

this idea. I know, Mr. Speaker, we will hear frequently this afternoon that no one in the House supports discrimination on the basis of gender, and I believe that is true. The issue is not what we say, though, it is what we do. And we have a chance to take a step against discrimination on the basis of gender, but I am sure, Mr. Speaker, there will be those who say this is the wrong time and the wrong step. I respectfully disagree.

There are those who say this is the wrong time to take this step because there will not be any statute of limitations; that is to say, people can sue forever if they have been the victim of employment discrimination. That is not accurate. You have 180 days in most States and a few more days in other States to file a claim once an act of discrimination has occurred. If a plaintiff does not file his or her claim by that time, the claim expires. This has been the law in a majority of circuits for a very long time. The U.S. Supreme Court disrupted that law. We are restoring it.

We expect to hear that there will be a flood of litigation, that the courthouses will be filled with people filing discrimination claims once this bill becomes law. That is not the case. Again, this bill restores the law as was understood by a majority of the circuits until the Supreme Court gave its ill-founded decision in the Ledbetter case. There was no flood of litigation under the prior understanding of the statute, and I do not believe there will be a flood of litigation now.

We will hear that this should apply only to intentional discrimination against women or others on the basis of gender. You know, if you are hit by a truck, Mr. Speaker, it doesn't matter if the truck driver intended to hit you or simply did so carelessly; if you are injured, you are injured. And if a person can show discrimination on the basis of any of the suspect categories under title VII under the law, they should be compensated, whether or not they can prove the discrimination was intentional. If there is a pattern and practice of discrimination because an employee is a woman, it should be remedied, and limiting this to intentional discrimination makes no sense.

We expect to hear that employees will sit on their rights; that they will have an opportunity to sue and wait for a very long time to do so. There is simply no evidence that people did that under the prior law as understood by the circuits. And, frankly, it would be a very ill-founded plaintiff who would do such a thing since it would cost them money to do so, reminding you that the burden of proof would fall upon the plaintiff to come up with the evidence of discrimination that took place a long time ago. So she or he has no incentive to sit on their rights and have to bear that burden of proof.

Finally, we will hear that employees will sit on their rights because somehow it makes economic sense to do so.

Mr. Speaker, it simply doesn't. The statute limits someone to go back 2 years backwards, for back pay, from the point at which discrimination took place. It would be a very irrational plaintiff who would wait a very long time to wait and go back those 2 years. The longer you wait, the more it costs you as a plaintiff.

So these arguments have been fully aired. I respectfully would argue they are all wrong. The time is right for us to stand up and not simply say we are against discrimination, but vote against discrimination, and pass this bill this afternoon.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, what we are saying is that there is no need to close off debate; that this legislation could very easily have been debated openly; that Members on both sides of the aisle could have been given the opportunity to bring forth amendments as they were able to in the Senate, and that this legislation would move forward. It is not only unfortunate but unnecessary for the majority to close off debate. And, as I stated previously, there is a pattern.

In the last Congress, despite having promised the most open and the most transparent, the most fair Congress in history, the reality was exactly the opposite: More pieces of legislation were brought to this floor under closed rules that did not allow any amendments during the last Congress, the first Congress where our friends on the other side of the aisle had the majority in many years. More pieces of legislation were brought to the floor with closed rules prohibiting all amendments than in history, in all of history before in the history of Republic. So that is unfortunate.

But we are seeing the pattern continue. It has continued in these weeks in the beginning of the 111th Congress, and already this is the fourth bill, the fourth piece of legislation brought to the floor under a structure that does not permit any amendments under closed rules. That is what we are saying, it is uncalled for, it is unfortunate. And we hope, I guess because hope springs eternal, that our friends on the other side of the aisle will open the process up and will allow Members from both sides of the aisle to introduce amendments and have them debated and have the majority work its will.

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

□ 1245

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to lead this bill today as a newly elected Member and a new member of the Rules Committee, and I appreciate working alongside my new colleague on the Rules Committee. And I'm sure we will have a busy afternoon together.

We have heard several arguments and supportive thoughts from many of my distinguished colleagues from this side

of the aisle. And I appreciate their thoughts and their very hard work that it has taken to bring this bill to the floor and the momentous occasion we will have today when we are able to take this vote. I have also heard several arguments from my esteemed colleague from Florida. And I just want to remind him that when this bill was debated during the last session of Congress in the Education and Labor Committee where there were ample opportunities to bring amendments, those people in opposition only brought two amendments. So this is not a bill where there is tremendous disagreement. And in fact, the fact that there were no speakers virtually in opposition to this bill shows us what an important piece of legislation we are dealing with today, and in fact only were the discussion around the process taken up today. And I feel that since we have already debated this bill in the House and the Senate when it was last here, we passed it by an overwhelming margin of 247-171. It was passed by a bipartisan vote in the Senate of 61-36.

I am confident that this bill will receive very strong support today and want to say that I'm proud to be a Member of this body when this is happening. I do want to remind my colleagues that this legislation simply restores prior law. It is so important. And by passing it, we are making great strides in protecting workers by reversing the Supreme Court's Ledbetter decision as we have been eloquently described to today. We owe it to all American workers to strengthen, not weaken, nondiscrimination charges based on gender, race and religion.

It has passed the House, and it has passed the Senate previously. Today we are here to send it on to President Obama for what will be his first signature of any bill.

I urge my colleagues to support workers everywhere and vote "yes" on the underlying bill. I urge a "yes" vote on the previous question and on the rule.

I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 88 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 88

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1) making supplemental appropriations for job preservation and creation, infrastructure investment, energy efficiency and science, assistance to the unemployed, and State and local fiscal stabilization, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2009, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed three and one half hours equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, who may yield control of blocks of that time. After general debate, the Committee of the Whole shall rise without motion. No further consideration of the bill shall be in order except pursuant to a subsequent order of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. TAUSCHER). The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my friend from California (Mr. DREIER). All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only. I yield myself such time as I may consume. I also ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 88.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, House Resolution 88 provides for general debate on H.R. 1, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. I would like to think this rule is not controversial because it is only about general debate, but it will lead the way to an important debate on the underlying legislation, H.R. 1, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act.

Madam Speaker, George W. Bush left this country with an economy much worse off than the one he inherited from the Clinton administration. Eight years after being handed record budget surpluses, President Bush passed on to President Obama an economy that has record budget deficits and is in worse shape since the Great Depression.

Unemployment is rising. Fifty-five thousand more jobs were lost yesterday alone. Wages are stagnating. And work hours are being cut back. People are having trouble making ends meet, including putting food on the table.

And that is where this recovery package steps in. The provisions that make up the American Recovery and Reinvestment Package range from investments in infrastructure and green technology to extending unemployment for workers who have exhausted their benefits. We provide aid to struggling

State governments and tax cuts for low and middle-income families and small businesses. These are all good investments that we hope will help reinvigorate our economy. And I look forward to voting for them tomorrow.

Madam Speaker, some of the most important parts of this package, in my opinion, are the antihunger provisions that will not only stimulate the economy, but will also help combat hunger in this country. This recovery package includes \$20 billion for the Food Stamp program, \$200 million for elderly nutrition services, including Meals on Wheels and Congregate Meals, \$726 million to increase the number of States that provide free healthy dinners to children in need, \$150 million to purchase commodities for food banks to refill emptying shelves, and \$100 million to improve State management information systems for the WIC program.

Madam Speaker, food stamp increases will reach about 14 million low-income households as soon as 25 days after enactment. About 90 percent of all food stamp households have income below the poverty line. In other words, these are benefits that are timely and they are targeted.

It is important to note that every dollar in food stamps that a low-income family receives enables that family to spend an additional dollar on food or other items. And don't just take my word for it. Leading conservative economists support inclusion of these benefits in the recovery package. Former Reagan economic adviser Martin Feldstein has said that a temporary food stamp increase would place resources in the pockets of people with a high propensity to spend quickly, rather than save, the limited income that they have.

Mark Zandi, a former economic adviser to the McCain campaign, says that a temporary increase in food stamp benefits gives the best "bang for buck." Specifically, he estimates that such an increase would generate \$1.73 in increased economic activity for each \$1 in cost.

Madam Speaker, increasing food stamps is not charity. It is stimulus. It is not a handout or a give-away. But investments in antihunger programs do fulfill our moral commitment to make sure our fellow citizens have enough to eat. More than 36 million Americans went hungry in 2007, before the economy took this drastic spike downward. Yet the last stimulus plan signed into law didn't include increases for food stamps or any kind of antihunger programs.

The fact that hunger remains a problem in America should make every single Member in this Chamber feel ashamed. H.R. 1 gives us a chance to begin to solve this problem and to prevent many more American families from slipping into hunger.

Madam Speaker, as I said at the outset, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act includes large invest-

ments in our infrastructure to help rebuild our roads and our bridges, to help with our water and sewer plants, to help State and local governments deal with the financial burdens and crises they are currently faced with. This is a bill that will help put people back to work and that will create millions of jobs that will hopefully stimulate this economy. The one thing I do know, Madam Speaker, is that doing nothing is not an option. That is what has been happening in the previous administration. They ignored this problem for far too long. And their response when the probably became a huge problem was grossly inadequate.

So, Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this rule and to support this package.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I want to begin by expressing my appreciation to my friend from Worcester for yielding me the traditional 30 minutes and I yield myself, as I said, such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, we all know that the United States of America is facing one of the greatest challenges we have ever had. This is a very tough and painful time for Americans all across the economic spectrum. People have been losing their homes. We have seen the jobless rate surge. And we have challenging and difficult days ahead of us. Every one has acknowledged that. Conservative, liberal, moderate, wherever you stand on the political spectrum, we all know that we are dealing with extraordinarily difficult times.

I have to say at the outset as my friend went through the litany of challenges that President Barack Obama has now inherited, it is true, we are facing very tough times. But I think it is very important to note that I was privileged to come to this institution in 1981. And when Ronald Reagan became President of the United States, if you look at the numbers that existed in 1980 and 1981, the time of the transition from the Carter administration to the Reagan administration, the inflation rate was 13.5 percent, the unemployment rate was 7.1 percent and interest rates were well into double digits.

Now, no one knows what tomorrow is going to bring. And most people have said that tomorrow is going to be challenging and difficult. And I personally believe that it is. But I think that it is important to note that the challenge which President Obama has inherited and which we, as elected leaders in this country, have inherited is a tough one. But it may or may not be unprecedented.

We do know this. And I'm very pleased that President Obama is at this moment right here in the Capitol meeting with members of the Republican Conference. And I have just come

from that meeting to begin the debate on the issue of the so-called economic stimulus package. President Obama, in his presentation to us, provided a very nice, encouraging message with which I agree. He said that as we deal with this economic stimulus package, let's work as hard as we possibly can to put politics aside.

This is a message that President Obama has carried repeatedly throughout his campaign. And 1 week ago today, as he stood on the west front of the Capitol, he made it very clear that that was that exactly what he wanted to do, was to put politics aside.

□ 1300

Now I will say to my friend that pointing the finger of blame is an unfortunate thing, and I think it is really being political, and that is why I hope very much that we can follow the words of encouragement that President Obama has just given Republican Members, and that is to put politics aside and as we debate this stimulus package, focus on the merits. "Focus on the merits" are the exact words that the President of the United States just used within the last few minutes downstairs.

I believe it is absolutely imperative that we look at the merits. Everyone knows that we need to take action to stimulate our economy, to get people back to work, to help people buy and keep homes, to keep businesses investing, job creating, and to ensure that the very important societal needs that are out there are adequately addressed.

The problem that we have, Madam Speaker, is that as we look at this package that is before us, unfortunately there has not been the kind of bipartisan cooperation that President Obama has encouraged and has personally sought.

As we look at the legislation, the measure that we are going to be working on further today upstairs in the Rules Committee, it is an \$825 billion package. It is an \$825 billion package which, based on the report that was released yesterday from the professional, nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, has levels of expending that go not just a year beyond where we are, not just 2 years beyond where we are, but to 10 years. And, Madam Speaker, I know very few Members have recognized this, one of our crack staff members found this out last night in looking at budget authority versus outlays, there is actually \$2.3 billion, according to the professional, nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, that in this stimulus package is expended beyond 10 years, beyond 2019.

Now again, following the words of encouragement that we as Republican Members have just received from President Obama downstairs focusing on the merits of the stimulus package versus politics is going to be a high priority for us. And that is why, again, this study which just came out from the professional, nonpartisan Congress-

sional Budget Office, remember this is not a Republican publication. Yes, I am a Republican, proud to be a Republican, I am simply reporting to the House, Madam Speaker, what it is that was included in this Congressional Budget Office study which I commend to every single one of our colleagues. I encourage people to look at the professional, nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office study, and the reason I am focusing on it is I want to share, along with the information that I just provided, that \$2.3 billion of this is actually expended beyond 2019, 10 years from now.

I would like to share a couple of paragraphs from this study. It is on page 4 and this is entitled H.R. 1, American Recovery and Reinvestment Act 2009 as introduced in the House of Representatives yesterday on January 26. It provides a summary. This is, again, from the CBO. It reads: "CBO expects that Federal agencies, along with States and other recipients of the funding, would find it difficult to properly manage and oversee a rapid expansion of existing programs so as to expend the added funds as quickly as they expend the resources provided for their ongoing programs."

This study goes on to say: "Lags in spending stem in part from the need to draft plans, solicit bids, enter into contracts, and conduct regulatory or environmental reviews. Spending can be further delayed because some activities are by their nature seasonal. For example, major school repairs are generally scheduled during the summer to avoid disrupting classes, and construction and highway work are difficult to carry out during the winter months in many parts of the country." It is snowing outside right now. We know that to be the case.

And then, Madam Speaker, this report, not a partisan report from the professional, nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office goes on to say: "Brand new programs pose additional challenges. Developing procedures and criteria, issuing the necessary regulations and reviewing plans and proposals would make distributing money quickly even more difficult—as can be seen, for example, in the lack of any disbursements to date under the loan programs established for automakers last summer to invest in producing energy-efficient vehicles. Throughout the Federal Government, spending for new programs has frequently been slower than expected and rarely been faster."

Madam Speaker, again, these are not my words. There is nothing partisan about this. These words came from the study released yesterday from the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office. I focus on this because I believe that President Obama was absolutely right 15 minutes ago when he said to Republican Members of this institution that we should focus on the merits and not on politics. We don't want to focus on politics because we know it is absolutely essential that we come together

with a package that will truly stimulate our economy, get Americans working, create jobs and deal with this very serious economic challenge.

Now as we move ahead, Madam Speaker, what needs to be done is we need to have a package that will not do as the Congressional Budget Office, the professional, nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office has stated, create slow, wasteful, duplicative spending, and that is basically what they are saying here. They are talking about in their independent analysis how difficult it is going to be to get these dollars out there, and to not spend \$2.3 billion of this 11 years from today, we should instead focus on fast acting, immediate action.

Now what is it that we can do to deal with the issue of immediacy that faces us? Well, on the opening day I was pleased to introduce legislation which is included in the alternative package that we are going to bring forward. That legislation is focused on addressing a particular problem that is out there in our economy, and that is the housing industry. Traditionally, the housing industry has played a very important role in reigniting our economy.

Yesterday the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, in his testimony before the Rules Committee, said there is no way the housing or the auto industry will be able to play a role in bringing us out of economic recession. And I challenged him on that because I don't believe that is in any way accurate in concluding it because we can take action.

On opening day I introduced legislation which calls for incentivizing Americans to purchase and have an interest in keeping their homes. What it consists of, and we will have this in our package, is a \$7,500 exclusion to help people offset the downpayment they make on their home. Everyone has recognized that a big part of this problem in the housing industry has been the fact that people put absolutely nothing down and had subprime rates of interest. And those subprime rates of interest allowed people, unfortunately, to treat their homes like rental units. So they had no vested interest in it, and so they were actually encouraged to walk away.

If we can say to an American, and we all know that the savings rate has gone up because of these challenging economic times, that they put some dollars aside that actually utilizes that to increase the percentage of their downpayment on that home purchase will play a role in dealing with that inventory of housing that is out there.

We saw the reports of the layoffs at Home Depot and a wide range of other companies yesterday. We know if we are able to encourage people to have a vested interest in their home and purchase their home, that will go a long way towards encouraging responsibility and seeing that they have a vested interest in that home. That is just one example.

We also believe when it comes to tax relief that we should provide tax relief to Americans who pay taxes. That is why in our package we are going to call for an across-the-board cut for every single American, reducing from 10 percent to 5 percent on the first level of income that is taxed.

Action like this, I believe, Madam Speaker, will provide an immediacy which is what the American people want. They want an immediate response. And yes, some spending is necessary. We recognize that infrastructure spending is necessary. But as we look at the litany of items that have been included in this package that in no way stimulate our economy, I believe that we should in fact focus on responsibility, private sector job creation, and economic growth. That, I believe, will mitigate the pain which so many of our fellow Americans are suffering at this moment.

Madam Speaker, because of the direction in which we are headed, I am going to encourage my colleagues to oppose this rule. I recognize it is only a general debate rule, but I am very troubled with the legislation that we have seen, some of the actions that have been taken in the committees of jurisdiction. With that, I am going to urge opposition to this rule.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I am all for bipartisanship, but I find it curious that the gentleman is preaching bipartisanship when this morning, and I read from Politico, there is a story that says this morning House minority leader JOHN BOEHNER went for the jugular, urging his members to oppose the economic centerpiece of Obama's first term just hours before the President paid the Republicans the compliment of coming to the Capitol for a private meeting, even before he did the same for House Democrats.

I will yield to the gentleman in just a second.

It seems to me if we want to be bipartisan, then everybody should reserve judgment until all the facts are on the table. I would like to think that the House minority leader would have reserved his judgment on the overall package until he and the Republican Members of this House had an opportunity to hear the new President out. That did not happen.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding, and let me say that I stand here, having just left the meeting with the President to come up to voice my strong opposition to the \$825 billion package that was unveiled without consultation with the Republican leadership. The partisanship has, unfortunately, been demonstrated through actions of my friend on the other side of

the aisle. So we are seeking opposition to it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Reclaiming my time, the fact of the matter is the economic downturn is no longer subject to debate. In the last 4 months, the country has lost 2 million jobs and is expected to lose another 3 to 5 million in the next year. This recovery package represents a crucial first step forward in a concerted effort to not only save but create millions of more jobs in this country. This is a defining moment for every single person in this Chamber. We need to act. We need to move forward with something big and bold, and not the same old, same old.

And bipartisanship, Madam Speaker, doesn't mean that Democrats should capitulate to every request that the Republicans make. Bipartisanship doesn't mean that we should embrace policies that have failed in the past, embracing the same old, same old.

Chairman OBEY was before the House Rules Committee last night and talked about the Republican amendments that he accepted during debate on this package in the Appropriations Committee. This is not everything I would like, Madam Speaker. Quite frankly, I think the package needs to be bigger. But this represents, I think, the best judgment of our new President, working with his advisers, and I think this package is a crucial first step forward in trying to bring this economy back from where it is today. This is a crucial step in trying to create millions of more jobs to put people back to work to try to stimulate this economy to get things moving again.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding, and I assume my friend has seen this Congressional Budget Office study, and I want to add, as we talk about this Congressional Budget Office study, that it is important to note that while our friend, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee talked about his acceptance of amendments, it is fascinating that the Energy and Commerce Committee had a rigorous debate on a number of amendments. They accepted four Republican amendments by voice vote that dealt with things like COBRA qualification, health information technology, the rights of pharmacists, and they dropped those four amendments from the bill. So what kind of bipartisanship is that, I ask my friend.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Reclaiming my time, I would say to my friend that the Congressional Budget Office study report is disputed by many, many on the House Appropriations Committee and many on the Senate Appropriations Committee. In fact, Mark Zandi who is a conservative economist and former adviser to JOHN MCCAIN, your Presidential candidate in the last go-around, projected that this stimulus package would create 4 million jobs by the end

of 2010 and it will provide a vital boost to this lagging economy.

The bottom line is, I think it is obvious that the kind of investments that are in this package, infrastructure, green jobs, investments in education, investments in Food Stamps and investments in medical technology, investments in making sure that we have more nurses and more primary care doctors, all of those things create more jobs and will stimulate the economy.

We can debate reports all we want, but those of us who have been here for awhile know that when you invest in things like infrastructure, you create jobs back home. That is what we are doing here. There are expedited provisions here to make sure that the money gets out quickly.

Madam Speaker, I would like to yield at this point 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT).

□ 1315

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Thank you very much, Mr. MCGOVERN.

I think it is very important for us to get our hands around exactly what the situation is now. Our house is on fire. There are two things we need to do. We got to get the water, and we got to get the water quickly and put this fire out. Our economy is crumbling right before our eyes. We are losing 6,300 homes to foreclosure every day. We are losing almost that many jobs every day. Each day there is a new headline, 5,000 jobs here, 6,000 jobs here. Ladies and gentlemen, we can't wait.

Now, let us talk about this economic recovery and investment package, because that is what it is, and let's be fair and accurate with the American people as we talk. We have a new administration that is saddled with the responsibility of leading and applying the executive decisions. This administration, the Obama administration, has come to Congress, and with them, together, we have put together this package, a package that has a great many things in it because our economy has a great many things in it.

Now, if you want to stimulate the economy, there are only three basic ways to do it: You can cut taxes, which is in here; you can do huge government spending, which is in here; and you can also use the Fed to cut the interest rates, which we have already done and they are frozen at zero. So we are left with these two things. And this package is equally balanced in terms of the impact that is needed. We need to get stimulus in as quickly as we can.

Madam Speaker, if I may just share with you a little letter I received from one of my constituents in a high school in Clayton County in Forest Park. Let me just read this.

It says, "Dear Congressman Scott. I am a high school student that attends Forest Park High School here in Clayton County, Georgia. This school is in bad shape and I hope you can help us get money for the school. The school needs new tile for restrooms and new

windows. The hallways need new lockers so that the lockers that don't open can be replaced. Classrooms need new desks so that some of the desks that have graffiti and old gum stuck to them can be replaced. We need more space in the lunchroom. Congressman Scott, the lines are so long in the lunchroom that when some students just get their food, it is time for them to go back to the classroom."

Well, in this package we have \$43 million into this Clayton County school system. In another county in my district, \$50 million. And I am sure every Member of this House can get a letter saying the same thing.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Madam Speaker, our country is riveted with those moments that try men's souls. We are at such a moment in our history. And when the history books are written on this moment, let it be said that both Republicans and Democrats came together and responded at this moment with the confidence that the American people are looking to us with a way out of this dilemma that we are in. That is why they elected us, to lead, to lead with confidence and with boldness, and to rise to the occasion of this moment that tries men's souls as those moments in our past history from the foundation of this country to now have.

Let us move with quick dispatch and get this measure off, passed and over to President Obama, so he can execute this plan immediately.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume just to say to my good friend from Clayton County, Georgia, who does a spectacular job, that we all want to ensure that schools and the other very pressing needs out there are addressed. Getting our economy growing is critical for that and I know my friend concurs with the importance for us to do that, and that is why I point to this independent, professional, nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office study which has indicated that there is going to be a tremendous lag time in getting those resources to those schools to which my friend has referred.

Madam Speaker, I would like to yield 2 minutes to my good friend from Moore, Oklahoma (Mr. COLE).

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I thank my good friend and distinguished ranking member of the Rules Committee from California for yielding.

I rise in opposition to this rule and to the underlying legislation. Let me say at the outset, I respect the Rules Committee and the very important function that it carries out as a former member, but it is preeminently, as it should be, the Speaker's committee. In this case I believe the Speaker has presented us with legislation in a format that is unlikely to receive significant minority support and participation,

and, frankly, that is unfortunate, Madam Speaker, because I think it is avoidable.

There is much in the current situation that, frankly, the two parties in this body agree on. We agree that we are in a serious recession. We agree that dramatic Federal response is required to deal with job loss and the mounting economic challenges we face. We agree that tax cuts are an important part of that solution. We have some disagreement over which ones and how much, but clearly it is an area we can find common ground on.

We agree that infrastructure is important to moving us forward, although I regret there is very little of this bill, frankly, that deals with infrastructure. Less than 10 percent in total actually goes to infrastructure spending. I think that is something we could find common ground on and enlarge. We disagree, quite obviously, over a whole range of other spending issues which constitute over half the bill.

In our opinion, the spending is simply too much. There are too many new programs that have not been authorized and gone through the appropriate committee process. There is unsustainable spending in this program, things like Pell Grants and IDEA money that is good, but frankly will ramp up and then immediately crash down. Or we will set ourselves up for a future tax increase, which I don't think anybody, certainly on my side of the aisle, is anxious to do. So there are areas of agreement and disagreement.

Madam Speaker, it is not too late to find common ground. We could defeat this rule and ask the Rules Committee to send us back three items that we could consider sequentially and separately. We could root out the bad programs. We could find common ground. We could find common ground on tax cuts. We can find common ground on infrastructure.

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

Mr. DREIER. I am happy to yield to my good friend, the former Rules Committee member and a great appropriator, an additional minute.

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

We could then have our disagreements over the spending portion of the bill. We could vote on each of these items separately. They could later be merged and sent on as a separate bill. In that process we would find significant bipartisan participation and agreement. But, unfortunately, the rule under which we are likely to bring the legislation to the floor is going to make that impossible and give us the old partisan debates that the country would like to see us move past.

So I would ask my colleagues to reject this rule and ask my capable friends on the Rules Committee in both parties to go back and to give us the type of process and the type of bill that will yield a bipartisan outcome, a bipartisan victory. That is what the

country wants, that is what America needs, that is what the President has asked us to do. That is what we are capable of doing if we will address this matter in the appropriate manner.

So I urge the rejection of this rule and the beginning of a bipartisan process where we can find so much common ground.

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

Madam Speaker, I have great respect for the previous speaker, who I had the pleasure of serving with on the Rules Committee for many years, but what we seem to be hearing over and over from the other side is they care about job loss, but they care about the survival of small businesses, but they care about the fact that hunger is a growing problem in America, but they care about the infrastructure, but.

Well, "but" nothing. The time has come, because things are so bad, and we don't have to argue about how we got here, but the reality is I think there is a consensus that we are in a serious economic meltdown right now and that in fact we need to do something. We need to do something big and bold. We need to try to jump-start this economy.

This may not be all that needs to be done, quite frankly, but the fact is, if you care about infrastructure, you need to support a bill that spends and invests in infrastructure. If you care about job losses in this country, then you have got to do something other than just talk about it, and invest in programs that will help create more jobs. If you care about the fact that hunger is a growing problem in the United States of America, which is shameful, then you need to do something that will not only help feed hungry people, but stimulate the economy. And this bill does that, and more.

So there are lots of things in this bill that I think will stimulate this economy. We could all find something that we don't like. But the fact of the matter is, if everybody had the opportunity to write this bill, there would be 435 different bills. This bill I think represents the best judgment of the new President of the United States, working with the Democratic leadership and working with Members in this House, and I think it deserves support.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Well, how we got in this situation is that ideology triumphed over reason. For the last eight years, and a little longer, we have been told that there are few problems in America that can't be solved other than by more tax breaks and a permissive attitude toward corporate law enforcement. Now we have the results, the Bush recession, and if we don't pass this legislation it will soon become the Bush depression.

Now, the real question we need to be asking is, "how do we get the biggest

bang for the buck?" We want to be concerned about every single one of these taxpayer dollars, that they do the most possible to ensure an economic recovery. And one of the people that we have turned to is a principal economic adviser to Senator JOHN MCCAIN and his presidential campaign.

He, like other economists, has analyzed the provisions of this bill, and he has told us that we will add to our gross domestic product \$1.72 for every 1 dollar that we spend in this bill on food stamps to help hungry people in this country. He also told us that on some of the corporate loss carryback provisions, we will get only 19 cents added per dollar spent, and that with a permanent corporate tax cut, as some have advocated, we will get only 30 cents for every dollar we invest.

I think we need to focus our attention where it does the most good in order to ensure an economic recovery for families across our country.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOGGETT. On your time, later.

Mr. DREIER. I will yield time to you if you will agree to yield for a question here.

Mr. DOGGETT. Let me give an example of what this bill does with regard to one provision in this bill that I was involved in writing that deals with the illegal action of the Secretary of the Treasury under President Bush, Mr. Paulson, to just suspend the law that President Ronald Reagan signed so that corporations wouldn't go out and dodge their taxes by taking over some other corporation's tax losses. Secretary Paulson suspended that law without any legal basis for banks in this country, and some have estimated that could result in a drain on the Treasury of \$140 billion. This bill closes that loophole.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

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

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

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOGGETT. On your time.

Mr. DREIER. I will be happy to yield the gentleman 1 additional minute, if he will yield.

Mr. DOGGETT. May I have regular order and may I be assured that I have my full minute to discuss what I want to discuss?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas will suspend.

The gentleman from California, the gentleman from Texas has been recognized.

Mr. DREIER. I just yielded him an additional minute.

Mr. DOGGETT. That is great. I have got an additional minute yielded here and a minute there. Which, Madam Speaker, may I take first?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 2 minutes.

Mr. DOGGETT. All right, I yield for 30 seconds to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding.

I simply wanted to engage in a little debate here, if I might, and that is the reason I yielded time to my friend, so that we could ask the question as to whether or not the gentleman has looked at the Congressional Budget Office study, the professional, non-partisan Congressional Budget Office Study.

Mr. DOGGETT. Not only looked at it, but I heard testimony all this morning in the Budget Committee.

Mr. DREIER. If I could complete my thought, my question is, have you in fact looked at the professional, non-partisan CBO study that came out last night talking about the slowness with which we will have to contend at getting these resources? And I agree with my friend on the need to try and get it in, and I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. DOGGETT. I have not only looked at the report, but I have spent most of the morning listening to the testimony of Dr. Elmendorf, who wrote that report, and indeed it is from that very report that the kind of language that I was referring to earlier, some of the proposals that you are advocating, are the ones that are the least effective for getting our recovery going, and that is why I think we have a blended proposal here. But some of the changes you want are not efficient. They are a weak way of getting recovery, and we should be focused on the biggest bang for the buck.

Now, let me focus on the minute that the gentleman from Massachusetts was kind enough to yield to me, because there is one provision in this bill that I think is very important. It is \$13.5 billion in additional assistance to many working families, many middle-class families, concerning higher education.

□ 1330

This was not in the bill as originally proposed by President Obama and his advisers, but he said, as he is saying to Republicans, I'm sure, right now, "If you've got a better idea, I'm open to it." And in this case, the better idea was an idea he advanced in the campaign that we need to do more, particularly at a time of economic downturn, to get more of our young people and perhaps not so young people back into community colleges, into higher education institutions across this country.

What this tax credit will do, in addition to the important increase in Pell grants in this bill, is to provide a refundable credit to many working families of up to \$1,000, up to \$2,500 to other families that will for the first time cover textbooks.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman another 30 seconds.

Mr. DOGGETT. This credit will for the first time cover textbooks, will supplement Pell grants, will provide a

real opportunity not only for individuals to retool their skills but in the process retool our whole economy with a better trained workforce.

I think this is a very effective way to address economic recovery. I'm pleased it has been incorporated in this bill. There is not a family that has a stake in higher education, trying to get someone into a higher education institution, or who has someone there now that is not likely to gain, middle-class families, working families, from this bill.

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

I will say that I truly do believe that we are making an attempt to follow the directive that was provided to us within the last hour by President Obama in his address to the Republican Conference when he talked about the need to focus on merits rather than politics here.

We are, in fact, offering an alternative. We are, in fact, saying that we believe that encouraging private sector growth and, yes, putting into place spending that will help to develop our infrastructure is important. So we acknowledge that.

The fact is if you look at what Ronald Reagan inherited in 1981, as I was saying in my opening remarks, an inflation rate of 13½ percent, interest rates that were beyond 15 percent, an unemployment rate that was in excess of 7 percent, what was it that was done the last time that we faced a challenge that, quite frankly, according to the numbers as of right now was even greater than it is today? What was the response, in a bipartisan way, of Democrats and Republicans alike? And I remember very vividly as we did this in May of 1981 and August of 1981. What happened, Madam Speaker, we put into place a package that restrained the rate of growth of Federal Government, cutting by 17 percent the rate of growth of Federal spending. That was done in May of 1981, known as the Gramm-Latta budget package. Then in August of 1981, the bipartisan Conable-Hance economic growth package brought about a broad across-the-board marginal rate reduction which tripled the flow of revenues to the Federal Government as it unleashed tremendous economic growth.

So, Madam Speaker, this notion that we are saying we are for small business but, we are for all these other things but, as my friend from Worcester has said just a few minutes ago, is preposterous. We have a very, very strong and positive track record on what needs to be done to get this economy growing. We have the ability to do that. And I believe that President Obama is sincere when he says we need to talk about the merits and not the politics.

Again, looking at 1981, when a number of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle joined in a bipartisan way to do this, that is the prescription for the challenges that we face today. It worked then, and I believe very strongly that it can work now. Encouraging

individual initiative and responsibility, stepping forward with ways in which we can help these industries that have been suffering greatly is something that can be done. And when this study that was done by the Congressional Budget Office made it very clear that in this package that has been brought before us, without consultation with the Republican leadership, without consultation with the Republican leadership, we are, in fact, expending dollars which will be slow and wasteful; and, Madam Speaker, we're expending dollars more than 10 years from now in this package.

So I will agree with my friends on the other side of the aisle we are never going to come to a perfect agreement, but I believe we should use what has, in fact, worked in the past in generating real economic growth.

With that, Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's history lesson about Ronald Reagan and about what happened in 1981. I wasn't here in 1981. I was a senior in college, but I appreciate the gentleman's giving me that history lesson.

But when he talks about the strong track record of the Republicans, I beg to differ. I think the American people differ. That's what the outcome of this election was about. People do not want more of the same. They're tired of the Republican track record. They want to go in a very different direction.

Madam Speaker, at this time I would like to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. I thank my friend from Massachusetts for yielding to me.

Madam Speaker, I stand in strong support of the economic recovery legislation before us today.

My own State, New York, has been hard hit by the recession. The collapse of the markets on Wall Street have left gaping revenue holes that have contributed to our \$15.4 billion State budget deficit.

In this economic crisis, high unemployment and rising costs have put a huge strain on many American families. This legislation contains a series of programs to provide relief, including helping workers train and find jobs, extending unemployment benefits, and increasing food stamp benefits.

I'm so proud that we will protect health care coverage for millions of Americans during this recession by providing an estimated \$87 billion in additional Federal matching funds. This will help States like New York maintain our Medicaid programs in the face of massive State budget shortfalls over the next 2 years. I have long fought hard for increased F-MAP funds and am grateful that the stimulus will provide some much-needed relief to our States as they struggle to maintain access to needed services. And as we marked up the bill last week in the Energy and Commerce Committee, I was

very, very proud that we had the monies in this bill.

We will also reduce our dependence on foreign oil by making investments aimed at dramatically increasing renewable energy production and renovating public buildings to make them more energy efficient. In this bill we will invest wisely in U.S. development of advanced vehicle batteries and battery systems through loans and grants so that America can lead the world in transforming the way automobiles are powered. We will also have tax credits for private homeowners for new furnaces, energy-efficient windows and doors, and insulation.

So this is a great bill, and, Madam Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to support this bill.

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

I am going to try again, Madam Speaker. I know that my friend who was a senior in college when I began my service here in the institution, I appreciate his reminding me of how much older I am than he, although I have to tell him I was not too much older than he when he was a senior in college and I was proud to begin my service here.

The fact is, okay, I've talked about Ronald Reagan. And I know my friend is from Worcester, and he's very proud of that, and what I would like to do is talk about John F. Kennedy, the President of the United States from his State.

In 1961 we all know John F. Kennedy became President. He did a lot of great things. He's been a model for Democrats and Republicans alike in so many areas. There were challenging economic times in the early 1960s, and John F. Kennedy did exactly what Ronald Reagan did in 1981, and my friend describes this as the "same old, same old."

Well, I believe that it's imperative for us to recognize the best way to get our economy growing. Not only Ronald Reagan but John F. Kennedy recognized it and put into place policies that unleashed the kind of economic growth to which we all aspire today. We know that it's been done many times throughout world history and it can happen.

So if my friend wants to criticize the gentleman from his State, President Kennedy, just as he criticizes Ronald Reagan for the same old, same old, Madam Speaker, I welcome his doing that.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, at this time I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, they never said our task and our job would be easy. I imagine when the Founding Fathers were trying to create this great Union, it was not easy

then as well. But we have a responsibility and a duty. We have taken an oath of office. We have a responsibility to the American people.

Our President has offered a solution. That is why we are here. And I rise to support the rule and the underlying bill because I am looking for an economic engine that will actually roll across America's railways, that will go into the hamlets and villages and communities where people are depressed and oppressed. And, frankly, there are items that I think answer the question whether or not we are concerned about creating jobs.

The increase of the earned income tax credit is one that we have seen work and can work. I have worked with John Hope Bryant, who chairs an organization dealing with financial literacy. We saw the impact of the earned income tax credit for Hurricane Katrina families, for working families, and that has been increased. For those who are seeking homes, we don't want to kill off the homeowners market, and we see now that the \$7,500 tax credit that had to be repaid in 15 years will now be waived and forgiven. We can get homeowners or home purchasers into homes, which Americans would like to do.

We will be seeing \$20 billion for school modernization, \$14 billion for K-12, and \$6 billion for higher education institutions. We will also be seeing moneys going for educational technology grants. But my school districts are already lining up to be able to create that economic engine to keep teachers at work and to train the next generation of workers.

There are green jobs.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I thank the distinguished gentleman.

There is more infusion of Medicaid dollars so that those who are uninsured will have the resources necessary to be able to, in essence, provide for their family but keep looking for work.

This is a calling of crisis. And so with the green jobs, the infrastructure, I do support this rule, but I would certainly like to see the mark of the transportation and infrastructure go from \$9 billion to \$12 billion. I would like to see the language of "use it or lose it" be restored. I want to make sure that the metro system of Houston can fall under the transit funding. And we're going to be working with the chairman of the Transportation Committee and our congressional delegation because these will create jobs across America. I want to see rail travel restored. I want to make sure the infrastructure of America is rebuilt. I want the bridges in the 18th Congressional District enrolled rebuilt by the hands and labor of the American people. That's what this stimulus is about.

There is no doubt that if we stand on this floor of the House or the other

body and ignore the cry of Americans, we too can hold our heads in shame.

Support this rule and support this legislation.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, I think that it's become very clear in this debate that we all recognize the fact that there is a great deal of suffering going on here in the United States of America. Our constituents are hurting. We are dealing with a very, very challenging economic downturn, and we all want to come together to try to find a way to jumpstart our economy.

President Obama has, just a few minutes ago, completed an address to the Republican Conference, Republican Members of this institution, and he went over to meet with our colleagues on the other side of the Capitol. And the words that really struck me that he offered to us were that as we deal with this economic stimulus package, Madam Speaker, it's important for us to focus on merits and not politics. Merits and not politics. And I completely concur with that. I completely concur with that. And, again, it was 1 week ago today that we were all privileged to be on the west front of the Capitol as we were able to witness history and we heard a similar message put forward by President Obama.

□ 1345

That's why, as we move ahead on this issue, we are going to expend our time and our effort focusing on the merits and what needs to be done to get our economy growing.

We know that there is going to be some very important government spending stimulus, and we support things like infrastructure spending, because we know that goods movement, as the economy starts to grow, is imperative, and it needs to be addressed. And so, yes, we support the kind of infrastructure spending that we have talked about.

But, Madam Speaker, as we look at the analysis that has been done on this \$825 billion package, it doesn't do what is essential. I believe that we need to make sure that every dollar expended gets into, on track, just as quickly as we possibly can. We all want to try and move that. President Obama has already talked about shovel-ready projects. We understand the imperative of this.

Unfortunately, the study that has been provided by the professional, non-partisan Congressional Budget Office has made it very clear that it is virtually impossible for us to achieve that goal with this package that has been put before us. In fact, Madam Speaker, in looking at the spending, it's not just beyond a year or 2 years, and the President in his remarks downstairs talked about the fact that he wanted us to get—maybe not within this year, but within the next 2 years—this spending out.

Yet, Madam Speaker, based on this professional, nonpartisan Congress-

sional Budget Office study again, not a Republican statement, \$2.3 billion of this package won't be expended until 2019. That's more than 10 years today, and that's what the CBO study has said, and I would commend that to all of our colleagues.

What is it that needs to be done? We need to recognize that bold, strong, decisive, across-the-board marginal rate cuts, doing everything we can to encourage individual initiative and responsibility, is the kind of legislative action that we here can take to get our economy growing and, as we discussed, as the President has said, the merits of this, unfortunately, we don't do that in this package.

That is the reason, Madam Speaker, that we will be coming forward with an alternative, an alternative, a very positive alternative that brings about marginal rate reduction for 100 percent, 100 percent of American taxpayers, so that they can save and invest. And we, of course, want to encourage consumption. We, of course, want to encourage the steps that are necessary to get our economy growing.

I would say again, the idea of incentivizing people to get off the couch and into showrooms of automobile dealerships, the idea of having people take responsibility and being incentivized to make a greater down payment on a home so that they will have a vested interest in it and not this very, very, very failed zero down payment and subprime rates of interest, these are the kinds of creative, bold, policies that we can put into place. That's what we want to do as we deal with the suffering that is out there.

I am convinced, Madam Speaker, based on the last half century and looking at the policies of John F. Kennedy and Ronald Reagan, that if we were to do that, we would do exactly what happened following the implementation of those policies by both John F. Kennedy and Ronald Reagan in the 1960s and the 1980s. We will boost the economy, increase the flow of Federal revenues to the Treasury and be able to address the challenges that are before us.

So, Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against this rule, because the underlying legislation itself is very, very badly flawed, and it's not what the American people need.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, let me begin by thanking Chairmen OBEY, RANGEL, WAXMAN, OBERSTAR, MILLER, SPRATT and GORDON for their incredible work on this package, and I want to thank their staffs.

I also want to thank ROSA DELAURO for championing the antihunger provisions in this package, which I think are so important, not only in terms of our moral obligation to help people in this country who don't have enough to eat, but it also helps stimulate the economy.

I also am grateful to Majority Leader STENY HOYER and to Speaker NANCY

PELOSI for their leadership in trying to put a good and solid reinvestment recovery package together.

Madam Speaker, we are facing extremely tough times. This economy is in the worst shape since the Great Depression. Millions and millions of people have lost their jobs and millions more will lose their jobs unless this Congress, working with this President, takes decisive action.

We are not talking about statistics, we are talking about people. We are talking about families, and they are hurting. There is not a single one of us in this chamber who, when we go home, do not encounter people who have lost their jobs or who are on the verge of losing their jobs.

People are struggling, people are fearful. Small businesses are struggling. They are asking for our help. Cities and towns and States are facing the worst financial crisis in decades, and they are looking for help.

The underlying bill before us provides a first step in helping remedy this terrible situation. John F. Kennedy liked to say that a rising tide lifts all boats. Well, that is what we are trying to do with this package.

We are trying to stimulate the economy. We are trying to make sure that everybody, not just the few who are rich, but everybody, those who are in the middle class and those who are poor, gets the help that they deserve.

My colleague talked about a substitute that the Republicans will offer. Well, that's great, and they will have an opportunity to debate and make their substitute and let the votes fall where they may. But the fact of the matter is that I personally believe that their approach, which I referred to as the same old same old, will not prevail. I hope it doesn't prevail. That's what this election was about. People do not want more of the same. They want a different direction.

Quite frankly, this stimulus package that we debated today should have been what President Bush asked for a year ago. We are late in coming to rescue so many families across this country.

I know it's fashionable on the other side to talk about tax cuts, tax cuts, tax cuts. The bill that President Obama and the Democratic leadership are putting together, 95 percent of American taxpayers get a break.

But I should tell my colleagues that for every dollar of direct spending, the economy gets \$1.50 in stimulus. Every dollar of tax cut produces 75 cents in economic stimulus. So I do think, while we can make the argument that tax cuts are important, investment in our infrastructure, investment in our schools, investment in our economy, is incredibly important.

People have said, well, there is no way we can get all this money out. I should point out in this bill there are strict accountability measures to ensure that highways and transit funds get out of the door quickly to create

jobs. It requires States to obligate 50 percent of the highway and transit funding within 180 days, or the Transportation Department can reclaim some of the States' highway and transportation funding in the bill. So there are incentives to get this money out quickly to help stimulate this economy.

Finally, Madam Speaker, let me say that this really is a defining moment. People are looking to their government for help. They are looking for us to take big, bold steps. They are looking at us the same way that people looked at Franklin Roosevelt during the Great Depression to come and try to put together a package to help get people back to work.

Well, that's what we're trying to do here. Madam Speaker, I will say this, I am proud to be on the floor today debating this rule which will pave the way for a debate on this Economic Recovery and Reinvestment Act, because it shows that this government, once again, has a conscience.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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 SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

PROVIDING FOR AN ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE

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

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 26

That when the House adjourns on the legislative day of Wednesday, January 28, 2009, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand adjourned until 2 p.m. on Monday, February 2, 2009, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the House adjourns on the legislative day of Wednesday, February 4, 2009, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand adjourned until 2 p.m. on Monday, February 9, 2009, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. The Speaker or her designee, after consultation with the Minority Leader, shall notify the Members of the House to reassemble at such place and time as she may designate if, in her opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order: ordering the previous question on House Resolution 87; adopting House Resolution 87; ordering the previous question on House Resolution 88; and adopting House Resolution 88.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on House Resolution 87, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 252, nays 175, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 32] YEAS—252

- Abercrombie
- Ackerman
- Adler (NJ)
- Altmire
- Andrews
- Arcuri
- Baca
- Baird
- Baldwin
- Barrow
- Bean
- Becerra
- Berkley
- Berman
- Berry
- Bishop (GA)
- Bishop (NY)
- Blumenauer
- Bocchieri
- Boren
- Boswell
- Boucher
- Boyd
- Brady (PA)
- Bralley (IA)
- Bright
- Brown, Corrine
- Butterfield
- Capps
- Capuano
- Cardoza
- Carnahan
- Carney
- Carson (IN)
- Castor (FL)
- Chandler
- Childers
- Clarke
- Clay
- Cleaver
- Clyburn
- Cohen
- Connolly (VA)
- Conyers
- Cooper
- Costa
- Costello
- Courtney
- Crowley
- Cuellar
- Cummings
- Dahlkemper
- Davis (AL)
- Davis (CA)
- Davis (IL)
- Davis (TN)
- DeFazio
- DeGette
- Delahunt
- DeLauro
- Dicks
- Dingell
- Doggett
- Donnelly (IN)
- Doyle
- Driehaus
- Edwards (MD)
- Edwards (TX)
- Ellison
- Ellsworth
- Engel
- Eshoo
- Etheridge
- Farr
- Fattah
- Filner
- Foster
- Frank (MA)
- Fudge
- Giffords
- Gonzalez
- Gordon (TN)
- Grayson
- Green, Al
- Green, Gene
- Griffith
- Grijalva
- Gutierrez
- Hall (NY)
- Halvorson
- Hare
- Harman
- Hastings (FL)
- Heinrich
- Herseth Sandlin
- Higgins
- Hill
- Himes
- Hinchee
- Hinojosa
- Hirono
- Hodes
- Holden
- Holt
- Honda
- Hoyer
- Inslee
- Israel
- Jackson (IL)
- Jackson-Lee (TX)
- Johnson (GA)
- Johnson, E. B.
- Kagen
- Kanjorski
- Kaptur
- Kennedy
- Kildee
- Kilpatrick (MI)
- Kilroy
- Kind
- Kirkpatrick (AZ)
- Kissell
- Klein (FL)
- Kosmas
- Kratovil
- Kucinich
- Kildee
- Larsen (WA)
- Larson (CT)
- Lee (CA)
- Levin
- Lewis (GA)
- Lipinski
- Loeb
- Lofgren, Zoe
- Lowey
- Lujan
- Lynch
- Maffei
- Maloney
- Markey (CO)
- Markey (MA)
- Marshall
- Massa
- Matsus
- McCarthy (NY)
- McDermott
- McGovern
- McIntyre
- McMahon
- McNerney
- Meek (FL)
- Meeks (NY)
- Melancon
- Hoyer
- Inslee
- Israel
- Jackson (IL)
- Jackson-Lee (TX)
- Johnson (GA)
- Johnson, E. B.
- Kagen
- Kanjorski
- Kaptur
- Kennedy
- Kildee
- Kilpatrick (MI)
- Kilroy
- Kind
- Kirkpatrick (AZ)
- Kissell
- Klein (FL)
- Kosmas
- Kratovil
- Kucinich
- Kildee
- Larsen (WA)
- Larson (CT)
- Lee (CA)
- Levin
- Lewis (GA)
- Lipinski
- Loeb
- Lofgren, Zoe
- Lowey
- Lujan
- Lynch
- Maffei
- Maloney
- Markey (CO)
- Markey (MA)
- Marshall
- Massa
- Matsus
- McCarthy (NY)
- McDermott
- McGovern
- McIntyre
- McMahon
- McNerney
- Meek (FL)
- Meeks (NY)
- Melancon

- Michaud
- Miller (NC)
- Miller, George
- Minnick
- Mitchell
- Mollohan
- Moore (KS)
- Moore (WI)
- Moran (VA)
- Murphy (CT)
- Murphy, Patrick
- Murtha
- Nadler (NY)
- Napolitano
- Neal (MA)
- Nye
- Oberstar
- Obey
- Olver
- Ortiz
- Pallone
- Pascarella
- Pastor (AZ)
- Payne
- Perlmutter
- Perriello
- Peters
- Peterson
- Pingree (ME)
- Polis (CO)
- Pomeroy
- Price (NC)
- Rahall
- Rangel
- Reyes
- Richardson
- Rodriguez
- Ross
- Rothman (NJ)
- Roybal-Allard
- Ruppersberger
- Rush
- Ryan (OH)
- Salazar
- Sanchez, Linda T.
- Sanchez, Loretta
- Sarbanes
- Schakowsky
- Schauber
- Schiff
- Schrader
- Schwartz
- Scott (GA)
- Scott (VA)
- Serrano
- Sestak
- Shea-Porter
- Sherman
- Shuler
- Sires
- Skelton
- Slaughter
- Smith (WA)
- Snyder
- Space
- Speier
- Spratt
- Stark
- Stupak
- Sutton
- Tanner
- Tauscher
- Taylor
- Teague
- Thompson (CA)
- Thompson (MS)
- Tierney
- Titus
- Tonko
- Towns
- Tsongas
- Van Hollen
- Velázquez
- Visclosky
- Walz
- Wasserman
- Schultz
- Waters
- Watson
- Watt
- Waxman
- Weiner
- Welch
- Wexler
- Wilson (OH)
- Woolsey
- Wu
- Yarmuth

NAYS—175

- 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)
- Broun (GA)
- Brown (SC)
- Buchanan
- Burgess
- Burton (IN)
- Buyer
- Calvert
- Camp
- Campbell
- Cantor
- Cao
- Capito
- Carter
- Cassidy
- Castle
- Chaffetz
- Coble
- Coffman (CO)
- Cole
- Conaway
- Crenshaw
- Culberson
- Davis (KY)
- Deal (GA)
- Dent
- Diaz-Balart, L.
- Diaz-Balart, M.
- Dreier
- Duncan
- Ehlers
- Emerson
- Fallin
- Flake
- Fleming
- Forbes
- Fortenberry
- Fox
- Franks (AZ)
- Frelinghuysen
- Gallely
- Garrett (NJ)
- Gerlach
- Gingrey (GA)
- Gohmert
- Goodlatte
- Granger
- Graves
- Guthrie
- Hall (TX)
- Harper
- Hastings (WA)
- Heller
- Hensarling
- Herger
- Hoekstra
- Hunter
- Inglis
- Issa
- Jenkins
- Johnson (IL)
- Johnson, Sam
- Jones
- Jordan (OH)
- King (IA)
- King (NY)
- Kingston
- Kirk
- Kline (MN)
- Lamborn
- Lance
- Latham
- LaTourette
- Latta
- Lee (NY)
- 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
- Moran (KS)
- Murphy, Tim
- Myrick
- Neugebauer
- Nunes
- Olson
- Paul
- Paulsen
- Pence
- Petri
- Pitts
- Platts
- Poe (TX)
- Posey
- Price (GA)
- Putnam
- Radanovich
- Reahberg
- Reichert
- Roe (TN)
- Rogers (AL)
- Rogers (KY)
- Rogers (MI)
- Rohrabacher
- Rooney
- Ros-Lehtinen
- Roskam
- Royce
- Ryan (WI)
- Scalise
- Schmidt
- Schock
- Sensenbrenner
- Sessions
- Shadegg
- Shimkus
- Shuster
- Simpson
- Smith (NE)
- Smith (NJ)
- Smith (TX)
- Souder
- Stearns
- Sullivan
- Terry
- Thompson (PA)
- Thornberry
- Tiahrt
- Turner
- Upton
- Walden
- Wamp
- Westmoreland
- Whitfield
- Wilson (SC)
- Wittman
- Wolf
- Young (FL)
- Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—5

- Brown-Waite, Ginny
- McCollum
- Solis (CA)
- Tiberi
- Young (AK)