided for high-speed and intercity passenger rail which is an historic investment in America's future.

The bill invests in the nation's public housing, provides funding to communities hardest hit by the foreclosure crisis to purchase and rehabilitate foreclosed housing, and includes money to fill financing gaps in the Low Income Housing Tax Credit caused by the collapse of the credit market. Together these housing appropriations will yield about 250,000 jobs.

While I believe more must still be done to adequately invest in public transit and to help communities with the growing number of foreclosures, we must not let the perfect be the enemy of the good.

This is a good bill Mr. Speaker and I urge a yes vote.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in the interests of transparency, because Republicans, the media and the American public were shut out of negotiations, I am suggesting a new name for the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, this so-called stimulus bill.

Based on what we know, I propose that we call it the Emergency Massive Expansion of Federal Spending to Double Our Budget Def-

icit by Circumventing the Legislative Process to Roll Back Welfare Reform, Intrude on Individual's Healthcare Decisions, Buy Green Golf Carts When We Don't Know How They Will Be Used, Bail Out Fiscally Irresponsible States, But We'll Give People an Average Whopping \$13 per week of Tax Relief, So We Hope They Won't Mind, Non-Stimulus, Non-Recovery Act of 2009.

There, I think that does a much better job of describing this bill.

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, we need a stimulus bill that will put people back to work and create jobs. We don't need a big government spending bill that has become a grab bag of special interest spending.

I have several concerns about the bill, but I would like to speak today about a specific issue involving special education funding.

Like most of my colleagues I'm sure, I hear all the time from educators—teachers, parents, superintendents—about special education funding. When the federal government enacted the special ed mandate back in 1974, it promised to provide 40 percent of the funds.

But it has only provided about 17 percent annually, which means local school districts have to make up this shortfall. This is patently unfair to our local school districts.

But now this bill contains a particularly troubling provision that would further exacerbate the problem. The stimulus bill contains restrictions on special education funding that would not provide the needed relief to local schools because it would only allow them to use the funds for specified programs and services—not give local school districts the flexibility they need to make up for the current shortfall in funding. Even worse, the "maintenance of effort" provision in the stimulus would force states and local schools to sustain spending in these tight budget times or lose their federal funding.

And the conference report extends this mandate from two years to three years—through 2011.

Mr. Speaker, our teachers play an exceptionally integral role in shaping our children and our Nation's future. They understand the needs of each student—far better than Washington bureaucrats ever will. We need to ensure that our educators are properly equipped and given the proper decision rights in how to make each child succeed.

I believe we should allow local schools more flexibility, and I urge the Secretary of Education to keep that important principle in mind as he implements the "maintenance of effort" provision.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the conference report to H.R. 1, the so-called economic stimulus package.

Congressional Democrats crafted this bill behind closed doors and only released all the details to us at midnight last night.

Their plan makes a bad bill worse by reducing tax relief for working families in order to fund more wasteful spending.

Our economy needs a shot of adrenaline, not a load of long-term pet projects.

I believe we need to act now; but we must get it right.

Much of this spending is for worthy projects, but they're not stimulative and should go through the regular appropriations process.

I joined my Republican colleagues and proposed a plan that focuses on letting individuals, families, and small businesses keep

more of their hard-earned money through tax relief. It would create 6.2 million jobs at half the cost, and that's using the Obama Administration's own statistical models.

Only 18 percent of conference report is dedicated to lowering federal income taxes. In fact, it provides for even less tax relief than the original House-passed bill. Infrastructure spending, similarly comprises only 17 percent of the discretionary spending in this package—down from \$1 billion in the original House bill.

Shovel-ready infrastructure projects and individual tax relief for small businesses should be part of our efforts to boost the economy. But that doesn't mean Congress should use this crisis as an excuse to spend hundreds of billions in taxpayer dollars on 33 new programs that won't have any economic impact in the near-term.

Mr. TANNER. I rise today in support of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. I do so with a strong sense of responsibility and a heavy heart.

Throughout my career in this body, I have stood up to champion the cause of fiscal restraint. I have seen the majority in this House change two times; presidents of both parties come and go. In all that time, I have called on the powers that be not to spend more than we can afford, whether it be in the form of excessive spending or unaffordable tax cuts.

This is truly an economic and financial crisis unlike any we have ever seen, and it is forcing tough decisions unlike any we have ever faced. Economists from across the ideological spectrum believe that our nation is in the midst of an economic catastrophe that requires government action. The papers are filled with sobering stories: small and large businesses on the verge of collapse, massive layoffs, historic levels of unemployment and families unable to afford their homes. The numbers are grim: 3.6 million people out of work since this downturn started; in my district alone nearly 6,000 citizens have been laid off in the last 13 months. Eight counties in my district have an unemployment rate of over 10 percent, and all but one county's unemployment rate is considerably above the current national average of 7.2 percent.

Blame for this crisis can be found far and wide: greedy Wall Street giants, irresponsible lenders and consumers, and regulators that were asleep at the switch. I truly believe that without action our economy will get much worse, and our nation will enter a period of hardship not known since the Great Depression. Inaction is simply not an option.

The bill before us is not perfect. It contains spending measures that I believe may have merit but should be vetted through the regular appropriation process. But the perfect cannot be the enemy of the good in these serious times.

This legislation contains critical infrastructure spending that invests in communities, roads, waterways and needed technology upgrades in West Tennessee and across this great country. The stimulus package contains tax provisions that will provide relief for families living on the margins and businesses struggling to meet payroll. Under this legislation, in fact, 95 percent of Tennessean and American taxpayers will receive a tax cut. Most importantly though, it will help create and save 7,900 private sector jobs in my district. By putting people to work, we will put money

in the pockets of all Americans to reenergize the economy.

There is no doubt that this bill comes at a cost, one greater than the \$787 billion price tag associated with it. Money will be borrowed and interest will have to be paid. Madam Speaker, as a fiscal conservative, that gives me great pause; I would not support this package if I did not believe that our country's future hung in the balance.

So I rise in support of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. I know that the recovery will not be immediate, but without this package recovery may not be possible at all.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, it is often said that legislating is the "art of compromise." Today, the House is considering a carefully negotiated economic recovery bill that represents a good balance of tax cuts and spending stimulus to help get our economy back on track and help get people in this country working again.

As a representative of small town Missouri and Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, I am particularly pleased that the legislation directs needed resources to rural parts of the country and further addresses an economic downturn that has become a national security threat to the United States.

Over the past year, the Government has taken steps to help reduce the impact of the recession on the American people. Some of those actions have proven helpful, while others must be reviewed and improved. But, economists from across the political spectrum have indicated that further economic stimulus is necessary to help reduce layoffs and create jobs.

Since January, bipartisan consensus has been built around a \$789 billion economic recovery bill designed to boost employment and invest in the health, education, and safety of the American people.

This legislation invests heavily in rural priorities, such as boosting funds for rural water programs; for rural highway and infrastructure projects, for school modernization initiatives; for Corps of Engineers projects; for agricultural-based alternative energy development; and for expanding Internet broadband technology. It directs additional funds toward military and VA construction projects and toward streamlining the VA claims process. And, it provides individual and small business tax relief, helps turn our country toward greener energy solutions, and strengthens the safety net for workers who have fallen on hard times.

The economic recovery bill is not perfect. But, sitting on the sidelines, simply watching our economy deteriorate, is simply not an option. Inaction on our part would undercut America's national security and would imperil jobs, savings, farms, and small businesses. We must do what we can to prevent such a tragedy, which is why enacting this legislation is in the best interest of our country.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this wasteful, unfocused, and massive government-spending bill. It is true that our country is in the middle of a severe economic downturn and economists on both sides of the financial debate agree that the current housing market and lack of available credit are at the root of this problem. Yet, Democrat leaders in the House and Senate decided to strip this legislation of an obviously stimulative \$15,000 homebuyer tax credit, in favor of a \$5 billion earmark to make federal

buildings "green." This is one of many glaring examples that this bill is not about stimulating the economy; it is about expanding the Federal Government in a time of crisis.

I believe White House Chief of Staff Rahm Emanuel characterized this democrat-spending bill best when he said, "You never want a serious crisis to go to waste. And what I mean by that is an opportunity to do things you think you could not do before." In a rush to capitalize on our country's economic situation the other side of the aisle has used fear and pronouncements of imminent catastrophe to fulfill their wants and achieve their goals of government expansion, longstanding liberal spending policies, and political payback.

Many have looked to our economic history to provide guidance during this difficult time, particularly to the New Deal instituted by President Franklin Roosevelt. Looking to the past we discover that Henry Morgenthau, Jr., FDR's Treasury Secretary, gave this quote in May of 1939 during the Great Depression.

"We have tried spending money. We are spending more than we have ever spent before and it does not work. And I have just one interest, and now if I am wrong somebody else can have my job. I want to see this country prosper. 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 eight years of this administration, we have just as much unemployment as when we started. And enormous debt to boot."

Unfortunately, what many economists have found at present and in the past is that New Deal principles are stale ideas that do not translate into economic stimulus in the 21st century. To find further confirmation that unfocused infrastructure and public works projects fail to stimulate a recessive economy one need only look to Japan during the 1990s.

Like this country's current situation, Japan in the late 1980s experienced the bursting of a real estate bubble. To combat the economic situation, the Japanese government embarked on a colossal spending spree pouring trillions of taxpayer dollars into wasteful roads, bridges and infrastructure projects. Japan finally came out of its economic tailspin, but many economists contend that it was not infrastructure spending that caused the economy to recover, but rather an intensive cleanup of the banks, and a growing export sector that boosted the country. According to a February 5, 2009, New York Times article, "Among Japanese citizens, the spending is widely disparaged for having turned the nation into a public-works-based welfare state and making regional economies dependent on Tokyo for jobs. Much of the blame has fallen on the Liberal Democratic Party, which has long used government spending to grease rural vote-buying machines that help keep the party in power."

For these, and many other reasons, I regret that I cannot support this unprecedented big government grab for citizen reliance on the federal government. History shows that the best way to encourage an economic turnaround, preserve jobs, and spur widespread economic growth, is to ensure that job-creators face a lower tax burden. It is evident that this country needs to lower its corporate and small business tax rates, and provide tax relief to middle-class families. What this country does not need is a scatter shot approach of federal spending that will only increase the debt burden on future generations and create

government dependence, while doing nothing to stimulate or create meaningful long-term job growth.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the stimulus package that our colleagues behind closed doors because of the lack of stimulus.

The American people are hurting. Too many jobs have been lost, and too many hard working Americans are worried about their future. Every day I receive calls from Arkansans opposed to Congress recklessly throwing around billions of dollars in an attempt to spend our way out of this crisis by getting more into debt.

The American people do need action; but responsible, focused action that will create jobs and return tax dollars to working Americans immediately. This is the time-proven and fastest way to truly stimulate our economy. We cannot afford nor can our children afford—an \$800 billion mistake which gives too little attention to creating and saving jobs and securing our retirement savings. I can't say to the average Arkansan who is fearful he or she will lose their job that this stimulus will save their jobs and help their lives it—so it does not deserve our support.

I urge Congress to work harder and together for a focused, responsible bill that will save and create jobs and protect pensions.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009.

I come to the floor to oppose this bill reluctantly. When I am home in my District I talk to my neighbors, old school friends, and folks in the coffee shop, they share with me the economic problems they are facing—fellow workers being laid off, difficulty in meeting the house payment because there is now only one wage earner. Small business owners are laying off people due to slow sales especially at car dealerships, retail stores, and restaurants.

The slow down of the U.S. economy has not missed my community—folks are hurting and Congress needs to act in ways that will jump start the housing markets, get credit and lending flowing, increase U.S. exports and provide tax relief so families have more money in their pocket to pay for daily household expenses.

But Mr. Speaker, I have many worries about the massive bill that we have before us today.

I worry there is too much spending in this so-called "Stimulus" package. The cost of this bill today is \$791 billion. Over time the bill will cost \$1.138 trillion. There is too much spending on government programs that should be funded through the normal appropriations process, not in this bill. Under the guise of stimulus, the huge increase in these government programs significantly raises the baseline on which future spending cannot be sustained without large tax increases. This policy could be devastating to our economy and prolong the current economic recession.

I worry that too little of the package goes toward the most effective tools for creating jobs for small business owners, like lower taxes and tax credits. In fact, the only help directed to small business, net operating loss, carry-back was reduced by this bill from \$1 billion to \$2 billion. The home buyer tax credit was reduced from \$35 billion to \$2 billion; the car tax credit to purchase a new car was reduced from \$11.5 billion to \$2 billion.

Infrastructure money for roads and bridges was \$67 billion, which I appreciate, although my request to add \$13 billion for combined

sewer operations funds in the infrastructure section fell on deaf ears. Compare this to Senate Majority Leader HARRY REID \$8 billion for a high speed train from Las Vegas to Disneyland. The priorities in this bill are wrong.

The small business tax breaks and infrastructure spending make up about \$100 billion of the total \$791 billion in the bill, but accounts for 2.5 million jobs of the 3.5 million jobs the White House has estimated will be retained or created by H.R. 1.

Mr. Speaker, to state it another way, \$691 billion of the spending may retain or create just one million jobs, most of which will be government bureaucrats that populate the big gray buildings in Washington, DC. That does little or nothing for job creation in my District.

I worry that printing nearly a trillion dollars of new money will result in inflation that will create economic problems over the next several years that will negate any short term gains that might be achieved by this package.

I worry that this additional trillion dollars of new money will create new economic problems by “crowding out” private investment dollars that otherwise might be available to stimulate our private sector economy, create new jobs, and grow the economy. Instead, the U.S. government will be sucking up those dollars to pay off its debt. Not to mention the burden this places on our children and grandchildren who will be saddled with the responsibility of paying off that debt.

I am also very frustrated with the non-stimulus liberal policies that found their way into this bill. Two of these policies have earned a lot of attention. First, there is more than \$1 billion for “comparative medical treatment research” that will be spent by a new panel of non-physicians that reviews the medical treatment decisions of physicians and healthcare professionals. Many feel that this treatment review committee could result in the rationing of treatments of drugs for patients, or even deny medical care to some people, especially seniors. Some have labeled this a form of “euthanasia.” While I don’t foresee that any time soon, it is very scary.

Another liberal policy that was put in this bill is the reversing of welfare reform, which was the “Welfare to Work” program that was enacted on a bipartisan basis in 1996. This legislation will encourage individuals to remain on welfare who would otherwise be given two years to develop skills and training to get a job and move off of the welfare rolls. The roll-back of this program will end up costing the taxpayers more money and reduce a job pool that many employers looked to for entry level hires.

Mr. Speaker, this 1,100 page bill was made available to Members at 10:30 p.m. last night. I suspect the majority of my colleagues, like me, have not had time to read through this bill line for line. We do not know what other policy shenanigans have been tucked into this massive bill.

I am also frustrated that a viable alternative, at least half the cost, was not even considered. The Republican alternative focused on small business owners and manufacturers, tax relief, consumer incentives to purchase new homes and cars and truck, along with infrastructure funding. Economists estimate this alternative would have created over 6 million jobs, twice the jobs at half the cost of the measure before us. But this alternative bill was stiff-armed by the Majority.

Mr. Speaker, it is because of all these worries and frustrations that I am not able to support this package. We could have worked on a bipartisan basis to craft a bill that we could all support. But we were not given a chance to do that. This bill was written behind closed doors by a small group of House Democrats. The American people deserve better from us. I will be voting against this bill.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Conference Report on H.R. 1, the “American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009.”

The economic challenges we are confronted with are as serious as any we’ve faced since the Great Depression. There is no doubt that we are paying the price for eight years of unregulated markets, regressive tax breaks, and a lack of investment in the needs of the American people. Now is the time to act boldly to create jobs, strengthen the frayed safety net, begin to fix our health care system, and make long-overdue investments in education, scientific innovation, and infrastructure that will spur our economy forward in the years to come. This legislation achieves all of these goals.

As Chairman of the Ways and Means Health Subcommittee, I am most proud of the health provisions in this legislation.

It is no overstatement to say that the development of an interoperable health information technology system in America will revolutionize medicine. H.R. 1 does just that. In addition to increasing efficiency and reducing unnecessary spending in our medical system, electronic health records will enable doctors to have the information they need—at their fingertips—to best treat their patients.

By building financial incentives into Medicare and Medicaid, and developing new grant programs, the Congressional Budget Office estimates that this bill will encourage 90 percent of physicians in America to adopt standardized health IT and that 70 percent of America’s hospitals will do the same. They also calculate that the improvements from this legislation will generate more than \$12 billion in savings from federal health programs and reduce health insurance premiums in the private sector as well.

H.R. 1 also makes a substantial investment to expand comparative effectiveness research. Right now, patients with the same diagnosis often receive dramatically different treatment. Medicine is an art, but also must be guided by science. By investing in this research, doctors and other health care providers will be able to obtain unbiased information regarding which procedures, pharmaceuticals, devices and other treatments work best for particular conditions. That way, they can choose the right treatment from options that have been independently evaluated.

If you’ve heard any controversy about this provision, it’s because the pharmaceutical and medical device industries are spending millions of dollars to drum up opposition. They don’t want doctors or patients to be able to objectively evaluate the value of their products. The smear campaign of disinformation has also been advanced by conservative ideologues in a cynical effort to foment distrust and discord prior to beginning a national conversation on health care reform. In fact, this research is broadly supported by a wide range of groups representing patients, physicians, health care organizations, unions and others.

H.R. 1 also protects the health care coverage for millions of workers who are losing their jobs because of our economic crisis. COBRA health continuation coverage provides a vital bridge for people to maintain their health benefits when they are between jobs. However, an average family COBRA premium is more than \$1000 a month—a financial commitment most unemployed workers can’t afford on top of their mortgages and other costs of daily living. By providing a 65 percent subsidy for these premiums for up to 9 months, H.R. 1 will help more than seven million people maintain their health coverage while they seek new employment.

When H.R. 1 is signed into law, the 111th Congress and President Obama will have done more to advance health care in America in less than two months, than was done over the entire two terms of the Bush Administration. We will also have set forth a solid road to move into the debate to guarantee that each and every person in America has affordable, quality health care that can’t be taken away.

In addition to the vital health care provisions, H.R. 1 includes essential provisions that will stimulate our economy in the short-term and build a foundation for long-term prosperity. By funding “shovel-ready” road, rail, water, school, and energy infrastructure projects we will create millions of new jobs, including more than 7,500 in my district. By bolstering safety net programs such as Unemployment Insurance and Food Stamps we are giving assistance to those hardest hit by the downturn. By investing in all levels of education, science, and clean energy we are setting the stage for economic renewal and the innovation that will drive our economy.

As President Obama has said, we will not get out of this economic mess overnight. But we can take the bold action that the current crisis demands and start the process of rebuilding our economy by passing the legislation before us today.

Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce the Business Activity Tax Simplification Act of 2009, a measure with far-reaching consequences for businesses throughout our nation.

Traditionally, states and localities have levied corporate income, franchise and other taxes only on those businesses that have a physical presence in the taxing jurisdiction. The growth of the Internet and interstate business transactions has made it possible for businesses to conduct transactions without the constraints of geopolitical boundaries. As a result, recently some states have attempted to expand their tax base by assessing business activity taxes against out-of-state companies that have customers but no property or employees in the taxing state. Both large and small companies are facing an increasingly unpredictable tax environment for businesses, which hinders business expansion and threatens the continued development of e-commerce.

The legislation we are introducing today, which I am pleased to champion with my colleague and good friend Mr. GOODLATTE—as well as Mr. ARTUR DAVIS, Ms. BACHMANN, Ms. HERSETH-SANDLIN, Mr. JONES, Mr. BOBBY SCOTT, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. WEINER, Mr. PENCE and Mr. JOE WILSON—will bring certainty to today’s increasingly chaotic tax environment for businesses by clarifying that the states cannot

attempt to tax the income of a company that has no physical presence within the taxing state's borders.

Our legislation sets forth clear, specific standards to govern when businesses should be obliged to pay business activity taxes to a state. Generally, a business must use employees or services in a state for more than 15 days in a calendar year before it is liable to pay business activity taxes to that jurisdiction.

The Business Activity Tax Simplification Act also modernizes legislation which Congress enacted 50 years ago that set clear, uniform standards for when states could tax out-of-state businesses for the solicitation of orders for sales. Like the economy of its time, the scope of Public Law 86-272 was limited to income taxes on tangible personal property. Our nation's economy has changed dramatically over the past half-century, and this outdated statute needs to be modernized to apply equally to the sale of intangible property and services, and to other business activity taxes.

I want to emphasize that the Business Activity Tax Simplification Act does not diminish the ability of states and localities to collect tax revenue. Rather, it rationalizes and makes more predictable the process of doing so.

The lack of clarity in current law has led to sometimes absurd results. A collection agent with the New Jersey Department of Taxation stopped a refrigerated truck on the New Jersey turnpike, loaded with product belonging to Smithfield Foods, a company headquartered in my state of Virginia. The agent held the truck and its driver for several hours and demanded that, to release the truck, Smithfield had to wire \$150,000 immediately to the New Jersey Department of Taxation. The agent claimed that he had the right to hold the truck and its contents because Smithfield had failed properly to file New Jersey tax returns.

Smithfield informed the New Jersey agent that his claim was unfounded. It explained that Public Law 86-272 protected it from New Jersey income taxation because it only engaged in solicitation in New Jersey and had no physical operations in the state. The agent refused to accept this explanation; however, he finally agreed to release the truck and its driver in return for \$8,000.

Smithfield appealed this aggressive and incorrect application of Public Law 86-272 to the New Jersey State tax commissioner. Ultimately, New Jersey accepted Smithfield's contention that it has no physical presence in the state and is not subject to New Jersey income tax. It issued Smithfield a refund and an apology for its roadside justice system, but not before Smithfield had invested much time and expense in resolving a situation which should not have arisen under current law. Our measure will help avoid such scenarios in the future by clarifying the physical presence standard embodied in Public Law 86-272.

New Jersey has used similar tactics against out-of-state companies selling intangible goods to its residents, a situation not covered by 86-272. It has argued that a mom-and-pop South Carolina software company with no physical presence in any states other than South Carolina and Georgia, owes a minimum of \$600 per year in corporate income taxes and fees based only on the sale of licensed software to a New Jersey entity, and that the company would owe such tax every year that its software was in use in the state, even for those years in which the company had no income from any customer in New Jersey.

The Louisiana Department of Revenue has threatened to assess business activity taxes on several out-of-state companies based merely on the fact that they broadcast programming into the state, arguing that the companies are exploiting the Louisiana market because the programming is seen or heard by individuals in Louisiana.

Several states attempt to assess business activity taxes on out-of-state credit card companies based on the fact that their customers reside in the taxing jurisdiction and on arguments that the credit card company has engaged in the "substantial privilege of carrying on business" in the state.

The Business Activity Tax Simplification Act offers Members the opportunity to put an end to nonsensical situations like these. In doing so, we will provide certainty to both U.S. businesses and to states, thereby fostering economic growth and development. I thank Mr. GOODLATTE and the original cosponsors of the Business Activity Tax Simplification Act for their support, and I urge each of my colleagues to assist us in enacting this much needed bipartisan legislation.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Conference Report to H.R. 1, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

American families, increasingly out of work and burdened by debt, are spending less, and businesses have drastically reduced their spending as a result.

That leaves only the federal government as the spender of last resort.

This bill is not perfect: it is not nearly large enough to replace the losses in Gross Domestic Product that characterize the current recession. But it lays a foundation of targeted government spending that will create millions of jobs.

It will also strengthen the social safety net so that families who have been hit hard by the economic downturn have the basic levels of resources they need.

The bill also addresses a component crisis of this recession: the spillover effects of large concentrations of foreclosed vacant and abandoned houses on our communities. Neighborhoods are the innocent bystanders in the foreclosure crisis.

As foreclosures and the vacant houses they can create continue at a record pace, the bill provides an additional \$2 billion to help our neighborhoods prevent the increased crime and deflated property values that come along with abandoned foreclosed properties.

It will also create jobs, and those jobs will be located in some of the hardest hit areas of the country. Fortunately, those funds are there, after being taken out by the Senate. I would like to thank Speaker PELOSI and conferees for including \$2 billion for the Neighborhood Stabilization Program.

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House are being asked to say to vote for a so-called stimulus package. This comes after having only 10 hours in the dark of night to read the final language of the 1,000 page report, which itemizes how we are to spend nearly a trillion taxpayer dollars.

Our economy is struggling right now and Kansans are well aware of that fact. Yet, by overwhelming majorities, they are asking me to vote against this package today. Kansans are pleading with Congress to look beyond

just tomorrow and look toward what is best for long-term economic recovery. Even the non-partisan Congressional Budget Office predicted that over the next decade, the extra debt created by this bill will "crowd out" private investment and lead to lower GDP. We are about to pass what will be the largest burden that one generation has ever passed on to another. And the non-partisan CBO says it won't even work! This hampers our economy in the long run and burdens our children with even more debt.

My constituents in Kansas are asking for real economic relief, not funding for pet-projects. While the majority continues to claim that this bill contains no earmarks, it still has billions in it to fund "green" golf carts, mouse habitats, and other such projects the majority evidently believes is a good use of Kansans' hard-earned tax dollars.

The conference committee, behind closed doors, decided \$8 billion for a high-speed railway between Las Vegas and Los Angeles will better stimulate the economy than an additional \$200 in the pockets of hard-working families all across our nation. My constituents are the folks who know best how to spend a dollar and stimulate the economy, not a distant federal bureaucracy in Washington.

A real stimulus needs to have a balance of tax relief and targeted investment. The majority is exploiting the current economic downturn to jam through a bill full of irresponsible spending and government expansion.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this non-stimulus package because it is selfish and irresponsible.

It is selfish—because it will burden future generations for years to come with unbelievable debt; trillions of dollars stolen from our children and grandchildren.

It is irresponsible—because it won't work! It will not stimulate the economy. It will not create jobs. It has been shown to be misguided by over 300 prominent economists, including three Nobel Prize winners.

In addition, the process has been an affront to all Americans. Less than 15 hours to read a bill over 1000 pages in length. Less than 2 hours of debate on the floor of the House on the most expensive spending bill in the history of mankind!

This is simply wrong.

Attached are three articles from papers today revealing the folly of this process and product.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 13, 2009]

DESPITE PLEDGES, PACKAGE HAS SOME PORK
(By Dan Eggen and Ellen Nakashima)

The compromise stimulus bill adopted by House and Senate negotiators this week is not free of spending that benefits specific communities, industries or groups, despite vows by President Obama that the legislation would be kept clear of pet projects, according to lawmakers, legislative aides and anti-tax groups.

The deal provides \$8 billion for high-speed rail projects, for example, including money that could benefit a controversial proposal for a magnetic-levitation rail line between Disneyland, in California, and Las Vegas, a project favored by Senate Majority Leader Harry M. Reid (D-Nev.). The 311-mph train could make the trip from Sin City to Tomorrowland in less than two hours, according to backers.

A new alliance of battery companies won \$2 billion in grants and loans in the stimulus package to jump-start the domestic lithium

ion industry. Filipino veterans, most of whom do not live in the United States, will get \$200 million in long-awaited compensation for service in World War II.

The nation's small shipyards also made out well, with \$100 million in grant money—a tenfold increase in funding from last year, when the federal Maritime Administration launched the program to benefit yards in places such as Ketchikan, Alaska, and Bayou La Bate, Ala.

None of the items in the sprawling \$789 billion package are traditional earmarks—funding for a project inserted by a lawmaker bypassing the normal budgeting process—according to the White House and Democratic leaders. Republicans also killed or reduced a number of projects they considered objectionable, such as \$200 million to re-sod the Mall in Washington and money for a new Coast Guard polar icebreaker.

But many Republicans, anti-tax advocates and other critics argue that the final version of the bill is still larded with wasteful spending and dubious initiatives that will do little to create jobs or spur financial markets. The legislation's sheer size and complexity set off a lobbying spectacle over the past few weeks, as diverse interests including pharmaceutical companies, cement firms and manufacturers of energy-saving light bulbs converged on Washington to elbow for their share.

"You have a moving vehicle, and people are trying to pile on and influence it in any way they can," said David Merritt, a health policy adviser to the presidential campaign of Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.) who is now a project director with Newt Gingrich's Center for Health Transformation.

Stimulus advocates say the GOP complaints are overheated and generally focus on projects that Republicans dislike for ideological reasons. Chad Stone, chief economist at the liberal-leaning Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, defended the bill. "The overwhelming bulk of what is in the package is effective and well-designed stimulus," he said.

Money for high-speed rail ballooned during the stimulus debate, from nothing in the House bill to \$2 billion in the Senate version and finally \$8 billion in the conference report, which was put together by Reid and other Democratic leaders.

Reid spokesman Jon Summers said in a statement that the transportation secretary "will have complete flexibility as to which program he uses to allocate the funds," but he acknowledged that "the proposed Los Angeles-Las Vegas rail project would be eligible." Summers said the rail funding "was a major priority for President Obama, and Sen. Reid as a conferee supported it."

One of the biggest targets of GOP complaints was a measure in the Senate version of the bill that did not name a recipient but would have provided \$2 billion for "one or more near zero emissions power plant(s)." Sen. Tom Coburn (R-Okla.) and other Republicans say the provision was clearly directed at reviving the FutureGen Alliance project, a proposed "clean coal" plant in Illinois.

Coburn called the item the "largest earmark in American history," but in the end he was able to claim only a partial victory, as the conference bill still contains \$1 billion that could be spent on FutureGen.

Another \$800 million is set aside for other carbon-capture projects, and a clause allows the money to go to projects that use petroleum coke instead of coal. That would probably benefit a company called Hydrogen Energy, which is jointly owned by British Petroleum and the multinational mining company Rio Tinto and has plans to build a power plant in California.

A provision introduced by freshman Rep. Larry Kissell (D-N.C.), a former textile in-

dustry employee, will require the Transportation Security Administration to purchase uniforms manufactured in the United States; most TSA clothing is currently assembled in Mexico and Honduras from U.S.-made fabric. The cost of the requirement is unclear—the agency spends about \$3 million on 12,000 new uniforms each year—but labor and trade groups argue that it will create 21,000 U.S. jobs.

"We view this as a very inexpensive way to create jobs and also stabilize jobs in place," said Lloyd Wood of the American Manufacturing Trade Action Coalition.

[From Indystar, Feb. 13, 2009]

ANALYSIS: STIMULUS WON'T JUMP-START ECONOMY

(By Jeannine Aversa)

WASHINGTON.—No, the big stimulus plan won't "save or create 3.5 million jobs," as the president and congressional Democrats claim—at least not this year.

The economy will remain feeble through 2009, analysts warn, and businesses will keep shedding jobs, though not as many as they would have without the \$789 billion boost.

The stimulus agreement, heading for final votes in the next day or so, goes to the heart of President Barack Obama's strategy to revive the economy and will go far in shaping how Americans view his economic leadership.

What it won't do is quickly snap the country out of the painful recession, now in its second year.

It should provide some relief, economists say, though some argue it won't plow enough money into the economy to prop it up.

Tax cuts will spur at least some spending by consumers and businesses, and that should help save or create jobs. Aid flowing to cash-squeezed states will prevent some layoffs.

And money for big public works projects, such as bridge and road repairs, and longer-term ventures, such as networks for more high-speed Internet connections, eventually will generate jobs and stir economic activity.

But even with the stimulus, many economists predict a net loss of 2 million, 3 million or even more jobs this year. The recession already had cost 3.6 million jobs through January. The unemployment rate, now at 7.6 percent, the highest in more than 16 years, will probably hit at least 9 percent by next year.

"The stimulus package is not going to turn the economy around right now," said William Gale, director of economic studies at the Brookings Institution.

"The best-case scenario is that it mitigates the depth and the severity of the downturn. That's not a bad thing. It's just not the magic bullet that fixes everything."

Some analysts say the job market won't return to normal health—with unemployment hovering around 5 percent—until as late as 2013.

And the broader economy? No sudden revival there either.

The economy is expected to slide backward for all of 2009—a decline in gross domestic product of more than 1 percent. That may not sound like much, but it would be the first yearly decline since 1991.

"Congress put the minimum charge into the stimulus battery," said Brian Bethune, economist at IHS Global Insight. "We're taking this big chance, turning the key and praying there is enough juice to turn over the economy. We should have juiced it up so much that we are guaranteed that this engine will start" through a bigger package of tax reductions.

This recession has proved especially stubborn and dangerous. The root causes—hous-

ing, credit and financial crises—are the worst since the 1930s and don't lend themselves to quick fixes.

The package includes Obama's signature "Making Work Pay" tax credit for 95 percent of workers. But negotiators scaled it back from Obama's campaign promise: to \$400 a year for individuals, instead of his \$500, and \$800 for couples, down from his \$1,000.

That equals around an extra \$13 a week in most paychecks, and it should show up very quickly after Obama signs the bill. The hope is Americans will then feel more inclined to go out and buy, which would help bolster the economy.

But will recession-shocked consumers, spooked by vanishing jobs, shattered nest eggs, tanking home values and surging foreclosures, actually spend money?

"Chances are people are going to save much or most of the tax cuts because of the climate of uncertainty and doom and gloom," Gale said.

Given the severity of the problems, economists said, the bigger the economic revival package the better. Some said it needed to be \$1 trillion to make a noticeable difference this year.

Others argued that the package should have been front-loaded with a lot more money—at least \$500 billion—in tax cuts, which tend to act more quickly to boost economic activity.

Mark Zandi, chief economist at Moody's Economy.com, estimates the bill will create just more than 2 million jobs by the end of 2010. The problem is, the recession will probably wipe out many more jobs than that. Zandi's prediction: 6.5 million jobs will disappear.

[From the Washington Times, Feb. 13, 2009]

CBO PREDICTS LOWER GDP IN A DECADE

(Stephen Dinan and S.A. Miller)

The Congressional Budget Office says President Obama's giant economic recovery bill will actually hurt Americans' paychecks in the long run, even if the plan's tax cuts start out putting an extra \$13 a week in most worker's pockets.

Building on a report issued last week, the Congressional Budget Office, Congress's official scorekeeper, said the flood of spending will boost the economy in the short term and will create new jobs. But over 10 years, extra debt will "crowd out" private investment, leading to a lower gross domestic product, which would hurt workers' wages.

"The reduction in GDP is therefore estimated to be reflected in lower wages rather than lower employment, as workers will be less productive because the capital stock is smaller," CBO said in a report issued Wednesday night, although it did not say how much damage would be done.

But for now, Alyson Jacobson, 42, said she'll take the \$13. She said she'd spur the economy buying haircuts for her four young children when the tax cut kicks in this spring.

"I'll have to save up for two weeks," the social worker in Bowie said of the anticipated spending spree. "It could go into more fruits because fruits are getting so expensive."

Her husband's pay is expected to get a \$13 boost, and the couple could pocket expanded child tax credits under the bill that leaders of the Democrat-led Congress scrambled to finalize Thursday.

The child tax credit will put about \$1,000 more in tax credits in the pockets of qualifying families with at least three children. The bill would expand the 15 percent credit to every dollar earned over \$3,000 from the current \$10,000 threshold.

As for the economy as a whole, CBO said in the short term, it will be better off with

spending; but over 10 years, the economy would at best break even and could actually be two-tenths of a percent lower than if Congress did not act.

Republicans, who have fought Mr. Obama's stimulus plan, said numbers confirm their fears.

"This is what happens when one party negotiates behind closed doors—you end up with bad legislation," said Rep. Dave Camp of Michigan, the top Republican on the House Ways and Means Committee, which writes tax laws. "What the Democrats are asking the American people to do is buy a \$1.1 trillion-dollar plane that barely gets off the ground before crashing. The ones left inside that wreckage will be the American worker and taxpayer."

Drew Hammill, spokesman for House Speaker Nancy Pelosi, California Democrat, blamed the bulk of the debt problems on former President George W. Bush and said they know they'll need to take more action to produce good-paying jobs.

"We know the deficits created by the previous administration are going to continue to have an impact on the economy," Mr. Hammill said. "We know that we can't afford not to act with the legislation that has been finalized, and we know there's going to have to be other pieces of legislation to address other economic concerns."

The CBO report said the new spending would create or save between 800,000 and 2.3 million jobs in 2009 and by 2010 would account for between 1.2 million and 3.6 million jobs.

The White House did not comment on the report. Mr. Obama has predicted that his plan could create or save up to 4 million jobs.

The extra \$13 a week will show up in pay this spring when the withholding formula is adjusted. Starting next year, the credit will add about \$7.70 per week to individual paychecks.

"It's almost pocket change," said Cindy Hockenberry, an accountant and research coordinator with the National Association of Tax Professionals. "To be quite honest, amounts that small I don't think [taxpayers] are going to feel it."

The tax relief, including business tax breaks, adds up to \$275 billion, or about a third of the \$789 billion package. The rest of the money—\$515 billion—is spending.

The Jacobsons also could be among the 23 million middle-class families to benefit from a suspension of the alternative minimum tax (AMT), which would otherwise wallop families making as little as \$50,000 a year with a 26 percent or 28 percent income tax rate.

The AMT was adopted in 1969 to make tax-sheltered wealthy Americans pay at least some income taxes. But it was not indexed for inflation and, over time, hit middle-income taxpayers if not forestalled by temporary "patches" passed annually by Congress. This year's patch was included in the stimulus.

The tax cut—which is supposed to help 95 percent of Americans, including low-income workers who do not earn enough to pay income taxes—would give single workers up to \$400 a year and families up to \$800.

The tax credit phases out completely for workers earning more than \$100,000 a year and couple earning more than \$200,000.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, at about 10:00 p.m. last night, the text of the \$792-billion so-called "stimulus" package was finally made available to Republicans. At 11:00 p.m., this 1073-page package was finally posted online for the public to see it. And, votes are expected by 2:00 p.m. today.

Are Republican legislators really supposed to digest and comprehend the single most

transformational piece of legislation that has come through Congress in 16 hours? We do a great disservice to the American people today by rushing this package through.

But, the level of disrespect we show the taxpayers today by this perversion of process is far exceeded by the level of disrespect we show the taxpayer by the substance of this package. As the Los Angeles Times stated in an editorial today, this bill "serves as a case study for the timeworn notion that haste makes waste."

Whether by design (The Washington Post did report that "House Speaker Nancy Pelosi . . . called the legislation 'historic and transformational' for its investments in Democratic social priorities.") or as a byproduct of the political wrangling to get the bill to the floor, this bill is chock-full of the pet projects and political priorities that lobbyists and lawmakers insisted upon.

But, the bill is supposed to have a single purpose: to stimulate the economy. Congress' one and only criterion for any project or program should have been its ability to help grow the economy and help create jobs. Again, the Los Angeles Times noted that scattered throughout the bill "are proposals that advance a political agenda more than an economic one."

Targeted investment in transportation construction is proven to grow the economy and create jobs. The U.S. Department of Transportation reported last year that every \$1 billion in federal highway investment, when combined with the required state matching funds, supports 34,779 American jobs. Of that, only about 12,000 are actual construction jobs. The rest are in supplier industries or related economic sectors. That's why Republicans in the House had moved to reprioritize spending in the House bill and triple investments in transportation construction—a motion the majority flatly rejected.

There is a substantial and tangible ripple effect to these investments. Yet, it gets lip service in this bill: \$27.5 billion of the \$792 billion bill (a mere 3.4% of the total bill) is invested in this proven stimulator.

Tax relief is similarly stimulative. The Republican alternative that was rejected by the majority would have created twice the jobs at half the cost. It would have done so by putting money back into the pockets of those who would use it to create jobs and to keep money cycling through the economy.

Amongst other things, this alternative, which I did support would have:

Reduced the lowest individual tax rates from 15% to 10% and from 10% to 5%. In Minnesota's Sixth Congressional District, 272,306 filers would benefit from the reduction in the 10% bracket alone and 228,926 filers would also benefit from the other rate reduction.

Allowed small businesses to take a tax deduction equal to 20% of their income. Nearly half a million Minnesota small businesses—each employing 500 or fewer employees—would benefit from this.

And, provided a home-buyers credit of \$7500 for those who can make a minimum down-payment of 5%.

What's more, Mr. Speaker, this package sets upon the shoulders of generations of Americans a debt that I don't think we can even comprehend. With this so-called stimulus, we raise the government's commitment to addressing this economic downturn over the

past year to \$9.7 trillion. From the first set of rebate checks passed last February to the bill before us now, \$9.7 trillion has been spent or pledged to addressing this recession.

And, all reports indicate that there is more to come. Treasury Secretary Timothy Geithner talked about another \$2 trillion for financial service sector bailouts just this week. President Obama's economic advisor, Larry Summers, has talked about additional stimulus and financial service bailouts that will be needed in the months to come. President Obama noted that this is just a leg in a stool when he came before the Republican Conference only a couple of weeks ago.

That's just for what's actually in the bill. A long history of expanding federal budgets has made it clear to the American people that no increase in spending is ever temporary. As the Los Angeles Times noted the \$191 billion in increased benefit spending in this package "expand programs that may be hard to trim after the crisis passes. . . . What's worse, there are no accountability measures attached to those funds. . . ."

An analysis by staff at the House Budget Committee looked at what happens if Congress continues to fund just 19 of the most politically popular programs at their new stimulus levels—programs like Pell Grants, Head Start, food stamps. Over the ten-year period ending in 2019, "these 19 programs alone would increase federal outlays and tax entitlements by \$1.59 trillion." (Wall Street Journal, February 12, 2009)

Even before we add in the financial service sector bailout and this "stimulus" bill, the American people were looking at the largest budget deficit in modern history for 2009—8.3% of the economy. According to an analysis by the Strategas Group, if you add in this bill and the bailout, "the deficit could hit nearly \$2 trillion, or 13.5% of the U.S. economy." The Wall Street Journal rightly calls this "uncharted territory" and reminds us that the consequences could mean "new federal debt in the trillions of dollars over the next few years, which could test the limits America's credit-worthiness," and could mean that "the U.S. will become less desirable as a destination for the world's capital."

With this bill today, Congress isn't helping America to dig itself out of the recessionary hole, we're merely digging it deeper. I cannot support this new direction for the American economy, Mr. Speaker. I stand today on the side of the American taxpayer and will vote to oppose this bill.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, the following letters relate to a matter of jurisdiction with respect to a provision included in the conference agreement to H.R. 1

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, February 13, 2009.

Hon. CHARLES B. RANGEL,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means,
Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN RANGEL: I write regarding the section entitled "Grants for Specified Energy Property in Lieu of Tax Credits" in H.R. 1. Although originally passed by the House of Representatives as a program administered by the Department of Energy, under the conference agreement on this bill, this program will reside at the Department of the Treasury.

I am pleased that the consultation process between our Committees has resulted in an

understanding that this grant program will be under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Energy and Commerce despite its administration through the Department of the Treasury.

I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding with respect to this program. I would also ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during consideration of the conference report on the House floor.

Sincerely,

HENRY A. WAXMAN,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
Washington, DC, February 13, 2009.

Hon. HENRY A. WAXMAN,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce,
Rayburn House Office Building, Wash-
ington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN WAXMAN: I write in response to your letter regarding the section entitled "Grants for Specified Energy Property in Lieu of Tax Credits" in H.R. 1. Although originally passed by the House of Representatives as a program administered by the Department of Energy, under the conference agreement on this bill, this program will reside at the Department of the Treasury.

I am pleased to confirm that the consultation process between our Committees has resulted in an understanding that this grant program will be under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Energy and Commerce despite its administration through the Department of the Treasury.

I will submit a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter for inclusion in the Congressional Record during consideration of the conference report on the House floor.

Sincerely,

CHARLES B. RANGEL,
Chairman.

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Mr. Speaker, the economy is in crisis—my constituents in Southeastern Pennsylvania and I see it every day.

Our families are struggling with lost income and lost health insurance—even as the demands on household budgets grow.

Our businesses are struggling with lost consumers, increased costs, and difficulties in accessing capital.

Our state, cities and towns are struggling with shrinking revenues in the face of increased demand for services, aging infrastructure and other obligations.

Today we will take the action essential to provide relief, create jobs, and lay the groundwork for future economic growth.

We will: cut taxes for 95% of American workers; reduce the cost of COBRA health coverage for the unemployed; improve access to capital and stimulate growth; repair infrastructure; invest in new energy sources and energy efficiencies; and drive the innovation that will keep America competitive in the global market place.

I am particularly proud of the major new investment in health information technology that will lead to near universal use of electronic medical records within 10 years—improving the quality and coordination of care, saving lives, and saving costs for patients, employers, and taxpayers.

This recovery package is a smart, timely investment to meet today's challenges and fulfill America's promise.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my Chair-

man, Mr. OBERSTAR, and Chairman OBEY for elevating the importance of Obey infrastructure investment towards the economic recovery of our Nation.

I strongly support the Conference Report to H.R. 1, particularly the infrastructure components, which direct desperately needed funds into our Nation's roads, bridges, transit systems, airports, and water-related infrastructure.

Each \$1 billion of Federal funds invested in infrastructure creates or sustains approximately thirty-four thousand jobs and \$6.2 billion in economic activity.

The \$64 billion dollars for infrastructure investments outlined in the bill will provide a real, tangible benefit to the seven hundred thousand individuals currently unemployed in my state—whether as a paycheck for those responsible for constructing these vital projects, or through increased productivity for small businesses that produce the materials needed for infrastructure projects.

However, unlike other economic recovery proposals, infrastructure investment provides not only a short-term benefit to American families, it also provides a long-term benefit in terms of sustainable and reliable infrastructure, as well as the potential for increased productivity for the Nation's economy through the efficient movement of goods and services.

Finally, infrastructure investment provides one of the only benefits that cannot be shipped off to foreign lands. The direct beneficiaries of domestic infrastructure projects are our towns, our local communities, our constituents.

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, the American economy is in dire straits and our constituents are looking to us to act. This is a moment when we should be coming together, putting party differences aside, and crafting responsible legislation that will both solve the problem and unite the country. I do not believe H.R. 1 is this legislation.

I am also disappointed that this conference was so small—with only five Members from the House—that it could have been conducted around the dining room table of my house in Cape Girardeau. It was so brief that it could have been over before I had the chance to make coffee for everyone.

Despite the promises of bipartisanship made at the outset, this legislation has been constructed and finished behind closed doors. The motion to instruct conferees we passed here unanimously gave members of this House 48 hours to review the bill before we vote. We got 14.

The American economy is hurting, families in my district in Southern Missouri are hurting, and we are applying a code of priorities here that doesn't fit the crisis we're facing. These funds should go to the people and places with the greatest potential to create jobs and improve the economy. This bill deviates from that mission while better solutions have been largely ignored.

Regarding the contents of the Financial Services portion of the conference report, I am pleased it reduces funding below both the House and Senate levels. However, \$6.9 billion for the Financial Services Subcommittee is still too much.

GSA will get \$5.5 billion to build and renovate new Federal buildings and ports of entry. However, in fiscal year 2008, GSA received a total appropriation of only \$1.4 billion for construction and renovations. This is a

huge windfall for an agency that, in my opinion, already has a hard time managing its regular budget.

The Accountability and Transparency Board created by this bill was provided \$14 million in the House bill, and \$7 million in the Senate bill. The funding for the Board in this conference report mysteriously increases to \$84 million. Even though this is called a "transparency" board, as the Ranking Member, I do not know how or why the funding increases by 600 percent over the House bill. Maybe these funds are needed, but no one on my side of the aisle knows who asked for this funding or how it will be spent.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act and I congratulate President Obama, our leadership, all of the committee chairs, and the staffs for crafting this legislation under extraordinary circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, this country is facing the worst recession in its history. Economists across the globe have confirmed this fact stating "the U.S. recession will be the longest and will worsen without heavy government spending." Just last month nearly 600,000 jobs were lost which is the deepest cut in payrolls in 34 years and the jobless rate of 7.6 percent is at its highest level in more than 16 years. Moreover of the top 20 monthly job losses in the history of this country 5 have happened in the last seven months.

Mr. Speaker as a student of history, I have tried to find a moment when our country faced such economic and political uncertainty. And as fate would have it, that moment was yesterday, as we marked the 200 year anniversary of President Abraham Lincoln's birthday and the 100 year anniversary of the NAACP.

As President Lincoln focused his efforts on keeping the Union whole, a great economic and social question loomed. What should the country do with its slaves? President Lincoln felt so strongly about maintaining the Union that he emancipated the slaves but the question of their economic and social well-being remained largely unaddressed.

It took a civil rights movement, Mr. Speaker, led by organizations like the NAACP to highlight the deplorable and inequitable economic conditions freed blacks faced. These conditions lay bare for the world to see in areas like: education, employment, housing, nutrition, and health. And it is these issues, Mr. Speaker, which are addressed in this bill.

For history has taught us that, you cannot pull a country out of recession or move a country forward unless you address these inequities. So while many of my colleagues will talk about all the new technologies and great ideas in this bill, I prefer to focus on the check Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. spoke about in 1963 at the Lincoln Memorial. Where he stated the following:

In a sense we have come to our nation's capital to cash a check. When the architects of our republic wrote the magnificent words of the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence, they were signing a promissory note to which every American was to fall heir. This note was a promise that all men, yes, black men as well as white men, would be guaranteed the unalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

It is obvious today that America has defaulted on this promissory note insofar as her citizens of color are concerned. Instead of honoring this sacred obligation, America

has given the Negro people a bad check, a check which has come back marked insufficient funds. But we refuse to believe that the bank of justice is bankrupt. We refuse to believe that there are insufficient funds in the great vaults of opportunity of this nation. So we have come to cash this check—a check that will give us upon demand the riches of freedom and the security of justice.

We have also come to this hallowed spot to remind America of the fierce urgency of now. This is no time to engage in the luxury of cooling off or to take the tranquilizing drug of gradualism. Now is the time to make real the promises of democracy. Now is the time to rise from the dark and desolate valley of segregation to the sunlit path of racial justice. Now is the time to lift our nation from the quick sands of racial injustice to the solid rock of brotherhood. Now is the time to make justice a reality for all of God's children.

Mr. Speaker, we have to act now, so that the families in Sumter, South Carolina will have clean water, so that children at J.V. Martin Junior High School in Dillon, South Carolina will no longer have to learn in a 150 year old school, so that a mother in Charleston, South Carolina will not be homeless, so that kids in Columbia, South Carolina will have a summer job, so that a teacher in Anderson Primary School in Williamsburg, South Carolina will not lose their job, and so that family in Florence, South Carolina looking for a way out of this economic recession will not suffer under a Governor's political ideology.

Mr. Speaker, America works when all of America is working and today we are ensuring that this promise of work in America will not be marked "insufficient funds."

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I support the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009. While this legislation is not perfect, it marks a strong response to the economic challenges faced by Oregon's hard-working families and it deserves support. In particular, I would like to highlight several elements of the legislation that are important to Oregonians and to the nation.

This legislation will create 3.5 million jobs and will give 95 percent of American workers an immediate tax cut. The bill also offers significant tax relief to homebuyers, manufacturers, and small businesses.

The legislation provides a significant extension of unemployment benefits, provides aid to Oregon to modernize our unemployment system and expand its coverage, and helps unemployed workers maintain their healthcare coverage.

This legislation puts a down payment on a much-needed investment in roads, bridges, mass transit, energy efficient buildings, flood control, clean water projects, and other infrastructure projects. These efforts will begin rebuilding and renewing America.

The legislation invests in health information technology to modernize our health care system and improve health outcomes. This investment will put people to work and will create a more efficient, effective health care system with fewer deaths, fewer complications, and lower health care costs.

The economic recovery package also represents a leap forward for the nation's clean energy economy. It includes about \$37.5 billion in funding for energy programs, almost double the Energy Department's typical entire annual budget, and more than 10 times the amount normally spent on conservation and

renewable energy. It also includes about \$20 billion in tax incentives for energy efficiency and renewable programs, which I helped design as a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Oregon is known for the progress that we have made developing a new energy future and for the innovative ways that we approach healthcare, sustainability, and transportation. This legislation will buttress those endeavors, while creating jobs and easing the economic impacts on those already hard hit. So, while I retain concerns about elements of the legislation, I feel strongly that we must seize this opportunity to rescue our economy and transform it to meet the challenges of the twenty-first century.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the conferees restored some of the state stabilization dollars previously approved by the House to help soften the financial crunch on local governments and schools. Having just come from the local government ranks—representing Fairfax County, Virginia, which if it were a city would be the nation's 13th largest city with the nation's 12th largest school system—I can tell you our local governments are hemorrhaging in the current economic crisis and are facing steep reductions in staff and services. You see, our state and local government partners do not have the luxury of printing money or enacting continuing resolutions. By statute they must balance their budgets annually.

While the final number for local and state aid is not as much as we wanted—and significantly less than what is needed—this investment is nonetheless critical to ensuring that our state and local partners are in a position to quickly advance on the investments and initiatives as the dollars begin to flow from this stimulus package. The aid we provide will help prevent layoffs for the very workers who will be carrying out the mission of this historic recovery package.

With respect to education, I and many of my colleagues, continue to be disappointed that the House's original proposal for school construction was not maintained. Some argued that school construction is not a federal responsibility when, in fact, the federal government has supported school renovation and construction in the past expressly for the purpose of creating jobs. During the Great Depression, the Works Progress Administration created hundreds of thousands of new jobs through the construction of 4,383 new schools and the renovation of thousands more in response to the greatest economic crisis of the 20th Century. Thankfully, some flexibility remains within the bill to allow school districts a means to address their growing capital needs and create new jobs.

Current data indicate our economy may contract by as much as \$2 trillion during this global crisis. With our action today, the Congress is investing \$789 billion to provide some cushion for workers, families and employers. We must do something. We must act. This bill is not the perfect solution, but, in the worst economic meltdown in 80 years, it is about stimulating economic activity, restoring credit flow to consumers and small businesses, financing critical investments that will have continuing returns for generations to come, and restoring the confidence of consumers and investors in our economy.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Thank you, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 168, the previous question is ordered.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. In its current form, yes, I do oppose the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. Miller of Michigan moves to recommit the conference report on the bill H.R. 1 to the committee of conference with instructions to the managers on the part of the House to—

(1) accept section 1008 of subtitle A of division B of the Senate amendment (relating to above-the-line deduction for interest on indebtedness with respect to the purchases of certain motor vehicles), and

(2) accept section 1009 of subtitle A of division B of the Senate amendment (relating to above-the-line deduction for State sales tax and excise tax on the purchase of certain motor vehicles).

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on adopting the conference report; and suspending the rules with regard to House Resolution 139, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 186, nays 244, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 69]

YEAS—186

Aderholt	Brown (GA)	Cuellar
Akin	Brown (SC)	Culberson
Alexander	Brown-Waite,	Davis (KY)
Arcuri	Ginny	Deal (GA)
Austria	Burgess	Dent
Bachmann	Burton (IN)	Diaz-Balart, L.
Bachus	Buyer	Diaz-Balart, M.
Barrett (SC)	Calvert	Dreier
Barrow	Camp	Duncan
Bartlett	Cantor	Ehlers
Barton (TX)	Cao	Emerson
Biggert	Capito	Fallin
Billray	Carney	Fleming
Bilirakis	Carter	Forbes
Bishop (UT)	Cassidy	Fortenberry
Blackburn	Castle	Foxx
Blunt	Chaffetz	Franks (AZ)
Boehner	Chandler	Frelinghuysen
Bonner	Childers	Gallegly
Bono Mack	Coble	Gerlach
Boozman	Coffman (CO)	Gingrey (GA)
Boustany	Cole	Gohmert
Brady (TX)	Conaway	Goodlatte
Bright	Crenshaw	Granger

Graves Marchant
 Griffith Matheson
 Guthrie McCarthy (CA)
 Hall (TX) McCaul
 Harper McClintock
 Hastings (WA) McCotter
 Heller McHenry
 Hensarling McHugh
 Herger McKeon
 Hoekstra McMorris
 Hunter Rodgers
 Inglis Mica
 Issa Miller (FL)
 Jenkins Miller (MI)
 Johnson (IL) Miller, Gary
 Johnson, Sam Mitchell
 Jones Moran (KS)
 Jordan (OH) Murphy, Tim
 King (IA) Myrick
 King (NY) Neugebauer
 Kingston Nunes
 Kirk Nye
 Kline (MN) Olson
 Kratovil Paul
 Lamborn Paulsen
 Lance Pence
 Latham Peters
 LaTourette Petri
 Latta Pitts
 Lewis (CA) Platts
 Linder Poe (TX)
 LoBiondo Posey
 Lucas Price (GA)
 Luetkemeyer Putnam
 Lummis Radanovich
 Lungren, Daniel Rehberg
 E. Reichert
 Mack Roe (TN)
 Manzullo Rogers (AL)

Rogers (KY)
 Rogers (MI)
 Rohrabacher
 Rooney
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Roskam
 Royce
 Scalise
 Schauer
 Schmidt
 Schock
 Sensenbrenner
 Sessions
 Shadegg
 Shimkus
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Souder
 Stearns
 Sullivan
 Terry
 Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Tiahrt
 Tiberi
 Turner
 Upton
 Walden
 Wamp
 Westmoreland
 Whitfield
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Wolf
 Young (AK)
 Young (FL)

Peterson
 Pingree (ME)
 Polis (CO)
 Pomeroy
 Price (NC)
 Rahall
 Rangel
 Reyes
 Richardson
 Rodriguez
 Ross
 Rothman (NJ)
 Roybal-Allard
 Ruppersberger
 Rush
 Ryan (OH)
 Ryan (WI)
 Salazar
 Sanchez, Linda
 T.
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Sarbanes
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schrader
 Schwartz
 Scott (GA)
 Scott (VA)
 Serrano
 Sestak
 Shea-Porter
 Sherman
 Shuler
 Sires
 Skelton
 Slaughter
 Smith (WA)
 Snyder
 Solis (CA)
 Space
 Speier
 Spratt
 Stark
 Stupak
 Sutton
 Tanner
 Tauscher
 Taylor
 Teague
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Tierney
 Titus
 Tonko
 Towns
 Tsongas
 Van Hollen
 Velázquez
 Viscolsky
 Walz
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters
 Watson
 Watt
 Waxman
 Weiner
 Welch
 Wexler
 Wilson (OH)
 Woolsey
 Wu
 Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—3

□ 1415

Messrs. SERRANO, ADLER of New Jersey, LARSEN of Washington, Ms. WATSON, Messrs. HINCHEY, PASCRELL, CARDOZA, RUSH, and ELLSWORTH changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. MCKEON, SOUDER, CARNEY, MORAN of Kansas, and YOUNG of Alaska changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 246, nays 183, answered “present” 1, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 70]

YEAS—246

Abercrombie
 Ackerman
 Adler (NJ)
 Altmire
 Andrews
 Baca
 Baird
 Baldwin
 Bean
 Becerra
 Berkley
 Berman
 Berry
 Bishop (GA)
 Bishop (NY)
 Blumenauer
 Boccieri
 Boren
 Boswell
 Boucher
 Boyd
 Brady (PA)
 Braley (IA)
 Brown, Corrine
 Buchanan
 Butterfield
 Capps
 Capuano
 Cardoza
 Carnahan
 Carson (IN)
 Castor (FL)
 Clarke
 Clay
 Cleaver
 Cohen
 Connolly (VA)
 Conyers
 Cooper
 Costa
 Costello
 Courtney
 Crowley
 Cummings
 Dahlkemper
 Davis (AL)
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (TN)
 DeFazio
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Donnelly (IN)
 Doyle

Kissell
 Klein (FL)
 Kosmas
 Kucinich
 Langevin
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Lee (CA)
 Levin
 Lewis (GA)
 Lipinski
 Loeb sack
 Lofgren, Zoe
 Lowey
 Lujan
 Lynch
 Maffei
 Maloney
 Markey (CO)
 Markey (MA)
 Marshall
 Massa
 Matsui
 McCarthy (NY)
 Hall (NY)
 McDermott
 McGovern
 Arcuri
 Baca
 Baird
 Baldwin
 Barrow
 Bean
 Becerra
 Berkley
 Berman
 Berry
 Bishop (GA)
 Bishop (NY)
 Blumenauer
 Boccieri
 Boren
 Boswell
 Boucher
 Boyd
 Brady (PA)
 Braley (IA)
 Brown, Corrine
 Butterfield
 Capps
 Capuano
 Cardoza
 Carnahan
 Carney
 Carson (IN)
 Castor (FL)
 Chandler
 Childers
 Clarke
 Clay
 Cleaver
 Cohen
 Connolly (VA)
 Conyers
 Cooper
 Costa
 Costello
 Courtney
 Crowley
 Cuellar
 Cummings
 Dahlkemper
 Davis (AL)
 Hare
 Harman
 Hastings (FL)
 Heinrich
 Baldwin
 Boccieri
 Boren
 Boswell
 Boucher
 Boyd
 Brady (PA)
 Braley (IA)
 Brown, Corrine
 Butterfield
 Capps
 Capuano
 Cardoza
 Carnahan
 Carney
 Carson (IN)
 Castor (FL)
 Chandler
 Childers
 Clarke
 Clay
 Cleaver
 Cohen
 Connolly (VA)
 Conyers
 Cooper
 Costa
 Costello
 Courtney
 Crowley
 Cummings
 Dahlkemper
 Davis (AL)
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (TN)
 DeFazio
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Donnelly (IN)
 Doyle

NAYS—183

Aderholt
 Akin
 Alexander
 Austria
 Bachmann
 Bachus
 Barrett (SC)
 Bartlett
 Barton (TX)
 Biggert
 Bilbray
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (UT)
 Blackburn
 Blunt
 Boehner
 Bonner
 Bono Mack
 Boozman
 Boustany
 Brady (TX)
 Bright
 Broun (GA)
 Brown (SC)
 Brown-Waite,
 Ginny
 Buchanan
 Burgess
 Burton (IN)
 Buyer
 Calvert
 Camp
 Cantor
 Cao
 Capito
 Carter
 Cassidy
 Castle
 Chaffetz
 Coble
 Coffman (CO)
 Cole
 Conaway
 Crenshaw
 Culberson
 Davis (KY)
 Deal (GA)
 DeFazio
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart, L.

Schrader
 Schwartz
 Scott (GA)
 Scott (VA)
 Serrano
 Sestak
 Shea-Porter
 Sherman
 Sires
 Skelton
 Slaughter
 Smith (WA)
 Snyder
 Solis (CA)
 Space
 Speier
 Spratt
 Stark
 Stupak
 Sutton
 Tanner
 Tauscher
 Teague
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Tierney
 Titus
 Tonko
 Towns
 Tsongas
 Van Hollen
 Velázquez
 Viscolsky
 Walz
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters
 Watson
 Watt
 Waxman
 Weiner
 Welch
 Wexler
 Wilson (OH)
 Woolsey
 Wu
 Yarmuth

Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dreier
 Duncan
 Ehlers
 Emerson
 Fallon
 Flake
 Fleming
 Forbes
 Fortenberry
 Foxx
 Franks (AZ)
 Frelinghuysen
 Gallegly
 Garrett (NJ)
 Gerlach
 Gingrey (GA)
 Gohmert
 Goodlatte
 Granger
 Graves
 Griffith
 Guthrie
 Hall (TX)
 Harper
 Hastings (WA)
 Heller
 Hensarling
 Herger
 Hoekstra
 Hunter
 Ingliis
 Issa
 Jenkins
 Johnson (IL)
 Johnson, Sam
 Jones
 Jordan (OH)
 King (IA)
 King (NY)
 Kingston
 Kirk
 Kline (MN)
 Lamborn
 Lance
 Latham
 LaTourette
 Latta
 Lewis (CA)
 Linder

LoBiondo
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 Lummis
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Mack
 Manzullo
 Marchant
 McCarthy (CA)
 McCaul
 McClintock
 McCotter
 McHenry
 McHugh
 McKeon
 McMorris
 Rodgers
 Mica
 Miller (FL)
 Miller (MI)
 Miller, Gary
 Minnick
 Moran (KS)
 Murphy, Tim
 Myrick
 Neugebauer
 Nunes
 Olson
 Paul
 Paulsen
 Pence
 Peterson
 Petri
 Pitts
 Platts
 Poe (TX)
 Posey
 Price (GA)
 Putnam
 Radanovich
 Rehberg
 Reichert
 Roe (TN)
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rogers (MI)
 Rohrabacher
 Rooney
 Ros-Lehtinen

Roskam	Simpson	Tiberi
Royce	Smith (NE)	Turner
Ryan (WI)	Smith (NJ)	Upton
Scalise	Smith (TX)	Walden
Schmidt	Souder	Wamp
Schock	Stearns	Westmoreland
Sensenbrenner	Sullivan	Whitfield
Sessions	Taylor	Wilson (SC)
Shadegg	Terry	Wittman
Shimkus	Thompson (PA)	Wolf
Shuler	Thornberry	Young (AK)
Shuster	Tiahrt	Young (FL)

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Lipinski

NOT VOTING—3

Campbell Clyburn Lee (NY)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised that there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1424

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OFFERING CONDOLENCES TO THE VICTIMS AND GRATITUDE TO THE RESCUE WORKERS OF CONTINENTAL CONNECTION FLIGHT 3407

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Madam Speaker, I am certain that everyone knows by now approximately 50 people lost their lives in a tragic plane crash last night in western New York. This crash occurred in the hometown of our colleague, CHRIS LEE, who has left Washington to assist in efforts ongoing in western New York.

I know that the whole House joins Mr. LEE, Mrs. SLAUGHTER, Mr. MASSA, and me in offering our deepest condolences to the loved ones of those killed in this tragic event and in offering tremendous gratitude to the firefighters, emergency personnel, and other first responders who bravely worked through the night and are still working today to deal with this accident.

I would now yield to my western New York colleague, Mrs. SLAUGHTER.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I appreciate very much your yielding to me.

We have suffered a terrible blow in western New York. I got home last night about midnight to turn on the television to see the suffering of my people, and my heart breaks for Upstate New York. Our worst fears were confirmed when we learned that no one survived that crash, and that one person on the ground was lost. They were less than 5 minutes away from the runway at the airport that might have saved their lives.

It is always a tragedy; and just this week we stood with our colleague Mr. COLE to worry and concern with him for the loss that he had in his district

due to the tornado. We appreciate that in western New York we take care of each other, and in the House of Representatives we care very much for each other as well.

The first responders and all the citizens of western New York who rushed to help and all the officials of New York and Washington and the local officials have our thanks and our good wishes. We will do everything that we can to try to ease the pain and to ease the suffering, and hope to God that this does not happen to us again.

MOMENT OF SILENCE

Mr. HIGGINS. Madam Speaker, I ask the House observe a moment of silence for the families and the victims of this tragic event.

□ 1430

RECOGNIZING DALE OAK

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, this is the last time that Dale Oak will be on this floor serving us as a member of the staff of the Appropriations Committee. He has been serving as the chief clerk for the Financial Services Subcommittee. He has served the Appropriations Committee in this House for 14 years, working for both the Republicans and Democrats, as has often been the tradition on the Appropriations Committee. He is leaving, and I simply want to thank him for the service he has given to the Committee and to the House, and wish him all the best in his new endeavor. He has been an incredibly hard worker, and we are all lucky to have public servants like him helping us.

I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I very much appreciate our chairman yielding. I, too, want to express our deepest gratitude to Dale Oak and his family for the years and years of work and sacrifice they have put in on our behalf.

As the chairman indicated, Dale has worked on both sides of the aisle in the front office, was very helpful to BILL YOUNG, I know, and to myself, and now to DAVID OBEY.

The people who really deserve our recognition and thanks, however, involve first and foremost Dale's wife, Janet, and their children, Eric and Anna.

Thank you all for your great service. Godspeed.

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SERRANO. With the indulgence of the Members, I know we all want to leave and catch a plane or train, but I have been fortunate during the 2 years that I have been chairman of this committee to have Dale Oak as the committee clerk. And I want to wish him all the best and tell the Members that those individuals who work 24/7 into late at night are people like Dale Oak

who make us look good and who serve the American people although their name and their work sometimes is not seen on a daily basis.

And so I thank you, Dale, for your service to our country.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

COMMEMORATING ABRAHAM LINCOLN ON THE BICENTENNIAL OF HIS BIRTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 139.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 139.

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. SCOTT of Georgia. 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 403, nays 0, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 71]

YEAS—403

Abercrombie	Braley (IA)	Crenshaw
Aderholt	Bright	Crowley
Adler (NJ)	Broun (GA)	Cuellar
Akin	Brown (SC)	Culberson
Alexander	Brown, Corrine	Cummings
Altmire	Buchanan	Dahlkemper
Andrews	Burgess	Davis (AL)
Arcuri	Burton (IN)	Davis (CA)
Austria	Butterfield	Davis (IL)
Baca	Buyer	Davis (KY)
Bachmann	Calvert	Davis (TN)
Bachus	Camp	DeFazio
Baird	Cantor	DeGette
Baldwin	Cao	Delahunt
Barrett (SC)	Capito	DeLauro
Barrow	Capps	Dent
Bartlett	Capuano	Diaz-Balart, L.
Barton (TX)	Cardoza	Dicks
Bean	Carnahan	Dingell
Becerra	Carney	Donnelly (IN)
Berkley	Carson (IN)	Dreier
Berry	Carter	Driehaus
Biggart	Cassidy	Duncan
Bilbray	Castle	Edwards (MD)
Bilirakis	Castor (FL)	Edwards (TX)
Bishop (GA)	Chaffetz	Ehlers
Bishop (NY)	Chandler	Ellison
Blackburn	Childers	Ellsworth
Blumenauer	Clarke	Emerson
Bocciari	Cleaver	Engel
Boehner	Coble	Eshoo
Bonner	Coffman (CO)	Etheridge
Bono Mack	Cohen	Fallin
Boozman	Cole	Farr
Boren	Conaway	Fattah
Boswell	Connolly (VA)	Finer
Boucher	Conyers	Flake
Boyd	Cooper	Fleming
Brady (PA)	Costa	Forbes
Brady (TX)	Courtney	Fortenberry