

to be in a severe budget crisis. We each here today in this Chamber, Madam Speaker, have the opportunity to get these much-needed funds to States and school districts across the country.

In addition, the budget of Colorado and more than half the States in the country assume that the FMAP increases will occur. If they don't, if this Chamber doesn't act here today, Colorado would have to come up with \$245 million more in cuts; and, in most States, including my home State, those cuts would generally hit education, law enforcement, and higher education. So the extension is critically important not only for the low-income families that rely on Medicaid for health services but also for all public services that are so essential for our communities.

Undermining public education during a recession is no way to build a world-class educational system, no way to create the economic engine of growth for our Nation for the next century when more than ever jobs will depend on what people know and their ability to think rather than what they can do with their hands.

By passing this here today, Madam Speaker, we can help ensure America's competitiveness in a global, knowledge-based economy. Inaction today in the face of today's crisis would simply mean further erosion of our Nation's human capital, our greatest asset.

Madam Speaker, this is not spending we are considering today. This is an investment. It's an investment in our most valuable asset, our children and our future.

I urge a "yes" vote on the previous question and the rule.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, many of my colleagues here today interrupted important activities back in their home districts in order to be here today for this unusual August session.

Some canceled important community events, put off important meetings with constituents or postponed time with their children to be here.

For me, today was the day that I was scheduled to present 11 military medals to Thomas Hetherington, a wonderful Niagara Falls man and decorated Naval officer.

Hetherington fought in both the Korean and Vietnam wars but struggled for years to convince the Pentagon to give him replacement medals; his originals were buried some years ago in the casket of his brother, who himself was a decorated Marine and Vietnam veteran.

This year, my staff was able to assist Mr. Hetherington with getting replacement medals to compensate for the ones he bequeathed to his brother. It was very important to his family and I was glad I could play some small role in navigating the bureaucracy for this constituent.

But last week we called Mr. Hetherington and said we had to postpone the service. Why? Because like my colleagues, I was summoned to Washington to vote on an absolutely critical package of legislation that the Senate approved late last week.

We're here today debating emergency assistance for states and school districts across the country, I can't think of a better reason for members to rush back to the Capitol.

We're here today to extend a lifeline to teachers and classrooms to ensure that students across this country are not hurt by a weak economy that has forced some states into drastic cutbacks.

Despite the failure of the Senate to move this bill during many months of debate until it finally passed this week, the urgency is real. And the appeal is broad.

This legislation saves or creates 310,000 American jobs, specifically for teachers, police officers, firefighters and nurses.

The funds will go immediately to states to prevent layoffs and in some cases to rehire teachers as summer comes to an end and students to go back to school.

Students here in Washington DC will be at school the week after next.

In my home state of New York, this package is worth roughly \$2 billion in Medicaid savings.

Since New York faced a budget shortfall, this bill directs more than \$600 million to the state to retain and create teacher jobs over the coming school year. The U.S. Department of Education says the bill will fund 8,200 positions.

This legislation is completely paid for, primarily by closing tax loopholes that encourage corporations to ship American jobs overseas. In fact, this bill will help us cut the deficit by \$1.4 billion over the next 10 years.

Amazingly, some on the other side have argued that this legislation is nothing more than a deal for "special interests," as they say.

These funds will assist states so that they can keep qualified teachers in classrooms and pay firefighters and police officers to keep our neighborhoods safe. Shouldn't we do everything in our power to protect those jobs?

Widespread layoffs in those sectors would hurt not only schools and children but would further depress the economy. Knocking Americans into the unemployment line does nothing for families—they deserve better. These people form the backbone of our economy.

Sadly, one of the reasons it took until the early part of August to pass this legislation is that Senate Republicans filibustered efforts to bring it forward for a vote.

Now that this measure is before us, I hope all of my colleagues will join me in supporting this legislation and quickly moving to a final vote this afternoon.

If protecting public safety and education means that I am helping "special interests," then count me in.

The material previously referred to by Mr. DREIER is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 1606 OFFERED BY MR. DREIER OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 3. It shall not be in order for the Speaker to entertain a motion to adjourn pursuant to H. Con. Res. 308 until the House has considered the measures specified in section 4.

SEC. 4. The measures referred to in section 3 are as follows:

(1) H.R. 4746, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prevent pending tax increases, and for other purposes;

(2) H.R. 3765, a bill to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law;

(3) H.R. 5141, a bill to repeal the expansion of information reporting requirements for payments of \$600 or more to corporations, and for other purposes;

(4) H.R. 4110, a bill to repeal the authority of the Secretary of the Treasury to extend the Troubled Asset Relief Program; and,

(5) H.R. 2842, a bill to rescind all stimulus funds that remain unobligated.

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise to a question of the privileges of the House and offer the resolution previously noticed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas the 111th Congress has failed in its promise to be the most open Congress in history, but has instead lost the public's trust by engaging in unprecedented political procedures to advance a partisan agenda;

Whereas on January 18, 2006, House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi stated in prepared remarks, "Democrats are leading the effort to turn the most closed, corrupt Congress in history into the most open and honest Congress in history.";

Whereas on November 7, 2006, House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi stated, "The American people voted to restore integrity and honesty in Washington, D.C., and the Democrats intend to lead the most honest, most open, and most ethical Congress in history.";

Whereas on November 16, 2006, incoming House Speaker Nancy Pelosi stated, "This leadership team will create the most honest, most open, and most ethical Congress in history.";

Whereas on December 6, 2006, incoming House Speaker Nancy Pelosi stated, "We promised the American people that we would have the most honest and open Government and we will.";

Whereas incoming Majority Whip Clyburn stated on December 8, 2006 that, "Democrats will exercise better leadership in the new Congress and work to raise the standard of ethics in this body";

Whereas Speaker Pelosi spoke of individual Member's ethics on January 31, 2007 when she stated, "These strong [ethics] rules are significant steps toward honest leadership; enforcing these rules is critical to ensuring every Member of Congress lives up to the highest ethical standard";

Whereas on January 5, 2010, while at a press conference during the health care debate, Speaker Pelosi stated, "There has never been a more open process for any legislation";

Whereas this statement was reiterated by the Speaker while at a press conference on February 26, 2010, when a reporter prefaced a question about Rangel by noting that Speaker Pelosi had promised to run the "most ethical and honest Congress in history" she interrupted him to say: "And we are.";

Whereas more bills were considered under closed rules, 64 total, in the 110th Congress under Democrat control, than in the previous Congress, 49, under Republican control;

Whereas fewer bills were considered under open rules, 10 total, in the 110th Congress under Democrat control, than in the previous Congress, 22, under Republican control;

Whereas zero bills have been considered so far in the 111th Congress under an open rule;

Whereas 26 bills have been considered so far in the 111th Congress under a closed rule, under Democrat control;

Whereas this Congress is the highest spending Congress in United States history;

Whereas this Congress has presided over the two highest budget deficits in United States history at a time when the public debt is higher than at any other time in history;

Whereas this Congress began its mortgage of the Nation's future with a "stimulus" package costing \$1.1 trillion that failed to lower unemployment, spur economic growth, or actually address the needs of struggling American business and families;

Whereas this Congress continued its free-flowing spending with an increase of \$72.4 billion in nonemergency discretionary spending in fiscal year 2009 to reach a total spending level of \$1.01 trillion for the first time in United States history;

Whereas this Congress approved a budget resolution in 2009 that proposed the six largest nominal deficits in American history and included tax increases of \$423 billion during a period of sustained high unemployment;

Whereas this Congress disregarded the needs and opinions of everyday Americans by passing a national energy tax bill that would increase costs on nearly every aspect of American lives by up to \$3,000 per year, eliminate millions of jobs, reduce workers' income, and devastate economic growth;

Whereas this Congress disregarded the needs and opinions of everyday Americans by passing a massive Government takeover of health care that will force millions of Americans from their health insurance plans, increase premiums and costs for individuals and employers, raise taxes by \$569.2 billion, and fund abortions—at a cost of \$2.64 trillion over the first ten years of full implementation;

Whereas this Congress nationalized the student loan industry with a potential cost of 30,000 private sector jobs and \$50.1 billion over ten years;

Whereas this Congress passed the DISCLOSE Act in violation of the first amendment, hindering citizens associations' and corporations' free speech while leaving all unions exempt from many of the new requirements, in order to try and influence the outcome of 2010 elections;

Whereas in spite of House Budget Committee Chairman's 2006 statement that "if you can't budget, you can't govern", the Democrat leadership has failed to introduce a budget resolution in 2010 as mandated by law, but instead self-executed a "deeming resolution" that increases nonemergency discretionary spending in fiscal year 2011 by \$30 billion to \$1.121 trillion, setting another new record for the highest level in United States history;

Whereas this Congress has failed Main Street through passage of a financial system takeover that fails to end the moral hazard of too-big-to-fail, does not address the Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac behemoths, and creates numerous new boards, councils, and positions with unconstitutionally broad authorities that will interfere with the creation of wealth and jobs;

Whereas this Congress has wasted taxpayer funds on an unnecessary and unconstitutional auto industry bailout, a "cash for

clunkers" program, a home remedification program ("cash for caulkers"), and countless other pork barrel projects while allowing the public debt to reach its highest level in United States history;

Whereas Democrats have recently insinuated that significant legislative matters would deliberately not be addressed during the 111th Congress until after the midterm elections in November 2010;

Whereas the New York Times reported on June 19, 2010 that, "For all the focus on the historic federal rescue of the banking industry, it is the government's decision to seize Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac in September 2008 that is likely to cost taxpayers the most money. . . . Republicans want to sever ties with Fannie and Freddie once the crisis abates. The Obama administration and Congressional Democrats have insisted on postponing the argument until after the midterm elections.";

Whereas the Washington Times reported on June 22, 2010 that House Majority Leader Steny Hoyer stated, "a budget, which sets out binding one-year targets and a multiyear plan, is useless this year because Congress has shunted key questions about deficits to the independent debt commission created by President Obama, which is due to report back at the end of this year.";

Whereas the Hill reported on June 24, 2010 that Senator Tom Harkin, a Democrat from Iowa, suggested that Democrats "might attempt to move 'card-check' legislation this year, perhaps during a lame-duck session. . . . 'A lot of things can happen in a lame-duck session, too,' he said in reference to EFCA.";

Whereas the New York Times published an article on June 28, 2010 titled "Lame-Duck Session Emerges as Possibility for Climate Bill Conference" that declares "many expect the final energy or climate bill to be worked out during the lame-duck session between the November election and the start of the new Congress in January.";

Whereas the Hill reported on July 1, 2010 that "Democratic leaders are likely to punt the task of renewing Bush-era tax cuts until after the election. Voters in November's midterms will thus be left without a clear idea of their future tax rates when they go to the polls.";

Whereas the Wall Street Journal reported on July 13, 2010 that, "there have been signs in recent weeks that party leaders are planning an ambitious, lame-duck session to muscle through bills in December they don't want to defend before November. Retiring or defeated members of Congress would then be able to vote for sweeping legislation without any fear of voter retaliation.";

Whereas the Hill reported on July 27, 2010 that Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid said, at the recent Netroots Nation conference of liberal bloggers, in reference to Democrats' unfinished priorities, "We're going to have to have a lame duck session, so we're not giving up.";

Whereas the Hill reported in the same piece on July 27, 2010 that the lame duck session will include priorities such as "comprehensive immigration reform, climate change legislation and a whole host of other issues";

Whereas the Declaration of Independence notes that governments "[derive] their just powers from the consent of the governed";

Whereas the American people have expressed their loss of confidence through self-organized and self-funded taxpayer marches on Washington, at countless "tea party" events, at town halls and speeches, and with numerous letters, emails, and phone calls to their elected representatives;

Whereas a reconvening of Congress between the regularly scheduled Federal elec-

tion in November and the start of the next session of Congress is known as a "lame-duck session of Congress";

Whereas the Democrat majority has all-but-announced plans to use any "lame-duck Congress" to advance currently unattainable, partisan policies that are widely unpopular with the American people or that further increase the national debt against the will of most Americans;

Whereas any such action would be a repudiation of the American people's expressed will and would not comport with the Democrats' public statements promising transparency and accountability; and

Whereas under the leadership of Speaker Pelosi and the Democrat majority, and largely due to the current trends of Government expansion and freedom retrenchment, the American people have lost confidence with their elected officials, and that faith must be restored: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) reaffirms the principle expressed in the Declaration of Independence that governments "[derive] their just powers from the consent of the governed";

(2) recognizes the fundamental importance of trust existing between the American people and their elected officials;

(3) confirms that adhering to the will of the people is imperative to upholding public trust;

(4) states that the American people deserve to know where their current elected officials stand on key legislative issues before Election Day;

(5) states that delaying controversial, unpopular votes until after the election gives false impressions to voters and deliberately hides the true intentions of the majority, while denying voters the ability to make fully informed choices on Election Day; and

(6) pledges not to assemble on or between the dates of November 2, 2010 and January 3, 2011, except in the case of an unforeseen, sudden emergency requiring immediate action from Congress.

□ 1210

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Georgia wish to present argument on why the resolution is privileged under rule IX to take precedence over other questions?

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I do, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I hold in my hands here the House Rules and Manual, which includes the rules of the House of Representatives. And under rule IX it states, in part, that questions of privilege shall be those affecting the rights, reputation, and conduct of Members.

Clearly, Madam Speaker, the reputation and conduct of Members is in question and highlighted in this resolution. What could be more questionable regarding conduct of Members than acting in a disingenuous manner by saying that a lame-duck session will not include controversial items and then planning to do just that?

Madam Speaker, the intent of the majority is clear. They wish to spend more, they wish to tax more, they wish to borrow more, and they wish to harm job creation in a lame-duck session. And the American people don't want this.

To positively and responsibly represent our constituents, Madam Speaker, I respectfully request that the resolution be considered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The resolution offered by the gentleman from Georgia declares a variety of facts and circumstances, expresses certain opinions, prescribes principles by which to schedule or conduct the constitutional session of the House, and proposes a special order of business with respect thereto.

In evaluating the resolution under the standards of rule IX, the Chair must be mindful of a fundamental principle illuminated by annotations of precedent in section 706 of the House Rules and Manual, to wit: that a question of the privileges of the House may not be invoked to effect a change in the rules or standing orders of the House or their interpretation, nor to prescribe a special order of business for the House.

The averment that this resolution presents a question of the privileges of the House under rule IX embodies precisely the contrary principle, under which each individual Member of the House would constitute a virtual Rules Committee, able to place before the House at any time whatever proposed order of business he or she might deem advisable simply by alleging an insult to dignity or integrity secondary to some action or inaction. In such an environment, anything could be privileged; so nothing would enjoy true privilege. With every question having precedence over every other question, the legislative attention of the House would be managed ad hoc by the presiding officer's discretionary power of recognition.

Accordingly, under the long and well-settled line of precedent presently culminating in several rulings during the first session of this 111th Congress, the Chair finds that such a resolution does not affect "the rights of the House collectively, its safety, dignity, or the integrity of its proceedings" within the meaning of clause 1 of rule IX and, therefore, does not qualify as a question of the privileges of the House.

The Chair therefore holds that the resolution is not privileged for consideration ahead of other business. Instead, the resolution may be submitted through the hopper for possible consideration in the regular course.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I appeal the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the House?

MOTION TO TABLE

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I move that the appeal be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to table.

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. 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 the motion to table will be followed by 5-minute votes on ordering the previous question on House Resolution 1606; and adoption of House Resolution 1606, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 236, nays 163, not voting 33, as follows:

[Roll No. 515]

YEAS—236

Ackerman	Gonzalez	Murphy (NY)
Adler (NJ)	Gordon (TN)	Murphy, Patrick
Altmire	Grayson	Nadler (NY)
Andrews	Green, Al	Napolitano
Arcuri	Green, Gene	Neal (MA)
Baca	Grijalva	Oberstar
Baird	Hall (NY)	Obey
Baldwin	Halvorson	Oliver
Barrow	Hare	Ortiz
Bean	Harman	Owens
Becerra	Hastings (FL)	Pallone
Berkley	Heinrich	Pascarell
Berman	Herseth Sandlin	Pastor (AZ)
Bishop (GA)	Higgins	Payne
Bishop (NY)	Hill	Perlmutter
Blumenauer	Himes	Petriello
Boccieri	Hinchee	Peters
Boren	Hinojosa	Peterson
Boswell	Hirono	Pingree (ME)
Boucher	Hodes	Polis (CO)
Boyd	Holden	Pomeroy
Brady (PA)	Holt	Price (NC)
Braley (IA)	Honda	Quigley
Brown, Corrine	Hoyer	Rahall
Butterfield	Inslee	Rangel
Capps	Israel	Reyes
Capuano	Jackson (IL)	Richardson
Cardoza	Jackson Lee	Rodriguez
Carnahan	(TX)	Ross
Carney	Johnson (GA)	Rothman (NJ)
Carson (IN)	Johnson, E. B.	Roybal-Allard
Castor (FL)	Kagen	Ruppersberger
Chandler	Kanjorski	Rush
Childers	Kaptur	Ryan (OH)
Chu	Kennedy	Sanchez, Linda
Clarke	Kildee	T.
Clay	Kilpatrick (MI)	Sanchez, Loretta
Cleaver	Kilroy	Sarbanes
Clyburn	Kind	Schakowsky
Cohen	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Schauer
Connolly (VA)	Kissell	Schiff
Conyers	Klein (FL)	Schrader
Cooper	Kosmas	Schwartz
Costa	Kratovil	Scott (GA)
Costello	Kucinich	Scott (VA)
Courtney	Langevin	Serrano
Critz	Larsen (WA)	Sestak
Crowley	Larson (CT)	Shea-Porter
Cuellar	Lee (CA)	Sherman
Cummings	Levin	Shuler
Dahlkemper	Lewis (GA)	Simpson
Davis (AL)	Lipinski	Sires
Davis (CA)	Loebbeck	Skelton
Davis (IL)	Lofgren, Zoe	Slaughter
DeFazio	Lujan	Smith (WA)
DeLauro	Lynch	Space
Deutch	Maffei	Spratt
Dicks	Maloney	Stark
Dingell	Markey (CO)	Stupak
Doggett	Markey (MA)	Sutton
Donnelly (IN)	Marshall	Taylor
Doyle	Matheson	Teague
Driehaus	Matsui	Thompson (CA)
Edwards (MD)	McCarthy (NY)	Thompson (MS)
Edwards (TX)	McCollum	Tierney
Ellison	McDermott	Tonko
Ellsworth	McGovern	Towns
Engel	McNerney	Tsongas
Eshoo	Meeks (NY)	Van Hollen
Etheridge	Michaud	Velázquez
Farr	Miller (NC)	Visclosky
Fattah	Miller, George	Walz
Filner	Mitchell	Wasserman
Foster	Mollohan	Schultz
Frank (MA)	Moore (KS)	Waters
Fudge	Moore (WI)	Watson
Garamendi	Moran (VA)	Watt
Giffords	Murphy (CT)	

Waxman	Wilson (OH)	Wu
Weiner	Woolsey	Yarmuth

NAYS—163

Aderholt	Franks (AZ)	Mica
Akin	Frelinghuysen	Miller (FL)
Alexander	Gallely	Miller (MI)
Austria	Garrett (NJ)	Minnick
Bachmann	Gerlach	Moran (KS)
Bachus	Gohmert	Murphy, Tim
Barrett (SC)	Goodlatte	Myrick
Bartlett	Granger	Nunes
Barton (TX)	Graves (GA)	Nye
Biggart	Graves (MO)	Olson
Blibray	Griffith	Paul
Bilirakis	Guthrie	Paulsen
Bishop (UT)	Hall (TX)	Pence
Blackburn	Harper	Petri
Boehner	Hastings (WA)	Pitts
Bonner	Heller	Platts
Bono Mack	Hensarling	Poe (TX)
Boozman	Herger	Posey
Brady (TX)	Hoekstra	Price (GA)
Bright	Hunter	Putnam
Brown (SC)	Inglis	Rehberg
Brown-Waite,	Issa	Reichert
Ginny	Jenkins	Roe (TN)
Burgess	Johnson (IL)	Rogers (AL)
Burton (IN)	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (KY)
Buyer	Jordan (OH)	Rogers (MI)
Calvert	King (IA)	Rohrabacher
Camp	King (NY)	Ros-Lehtinen
Campbell	Kingston	Royce
Cantor	Kirk	Ryan (WI)
Cao	Kline (MN)	Scalise
Capito	Lamborn	Schmidt
Carter	Lance	Sensenbrenner
Cassidy	Latham	Sessions
Castle	Latta	Shadegg
Chaffetz	Lee (NY)	Shimkus
Coble	Lewis (CA)	Shuster
Coffman (CO)	LoBiondo	Smith (NE)
Cole	Lucas	Smith (NJ)
Conaway	Luetkemeyer	Smith (TX)
Crenshaw	Lummis	Stearns
Culberson	Mack	Sullivan
Davis (KY)	Manzullo	Terry
Dent	Marchant	Thompson (PA)
Diaz-Balart, M.	McCarthy (CA)	Thornberry
Dreier	McCaul	Tiahrt
Duncan	McClintock	Tiberi
Ehlers	McCotter	Turner
Emerson	McHenry	Upton
Fallin	McIntyre	Walden
Flake	McKeon	Westmoreland
Fleming	McMahon	Whitfield
Forbes	McMorris	Wilson (SC)
Fortenberry	Rodgers	Wittman
Fox	Melancon	Wolf

NOT VOTING—33

Berry	Jones	Salazar
Blunt	LaTourette	Schock
Boustany	Linder	Snyder
Broun (GA)	Lowey	Speier
Buchanan	Lungren, Daniel	Tanner
Davis (TN)	E.	Titus
DeGette	Meek (FL)	Wamp
Delahunt	Miller, Gary	Welch
Diaz-Balart, L.	Neugebauer	Young (AK)
Djou	Radanovich	Young (FL)
Gingrey (GA)	Rooney	
Gutierrez	Roskam	

□ 1239

Messrs. BARRETT of South Carolina, MCHENRY, and GRAVES of Missouri changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

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

So the motion to table was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, I regrettably missed rollcall vote No. 515 on August 10, 2010. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

MOMENT OF SILENCE FOR VICTIMS OF THE HARTFORD DISTRIBUTORS TRAGEDY

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

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, I rise on a very solemn and sad moment to express condolences to families of the victims within my congressional district in the State of Connecticut.

I have always empathized with my fellow colleagues when they address the House about fateful events that occur in their communities. I just never imagined that tragedy would strike so close to home. And it's hard to conceive, I know for everyone here, that bad things happen to good people.

On the morning of August 3, 2010, eight men went to work, some looking forward to vacation, others nearing retirement, none expecting the calamity that would follow. I thank my colleagues for indulging me the time to express the heartfelt condolences of the Nation and this body. Eight men went to work that morning. Some of them followed in the footsteps of their fathers and brothers before them. This is a family business, many of whom had served and worked at this family business for over 20 years. Neither they nor their families and friends could anticipate the senseless, unthinkable actions that occurred on that morning. Yet bad things happen to good people.

So consequently, ordinary people are going through extraordinary circumstances, punctuated by acts of heroism, courage, and camaraderie that unites them. These eight men, Bill Ackerman of East Windsor, Bryan Cirigliano of Newington, Francis Fazio of Bristol, Louis Felder of Stamford, Victor James of Windsor, Edwin Kennison of East Hartford, Craig Pepin of South Windsor, and Douglas Scruton of Manchester, lost their lives that day.

They were Teamsters of Local 1035. But beyond that, they were husbands, fathers, grandfathers, coaches, and friends. They were leaders and stalwarts in their communities where they lived and served. All were part of a family business, which makes this so tragic, a family that's operated a business since 1955. The owner of that business I was with that fateful morning. Stunned and shocked, as everyone was, his thoughts were only about the safety and well-being of his workforce, his concern as to whether or not they would be able to keep their wages. And he talked to the comptroller, making sure that benefits would be extended. And his heart went out to all of the families who were victims of this senseless, tragic slaying.

It's a family business. It was a tragic and horrific thing that took place in Manchester, Connecticut. What the people of Hartford Distributors have, as they went through this, and the several vigils and memorials that have been created, and the funeral services

that are still going on, is they understand that they have one another. And they intend, later this week, to lock arms and march back into the warehouse together, and continue to move forward, always remembering those eight men.

I ask that the Members rise and observe a moment of silence in memory of these eight men and their families during this senseless tragedy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members will rise and observe a moment of silence.

QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. RANGEL. Madam Speaker, I rise to a point of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is aware of valid bases for the gentleman's point of personal privilege.

The gentleman from New York is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. RANGEL. My dear friends and colleagues, I rise to the floor because the newspapers and the media have indicated that there is a concern about some of the Members in this House that I retire or remove myself from this body. And I have always tried to play by the rules. And I cannot think of anybody that has encouraged me to speak here.

I want to thank all of you who are concerned about me for saying that, you know, a guy's a fool to represent himself, as some of the people have said. But I have been losing a lot of sleep over these allegations, and my family and community. And some of these rules that they have is that I am restricted by confidentiality. But for years I have been saying, No comment, no comment, no comment to a lot of serious allegations because I could not comment, and I would refer them to the Ethics Committee.

When the Ethics Committee finally brought out their statement of alleged violations, it was a long list of things, and somehow the chairman of the subcommittee of investigation indicated that I had received a lot of offers to settle this thing so that it would not cause embarrassment to my Democratic friends, and that I had been offered a reprimand. And a lot of people kind of felt that that sounded like a wonderful opportunity to remove this so that I could leave the Congress with some degree of dignity.

Why, even some people said that the President had suggested that his life might be made easier if there was no CHARLIE RANGEL so-called scandal. But I interpret it another way. I think when the President said that he wanted me to end my career in dignity, he didn't put a time limit on it. And I would think that his concern would be that if any Member of the House of Representatives has been accused of serious crimes or allegations, that somehow within the process, even though we are not entitled to a court process,

there has to be some process in which the Member has an opportunity to tell his constituents, his family, and his friends what he didn't believe.

So when the chairman of the investigative committee said I had been offered a settlement, it reminded me of something that I will devote my retiring years to besides education, which is the major thrust of my attempt here, is that those of you that come anywhere near criminal courts, we have a terrible thing that happens throughout these United States. And that is that someone gets arrested for a very serious crime, and they get their lawyer, and the lawyer explains that, I think it's better that you plead guilty to a lesser crime. And he says, Well, I am not only not guilty, but I don't even know what's involved here. They said, Well, listen, we are not suggesting that you plead guilty if you are innocent, but we think you ought to know that this judge, if you are found guilty, is going to send you away for 20 years. On the other hand, you have no offenses, you are a first offender, and if you could just forget about this thing and explain later what happened.

□ 1250

So he continues to tell his lawyer that, hey, I am willing to admit what I have done wrong, and I have done some things wrong, but I shouldn't have to anyway. He says, listen, we would never tell you to quit or resign. We are just telling you that it would be easier for us if this were not an issue. But knowing the President as I do, I think he believes that dignity means that everybody is entitled to be judged for allegations against them.

Now, what is working against me? We come back to this House because the Speaker has called us here in order to make certain that we provide resources for governors and mayors to maintain our teachers and our firefighters, and RANGEL is not on the schedule for anything. Which is okay, because I know that the members of the committee, they work hard, it is a selfless job. God knows I wouldn't take it. I respect the time that they have placed on this. And it has been almost 2 years.

But I have a primary that takes place a couple of days before they even thought about meeting. And then I found out from my lawyer that even when they meet on the 13th of September, there is no trial date for then.

So I don't want to be awkward and embarrass anybody. As a matter of fact, those people that believe that their election is going to be dependent on me resigning, I would like to encourage Democrats to believe, I think Republicans have given you enough reason to get reelected, and they continue to do something.

But quite frankly, I think I have given. I mean, a lot of people don't know, but when the—well, I don't want to be critical of the Ethics Committee because my lawyer said you can't get