reach our highest unemployment number since the Great Depression. But this unemployment number does not tell the complete story.

Last month alone, 731,000 people simply gave up looking for work out of frustration with the lack of employment prospects, and today 13.9 percent of Americans, or more than 21 million of our neighbors, have either given up looking for a job or are working in a job that is no longer full time. These workers are underemployed.

These numbers are a stark reminder of how important it is for us to get these people back to work, and that is why we need to pass the economic recovery package today without delay.

Madam Speaker, we have an opportunity to create or save 3.5 million jobs. Let's do the right thing and get these people back to work.

THE JOBS BILL HAS TURNED INTO A SPENDING BILL

(Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, a couple of months ago, the talk from congressional leadership was to produce legislation that was about providing jobs for America's families and small businesses, with lots of opportunities for our needed investments.

Sadly, what was supposed to be a jobs bill has turned into a spending bill that is going to provide about a $7.70 tax break for workers while adding $9,400 of debt, plus or minus some, with interest, for each family that is going to have to be paid by our children and grandchildren. I think if you have got one person working in that family, it is going to take a few years of saving up all those tax credits in order to pay for this bill.

Plus, unfortunately, we still never got guarantees that the billions of dollars worth of automobiles, buses, furniture, computers, and everything else here even has to be made in the United States of America. I am not very happy about that, and I don't think Americans should be, either.

RECOVERY AND REINVESTMENT ACT

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

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, we just can't ignore the facts. The facts are, we lost 600,000 jobs last month and the prior month and the prior month, and some 3.6 million jobs last year. Banks have failed. We have had a real contraction in the economy. My friends on the Republican side of the aisle, their position is, ''Just say no. We like the status quo.''

We can't afford the status quo anymore, ladies and gentlemen. We must act. This is a time for bold action, and in the Recovery and Reinvestment Act we will maintain or create somewhere between 3 million and 4 million jobs in the construction industry and the energy industry; we will maintain jobs of teachers and firefighters and policemen. We will pass this bill today in the House of Representatives, and I am glad, because in Colorado we need this effort, we need these jobs, and so does the rest of the Nation.

KEEP OUR COMMITMENT TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

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

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to ask that we all uphold the honor of the House and keep our commitment to the American people.

Less than 3 days ago, my good friend and colleague, Mr. LEWIS of California, asked this House to instruct our conferees not to record their approval of the conference agreement on the stimulus bill until the text of that agreement had been made available in an electronic, searchable, and downloadable form for at least 48 hours. That motion passed unanimously.

Essentially, we gave our word, the word of the people's House, to all Americans, guaranteeing them that they would have ample opportunity to review this proposed legislation.

This bill was filed last night. It is over 1,000 pages long. And, with the exception of omnibus legislation, it is the largest spending bill this House has ever considered. Madam Speaker, I must confess, I haven't had time to read the legislation; my staff hasn't had time to read the legislation; I doubt my colleagues have had time to read the legislation; and, most importantly, the American people have had no time to read the legislation.

So now, less than 10 hours since we could first see this 1,000-page bill, we are poised to break our commitment to the American people and to pass this legislation with little or no time to even read it.

ECONOMIC RECOVERY PLAN

(Mr. INSLEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. INSLEE. Madam Speaker, one of the attributes of this economic recovery plan is it is not based on yesterday; it is based on tomorrow.

It is not your grandmother's recovery plan where we just built asphalt and concrete; it is built on the new high-tech green collar jobs that can truly give us a prolonged burst of economic recovery. And that is why, when I vote for this today, I am going to be proud that we are launching a new Apollo clean energy project to give this country the thousands of green collar jobs, to start selling high-tech clean energy products to China, to start making lithium ion batteries so that we can make electric cars right here in America and start selling them across the world. And I hope some of my brethren across the aisle will not vote against research so we can find a way to burn coal cleanly, against research to make electric cars more affordable to Americans, against research to make our houses more efficient.

This is a plan to start an economic energy revolution. We should pass it and be proud of it today.

VOTE ''NO'' ON THE STIMULUS BILL

(Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Madam Speaker, buried in the stimulus bill that we will be voting on today is a provision that will gut the welfare reform measures that the Congress passed in 1996. The legislation will move us down a path that will take us away from welfare reform that required work, training, and education in exchange for benefits, back to the old system that says to single young women that, as long as you don't get married, don't get a job, and keep having children, that we will continue to subsidize you at taxpayers' expense.

The old system that this legislation moves us to kept generations of American families in poverty, and I urge a ''no'' vote on the stimulus bill.

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

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 168 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 168

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany 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. All points of order against consideration of the conference report are waived except those arising under clause 9 of rule XXI. The conference report shall be considered as read. All points of order against the conference report are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the conference report to its adoption without intervening motion except: (1) 90 minutes of debate and (2) one motion to recommit if applicable.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I make a point of order against the resolution.

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

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I make a point of order against this resolution because the resolution is in violation of section 426(a) of the Congressional Budget Act.

The resolution before us violates the provisions of 426(a) because it contains a waiver of all points of order against the conference report, including a waiver of section 425 of the Congressional Budget Act which prohibits the consideration of a conference report in violation of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act.

We got this 1,000-page package online after midnight, totally in violation of the 48-hour commitment that was made by every Member to support that period of time during which it could be read; and we have no idea, Madam Speaker, as to whether or not there are in fact unfunded mandates in this measure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California 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 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 California and the gentleman from Colorado 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 California.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, let me begin by saying I see my friend from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER) here. It was announced late last night when we were in the Rules Committee that the distinguished Chair of the Committee on Rules, Mrs. SLAUGHTER, would be managing this rule; and I can only surmise that she is not here due to the very tragic news that we got overnight of the loss of 48 lives in the Continental plane crash that took place just outside of Buffalo.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. Yes, I am happy to the yield to my friend.

□ 0915

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Yes, the plane crash is why she is not here today. And it is a tragedy that we all feel this morning.

Mr. DREIER. Reclaiming my time, that is exactly what I wanted to say. As we begin this debate, our thoughts and prayers go to all of the victims and the families and Mrs. SLAUGHTER whom I know is dealing with that issue, Madam Speaker.

Let me say, as we now focus on this very, very important debate, we had a unanimous vote here in the House, a unanimous vote, that called for 48 hours to be provided for Members of Congress and the American people to see this measure before we would have a chance to vote on it. We all know, as Speaker PELOSI said yesterday, that this is both transformational and historic. And for that reason, I believe that if we have a measure before us that is historic and transformational, we should comply with the vote that was cast by every single Member who was present at the time saying that 48 hours should be provided. And unfortunately, there was virtually no time provided. We had a copy of the bill placed before us in the Rules Committee very late last night. And it is my understanding that the online measure at that point, which was touted by Members who were in the Rules Committee, actually omitted three sections of the bill and that it was not placed online as we're going to be voting on it today until after midnight; after midnight. So that means earlier this morning is when it was placed online.

Now, Madam Speaker, I have a statement here from our good friend, the distinguished majority leader, Mr. HOYER, who said, ''The House is scheduled to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow and is expected to proceed directly to consideration of the American Recovery and Reinvestment conference report. The conference report text will be filed this evening, giving Members enough time to review the conference report before voting on it tomorrow afternoon.''

Madam Speaker, the American people are hurting. We are going through one of the most difficult economic challenges that we've faced in modern history. There is no doubt about it. In fact, if one looks at the economic downturn, we suffered in 1991 and 2001 very, very shallow economic recessions. The early 1980s was the last time we faced a challenge as difficult as the one we are in the midst of today. We have put forward a very pro-growth economic package that I know that the American people would be able to support. And I'm convinced, based on the empirical evidence that we have of what took place in 1961 and 1981, it would unleash the potential of the American people, because we are the most productive worker on the face of the Earth. We are the people who are the most innovative in the world. And for us to, in any way, constrain that growth potential is, I believe, wrong.

And what we have before us is a 1,000-page bill. This is 1,000 pages, Madam Speaker. And I'm reminded when Ronald Reagan was delivering a State of the Union message when he held up a document that was just about like this, and he dropped it right there on the lectern. And he said that he would never sign anything like that again. And here we are on Friday the 13th of 2009, we are in the midst of considering a measure following a campaign that promised transparency, disclosure, accountability and hope. And as we listened to the debate last night in the Rules Committee, which went on for quite a while, I have to say that there is a lot of hope involved in this 1,000-page bill. But there are things about it that we know. It is approaching $1 trillion when you take interest in consideration. I know it is $790 billion, but when you take into consideration the interest that will be shouldered, it is a $1 trillion package. We know that.

The hope is that people are saying it is this or nothing else, Madam Speaker, this or nothing else. And I have got to tell you that that is not the case. That is not the case. We, as Republicans, have come forward with a package from our economic stimulus working group which I believe would prevent us from having to deal with anything like this whatsoever. And the point of order that I'm raising, Madam Speaker, has to do with the fact that we don't know what is in here. I don't think that anyone knows whether or not there are unfunded mandates in here that have been imposed on the private sector, on the American people, or on local governments.

And so with that, I would like to, at this juncture, reserve the balance of my time, Madam Speaker.

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

Technically, this point of order is about whether or not to consider the rule and ultimately the underlying bill. But we know what it is really about, and that is about trying to block the bill without any opportunity for debate and without any opportunity for an up-or-down vote on the legislation itself. And that is just plain wrong.

I sincerely hope my colleagues will vote ''yes'' so we can consider this critical legislation today on its merits and not kill it on a procedural motion. We have a long day ahead. Let's not waste any more time on trying to stop this legislation from being debated or enacted. Those who oppose the bill can vote against it on final passage. That is their prerogative. We must consider this rule, and we must pass this conference report for the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act today.

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

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

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining on the debate on the point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. DREIER. At this time I would like to yield 1 minute to my good friend from Texas (Mr. POE).

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, procedure is important. Procedure rules are important because they are placed there for a reason. This House unanimously voted that there should be 48 hours after a bill is filed before we voted on it. The

reason for that is to give us time to read it. It is unconscionable that we would vote on a 1,000-page bill without at least reading the bill. But we didn't get 48 hours. I guess the motion really meant 4 to 8 hours, because that is all we've really received, 4 to 8 hours to decide whether or not to proceed.

We need more time to read the bill. Let's stay here until tomorrow or Sunday or Monday. But let's read the bill, regardless of our position on it, and then we can be knowledgeable to vote on this $1-trillion package one way or the other. The idea that we're going to vote on a bill we haven't read because we didn't get time to do it is absurd, Madam Speaker.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to say this saddens me greatly. President Obama has come forward and talked about the issue of transparency, disclosure and accountability, and he has talked about hope, and he has talked about change. And we've all been very inspired by the words of President Obama. And we've been inspired by many of his actions and his effort to reach out and work with us in a bipartisan way to deal with the challenge of getting our economy back on track. It is something that I believe is terrific. It's wonderful. And it's what is needed at this time.

But I will say, Madam Speaker, that as we look at what has been put before us, a 1,000-page bill, and we are told by so many that if we don't vote for this bill, we're choosing to do nothing, in fact, I will say that I did not like it when the President said that there are some out there who want to do nothing. And Madam Speaker, I will say that I know of no Republican, no Democrat, I know of no one in this country who wants to do nothing. Because just the other night when I had a telephone town hall meeting and listened to a number of people, including a small contractor, a small businessman who is a building contractor, having trouble getting access to credit so that he can get to work, I was struck with the fact that he told me, looking at a $1-trillion measure is not only not going to help him, but in fact, it will exacerbate, it will worsen the challenges that he has. We talked about our alternative.

In fact, in this town hall meeting, Madam Speaker, one of my constituents asked me at the outset to support President Obama and his package. And when I began explaining the difficulty with this package and the alternative that we have that is focused on small businesses, entrepreneurs, the self-employed and families across this country, focusing on marginal rate reduction, focusing on encouraging responsibility so that people can gain equity in their homes by incentivizing them to make a greater down payment on that home and to take up the inventory that exists there, as I walked through these provisions, this person who began saying to me that it was imperative that I support this package then said, your alternative makes much more sense.

And so, Madam Speaker, I want to disabuse any of my colleagues of this notion that we want to do nothing. We very much want to work diligently to ensure that we can get our economy back on track. And we have a pro-growth package which is modeled after what John F. Kennedy did in 1961 and what Ronald Reagan did in 1981.

And with that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, again I want to urge a ''yes'' vote so that we can consider this rule and consider the legislation today. It is not a time for delay. It is not a time for inaction. For 8 years, we've had continued deferred maintenance, we've had continued problems in the economy to the point we are now required to move forward and move forward in a bold way. That is the purpose of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. It has been discussed and debated over the course of the last month in full view of the American people. And it is time to take it up here in the Congress and pass it.

And with that I urge a ''yes'' on the consideration of the rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Will the House now consider the resolution?

The question of consideration was decided in the affirmative.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 1 hour.

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

And I yield myself such time as I may consume.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I also ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 168.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, America is in a tough spot today. Today we face one of the greatest economic challenges we've seen in the history of this Nation. With this great economic crisis comes great responsibility for this body which is vested to represent the best interests of the American people. Madam Speaker, the Bush administration left us with the worst economy we've faced since World War II. Like President Franklin D. Roosevelt did over 75 years ago, we must build a floor under our economic downward spiral and set America on a new, more prosperous course.

Since this recession began, 3.6 million Americans have lost their jobs. Last month alone, the country lost nearly 600,000 jobs, the equivalent of losing every job in the State of Maine. Even more troubling is the news that our Nation is expected to lose another 3 to 5 million jobs within the next year if we don't take action now. And it must be taken now. In fact, 2008 was the worst year for job loss since 1945, while unemployment has skyrocketed to the highest level in 26 years.

Madam Speaker, Americans are worried. Nothing is on the minds of American workers and families more than the troubled state of our economy.

□ 0930

At dinner tables across this Nation, American families are concerned, not only about our country's economy, but about their own futures and 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 their mortgage? Can they sell their house? What about the rent and the child's education?

We must act now to turn things around. If nothing is done, our economy will continue its downward spiral, jeopardizing the futures of all Americans.

As President Roosevelt once said, ''In our seeking for economic and political progress, we all go up, or else we all go down.''

And, Madam Speaker, I join my colleagues here today determined to make sure that all Americans go up, each and every one of us. We are here to take swift, bold action to boost our economy and put Americans back to work. Our actions today may determine the prosperity and well-being of Americans for generations to come.

This compromise of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act is a major victory for the American people. It will help strengthen our economy and help Americans hurt by this recession today, as well as investing in our shared future.

This bill will create and save nearly 4 million jobs, jump-start our economy, and bring the process of transforming it for the 21st century with carefully targeted priority investments. We will also provide immediate direct tax relief to over 95 percent of all Americans.

Madam Speaker, for our future, we will significantly increase clean, renewable energy production, invest in a new smart power grid, put people to work in the short-term, while freeing us from our dependence on foreign oil in the long run.

We'll renovate buildings and homes to make them more energy efficient, and create jobs that can't be sent overseas, while helping to curb global warming at the same time. We will rebuild our crumbling infrastructure and improve our roads, bridges, and schools, and in doing so, we will strengthen our path forward.

We will invest in our health care system, cutting red tape and ensuring broader coverage, while saving countless lives and dollars.

Finally, this legislation will assist those who have been impacted most by

this crisis, by increasing food stamp and unemployment benefits, and making it easier for those who lose their jobs to keep their health insurance. These are just a few highlights of this comprehensive bill.

Madam Speaker, the American people are hurting and they demand action. But they are also justifiably concerned about government spending in such difficult times. I want them to know that this bill contains strict transparency and accountability measures. It is open and visible and will be for people to look on the Web for each dollar that is spent. Americans will be able to go on-line to see how their tax dollars are being spent and provide comment.

The bill contains no earmarks, and provides important protections to State whistleblowers who report fraud and abuse.

Furthermore, this legislation does not waste any time. It will immediately help put people to work, maintain their jobs, and begin to stabilize our economy. Just this week the CEO of Google said his company would ''absolutely'' hire new people if we pass this bill.

Additionally, economists and elected officials from across the ideological spectrum have broadly endorsed this bill, and beseech us to pass it, because they agree we need bold action to turn our economy around.

President Roosevelt told us that ''One thing is sure, we have to do something. We have to do the best we know how at the moment. If it doesn't turn out right, we can modify it as we go along.''

Madam Speaker, it took us many years to get into this situation. We know this bill alone will not solve all of our economic woes overnight. We know that the road back to economic stability and prosperity will require hard work over time. But this bill is the right size and scope necessary to truly help us turn things around. I'm proud to say that America has faced great challenges before and turned crisis into opportunity.

This legislation gives us the means to address this crisis immediately, and the opportunity to build the foundation for long-term prosperity. Like it has in the past, the ingenuity of American workers will be the engine of growth and prosperity if we just give them a chance to get back on the job.

I urge my colleagues to support the conference report on the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act and, by doing so, restore confidence, strengthen our economy, and ensure a brighter future for our citizens from coast to coast.

I now reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume to begin by expressing my great appreciation to my friend from Colorado for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

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

Mr. DREIER. Let me begin, as I did at the outset of the debate on the unfunded mandate point of order, Madam Speaker, by saying that we are all saddened with the very tragic news that Ms. SLAUGHTER and her constituents have faced with the tragic plane crash which has taken place just outside of Buffalo with, reportedly, 48 people killed, and our thoughts and prayers continue to be with all of them.

Let me say, at the beginning of this, Madam Speaker, I asked my friend who's managing this rule to yield to me, because I find it—I will associate myself with many of the points that he made. I will associate myself with certainly his closing remarks about the ability of the United States of America to take on great challenges that we face.

But, Madam Speaker, to stand here and somehow talk about the great degree of transparency, when we, at midnight, were sitting in the Rules Committee, and the questions being posed to us could not be answered; that we were posing could not be answered, number one. And number two, we had before us a bill that we were told was exactly what the gentleman had said, made available on-line so that the American people could see it, and then I arrived just a few hours later, had come in early this morning to find that the measure was not even available on-line until well after midnight because three sections of the bill were, in fact, missing.

And so, my point is that we all know how much pain there is right now across this country. When you look at the people who have lost their jobs, if you look at people who are losing their homes, if you look at the tragic loss of life that is taking place, I talked to a good friend of mine yesterday who told me that his son's best friend's father had just committed suicide because of the economic downturn that we are facing.

Madam Speaker, we know how personal this is. We know how terrible the situation that we face is. And that's why I believe that the commitment that has been made overwhelmingly, across the board, by Democrats and Republicans alike, that we would spend time deliberating over this issue to ensure that we get it right, that we would work in a bipartisan way, as President Obama repeatedly has promised, from his inaugural address right here on the west front of the Capitol to speech after speech that he's delivered, and through many of his actions.

Now, last night, as we sat approaching midnight in the Rules Committee, my very good friend, the distinguished chair of the Committee on Appropriations was before us, talking about the fact that every single day, since the election, save two, he and members of his staff have been working to try and put this bill together. He referred to the fact that members of his staff, for the second time in a week or two, have gone 2 days without any sleep, working to put this bill together.

We all understand, Madam Speaker, the urgency that is there. No one wants to delay action. No one wants to delay action on this very important bill because of the fact that the American people are hurting.

But we do know this: What we've been able to see in this measure, in fact, goes way beyond the goal that is stated, that being stimulating our economy. We understand that important infrastructure spending cannot only play an important role in creating jobs, but it also can deal with the very important issue of goods movement, ensuring that our constituents are able to move around. We know that the grid and broadband infrastructure development is critical if we are going to remain competitive in this global marketplace. And yet, that is a very small fraction of this nearly $1 trillion measure, Madam Speaker.

Now, as we listened to the testimony that was delivered in the Rules Committee, an exchange took place between the distinguished chair of the Committee on Appropriations and our new Rules Committee colleague, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX). And in that exchange, the question that was asked by Ms. FOXX was, how many jobs are going to be created by this measure?

And I congratulate the distinguished chair of the Committee on Appropriations for pointing to the fact that he has no idea how many jobs are going to be created. And he correctly said that we can all find our own economists who support the notion of a certain number of jobs being created.

Now, I will say that the chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, Christina Romer, under President Obama, has, based on her study, found that the alternative proposal that we Republicans offered would create nearly twice as many jobs in half the amount of time than this package that is before us. So using one of his economists, Madam Speaker, I will say it buttresses our argument to ensure that we put into place our package for commission growth, as opposed to a massive spending bill.

So the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations said he has no idea how many jobs are going to be created.

And what is it that we have before us? We have before us a package that is indicative of what I describe as the ideological baggage of the past. It is nothing but throwing money at the problem, without the kind of oversight that is necessary, without the kind of scrutiny that is necessary.

And as my friend from Texas, Judge POE, said earlier, one of his constituents wants to opt out of this plan because the estimates are that it will cost $10,000 per family. Well, unfortunately, that's not an option that we have before us right now, because this is the measure that people are going to be voting on and I suspect will pass.

I believe that it's a mistake. I believe it's a mistake, and I will tell you who

else I believe if he were alive would conclude that it's a mistake. And we've used this quote repeatedly. It first came to my attention by our friend from St. Louis, TODD AKIN, who told me that his 88-year-old father who obviously lived during the time of the Great Depression found this quote. Henry Morgenthau was the Treasury Secretary under Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and he testified before the House Ways and Means Committee in 1939. And in that testimony, Madam Speaker, the Secretary of the Treasury, under Franklin Roosevelt, obviously, not some right-wing conservative economist, the Treasury Secretary under Franklin Roosevelt said: ''We have tried spending money. We are spending more than we have ever spent, and it does not work. I say, after 8 years of this Roosevelt administration, we have just as much unemployment as when we started, and an enormous debt to boot.''

Now, that was in 1939, Madam Speaker. We are making a mistake if we proceed with this measure. I believe that.

The American economy is going to get stronger because, as I said earlier, we are the most productive, we are the most innovative people on the face of the earth. We're going to get stronger. My fear is that this measure will, in fact, slow the economic recovery that we all would like to see take place soon.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, just two points and then I would like to recognize my friend from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

But I think the really sad story, Mr. DREIER, that you related about the suicide underscores the urgency of this bill and the reason that it needs to be handled without delay.

The second point I wanted to respond to is Christina Romer said that the Republican House analysis is flat wrong in its claim that the House Republican stimulus is much more effective. ''No matter what your analytical assumption,'' she says, ''the plan that the President supports would result in substantially greater job creation than the House Republican plan.''

And with that I would yield 3 minutes to my friend from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

□ 0945

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, on January 20, President Obama and his administration inherited the worst economy since the Great Depression.

A record budget deficit and a worsening economy, an economy that is now losing 600,000 jobs a month, was the result of failed economic policies. For too long, the previous administration allowed the deficit to rise through wasteful spending, including unpaid wars and tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans, while ignoring the challenges facing our economy.

Let me be clear: This economy did not go bad overnight. No, Madam Speaker. It took years of neglect to bring us to this position.

As a result, we are here today, trying to help our economy with a bold and historic recovery package. Economists ranging from conservative to liberal all agree that a recovery package is needed and that such a package must be bold. Any recovery package, they say, must provide a real shot in the arm to the economy, and that is what we have before us today. We have a package that will provide immediate funding to help the economy, but it is also designed to prevent an economic lull like the one we saw a few years after the Great Depression.

Madam Speaker, we have people in our country who are going hungry, and there is money in this package for food stamps—the most effective and immediate stimulus available—and there is money for unemployment. There is money for roads and for bridges and for other important shovel-ready infrastructure programs. Yes, there are targeted tax cuts that will allow middle- and low-income families to receive tax relief during these trying times. Is it perfect? No. This is not the package I would draft if it were solely up to me, but it is the package that came through a bipartisan and open process.

Now, my Republican friends had the opportunity to address this problem. Former President Bush could have acted on these programs before he left office, but he chose not to do so, allowing the recession to worsen. When Republicans decided to put forth an alternative plan, it was simply comprised of the failed policies of yesterday. When economists said there should be money for food stamps, my Republican friends on the other side of the aisle said ''no.''

When economists said there should be money for transportation and infrastructure, my Republican friends said ''no.'' When economists said there should be money for unemployment and for aid to States for school construction, my friends on the other side of the aisle said ''no.''

Madam Speaker, it is not enough to say ''no'' and to simply revert to the failed policies of the past. My friends offered their package. We had a vote and it failed miserably. People have had it with the failed economic policies of George W. Bush. Yet, instead of trying to work with President Obama and this Congress on a real recovery package, they continued to defy the needs of the American people and continued saying ''no.''

Saying ''no'' is easy. Saying ''no'' means you don't have to take responsibility for anything, but that is not what the American people want, and that is not what the American people voted for in the November elections.

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

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, the bill before us will save or create more than 3 million jobs, and it will help people put food on their tables and receive health care as they try to make it through this recession.

We need to fix this economy, and Democrats, with or without the Republicans, are going to do what is necessary to help the American people. Enough of politics as usual. We need to move forward. The American people are looking to us for help, and this package provides the help that they need.

I congratulate the Speaker and the leadership and the chairman who worked on this recovery package. I urge my colleagues to support the rule and to support H.R. 1.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

As I listen to my good friend from Worcester, I would say, my gosh, we certainly have seen a change in the level of debate around here. It is fascinating to see.

Madam Speaker, as I listen to my friend from Colorado, I have got to tell you that, when I was quoting Dr. Christina Romer, chief of the Council of Economic Advisers, it was her methodology that was used that created twice as many jobs at half the cost.

With that, I am happy to yield 3 minutes to my very hardworking Rules Committee colleague, the gentleman from Miami, Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART).

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, it is not petty when we say that each Member of this House should have the opportunity to read this legislation. We are the people's House. Every Member is elected. We are all cognizant of the great difficulty being suffered by the American people, of the jobs being lost, of the very, very sad stories facing each of our districts. So it is not petty to say that, as the House requested, we should have 48 hours to review this legislation.

With regard to the substance, what we have been able to gauge is in the legislation. I remember when we first started discussing this package and, really, the tone of bipartisanship that was engulfing the Nation at the time. I was pleased because I believed that we would be able to modernize with this legislation. I believed we would see a modernization of the infrastructure—of the roads and bridges—of the United States.

When I saw the first $800 billion bill that was passed on January 28, including $30 billion for shovel-ready infrastructure projects, I thought that was most unsatisfactory, that a great opportunity was being lost. Since we are going to burden the American people with all of this debt, I thought at least we would modernize our infrastructure. I thought, well, maybe when the bill comes back it will be improved, and we will see more of the $800 billion, more than $30 billion within the $800 billion for our roads and bridges and for the modernization of our infrastructure.

When I saw the bill returning and that instead of $30 billion there was $29

billion to modernize our infrastructure, I realized that this opportunity lost is more than sad, because the American people believed that this was sacrifice for modernization, for higher productivity, for the creation of jobs. That is not what it is.

So, with sadness, I rise not only to oppose the rule but to say that this is an unsatisfactory package and that we can do better. We all believe that we need to act. I hope that we all come to the conclusion that we must, that we can do better.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI), a member of the Committee on Rules.

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, it is clear that our economy is in peril. For months, the House of Representatives has been working to develop solutions to revive the job market, to keep people in their homes and to restore faith in the American economy. We have held substantive hearings and markups. We have debated the merits of different proposals. We have listened to nonpartisan expert testimony on what the Federal Government can do to save the jobs we have and to create millions more.

I have listened to and have participated in this debate, and I have weighed the opinions of the experts, but when I consider the package before us today, I think mainly of the people in my district who are suffering.

I think of families in my district who are living on food stamps. I think of seniors who can no longer afford to see a doctor when they're sick. I think of the new mother who has just been laid off and who is not sure if she can pay her mortgage next month.

I think of Francisca Monterjano. Francisca lost most of her 401(k) when the stock market crashed last year. She lined up outside of Raley Field earlier this month, along with thousands of my constituents, eager for part-time work even though she is retired.

Francisca and the rest of my constituents have spoken, Madam Speaker. They have told me clearly:

We need this package. We need the unemployment benefits and the increased access to health care that it represents. We need the nearly 4 million jobs it will save or create. 7,800 of those jobs will be in my district alone, and many of these will be in the clean energy industry that will drive our future economy. We need the public transit and flood protection infrastructure that the bill will provide. We need the investment in primary and secondary education that will help train our children for work in the jobs of the future, and we need the tax relief that this bill contains.

Today's package is a product of compromise and of negotiation. It is not perfect. Yet the state of our economy is too bleak not to act now. Millions of people across our country are suffering too much for this House to shy away from its responsibility to lead. Now is not the time for partisan bickering or for political gain. Now is the time for action, for leadership.

So today, Madam Speaker, I choose to lead by casting my vote in favor of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, at this time, I am happy to yield 1½ minutes to my very distinguished colleague from Tulare, California (Mr. NUNES).

Mr. NUNES. Madam Speaker, this legislation is not about creating jobs. If jobs were the priority of Democrats, leaders would have listened to my pleas to help California.

I had asked Democrat leaders to include a provision that would not have cost one penny. It would have simply brought water to my constituents, and it would have saved 60,000 jobs.

Folks may ask: Why didn't the Democrat leaders put this in? Well, it is because their friends in the radical environmental community have decided that 2-inch minnows are more important than the people in my district. Just listen to a California deputy attorney general who moonlights as a radical environmentalist. Here is what he said about my constituents:

''What parent raises their child to be a farm worker? These kids are the least educated people in America . . . They turn to lives of crime. They go on welfare. They get into drug trafficking, and they join gangs.''

This is pathetic. You are spending $1 trillion, and you will not put in one provision that would create or save 60,000 jobs. This is an insult to my constituents, an absolute insult.

Vote ''no'' on this rule. Vote ''no'' on this bill.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, how much time remains on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 16 minutes remaining; the gentleman from Colorado has 17½ minutes remaining.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), a member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. POLIS of Colorado. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009. I want to thank Speaker PELOSI, Chairman OBEY, Chairman MILLER, and all of my colleagues for doing what this crisis demands and for doing what the American people have asked us to do.

This is no ordinary economic downturn. It is a rapid meltdown that threatens the very foundations of our capitalist system. The Bush administration took a record budget surplus and left us the largest deficit in U.S. history. Our national debt has doubled, and the amount we owe to foreign countries has tripled. Five million Americans no longer have health insurance, and 7.6 million families have fallen into poverty. The laundry list of mistakes from the previous administration's failed policies has left us no choice but to take swift and decisive action to tackle these challenges head on.

This landmark legislation represents a new chapter and a new direction for our great Nation. By creating 3.5 million jobs and by investing in our infrastructure—physical and human—we are taking immediate action to restore growth and prosperity to the American people. Americans understand that a healthy environment goes hand in hand with a healthy economy.

This bill gives States and renewable energy producers the tools they need to green our energy infrastructure. It promotes a green workforce, spurs green innovation and invests heavily in our public lands. It does this while creating new and long-lasting jobs that will make our country the economic, scientific and environmental leader that it once was and once again will be.

Madam Speaker, we can and will regain the world's confidence in our economy. We will retain our global competitiveness, and we will, indeed, save capitalism and free enterprise with one of the largest tax cuts ever.

With its robust commitment to our education system, this legislation invests in our children's future and paves the way for generations of success. Education is the only meaningful, long-term investment we can make to stimulate the American economy, and there is no better way to remain the world's leader in innovation.

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

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. POLIS of Colorado. I applaud President Obama and my colleagues in both Chambers for working hard to ensure that education from early childhood through college is an important part of the recovery package.

Again, I applaud the tireless efforts of all those involved in the crafting and in the negotiation of this historic legislation.

□ 1000

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, it's not often that we have the opportunity to hear the brilliance of both DIAZ-BALART brothers in the same debate.

Now I would like to yield 1 minute to our good friend from Miami, the other DIAZ-BALART.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, we clearly need a stimulus bill, a bill that creates jobs. Unfortunately, the only thing that this is going to stimulate is more government bureaucracy and government bureaucrats. This will not help the economy.

Let me add some ammunition.

Only $3 billion, which is one-third of 1 percent to help the job creators to stimulate small businesses. One-third of 1 percent for small businesses that are the job creators? And yet, it's going to add $9,400 for all of our American families in debt; $9,400. Less than

7 percent of the money goes to infrastructure. That's shameful.

You know, this House debated recently the TARP bill to try to cover itself for the embarrassment, the embarrassment and lack of accountability of that TARP bailout bill. This is just the ''Son of TARP.'' We're going to be embarrassed. It's not going to help the economy like it's supposed to, and we're going to read about the scandals.

Please vote this bill down.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I would like to yield to the chairman of the Transportation Committee, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), 3 minutes.

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. This bill provides $64.1 billion for transportation and infrastructure investments under the jurisdiction of our committee. What is included in this bill from the jurisdiction of our committee will create and sustain 1.8 million jobs, real jobs, construction jobs, professional journeymen, career apprentice, brick layers, cement finishers, backhoe operators. Real jobs in the U.S. economy for people who will be paying taxes, not being paid unemployment compensation for not working. They will get a working day's wage, and they will pay taxes on it and their companies will pay taxes on it.

We'll generate $322 billion of total economic activity over the next 2 years.

And we are going to ensure that the States, departments of transportation, the municipal metropolitan planning organizations, the individual city and regional and metropolitan area planning organizations, and the transit organizations, and the airport authorities do what they have told this committee they will do: deliver jobs, half of that funding in the first 90 days. And we will hold hearings every 30 days with reports, according to a schedule we've laid out for the State agencies, on delivery of those jobs putting the money under contract.

The Portland Cement Association testified before our committee in January saying 45 companies had 130 million metric tons of Portland cement produced and invested in the marketplace in 2007. Last year it was 95 million metric tons. For this year they project 9 million metric tons. They can ramp up to over 90 million metric tons of cement produced for ready-mix concrete to put people to work in the marketplace.

In the transit sector, over 5,500 options are now on call for the producers who can go from their now 5,000 to over 7,000 transit vehicles ramping up in 30 days. I've been to one of the transit producers in this country, they are ready to move.

And 82 percent of their purchases are U.S. suppliers, all final manufacturers in the United States, and all steel. All cement in our surface transportation program will be made in America, produced in America, invested in America.

We can do this. We will put people to work. We will oversee the implementation of this program, and we will put that on our Web site so the American people will know that this program is working.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise in strong support of the Conference Report on H.R. 1, the ''American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009''.

According to the employment statistics released by the Department of Labor last week, as of January 2009, there are 11.6 million unemployed persons in the U.S., for all sectors of the economy combined. In addition, when part-time and discouraged workers who want full-time jobs are included, the number of unemployed/under-employed workers increases to 22.3 million.

The construction sector has been particularly hard-hit—it has the highest unemployment rate (18.2 percent) of any industrial sector. As of January 2009, there were 1,744,000 unemployed construction workers in the nation.

This bill is urgently needed to put Americans back to work. The infrastructure investments funded by this bill will create good, family-wage jobs—jobs that cannot be outsourced to another country, because the work must be done here in the U.S. on our roads, bridges, transit and rail systems, airports, waterways, wastewater treatment facilities, and Federal buildings.

For more than a year now, I have worked to ensure that infrastructure investment plays a key role in our nation's economic recovery.

I thank Chairman OBEY for working so closely with me in this effort. We consulted extensively on the transportation and infrastructure provisions in the bill. Through his efforts and those of his staff, we were able to retain many of the good provisions in the House bill that were not in the Senate bill, and to develop good compromises where the bills differed. I particularly appreciate the hard work of Beverly Pheto, Staff Director, and Kate Hallahan and David Napoliello of the Transportation Subcommittee.

The legislation before us today does not include everything I had proposed. While I would have preferred increased funding levels, and tighter use-it-or-lose-it deadlines, I do not intend to let ''perfect'' become the enemy of ''good''.

This is a ''good'' bill. It is desperately needed by the American people, and it deserves our support.

This bill provides $64.1 billion for Transportation and Infrastructure Committee infrastructure investments. This funding will create or sustain 1.8 million jobs and generate $322 billion of economic activity. It will get construction workers off the bench and back on the job.

To ensure that the purpose of this legislation is achieved, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure will exercise vigorous oversight over the economic recovery funds within its jurisdiction. Federal agencies and grant recipients within our Committee's jurisdiction must understand that ''business as usual'' is not good enough anymore, and they will be held accountable to a high standard. We will insist that States, cities, and transit agencies live up to their assurances that they will be able to have contracts in place in 90 days for a substantial portion of the funding authorized by this bill. We will insist that projects under this bill be new projects, not simply replacements for projects which States were planning to carry out under existing programs. We will insist that Federal agencies expedite the process of approving projects and awarding grants.

With aggressive action by Federal agencies and grant recipients, the infrastructure funds provided by this bill can produce a substantial number of jobs by June, while also improving our deteriorating infrastructure and laying the foundation for our future economic growth.

I thank Speaker PELOSI, Chairman OBEY, Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, Chairman OLVER, Chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies, and our colleagues for working with me and other Members of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure throughout the development of this legislation.

I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the Conference Report on H.R. 1, a true investment in America's future.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, at this time I am happy to yield 1 minute to our hardworking new colleague from Tequesta, Florida (Mr. ROONEY).

Mr. ROONEY. Madam Speaker, I can't tell you how disappointed I am as a new Member of this body as to the process that we are deliberating here today having only received this bill late last night and now we are voting on it today. What happened to the open and transparent Congress that I promised my constituents and that the President asked us to do when I was elected here not too long ago? The Democrats say that there has been transparency, but we know that this is not true.

What about the backroom deals? What about reaching across party lines? The minority has been left out of the discussion, and the people of my district expect and deserve better. I cannot vote for such a large bill that levies our economic future on the backs of my children.

Where is the help for more take-home pay for Martin County? Thirteen dollars a week? Where is the foreclosure relief for St. Lucie County? It's been cut in half. And what about jobs? I couldn't find one specific job for St. Lucie County which unemployment rates are now rivaling Detroit, Michigan.

The majority says it's their plan or nothing, and we are the party of ''no.'' But we had a plan. It was a good plan. And I sincerely hope in the future we will be able to work together as the people expect us to do.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, at this time I would yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California, the chairman of Education and Labor, Mr. MILLER.

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Madam Speaker and Members of the

House, we all know, and the people know, that the American economy is in a crisis. It's not that this bill in and of itself will fix the American economy, but this bill takes a major step to fill in the huge gap, and that is the loss of spending at the local level among our school districts, our water districts, our cities, our counties, and our States. Why is that happening? Because they're hemorrhaging a huge loss. And over the next couple of years, over $2 trillion will be missing in economic activity. This is a bill that's designed to stimulate those local economies.

In the education area, there's $56 billion that's available to local school districts for the rehabilitation, the repair, and the renovation of school buildings so that children will go to school in safe, well-lighted, modern facilities so that they will be green. They can put in new heating, new air conditioning systems, $600 million for new technologies so every school in this country will be connected to the best technology in the world. They will be able to engage in curriculums that now are impossible for them. They can have modern labs. That's the promise of America in this.

And who will do those jobs? Local contractors, heating contractors, electricians, plumbing contractors, building contractors from our local communities who will hire other people in our local communities. That's what will happen with this legislation. That's the promise of this legislation.

It will help school districts from keeping to lay off teachers. In the matter of a few weeks, California will start issuing its advanced pink slips. Hundreds of thousands of teachers across this nation will be in this same situation. Now, school districts will know that they're going to get $13 billion in title I in IDA money that will help them reduce the number of people who will be unemployed if we do nothing.

If we do nothing, unemployment will continue, and we know that it will continue for the next few months. But we're trying to mitigate against the increased unemployment through school construction, through highway construction, making sure the students can stay in college as their families are under pressure because of the loss of jobs, the diminished work hours, the loss of pay. We want to make sure that they can stay there so we provide an additional increase in the Pell Grant.

This is very important to this Nation. It's very important to our students, and it's very important that we have an opportunity to create in this economic crisis a 21st century education plan.

You know, it's just amazing. We always hear that history repeats, and here we see it again. And if you go back and you look at Arthur Schlesinger's study of the failures of the Hoover administration leading up to the elected of 1932, this book, ''Crisis of Old Order,'' we see that today, history is repeating itself.

Today, when this country cries out to help this economy, to help America's families who are unemployed, who are losing income, who are losing jobs, President Obama stepped forth with the American Recovery Act. The Republicans stepped forth with saying ''no.'' That was reflected when Minority Leader JOHN BOEHNER gave instructions to his colleagues to oppose the bill. Even as President Obama was traveling the Hill to meet with them and discuss this bill with them, they decided in advance of that meeting they would say ''no.''

Minority Whip ERIC CANTOR of Virginia has said that ''no'' is going to be the Republican strategy on this economic crises. ''No'' is going to be their strategy, he said.

The Republican national spokesman of late, radio host Rush Limbaugh, added that ''no'' is the strategy by asserting on the air that he wants President Obama to fail. Does he understand if President Obama fails that the American families lose income, they lose their jobs, and the crisis continues? And here we see the repeating of ''no.''

It was President Hoover in the midst of the Depression with his policy that the Federal Government could do nothing to help this Nation, and he was so wrong. He asked Will Rogers to think up a joke that would stop hoarding by the American public. He asked Rudy Vallee, Can you sing a song that would make people forget the Depression? I will give you a medal. He asked Christopher Morley, Perhaps what this country needs is a poem.

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

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman 30 seconds.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. This economic crisis will not be solved by a song, a poem, or a good joke. It will be solved by this Congress going to work with this new President to meet this crisis head on. It will be solved when we provide jobs in this country, when we free up the credit markets, when we force the banks to lend as they should be doing, and we provide this stimulus bill.

All Members of Congress should be very proud to vote ''aye'' on this legislation and yield to the cries and the needs of American families and workers.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, we share the goal of getting our economy back on track. One of the most compelling stories came from a town hall meeting in the hometown of our great friend, the distinguished chair of the Republican Conference, the gentleman from Columbus, Indiana (Mr. PENCE). I yield him 3 minutes.

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

Mr. PENCE. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his kind remarks.

The American people know and House Republicans know our Nation is facing a serious recession. American families are hurting. Many have lost their jobs. Many million more are worried they will be next. House Republicans know that Congress must do something. But it's important that we do the right thing.

As this debate begins today, we just heard moments ago from a distinguished colleague and others that somehow Republicans are about saying ''no.'' Well, let me say with great respect to the gentleman, this is not about saying ''no.'' This is about saying ''yes'' to solutions that will put Americans back to work.

Republicans have brought forward such solutions built on the time honored experience of President John F. Kennedy, of President Ronald Reagan, and the experience of this Nation with the impending recession that followed September 11. We didn't go on a spending spree on Capitol Hill. We didn't offer Americans a $13-a-person tax cut. John F. Kennedy, Ronald Reagan, and this Congress and this government after September 11, under George W. Bush, cut taxes across the board for working families, small businesses, and family farms; and the economy grew.

But what has the majority brought to the floor today? The truth is this stimulus bill will do nothing to stimulate this economy in the long term. The only thing the Democrats' stimulus bill will do is stimulate more government and more debt.

The American people are asking, what's 13 bucks a week going to do to get this economy moving again for the average American? What's $2 billion for community organizing to organizations like ACORN going to do to get Americans from the unemployment line to the factory line or millions to begin rationing health care or to purchase green golf carts going to do to put families back to work in Indiana?

As the gentleman said, I had a town hall meeting Monday, myself, in Indiana. A 13-year-old girl stood up, told me that her dad, raising her and her sister, alone as a single parent had lost half of his hours at work. He'd gone from 40 hours to 24 hours. And she stood up bravely in front of 300 Hoosiers, and she said, Anything in that bill, Congressman, that can help my dad get back to full-time? And I looked at little Hillary, congratulated her for her courage, and I said, Hillary, because I can't answer ''yes'' to your question that there is anything in this bill that's going to help get your dad back to full time, I can't vote ''yes'' on this bill. And the 300 Hoosiers in that room exploded in agreeing applause.

The American people know what's going on here. The American people know that this administration and this Congress are about to pass a bill that will not grow our economy. It will merely grow our government. We can do better. We must do better. This Congress owes the American people no less.

□ 1015

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, how much time does each side have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER) has 7¾ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) has 11¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I reserve my time so we can kind of even up.

Mr. DREIER. At this time, Madam Speaker, I'd like to yield 2 minutes to our very dynamic new member of the Rules Committee, the gentlewoman from Grandfather Community, North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

Ms. FOXX. I thank my colleague for yielding me time, Madam Speaker.

I'm highly insulted by the comments of the Deputy Attorney General from California that were shared with us a few minutes ago. As a lifetime farmer and a representative of many farmers, this is another indication of the atmosphere of arrogance within the majority party. It's an arrogance also expressed here this morning that only the President of this country can save us. Well, thank you very much, the American people have done very well by themselves over the last 200-plus years, and we haven't needed any President to save us.

The majority says saying ''no'' is easy. Republicans aren't saying ''no'' to the needs of the American people. We have a better alternative that's not being considered. For the majority, spending other people's money is easy. That's what this bill does. It's generational abuse.

Last night, Mr. OBEY said that the bill had been worked out with the White House. So I asked him to show us the accountability the President's been promising, show me how the spending leads to job creation section by section. He could not. I ask you, where's the beef?

Then he said, it's irrelevant what we think about this bill. The first article in the Constitution is about the Congress. It's not irrelevant what we think about this bill. My constituents don't like this bill. I don't like the bill.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the rule, vote ''no'' on the bill and say to the majority, we're not going to take your arrogance and we are not going to take your stealing the money from us, our children and our grandchildren.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I continue to reserve.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I was just congratulating Ms. FOXX on her thoughtful statement. At this time, I'm happy to yield 2 minutes to our good friend from Westminster, South Carolina (Mr. BARRETT).

Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule to this conference report between Democrats to H.R. 1. This backroom-written Democrat spending bill costs too much money, doesn't fix the problem fast enough, and fails to make enough good jobs.

In the long run, Madam Speaker, this bill will cost working families over $1 trillion. After today, each American household will owe $100,000 to pay for government debt. What's even scarier, in this conference report Democrats took what little bit of tax relief was in there away from families and small businesses so they could increase spending on pet projects like $50 million to the National Endowment of the Arts and $300 million for green golf carts.

The Congressional Budget Office has estimated that less than half the money in the Democrat stimulus plan will be spent in the next 2 years. Madam Speaker, folks in South Carolina and across this country are losing their jobs today. American families are struggling to make ends meet and cannot afford to wait 2 years to see a potential improvement in their economy.

The real problem, Madam Speaker, is Democrats have lost their faith in the American people. They don't see what I see. I look at the people back home in South Carolina, and I know that they are the key to moving America forward. The barbershop on the corner, the hardware store down the street, they're the driving force of the economy, not the bureaucrats in Washington.

And it's because of my faith in the American people that I support the House Republican economy recovery plan. This plan allows small businesses, the heart and soul of our economy, to take a tax deduction equal to 20 percent of their income, a deduction that will allow small businesses to hire new employees, to grow. In South Carolina, this plan will create 34,000 jobs more than the Democrat plan and will cost half.

It's my sincere hope that the spending bill fails, and we in Congress can debate a bill that won't put a crushing burden on our children, won't take 2 years to work, and will rely on our small businesses. Vote ''no'' on this plan.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I'd like, Madam Speaker, to yield 1 minute to my friend from New York, Mr. BISHOP.

(Mr. BISHOP of New York asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Madam Speaker, let me start by taking this opportunity to commend both the House and Senate conferees on crafting this compromise legislation that will create and preserve nearly 3.5 million jobs here in America and will set our Nation on a course toward economic recovery.

It is imperative that we plug the holes in our job market that lost 600,000 jobs last month alone, and these holes will not be plugged by a strategy of saying ''no'' nor will they be plugged by a strategy of returning to the failed policies of the past, which is all our friends on the other side of the aisle are offering.

Through investing in our infrastructure and investment in our children's education and preserving the ability of our States to provide essential services, this bill will create jobs for millions of Americans, even as we better prepare the next generation for the challenges they will face.

Madam Speaker, I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to ensure that this historic effort will return our Nation to economic prosperity and provide hope to the millions who have suffered as a result of the failed policies of the past.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, at this time, I'm happy to yield 1 minute to a former Rules Committee member, the gentleman from Marietta, Georgia (Mr. GINGREY).

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I had some prepared remarks, but I'm going to set those aside because I saw an article this morning in The Hill newspaper by Cheri Jacobus, and I think it says it all and I want to quote an excerpt.

''Congress should throw this greasy pile of pork into the grinder. Instead, give every American household a $10,000 stimulus check to spend as we please. With approximately 100 million households nationwide, we hit that magic number of $1 trillion. This, along with a 2-year moratorium on capital gains taxes, will get the economy off life support.

''Instead of condoms, green golf carts, mouse habitats and government-run health care, Americans would spend based on individual priorities, thus spurring competition, resulting in higher-quality goods and services. Good banks succeed; bad banks fail. Well-priced, quality automobiles hit the streets; lemons fade away. Capitalism lives to fight another day and the greatest country on Earth narrowly survives its near-death experience with socialism.''

Mr. PERLMUTTER. At this time, Madam Speaker, I'd like to yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California, Ms. BARBARA LEE.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, let me thank the gentleman for yielding and applaud our Speaker and President Obama and our leadership for a fair and balanced bill.

The disastrous economic policies of the previous administration, including the irresponsible tax cuts for the wealthy, the war in Iraq and a regulated financial services industry, have left our Nation in shambles. Many more people, millions more, are living in poverty, without health insurance, and unemployment is through the roof.

Recognizing this urgency, I established the Congressional Black Caucus Economic Recovery Task Force, chaired by Congressman CLEAVER, to help guide our response to the economic crisis.

Historically, the role of the Congressional Black Caucus has been to act as the conscience of the Congress and ensure that no American is left behind.

This is our moral responsibility. That was our overriding goal with this bill, as we sought to create more jobs for more people.

This package will help working families by expanding food stamps, unemployment insurance, and health coverage for the uninsured, and investing in education and job training, infrastructure, foreclosure relief, and assistance.

It's not perfect. It should have been much, much bigger, but it's a critical first step. It reflects our values as a Nation.

Although the American dream has turned into a nightmare for many during this economic crisis, many people, many people have been living this nightmare for years. So we've got to continue to fight on their behalf, and we will.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, at this time, I'm happy to yield 1 minute to our good friend from Roswell, Georgia (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I appreciate my friend for yielding.

Madam Speaker, you really can't be serious. You can't be serious. This would be humorous if it wasn't so sad. Got this at 11 o'clock last night, over 1,000 pages. What's in it? Have you read it? We found $30 million for mice. Got $30 million for mice. You can't be serious. What a joke. $30 million for mice. Does that create jobs?

Imagine what we could do with $30 million, Madam Speaker. Imagine what we could do with $1 trillion, Madam Speaker, if we worked together for real solutions.

We understand that people are hurting, but this majority is only interested in paying off and buying political friends like $2 billion for ACORN and $300 million for golf carts for bureaucrats. What a joke.

But the American people aren't laughing. This bill is selfish because it robs from future generations. It's irresponsible because it won't work. What a joke. The American people aren't laughing.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas, Ms. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE, and as she's getting ready, I would say to my friend, Dr. PRICE from Georgia, there's not anything in that bill about mice, $30 million for mice. We talked about it yesterday. It's not in there, and I challenge him.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

The Chair will ask Members to refrain from interrupting another in debate after that Member has expressed a refusal to yield.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Let me thank the distinguished gentleman from Colorado and the Rules Committee for the heavy lifting, along with the Appropriations Committee and Financial Services Committee, and all of those who have joined the leadership in this heavy responsibility of governance.

I'm proud to be part of the governing party, if you will, the Democratic caucus that has the responsibility of leading this Nation, and we accept the burden and responsibility of making sure that there is a credible answer to America's problems.

Someone needs to talk to the unemployed construction worker or the young woman laid off in the retail industry or retiree who wants to come back to work. This bill is a responsible bill, $64 billion in transportation and infrastructure, 1.8 million jobs; the construction worker back to work; $800 payment for a couple, $400 payment for a single person. It's not $13 a week, as they'd like to say. It's a lump sum that people are desperately in need of.

This is an important and responsible act. We're putting together in my office task forces to ensure that Houston communities get this relief. It's important to vote for this bill. America needs this bill. It's time to answer the call of America. I support the Rules Committee and economic recovery bill.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, at this time, I'm happy to yield 1 minute to our friend from Mesa, Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

A lot has been said about the process here, and it needs to be said. To receive a bill that's over 1,000 pages at 11 o'clock last night and expect to vote on it with any knowledge of really what's in it today is simply absurd. So the process is wrong, but we need not lose sight of the broader picture here. We know enough about this legislation to know that it is bad legislation. First and foremost, the process is bad, but it's bad legislation.

Now, some will say, well, you're just not a Keynesian, you don't believe in Keynesian economics. Keynes would be embarrassed by this legislation. If you believe in Keynesian economics, then certainly you would spend money in a way that stimulates the economy. I doubt that John Maynard Keynes would believe that $50 million for the National Endowment for the Arts would be stimulative. All that it stimulates is more spending later.

And the problem here is we're creating hundreds of new Federal programs that will continue in perpetuity, that will become a drag on the economy, not bolster it.

Vote against this legislation.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I'd like to yield 1 minute to my friend from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Thank you very much.

Madam Speaker, this is no joke. To my friends on the other side of this aisle, this is a very serious matter. We've lost 3,673,000 jobs in the last year alone. Madam Speaker, that is 10,000 jobs every day.

Now, what we have here is plain and simple. Our economy has leaks and holes in it all throughout. That's why you've got 1,000 pages there because it's big. Our economy is big.

You say you haven't read it. I would say you have read it. You've come down here and poked holes about it, said this is what's wrong with it and that's what's wrong with it. How do you know that if you haven't read it?

□ 1030

The other point is this, Madam Speaker: last November the people of the United States made a decision and that decision was to put Barack Obama as President, because they wanted a new direction. He has pleaded, he has cajoled, he's gone all across this country asking for help. I say, Madam Speaker, let us give him the help, let us come together, and let us go ahead and pass this bill without delay. The American people are counting on us.

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

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

I would yield my friend 30 seconds. Has his time expired, Madam Speaker?

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

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds to simply say to my friend, who unfortunately wouldn't yield, we do have a thousand pages here. This was put online after midnight. We all voted in favor of 48 hours—you voted in favor of 48 hours—to allow the American people and our colleagues to see this. We all understand the urgency of this matter. Has my colleague read this? Many of us have been trying to go through it since after midnight in the Rules Committee.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. I was up until 3 o'clock this morning reading it. If you had done this, Mr. DREIER, you were here debating it last week——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

Mr. DREIER. Two-and-a-half hours, and you went through a thousand pages.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, at this time I am happy to yield——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I would like to inquire how much time remains, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado has 3 minutes remaining. The gentleman from California has 4½ minutes remaining.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, at this time I am happy to yield 1 minute to a former Rules Committee member, one of our new appropriators, the gentleman from Moore, Oklahoma (Mr. COLE).

Mr. COLE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise to oppose the rule and the underlying legislation, H.R. 1. This underlying bill is unfocused, it's bloated, and it's self-defeating. It won't stimulate our economy. It will certainly stimulate growth in the size of government.

The bill fails in four basic areas:

First, its tax cuts are too small, too temporary and simply don't encourage people to purchase products or employers to hire people.

Second, much of the spending in the bill is recurring and will add to the size of government and ultimately slow future growth.

Third, our country is at war and yet nothing in this bill helps those protecting our freedom. And by ignoring legitimate procurement issues, we fail to take a measure that would actually stimulate the economy.

Finally, Madam Speaker, this bill is sold as an infrastructure bill, yet only 7 percent of the spending is actually on infrastructure. We can do better than this. We can have a bipartisan, open process and pass legislation we can all be proud of.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I would like to yield 1 minute to my friend from Ohio (Mr. BOCCIERI).

Mr. BOCCIERI. Madam Speaker, the United States of America is in a great recession and we will be judged as a United States Government by two measures—by action or inaction.

And I tell my friends on the other side of the aisle who are not going to vote for this measure today, you are walking away from America and Americans in her greatest time of need. I remember as a C–130 pilot flying missions in and out of Iraq how much money we were spending over there to rebuild roads and bridges in Iraq and to make sure every man, woman and child in Iraq had universal health care coverage. You didn't bat an eye to vote for them. You didn't bat an eye to bail out $700 billion for Wall Street. This is about investing in America and Americans in their greatest time of need. We have to be measured by what we're going to do. Are we going to be leaders or are we going to be blockers? Are we going to act or are we not? Are we going to vote for Iraqis or Americans?

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members seated in the Chamber will refrain from shouting interjections out during debate, and Members should address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, at this time I am happy to yield a minute to my good friend from Tyler, Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, this rule is so cynical. The biggest spending bill in the history of the world and the rule says we can't even have the bill read out loud here on the floor so the American people really know what we're doing to future generations.

And to hear my colleagues across the aisle, Madam Speaker, talk about the jobs, 600,000 jobs being lost in the last month, it breaks my heart for every job. We lost 1200 in east Texas yesterday. Why? Because the hope and the change that people voted for in the President has come to doom and gloom. They have held on to avoid letting their workers go, but now for the last month they've heard the Democratic proposals and what they see is no hope. There's no hope left in this bill. It's not going to help the economy, so they're having to let their workers go. We say yes to the American people. We say no to the atmosphere of arrogance that says the American people are not the solution. They are the solution. Give them a tax holiday. Let them keep their own money and spend it to get the economy going. That's yes to America. That's yes to the American solution.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I would like to yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH).

Mr. FATTAH. This is going to be a clear point of demarcation. Eight years of the Bush administration and we lost millions of jobs. Millions of Americans lost their homes, lost their investments. Our schools crumbled. And now as we launch into these 4 and 8 years, we're going to see schools rebuilt, millions put to work, we're going to see the economy turn around, and it starts today.

Now in '93 when we had the Clinton economic plan, not one Republican voted for it in the House or Senate. But we did get 27 million new jobs, we did balance the budget, and pay down the national debt. History has a way of repeating itself.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I would like to yield at this point 30 seconds to our good friend from Texas, distinguished secretary of the Republican Conference, Mr. CARTER.

Mr. CARTER. I thank the gentleman.

The President told us that this bill was not going to have any earmarks in it and if it was, he was going to do something about it and I'm proud of him.

I'm concerned about an earmark. An earmark is a Member-directed initiative. We have an earmark for a train from Las Vegas to California. That seems to be one of the earmarks we had. I'm not sure in this 25 feet high bill we've got here that we've still got the mouse, but we had a $30 million earmark for a mouse in California.

I hope you'll veto this bill.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, how much time do we each have?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado has 1½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from California has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I would like to reserve the balance of my time for closing.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I began by reporting to the House of the sad news that I received yesterday when a man telephoned me to say that his young son's best friend's father had just committed suicide because of the economic difficulty their family was facing. We all know how serious this situation is. We have friends who have lost homes, people who have lost jobs, and we all know that it is imperative that we take action and that we take action now, and most important, Madam Speaker, that we do the right thing.

Now I'm going to urge my colleagues to oppose the previous question on this measure. Why? So that we can do what every single Member of this institution on a unanimous recorded vote said they wanted to do on Tuesday, and, that is, say that 48 hours should be provided for Members to look at this bill. The Rules Committee got this package very late last night, around midnight. We were told at that time just before midnight that it was online, available for the American people to see, and, Madam Speaker, it was not. Three sections were missing. Not until well after midnight was this made available. And so any Member who cast a vote in favor of allowing 48 hours for this measure to be considered should vote no on the previous question so that we will provide an amendment to allow for what everyone said they wanted to in fact take place.

This measure is, as has been reported, a thousand pages, and no one knows what it's going to do, including our friend the chairman of the Appropriations Committee who in his testimony last night before the Rules Committee said he had no idea how many jobs would be created. He had no idea how many jobs would be created, but we have to take action. And, Madam Speaker, we can take action by putting into place a growth-oriented tax package which will in fact get our economy back on track.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the previous question.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, my friend from California's story about the gentleman who committed suicide underscores the urgency of this matter. This is not a time for delay. This is not a time for inaction. It is a time for action. The President has requested this bill get passed to put America back to work. This bill will maintain or create 3.6 million jobs. We've lost hundreds of thousands of jobs over the course of the last few months. We need to stop that downward spiral and this will do that. It has five major components. First there's construction and reconstruction of our infrastructure. Current jobs, long-term investment. A look to the new energy future, new jobs in science and technology, in health care and in energy. It gives our States a chance to stay on their feet by backfilling some of their losses for teachers and firefighters and policemen and maintenance workers. There is a tax

cut for 95 percent of America in this bill. Finally, there is a piece that helps those folks who have been hurt by this downturn with Medicaid and food stamps and unemployment insurance.

This bill is a fantastic step forward. There will be a series of steps that have to be taken and it will take time. But we have faith in the American people. We have faith in this country. We are going to change the direction of this Nation and put 3.5 million people back to work.

I urge a ''yes'' vote on the previous question.

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

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 168 OFFERED BY MR. DREIER OF CALIFORNIA

Strike ''upon adoption of this resolution'' and insert ''not sooner than 10:45 p.m. on the calendar day of February 14, 2009''.

(The information contained herein was provided by Democratic Minority on multiple occasions throughout the 109th Congress.)

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Democratic majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives, (VI, 308–311) describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as ''a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.'' To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that ''the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition'' in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R–Illinois) said: ''The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.''

Because the vote today may look bad for the Democratic majority they will say ''the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.'' But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the definition of the previous question used in the Floor Procedures Manual published by the Rules Committee in the 109th Congress, (page 56). Here's how the Rules Committee described the rule using information from Congressional Quarterly's ''American Congressional Dictionary'': ''If the previous question is defeated, control of debate shifts to the leading opposition member (usually the minority Floor Manager) who then manages an hour of debate and may offer a germane amendment to the pending business.''

Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled ''Amending Special Rules'' states: ''a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.'' (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.''

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Democratic majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I yield the 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 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 234, nays 194, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 66]

YEAS—234

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Adler (NJ)
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boccieri
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Driehaus
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ellison
Ellsworth
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Foster
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Giffords
Gonzalez
Gordon (TN)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kosmas
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McMahon
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Speier
Spratt
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—194

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

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

NOT VOTING—4

Campbell
Lee (NY)
Solis (CA)
Stark

□ 1107

Messrs. SHADEGG, BLUNT, MARSHALL and McINTYRE changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

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

[Roll No. 67]

YEAS—231

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Adler (NJ)
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boccieri
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Driehaus
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Foster
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Gonzalez
Gordon (TN)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kosmas
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McMahon
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis (CA)
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stupak
Sutton
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—194

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

NOT VOTING—7

Campbell
Cao
Israel
Lamborn
Lee (NY)
Radanovich
Stark

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1114

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. CAO. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 67, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

□ 1115

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

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

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

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

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

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

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, further parliamentary inquiry.

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

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

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

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

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 168, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 1) making supplemental appropriations for job preservation and creation, infrastructure investment, energy efficiency and science, assistance to the