picture. Comprehensive immigration is the only way to solve the problem, an approach that respects our core American values of family, equality and human rights.

I challenge my colleagues, as we approach the next session, to look beyond the anti-immigrant rhetoric and join me in comprehensive immigration reform.

WE HAVE OTHER CHOICES THAN THIS CHOICE

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, many people know the famous speech from Henry V called: ''We few, we happy few, we band of brothers.''

So, with apologies to William Shakespeare, I want to say that I believe there will be a band of patriot Representatives here today and tomorrow who will resist being led into making an egregious mistake for this Nation. Neither September 28 nor 29 is a particularly significant day, but we will long remember what we do on these days. We face a challenge to our country and to our way of life if what has been told to us is presented on this floor for a vote, and I urge my colleagues not to be fooled by it.

We will not be a happy few if we are presented a plan that takes $200 billion to $700 billion from our taxpayers to try to solve a problem caused primarily by other Members of this body who simply do not understand fundamentally what has made this country great, but we will be right.

The very people in both the House and Senate who helped create this problem, including the chairmen of the respective committees in the House and Senate, gave Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac the authority to abuse our system, and they are now crafting the bailout. They blame others, but there are hundreds of articles that suggest otherwise, including the one here from Calomiris and Wallison, which I submit for the RECORD.

I urge my colleagues not to be swayed by this siren song that we have no choice but this choice. We have other choices, and the choice we make today will set the tone for our country and, perhaps, for the rest of the world for the foreseeable future.

HONORING CONGRESSMAN MICHAEL MCNULTY

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

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I take this minute to call to the attention of the House today a true American patriot. One of our colleagues is spending his last few hours, day and night, with us after two decades in the House. I refer to our Speaker pro tem, the gentleman from New York, MIKE MCNULTY, who has given two decades of his life to the service of our country. He has been one of our most exemplary colleagues. He has probably served as Speaker pro tem—in the chair that he has right now—with the gavel in his hand, for hundreds of hours, for probably more hours as Speaker pro tem than has any other Member of the House today.

I just want to say thank you, MIKE, for your years of service and to your family for sharing you with us for these two decades. As you ride off, back to your district to share the rest of your life with your family and new challenges, I say thank you and God's speed. You're leaving here at the height of your game and under your own power and terms, not into the sunset but into a bright new future and a new dawn.

Thank you, MIKE, for your service to our country.

BURNING DOWN THE HOUSE

(Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor, realizing that we are in a severe financial situation in this country on Wall Street that will have a negative effect on Main Street as well. It must be addressed, and it must be addressed quickly.

You know, I came to this floor last night, and I spoke to the American public. I said last night that you should be concerned this morning, that you should be very much alarmed by what is going on here. Obviously, Washington is not hearing from you and is not abiding by your wishes. Yes, there is a problem, and yes, also there are solutions, and yes, there is a way to deal with this problem but not by putting the American taxpayer on the hook.

In order to get those solutions, we should not go to those very same people who brought us this problem in the first place—those people who tried to block reform in the past.

I hear in the news today that there was a deal, that Speaker PELOSI has basically adopted the Paulson plan. Well, I don't know what all of the ramifications of the deal are and who is involved, but I can say this:

Those who support and those who used to work for Goldman Sachs will support this deal. Those who have gotten contributions from Countrywide will support this deal. Those who have gotten substantial contributions will support this deal. Most importantly, those who have blocked reform in the past will support this deal.

I will not support this deal as it has been laid out so far. If you want to know how to find out more about how we got here, just simply go to YouTube, and put in ''burning down the house,'' and you will get a better understanding of exactly how we got here and why we should not be going back to the very same parties who brought us here with this solution.

TWO FIG LEAVES OF A BAD $700 BILLION BILL

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

Mr. SHERMAN. The New York Times reports that the administration has finally agreed to two of the tiniest fig leaves designed to help Members vote for this bad bill. The first is that the bill will include a provision to require some future President to propose a revenue bill to pay for the hundreds of billions of dollars we're going to lose.

Now, how meaningless is this?

If a President likes and wants to give us a revenue bill, he'll do it without a statutory directive. If he sends us a tax-raising bill with a note saying that he hates it but that he's submitting it only to comply with the statutory provision, certainly, such a proposal is dead on arrival.

If this is what it means to say you've paid for a bill, then will this same ''pay-for'' definition apply when we are discussing bills not giving money to Wall Street, but future bills that would provide for transportation, health care and tax cuts for the middle class?

The second fig leaf is the insurance provision. It simply authorizes the Treasury to set up such an insurance plan without directing that they actually use it. They [Treasury] hate it. They won't use it. If they did use it, it would send, perhaps, even more money to Wall Street.

This bill involves hundreds of billions of dollars that are going to bail out foreign investors, and million-dollar-a-month salaries will continue to go to Wall Street executives.

That's why 400 eminent economics professors, including three Nobel Laureates, have written to us to say, ''We ask Congress not to rush, to hold appropriate hearings and to carefully consider the right course of action.'' These are 400 professors of economics. Three Nobel Laureates say, ''Do not panic. Hold hearings. Let's write this bill well.''

MARTIAL LAW

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I also come to the floor today to talk about this $700 billion bill that's in front of us. I use the term ''bill'' advisedly because we have seen no bill. We are here, debating talking points on, perhaps, what is the largest fundamental change in our Nation's financial system in its history.

House Republicans have been cut out of the process. Not only have we been