

Delaying the transition is confusing to our consumers, expensive for our broadcasters, will slow down deployment of broadband services, and has potentially dangerous implications for public safety. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to keep the digital transition on the right path and oppose Senate bill 238.

REMEMBERING THE 1969 SANTA  
BARBARA OIL SPILL

(Mrs. CAPPS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Speaker, 40 years ago today, on January 28, 1969, a "blowout" erupted below Union Oil's Platform A 6 miles off the Santa Barbara coast. Before it was capped, more than 3 million gallons of oil spewed into the sea.

For weeks national attention was focused on the spill's disturbing, dramatic images: oil-soaked birds, unable to fly, slowly dying on the sand; 35 miles of sandy beaches coated with thick sludge; over 800 square miles of ocean covered with an oily black sheen.

I lived in Santa Barbara in 1969. I recall how our community came together to save wildlife and clean up our beaches. But the spill's impact went far beyond the ecological and economic damage to our community.

The disaster was considered to be a major factor in the birth of the modern-day environmental movement. There followed a wave of national environmental legislation, including the Clean Air and Water Acts, and laws to protect coastal areas and endangered species.

Now, after 40 years, as we still face the responsibility to protect and preserve our environment, we must never forget this important moment in our Nation's history and commit ourselves to speeding the transition to a clean energy economy.

□ 1015

AUTHORIZING THE USE OF THE  
ROTUNDA OF THE CAPITOL FOR  
A CEREMONY IN HONOR OF THE  
BICENTENNIAL OF THE BIRTH  
OF PRESIDENT ABRAHAM LIN-  
COLN

Mr. CAPUANO. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to discharge the Committee on House Administration from further consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 27 and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 27

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That rotunda of the*

United States Capitol is authorized to be used on February 12, 2009, for a ceremony in honor of the bicentennial of the birth of President Abraham Lincoln. Physical preparations for the conduct of the ceremony shall be carried out in accordance with such conditions as may be prescribed by the Architect of the Capitol.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 92 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 92

*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 further 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. Further general debate shall be confined to the bill and amendments specified in this resolution and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. Notwithstanding clause 11 of rule XVIII, no further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such further amendments are waived except those arising under clause 9 of rule XXI. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.*

Sec. 2. The chair of the Committee on Appropriations shall insert in the Congressional Record not later than February 4, 2009, such material as he may deem explanatory of appropriations measures for the fiscal year 2009.

Sec. 3. The chair of the Committee on Ways and Means may file, on behalf of the Committee, a supplemental report to accompany H.R. 598.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, I rise to make a point of order against consideration of the rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, I raise a point of order against consideration of the rule because the rule contains a waiver of all points of order against the provisions in the bill and amendments made in order by the rule and, therefore, it is in violation of section 426 of the Congressional Budget Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida makes a point of order that the resolution violates section 426(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

The gentleman has met the threshold burden to identify the specific language consisting of the waiver against amendments in the resolution on which the point of order is predicated. Such a point of order shall be disposed of by the question of consideration.

The gentleman from Florida and a Member opposed, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), each will control 10 minutes of debate on the question of consideration.

After that debate, the Chair will put the question of consideration, to wit: Will the House now consider the resolution?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, thank you very much.

I will be using most of my arguments from the Congressional Budget Office cost estimate dated January 26, 2009. The CBO and the Joint Committee on Taxation estimated that enacting the provisions in division B would reduce revenues by \$76 billion in fiscal year 2009, by \$131 billion in fiscal year 2010, and by a net of \$212 billion over the 2009–2010 period.

So combining the spending and revenue effects of H.R. 1, the CBO estimates that enacting the bill would increase the Federal budget deficit by over \$170 billion over the remaining months of the fiscal year 2009, by \$356 billion in the year 2010 and \$174 billion in 2011, and it continues on, \$816 billion over the period 2009 to 2019.

There is a wide range of Federal programs here which increase the benefits payable under the Medicaid unemployment compensation nutrition assistance program, and the legislation would also reduce individual and corporate income tax collections and make a variety of other changes to tax laws. This is basically an unfunded mandate.

CBO anticipates that this bill would have a noticeable impact on economic growth and employment in the next few years. Following long-standing congressional budget procedures, this

estimate does not address the potential budget effects of such changes in economic outlook. But the point that the CBO is making is that this is a huge unfunded mandate, particularly in the Medicaid and unemployment compensation and nutrition assistance program.

So with that, Madam Speaker, in light of the provisions in the bill and the amendments made in order by the rule, are, therefore, in violation of section 426 of the Congressional Budget Act, I do, Madam Speaker, raise this point of order.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Technically this point of order is about whether or not to consider this rule and ultimately the underlying bill. In reality, it's about trying to block this bill without any opportunity for debate and without any opportunity for an up-or-down vote on the legislation itself. I think that is wrong and hope my colleagues will vote "yes" so we consider this important legislation on its merits and not kill it on a procedural motion.

We have a long day ahead. Let's not waste more time on dilatory measures. Those who oppose this bill can vote against it on final passage. We must consider this rule, and we must pass H.R. 1 today.

I have the right to close, and, in the end, I will urge my colleagues to vote "yes" to consider the rule.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished ranking member of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER).

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding and let me say that I rise in strong support of this effort to raise this point of order. And I will say to the distinguished Chair of the Committee on Rules, this 10-minute period of time is when we can debate whether or not this is, in fact, an unfunded mandate that is going to dramatically increase costs. That's what this debate is all about.

It's not about simply killing the bill, it's about utilizing a procedure that exists here in this institution, and I hope very much that our colleagues will join with our friend from Florida and ensure that we do address this very, very important issue.

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, if I may continue, the distinguished chairwoman of the Rules Committee has indicated that this point of order would eliminate debate and not offer the opportunity to Members to really discuss the rule at all. But I would like to say to her, and she was in the Rules Committee when I came out to present my amendment, when the Energy and Commerce Committee marked up that portion of the stimulus package, we were in session for 12 hours. During

that time we had six amendments accepted on the Republican minority side.

It turns out that all six of these amendments were agreed to unanimously by the majority. When the bill went to print and when I went to the Rules Committee, I found my amendment was not included, and neither was the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. MURPHY's or Mr. BLUNT's. Three of the amendments were not included, and we questioned how could this be that out of a full markup of Energy and Commerce Committee, we passed six amendments and only three were put in. Yet the Speaker's office had a sheet, a fact sheet, which indicated that all six amendments were put in the bill and all six of these amendments show the bipartisan-ness of this stimulus package.

Now I think what happened on the Energy and Commerce Committee happened in the Ways and Means Committee and it happened in Appropriations Committee. So this, in fact, stimulus package is not bipartisan.

Reading from the Office of Speaker NANCY PELOSI, her fact sheet of January 27, 2009, she says this is a bipartisan, open and transparent legislative process. It is not, Madam Speaker. The amendments that came out of Energy and Commerce, 50 percent were dropped arbitrarily, capriciously, without any comment from the minority.

Now one of those amendments, which was mine, indicated if you are going to give federal subsidies for COBRA, which is unemployment compensation for individuals in America, why give them to people who have a net worth of \$1 million or \$100 million?

□ 1030

There was no threshold in this bill. So, I basically said, if you're going to give COBRA subsidies, that is you're asking to have the taxpayers pay 65 percent of the COBRA for anybody unemployed, including a man who, for example, left Lehman Brothers or Bernie Madoff; all those people who, under the Democrats' position in the stimulus package, would be able to apply for COBRA subsidies and have the taxpayers in my home county have to pay for their health benefits.

They are asking the taxpayers to pay 65 percent almost indefinitely. And I basically said this should not apply to people that are making \$100 million, \$10 million, or have a net worth of that amount. And, Mr. WAXMAN, who is the chairman of the Energy and Commerce, was kind enough to say, I agree with you, and that should be part of the bill. So my amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DREIER. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEARNS. Yes, I'll be glad to yield.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding. I'd simply like to inquire of him again about this procedure through which this committee went. It's my understanding that these

amendments were all adopted in a bipartisan way, with a unanimous vote in support of these amendments that were later just dropped from the bill that was introduced. And then, we have this statement from the Speaker's press office, a fact sheet stating, In the Energy and Commerce Committee, 57 amendments were dropped, and 43 by Republicans, 6 of which were adopted and incorporated into the bill.

Is that correct?

Mr. STEARNS. I thank the distinguished Member. That is absolutely true. And I think, as he clearly points out, I think we should really ask the distinguished chairwoman of the Rules Committee, why were, in this case, three amendments that were agreed upon in Energy and Commerce, why were they dropped from the print?

And, perhaps if she can't, then I think really the Speaker, whose office this fact sheet came from, should clearly tell us why she dropped amendments that were passed through the democratic process here in the House of Representatives of the United States of America. Yet, they have a fact sheet saying they are still in here. She uses the word "bipartisan" when you can't say it's bipartisan if, in my case, my amendment is not in there. It was agreed upon. And others in the Energy and Commerce, their amendments are not here as well.

So I would be glad to yield time to the distinguished chairwoman of the Rules Committee to find out why these amendments, after they were passed overwhelmingly in the Energy and Commerce Committee, are not in the print.

The distinguished chairwoman of the Rules Committee, does she wish to answer?

Ms. SLAUGHTER. We had a thorough airing of this last night, Madam Speaker. Everybody knows what happened here. It had nothing at all to do with the Rules Committee.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEARNS. I'd be glad to yield.

Mr. DREIER. With all due respect, for the Chair of the Committee on Rules to stand up and say we had an hour discussion on this last night, and everybody knows what happened. Madam Speaker, I don't think the author of the amendment, Mr. STEARNS, was there when last night in the Rules Committee discussed this and this came forward. I just don't see that as any kind of answer.

I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, how much time do I have left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. STEARNS. I reserve the balance of my time, Madam Speaker.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, it's clear she has no response to the rhetorical question: Why were amendments that were agreed upon in the Energy

and Commerce dropped capriciously and arbitrarily from the print. And I think we will just let that as a question remain in the House of Representatives and point out to all the Members that when the Speaker puts out a sheet, a fact sheet, in which she says it's a bipartisan bill, it's open and transparent, well, that obviously is not true.

There's no one on the Democrat side here this morning to explain how amendments that were agreed upon in Energy and Commerce were dropped, and perhaps the same was true of the Ways and Means, and also the Appropriations Committee.

And, for those Members, like myself, who came up and asked why my amendment that was accepted was not included as an amendment to the stimulus package, and the distinguished chairwoman of the Rules Committee cannot even answer the simple question of why were amendments not included, when in fact they were passed overwhelmingly in Energy and Commerce.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, let me correct what Mr. DREIER thinks I said. I said we had a thorough airing of this issue last night at Rules. Although it is not our job to explain why the Speaker's press office—

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I will not.

Certainly, by now, we know a re-dherrring when we see one. This is one of the reddest I have seen in such time that I have been here. And I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on a motion to consider so that we can get about the business of the United States, debate, and pass this important piece of legislation that over 80 percent of the people want us to do.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired. The question is, Will the House now consider the resolution?

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 15-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 240, nays 174, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 39]

YEAS—240

Abercrombie	Berkley	Bright
Ackerman	Berman	Brown, Corrine
Adler (NJ)	Bishop (GA)	Butterfield
Altmire	Bishop (NY)	Capps
Andrews	Blumenauer	Capuano
Arcuri	Bocchieri	Cardoza
Baca	Boren	Carnahan
Baird	Boswell	Carney
Baldwin	Boucher	Carson (IN)
Barrow	Boyd	Castor (FL)
Bean	Brady (PA)	Chandler
Becerra	Braley (IA)	Childers

Clarke	Johnson, E. B.	Perriello
Cleaver	Kagen	Peters
Clyburn	Kanjorski	Peterson
Cohen	Kaptur	Pingree (ME)
Connolly (VA)	Kennedy	Polis (CO)
Conyers	Kildee	Pomeroy
Costa	Kilpatrick (MI)	Price (NC)
Costello	Kilroy	Rahall
Courtney	Kind	Rangel
Crowley	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Reyes
Cuellar	Kissell	Richardson
Cummings	Klein (FL)	Rodriguez
Dahlkemper	Kosmas	Ross
Davis (AL)	Kratovil	Rothman (NJ)
Davis (CA)	Kucinich	Roybal-Allard
Davis (IL)	Langevin	Rush
Davis (TN)	Larsen (WA)	Ryan (OH)
DeFazio	Larson (CT)	Salazar
DeGette	Lee (CA)	Sánchez, Linda
Delahunt	Levin	T.
DeLauro	Lewis (GA)	Sarbanes
Dicks	Lipinski	Schakowsky
Doggett	Loebsack	Schauer
Donnelly (IN)	Loftgren, Zoe	Schiff
Doyle	Lowe	Schrader
Driehaus	Luján	Schwartz
Edwards (MD)	Lynch	Scott (GA)
Edwards (TX)	Maffei	Scott (VA)
Ellison	Maloney	Serrano
Elsworth	Markey (CO)	Sestak
Engel	Markey (MA)	Shea-Porter
Eshoo	Marshall	Sherman
Etheridge	Massa	Shuler
Farr	Matheson	Sires
Fattah	Matsui	Skelton
Finler	McCarthy (NY)	Slaughter
Foster	McCollum	Smith (WA)
Frank (MA)	McDermott	Snyder
Fudge	McGovern	Speier
Gonzalez	McIntyre	Spratt
Gordon (TN)	McMahon	Stark
Grayson	McNerney	Stupak
Green, Al	Meek (FL)	Sutton
Green, Gene	Meeks (NY)	Tanner
Griffith	Melancon	Tauscher
Grijalva	Michael	Teague
Gutierrez	Miller (NC)	Thompson (CA)
Hall (NY)	Miller, George	Thompson (MS)
Halvorson	Mitchell	Tierney
Hare	Mollohan	Titus
Harman	Moore (KS)	Tonko
Hastings (FL)	Moore (WI)	Towns
Heinrich	Moran (VA)	Tsongas
Herse	Murphy (CT)	Van Hollen
Hill	Murphy, Patrick	Velázquez
Himes	Murtha	Visclosky
Hinche	Nadler (NY)	Walz
Hirono	Napolitano	Wasserman
Hodes	Neal (MA)	Schultz
Holden	Nye	Waters
Holt	Oberstar	Watson
Honda	Obey	Watt
Hoyer	Oliver	Waxman
Inslee	Ortiz	Weiner
Israel	Pallone	Welch
Jackson (IL)	Pascrell	Wilson (OH)
Jackson-Lee	Pastor (AZ)	Woolsey
(TX)	Payne	Wu
Johnson (GA)	Perlmutter	Yarmuth

NAYS—174

Akin	Camp	Franks (AZ)
Alexander	Campbell	Frelinghuysen
Austria	Cantor	Gallely
Bachmann	Cao	Garrett (NJ)
Bachus	Capito	Gerlach
Barrett (SC)	Carter	Giffords
Bartlett	Cassidy	Gingrey (GA)
Barton (TX)	Castle	Gohmert
Berry	Chaffetz	Goodlatte
Biggert	Coble	Granger
Bilbray	Coffman (CO)	Graves
Bilirakis	Cole	Guthrie
Bishop (UT)	Conaway	Hall (TX)
Blackburn	Davis (KY)	Harper
Blunt	Deal (GA)	Hastings (WA)
Boehner	Dent	Heller
Bonner	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hensarling
Bono Mack	Diaz-Balart, M.	Heger
Boozman	Dreier	Hoekstra
Boustany	Duncan	Hunter
Brady (TX)	Ehlers	Inglis
Broun (GA)	Emerson	Issa
Brown (SC)	Fallin	Jenkins
Buchanan	Flake	Johnson (IL)
Burgess	Fleming	Johnson, Sam
Burton (IN)	Forbes	Jones
Buyer	Fortenberry	Jordan (OH)
Calvert	Foxx	King (IA)

King (NY)	Miller (FL)	Ryan (WI)
Kingston	Miller (MI)	Sanchez, Loretta
Kirk	Miller, Gary	Scalise
Kline (MN)	Minnick	Schmidt
Lamborn	Moran (KS)	Schock
Lance	Murphy, Tim	Sensenbrenner
Latham	Myrick	Sessions
LaTourette	Neugebauer	Shadegg
Latta	Nunes	Shimkus
Lee (NY)	Olson	Shuster
Lewis (CA)	Paul	Smith (NE)
Linder	Paulsen	Smith (NJ)
LoBiondo	Pence	Smith (TX)
Lucas	Petri	Souder
Luetkemeyer	Pitts	Stearns
Lummis	Poe (TX)	Sullivan
Lungren, Daniel	Posey	Taylor
E.	Price (GA)	Terry
Mack	Putnam	Thompson (PA)
Manzullo	Radanovich	Thornberry
Marchant	Rehberg	Tiahrt
McCarthy (CA)	Reichert	Tiberi
McCaul	Roe (TN)	Turner
McClintock	Rogers (AL)	Upton
McCotter	Rogers (KY)	Walden
McHenry	Rogers (MI)	Wamp
McHugh	Rohrabacher	Westmoreland
McKeon	Rooney	Wilson (SC)
McMorris	Ros-Lehtinen	Wittman
Rodgers	Roskam	Wolf
Mica	Royce	

NOT VOTING—18

Aderholt	Dingell	Space
Brown-Waite,	Higgins	Wexler
Ginny	Hinojosa	Whitfield
Clay	Platts	Young (AK)
Cooper	Ruppersberger	Young (FL)
Crenshaw	Simpson	
Culberson	Solis (CA)	

□ 1105

Mr. TIERNEY and Ms. DEGETTE changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

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.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. LATOURETTE was allowed to speak out of order.)

WELCOMING TIBERI TRIPLETS

Mr. LATOURETTE. Madam Speaker, I just for a minute ask the membership to pause for an announcement, and I will be very brief. I do see the dean of our Ohio delegation over there, Ms. KAPTUR, and I know she will want to share in this news as well.

By luck of retirements and defeats and everything else, I now have the pleasant responsibility of being the Republican dean of the Ohio delegation. And some of you may have noticed that our colleague, Mr. TIBERI of Columbus, has not been with us for votes. Some were concerned that he was ill, something was going on.

I have the happy duty to inform the House that he and his wife Denice a week ago Sunday, are now the proud parents of triplets. Daniela, Gabriela, and Cristina are all doing well. Cristina is scheduled to be released from the hospital soon.

So if Congressman TIBERI looks a little tired and a little more worn-out than he has in the past, that is the reason. I know that the House will want to congratulate him and Denice and their three daughters.

The Speaker pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New York is recognized for one hour.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER). All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous materials into the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, nothing is on the minds of Americans more than the sad state of our economy. At dinner tables and water coolers across this great Nation, Americans are concerned not only about our economy, but their own well-being. Will they have a job next week, will they be able to retire when they plan to, will they be able to afford the mortgage, the rent, and their child's education.

Madam Speaker, the Bush administration left us with the worse economy we have faced since World War II. The economic downturn is no longer subject to debate. In the last 4 months, this country has lost 2 million jobs. And, unfortunately, is expected to lose another 3 to 5 million in the next year alone. In fact, 2008 was the worst year for job loss since 1945 while unemployment has skyrocketed to the highest level in 15 years.

This week, major corporations from Caterpillar to Sprint, Nextel to Home Depot announced that they were cutting 62,000 jobs.

Fortunately, it is not too late to turn things around, but the time is almost gone. We must act now. If nothing is done, our economy will continue this downward spiral, and we must take action to boost this economy and to start putting America back to work.

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act is a critical and necessary investment that will create and save 3 to 4 million jobs, will jump start our economy and begin the process of transforming it for the 21st century with \$550 billion in carefully targeted priority investments.

Madam Speaker, this plan helps to strengthen Main Street and the middle class, not Wall Street. In order to improve the plight of hardworking Americans, we will provide immediate, direct tax relief to over 95 percent of Americans.

Not only will the American Recovery and Reinvestment Plan create jobs and grow the economy, it makes a significant investment in our future.

By doubling clean, renewable energy production, we will put people to work in the short term while freeing us from our dependence on foreign oil in the long run.

By renovating public buildings and homes to make them more energy efficient, we will create jobs that can't be exported while curbing global warming at the same time.

By rebuilding our crumbling infrastructure and improving our roads, bridges, and schools, we will strengthen our path forward.

And by investing in our health care system, we will cut red tape, prevent mistakes, and save countless dollars and lives.

I am particularly proud that this bill contains funding for AmeriCorps, which will provide recent college graduates with jobs, sending them into struggling communities to help turn them around, much like the Civilian Conservation Corps did after the Great Depression.

Finally, we will assist those who have been impacted most by the crisis by increasing food stamp and unemployment benefits, and making it easier for those who have lost their jobs to keep their health insurance. And these are just a few highlights of this comprehensive bill.

Madam Speaker, the American people are hurting. They are also justifiably concerned whether government spending in such difficult times is correct. I want them to know that this bill contains strict accountability measures to ensure the maximum return for every tax dollar invested. Americans will be able to go on the web to see how their tax dollars are being spent and to provide public comment.

The bill contains no earmarks and ensures that funds to help small businesses will not go to entities that already receive money from the financial rescue package.

Furthermore, the legislation doesn't waste any time. It will immediately help to put people to work and begin to stabilize our economy.

According to the Office of Management and Budget, three-quarters of the overall package will be spent in the first 18 months. And in an independent analysis, economist and former McCain adviser Mark Zandi found that 41 percent of the funding in this bill will be spent this year alone to jump start our economy and result in 4 million new jobs by 2010.

Madam Speaker, our economic woes will not be solved overnight, but we did not get into this mess overnight. This bill alone will not solve all of our economic challenges. We know that the road back to economic stability and prosperity will require hard work over time to truly turn things around. But America has faced great challenges before and turned crises into opportunity. This legislation is critical to build a foundation for long-term prosperity.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act; and by doing so, to restore confidence, to strengthen our economy, and lift up our hardworking citizens from coast to coast.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I want to begin by not only thanking the distinguished Chair on the Committee on Rules for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, I would like to associate myself with the first three sentences of her presentation.

It was in the opening remarks that the distinguished Chair of the Committee on Rules presented that she talked about the pain that the American people are feeling as we go through one of the most serious economic downturns in our Nation's history. It is a very, very difficult time. And on that, Democrats and Republicans are in total agreement and it is absolutely imperative that we take action in this institution and that we take action that will provide the best jump start for our economy that we possibly can.

□ 1115

The Republican Conference, Madam Speaker, was very privileged to welcome the President of the United States yesterday afternoon. We had lunch downstairs and a freewheeling discussion on the issue that we are here addressing at this moment. And that issue is how do we get this economy growing again. And we are in the midst of a raging debate on it. It is true that we are very concerned. And most Republicans have, since we saw this \$825 billion package introduced, been opposed. But yesterday we did listen to President Obama. A number of questions were posed to the President in this freewheeling discussion.

The thing that I came away with from that meeting yesterday was we need to focus on the merits of this issue that is before us and not on politics. Pointing the finger of blame is useless. What we need to do is figure out how we can come together and put into place the very best fiscal policy that we can be sure that we grow our economy. I agree totally with President Obama. We need to set politics aside and focus on the merits. And I think that he left us with a good feeling about his commitment to do just that.

Unfortunately, Madam Speaker, what we have seen with the development of this package, the way it was handled in the House Rules Committee, and the way that we are considering this measure on the floor, it appears that there is very little focus on the merits and that most of the attention is focused on politics. I will say that when we focus on merits, it seems to me that the wisest thing for us to do is not to listen to the words of a partisan Republican or the words of a partisan Democrat or even the words of a bipartisan Republican or bipartisan Democrat. What I believe we need to do, Madam Speaker, is to look at the message that has come to us from the professional, nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office.

Now, the Congressional Budget Office had a preliminary study which the distinguished Chair of the Committee on Appropriations dismissed. And I understand that. He made some very compelling arguments before the Rules Committee the day before yesterday on that. And frankly, I couldn't dispute them. But they did come forward yesterday with a very, very exhaustive study in which they say, and I quote, Madam Speaker, "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." It goes on, Madam Speaker, to talk about the challenges of dealing with the regulatory structure that is in place. And we looked at the issue of budget authority versus outlays. And I would focus my colleagues' attention on the third-to-the-last graph on the Congressional Budget Office study in which it makes it very clear that \$2.3 billion, \$2.3 billion, of this package will, in fact, not be expended until after 2019. That is 2-0-1-9. That is not 2009, not 2010, not 2011. That is more than 10 years from now.

So, Madam Speaker, if we are, in fact, coming together in a bipartisan way to figure out how we can jumpstart our economy immediately, this is obviously not the answer.

This is a copy of H.R. 1 that has just been given to me. It is 627 pages long. And that totals \$1.18 billion for every single page in this bill, H.R. 1.

What we need to focus on, Madam Speaker, is the issue of getting the economy growing with what most economists believe and what history has shown to be stimulative: Tax relief. Growth-oriented tax relief. Now this morning I picked up the US News and World Report issue that has a "Capital Commerce" column from James Pethokoukis who quoted a wide range of economists making 10 points that very, very seriously raise concerns. And I would like to point to just one of them. Christina Romer, who is the new head of the Council of Economic Advisers for President Obama, said that tax increases appear to have a very large, sustained and highly significant negative impact on output. The more intuitive way to express this result is that tax cuts have very large and persistent positive output effects.

Now, Madam Speaker, it's obvious that the kinds of tax cuts that we are talking about are those that generate economic growth, relief on job creators, making sure that we have marginal rate reduction that will benefit 100 percent of American taxpayers. These are the kinds of things that we are offering in our Republican substitute. And I hope very much that our colleagues will support it.

This package that is before us is badly flawed, as we are going to hear throughout this debate and as was

pointed out yesterday. And I'm going to urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this rule. This rule is very unfair. There were 206 amendments submitted to the Rules Committee. Eleven have been made in order of 206 amendments. A majority of those amendments were offered by Democrats. So obviously there is a desire to make major modifications in this legislation. And for that reason, this rule is badly flawed. I'm going to urge my colleagues to reject it.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from California, a member of the Committee on Rules, Ms. MATSUI.

Ms. MATSUI. I want to thank the gentlelady from New York for yielding me time, our leader on the Rules Committee.

Madam Speaker, everyone here knows the dire state of our economy. I have talked with and listened to many of my constituents in Sacramento who are struggling to make ends meet. They are facing layoffs, furloughs, foreclosure, unpaid medical bills and a lack of support to help them in this crucial time.

Last month, the Greater Sacramento unemployment rate rose six-tenths of a point to 8.7 percent, the highest monthly job loss since 1993. Approximately 4,700 jobs were cut in the region just that month. And also last month, the State of California suffered the third biggest monthly job loss since the end of World War II.

That is why my colleagues and I have been working to develop this economic recovery package. This package includes historic investment in clean technology, transportation infrastructure, flood protection and our children's education. It also goes to great lengths to assist our States in these difficult times with unemployment, Medicaid and COPS funding.

These investments will help important priorities in my city and region as well as across the State. Sacramento needs urgent funding to strengthen levees on the Sacramento and American Rivers, make renovations at Sacramento State University and our local schools, invest in Sacramento Regional Transit's light rail and bus, improve the terminal at Sacramento International and work to improve Sacramento Municipal Utility District's electric grid. We also have progress to be made on the downtown intermodal station and the accompanying relocation of the downtown rail lines.

I am glad that all of these important projects will be eligible for funding under this package. Each project will improve our city and create jobs that will stimulate the economy. This legislation will go to great lengths to help Sacramento's 8.7 percent unemployment rate. I also understand that Sacramento will receive, actually California will receive about \$4 billion in education funding, something our State desperately needs.

Another key investment in this package is our Nation's broadband. It is unacceptable that our country has progressively fallen behind in broadband deployment. This new investment will ensure that every American can access information so they can achieve the American Dream.

Of significant importance to Sacramento is flood protection. The constant threat of flooding makes it more urgent than ever that the Federal Government commit to flood protection infrastructure. I am encouraged that this bill includes \$2 billion to fund the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Construction account. This money will help restore levees in my district and other flood control infrastructure across the country.

I know that there needs more to be done especially in the Natomas area of Sacramento. And I look forward to working with Chairman OBEY and Chairman VISCLOSKY to continue their commitment to the Corps and ensure that adequate resources are dedicated to flood protection and public safety.

Madam Speaker, we need to address this economic crisis head-on. This package is a substantial step forward. As we have heard from experts on both sides of the aisle, on both sides of the political spectrum, this will not cure our economy's problems. But it will begin to ensure that hardworking Americans get back to work and back on track.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, at this time, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to our very hardworking new member of the Committee on Rules, the gentlewoman from Grandfather Community, North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague, the ranking member of the Rules Committee, for giving me this time.

I want to say that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle practice revisionist history. President Bush inherited a recession. But the tax cuts that were put in place in 2001 and 2003 helped revive our economy and put it on the path to having 54 straight months of excellent job growth. When things started going poorly in the economy was when the Democrats took control of the Congress in 2007. That is when we started having problems. And I think it's important that we point that out.

They have a real hard time, I think, dealing with the facts. Yesterday we got what was called a "fact sheet" from the Speaker's Office saying that this was a bipartisan, open and transparent legislative process. And yet we learned during the process of the committee meeting that information on here was not accurate. And I think it is important, again, that we see there is a pattern of trying to change the facts to suit themselves.

Now I want to talk a little bit about what else is wrong with this rule and the bill that it supports. I have a

strong background in education. I was a school board member, a university administrator and a community college president. And I want to say that putting money into education in the way it's being done in this bill is not going to help stimulate the economy. We know, again, from research that more spending K-12 does not significantly improve educational performance. So this is not going to stimulate the economy. We also know that Federal early education programs don't have lasting benefits for disadvantaged children. Much as we would like to rewrite the facts, it doesn't happen.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado, a member of the Rules Committee, Mr. POLIS.

Mr. POLIS of Colorado. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and the American Recovery and Reinvestment Bill of 2009 and want to thank Speaker PELOSI, Chairman OBEY, Chairwoman SLAUGHTER and all of my colleagues for their timely and decisive leadership on this issue.

Like most Americans, I am distressed about the state of our economy and the impact of our recession on hardworking families.

My home State of Colorado and many of our school districts, faced with draconian budget cuts, are seeing reductions in critical services when they are needed most, workers are being laid off left and right, and there is a massive scaling back of statewide investment. Tens of thousands of Coloradans lost their jobs in October and November alone.

The time has come to set aside partisanship and ideology and to forcefully tackle these underlying conditions and factors that have frozen economic activity in our Nation.

□ 1130

That's why we must ensure that this legislation passes the House and Senate and reaches President Obama's desk as soon as possible.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to be part of the solution and be part of supporting this measure to rebuild our Nation's infrastructure, both physical and human infrastructure, and renew confidence in our economy.

As some of you may know, before joining Congress I served as chairman of our State Board of Education in Colorado and superintendent of the New America Charter School. As an educator, I can tell you that education is the most meaningful medium and long-term investment that we can make to stimulate the American economy. This bill lays the foundation of an education system and green economy for the 21st century by investing in our future. It builds high-tech green schools, reaches out to at-risk kids and children with disabilities, and increases Pell Grants and Work Study aid to help students afford college. Without it, we risk losing precious ground in our fight to close the gap in education.

In my district, Adams County has suffered enormously from the economic downturn, experiencing the 10th highest unemployment rate out of Colorado's 64 counties with over 16,000 unemployed workers. This historic bill will immediately prevent further job loss in hard-hit places like Adams County. I urge support of this bill on behalf of American families.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, at this time, I'm happy to yield 1 minute to our distinguished former Republican whip, my friend from Springfield, Missouri (Mr. BLUNT).

Mr. BLUNT. Madam Speaker, last year, I worked with the Speaker to help pass a stimulus bill that the Speaker at that time said had to be, first of all, timely and targeted. And, Madam Speaker, I would argue that this bill is neither. It's certainly not targeted; it's a broad brush of everything that the majority has wanted to do for the last decade even before they were in the majority. And it's not timely. In fact, the estimates are that 7 percent of the money that would be spent in this bill could be spent in the next year.

Alice Rivlin, President Clinton's budget director, said yesterday before the House Budget Committee, we would be a lot better off if we were debating that 7 percent, and we were taking the other 93 percent and having hearings and trying to do what the Speaker said in her fact sheet we had done here. Ms. FOXX just mentioned this fact sheet—which, frankly, Madam Speaker, wasn't even factual when it was printed. It says in my committee, the Energy and Commerce Committee, that six Republican amendments were adopted and incorporated into the bill. Three of them were already taken out of the bill before the fact sheet was printed, Madam Speaker.

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

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I would like to yield my friend an additional 30 seconds to continue his very important argument about the issue that Ms. FOXX raised.

Mr. BLUNT. I thank the gentleman for yielding. Three of these were already out of the bill when this was printed. The amendment I had just simply said nothing in this legislation would prevent pharmacists from talking to their patients. That wasn't quite good enough. So in the 12-hour markup—that really did nothing to change the bill as it turns out—we spent 3 hours of that 12 hours agreeing on language so pharmacists could talk to their patients, and that language was taken out before this fact sheet was even printed. The fact sheet is not factual. The stimulus isn't stimulating. I urge that we defeat this rule and defeat this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Colorado will manage the time of the gentleman from New York.

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS of Colorado. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California, a member of the Appropriations Committee, Ms. LEE.

Ms. LEE of California. Thank you for yielding. And let me just say I, today, rise in support of the rule and also, of course, the bill.

First let me just say the economic policies of the previous administration we all recognize has left our Nation in shambles. The huge tax cuts for the wealthy, the war in Iraq—\$10 billion a month—and the greed in this unregulatory environment of the previous administration has brought us to this point. And so I think it's incumbent upon the Republicans, especially, in this body to work together to try to help this country dig itself out of what has transpired in the last 8 years.

Today, more people are living in poverty, more people are living without health insurance, and more people are unemployed than they were 8 years ago, and it's only getting worse. That's why the bill we're debating today is so important.

I applaud President Obama and Speaker PELOSI, our leadership, Majority Whip CLYBURN and Chairman OBEY, for crafting this robust economic stimulus package and their efforts to ensure bipartisanship in this. I'm pleased that it includes funding for a number of important initiatives that many of us have fought for, including extended unemployment benefits, expanding the food stamp program, and providing increased Medicaid funding to the States to help people just get through this crisis. It also funds a range of transportation and infrastructure projects to rebuild our roads, modernize our schools, rehab our housing stock and prevent foreclosures. It creates jobs. It puts our Nation's path to recovery in a very strong position by including \$4 billion in job training, including \$500 million in green jobs and \$1.2 billion in youth training programs.

I'm pleased that State and local governments will be able to tap into the \$2.7 billion of these job training funds to fund innovative programs to provide reemployment services, job training, summer jobs, and year-round employment for youth.

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

Mr. POLIS of Colorado. I yield an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. LEE of California. Taken together, this bill will help put our Nation back on the right track.

But frankly, I think—and many of us think—it could and should have been much bigger, at least \$1 trillion, but we're working together to try to reach some type of consensus so that we can move forward in a bipartisan fashion. It should have been enacted, I think, a year ago, when some of us first called for a new stimulus package to jumpstart our economy. Instead, the previous administration just refused to take action, letting our economy collapse before choosing to bail out their

friends. So let's move this bill forward. Let's move this bill forward for Main Street.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I tell my friend from California that her dream has come true, this bill, according to CBO, is \$1.1 trillion.

With that, I would like to yield 2 minutes to my very good friend from Westminster, South Carolina (Mr. BARRETT).

Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the rule of H.R. 1. And it's surprising that out of the 206 amendments submitted to the Rules Committee only 11 were accepted and going to be debated here today.

Today, we will spend about 8 hours on a bill that cost about \$825 billion and could potentially put our country in much more debt than we can handle.

Without a doubt, Madam Speaker, the American people are suffering. In my home State of South Carolina, the unemployment rate was about 9.5 percent in December, the highest in 25 years. Our national debt is increasing. And on Monday alone, 70,000 Americans lost their jobs.

Unfortunately, rather than focusing on job-creating measures like infrastructure and tax cuts—like I think should be in there—the Democrats have put forth legislation with billions in unwarranted and unrelated spending. I believe the government's responsibility is to ensure the actions taken are aimed at providing immediate and meaningful economic stimulus while at the same time trying to offer long-term solutions.

The Democrat plan fails to provide a swift and substantial positive impact on the economy. The Congressional Budget Office alone has estimated that much less than half of this money would be spent over the next 2 years. American families, Madam Speaker, are struggling to make ends meet and cannot afford that long to see an improvement in this economy.

In addition to having reservations regarding the effectiveness of the proposed stimulus package in the short term, I'm concerned that my Democrat colleagues have filled this bill with non-stimulative spending. The Democrat plan provides, for example, \$50 million for the National Endowment of the Arts, \$250 million for NASA to study climate change, and \$1 billion for the 2010 census package.

If Congress truly wants to stimulate the economy without damaging our future by increasing the debt, we should make real choices and cut programs in order to pay for other initiatives that truly stimulate the economy. In these challenging financial times, we cannot afford to open the door to more spending.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this rule.

Mr. POLIS of Colorado. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin, the chairman

of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. OBEY.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, the constant refrain of Republican critics on this bill is that it spends too much money and spends it too slowly. That shows, in my judgment, a failure to appreciate the depth and the duration of our economic crisis.

In testimony before the House Budget Committee yesterday, the CBO Director, Doug Elmendorf, explained that if nothing is done, our economic output will fall below its potential by \$1 trillion in 2009, by \$900 billion in 2010, and by at least \$600 billion in 2011. That would represent a loss in Americans' income and output of \$2.5 trillion, or about \$8,000 per person that would be lost forever. Director Elmendorf noted that this would be the largest gap relative to the size of potential output since the Great Depression.

When put in that perspective, this \$825 billion package is not too large, even with a sizeable multiplier—in fact, it's probably smaller than it ought to be, but it's well worth doing.

In addition, the fact that some infrastructure efforts will take more than 18 months to complete, and thus outlays will continue into 2011 is also justified despite the criticism.

As economist Alan Blinder recently told the Wall Street Journal, because we face a deep and prolonged gap in output, we could certainly use some time release capsules in the form of infrastructure spending to continue to provide a boost to the economy. It ought also to be worth noting that what matters after all is what employers decide about employment, not when the Federal Government outlay takes place.

State and local governments, as well as private construction companies, are making decisions now about whether to fire their staff or how many to fire. Federal reimbursements to governments for education or infrastructure may not occur for a year, but the jobs are preserved today. I would hope that we would remember that.

Much is also made of the fact that this bill will cause an increase in the deficit; absolutely, without question. But the proper question to ask them is how much more would that deficit increase if we do nothing? How much deeper would our employment numbers fall if we do not do something? How many more Americans will lose their health insurance as well as their jobs, as well as their retirement security if we continue to talk about business as usual?

The fact is that we need to compare the cost of this package with the cost of doing nothing. The cost of doing nothing would be catastrophic. The cost of this package is well worth the risk considering the alternative.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, at this time, I'm happy to yield 1 minute to a hardworking member of our Economic Stimulus Working Group, the gentlewoman from Hinsdale, Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT).

Mrs. BIGGERT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the rule for H.R. 1, the so-called "economic stimulus package."

At a time of record unemployment, deficits and foreclosures, I believe that we can't do nothing. I believe it is our duty to act swiftly and responsibly to jump-start our ailing economy, and that is why we should be enabling families, entrepreneurs, small businesses and job seekers to keep more of what they earn through fast-acting tax relief, not new wasteful government spending on numerous programs that hold little potential for economic stimulus.

Today, Congress should be considering increased deductions for individuals and small businesses, and tax-free unemployment benefits to help individuals get back on their feet and provide for their families.

Unfortunately, Madam Speaker, the bill before us today misses the mark. It contains at least \$132 billion in new programs and spending that will not create jobs in the immediate future. In fact, a report issued on Monday by the Congressional Budget Office and the Joint Committee on Taxation estimated that enacting H.R. 1 would increase budget deficits by \$816 billion.

I would urge my colleagues to oppose this rule and the bill before us today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) now controls the time.

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE).

Mr. ETHERIDGE. I thank the gentle lady for yielding.

And as I sat on the floor today and listened to some of the dialogue, let me very quickly, before I make comment, share with you. I had to go home last night to the wake of a very dear friend of mine. As I stood in the receiving line, every single person, irregardless of their party background, came up to me and said, "You need to go back to Washington and vote for that recovery package. We're hurting, and we need it passed quickly."

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the rule for H.R. 1, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009, and for the underlying bill. This bill provides urgently needed relief for struggling individuals and businesses and will create or retain three to four million jobs in this country.

H.R. 1 includes America's Better Classroom Act, which will provide tax credits to enable up to \$25 billion in school construction and modernization, an initiative that I've been working on for over 12 years, along with my colleagues. Together, with \$20 billion in grant funding, these tax credits will enable local communities to address overcrowding and deteriorating classrooms and make sure that students have facilities that prepare them to

enter the workforce of the 21st century. School construction projects will create over 10,000 jobs in North Carolina alone.

While investments are also in this bill for improving roads, bridges, alternative energy, environmentally friendly energy sources, and modernizing public buildings, it will create even more jobs while helping to bring our infrastructure into the 21st century.

We need this legislation to address the urgent and dire economic conditions in my home State of North Carolina and across this country. The tax credits and job creation provisions of H.R. 1 are a bold step that will put our economy back on track quickly. It will invest in the people here in America. And it will do so with accountability and with transparency.

□ 1145

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this rule and the underlying bill.

The people I talked with last night in Rocky Mount, they weren't interested in arguments. They want results from this Congress, and they want us to act quickly.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds to respond to the distinguished Chair of the Committee on Appropriations and to respond to his questions by saying again I would commend to him and his colleagues today's U.S. News and World Report that has just come out with an analysis from Democratic- and Republican-leaning economists, all of whom point to the fact that increasing spending dramatically, as this measure would do, in fact, will undermine the potential for what it is we're trying to do and tax cuts are the answer to get the economy growing.

With that, Madam Speaker, I would like to yield 1 minute to our very good friend, my junior colleague from Indianapolis, Indiana (Mr. BURTON).

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, instead of tax cuts, we've given Wall Street and the bankers \$700 billion in the bailout; \$14 billion to the auto industry; and this bill is \$850 billion, an "economic stimulus" package. No tax cuts really, just more and more spending. And this is going to cause a severe inflationary problem down the road.

And what have the President, the Vice President, and chief economic adviser to the President said? They said this is a good down payment on the problem. So today on television some of the news commentators said, well, is the money we're spending so far going to be enough? And I will just say to them right now if they're paying any attention, according to the administration and the chief economic advisers, this is just a down payment. We're going to spend trillions and trillions more, wasteful spending into a black hole, in my opinion, and it's going to cause severe inflationary problems and

economic problems down the road that nobody really anticipates.

We have got to cut spending and we need to cut taxes. That's the solution to the problem.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

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

Mr. SHERMAN. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time.

This bill contains aid to States, which is important because the worst thing for us to do in a recession is to fire cops and teachers. This bill includes \$114 billion of business tax incentives, which are well crafted because we do not cut tax rates. What we simply do in this bill is allow businesses to take deductions in 2009 that they would otherwise be taking early next decade. And, in fact, of that \$114 billion listed as going to business, well more than 80 percent comes back to the Treasury early next decade.

But what can we tell markets today about what is likely to happen to the national debt over the next decade? We are saddled with an \$11 trillion national debt. The Fed has quietly issued \$7 trillion of guarantees and loans. We've sent nearly a trillion to Wall Street, all on top of a trillion dollar deficit.

Before we do more, we should put into statute the tax increases and expenditure cuts, painful as they will be, that will go into effect in the year after unemployment drops below 4 percent. Sure, we would have to modify such provisions before they go into effect. But we need to adopt both halves of Keynesian economics, both stimulus now and austerity later, and we need to put both halves in statute. Otherwise, those of us who will be advocating fiscal restraint in the future may well lose, and our only recourse will be to prevent the full measure of stimulus that this economy needs now because we are fearful that we will not be able to reverse it later. And, in fact, that is what has happened.

This bill provides inadequate stimulus today and inadequate recapture of that stimulus, actually virtually no recapture of that stimulus, early next decade.

If we're going to use Keynesian economics, let's put into statute both halves. Otherwise, we can provide only empty promises to our children and empty promises to Wall Street and to the world economic community that we will do something about this deficit next decade.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds to respond to my good friend from California, our new father from California, to simply say that if one looks at many analyses that have been provided, it is very apparent that juxtaposing growth-oriented tax cuts to spending, those growth-oriented tax cuts can provide the immediate jump-start that is necessary for

the economy, and that's why I think we should come together in support of our package.

With that, Madam Speaker, I am happy to yield 1 minute to our very good friend from Omaha, Nebraska (Mr. TERRY).

Mr. TERRY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to voice my objection and disapproval to this massive spending bill, perhaps a trillion dollars by the time it's all done. And that is being sold as the only way to jump-start the American economy.

Portions of this bill may lead to financial relief for some individuals and some small businesses, but most of the new spending will simply increase the size of the Federal Government, creating a new baseline which is not sustainable. Now, that concerns me greatly because this trillion dollars goes to the national debt, which is, to me, a drag on the economy now.

Economists tell us, and I believe them, that this will cause an increase in the inflation rate, create stagflation, and increase interest rates over the next several years. This is not the right way to go at this point of time.

If the bill contained tax cuts, incentives, as well as the infrastructure that is much needed in America, I could support that.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCHWARTZ).

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Madam Speaker, the people of my district, like all Americans, are deeply worried about the economic challenges facing our Nation and optimistic about the future under our new President. They know that swift and meaningful action is needed to restore confidence in our markets, save jobs, and rebuild our economy.

This rule allows the House to take an important step to address the needs of people and industries most affected by the current economic downturn and to stimulate the innovation that is essential to drive our economy in the future. Action is necessary now towards energy independence, educational advancement, infrastructure, and improvements in quality and efficiency in health care to better enable us to meet the economic challenges ahead.

I am particularly proud of the major new investment in health information technology. By increasing the use of health IT to 90 percent of physicians in this country within 10 years, we can assure that vital medical information is available at the point of service, we can improve quality and reduce unnecessary interventions, better coordinate care, save lives, and save costs for patients, employers, and taxpayers, all leading to a healthier, more economically competitive America. It is a smart, timely investment to meet today's challenges and fulfill America's promise.

I encourage my colleagues to vote "yes" on the rule, to vote "yes" on final passage, and by doing so vote

“yes” for relief for American families, to vote to stimulate job growth here in America, to vote “yes” for the essential investments we need now for the future.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, at this time I am happy to yield 2 minutes to our friend from Mesa, Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I'm glad that this stimulus, and I think all of us are glad, most of us are glad, that this stimulus contains no earmarks from Congress. There's a lot of pork in it certainly, but not earmarks from Congress.

What most people don't realize, however, is that next week we're slated to consider a huge omnibus bill to pass spending bills that didn't get passed in last year's session. That bill, that massive, massive bill, is going to come to the floor with at least, and we have no idea how many, but at least 4,000 earmarks, 4,000 earmarks that have not been vetted by the whole House. Most of them have not even been vetted by the full Appropriations Committee. Some were passed by the subcommittees, but few of them, like the Labor-HHS bill with about, I think, 1,200 earmarks, wasn't even vetted by the full committee; yet it's going to be considered on the floor without the ability to challenge these individual earmarks. Nobody can stand and challenge individuals earmarks. There may be questions about campaign contributions that coincide with earmarks being put out. We can't challenge that. We can't do it because it simply wasn't allowed.

Now, the other side will likely blame our side, well, you guys held up appropriations. We have not been in charge of this body for 2 years; yet we're going to be asked to consider legislation with thousands of earmarks that have not been vetted by the full House and where there is no ability by anyone in this Chamber to actually strike an individual earmark or to question spending.

Now, the reason I bring it up now, this rule, section 2 reads: “The Chair of the Committee on Appropriations shall insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD not later than February 4, 2009, such material as he may deem explanatory of appropriations measures for the fiscal year 2009.”

What that is to do is to finally get the report of actually what earmarks will be in the bill. Well, guess what.

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

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I am happy to yield my friend an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. FLAKE. February 4 is the same day we will actually be considering this bill on the floor.

I would yield to the chairman of the Rules Committee to see if she would consider amending the rule to allow the report to be filed on February 2. That is what our own rules say we

should have, that space of time, at least 2 days for people to actually consider these earmarks.

I yield to the gentlewoman of the Rules Committee.

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

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I would like to yield my friend from Mesa an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the gentleman.

I yield to the gentlewoman.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

We appreciate your thoughtfulness, Mr. FLAKE, and the good work that you do in the House. But we don't have the capacity to change the date for that report. Otherwise, we would have been happy to consider it.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, the majority has the ability to modify that date as they see fit, and it's a very easy procedure that can be done.

I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. FLAKE. Keep in mind, Madam Speaker, that unless the date is changed, we are likely to get a report on the same day that we vote. More than 4,000 earmarks stuffed into an omnibus bill that we've had no ability to see.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, I would offer a proposition to the gentleman from Mesa.

He continually raises the question of the nexus between earmarks and campaign contributions. I think there's a terrific way to eliminate that nexus. Would he care to join me in cosponsoring the legislation which I introduced in the first day of the Congress to create 100 percent total public financing and to forbid a single private dollar from being contributed to any Member of the House's campaign? That certainly would eliminate totally any potential nexus between campaign contributions and earmarks and allow the Congress to use its judgment legislatively without bringing into question the integrity of the political process.

□ 1200

Mr. FLAKE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. I see no reason to put the taxpayers on the hook to fund our campaigns. We shouldn't—

Mr. OBEY. Taking back my time, it's obvious the gentleman, I guess, is more comfortable complaining about earmarks than doing something about campaign financing.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, at this time I am happy to yield 1½ minutes to our new colleague from Peoria,

Illinois, the home of Caterpillar, Mr. SCHOCK.

Mr. SCHOCK. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment process for H.R. 1.

A couple of points. First of all, I rise in opposition as a Member who has submitted a thoughtful, bipartisan amendment to the Rules Committee, one of the over 200 that was submitted, one of the few that had bipartisan support. I worked with my good Democratic colleague from the State of Washington.

Simply put, it would have required the Federal Government, State government and local governments receiving this stimulus money to spell out who is getting this money, what contractors were awarded the money and its intended use. Just shortly, a few months ago, we awarded nearly \$700 billion to financial institutions; \$350 billion has been spent, and many taxpayers in my district and around the country are asking where it went. This simply would have required that this money moving forward would clearly spell out who is getting it for what purposes.

I can tell you, coming from the State of Illinois, where we have a Governor on trial right now for giving pay-to-play contracts for campaign contributions, I and many of my colleagues from our State wish to know where this money is going to go given the great latitude given to local governments and States.

The second point. This bill flies in the face of the American public's wishes. Frank Luntz just released a survey that over 84 percent of the American people wish for more spending on infrastructure as a means to stimulus, yet \$800 billion in this bill, less than 8 percent is going to go for infrastructure. A similar super majority of Americans oppose giving tax incentives, tax credits, tax cuts to people in this country who do not pay income tax, yet this bill does just that.

So we have heard a lot of talk about bipartisanship, we had a great meeting yesterday with the President, his willingness to work with us, but bipartisanship is not “you write the bill, we vote for it.”

I urge a “no” vote.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Madam Speaker, bipartisanship is important, and we are reaching out for it. There is no President in history that has reached out and has done more to reach out and to show them than President Barack Obama. He has done so.

On our side, the amendments that you wanted, many of those were included by Chairman OBEY, Chairman RANGEL and the other chairmen in this. There were some objectionable items.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Madam Speaker, I would like to yield my friend an additional minute.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Well, thank you very much, I can certainly use it.

Because of this, this country is looking for us to provide the kind of leadership that is needed. They don't want us to hang around the docks like little boats. They are looking for us to go way out where the big ships go. We must think big and bold. Our economy is crumbling around us.

Let me speak for a moment about what we need in Georgia. I don't know about your States, but Georgia's economy is crumbling and is in need. We will get just more than \$6 billion in construction, and these are ready-made construction projects. Let me read what we have in the law.

It says these new starts and priority projects would be under construction, and, we would be able to award contracts at least within 120 days so that we are moving forward and making sure that these jobs are created in the areas that are needed most.

Now, we don't have a choice in this. The wrong thing for us to do is to do nothing. We have got to act big, we have got to act bold, and the American people are looking to us. We have got to move with confidence.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. I would yield.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding and let me say I completely concur with several points that he has made which I think are very important. His first point that President Obama has reached out in a bipartisan way, it is nearly unprecedented, very unprecedented that he came and met, as he and the gentleman and I discussed yesterday privately, right here in this Capitol with Republican members.

The second, the fact you said we have, in fact, seen bipartisanship from the other side, there were 94 amendments submitted by Republicans and 104 amendments submitted by Democrats. A grand total of 11 amendments have been made in order. When you have so many Democrats and so many Republicans who have been cut out of the process, it's very unfortunate.

The third point that the gentleman makes, which I think is a very valid one, we need to have a bold, strong package here rather than doing nothing. That's why I believe passionately that growth-oriented tax rates, as has been stated by economist after economist, are the way to the future, and I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Well, tax cuts are good, but they are not the only thing. Every economist that we have talked with has said it is spending, because when you spend, you are putting money directly into the economy, creating jobs, and those jobs will yield back tax receipts as well.

When you have tax cuts, it's discretionary. A person can use it to save, they can use it to do whatever. But when you inject money directly into the economy, you are, in fact, stimulating that economy.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I would like to yield myself an addi-

tional 30 seconds and engage in a discussion with my colleague on this.

Madam Speaker, let me just say that economist after economist has pointed to the fact that if we focus on spending, which the gentleman has talked about, there is a lag time. In fact, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office analysis has indicated that spending will go as far as beyond the 10 years from now.

So the gentleman is absolutely right, Madam Speaker, we need to immediately stimulate the economy. And more than a few of these economists, including the President's Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, Christina Romer, pointed to the fact that tax cuts are, in fact, the way to provide that immediate stimulus.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Does the gentleman have more time to yield?

Mr. DREIER. We have got a limited time. I have already yielded my friend an additional minute. Maybe Ms. SLAUGHTER might yield the gentleman a minute so that he could respond.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I can yield the gentleman 30 additional seconds but no more.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. I am so glad you pointed that out, because let me show you, let me just illustrate to you, everything is different, every State is different.

My State has over 6 billion shovel-ready projects ready to go. In one county alone, in Clayton County, we have got \$43 million ready to go; in Cobb County, \$50 million; Henry County, \$12 billion; in Douglas County, \$11 million and in Fulton County, \$62 million. These are shovel-ready projects ready to go that will create jobs.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, let me yield myself 15 seconds to simply say to my colleague that yesterday we had a great discussion about Clayton County. I appreciate the fact that he has several shovel-ready projects.

I still point to the fact that the CBO analysis points out that getting those dollars immediately is, in fact, not going to happen in fact as fast as the gentleman from Clayton County and I would like to see happen.

At this point I would like to yield, Madam Speaker, 1½ minutes to our very hardworking friend, the former chairman of the Committee on Small Business, the gentleman from Egan, Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO).

Mr. MANZULLO. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule. The problem today is nobody is talking about restarting manufacturing. That's what we need to do in order to re-stimulate the economy.

We need to help businesses create orders and make sales, and the place to start is by offering a voucher, so that if you buy a brand-new automobile you get a \$5,000 voucher. This is the way to jump-start the economy without continuing to spend trillions of dollars.

In 2007, 17 million new cars were sold, a year later, only 10 million. That

sucked \$175 billion out of the economy. If we can get back to selling 15 million cars, we can add \$125 billion to the economy, and if you multiplied that times three or seven, which is economic growth, easily over \$1 trillion.

When cars and trucks start selling, people go back to work. It refurbishes local and State tax funds. It restarts the manufacturing and supply chains. People, instead of receiving unemployment compensation, start paying Federal and State income tax.

This is so easy. Get the people back to work to manufacture the automobiles, have a \$5,000 voucher. The total cost is only \$75 billion for 15 million new automobiles. This is what it takes. This is called trickle-up economy. You aim the focus of the stimulus at the problem, and that's the lack of sales of automobiles and trucks in this country.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

Mr. SCHIFF. I thank the chairman and rise in support of the rule and the stimulus bill.

In 2008, more than 2.6 million Americans lost their jobs, the highest yearly job loss total since 1945. In my home State of California, the unemployment rate soared to 9.3 percent last month, its the highest in 15 years.

It's clear that Congress must take aggressive action to stave off a long and deep recession. This legislation will help create jobs quickly, restore purchasing power and help those in need.

With such a large stimulus under consideration, we also have an opportunity to build infrastructure that will promote long-term prosperity. While we have to place a premium on dispensing funds quickly, we must also make a large significant and lasting investment in our country's future. When this recession is far behind us, I hope we can look back and see that something positive came out of it.

By investing in renewable energy, we can achieve both short-term and long-term goals. We can fund many shovel-ready projects that will give the economy a quick boost, but we can also make an investment in America's future, creating high-paying jobs and changing the energy paradigm of this country.

Let's make sure we produce a foundation for the Nation's long-term health and prosperity and a lasting improvement in our standard of living.

In 2008, more than 2.6 million Americans lost their jobs, the highest yearly job-loss total since 1945. In my home state of California, the unemployment rate soared to 9.3 percent last month—its highest point in 15 years. It is clear that Congress must take aggressive action to stave off a long and deep recession and that we must do more to ensure that appropriated money is spent efficiently and effectively to ensure America's future success.

This legislation will create jobs quickly, help restore purchasing power, assist those in need and begin to reignite our flagging economy.

With such a large stimulus package under consideration, we also have a unique opportunity to build infrastructure that will promote long-term prosperity. While we must place a premium on dispersing these funds quickly, we must also make a large, significant and lasting investment in our country's future. I hope to be able to look back on this period, when the recession is far behind us and see that something positive came out of this crisis.

By investing in renewable energy, we can achieve both short-term and long-term goals. The green energy sector has many shovel-ready projects that would give the economy a quick boost. But renewable energy is also vital to our continued economic health—it creates high-paying American jobs in a fast-growing industry and protects our nation's natural resources. In passing this bill, we take the first step on the path toward a clean sustainable high-tech economy.

I believe that the stimulus will help revive our economy both by helping American families who are struggling to make ends meet and by making critical investments in our future. It will help establish the foundation for the nation's long-term economic health and prosperity and ensure a lasting improvement in the standard of living for our children and their children.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, at this time I am happy to yield 1 minute to our very thoughtful and hard-working colleague from Knoxville, Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and the bill that it brings to the floor. The bill has some good things in it, but we simply can't afford them.

When a family falls deeply head over heels into debt, it doesn't go out and immediately and greatly increase its spending. If it does, it gets in even worse trouble.

The majority voted to increase our national debt to an incomprehensible \$11.315 trillion in the last big bailout bill. Now we are told we face trillion-dollar deficits for several years to come.

We simply cannot afford this so-called stimulus package. All it is really a short-term fix for our addiction to spending. And it's false to say if we don't pass this package, we are voting to do nothing. We haven't given enough time to see what effect all the trillions of dollars of actions taken by the Federal Reserve and the Treasury over the last few months have had and will have.

Most Americans support more spending on our infrastructure, but this is less than 8 percent of this bill, and highway spending is only 3 percent. We could do far more, Madam Speaker, for our economy at far less cost if we would give significant tax credits to anyone who would buy or build a new home and people who would buy new or used cars and trucks.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, may I inquire from my colleague how many speakers he has remaining?

Mr. DREIER. I think at this juncture we have a couple of speakers remaining.

May I inquire of the Chair how much time is remaining on each side, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 4¼ minutes remaining and the gentlewoman from New York has 1 minute remaining.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. At this time I am happy to yield 1 minute to our very, very good friend from Highland Park, Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

Mr. KIRK. Madam Speaker, I have now successfully amended this bill twice. The first Kirk amendment blocked stimulus funds from going through Governor Blagojevich's hand.

The second Kirk amendment deleted funding for \$200 million to resod the National Mall. Now the Mall plan collapsed last year after the Park Service received 13,000 objections, including the ACLU, that objected to the plan's restrictions on protest space.

I also objected to the need to turn the reflecting pool into an ice-skating rink, for an expensive contemplation area and new water-taxi service the taxpayers would pay for but no one would use.

It's surprising the Appropriations Committee even approved this funding. Unfortunately, congressional leaders have rejected my amendment allowing bipartisan oversight over the \$825 billion of spending in this bill.

This bill claims to set up a transparency board and an advisory committee, but all of the members will work for the White House. Congressional leaders rejected any oversight by anyone who does not report directly to the President.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, at this time I would like to yield 1 minute to another member of our Economic Stimulus Working Group, our new colleague from Buffalo, New York (Mr. LEE).

Mr. LEE of New York. I thank our esteemed ranking member for yielding.

I rise in opposition to the rule, but more importantly to the underlying bill. The stimulus bill is fraught with spending that truly misses the mark, and what we need to turn around is our struggling economy. The stimulus should spark job creation and ease the strain on middle class America.

□ 1215

We spent our way to prosperity and a bloated Federal Government. The bill does not provide adequate tax relief to small business and middle-class Americans who are on the front line of this crisis. For every dollar this plan devotes to small business, \$6 are used to create new Federal programs, programs which never seem to end.

Creating new Federal programs for every American is not a responsible blueprint for creating jobs in our country and in western New York. Western New Yorkers are no strangers to doing more with less. It's time the Federal Government follow that same pattern.

Now Washington needs to do something quickly and responsibly.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, may I inquire of the Speaker again how much time is remaining on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 2¾ remaining, the gentlewoman from New York has 1 minute remaining.

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

Madam Speaker, on the 9th of January, then President-elect Obama made it very clear. He said, There is no disagreement. That we need action by our government; a recovery plan that will jump-start our economy. And there is total agreement on that. Total agreement on that.

We all know, both sides of the aisle, that in our districts, whether it's Georgia, New York, California, our constituents are hurting. We are all feeling the pain of this economic downturn. The question is: What action will we take? Are we going to put into place a bill that is 627 pages long, \$1.18 billion for every single page of that bill, with spending that will go beyond the next 10 years as we seek to immediately jump-start our economy, or are we going to do what so many economists from both sides of the aisle have indicated we need to do—put into place strong growth-oriented tax cuts that can provide the fast-acting jump-start that we all seek. That is the choice that we have here.

Now, Madam Speaker, unfortunately, this rule, this rule does not allow the kind of debate the Democrats and Republicans deserve: 206 amendments offered to the Rules Committee, most of them amendments from Democrats. Ninety-four of those 206 came from Republicans. Yet, only 11 were made in order.

That is why this rule is unfair, and it's unfair to the American people. We need to have a growth-oriented package, and we are going to come forward with that, but we also need to have a number of these other creative, thoughtful proposals that so many of our colleagues have offered come before us.

This bill, according to the Congressional Budget Office, will exceed \$1.1 trillion if you take into consideration the interest payments. That is going to impose a tremendous burden on future generations, and it is not going to provide the jump-start that President Obama has talked about.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this rule, "no" on the underlying legislation. But when we do have our opportunity to provide a balanced, growth-oriented package, I hope the Democrats and Republicans can come together to provide that immediate jump-start that we need.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, not anyone in the Rules Committee last night would ever have guessed that

I was importuned more than once to make sure there weren't too many amendments out here today; that there were pending trips, things that people had to go to.

The hypocrisy of it sometimes gets the better of me, and I must admit that even mentioning it is somewhat petty on my part. But, nonetheless, I think it needs to be said.

I would be happy to stay here tomorrow and continue to debate this. Frankly, I don't know how anyone can go home this weekend and look in the faces of our constituents and look at the young people, as one of my neighbors said, who had to be pulled from college because he couldn't afford it; for people who don't know if they are going to be working next week; for people who absolutely don't know if they have any future, how do we continue this cold and bitter winter in upstate New York, where the heating prices go up every single day, and where absolutely too many people don't know where the next meal is coming from at the same time as the community kitchens are running out of food.

We are in a very serious condition here, Madam Speaker. This is no time for politics. Everybody says it, but so few people mean it. I mean it. I urge a "yes" vote on the previous question and on the rule, and hope that we can do one today that will begin to rebuild the country we love, America.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, I rise today to highlight an amendment included in the legislation before us today that will not only put Americans to work, but will also improve the safety of our communities. This amendment will go a long way to help put firefighters back in our neighborhoods.

President Obama clearly understands the value of firefighters in our communities, as in his inaugural address he spoke of the firefighters' "courage to storm a stairway filled with smoke" in describing the faith and determination of the American people.

By waiving the matching requirement under the Staffing for Adequate Fire and Emergency Response (SAFER) program, this amendment will ensure that thousands of firefighters are either hired or retained nationwide without adding a single penny to the federal deficit.

All across our Nation, State and local governments are struggling. My State of Connecticut is currently facing a one billion dollar budget deficit this year alone. As a result, our governors, mayors and selectmen are being forced to make deep and at times dangerous budgetary cuts that are unfortunately resulting in many localities not being able to participate in the SAFER program, which is meant to assist departments in hiring additional firefighters.

Congress has funded the SAFER program in the past, and it would be irresponsible for the House to allow this funding to go unused. For this reason, I am extremely pleased that we adopted the aforementioned amendment and ensured that this funding gets to the local fire departments during this time of need.

Madam Speaker, this is just one more example of the responsible, beneficial provisions included in the American Economic Recovery

and Reinvestment Act that will lead our country back to economic stability. I thank all of my colleagues for their support.

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

The previous question was ordered.

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.

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, this 15-minute vote on adoption of House Resolution 92 will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the motion to suspend the rules on S. 328.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 243, nays 185, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 40]

YEAS—243

Abercrombie	Eshoo	Lynch
Ackerman	Etheridge	Maffei
Altmire	Farr	Maloney
Andrews	Fattah	Markey (CO)
Arcuri	Filner	Markey (MA)
Baca	Poster	Marshall
Baird	Frank (MA)	Massa
Baldwin	Fudge	Matheson
Barrow	Giffords	Matsui
Bean	Gonzalez	McCarthy (NY)
Becerra	Gordon (TN)	McCollum
Berkley	Grayson	McDermott
Berman	Green, Al	McGovern
Bishop (GA)	Green, Gene	McIntyre
Blumenauer	Griffith	McMahon
Bocchieri	Grijalva	McNerney
Boren	Gutierrez	Meek (FL)
Boswell	Hall (NY)	Meeks (NY)
Boucher	Halvorson	Melancon
Brady (PA)	Hare	Michaud
Bralley (IA)	Harman	Miller (NC)
Bright	Hastings (FL)	Miller, George
Brown, Corrine	Heinrich	Minnick
Butterfield	Herseth Sandlin	Mitchell
Capps	Higgins	Mollohan
Capuano	Himes	Moore (KS)
Cardoza	Hinchey	Moore (WI)
Carnahan	Hinojosa	Moran (VA)
Carney	Hirono	Murphy (CT)
Carson (IN)	Hodes	Murphy, Patrick
Castor (FL)	Holden	Murtha
Chandler	Holt	Nadler (NY)
Childers	Honda	Napolitano
Clarke	Hoyer	Neal (MA)
Clay	Inslee	Nye
Cleaver	Israel	Oberstar
Clyburn	Jackson (IL)	Obey
Cohen	Jackson-Lee	Olver
Connelly (VA)	(TX)	Ortiz
Conyers	Johnson (GA)	Pallone
Cooper	Johnson, E. B.	Pascrell
Costa	Kagen	Pastor (AZ)
Costello	Kaptur	Payne
Courtney	Kennedy	Perlmutter
Crowley	Kildee	Perriello
Cuellar	Kilpatrick (MI)	Peters
Cummings	Kilroy	Peterson
Dahlgemper	Kind	Pingree (ME)
Davis (AL)	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Polis (CO)
Davis (CA)	Kissell	Pomeroy
Davis (IL)	Klein (FL)	Price (NC)
Davis (TN)	Kosmas	Rahall
DeFazio	Kratovil	Rangel
DeLauro	Kucinich	Reyes
Dicks	Langevin	Richardson
Dingell	Larsen (WA)	Rodriguez
Doggett	Larsen (CT)	Ross
Donnelly (IN)	Lee (CA)	Rothman (NJ)
Doyle	Levin	Roybal-Allard
Driehaus	Lewis (GA)	Ruppersberger
Edwards (MD)	Lipinski	Rush
Edwards (TX)	Loeb sack	Ryan (OH)
Ellison	Lofgren, Zoe	Salazar
Ellsworth	Lowey	Sánchez, Linda
Engel	Lujan	T.

Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schauer  
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  
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—185

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

NOT VOTING—4

Brown-Waite,  
Ginny

Cassidy  
Delahunt

□ 1243

Mr. MINNICK changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

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.

DTV DELAY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 328, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BOUCHER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 328, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 258, nays 168, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 41]

YEAS—258

Abercrombie	Engel	Markey (CO)
Ackerman	Eshoo	Markey (MA)
Aderholt	Etheridge	Marshall
Andrews	Farr	Massa
Arcuri	Fattah	Matheson
Baca	Filner	Matsui
Baird	Fortenberry	McCarthy (NY)
Baldwin	Foster	McClintock
Barrow	Frank (MA)	McCollum
Bean	Fudge	McDermott
Becerra	Giffords	McGovern
Berman	Gonzalez	McHugh
Berry	Gordon (TN)	McIntyre
Bilirakis	Grayson	McMahon
Bishop (GA)	Green, Al	McNerney
Bishop (NY)	Green, Gene	Meek (FL)
Blumenauer	Griffith	Meeks (NY)
Boccheri	Grijalva	Michaud
Boren	Gutierrez	Miller (NC)
Boswell	Hall (NY)	Miller, George
Boucher	Halvorson	Minnick
Boyd	Hare	Mitchell
Brady (PA)	Harman	Mollohan
Braley (IA)	Hastings (FL)	Moore (KS)
Bright	Heinrich	Moore (WI)
Brown, Corrine	Herseth Sandlin	Moran (VA)
Buchanan	Higgins	Murphy (CT)
Butterfield	Hill	Murphy, Patrick
Capps	Himes	Murtha
Capuano	Hinchey	Nadler (NY)
Cardoza	Hinojosa	Napolitano
Carnahan	Hirono	Neal (MA)
Carney	Hodes	Nye
Carson (IN)	Holt	Oberstar
Castor (FL)	Honda	Obey
Chandler	Hoyer	Olver
Childers	Inslee	Ortiz
Clarke	Israel	Pallone
Clay	Jackson (IL)	Pascarell
Cleaver	Jackson-Lee	Pastor (AZ)
Clyburn	(TX)	Perriello
Cohen	Johnson (GA)	Peters
Connolly (VA)	Johnson, E. B.	Petri
Conyers	Jones	Pingree (ME)
Cooper	Kagen	Polis (CO)
Costa	Kanjorski	Pomeroy
Costello	Kaptur	Posey
Courtney	Kennedy	Price (NC)
Crowley	Kildee	Rahall
Cuellar	Kilpatrick (MI)	Rangel
Cummings	Kilroy	Reyes
Dahlkemper	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Richardson
Davis (AL)	Kissell	Rodriguez
Davis (CA)	Klein (FL)	Roe (TN)
Davis (IL)	Kosmas	Rogers (AL)
Davis (TN)	Kratovil	Rogers (KY)
DeFazio	Kucinich	Ros-Lehtinen
DeGette	Langevin	Ross
DeLauro	Larson (CT)	Rothman (NJ)
Diaz-Balart, L.	LaTourette	Roybal-Allard
Diaz-Balart, M.	Lee (CA)	Ruppersberger
Dicks	Levin	Rush
Dingell	Lewis (GA)	Ryan (OH)
Donnelly (IN)	Lipinski	Salazar
Doyle	LoBiondo	Sánchez, Linda
Driehaus	Loeb sack	T.
Duncan	Lofgren, Zoe	Sanchez, Loretta
Edwards (MD)	Lowey	Sarbanes
Edwards (TX)	Luján	Schakowsky
Ellison	Lynch	Schauer
Ellsworth	Maffei	Schiff
Emerson	Maloney	Schrader

Schwartz	Speier
Scott (GA)	Spratt
Scott (VA)	Stark
Sensenbrenner	Stupak
Serrano	Sutton
Sestak	Tanner
Shea-Porter	Tauscher
Sherman	Taylor
Sires	Teague
Skelton	Thompson (MS)
Slaughter	Tierney
Smith (NJ)	Titus
Smith (WA)	Tonko
Snyder	Tsongas
Space	Turner

Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

ELECTING MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 96

*Resolved*, That the following named Members be and are hereby elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

(1) COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY.—Ms. Loretta Sanchez of California, Ms. Harman, Mr. DeFazio, Ms. Norton, Ms. Zoe Lofgren of California, Ms. Jackson-Lee of Texas, Mr. Cuellar, Mr. Carney, Ms. Clarke, Ms. Richardson, Ms. Kirkpatrick of Arizona, Mr. Luján, Mr. Pascrell, Mr. Cleaver, Mr. Al Green of Texas, Mr. Himes, Ms. Kilroy, Mr. Massa, Ms. Titus.

(2) COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM.—Mr. Kanjorski, Mrs. Maloney, Mr. Cummings, Mr. Kucinich, Mr. Tierney, Mr. Clay, Ms. Watson, Mr. Lynch, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Connolly of Virginia, Ms. Norton, Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Davis of Illinois, Mr. Van Hollen, Mr. Cuellar, Mr. Hodes, Mr. Murphy of Connecticut, Mr. Welch, Mr. Foster, Ms. Speier, Mr. Driehaus.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut (during the reading). Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, reserving the right to object, we weren't able to hear on this side what the gentleman asked unanimous consent for.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will continue to read.

The Clerk continued to read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Georgia withdraw his objection?

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Further reserving, Madam Speaker, I would just point out that the ratio on the floor of the House is approximately 59 percent majority party, 41 percent minority party. However, in committees, many committees, that ratio is not adhered to.

We on the minority side have asked the Speaker to make certain that the committees reflect the percentages on the floor of the House. It was impossible to discern from the names read, but we would reiterate our concern to the Speaker regarding the percentages on committees reflecting majority and minority party.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Georgia withdraw his objection?

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I withdraw my objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NAYS—168

Adler (NJ)	Garrett (NJ)	Moran (KS)
Akin	Gerlach	Murphy, Tim
Alexander	Gingrey (GA)	Myrick
Altmire	Gohmert	Neugebauer
Austria	Goodlatte	Nunes
Bachmann	Granger	Olson
Bachus	Graves	Paul
Barrett (SC)	Guthrie	Paulsen
Bartlett	Hall (TX)	Pence
Barton (TX)	Harper	Perlmutter
Berkley	Hastings (WA)	Peterson
Biggert	Heller	Pitts
Bilbray	Hensarling	Platts
Bishop (UT)	Herger	Poe (TX)
Blackburn	Hoekstra	Price (GA)
Blunt	Holden	Putnam
Boehner	Hunter	Radanovich
Bonner	Inglis	Rehberg
Bono Mack	Issa	Reichert
Boozman	Jenkins	Rogers (MI)
Boustany	Johnson (IL)	Rohrabacher
Brady (TX)	Johnson, Sam	Rooney
Broun (GA)	Jordan (OH)	Roskam
Brown (SC)	Kind	Royce
Burgess	King (IA)	Ryan (WI)
Burton (IN)	King (NY)	Scalise
Buyer	Kirk	Schmidt
Calvert	Kline (MN)	Schock
Camp	Lamborn	Sessions
Campbell	Lance	Shadegg
Cantor	Larsen (WA)	Shimkus
Cao	Latham	Shuler
Capito	Latta	Shuster
Carter	Lee (NY)	Simpson
Cassidy	Lewis (CA)	Smith (NE)
Castle	Linder	Smith (TX)
Chaffetz	Lucas	Souder
Coble	Lucas	Stearns
Coffman (CO)	Luetkemeyer	Sullivan
Cole	Lummis	Terry
Conaway	Lungren, Daniel	Thompson (CA)
Crenshaw	E.	Thompson (PA)
Culberson	Mack	Thornberry
Davis (KY)	Manzullo	Tiahrt
Deal (GA)	Marchant	Tiberi
Dent	McCarthy (CA)	Upton
Doggett	McCaul	Walden
Dreier	McCotter	Walz
Ehlers	McHenry	Wamp
Fallin	McKeon	Westmoreland
Flake	McMorris	Whitfield
Fleming	Rodgers	Wilson (SC)
Forbes	Melancon	Wittman
Foxx	Mica	Wolf
Franks (AZ)	Miller (FL)	Young (AK)
Frelinghuysen	Miller (MI)	Young (FL)
Gallegrly	Miller, Gary	

NOT VOTING—6

Brown-Waite,	Payne	Wilson (OH)
Ginny	Solis (CA)	
Delahunt	Towns	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1253

So (two-thirds not being in the affirmative) the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.