

The political left in this country is coaxing the American people right now, who are very uncertain. We are in uncertain economic times. They see health care costs that are skyrocketing out of control. They have concerns about preexisting conditions and jobs and a whole host of other things. And the political left is saying, give us your birthright of freedom. Give us your birthright of opportunity. Entrust it to us, who can't balance a budget, who are spending your children's prosperity away, and trust us.

What I think I am sensing, and I think what all three of us are sensing, the American public is saying, whoa. Whoa. We are not going to trade a birthright away, for what? For nothing? To entrust the future to people that literally cannot balance a checkbook? People who have taken our national debt and will double that amount in 5 years and will triple that amount in 10 years? That is incredibly sobering.

So here we are on the brink of Speaker PELOSI grabbing control of one-sixth of the American economy, one-sixth of the American economy. As we speak, the Rules Committee is meeting. They have not had the opportunity to fully vet this bill.

It went from 1,000 pages that was fundamentally rejected by the American public over the August recess, fundamentally rejected by the thousands of Americans that showed up over the last couple of days, and yet now she has doubled down. With all due respect to the Speaker, she has doubled down and taken 1,000 pages and turned it into 2,000 pages.

It takes away my breath. I think it takes away most Americans' breath, thinking about the amount of indebtedness being created and, ultimately, this generational theft.

□ 2230

Mr. HOEKSTRA. If the gentleman will yield, I think we also put this in the context of already what's happened in this year. Very early on this year, we spent \$800 billion to stimulate the economy. It hasn't worked. Today we saw the numbers. They came out, 10.2 percent unemployment. If you include those who have stopped looking for work or those who are maybe working part-time because they can't find a full-time job, that goes up to 17.5 percent. So 17.5 percent of the American people are either unemployed, stopped looking for work or underemployed. You know, that's the effect of our stimulus bill that was passed. I don't think any of us voted for it.

Then we put on top of that the cap-and-trade vote that my colleague was talking about, which is going to just hammer manufacturing and put a huge tax on every American again and every business out of this new carbon tax. Then you put the health care bill on top of it, \$1.2 trillion, and people are wondering, Why isn't the economy coming back? Because we put so much

uncertainty into the business climate. We've loaded up the debt. People were talking about, you know, the debt under President Bush. In 1 year they've tripled the deficit from what, \$450 billion. And that was the deficit under the Democratic Congress. I think the last time Republicans had control, the deficit was around \$250 billion. It was going the other way. It was going down. Ever since the Democrats have been in charge of Congress, it's been going up, so that we are now at \$1.4 trillion in a single year deficit.

All of these new taxes and new spending out there—the deficit is projected to be what, \$1 trillion every year for as far as the eye can see, and people are wondering why there's not job creation? It's not hard to figure out. I yield back.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. I will just put this in my own perspective the best I can here. I have always believed, as I know the three of you have, that the true statesmanship was the effort to try to look to the next generation. Someone said that a politician looks to the next election, whereas a statesman looks to the next generation. Some of those issues have been my life. I was the director of what Arizona's version is of a children's department. We've always wanted to try to look to the future and look to next generations. That's why I was so intrigued by the gentleman from Illinois' comments about our birthright, about freedom because I believe of all the tragedies in the Pelosi bill, that the loss in freedom is the big one.

This is not the first time that we have struggled in this country about that. There was a time when the colonists were here that they were oppressed so badly by the Crown of England that they said that we have to somehow break free. But there were those who were afraid, and I understand that. See, they didn't have freedom at that time. They were trying to gain it. They were trying to go against all odds to try to do what they could. But some were afraid.

I will never forget Samuel Adams' words because I think it should apply to all of us here tonight. I think it should apply especially to those on the other side of the aisle that are struggling tonight with how they're going to vote. He said to the colonists who were afraid to fight the King, he said, If you love wealth better than liberty, if you love the tranquility of servitude better than the animating contest of freedom, go from us in peace. We seek not your counsel or your arms. Crouch down, and lick the hands that feed you, and may your change sit lightly upon you, and may posterity forget that you were our countrymen.

And I would say today that we need that same call to liberty that they had back then that made them march with bloody feet in the frozen ground to find liberty for us. I have got two little babies at home that are just a little over a year old, and I don't want to throw

away their birthright or the freedom that I hope that they will walk in someday. I want them to stand in the light of the freedom that we see on the top of this Capitol dome. May it be.

#### HEALTH CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MURPHY of New York). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the privilege of being recognized by you, the Speaker and address on the floor of the House of Representatives in this seamless effort that we have to stand up and defend the freedom that this country needs. This has been for a long time about socialized medicine, socialized health care, the reason that so many people came to this Capitol and so many people have all across this country laid out and stood up and gone to congressional offices and joined in their groups, the tens of thousands of people who were here yesterday and so maybe people that are looking across the country, jamming the telephone lines, doing everything that they can. Mr. Speaker, the American people don't want this socialized medicine. I understand that the gentleman from Arizona has a presentation that he would like to make in a window here for a few minutes, and I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Arizona for that period of time before we pick up the balance of this exchange.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Well, I certainly thank the gentleman. In the last hour, I tried to talk about some of things that the Republicans were for, but I had made a commitment to give some remarks on the Pelosi health care plan. So I really appreciate everyone's indulgence here because I feel like I'm taking more than my share, but I will make these comments and then I will make myself scarce, if that will be all right.

Mr. Speaker, only 1 week ago, on Friday, October 29, Speaker PELOSI and her fellow liberal Democrats introduced H.R. 3962. But they grossly mislabeled the Affordable Health Care for America Act. The bill would more accurately be entitled, The Big Spending, Big Taxing, Big Entitlement Pelosi Plan for Big Government Takeover of America's Health Care Act.

Despite House Majority Leader STENY HOYER claiming during their press conference that the health care bill was part of an open and transparent process to reform our health care system, the American people were oddly prohibited from even attending the liberal Democrats' publicity rally on the steps of the Capitol. Mr. Speaker, this really isn't surprising considering the Democrats' habit of closing Republicans completely out of the legislative process and negotiating the provision of this current health care plan behind tightly closed and locked doors.

Mr. Speaker, the new Pelosi plan looks and sounds starkly similar to the Democrats' first attempt at a Big Government takeover of health care, H.R. 3200. That is because essentially it is the same Big Government socialist nonsense Speaker PELOSI introduced months ago, the same plan that caused literally millions of Americans to speak out against it through letters, petitions, protests, and by showing up to register their staunch disapproval at town hall meetings throughout the country all summer and fall.

Now it seems clear that the voice of Americans have fallen upon deaf ears in this House of Representatives, Mr. Speaker, and Ms. PELOSI and Mr. REID are determined to shove this partisan nightmare down the throats of the American people.

Now, buried within the contents of this 2,000-page bill as well as a separate 13-page bill that would increase the deficit by more than \$200 billion are details that will see a massive Federal intrusion in the health care of every American. For instance, Mr. Speaker, the Pelosi health care plan creates 111 new offices, bureaus, commissions, programs bureaucracies over and above the entitlement expansions. This includes, Mr. Speaker, a government-run insurance program that could cause as many as 114 million people in America to lose their current coverage. The Pelosi health care plan also abolishes the private market for individual health insurance, forcing individuals to purchase coverage in a government-run exchange.

The Pelosi health care plan enacts insurance regulations that would raise premiums and encourage employers to drop coverage. The Pelosi health care plan enacts trillions of dollars in new Federal spending that would exacerbate the deficit and imperil the Nation's long-term fiscal viability. The Pelosi health care plan also taxes all Americans: individuals who purchase insurance, individuals who do not purchase insurance and millions of small businesses.

Mr. Speaker, this will absolutely kill millions of jobs and raise health care premiums across the board. Mr. Speaker, the Pelosi health care plan also cuts Medicare by \$500 billion, which will devastate the Medicare Advantage program and result in higher premiums and dropped coverage for more than 10 million seniors. And nearly 70,000 of those seniors, Mr. Speaker, live in my district alone.

The Pelosi health care plan would eliminate more than 5.5 million jobs as a result of taxes on businesses that cannot afford to provide health care insurance coverage, and this is according to the model developed by Christina Romer, the chairwoman of the President's own Council of Economic Advisers.

Mr. Speaker, in 2008 health care spending in the United States reached \$2.4 trillion, and it was projected to reach \$3.1 trillion in 2012 and \$4.3 trillion by 2016.

□ 2240

Health care spending is 4.3 times the amount that we spend on national defense. And now the Congressional Budget Office has testified before Congress that the Democrat health care plan will actually increase that already sky-high health care spending.

Only weeks ago, Mr. Speaker, President Obama stood on this very floor and promised a joint session of Congress and the American people that he would "not sign health care legislation if it adds one dime to the deficit now or in the future." But, unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, that is one of the many promises that will unequivocally be broken by the Pelosi health care plan. Adding in the more than \$200 billion cost of the unfunded companion "doc fix" bill, H.R. 3961, the health care "reform" agenda proposed by liberal Pelosi Democrats totals more than \$1.5 trillion, nearly double President Obama's stated figure.

Mr. Speaker, that unequivocally breaks the President's promise by increasing the deficit to the tune of hundreds of billions of dollars. Add the \$1.5 trillion projected cost of this bill, and it's still a conservative estimate given the historic precedent of drastically underestimating the cost of government programs, Mr. Speaker.

When Medicare passed in 1965, the Congressional Budget Office predicted it would cost \$12 billion per year by 1990. In reality, the cost of Medicare in 1990 was \$110 billion, more than nine times greater than projected. Likewise, the Medicare expansion of it in 1987 was projected to cost \$1 billion annually. By 1992, the actual cost was \$17 billion, or 17 times the amount projected. What makes us think that a government takeover of more than one-sixth of our economy is going to be any different, Mr. Speaker?

Someone recently pointed out that a nearly 2,000-page bill of over 400,000 words that costs as much as this one does, that that plan amounts to over \$2.2 million per word, and there are a lot of words in this bill, Mr. Speaker.

Moreover, the Pelosi health care plan is a massive increase in the size and scope of government, creating, expanding, or extending at least 43 entitlement programs and 111 additional offices, bureaus, commissions, programs, and bureaucracies over and above the entitlement expansions.

During the worst economic recession since the Great Depression, this bill would impose numerous new taxes.

Number one, it would impose a 5.4 percent surtax that would primarily be shouldered by small businesses. It would impose a 2.5 percent penalty tax on those who do not acquire health care insurance. New and increased taxes on a wide variety of health plans, including HSAs and HRAs. An ironic, and this one kills me, an ironic 2.5 percent tax on medical devices. And an 8 percent tax on businesses that can't afford to provide health insurance for employees, just to name a few, Mr.

Speaker, bringing the total to \$729.5 billion in new taxes on small businesses. Individuals who cannot afford health coverage and employers who cannot afford to provide coverage to meet the Federal bureaucrats' standards created under this bill will all pay the bill.

Now, our top marginal income tax rate right now is 35 percent. Mr. Obama wants to boost the top rate to nearly 40 percent in 2011 by allowing some of the tax cuts enacted under former President George W. Bush to expire. The new health care taxes imposed by this bill would come on top of that. This would mean that just the Federal tax rate alone would be 45 percent. And when you add in the State and local taxes, individuals and small businesses could see total tax rates of close to 60 percent, Mr. Speaker.

The cost of the Pelosi government takeover of health care and new taxes it would impose alone are a disaster of the first magnitude for America. But the monstrosity of the Pelosi health care plan doesn't even end there.

On September 9, during his address to the joint session of Congress, President Obama stated verbatim the following quote: "One more misunderstanding I want to clear up—under our plan, no Federal dollars will be used to fund abortions."

But despite promises and statements made by the President to the contrary, Mr. Speaker, this bill explicitly allows Federal funding of abortion and permits Federal subsidies to go to private insurance plans that cover abortion, making this bill potentially the largest expansion of abortion on demand in America since *Roe v. Wade*.

White House health adviser Zeke Emanuel is a longtime proponent of rationing as a means for controlling and distributing the vital health care services Americans need. And for all the furor over the "death panels," a term that the Democrats so viciously mocked, H.R. 3962 would establish a new "Center for Comparative Effectiveness Research," perhaps more accurately labeled a "life and death panel," since the panel would be allowed to deny lifesaving treatments to patients on the grounds of cost savings, the same sort of rationing we see in Britain's national health care service which routinely denies costly patient treatments to those whose lives are deemed less worth saving.

This is the inescapable reality of government health care, Mr. Speaker. The scarcity of resources and the inevitable unresponsiveness of massive bureaucratic systems result in rationing of health care services, deciding on who may receive care and who is forced by the government to go without. And this should not happen in America.

These "decisions" would be in the hands of President Obama's new "health czar," or the "Health Choices Commissioner" created by this legislation. The "health czar," or the "Health Choices Commissioner," could forcibly

enroll individuals in government-run insurance, and they would be required to conduct random compliance audits on health care benefits, allowing the Federal Government to intervene in the business practices of all employers who offer coverage to their workers. And that is unbelievable, Mr. Speaker.

The Pelosi bill also contains numerous so-called "sweet treats" for the notorious allies of liberal Democrats. The Pelosi plan makes groups like ACORN and Planned Parenthood eligible for Federal grants administered by the health czar. It refuses to address frivolous medical lawsuit reform while it actually creates new incentives for the trial lawyers to sue the doctors and medical industry into the stone age. Speaker PELOSI and her liberal colleagues are shamelessly sticking their thumbs in the eyes of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans have offered more than 40 alternative health care plans that would implement true health care reform in this country, including empowering those who cannot afford insurance with the ability to purchase their own insurance policy from the private sector; allowing families and businesses to purchase health care insurance across State lines; allowing individuals, small businesses, and trade associations to pool together and acquire health care insurance at a lower price, the same way large corporations and labor unions do; giving States the tools to create their own innovative reforms that lower health care costs; and ending frivolous lawsuits that contribute to higher costs.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, it is clear that instead of listening to the American people and embracing these real solutions, Speaker PELOSI and her liberal colleagues have chosen to placate their most liberal allies, from ACORN to Planned Parenthood to trial lawyers, and to forcibly shove this bill down the throats of the American people.

But, you know, Mr. Speaker, in closing, of all the egregious things that I have just told you about this bill, the worst of it is the way that it steals America's freedom with the word "shall." Mr. Speaker, the word "shall," as we all know in this Chamber, is the key word in all government mandates and control. The word "shall" is government force. Unbelievably, the word "shall" appears in the Pelosi health care plan more than 3,425 times. The Obama-Reid-Pelosi Federal Government is using the force of law with the word "shall" 3,425 times to steal the freedom of the American people and forcibly insert a bureaucrat between patients and their doctors. The Pelosi health care plan is nothing but 2,000 pages of Big Government, higher taxes, and literally thousands of government mandates.

Mr. Speaker, flying in the face of NANCY PELOSI's claim that the health care bill that she has would be posted online for 72 hours for review before

final vote, it looks like tomorrow this body will be forced to vote on a bill that will completely overhaul one-sixth of the economy and potentially devastate our health care system all against the will of the vast majority of Americans. And I encourage every last one of them, Mr. Speaker, for the sake of their children and future generations, to stand up against this bureaucratic socialist monstrosity.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Iowa for his kindness in allowing me to keep this commitment.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I really thank Congressman TRENT FRANKS. Mr. Speaker, that presentation that we just heard over the last few minutes is something that I know he sat in his office in late hours and put this together and brought through and brought out some of the most significant components in this 1,990-page bill that has a 40-page amendment and makes it 2,030 pages altogether.

As we speak here tonight, the Rules Committee is off into something that started up at about 2 o'clock this afternoon, and it's 10 minutes to 11 tonight.

The real debate on this bill is us down here talking, Mr. Speaker, or the people up in the hole in the wall that finally has television cameras in it. For the first time, I think, in the history of the United States Congress, we see at least a significant bill that's being televised.

□ 2250

I have gone up there, and the Rules Committee by the way, Mr. Speaker, I don't disrespectfully refer to it as the hole in the wall. I am the person who thinks so much of the Rules Committee, up where they deny amendments to be offered here at the floor, at the direction I believe of the Speaker, up on the third floor of the Capitol, a little old room that doesn't even have room for all of the Members that want to engage in this, let alone staff, so the hallway is full of staff and Members. If there is information that needs to go in, they pass in papers like a bucket brigade to make an argument before a Rules Committee that is being asked to be an expert on everything that Congress, all of us, might want to know or vote on.

This is a piece of the process that for the first time the American people are learning about because they can now see on television what goes on. It has changed the dynamics in that room. I came down here 2½ years ago and called for television cameras in the Rules Committee. They weren't too impressed with that request, so I introduced a resolution to move the Rules Committee down to the floor of the House of Representatives because that is where the debate is taking place so the American people can see it.

Now we are on about maybe the third panel of the Rules Committee and the American people, some of them, and I have had people ask me would anybody

go up and watch the debate in the Rules Committee. Well, people all over America are doing that. Some are watching this tonight. Some have keyed into the channel that is showing the Rules Committee. It is going on and on. There are people that seemed to be a little bored by that. Who is watching? Watch your e-mail account, Members, because they are sending messages in. The people who are watching the Rules Committee with eyes like an eagle are the ones who came to this Capitol yesterday by the tens of thousands and filled this place up and said, Keep your hands off of my health care. They want to see how this system works. Some of them are becoming experts. They are going to be, some of them, the future leaders that come into this Congress because they are fed up.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are fed up with the assault on American freedom and the complete disregard for the very foundations of American exceptionalism. In fact, I don't know if some of these people who are supporting this bill couldn't actually say the word sincerely that American is an exceptional country. We have a whole lot of reasons why we are exceptional, and at the core of each of them are freedoms. So that, Mr. Speaker, is the backdrop of what all is going on here.

The schedule is to bring a rule down and have a vote about 9 tomorrow, and then start carrying out a debate, and a debate that will be limited. It has already been announced by the chair of the Rules Committee, LOUISE SLAUGHTER, that they are only going to accept two amendments to the bill. Now when the public has been told by the chair of a committee that there are only going to be two amendments that will be allowed to be debated on the floor of the House and voted on, and I presume one of them will be the Republican leader's amendment and the other one may be a motion to recommit, but only two, I think it tells everybody in America who is watching this show up here in the hole in the wall of the Rules Committee, what the deal is.

If you are going to go to a committee and offer amendments to perfect legislation and in all good seriousness engage in the debate, and debate for hours and hours and hours before a chair and a committee that has already announced to the world that all of those amendments that are being offered save two will be rejected and have no value, that, Mr. Speaker, is what is going on right now. The American people are figuring it out. They have a nose and a sense for this.

So what I would like to do as this evening unfolds is recognize the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) who has been such a strong and articulate voice and a dynamic leader. Mr. Speaker, anybody who is here tonight loves this country and loves our freedom and is absolutely opposed to socialized medicine.

I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. I thank the gentleman from Iowa for leading off with this discussion this evening with regard to the legislation that is going to be coming down the road very quickly. How quickly we do don't know, but obviously more quickly than Speaker PELOSI promised.

Before you got here, on September 4, Madam Speaker said at that time she would allow Members of this body, Republicans and Democrats alike, and she also promised the American public they would have 72 hours in order to look over the bill, read the bill, and understand the bill. She made that promise.

Now, as you point out as we speak here on Friday evening, almost 11 in the evening, we still don't know what the final bill is. That is somewhat ironic because a number of Members on the other side of the aisle, 190 or so, have already been out in the press saying that they will be supporting the bill when it comes up.

I have to ask, How are you saying you will be voting when the final version of the bill hasn't been printed yet, when you don't know what the amendments are or what the text is? But there are 190 who have said they will be voting "yes" on the bill at the first opportunity.

Speaker PELOSI said she would give us 72 hours for Members and the American public to look at it, but she has gone back on that promise. She said she didn't really mean with that period of time, so at 11 tonight or 1 in the morning, we may then see the final version of the bill out of the Rules Committee, whenever they decide to do it, in the dead of night, perhaps. And then the bill will come up as soon as they want it to. So, so much for that promise.

The other point, there is a much larger issue, and I think this issue was somewhat addressed at the rally yesterday on the steps of Capitol at noon Thursday, and that is the constitutional issue here. We discussed this a little, and other Members have come here with their Constitution, and it reminds Members of Congress and the public that we live under the rule of law in this country and the Constitution, and we can't go outside of those parameters. And the Constitution says there are certain rights and responsibilities and powers that the Federal Government has, and the 9th and 10th Amendment tells, the 10 Amendment specifically, all rights not specifically delegated to the States are retained by the States and the people respectively.

So you have to ask, How is it that this body believes, the Democratic majority and President Obama believes that we can impose a personal mandate on the American public? How can they begin under our Constitution to start telling people that they actually have to buy a certain product by private industry or through the public option,

basically through the government, whether they like it or not?

I will just digress on that point for a moment. If you don't like it, if you don't purchase an insurance policy that the government tells you you have to, you will be fined. You will be fined upwards of 2½ percent of your income. The legislation also says if you do not pay that fine for not buying that insurance, then what will happen? Well, of course, section 7201 of the code says you can be fined an additional \$250,000, a quarter of a million dollars, and you can be sent to jail for 5 years.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Would that be debtor's prison then in the bill? If you don't pay the fine, then you go to jail?

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. I would almost presume so. Think about it. Who is that language targeted for? Is it targeted for the Bill Gates of the world who probably can buy any sort of Cadillac insurance that they want? Or the people on Wall Street who have the expensive Cadillac coverage because their employers provide it for them? No, of course not.

Is that aimed at the poor, non-working American who can't afford insurance because they are disabled or whatever? No, because those people are protected currently under U.S. law, under Medicaid, and they get health care insurance through Medicaid.

□ 2300

So who is that language in the bill really targeting? That is basically the middle class, those people who are struggling right now, with around 10 percent unemployment we're looking at in this country. Actually, it's 10.2 percent, I think, is the last number, looking at 10.2 percent. Those people are struggling and they're saying, I'm paying all my other bills—my mortgage, my credit cards, my kids' college education, and right now I have to make the decision that I'm not going to be able to afford to buy insurance right now. Guess what? Too bad. Under their bill, you are going to be fined for not buying that insurance policy. And if you don't pay that fine, you could be subject to punishment.

One last point on this, if I may, and then I will yield back to the gentleman. The other person, the other group that this is targeted at is the young. Before you came to the floor, the previous gentlemen were talking about how this relates to No Child Left Behind and that sort of thing and how the Federal Government is intruding in our lives in so many other areas, and how No Child Left Behind just didn't work at all, that's why I didn't support it.

And I coined the phrase—or maybe somebody else coined it before me—that actually this health care legislation is "No Child is Left a Dime." And the reason that no child is left a dime is because this is a \$1.2 trillion expenditure, and where is that \$1 trillion coming from? Well, it's really not coming from you and I because we're already

looking at, what is it, around \$1.6 trillion, \$1.7 trillion that we're in deficit right now? In other words, we don't have the money to pay for this bill. So who's going to pay for this bill? Your kids, my kids, America's kids, our grandkids.

So the benefits that are going to be paid to people today, you and me and the other people who are listening tonight here in the gallery and elsewhere, the people that are going to enjoy the benefits of this legislation today, such as they are, are going to be paid for by future generations. So there may be a lot of people who consider they're supporters of Obama, young people that in the past campaign said he's going to do great things for us. What is he really doing for the young people of today? Putting a tremendous burden on them as far as what they're going to have to pay for the people who are living today.

I will give you one example of that. There is something in the legislation called the "class provision" or the "class act." What that basically is—yes, the class act, treatment of class act as long-term care insurance. What that basically is is trying to set up a program—good idea in concept—of trying to get people to have long-term care insurance. This is one of those budgetary gimmicks that's in the bill that makes it look as though we're actually saving money today. It makes it look as though the budget deficit is going down so they can say, hey, we're actually saving money. What are you talking about, Republicans? We're actually helping the budget deficit. Well, it's really a budgetary trick, and I can explain it in 30 seconds.

What that does is this: it starts collecting taxes today basically on people who are working, what have you. So young people today will be paying taxes today, and over the next 10 years those young folks will be paying in, what, \$72 billion, a huge amount of money. But of course young people today will not be getting any advantage of that money. As a matter of fact, that money won't be going out the door to any large extent over the next 10 years because young people won't be needing long-term care coverage or insurance.

So basically you're putting in the bank all that money for the next 10 years. That makes the budget deficit look better, but in reality it's young people paying for benefits for people today. And their benefits—I'm not sure who's going to be around to pay for them and all of their needs and what have you. So it's a budgetary gimmick to make it look as though things are better than they really are to bring down the deficit. At the end of the day, after those 10 years, costs explode again and the next generation, our kids and grandkids, will be the ones who are not left a dime because it will all be right here in Washington paying for these benefits.

And with that—I see you have a chart to perhaps explain all of this to

us—I yield back to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman for his relentless effort and, I will say, a thorough understanding of what we know about these 1,990 pages-plus-40. And we do know that's 2,030 pages at least.

I have made the statement, Mr. Speaker, and I think it's important that the American people know this: yes, we should have an opportunity to evaluate all of the implications. There are going to be amendments that will come out that we have not seen that are likely to be approved by the Rules Committee because they will be giving direction, not because they will be doing a significant analysis.

The American people want to read this bill. We handed this bill out yesterday to the tens of thousands of people that came here to this United States Capitol, the 2,000-page bill. I don't think I will ever forget the image of JOHN CULBERSON standing on the wall tossing pages of the bill out to people who passed it around. They would each take one page and pass it to somebody else. And they went around this Hill and they began asking Members of Congress, tell me what this means, tell me what this page means. There were not enough pages of the bill to go around to all the people that came to oppose this bill yesterday, and there won't be enough pages to go around to all the people that come to oppose this bill tomorrow at 1 o'clock, east side steps of the Capitol. We've got another wave of American people that are coming in here to express their rejection for socialized medicine.

It is so important to understand this. When people say, well, I sat up and I read the bill, there are people out there, salt of the Earth, good regular people that took it upon themselves to read what's available for them to read, to work through those 1,990 pages, and they will do everything they can to understand it. If they don't understand it, they sometimes feel like they're inadequate because they're not a lawyer or they're not educated or they're not a legislator. Here is the statement that I think is important for the American people to know, Mr. Speaker, and that is, you can take the smartest person in the world and you can shut them up in a room with a desk or a table and a chair and give them 6 months in that room to read this bill and ask them to write up a summary of what the bill does, the effects, the costs, the implications, and the nuances that would be interpreted one way or another with the latitude and license that's in the bill.

You can ask the smartest person in the world to analyze the 3,425 "shalls" that are in the bill; you can ask that smartest person in the world to analyze what it means, this one—there is more than one "may," but one of the most important "mays" in the bill is, Members of Congress "may" utilize the newly formed government option. The

government option for all this right over here, this public health plan, Members of Congress "may."

There was an amendment offered in Energy and Commerce—or maybe it was Ways and Means, or both—that said anybody that votes for this bill would be compelled to live underneath the health insurance policy that they would create under the Federal Government, the government option.

If Congress thinks this is such a good deal, they've got 3,425 "shalls" in the bill, why not make it 3,426 "shalls" in the bill and make "Members of Congress shall live underneath this law." That would be the actual poison pill for this bill. If the people over here, the ones that have signed on to whatever document it is, the 190 or so that say they will vote for whatever bill NANCY PELOSI thinks should come to this floor, if they had to live underneath the law that they are imposing on the American people, all they have to do is do a little amendment that says, Members of Congress "shall" use the government option, not "may." Strike "may," put in "shall," kills the bill, or it makes it a policy good enough that we can all live with and the American people wouldn't have to come and storm this Capitol. They wouldn't have to take this hill; they wouldn't have to hold this hill until we kill the bill. But we're going to have to do that. We have to keep this up.

We fought a great battle yesterday. There is a good battle going on up in Rules right now. There is another battle tomorrow at 1 o'clock here at the Capitol on the east side of the steps, Mr. Speaker. And this has to go on and on and on until this bill is killed.

This idea was killed back in 1993 and 1994. A bill never came to the floor then. I will give President Clinton credit; he wrote a bill, but it never came to the floor because the American people took it apart and rejected it. And someplace over there against the wall I have a chart of the original "HillaryCare" that we took off of the archives of The New York Times. It is a scary thing. It is a very scary thing. And if we can find it over there I will put it up, Mr. Speaker, so everybody can see it. It's in black and white.

This is the real color version of the original House bill, which is H.R. 3200. This bill and this analysis comes from KEVIN BRADY in the Ways and Means Committee. He has done a fantastic job of educating the American people. The flow chart that was created in 1993 and 1994 is the one that scared the living daylights out of me and caused me to get engaged in the political world because I could not tolerate what government was doing to me.

The people that believe that they are intellectual elitists, that think that they know more than the American people know and want to take away our freedom had drafted a bill called HillaryCare that really did swallow up at that time one-seventh of the U.S. economy. It didn't come to the floor

because it was killed because the American people found out about it.

□ 2310

This is the flowchart that is now 15 years later.

This is the organizational chart of the House Democrats' original health care plan.

This is H.R. 3200. The new one is uglier, but I can tell you this is all pretty much in here. The colored boxes are new agencies. There are at least 32 colored here, and there are 53 in the bill. In the bill before, it was amended with a Ways and Means component of this thing, and it went from 1,000 pages to 2,000 pages. These 32 agencies colored and 53 all together now have grown to 111 new Federal agencies so that we can have a complete nanny state that will direct our lives from conception to natural death.

That sounds like a pro-life statement. Well, for me, it generally is, Mr. Speaker.

This bill of 2,000 pages that is before us does affect us from conception to natural death because it funds abortion and it has death panels and it regulates everything that has to do with our health care—the cost, the access—everything that has to do with it from conception to natural death.

On these charts with colors on it, I'd focus your attention to two things or, actually, to three things, Mr. Speaker. This one is the health choices administration, which we've heard the gentleman speak of. This is where they would regulate everything—all of the health insurance in America, all of the health care in America. This is the HCA commissioner, the health choices administration commissioner. He is the new czar. As I talk about the black-and-white version of HillaryCare, this is what we saw in 1994. This is the black-and-white flowchart that was created by the closed-door meetings that Hillary Clinton had when she was appointed the individual to write this all up.

Now, again, I give them credit. They wrote a bill. They met in secret. They met behind closed doors a lot of the time, and that caused them some problems.

Phil Gramm, who was down at the other end of that hallway—right out the center to the other end—stood on the floor of the United States Senate, and he said, This bill passes over my cold, dead, political body.

It was this scary flowchart that scared the living daylights out of me, and it scared me into the public service/political life to try to put the brakes on the overgrowth of government. The American people rejected this in 1994. They threw this out, and the bill never came up for a vote anywhere.

Now we have this full-color monstrosity of H.R. 3200, which is even scarier, but the focus down here is on the public health plan side which has to compete with the private sector

side. These two boxes exist today—private insurers and traditional health plans.

Private insurers: 1,300 companies selling insurance, not policies. 1,300 companies, Mr. Speaker, right here. There are 100,000 policy varieties to choose from, which is a tremendous amount of competition. There are some States that don't have much because it's like 70 to 80 percent in a few States where a single provider has that market share.

So what we do is we open it up to sell insurance across State lines. That provides the competition. It's all the competition we need, and it's more competition than the Democrats in this Congress are willing to accept.

So, Mr. Speaker, this public health plan which will be run by the new health choices administration czar—commissioner, commissar-issioner—will write the rules to benefit the Federal plan that will be subsidized by taxpayers. Then it will make it difficult, if not impossible, for the private health plans to compete against the public. We've seen it in the school loan program. We've seen it in the flood insurance program. This bill must not pass or that's going to happen to everybody's private insurance.

By the way, this bill that's up there before Rules right now cancels every health insurance policy in America in either 2011 or at the end of 2013, depending on the definition.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas. Mr. GOHMERT. I thank my friend from Iowa.

I thought it was a point worth making since we heard on Thursday that AARP has now endorsed the plan. They came out at first and endorsed the Obama-Pelosi plan earlier this year, and then they lost so many members that AARP said, Well, we were basically endorsing a concept but not this particular bill, because people were mad about it. They came out on Thursday, and they put their stamp of approval on it.

It turns out, apparently, that AARP makes more money from selling insurance than they do from their membership dues. They apparently got a heck of a sweetheart deal that was cut with the administration. So, yeah, they're willing to put their stamp of approval on it because there's money in it for them, not for their members. Now, their members are going to get screwed around pretty big. They're going to have a \$500 billion cut to Medicare. They're going to really get hurt badly, but the AARP people who run AARP are going to come out real good.

Then I noticed an article tonight that came out, which says: AMA members revolt over ObamaCare endorsement.

It turns out the association, or the AMA's board of trustees, failed to obtain delegate approval before endorsing this new Pelosi-Obama monstrosity. Let's see.

The president of the Florida Medical Association said: The delegates are

pretty upset with the board of trustees right now, and they were submitting an emergency resolution to revoke that endorsement. The trouble is it probably won't come to a vote until Monday.

This article says: Rescinding the AMA endorsement would be a significant blow to ObamaCare at a critical point in the debate as reflected in the Democrats' reaction Thursday when they won endorsements from the AMA and AARP.

Well, we know why AARP endorsed.

Anyway, this says: AMA sources confirm a resolution that would effectively revoke the AMA's endorsement will be introduced during the delegates' conference at the association's general meeting in Houston.

The article also points out that the AMA board issued a similar endorsement back in July without delegate approval when it declared the AMA support for the earlier House version of the bill.

Then this article points out that, after that endorsement, 10,000 physicians logged onto Sermo.com. Ten thousand physicians. It's an online physicians' community. They logged on to voice their opinions. According to the Sermo Web site, of the doctors who responded, 94 percent do not support the bill, and 95 percent state that the AMA does not speak for them with its endorsement.

Isn't that something? The AARP is not speaking, really, for retired people. It's speaking for the executives at AARP who are going to do really well. I understand there are some waivers and some neat stuff for them in there. The AMA board, apparently, is not speaking for the medical doctors in America.

I would be glad to yield back.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I reclaim my time, and I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. You raise a fascinating point, and I posit two questions to you.

If the Congress were to pass this bill, we know what some of the ramifications would be. It's going to be raising premiums. That is according to the CBO, the Congressional Budget Office. It's going to reduce health choices. It's going to cause delays and denials of care. Here is the one where I'll put a question to you:

\$500 billion in Medicare cuts. Why would it be in the best interest of senior citizens, which I presume are who AARP would supposedly be looking out for—why would they suggest that they would be looking out for seniors when they're going to be cutting benefits to seniors for \$500 billion?

That's not my number that I came up with. That is language right out of the bill, and it can be verified with the CBO.

So it's counterintuitive that any organization would be doing something against their measures unless—and I just came in at the point when you

were saying this—an organization is, maybe, making more money out of the deal for themselves than for the people whom they represent.

I'll yield.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, I would make this point.

I'm trying to run through the list of organizations in my mind that support this bill, and there are quite a lot of them. Then I'm trying to come up with a name of an organization that supports the bill that doesn't have a vested interest, and it seems as if it's a very broad approach to this from the perspective that—let's just say, as for the AMA, they get more dollars into the industry. They've done a calculation. It seems a little cynical. That's how it is. AARP, they're willing to take a \$500 billion cut in Medicare benefits because they can make it back—and then some—by selling insurance through the exchange.

□ 2320

I would pose this question to the gentlemen that are so knowledgeable on this subject that are here on the floor, or anyone that would care to come down here, and I would be glad to yield to a knowledge base, if it exists, on the other side of this aisle as to where are the unvested interest supporters for socialized medicine? Who are they? Where are they? Can you name one? Is there either one of you that could answer that question or anybody here in the Chamber tonight that I could yield to that could speak to that? I am completely flummoxed when I think about altruism behind socialized medicine. Where are they? I would like to know. I'm finding all kinds of patriots that are for killing this bill.

I saw altruism like I had never seen before yesterday, patriotism in its purest form, of people that dropped everything. I shook hands with people from San Francisco and Oregon and most of the States in the country. I am convinced that we had people here from every State in America yesterday. They just want to have their freedom to buy the health insurance policy that they choose; they want the freedom to succeed; and they want the government to stop growing and start shrinking and un-tax them and take the burden off of children and grandchildren. And I see that. I see those salt-of-the-Earth Americans that are there. Any one of them could have showed up at a church picnic at my house or my place in my neighborhood. And the tears run down their cheeks because of what's happening in America. It's not just because of the song, it's not just because of the prayer. It's afterwards, hours afterwards, and they're saying, What can I do? What can I do? I'm losing my county. And their faces are being washed with tears, and the cynicism that grows within me because of the vested interest, and nobody can answer me, where is the contingency of the people that just want to have what's best for America? I can't find them.



Mr. GOHMERT. Well, I can't name you one without a vested interest that supports this, but apparently just today the American Association of Neurological Surgeons and the Congress of Neurological Surgeons, two different groups, announced their opposition to the House bill.

I know from personal experience, when a brain tumor was killing my mother and eventually took her life, these neurologists and neurosurgeons are the ones that knew the most about what was best for my mother in those last years that the tumor was taking her; a brain tumor. Wow. An incredibly brilliant bunch of people, those doctors that work on the brain.

They apparently made no bones about it. They were not happy, apparently, that the AMA came out and endorsed it. They made it a matter of the minds on which they have, since they work on the mind, that this is not a bill that's going to be good for America, it's going to devastate America. In fact, the Congress of Neurological Surgeons' president stated, "Overall we believe this legislation will ultimately limit patient choice by putting the government between the doctor and the patient which will interfere with vital patient care decisions. As it stands, this House bill could amount to a complete government takeover of health care."

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. You raise another interesting point. Again, we have to start from the premise with what is in the bill right now, what the CBO has told us and what the bill will do, if they do pass it tomorrow or Monday, what it will do is raise our premiums for insurance, it will reduce our health choices, it will delay or deny care, it will take away half a trillion dollars from our seniors in Medicare, and it will raise taxes by \$729 billion.

We know those are the facts. That will happen if this bill passes. But you were saying with regard to the delegates, the doctors out there, the real doctors that you and I have are fighting back and saying that they may take back the endorsement from the AMA. But it may be too late; which raises this question, then: What is the rush? What is the rush to judgment? Why are we doing this on a Saturday or maybe a Sunday? We have only ever voted on a weekend when it's an emergency situation, like for a war resolution or things dealing with the military or what have you.

Is there any reason why this bill could not lay over for a week while the Members go back to their districts for Veterans Day and meet with veterans, meet with seniors, meet with doctors, meet with the other real folks? I cannot think of one reason why Speaker PELOSI would not allow us.

I would ask, I am sure she is up at this hour—and we have a few minutes left—I would appreciate it if Speaker PELOSI could come down here right now and explain to us why we can't have a week when the veterans and everybody else gets to comment on this.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, I would make this point, that the legislative strategy for them is this, that they were queued up to ram this bill through before the August break. That's what they wanted to do. They rammed cap-and-tax through before the August break, and no one read the bill. Mr. GOHMERT from Texas stood here on this floor and he posed a series of questions, and the one that stands out in my mind, it will be historically remembered, I think, forever, that there was no bill in the well. There was no real copy of the bill. And I know no one read the bill because the bill didn't exist.

Congressman GOHMERT finally said, after 35 minutes of holding up the debate, "Madam Speaker, if the House of Representatives passes a bill that doesn't exist, is it possible to message a bill that doesn't exist to the United States Senate?"

That was the question, Mr. Speaker. The result was, apparently, yes. Apparently in this Congress we can pass a bill that doesn't exist and message a bill that doesn't exist to the United States Senate. That's the subject matter that I think is important. And this 2,000-page bill that we have now, the reason that they are pushing on it is because we went home for August, and the town hall meetings were jam packed full all over the country. We saw real-time footage that came out, angry people, frustrated people, people that just want to be left to succeed and left to be free, filled up these buildings, filled up the community buildings, jammed these places. There were meetings held in Iowa outside because we didn't have buildings big enough for the town hall meetings. The tiny little down of Adel, over 600 people in a meeting just like that. What the message from that was, the American people don't want this bill. They don't want socialized medicine. They want to kill this bill. They made their opinions known loudly and clearly for the entire month of August and into September.

But now these Members of Congress have been in Speaker PELOSI's echo chamber since then, they haven't really been back home listening to their constituents the way they were in August; and now they have gone all wobbly again. She is afraid to let them go back home to be braced up by their constituents.

That's the calculation. It's a political calculation. It's not a logical one. I recognize the gentleman from New Jersey asked for a logical one. There is a difference between reasons and excuses. There isn't a reason. There are only excuses.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GOHMERT. I think my friend from Iowa just made a great point about why there needs to be this rush to bad judgment by the Speaker and by the administration, and it answers the question of our friend from New Jersey about why this rush to bad judgment. That is exactly if the Democrats go

home for the weekend, just when they think they are about to get the last vote by adding something that will get their vote, by twisting the arm—I don't know if we are threatening losses of committees, I understand that's gone on around here in the recent past, but they are so close, they think, to getting this vote done, this travesty against the American people, if they go home, they are going to hear about what's going on.

What I can't help but come back to, when my friend, Mr. GARRETT from New Jersey, asked about why rush? We have heard our President and all of those who seek to make excuses for him trying to make up his mind on what to do in Afghanistan say, He doesn't want to rush and make a bad decision. He wants to take his time.

Can you imagine the stress being heaped upon our soldiers who are either in harm's way in Afghanistan or get news, you are about to be sent into harm's way into Afghanistan, and you have a President that can't commit to whether he is going to give them what they need to win in Afghanistan?

I can't imagine anything more stressful and debilitating to hear, You are going to send me into harm's way? You've got a report that has been sitting on your desk since August that says if you don't give us the troops we need, we're going to lose this war. That means I am likely going to be killed while you are trying to make up your mind, and you are playing footsie with different groups and shows and doing all these fun things, and we are over here in harm's way; you can't make up your mind.

Okay. We will give him that he needs to take his time. We understand that he voted "present" probably more than anybody else in recent history in the Senate because he couldn't make up his mind down there, but how about giving us the same benefit of the huge doubt we have about his decision-making? Give it to the Congress.

□ 2330

Let us have time so a mistake, a huge mistake, is not made here. This is scary stuff, what is about to be heaped on us. Let us have the same amount of time that he has demanded.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, this is a destiny bill. This is a piece of legislation that changes the direction of the United States of America, Mr. Speaker, forever. There is no going back to a point. It isn't like we missed an exit on the interstate and we will just go to the next exit and get off and turn around and go back. This is taking the off ramp from freedom, and it is going into the abyss of socialism. It is the leap off into the abyss of socialism.

This bill, this is a socialized medicine bill that is the crown jewel of socialism. There is no other way to define it, when you take over 17.5 percent of the economy, one-sixth of the economy. This legislation cancels every single

health insurance policy in the United States of America, a good chunk of them at the end of 2011 and all the rest of them by 2013.

The promise that the President of the United States made was that if you like your health insurance policy, you get to keep it. Well, you get to keep it until they cancel it. Can you keep it until 2011 and think the President kept his word? I will leave that out there as a rhetorical question, Mr. Speaker. But that is something that brings me great concern.

We aren't going to raise taxes on anybody that makes under \$250,000 a year. We know it raises the taxes on everybody.

We aren't going to hurt the little man. Here is a little, little man piece. It hurts them all. If they go with this rating that is in there, just in the individual market, a 25-year-old male in Indianapolis, we will pick that, that happens to be the state of our conference chair, he would be paying about \$84 a month for his premium. If this bill passes, it jumps to \$252. It is a 300 percent increase in the premium that he is paying.

Now, this is a young man that is trying to get into the workforce, that is trying to build an economic base. Usually when you start in, that is when you make the least, and you grow your income stream. You are young and healthy. You can't afford much insurance. You don't need much, because you are young and you are healthy. But this would triple the insurance premiums for a 25-year-old man and fine him or punish him if he doesn't buy the policy, and eventually put him in jail.

Then you have the family of four, roughly 40-years-old, a couple of kids. They would be paying today in Indianapolis about \$535 a month for insurance. They can probably afford that, if they have been raising their income up. It is tough, I know, but usually they will find a way to maneuver. But this bill makes it so much worse. Now that \$535 premium would go to \$1,087. The premiums would be a 221 percent increase.

I can go on down the line, Mr. Speaker. I recognize the clock is ticking. I want to make sure if any of my colleagues have a last thing they have to say, they will let me know.

I yield quickly to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Just one last point, because I know the time is up here, is that going to the point of rushing through this, we are not in control. We are in the minority party. We cannot set the agenda. This bill could come up in an hour from now, or this bill could come up Saturday morning or Saturday afternoon.

We hope and wish the leadership on the other side, Speaker PELOSI, would give us the time they promised, at least 72 hours. We have the whole week to do so.

But there is still an opportunity, however, for the American public to

come back here tomorrow at 1 o'clock and have their voice heard on the green here by the Capitol.

With that, I yield to the gentleman. Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, I appreciate the gentleman from New Jersey bringing this up again.

Here is the message. We have had all kinds of battles in this country and people have paid a huge price. We had Lexington and Concord. We had patriots that marched through the snow with bloody feet to go to Trenton. We had Saratoga. We had Yorktown. We had Hamburger Hill. We had Pork Chop Hill.

We had the battle of Capitol Hill yesterday, and the American people took this hill. We have to come back to this hill tomorrow at 1 o'clock. We have to hold this hill until we kill this bill.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 0225

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ARCURI) at 2 o'clock and 25 minutes a.m.

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3962, AFFORDABLE HEALTH CARE FOR AMERICA ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3961, MEDICARE PHYSICIAN PAYMENT REFORM ACT OF 2009

Mr. POLIS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 111-330) on the resolution (H. Res. 903) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3962) to provide affordable, quality health care for all Americans and reduce the growth in health care spending, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3961) to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to reform the Medicare SGR payment system for physicians, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of the birth of a child.

Mr. CARTER (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of responding to the needs of his constituents regarding the tragedy at Fort Hood, Texas.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HIMES) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HIMES, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. TOWNSE, for 5 minutes, today.  
Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. MCDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.  
Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SESTAK, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.  
Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. PASCRELL, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. HIGGINS, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. POE of Texas) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, November 9 and 10.  
Mr. WOLF, for 5 minutes, today, November 9 and 10.

Mr. PAUL, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. MCCLINTOCK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GOODLATTE, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. WESTMORELAND, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WAMP, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. BUYER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GOHMERT, for 5 minutes, today.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 26 minutes a.m.), the House adjourned until today, Saturday, November 7, 2009, at 9 a.m.

#### OATH OF OFFICE—MEMBERS, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER, AND DELEGATES

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members, Resident Commissioner, and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in 5 U.S.C. 3331:

"I, AB, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United