What makes Dr. Yellen a particularly strong nominee is the attention she has paid to connecting the labor market to monetary policy. Much of her career has been devoted to these subjects. In October 2009, our unemployment rate reached 10 percent. Today, with the help of the Fed's actions, it stands at 7 percent. In my home State of Illinois, unemployment stood at 10.7 percent in 2009, and is down to 8.7 percent today. Though this is far from good enough, it shows real progress.

Our next Fed chair should be able to take on the challenges our economy still faces—lowering the unemployment rate even further and meeting inflationary goals. The focus that Dr. Yellen brings to the labor market gives me confidence that she can help our Nation reach new highs when it comes to creating jobs and getting Americans back to work.

The Wall Street Journal recently prepared an interesting analysis examining more than 700 predictions made by 14 Fed policymakers. That analysis found Dr. Yellen to be the most accurate of the 14. That did not surprise me. Dr. Yellen could not be more deserving of this nomination given her experience and precise economic judgment. She has the know-how to make the decisions that a Fed chair needs to make about how to move our economy further forward successfully and transparently.

I support Dr. Yellen's nomination and look forward to working with her as she becomes our Nation's first Chairwoman of the Federal Reserve.●

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume legislative session.

## EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION EXTENSION ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the next vote be 10 minutes in duration, the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived, and there be 2 minutes equally divided prior to the vote on the motion to proceed to S. 1845.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

There will be 2 minutes equally divided prior to the cloture vote.

The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, on December 28, 1.3 million Americans lost their extended unemployment benefits. They are the first wave of what will be more than 3 million other Americans. These people have worked, they have qualified for unemployment insurance, they need help, and we have to help them. If we don't do that, not only will these families suffer, the economy will suffer. The CBO estimated we will lose 200,000 jobs if we don't extend unemployment benefits, and 0.2 percent of growth.

If we want to help working families—people who qualify because they worked and have to continue to look for work to be qualified—and our economy, then vote to at least let us go forward. Give us 3 months to work on issues, funding, and anything else, but don't throw these people off a cliff and leave them without anything.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, this is a serious issue, but if this was anything other than a political exercise, the majority leader would have rescheduled this vote when we did not have 17 Members of the Senate unable to be here and vote on this.

I have no doubt as to what the outcome will be on this cloture vote, but I believe it is purely a scheduling matter. It ought to be postponed to a later time when we can have a real debate so we can look for a way to pay for this extension of unemployment benefits and how to get the economy growing again so people can find jobs. That is what people want; they want to work. They don't want unemployment compensation; they want jobs so they can provide for their families.

Unfortunately, because of the timing of this vote, we know what the outcome is, and it is transparent that this is a political exercise and not a real effort to try to fix the problem.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the vote be scheduled tomorrow at 10 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. PRYOR. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### VOTE EXPLANATIONS

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Unfortunately, I was not here to vote for Janet Yellen, the head of the Federal Reserve. Had I been here to vote, I would have voted to support her in that position.

My flight was delayed, and so I did not get back in time for the vote. I want to make sure that the RECORD shows that I support her as the new chairman of the Fed.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I was on the same flight with Senator SHAHEEN. I was looking forward to having the opportunity to vote for Janet Yellen to be Chair of the Federal Reserve. I am very disappointed I didn't get to formally vote for her, but I want to make sure that the RECORD reflects my strong support.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### YELLEN NOMINATION

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I rise today in opposition to secrecy, in opposition to the veil of secrecy that cloaks the money changing hands that takes place in the temple of the Federal Reserve. While the money changes hands, the monied class gets richer and the middle class gets shortchanged.

It is more than time to part the curtain that hides the trillions of dollars that changes hands. There is a revolving door from Wall Street to the Treasury to the Fed and back again. We have former Secretaries of the Treasury who go from government to Wall Street pocketing hundreds of millions of dollars.

I have called repeatedly for transparency at the Federal Reserve so Americans can see what is being done with their money supply. Every time I call for transparency, people from both sides have said transparency would undermine Fed independence. The problem is that Congress created the Fed and Congress was intended to have oversight over the Fed, and as time has gone on we have lost that oversight, so independence has really led to abuse.

Some say: Well, the Fed is audited each year.

The investigator general who is responsible for auditing the Fed came to Congress in 2009, and here is what she had to say during a question-and-answer session in a House committee. A Congressman asked:

> What have you done to investigate the off-balance sheet transactions conducted by the Federal Reserve which, according to Bloomberg, now total $9 trillion in 8 months?

She fumbled, she repeated herself, she looked silly, and then she said:

> You know, I think it may be important at this point to—

Yadda, yadda, yadda, and then several yaddas later, this bombshell from the auditor:

> We do not have jurisdiction to directly go out and audit Reserve Bank activities specifically. So, really, there is no audit of the Federal Reserve, so don't let anybody say that we have an audit. No meaningful audit

exists, and when the primary auditor and overseer of the Fed was asked about $9 trillion, the inspector general had no clue what had been purchased with the money.

Is there a chance the Fed only has our best interests at heart? Sure. But when trillions of dollars change hands, wouldn't one want to know who got the money and whether anyone enriched themselves in the process?

We know $9 trillion is over half of our entire national debt. This is money that ultimately becomes debt for all of us. It is being doled out, in secret, by our central bank. This is, in a sense, laundering money from the American people to bail out big banks and Wall Street.

This month we learned that the Fed's official balance sheet has reached an astounding $4 trillion. To put that in perspective, the balance sheet of the Fed is now larger than the fourth largest economy in the world—Germany.

Transparency at the Fed would not hurt the Fed, but a complete lack of transparency continues to hurt and cheat the rest of us. At the very least the American middle class deserves to know what goes on behind the curtain, what decisions are made, and how they benefit Wall Street and the monied class.

Being secret and reckless with trillions of dollars is only the tip of the iceberg when it comes to the problems associated with the Fed. The history of the Federal Reserve has also been the history of the devaluation of the dollar. There was a time when the dollar was as good as gold. When the people grew restless or concerned that the government was debasing the currency, the people would simply express their displeasure by exchanging their paper for gold. Convertibility was a check and balance against Kings and Queens and any form of government that chose to spend money it did not have. When the government ''borrowed'' from the currency by diluting its value, the people had recourse to protect themselves. Now, the great American dollar that was once backed by gold is backed by promises.

For many decades the dollar was said to be backed by the full faith and credit of the Federal Government. Trust lingered from the historical evolution, from barter to a medium that people valued such as gold or silver. The trust that still exists today lingers from the thousand-year history when currency had inherent value and that if paper substitutes were used, they could always be exchanged for something of real value.

After World War II we instituted a partial gold standard that allowed foreign countries to exchange their paper for gold—and exchange they did. During the 1960s, as the United States inflated and borrowed to pay for the war on poverty and the war in Vietnam, foreign countries became skittish and turned in their dollars by the millions. Nearly half of the gold reserves were removed by foreign countries in the space of a few years. President Nixon closed the gold window in 1971, and that was that. The last link to gold was severed. But make no mistake—the trust that remained in the dollar was derived from the historic trust engendered by convertibility of paper to gold.

For decades the full faith and credit promise allowed the Fed to continue to inflate, and still the people remained relatively passive in their acceptance of an unbacked, completely discretionary paper currency—but not without hiccups. Inflation nearly got the better of us in the 1970s, and now debt threatens to do the same.

Something profound, though, occurred in the past few years beginning with the panic of 2008. The Fed began to back the dollar with not just promises but perhaps really bad promises.

Since early 2008 the Fed has added nearly $3 trillion to its asset sheet, and included among these ''assets'' is stuff that nobody else seems to want, such as bad car loans and nonperforming mortgages. According to Mauldin and Tepper's book ''Code Red,'' at $4 trillion, and roughly $55 billion in equity, the Fed is leveraged at about 77 to 1. Think about that. That is an insane amount of leverage for any bank. The Fed is more leveraged than the balance sheets of Lehman Brothers, Bear Stearns, Freddie or Fannie, before those institutions essentially failed.

Jim Rickards, author of ''Currency Wars,'' notes: The Fed is insolvent on a mark-to-market basis. . . . The Fed has wiped out its capital on a mark-to-market basis. Of course, the Fed carries those notes on its balance sheet ''at cost'' and does not mark them down to market, but if they did, they would be broke. The insolvency of the Fed will become a major issue in the years ahead and may necessitate a financial bailout of the Fed by the taxpayers.

So the once-proud dollar that was once backed by gold, then backed by the full faith and credit of the world's greatest economy, is now backed by used car loans and underwater mortgages.

But those who trust in paper say: Look. For 50 years now we have had no convertibility, and amazing improvements in productivity and wealth have occurred.

Perhaps. But one might also argue that we are living on the borrowed plumage of the past, that our current acceptance of a paper currency rests on the glory of our industrial and monetary past. No one can tell for sure what the future holds, but I for one am concerned that the panic of 2008 may not have been an anomaly but a harbinger of something far worse. I am concerned we have papered over our problems in a sea of new currency. That quantitative easing has created an illusion of safety and security, but beneath the surface lurks a bigger and more malevolent future.

Don't take my word for it. Listen to some of the economists who predicted the financial crisis of 2008.

Economist Jim Grant recently said:

> From the United States to Europe and Asia, the world's central banks are flooding markets with liquidity and pushing deeper into unknown monetary policy territory and I feel this journey will not end well.

Nassim Taleb, author of the ''Black Swan,'' writes:

> Someone made a mistake lending and someone made a mistake borrowing . . . and it is a mistake to transform private problems into public debt. We are facing an environment with a huge amount of debt. The next mistake is going to be to overprint, which is going to be the way out for them, which is why I fear hyperinflation.

Yale University housing expert and recent Nobel Prize winner Robert Schiller:

> This financial crisis that we've been going through in the last 5 years has been one that seems to reveal the failure to understand price movement . . .

Not shying away from his concerns that the Fed is simply inflating the housing bubble in America's largest cities, he argues:

> [Housing prices] are up 12 percent in the last year. That is a very rapid rise in prices, and I believe it is accelerated somewhat by Fed policies . . . the housing market, it has its own momentum right now as people see it coming back. We're sort of in the beginnings of another housing bubble.

Since we abandoned the sequester budgetary caps, any pretense of fiscal discipline is gone. Politicians can attempt to obfuscate the truth with promises of spending restraint in the outyears, but everybody knows that the promise to cut in the outyears is a pipe dream and that all that really counts is the first 2 years of the Ryan-Murray plan that will add over $60 billion in new spending.

What really causes China concern is not the new spending we are incurring but that the total new debt added over 10 years will be $7 trillion. China's response to our fiscal lack of discipline was to downgrade our debt. Our $17 trillion debt is manageable only with the Fed buying it and only with low interest rates.

China's Dagong Global Credit Rating said in their statement on the downgrade:

> The deal means only an escape from a debt default for the time being, but hasn't changed the fact that the growth of government borrowing has largely outpaced overall economic growth and fiscal revenues.

These are facts, and both sides—Republicans and Democrats—are ignoring the facts. China, when they downgraded us, said it, and we cannot escape this fact: The growth of government borrowing has largely outpaced economic growth and fiscal revenues. It is sad when the Chinese Government can see major economic problems for us that Washington continues to ignore.

At current rates, we pay about $237 billion in interest payments. If interest rates rise by 1 percent, interest spending will increase by $1.2 trillion. If interest rates return to the norms of the

1980s, the taxpayer will be on the hook for an additional $6.17 trillion. If interest rates go to 10 percent, ''Katy, bar the door.'' The panic will be upon us.

Most conservatives would be aghast if we talked about price controls. Conservatives realize, as most economists now do, that price controls lead to a glut if the price is too high and to bare shelves if the price is too low. The Soviet Union was brought low for that very reason. No one, no matter how wise, can determine the correct price of bread without a marketplace.

Anytime a government tries to set prices, the consequence is disastrous. But many leaders who are quite aware of the destructive nature of price controls nevertheless advocate for allowing the Fed to set the price of money, for that is what interest rates are—simply the price of money. Like any other price, though, setting interest rates lower than the market rate of interest encourages more use of the money and more economic activity. But if the rates are kept below the market rate, we interrupt the feedback loop that informs producers that they are overproducing, and the bubble expands until overproduction has reached such a point that the correction is a catastrophe. That is what happened with the housing bubble. We kept interest rates too low for too long and the bubble grew and grew and grew and we are still suffering from that. And what are we doing now? Exactly the same thing.

Jim Rickards explains this phenomenon:

> Market participants and policymakers rely on market prices to make decisions about economic policy. What happens when the price signals upon which policymakers rely are themselves distorted by prior policy manipulation? First you distort the price signal by market manipulation, but then you rely on the ''price'' to guide your policy going forward. This is the blind leading the blind.

Politicians have been complacent in letting the Fed manipulate interest rates for many reasons. Many politicians are reticent to get involved in monetary policy. They are worried of being blamed if the economy sours with monetary reforms. Many politicians believe the economy is better off with the Fed than with the panics that occurred before the Fed. But perhaps the variations in the economy of late indicate just as much instability with the Fed as before the Fed.

There is some truth to the fact that big debt and deficit financing in all likelihood require a central bank to pay the debt with inflated dollars, and there is some truth to this.

John Mauldin and Jonathan Tepper's new book, ''Code Red,'' highlights this very point:

> In 2011, the Federal Reserve financed about three-quarters of the U.S. deficit; in 2012, it financed over half of it; and in 2013, it will finance most of it.

We are on course to finance the entire U.S. debt in 2014.

Now, for anyone imagining a day without a Fed, they would have to propose a government that would balance its budgets annually. Without fiscal restraint you cannot ever have monetary restraint. The opposite is where we are now. With fiscal irresponsibility, borrowing over $1 million a minute, you need a compliant monetary policy, and that is exactly what we have.

But there are consequences to massive debts and corresponding massive purchases by the Fed. The consequences can be gradual or abrupt. The gradual bankrupting of America is proceeding apace. We pay for it with new money created by the Fed.

The result is a gradual loss of purchasing power. Over the past 100 years, the dollar has lost 96 percent of its value. A nation can survive this gradual loss we have, but some would argue that the people hurt most are those who are least able to absorb rising prices—the poor and the elderly on fixed incomes.

The other possible outcome is an abrupt loss of confidence in the currency. The panic of 2008 approached mass fear that the system was unsound. Reports that the emperor had no clothes were taken seriously, as even the soundness of money market funds was questioned.

Our system of paper currency now backed by the promises of politicians, a $17 trillion debt, and used car loans and bad home mortgages is always one panic away from dissolution. When that day comes is uncertain. Can the Fed continue the legerdemain; can the Fed continue the illusion of wealth that comes with freshly inked money? Time will tell. But I, for one, want to know what the Fed is doing. Are individuals enriching themselves at the expense of the public? Does Fed policy enrich one group of individuals at the expense of another? What assets does the Fed hold? What informs their decision-making process?

I, for one, want answers. I, for one, want transparency.

President Obama's choice of Janet Yellen as the new head of the Federal Reserve is concerning due to the policies Ms. Yellen has promoted in her history at the Fed.

The Federal Reserve's answer to economic crisis has long been simply to print more money, or what they call ''quantitative easing.'' It does not take a rocket scientist to figure out that printing money out of thin air is not sound long-term economic policy. But Ms. Yellen has been a major cheerleader for it. The Washington Post's Neil Irwin wrote that ''Yellen has been not merely an engineer of the Fed's policies of 'quantitative easing' and 'forward guidance,' but a consistent voice within the central bank to go further.'' Quantitative easing is not enough. She wants more.

Will she go further? Will the same policies continue unabated? Those of us who think quantitative easing has gotten out of hand are now being asked to confirm a nominee who thinks the Fed has not done enough along these lines.

The vote was overwhelming to confirm Janet Yellen, but I think we will rue the day that we endorsed quantitative easing.

I believe the Federal Reserve is structurally flawed. I believe we need to be able to prevent or restrict any Chairman today or in the future from aiding and abetting the allies of banks and big government. As monetary historian Peter Bernholz wrote in his famous book ''Monetary Regimes and Inflation'': '' . . . we draw the conclusion that the creation of money to finance a public budget deficit has been the reason for hyperinflations.''

I see nothing in Yellen's past performance at the Fed that would indicate that her policies will be any different than what we see today. In fact, I see evidence that things may well get worse.

I have introduced a bipartisan bill called Federal Reserve Transparency Act, known also as Audit the Fed. The purpose of my bill is to eliminate the current restrictions on GAO audits of the Fed, along with mandating that the Federal Reserve's credit facilities, securities purchases, and quantitative easing activities become subject to congressional oversight.

Looking into what the Federal Reserve does with our money has significant support from both parties, many Members of which have heard the same concerns back home in their States and districts.

Audit the Fed passed overwhelmingly in the House with 350 votes. Every Republican and 100 Democrats voted for it.

The Federal Reserve is one of the most secretive institutions in our history. For decades, the people in charge at the Fed, politicians, and various ''experts'' have insisted that such secrecy was integral to its independence and effectiveness.

But the results of complete secrecy have been Fed policies that are questionable at the least. This idea that the Federal Reserve is at the root of some of our economic problems is brandnew to many Americans precisely because we are not allowed to know what this powerful institution does behind closed doors—despite the fact that it has a direct impact on our lives.

I can see no reason why the American public should not be allowed to see behind the veil of secrecy at the Fed. I will continue to do what I can to part that veil. I will continue to fight for a full and persistent audit of the Fed. Audit the Fed passed the House overwhelmingly, but we have been unable to get a vote in the Senate. I will continue to fight for that vote.

Although I was delayed by the weather, I am here today to oppose Janet Yellen's nomination for two reasons. I believe she will continue the gradual destruction of the dollar's value and because I believe the time is now for a full audit of the Fed.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators allowed to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, we have the opportunity today to take care of some very important unfinished business. We left town last year without ensuring that millions of American jobseekers could retain access to vital unemployment insurance. I hope we correct this and restore the Federal unemployment program, the Emergency Unemployment Compensation program, which was allowed to expire on December 28.

Unemployment insurance has helped tens of millions of Americans weather the storm of the difficult economy over the last several years. It has helped workers put food on the table, kept a roof over their heads, and kept millions out of poverty.

But because Congress has so far failed to extend it, 1.3 million Americans were abruptly cut off from their vital unemployment insurance the week after Christmas. And over the course of this year, another 3.6 million Americans will be cut off from unemployment insurance as they exhaust their State benefits and have nowhere else to turn. That is a total of 4.9 million Americans—including 35,500 Iowans. They have spent 6 months or more trying to find new work, going out and pounding the pavement day after day, but must now worry about how they and their families and children are going to survive. How will they keep up with their heating bill, their rent, their car payment, or their mortgage?

We used to all agree here in Washington that if you lose your job through no fault of your own, especially at a time of chronic unemployment, you should have some support while you're looking for new work. The American people certainly agree. A poll released last week shows that 55 percent of voters say that Congress should act to maintain the program.

Unfortunately, some people in this chamber seem to think that the misfortune of losing a job means that these hardworking folks are to blame, or that they don't deserve this basic lifeline. Some here in the Senate have even called it a ''disservice'' to continue this program. That kind of harshness toward people who are trying to do the right thing but who are victims of circumstance is simply wrong.

Jobseekers are not sitting around watching TV and collecting compensation they don't deserve. In fact, participation in the unemployment insurance program requires that workers have a significant work history—which means they have paid into the system and earned this insurance. Collecting on the insurance also requires workers to have lost their job through no fault of their own, and to be actively looking for work. Participants in the program are playing by the rules. It is now our responsibility to make sure that workers who are out of luck in this economy have some basic income to make ends meet.

The fact is times are still tough and jobs are hard to come by. For every job opening there are three job seekers. That is why so many millions of workers have been searching for new work for such a long time. The American people know this, too. In last week's poll, 57 percent of voters said that the unemployed ''would rather work, but cannot find a job in today's economy.''

Although the payments under the Federal program were modest—after cuts due to sequestration, payments averaged just $269 per week—these funds were crucial for keeping households afloat. For many, this is their last lifeline. If Congress fails to restore the Federal program, millions of people will face real economic devastation.

Also, we have to remember that unemployment insurance is not just a lifeline for families, but for our economy as a whole. After all, one of the best ways to grow our economy and to create jobs is to support spending power. And that is exactly what unemployment insurance does. When unemployed workers can continue to pay their bills, businesses can continue to make sales and provide services, and the economy grows. The Congressional Budget Office has found that unemployment insurance is one of the most efficient policy tools we have to improve economic growth. If the Federal unemployment insurance program is restored and extended through 2014, it will increase GDP by 0.2 percent and create 200,000 jobs. Those jobs will be lost if we do not act.

Congress has a long history of acting to ensure basic security for working people during tough economic times. In the past, when the job market was this challenging, politicians on both sides of the aisle agreed that the Federal Government had an obligation to step in and help the long-term unemployed while they are struggling to find a work. Indeed, the current program of extended unemployment benefits was put in place in 2008 by President George W. Bush when the unemployment rate was 5.6 percent. While unemployment is falling, it is still at a high rate, 7.0 percent. And that's just the official rate. Unofficially, when we include those folks who want to work full-time but can only find part-time work and those who have given up actively looking for work, the rate is actually 13.2 percent.

Long-term unemployment has been at record highs for years. Currently 37 percent of unemployed workers have been looking for new work for at least 6 months. Congress has never allowed Federal unemployment insurance to expire when more than 23 percent of unemployed workers were long-term unemployed.

Our economy is recovering, but we are not there yet. American jobseekers and their families still need Federal unemployment insurance. Our economy needs these families to have some basic means of survival. There is no justification for not restoring the current program. This is a modest, short-term extension of 3 months. I would prefer to see us approve a year-long extension, so that families who rely on the program have peace of mind that they will not be cut off from this lifeline again. But I am pleased that Senator HELLER has joined with Senator REED, myself, and others to put forward this proposal.

Congress has an obligation to restore and continue the Federal unemployment insurance program to ensure that Americans and their families can survive while trying to get back on their feet and find new work. They are depending on us. I urge the Senate to act to restore the Federal unemployment insurance program.

## ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

### JACKSON, MISSOURI

• Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize Jackson, MO, as it celebrates its 200th anniversary in 2014. Jackson is a proud community with a long history of hard work and an unmistakable spirit of community.

Founded in 1814, Jackson is the county seat of Cape Girardeau County in southeast Missouri. With only 300 residents at its founding, the town still supported five stores, two shoemakers, and a tannery—a thriving hub for the time. Jackson's growth has been slow and steady, but stable. Today, nearly 14,000 people live and work in Jackson.

As it embarks on its 200th year, Jackson is one of the fastest growing communities in Missouri. Its city slogan, 'The City of Beautiful Homes, Churches, and Schools,' aptly represents a community committed to progress and improvement. In 2009, Money Magazine named Jackson 59th on its list of best small towns in the United States. With the many thousands of small towns across our country, this is a considerable distinction—although, to be sure, Jackson is worthy of a spot much higher.

Jackson's small town feel makes it a great place to call home. The citizens come together for events ranging from the annual Independence Day celebration in the city park, to its