Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Tuesday, January 25, 2011, at 10 a.m.

House of Representatives

THURSDAY, JANUARY 6, 2011

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC, January 6, 2011.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MICHAEL K. SIMPSON to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER, Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

You, O God, are our refuge and our strength. History has taught us You are a helper close at hand in times of distress. We shall not fear, even when the whole Earth is unstable and seems to rock. Our human frailty has revealed that we can easily be shaken. Nations are in tumult, mountains of power fall, and economic waves rage and foam.

You alone, Lord God, cannot be shaken. Each dawning day finds You as our stronghold. Your voice works wonders over all the Earth. Wars are pushed to an ending, but You alone break the bows and snap the spears that pierce the soul. You burn off our shields with Your fire, and we hear once again Your voice: "Be still and know that I am God; supreme over all the nations, supreme over all the Earth."

O God, be our stronghold, now and forever.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day’s proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof. Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Pledge of Allegiance will be led by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. GOWDY).

Mr. GOWDY led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 10 requests for 1-minute speeches from each side.

THE HISTORIC SOUTH CAROLINA DELEGATION

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to welcome the four new members of the South Carolina delegation to the 112th Congress. This past election, the voters of South Carolina let their voices be heard. The message was loud and clear: limit spending, with the largest Republican South Carolina delegation in over 130 years. The voters can rest assured the message was heard in Washington. These four conservative, successful small business leaders were elected based on their principles. Promises to reduce spending, limit government, and attain fiscal responsibility will now be real priorities.

The people of South Carolina will benefit the most from this dynamic young team. The enthusiasm they bring is energizing. Congressmen TIM SCOTT, JEFF DUNCAN, TREY GOWDY and MICK MULVANEY are welcome to Federal public service. We will work together in making this the most accessible and accountable delegation for the people of South Carolina.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

PROMOTING THE GENERAL WELFARE

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

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, the new Republican majority has decided that today we will read the United States Constitution, which I guess is a good thing. But like every other American, I can and do read it for myself. In fact, I did it this morning and came across
the phrase “promote the general welfare.”

Next week, the new Republican majority will put forward a bill to repeal health care reform; to tell seniors, go back to a world where you can choose between your life’s prescriptions and your food; to tell our soldiers, go back to a world where an insurance company can deny you coverage because you had the misfortune to be born with a disease. That is what they are doing next week.

Listen hard, listen hard today to those words, “promote the general welfare.”

**THIS ILLEGAL ACT**

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this new Congress must be committed to listening to the will of the people and following the Constitution. Immediately we must right a wrong that has been forcibly placed like chains on the American people.

The unhealthy national health care bill bruises the doctrine of the Constitution. The people don’t want the government stealing their individual liberty to make health decisions. Congress must repeal this totalitarian act.

In a few moments, Congress this day, on this new day, will read the Constitution on the House floor, the sacred rule of law for this Nation. Nowhere in this document of wisdom does the Federal Government have the omnipotent authority to force any American to buy any product or face criminal penalties, whether it is a car, health insurance, or a box of donuts.

The nationalized health care bill is an unconstitutional oppression of the American citizen. We will repeal this injustice. On this new day, we stewards of the Constitution must right this wrong, this illegal law that has been coerced upon the people without their consent.

And that’s just the way it is.

**CONDEMNING THE NEW YEAR’S DAY ATTACK ON A COPTIC CHURCH IN EGYPT**

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

Mr. SIRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to condemn the senseless and heinous attack that took place on New Year’s Day in Alexandria, Egypt, during a Coptic Christian mass ushering in the new year.

The suicide bombing that took place 20 minutes into 2011 took the lives of 23 Christians and wounded more than 90 others. Although no one has claimed responsibility for the attack, the Egyptian Government has linked the al-Qaeda terrorist organization to this brutal attack. Whoever the perpetrators may be, their actions epitomize the definition of evil and remind us of the constant struggle around the world against terrorism. Security must remain a priority in Egypt and all freedom-fighting nations.

This event illuminates the unprecedented prejudice facing this minority population and the evident inter-religious struggle for violence that is plaguing Egypt. This deplorable act of violence is yet another example of the escalation of violence against Egypt’s Coptic Christians, who make up about 10 percent of the population.

I offer my condolences to the families of those who were killed in the bombing, and I hope the Egyptian Government honors their promise with a swift and thorough investigation of this vicious crime.

**AMERICAN ENERGY, AMERICAN JOBS**

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

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, well, here we go again. Gasoline: $3, $4, and soon $5 a gallon. Oil at $100 a barrel. Yet America’s offshore resources total more than 86 billion barrels of oil and 420 trillion cubic feet of natural gas, enough oil to replace imports from Saudi Arabia and Venezuela for the next 80 years. But the administration’s moratorium says “no” to American oil and “yes” to OPEC.

We don’t have to buy hundreds of billions of dollars worth of oil from OPEC, borrow $900 billion from China, run a massive trade deficit or raise taxes. The revenues and leases from offshore exploration can bring up to $3.7 trillion in Federal revenue to slash our deficit, build clean power plants, clean up our air and water, increase renewables, and rebuild our crumbling highways and bridges—all while creating millions of jobs and trillions in economic output.

I hope my colleagues will join me as I reintroduce the bipartisan American Conservation and Clean Energy Independence Act so we can work on securing America’s prosperity and American jobs using American resources.

Stop talking; start building.

**VOTE “NO” ON REPEALING THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT**

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

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak against the reckless attempt to repeal the Affordable Care Act.

The new law has already put in place critical protections to help our families across this country. I want to tell the story of one family in my district whose life has been dramatically helped by this law, the Strong family of Santa Barbara.

Bill and Victoria Strong’s daughter, Gwendolyn, was diagnosed at age 6 months with a rare disease, muscular atrophy. Her care is extremely expensive; and before the new law, the Strongs lived in constant fear that Gwendolyn would reach her policy’s lifetime limit, no longer be covered for treatments and be uninsurable because of her pre-existing condition.

The elimination of lifetime caps has given the Strongs peace of mind. They are guaranteed Gwendolyn will receive the care she needs and their family is protected from bankruptcy.

Repealing these safeguards will take that security away. It would put this courageous little girl at risk of having her health care cut off when she needs it most and it would put this inspiring family at risk of bankruptcy.

I urge my colleagues to stand for all those who are benefiting from the law, as the Strong family is. Vote “no” on repealing the Affordable Care Act.

**ROADMAP TO ECONOMIC RECOVERY**

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, while this is my first opportunity to address the House, it won’t be my last. The people of eastern and southeastern Ohio sent me here to be their voice, and I intend to be that voice. On their behalf, I will speak out—loud and clear—on the issues that matter to the working people of my district.

People sent me here for one primary reason: They think Congress has lost its way. And my constituents gave me a map they want us to use to get back on the right path. It’s a simple map, drawn in bold, unmistakable strokes. Americans want us to be true to our founding principles, and the roads are open for all. But there are no shortcuts for special interests.

But, most of all, this roadmap was made in America and paid for upfront. That’s how our spending must be. We owe it to taxpayers to disclose what our votes will cost and be clear about how they’re paid for.

And, finally, Mr. Speaker, the map my constituents gave me leads in one very clear direction—toward economic recovery for every American. That’s the way I’m headed. And I will cast my votes here with that in mind.

**HEALTH CARE REPEAL AND IMPACT ON JOBS**

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

Mr. BACA. All throughout Congress, the Republicans consistently asked, “Where are the jobs?” They asked this last year. Yet in their first major action, the House Republicans are showing their true colors: playing politics at the expense of hardworking Americans.
DON'T TAMPER WITH HIGHWAY TRUST FUND
(Mr. COURTNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)
Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, despite repeated warnings yesterday from groups as diverse as the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the Ironworkers, the Laborers, the American Trucking Association, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the American Automobile Association, the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, the American Federation of Teachers, and the AFL-CIO, Republicans adopted a new rule which allows Congress to tamper with the transportation authorization fund and the highway trust fund. And despite the protests from the majority that it wasn't doing it, yesterday, UBS-PaineWebber put out a stock advisory that transportation construction companies were being downgraded because of the damage that the Congress did yesterday.

Mr. Speaker, the transportation and construction sector of our country is in a depression. There is 25 percent unemployment. The last thing this country needs is to tamper with the highway trust fund. And yesterday, that's what the new majority did.

The Democrats will fight to restore the transportation authorization fund, make sure that America has the transportation system that it needs, and get people back to work in the hardest-hit sector in the American economy.

TAKING THE OPPOSITE APPROACH
(Mr. WALZ of Minnesota asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)
Mr. WALZ of Minnesota. Yesterday a new Congress was sworn into office, and just like the one before it, a top priority is to get our economy moving in the country. We're profoundly disappointed, though, that the new majority of the Republicans has decided to take the opposite approach: skyrocketing the debt, denying rights, and mortgaging those blessings for our posterity. For far too long, the Federal Government has been using its credit to take the opposite approach: skyrocketing the debt, denying rights, and mortgaging those blessings for our posterity. And that must end.

We have a responsibility, Mr. Speaker, to make the tough decisions to cut spending, to eliminate the Federal deficit and begin to pay down the immense debt that threatens the opportunities that will be available for our children and our grandchildren. Our work will be difficult but it must be done. Let us all face up to these challenges and get to work.

REJECTING REPEAL OF AFFORDABLE CARE ACT
(Ms. SCHAKOWSKY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)
Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of my constituent, David Zoltan-Breiger, 33 years old, who now has coverage under Illinois' Pre-Existing Condition Plan thanks to the Affordable Care Act. David has diabetes. Because of his preexisting condition, he couldn't get insurance for over 2 years after losing his job. David is absolutely elated that he no longer has to wait for hours in the emergency room to get lifesaving insulin. Without coverage, the EIR was his only option. Instead, he now has regular visits with the doctor and can avoid the medical crises that had become a frequent nightmare.

What happens to David under repeal of the bill? He, like so many others, would lose coverage and once again be at the mercy of insurance company CEOs. We cannot go back. We must reject the Republican call for repeal of the Affordable Care Act.
Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I want to follow up with my colleague LEFORTENBERRY’s thoughts.

The school in my district, Millard South, endured the ultimate tragedy when a student, who was suspended, returned with a gun. He walked into the assistant principal’s office and shot her. Ms. Kaspar later died.

My profound sorrow for this incident—the ultimate parents’ nightmare. My kids attend that school district; so we were getting the call about the lockdown. I don’t think there is anything more disturbing to a parent anywhere than when the veil of safety of a school has been pierced by such violence.

The principal, who was also shot, is going to survive. He is also a neighbor of ours, and so I am glad that he will be fine.

I ask this floor and our colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join the Omaha community in expressing the depth of our sorrows. I ask for your prayers for not only the students of that school but for all of the teachers, for the family of the assistant principal who died, and for the principal who is fighting for his life right now. I appreciate everyone’s concern.

THE HYPOCRISY OF THE ELIMINATION OF PAYGO

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

Mr. MORAN. Horrible tragedies like this incident that cited by the two previous speakers remind us that there are simply too many guns too readily available to too many children. It has got to stop.

On a very different subject, though, Mr. Speaker, when Ronald Reagan ran for President, he said that any President who does not submit a balanced budget should be impeached. He never did balance a budget. In fact, the only times that our budget has been balanced was during the Clinton administration, and for one of what is called PAYGO—that you don’t increase spending without increasing a comonstant amount of revenue; and you don’t cut taxes without immediately cutting the same amount of spending. That worked. We had three successive years of budget surpluses, and we passed on a $5.6 trillion projected surplus to the Bush administration.

Yet, as soon as the new Republican Congress came in at the beginning of the 21st century, they eliminated PAYGO. Two years of two deep tax cuts and a massive expansion of Medicare were never paid for. As a result, we had a $9 trillion fiscal reversal. When the Democrats came back in, we reinstated it; but yesterday the new Republican Congress exempted $5 trillion from PAYGO—$4 trillion of unpaid-for tax cuts and $1.3 trillion of savings we could have gotten from health care reform.

It is the height of hypocrisy and deeply disappointing.

THE 14TH AMENDMENT OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES

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

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I first want to extend the sympathies of Colorado and of the Representatives to our friends from Nebraska. We suffered the Columbine tragedy a number of years ago, so we definitely understand how painful something like this is.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose for me rising today is to talk about what has been given to this country in the form of the Constitution, particularly in the 14th Amendment.

I would say to my friend from Texas, “nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.”

Until we passed that affordable health care act, people with pre-existing conditions were being denied equal protection of the laws. They now have freedom from discrimination. Yet my friends on the Republican side of the aisle want to take away that freedom. That’s wrong.

That’s wrong for people in my district and for millions of people across the country because they, their kids, their families, and their friends have different physical conditions that require attention and must be covered and not discriminated against.

THE SUPREME COURT NEEDS A LESSON

Mr. COHEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, in a few minutes, we are going to have the reading of the United States Constitution—a show for the American public—for anybody who knows anything about constitutional law knows that it is up to nine men and women as to what the Constitution says.

When the Constitution was originally drafted—and I love it and I defend it—and it said slavery was permissible. Until the U.S. v. Warren Court, in its correct decision in Brown v. Board of Education, it said separate was equal, and we knew it wasn’t. African Americans were held back with Jim Crow laws.

Five people on the Supreme Court, not the whole nine, can make decisions that change what the Constitution is interpreted.

Bush v. Gore, an abomination of a case that determined the Presidency for 8 years and took away States’ rights. The Citizens United case funded the opposition that turned in the majority that the Republicans now have.

Making corporations the equal of people and putting money into politics poisoned the political system. The Supreme Court should read the Constitution. They need a lesson.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings is a violation of the rules of the House.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under close rule XX, the Chair confers recognition for that purpose.

A call of the House was ordered.

The call was taken by electronic device, and the following Members responded to their names:

[Roll No. 7]
Do you solemnly swear or affirm that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter, so help you God.

Congratulations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 5(a) of House Resolution 5, the Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) for the reading of the Constitution.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for a question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind all Members that they should not traffic the well while in order to ensure bipartisanship and fairness, I may recognize Members out of order.

The text we are reading today reflects the changes to the document made by the 27 amendments to it. Those portions superseded by amendment will not be read.

In order to ensure fairness for all those interested in participating, we have asked Members to line up on a first-come first-served basis. I will recognize Members based on this guidance.

In order to ensure relative parity and fairness, I may recognize Members out of order to ensure bipartisan balance. Two Members, one from each party, will be recognized out of order. Each Member will approach the podium and read the passage laid out for him or her.

The Speaker and two members of the leadership of each party will begin the reading, and then I will recognize Members in order. I thank the Members of both parties in advance for their participation in this historic event.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not recognized for that purpose.

Mr. INSLEE. I ask unanimous consent to ask the gentleman to yield for a question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for debate. This is not a debate.

Mr. INSLEE. I will wait till Mr. GOODLATTE is recognized, and I will ask him to yield so we can have clarity of this.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for the reading of the Constitution, not for debate.

Mr. INSLEE. If I may ask unanimous consent to ask Mr. GOODLATTE to yield for just a question so we all understand the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Washington have a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. INSLEE. Yes. My parliamentary inquiry is, may I ask the gentleman to yield for 30 seconds to ask a question of the derivation of this language that we will all be reading in good faith and in good spirits today?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is not in order at this point.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, as a part of the opening remarks, I will explain and I hope answer the question of the gentleman from Washington.

This morning, for the first time in the history of the House of Representatives, we will read aloud the full text of the Constitution of the United States. We hope this will inspire many more Americans to read the Constitution.

The text we are reading today reflects the changes to the document made by the 27 amendments to it. Those portions superseded by amendment will not be read.

In order to ensure fairness for all those interested in participating, we have asked Members to line up on a first-come first-served basis. I will recognize Members based on this guidance.

In order to ensure relative parity and fairness, I may recognize Members out of order to ensure bipartisan balance. Two Members, one from each party, will be recognized out of order. Each Member will approach the podium and read the passage laid out for him or her.

The Speaker and two members of the leadership of each party will begin the reading, and then I will recognize Members in order. I thank the Members of both parties in advance for their participation in this historic event.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not recognized for that purpose.
Washington’s original question about parliamentary procedure be in order at this time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In light of the modicum of debate by the gentleman from Virginia, that would be appropriate.

Mr. INSLEE. If I may make a unanimous consent to ask Mr. GOODLATTE a question so that we all do understand the nature of the language that we will be reading, I think it would be very helpful to us on a bipartisan basis.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Virginia may yield for that purpose.

Mr. INSLEE. I thank the Speaker.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Could you explain to us the decision-making process about which language to read or not, that since we have not had discussion today—I will wait for a moment, Mr. Speaker. We do want to have a good bipartisan discussion with the Congressional Research Service of the Library of Congress, and it has been up to us to ascertain the intent of the amendment, and the language which language is operative or not. But the language has not specifically been deleted by the amendment, so it could be subject to some interpretation of which language really has been removed and which has not.

So I think it would be helpful to the Members if you explain to us how the determinations of what to read have been made or not made so that we will all be on the same page as to congressional intent.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I thank the gentleman for his question.

We have consulted with the Congressional Research Service of the Library of Congress. The Library of Congress actually maintains a copy of the Constitution which includes those sections that have been superseded by amendment. So we are not reading those sections that have been superseded by amendment. And we have arranged that that determination be made based upon our consultation with the Congressional Research Service.

Mr. INSLEE. And would the gentleman accept the premise that since we have not been able to review the exact language we will be reading today—I will wait for a moment, Mr. Speaker. We do want to have a good bipartisan success here today, and this is a special moment for us all.

So the guess the question is: I take it that since we have not had discussion about which language to read or not, that this is not intended to create any statement of congressional intent about the language but, rather, to do our best to have a moment of comity to read language as best as we can ascertain it. Is that correct?

Mr. GOODLATTE. I think the gentleman has stated that very well.

Mr. INSLEE. I thank you. And I very much appreciate leadership in bringing this to our attention today.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, if I may ask unanimous consent to address Mr. GOODLATTE.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Virginia yield for that purpose?

Mr. GOODLATTE. I yield to the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized. There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. I thank the gentleman for his question.

Let me first begin by saying that I think every Member of this body is approaching the reading of their Constitution with the most sacred possible spirit in what is clearly an unprecedented moment in the history of the Congress of the United States. And I don’t take it lightly when my colleagues or when others, before we begin the reading of our sacred document, are raising questions about what we are studying. I think we should be studying what specifically will be redacted based upon amendments or based upon the recommendations of Libraries of Congress.

But I also want to be very clear, Mr. Speaker and Mr. GOODLATTE, I recognize that in reading those redacted—and this is very emotional for me. This is very emotional, I know, for a number of Members, given the struggle—and I am not trying to give a shot at the process. Mr. GOODLATTE knows me and he knows that I am approaching this—given the struggle of African Americans, given the struggle of women, given the struggles of others to create a more perfect document, while not perfect, a more perfect document, to hear that those elements of the Constitution that have been redacted by amendment are no less serious, no less part of our ongoing struggle to improve the country and to make the country better, and our sense in our struggle and whom we are at the Congress of the United States at this point in American history and our desire to continue to improve the Constitution, many of us don’t want that to be lost upon the reading of our sacred document.

So with that said, I thank the gentleman for yielding. And I just wanted to indicate that this is done with sincerity. It is not done to take a shot at the idea of reading the Constitution. But certainly more were informed, for example, that the three-fifths clause would not be mentioned and that other elements of the Constitution which justify why some of us fight for programs in the Congress will not be written in the redacted version, it is of consequence to whom we are.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I thank the gentleman for his comments, and I take them very much to heart as has our leadership.

In fact, in recognition of the gentleman’s concern, I mentioned in my comments that only two Members would be recognized out of order to read sections. One is the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH), the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, who will read the first article of section 3 dealing with the judiciary. The other is the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. Lewis), who many regard as the foremost advocate for civil rights in the Congress. He will read the 13th Amendment. In that regard, we hope to address the concern that you raised.

Mr. GOHMERT of Texas. Mr. Speaker, if I may ask unanimous consent to address the gentleman from Virginia.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Texas yield for that purpose?

Mr. GOODLATTE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized. There was no objection.

Mr. GOHMERT. Out of the same deference and respect for this document that we revere, I think it is important that we use the language of the Constitution itself. They are not deletions; they are amendments. And, in that respect, we go by the “amended” document, not by the “deleted” document. There are too many that have fought and died for those amendments to call them deletions.

Mr. GOODLATTE. It is an amended document. We are going to read the document as amended.

I thank the members of both parties in advance for their participation in this historic event, and I thank the leadership and Members for providing for this reading in the rules of the House.

It is now my distinct honor to yield to the Speaker of the House to begin the reading.

Mr. BOEHNER. “We the People, of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the minority leader, the gentleman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. “Article I, section 1: All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the majority leader, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR).

Mr. CANTOR. Article I, section 2: “The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.”

“Now person shall be a Representative who shall not have attained to the age of 25 years, and been 7 years a citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, be an inhabitant of that State in which he shall be chosen.
“The actual enumeration shall be made within 3 years after the first meeting of the Congress of the United States, and within every subsequent term of 10 years, in such manner as they shall by law direct.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Article I, continuation of section 2: “The number of Representatives shall not exceed one for every 30,000, but each State shall have at least one Representative; and until such enumeration shall be made, the State of New Hampshire shall be entitled to choose three, Massachusetts eight, Rhode Island and Providence Plantations one, Connecticut five, New York six, New Jersey four, Pennsylvania eight, Delaware one, Maryland six, Virginia ten, North Carolina five, South Carolina five, and Georgia three.

“When vacancies happen in the representation from any State, the executive authority thereof shall issue writs of election to fill such vacancies.

“The House of Representatives shall choose their Speaker and other officers, and shall have the sole power of impeachment.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from California, the majority whip, Mr. MCCARTHY.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Article I, section 3: “The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State for 6 years; and each Senator shall have one vote.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ROTTMAN).

Mr. ROTTMAN of New Jersey. “Immediately after they shall be assembled in consequence of the first election, they shall be divided as equally as may be into three classes. The seats of the Senators of the first class shall be vacated at the expiration of the second year, of the second class at the expiration of the fourth year, and of the third class at the expiration of the sixth year, so that one-third may be chosen every second year.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY).

Mr. CONAWAY. “No person shall be a Senator who shall not have attained to the age of 30 years and been 9 years a citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, be an inhabitant of that State for which he shall be chosen.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT).

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. “The Vice President of the United States shall be President of the Senate, but shall have no vote, unless they be equally divided. The Senate shall choose their other officers, and also a President pro tempore, in the absence of the Vice President, or when he shall exercise the office of President of the United States.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

Mr. WALBERG. “The Senate shall have the sole power to try all impeachments. When sitting for that purpose, they shall be on oath or affirmation. When the President of the United States is tried, the Chief Justice shall preside, and no person shall be convicted without the concurrence of two-thirds of the Senators present.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CRITZ).

Mr. CRITZ. “Judgment in cases of impeachment shall not extend further than to removal from office, and disqualification to hold and enjoy any office of honor, trust or profit under the United States; but the party convicted shall nevertheless be liable and subject to indictment, trial, judgment and punishment, according to law.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

Mr. POE of Texas. Section 4: “The times, places and manner of holding of elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations except as to the place of choosing Senators.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER).

Mr. WEINER. Section 5: “Each House shall be the judge of the elections, returns and qualifications of its own Members, and a majority of each shall constitute a quorum to do business; but a smaller number may adjourn from day to day and may be authorized to compel the attendance of absent Members in such manner and under such penalties as each House may provide.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WOMACK).

Mr. WOMACK. “Each House may determine the rules of its proceedings, punish its Members for disorderly behavior and, in all cases except impeachment, expel a Member.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS).

Ms. EDWARDS. “Each House shall keep a Journal of its proceedings and from time to time publish the same, excepting such parts as may in their judgment require secrecy; and the yeas and nays of the Members of either House on any question shall, at the discretion of one-fifth of those present, be entered on the Journal.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER).

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. “Neither House during the session of Congress shall, without the consent of the other, adjourn for more than 3 days nor to any other place than that in which the two Houses shall be sitting.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Section 6: “The Senators and Representatives shall receive a compensation for their services to be ascertained by law and paid out of the Treasury of the United States. They shall in all cases, except treason, felony and breach of peace, be privileged from arrest during their attendance at the session of their respective Houses and in going to and returning from the same; and for any speech or debate in either House, they shall not be questioned in any other place.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS).

Mr. PITTS. “No Senator or Representative shall during the time for which he was elected be appointed to any civil office under the authority of the United States which shall have been created or the emoluments whereof of shall have been increased during such time; and no person holding any office under the United States shall be a Member of either House during his continuance in office.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Section 7: “All bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives; but the Senate may propose or concur with amendments as on other bills.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON).

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. “Every bill which shall have passed the House of Representatives and the Senate shall, before it become a law, be presented to the President of the United States. If he approve he shall sign it, but if not he shall return it, with his objections to that House in which it shall have originated who shall enter the objections at large on their journal, and proceed to reconsider it.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN).

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. “If after such consideration two-thirds of that House shall agree to pass the bill, it shall be sent together with the objections to the other House by which it shall likewise be reconsidered, and if approved by two-thirds of that House, it shall become a law.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. GOWDY).

Mr. GOWDY. “But in all such cases the votes of both Houses shall be determined by yeas and nays, and the names of the persons voting for and against the bill shall be entered on the Journal of each House respectively.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from California (Mrs. DAVIS).

Mrs. DAVIS of California. “If any such bill shall not be returned by the President within 10 days, Sundays excepted, after it shall have been presented to him, the same shall be a law.
in like manner as if he had signed it, unless the Congress by their adjournment prevent its return, in which case it shall not be a law.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LoBIONDO).

Mr. LoBIONDO. “Every order, resolution, or vote to which the concurrence of the Senate and House of Representatives may be necessary (except on a question of adjournment) shall be presented to the President of the United States; and before the same shall take effect, shall be approved by him, or being disapproved by him, shall be repassed by two-thirds of the Senate and House of Representatives, according to the rules and limitations prescribed in the case of a bill.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

Mr. LANGEVIN. Section 8: “The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; and before the same shall take effect, shall be approved by the President of the United States.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE).

Mr. LANCE. “To borrow money on the credit of the United States; to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes; to establish an uniform rule of naturalization, and uniform laws on the subject of bankruptcies throughout the United States.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. “To coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin, and fix the standard of weights and measures; to provide for the punishment of counterfeiting the securities and current coin of the United States; to establish post offices and post roads.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

Mr. HENSARLING. “To promote the progress of science and useful arts, by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE).

Mr. INSLEE. “To constitute tribunals inferior to the Supreme Court; to define and punish piracies and felonies committed on the high seas, and offenses against the law of nations.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN. “To declare war, grant letters of marque and reprisal, and make rules concerning captures on land and water; to raise and support armies, but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than two years.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

Mr. HOLT. “To provide and maintain a navy; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; to provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections and repel invasions.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CANSECO).

Mr. CANSECO. “To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia, and for governing such part of them as may be employed in the service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively, the appointment of the officers, and the authority of training the militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT. “To exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever, over such district (not exceeding 10 miles square) as may, by cession of particular States, and the acceptance of Congress, become the seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like authority over all places purchased by the consent of the legislatures of the States in which the same shall be, for the erection of forts, magazines, arsenals, dockyards, and other needful buildings.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEST).

Mr. WEST. “And to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, and to exercise like authority over all places purchased by the consent of the legislatures of the States in which the same shall be, for the erection of forts, magazines, arsenals, dockyards, and other needful buildings.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING).

Mr. KEATING. Section 9: “The migration or importation of such persons as any of the States now existing shall think proper to admit, shall not be prohibited by Congress prior to the year 1808, but a tax or duty may be imposed on such importation, not exceeding 10 dollars for each person.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK).

Mrs. BLACK. “The privilege of the writ of habeas corpus shall not be suspended, unless when in cases of rebellion or invasion the public safety may require it. No bill of attainder or ex post facto law shall be passed.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER).

Mr. PERLMUTTER. “No capitation, or other direct, tax shall be laid, unless in proportion to the census or enumeration herein before directed to be taken. No tax or duty shall be laid on articles exported from any State.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. McMORRIS RODGERS).

Ms. McMORRIS RODGERS. “No preference shall be given by any regulation of commerce or revenue to the ports of one State over those of another; nor shall vessels bound to, or from, one State, be obliged to enter, clear, or pay duties in another.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNDA).

Mr. HUNDA. “No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law; and a regular statement and account of the receipts and expenditures of all public money shall be published from time to time.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ).

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ. “No State shall enter into any treaty, alliance, or confederation; grant letters of marque and reprisal; coin money; emit bills of credit; make any thing but gold and silver coin a tender in payment of debts; pass any bill of attainder, ex post facto law, or law impairing the obligation of contracts, or grant any title of nobility.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. PERLMUTTER).

Mr. PERLMUTTER. “No State shall, without the consent of Congress, lay any impost or duty on imports or exports, except what may be absolutely necessary for executing its inspections laws; and the net produce of all duties and imposts, laid by any State on imports or exports shall be for the use of the Treasury of the United States; and all such laws shall be subject to the revision and control of the Congress.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

Mr. RANGEL. “No State shall, without the consent of Congress, lay any duty of tonnage, keep troops, or ships of war in time of peace, enter into any agreement or compact with another State, or with a foreign power, or engage in war, unless actually invaded, or in such imminent danger as will not admit of delay.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. HAYWORTH).

Ms. HAYWORTH. Article II, section 1: “The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America. He shall hold his office during a term of 4 years and together with

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the
the Vice-President chosen for the same term, be elected as follows:'

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE).

Mr. PAYNE. "Each State shall appoint, in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct, a number of electors, equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress; but no Senator or Representative in Congress elected in one State shall be appointed an elector."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG. "The Congress may determine the time of choosing the electors and the day on which they shall give their votes, which days shall be the same throughout the United States."

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

Mr. PALLONE. "No person except a natural born citizen, or a citizen of the United States at the time of the adoption of this Constitution, shall be eligible to the office of President."

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Speaker notes a disturbance in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of the proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.

The Chair notes a disturbance in the gallery in contravention of the law and rules of the House. The Sergeant at Arms will remove those persons responsible for the disturbance and restore order in the gallery.

The gentleman from New Jersey. Mr. GOODLATTE. "Neither shall any person be eligible to that office who shall not have attained the age of 35 years and been 14 years a resident within the United States."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GRIFFITH).

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. "The President shall, at stated times, receive for his services a compensation, which shall neither be increased nor diminished during the period for which he shall have been elected, and he shall not receive within that period any other emolument from the United States, or any of them."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the ladywoman from California (Ms. RICHARDSON).

Ms. RICHARDSON. "Before he enter on the execution of his office, he shall take the following oath or affirmation: I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will faithfully execute the Office of the President of the United States and will to the best of my ability preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA).

Mr. LATTA. Section 2: "The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States and of the militia of the several States when called into the actual service of the United States; he may require the opinion in writing of the principal officer in each of the executive departments, upon any subject relating to their respective offices, and he shall have the power to grant reprieves and pardons for offenses against the United States, except in cases of impeachment."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. "He shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur, and he shall nominate, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, judges of the Supreme Court, and all other officers of the United States, whose appointments are not herein otherwise provided for, and which shall be established by law."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY).

Mr. CASSIDY. "But the Congress may by law vest the appointment of such inferior officers as they think proper, and the President alone, in the courts of law, or in the heads of departments."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the ladywoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE).

Ms. DEGETTE. "The President shall have power to fill up all vacancies that may happen during the recess of the Senate, by granting commissions which shall expire at the end of their next session."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Section 3: "He shall from time to time give to the Congress information of the state of the Union and recommend to their consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient; he may, on extraordinary occasions, convene both Houses, or either of them, and in case of disagreement between them."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. "With respect to the time of adjournment, he may adjourn them to such time as he shall think proper: he shall receive ambassadors and other public ministers; he shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed and shall commission all the officers of the United States."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT).

Mr. CHABOT. "The President, Vice-President, and all civil officers of the United States shall be removed from office on impeachment for, and conviction of, treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH), the chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. "The judicial power of the United States shall vest in one Supreme Court and in such inferior courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish. The judges, both of the Supreme and inferior courts, shall hold their offices during good behavior and shall, at stated times, receive for their services a compensation, which shall not be diminished during their continuance in office."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Section 2: "The judicial power shall extend to all cases, in law and equity, arising under this Constitution, the laws of the United States, and treaties made, or which shall be made, under their authority, to all cases affecting ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, to all cases of admiralty and maritime jurisdiction."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Farenthold).

Mr. FARENTHOLD. "To controversies to which the United States shall be a party, to controversies between two or more States, between a State and citizens of another State, between citizens of different States, between citizens of the same State claiming land under grants of different States, and between a State or the citizens thereof and foreign States, citizens or subjects."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. DONELLY).

Mr. DONELLY of Indiana. "In all cases affecting ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls and those in which a State shall be party, the Supreme Court shall have original jurisdiction. In all the other cases before mentioned, the Supreme Court shall have appellate jurisdiction, both as to law and fact, with such exceptions and under such regulations as the Congress shall make."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE).

Mr. PEARCE. "The trial of all crimes, except in cases of impeachment, shall be by jury and such trial shall be held in the State where the crime shall have been committed; but when not committed within any State, the trial shall be at such place or places as the Congress may by law have directed."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ALTMIRE).

Mr. ALTMIRE. Section 3: "Treason against the United States shall consist only in levying war against them or in adhering to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort. No person shall be convicted of treason except on the testimony of two witnesses to the same overt act, or on confession in an open court."
Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER).

Mr. TURNER. "The Congress shall have power to declare the punishment of treason, but no attainder of treason shall work corruption of blood or forfeiture except during the life of the person attainted."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CARNEY).

Mr. CARNEY. Article IV, section 1: "Full faith and credit shall be given in each State to the public acts, records, and judicial proceedings of every other State. And the Congress may by general laws prescribe the manner in which such acts, records and proceedings shall be proved, and the effect thereof."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HARRIS).

Mr. HARRIS. Section 2: "The citizens of each State shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

Mr. SCHIFF. "A person charged in any State with treason, felony, or other crime, who shall flee from justice and be found in another State, shall on demand of the executive authority of the State from which he fled be delivered up, to be removed to the State having jurisdiction of the crime."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GIBBS).

Mr. GIBBS. Section 3: "New States may be admitted by the Congress into this Union; but no new State shall be formed or erected within the jurisdiction of any other State; nor any State be formed by the junction of two or more States, or parts of States, without the consent of the legislatures of the States concerned as well as of the Congress."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. "The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to prejudice any claims of the United States, or of any particular State."

Mr. GOODLATTE. Section 4: "The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a Republican form of government, and shall protect each of them against invasion; and on application of the legislature, or of the executive (when the legislature cannot be convened) against domestic violence."

Article V: "The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, or, on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, shall call a convention for proposing amendments, which, in either case, shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States . . ."

I now yield to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. POTTENBERGER).

Mr. POTTENBERGER. "... or by conventions in three-fourths thereof, as the one or the other mode of ratification may propose by the Congress provided that no amendment which may be made prior to the year 1808 shall in any manner affect the first and fourth clauses in the ninth section of the first article; and that no State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI).

Ms. MATSUI. Article VI: "All debts contracted and engagements entered into before the adoption of this Constitution, shall be as valid against the United States under this Constitution, as under the Confederation."

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

Mr. GARRETT. "This Constitution and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof and all treaties made, or which shall be made under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, any thing in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. "The Senators and Representatives before mentioned, and the members of the several State legislatures, and all executive and judicial officers, both of the United States and of the several States, shall be bound by oath or affirmation to support this Constitution; but no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMMORN).

Mr. LAMMORN. Article VII: "The ratification of the conventions of nine States shall be sufficient for the establishment of this Constitution between the States so ratifying the same."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO).

Ms. HIRONO. "The word 'the' being interlined between the seventh and eighth lines of the first page; the word 'thirty' being partly written on an eighth line of the first page; the words 'is tried' being partly written on an eighth line of the first page."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPPTON).

Mr. TIPPTON. "Done in convention by unanimous consent of the States present the 17th day of September in the year of Our Lord 1787 and of the Independence of the United States of America the 12th in witness whereof we have hereunto subscribed our names."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now recognize the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CARNAHAN).


Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).


Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT).


Mr. LEVIN. The preamble of the Bill of Rights: 'Congress of the United States, begun and held at the City of New York on Wednesday, the 4th of March 1789.'

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Alabama (Mrs. ROBY).

Mrs. ROBY. "The conventions of a number of the States, having at the time of their adopting the Constitution exercised a desire to prevent misconception or abuse of its powers, that further declaratory and restrictive clauses should be added, and as extending the ground of public confidence in the government will best ensure the beneficent ends of its institution."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. ROSS).

Mr. ROSS of Arkansas. "Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, two-thirds of both Houses concurring that the following articles be proposed to the legislatures of the several States, as
amendments to the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BONNER).

Mr. BONNER. "... all or any of which shall be so levied, or any taxes in any amount, shall be levied, shall be assessed, or any duties or other imposts or excises shall be laid, shall be imposed, and any taxes shall be levied, assessed, or imposed, shall be levied, assessed, or imposed, at any place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized." "The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated; and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. The Sixth Amendment: "In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from California (Ms. SPEIER).

Ms. SPEIER. The Sixth Amendment: "And to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him, to have compa-

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND).

Mr. WESTMORELAND. "And to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him, to have compu-

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. WALKER).

Mr. WALKER. The Fifth Amendment: "No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a grand jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the militia, when in actual service in time of war or public danger.

Ms. CHU. "A quorum for the purpose of the United States shall not be con-

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. Guinta).

Mr. Guinta. The Second Amendment: "A well-regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. Sherman).

Mr. SHERMAN. The Third Amendment: "No soldier shall, in time of peace, be quartered in any house without the consent of the owner, nor in time of war, but in a manner to be prescribed by law.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. Price).

Mr. PRICE. "... the person having the greatest number of votes as Vice President, shall be the Vice President, if such number be a majority of the whole number of electors appointed; and if no person have such majority, then from the persons having the highest numbers not exceeding three on the list, the Senate shall choose the Vice President.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Southerland).

Mr. SOUtherLAND. "The person having the greatest number of votes as Vice President, shall be the Vice President, if such number be a majority of the whole number of electors appointed; and if no person have such majority, then from the two highest numbers on the list, the Senate shall choose the Vice President.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. Lewis).

Mr. LEWIS. "... and they shall make no law depriving any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. Franks).

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. "Nor shall any person be subject for the same offense to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself; nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. Engel).

Mr. ENGEL. "... and they shall make no law..."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Rigell).

Mr. RIGELL. "... and they shall make no law..."
Mr. RIGELL. Amendment 14: “All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT).

Mr. WATT. “Nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN).

Mr. WITTMAN. Section 2: “Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each State, excluding Indians not taxed. But when the right to vote at any election for the choice of electors for President and Vice President of the United States, Representatives in Congress, the executive and judicial officers of a State, or the members of the Legislature thereof, is denied to any of the male inhabitants of such State, being 21 years of age, and citizens of the United States, or in any way abridged, except for participation in rebellion, or other crime, the representation therein shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of male citizens 21 years of age in such State.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from New York (Ms. CLARKE).

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Section 3: “No person shall be a Senator or Representative in Congress or elector of President or Vice President, or hold any office, civil or military, under the United States, or under any State, who, having previously taken an oath, as a Member of Congress, or as an officer of the United States or as a Member of any State legislature.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from New York (Ms. ELLMERS).

Mrs. ELLMERS. “Or as an executive or judicial officer of any State, to support to the Constitution of the United States, shall have engaged in insurrection or rebellion against the same, or given aid or comfort to the enemies thereof. But Congress may by a vote of two-thirds of each House remove such disability.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL).

Mr. ISRAEL. Section 4: “The validity of the public debt of the United States, authorized by law, including debts incurred for payment of pensions and bounties for services in suppressing insurrection or rebellion shall not be questioned. But neither the United States nor any State shall assume or pay any debt or obligation incurred in aid of the insurrection or rebellion against the United States, or any claim for the loss or emancipation of any slave: but all such debts, obligations and claims shall be held illegal and void.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOYAR).

Mr. GOYAR. Section 5: “The Congress shall have the power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article.”

Amendment 15, Section 1: “The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BURKE).

Mr. BURKE of New York. Section 2: “The Congress shall have the power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.”

Amendment 16: “The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States and without regard to any census or enumeration.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON).

Mr. OLSON. Amendment 17: “The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, elected by the people thereof, for 6 years; and each Senator shall have one vote. The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. LARSEN).

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. “When vacancies happen in the representation of any State in the Senate, the executive authority of such State shall issue writs of election to fill such vacancies: provided that the legislature of any State may empower the executive thereof to make temporary appointments until the people fill the vacancies by election as the legislative may direct.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from New York (Ms. SCHWARTZ).

Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania. Amendment 20: “The terms of the President and the Vice President shall end at noon on the 20th day of January, and the terms of Senators and Representatives at noon on the third day of January of the years in which such terms would have ended if this article had not been ratified; and the terms of their successors shall then begin.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE).

Mr. SCALISE. Section 2: “The Congress shall assemble at least once in every year, and such meeting shall begin at noon on the third day of January, unless they shall by law appoint a different day.”

Section 3: “If, at the time fixed for the beginning of the term of the President, the President elect shall have died, the Vice President elect shall become President.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN).

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. “If a President shall not have been chosen before the time fixed for the beginning of his term, then the Vice President elect shall act as President until a President shall have qualified; and the Congress may by law provide for the case wherein neither a President-elect nor a Vice President-elect shall have qualified, declaring who shall then act as President or the manner in which one who is to act shall be selected, and such person shall act accordingly until a President or Vice President shall have been qualified.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. HURT).

Mr. HURT. Section 4: “The Congress may by law provide for the case of the death of any of the persons from whom the House of Representatives may choose a President whenever the right of choice shall have devolved upon them and for the case of the death of any of the persons from whom the Senate may choose a Vice President whenever the right of choice shall have devolved upon them.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO).

Mr. SERRANO. Section 5: “Sections 1 and 2 shall take effect on the 15th day of October following the ratification of this article.”

Section 6: “This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PLATTS).

Mr. PLATTS. Amendment 21, passed by Congress February 20, 1933, ratified December 5, 1933:

Section 1: “The 18th article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States is hereby repealed.”

Section 2: “The transportation or importation into any State, Territory or
Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. SCHRADER).

Mr. SCHRADER. Section 3: "This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified by an amendment to the Constitution by conventions in the several States, as provided in the Constitution, within 7 years from the date of submission hereof to the States by the Congress."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

Mr. GEORGE MILLER. Amendment 22, passed by Congress on March 21, 1947.

Section 1: "No person shall be elected to the office of the President more than twice, and no person who has held the office of President more than 2 years of a term to which some other person was elected President shall be elected to the office of President more than once."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. NUNNELEE).

Mr. NUNNELEE. "But this article shall not apply to any person holding the office of President when this article was proposed by the Congress, and shall not prevent any person who may be holding the office of President, or acting as President, during the term within which this article becomes operative from holding the office of President or acting as President during the remainder of such term."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. "But this article shall not apply to any person holding the office of President when this article was proposed by the Congress, and shall not prevent any person who may be holding the office of President, or acting as President, during the term within which this article becomes operative from holding the office of President or acting as President during the remainder of such term."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GIBSON).

Mr. GIBSON. "If the Congress, within 21 days after receipt of the latter written declaration, or, if Congress is not in session, within 21 days after Congress is required to assemble, determines by two-thirds vote of both Houses that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President shall continue to discharge the same as Acting President; otherwise, the President shall resume the powers and duties of his office."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN).

Mr. HULTGREN. Amendment 26, passed by Congress March 23, 1971; ratified July 1, 1971.

Section 1: "The right of citizens of the United States, who are 18 years of age or older, to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of age."

Section 2: "The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FINCHER) who will read the last amendment of the Constitution.
“No law varying the compensation for the services of the Senators and Representatives shall take effect until an election of Representatives shall have intervened.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, with apologies for Members who were waiting to read, we have now completed the first reading aloud of the United States Constitution.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, our expectation was that the new Republican majority would read the Constitution as written and the subsequent amendments. There is a broad body of law and interpretation that has developed from 1787 until the adoption of the last Amendment in 1992 that has turned our Constitution into a living document, paid for by the blood, sweat and tears of millions of Americans from the Revolutionary War, through the Civil War to even our current conflicts.

The new Republican majority and their re-drafted Constitutional reading gives little deference to the long history of improving the Constitution and only seeks an interpretation of our Constitution based on the now, not the historic, broad body of law and struggle that it has taken to get there. It leaves out the need to continue to refine the Constitution so that we have a more perfect union.

The 10th Amendment remains the center of conservative ideology. It reads, “The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.”

The 112th Congress’ Republican majority is building its agenda around the 10th Amendment. It is determined to limit the scope of Congress’ activity to legislation “reserved” to the United States. Then, all other rights are in the purview of the states. Under this historic logic, slavery was a state right protected by the Constitution and the 10th Amendment. But slavery by definition is not a human right, and therefore states rights cannot be human rights. That is why for the last five Congresses, I’ve introduced a series of Constitutional amendments that would improve the document for all Americans by guaranteeing essential rights.

Unfortunately, legislation is subject to local interpretations of who should vote and how. That results in thousands of different systems, all with different rules and different regulations. It means education is a state right, which means a child’s likelihood of success is based on where he or she is born and the quality of schools that happen to be there. It means health care is a right, and God help you if your state, county or city cannot provide access to high quality care.

I will soon reintroduce the following amendments, in the hopes of creating a more perfect union.

H.J. Res. 28—Guaranteeing the right to vote to all Americans
H.J. Res. 29—Guaranteeing the right to an education of equal high quality
H.J. Res. 30—Guaranteeing the right to health care of equal high quality
H.J. Res. 31—Guaranteeing the right to equality and to reproductive rights to women
H.J. Res. 32—Guaranteeing the right to high quality housing
H.J. Res. 33—Guaranteeing the right to a clean and safe environment
H.J. Res. 34—Guaranteeing progressive taxation

H.J. Res. 35—Guaranteeing the right to full employment and balanced growth
H.J. Res. 36—Abolishing the electoral college, and providing direct election of the President and Vice President

I hope my Republican and Democratic colleagues will join me in converting a reverence for the Constitution into a movement to improve it on behalf of all Americans.

APPOINTMENT—PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 11 of rule X and clause 11 of rule I, and the order of the House of January 5, 2011, the Chair announces the Speaker’s appointment of the following Member of the House to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence:

Mr. ROGERS, Michigan, Chairman.

RESOLUTION TO CUT CONGRESS’ BUDGET

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 22) reducing the amount authorized for salaries and expenses of Member, committee, and leadership offices in 2011 and 2012.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. Res. 22

Resolved, SECTION 1. REDUCTION IN MEMBERS’ REPRESENTATIONAL ALLOWANCE.

(a) ALLOWANCES ADOPTED IN 2011 AND 2012.—The amount of any Members’ Representational Allowance established in accordance with section 101 of the House of Representatives Administrative Reform Technical Corrections Act (2 U.S.C. 57b) for 2011 or 2012 may not exceed 95 percent of the amount of the Allowance so established for 2010.

(b) INTERIM REDUCTION PENDING ADOPTION OF NEW ALLOWANCE.—Until a Members’ Representational Allowance is established in accordance with section 101 of the House of Representatives Administrative Reform Technical Corrections Act (2 U.S.C. 57b) for 2011, the amount of such Allowance, as in effect on the date of the adoption of this resolution, is reduced by 5 percent.

SEC. 2. REDUCTION IN AMOUNT AUTHORIZED FOR SALARIES AND EXPENSES OF HOUSE LEADERSHIP OFFICES IN 2011 AND 2012.

(a) REDUCTION.—The head of any House leadership office may not authorize the disbursement of any amounts appropriated for salaries and expenses of such office during calendar year 2011 or fiscal year 2012 at a rate exceeding 95 percent of the rate provided for such salaries and expenses for fiscal year 2010.

(b) DEFINITION.—In this section, a “House leadership office” is any office whose salaries and expenses were appropriated for fiscal year 2010 under the heading “House leadership offices” in the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2010.

SEC. 3. REDUCTION IN AMOUNT AUTHORIZED FOR EXPENSES OF COMMITTEES IN 2011 AND 2012.

(a) PRIMARY EXPENSE RESOLUTIONS.—The aggregate amount authorized for expenses of committees of the House of Representatives for 2011 and 2012 under primary expense resolutions adopted by the House under clause 6 of rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives may not exceed 95 percent of the aggregate amount provided for expenses of committees under such resolutions for 2010 and 2011.

(b) INTERIM FUNDING PENDING ADOPTION OF PRIMARY EXPENSE RESOLUTIONS.—Notwithstanding paragraph (c) of clause 7 of rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives, each committee described in paragraph (a) of such clause shall be entitled for each month during the period specified in paragraph (a) of such clause to 95 percent of the amount otherwise determined under paragraph (c) of such clause.

SEC. 4. REDUCTION IN AMOUNT AUTHORIZED FOR SALARIES AND EXPENSES OF COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS IN 2011 AND 2012.

The chair of the Committee on Appropriations may not authorize the disbursement of any amounts appropriated for salaries and expenses of the Committee during fiscal year 2011 or fiscal year 2012 at a rate exceeding 91 percent of the rate provided for such salaries and expenses for fiscal year 2010.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 5(b) of House Resolution 5, the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRADY) each will control 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.
the taxpayers’ dollars demonstrates, we hope, to the American people that we are listening.

Mr. Speaker, the people’s House should act first and lead by example. Everybody knows that across this country families and small businesses have cut their spending, are paying off their debt, and are striving to live within their means. We should do the same, and this legislation is a beginning. Chairman Brady does that by having an immediate impact, and I would like to thank the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) and his transition team for their hard work and their constructive ideas.

Under this resolution, each leadership, committee and Member office in the 112th Congress will receive no more than 95 percent of its 111th Congress funding level. In fiscal year 2011, this will mean a savings of $1 million from leadership offices, a savings of $8.1 million from committee budgets, and a savings of $26.1 million from, collectively, the Members’ office budgets. For those who may not know, the Members’ budgets are the specific amounts that are given to Members so that they can carry out their functions as Members of Congress. It includes the ability to communicate with their constituents, it includes paying their staff off. It includes paying for their transportation from their district to Washington, D.C. and back; it includes the rental on their district offices. In other words, it is the money that is utilized for Members to carry out their official activities. These are important jobs that Members are required to do if in fact we are to represent our people appropriately. Nonetheless, even though these are important things that we do, we should try to be even more efficient in the way that we do them. That is the purpose of this legislation before us.

Mr. Speaker, these are substantial cuts in budgets, in budgets that frankly cannot and are in an upward trajectory. We must all find ways to do more with less, to enhance our productivity, and to ferret waste or inefficiencies wherever they may be. With that being said, this initial savings is only a down payment on future efforts. My colleagues and I on House Administration are dedicated to continuing savings and reductions in spending in other areas as well. Thus, for fiscal year 2012, we have committed to keep the same percent reduction in place. We are also directing all House officers, such as the Clerk, the Sergeant at Arms and the Chief Administrative Officer, to find savings within their own organizations without sacrificing the efficiency and the excellence with which they pride themselves on maintaining; in other words, to do what all Americans are attempting in their own lives, finding ways to do more with less. We look forward to hearing from these and other Members in specific ways on what their cost-savings plans will be.

As has been said by our Speaker, we have committed to cutting domestic spending and returning non-security discretionary spending to 2008 levels. If we could live on that level of spending a mere 2 years ago, surely we can find ways to do so again. Again, American families are doing it. American businesses are doing it. We must try as well.

Mr. Speaker, listening to the American people and restoring the proper role of government means decreasing spending, ending our deficit mentality, and fostering job creation. These are the virtues we should pursue to the country great and will sustain us in the future.

I want to publicly thank my colleague from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) and his transition team for the efforts that they have put into this legislation, and I would urge all of my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as a staunch advocate for strong, accountable stewardship of hard-earned taxpayer dollars, I applaud any efforts to responsibly address this concern. This is a constant challenge for our district every day in the city of Philadelphia, and I spend a large portion of every day listening to constituents as they voice their concerns over our economy and the real impact it has on their day-to-day lives. Importantly this House must take steps to ensure that resources are effectively utilized, administered and accounted for. To that end, I support this resolution and encourage my colleagues to do so as well.

During the 111th Congress, significant steps were taken by the House leadership to expand transparency and responsible use of taxpayer dollars. At the direction of Speaker PELOSI, the Committee on House Administration worked with the office of the CAO to introduce the House statement of disbursements in an online, electronic format. For the first time, constituents, the media and other concerned individuals could review every penny spent by Members, committees and leadership offices.

Through the Green the Capitol initiative and with the cooperation of the Architect of the Capitol, we rolled out enhancements designed to increase the energy efficiency of the Capitol Complex, resulting in cost savings.

Under the Democratic majority, we put in place requirements that only vehicles meeting lower greenhouse emissions standards were eligible for MRA-funded lease payments. Not only does this have a positive environmental impact, it also reduces fuel costs, since these vehicles are generally more fuel efficient.

The cost savings that were introduced were done responsibly and with a constant eye on ensuring that Members have the resources they need also to be able to serve their constituency. That’s ultimately the reason why we are here. I look forward to exploring additional, responsible cost savings opportunities with Chairman LUNGREN in the spirit of bipartisanship cooperation that we have enjoyed for many years, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) who spent an enormous amount of time beginning immediately after the elections to bring us to this point.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman of the House Administration Committee for his help and assistance as we worked through the transition. I also want to thank the ranking member the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRADY) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS) as well who were designated by then-Speaker PELOSI to be a formal conduit for us on the transition. They were most helpful and gave us good input and advice. And I want to thank all the Members who participated and the staff whom we reached out to in a survey across this campus to say, How can we do this better? How can we be more efficient with our time and the taxpayers’ money? Where can we cut costs?

Today is that first installment. There is an old saying that the journey of a thousand miles begins with a single step. Ladies and gentlemen, this is a single step forward, but it is a $35 million first step. We think we can at least save that in this effort today, and leadership really starts at the top.

The American people have spoken loudly and clearly. They are very concerned about the economy and their local and their communities and they are equally and deeply concerned about the deficits that have been racked up by both parties over time. We have to turn that around, or we end up looking like some of these countries elsewhere around the globe that are facing financial ruin if they don’t change. We have to change, too, and we are asking ourselves to take the first step here and save at least $35 million.

As the gentleman from Pennsylvania has pointed out, the gentleman from California has pointed out, this is the first installment. Our management team in this organization is looking at each department on how they can achieve additional savings. As you know, we have an Inspector General that looks at everything on Capitol Hill and identifies ways we can improve safety and security and cut costs and be more efficient, so we are letting them do their management piece.

Now, I was a small business owner for 22 years, and I have lived with that Oregon. I understand that if you don’t watch the pennies and the nickels, you will never get to the dollars. You have to look at
everything you do in real time to try and squeeze out efficiency, and I think we have done that.

As Republicans, our pledge to America was to do exactly that across the government, and you will see oversight hearings about policy, oversight hearings about job创造 jobs and stopping regulations because we want to get America working again. And I know my colleagues on the other side of the aisle share that view, that it is the private sector jobs that we have to get restored in this country. We have to grow the economy and create jobs and put Washington's fiscal house in order, and we will take the first steps today with this legislation and this resolution.

So, specifically, we cut we believe $35 million out of our own budgets. It is a 5-percent reduction, except, I should point out, the Appropriations Committee will actually suffer a 9-percent reduction, and they came forward with that level. I applaud them for that. That's a flexible. Members will still determine within their budgets how they are spent. We don't micromanage here. We treat you as adults, and we are going to treat government agencies as adults. But we will expect results because the American people spoke clearly in November and said, we want transparency, we want openness, we want accountability, we want you to cut deficit spending, and we want you to create private sector jobs.

So, Mr. Chairman, I think we have begun that process today. I thank my colleagues on the other side of the aisle for supporting this bipartisan effort.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. I also would like to thank Mr. WALDEN for allowing us to participate, myself and Mr. ANDREWS from New Jersey.

I certainly do not want to get you in any kind of trouble here today, but we did have some ideas that happened to fall into place. It's not impossible to implement. You know that was just great minds thinking alike. It wasn't that it was our idea that did that. But I am talking especially toward the schedule. I do appreciate that. I appreciate you allowing us to participate in what you have done there and look forward again to working with you in the future.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. RODERS), the chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this is a historic time for this Congress, this House and my committee. I can say without a moment's hesitation that this day represents a crucial turning point for our Nation as this new Congress begins a path of fiscal sanity.

With this resolution today, Congress will begin immediately to reduce spending, starting here and now with our own office budgets and our committee budgets and the like.

To demonstrate my strong commitment to slashing spending, reducing our national deficit and getting our economy back on track, I have directed my own committee budget to be cut not by 5 percent, Mr. Speaker, but by 9 percent, nearly double the amount of reduction proposed for other House offices. What the Appropriations Committee is saying to all other committees is, we are seeing your four. So we are cutting 9 percent.

This year, the Appropriations Committee will be ground zero for a wide range of reductions across the Federal Government, and by cutting our own budget first, Mr. Speaker, we are showing we are willing to lead by example. This is a critical time for the Appropriations Committee, as we will carry out the most expansive reduction of discretionary spending in the history of this country. Under my watch, the Appropriations Committee will be an instrument of change, to enforce the will of the American people.

My Republican colleagues on the committee and I are ready to stand and fight for the American people and show that we are serious about our commitment to rein in government spending and control our exploding deficits. Yet it is important to remember that slashing spending to save taxpayer dollars and reducing the size of government is a means to an end. We must always keep our eyes on the ultimate goal—improving our economy, getting our people back to work and safeguarding the Nation's financial security for the future.

The one and only mandate that we received from the American people in November, in my judgment, was to put our own house in order. This is why people came to the polls and voted for a change in this body, and this is the duty that we must fulfill.

To this end, it is clear that this Congress cannot let favor get in the way. We've got to make sure that every task of government is accomplished more efficiently and more effectively than it ever has been before, because if life is going to change in America, life has to change here in Washington. And this is the first step.

I urge the adoption of this resolution.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. At this time I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. ROBY), a member of the transition team.

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, our Nation is on an unsustainable path. Over the last 2 years, all we have seen from Washington is more spending, more borrowing, and more debt. The American taxpayer has been burdened with $3 trillion worth of bailouts and buyouts. Never before has the government spent so much while the people received so little. One of the goals of the transition team was to restore fiscal responsibility to Congress. And I would like to thank the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) for his leadership on that transition team.

The American people have been making these tough choices all along. I think it's time that this House put its own house in order. But we have to remember that actions speak louder than words. Difficult times mean leaders have to lead. We have a chance to take a bold step to say that we're going to try to stop this culture of spending that we've all gotten used to and say, let's start a culture of savings.

Now, that's not going to be easy. It's going to be hard. It's going to be painful. It's going to be difficult. It's going to take courage. But that's where we begin to start. That's what this resolution does. It says that we're going to take the first step. We're going to cut our own spending. We're going to do more with less. And I think right now we can do a whole lot more with a whole lot less. I know that, you know that, and I think the American people know that. But we all know that we need money to provide services.

Right now, it seems to me that government needs something more. We need discipline to rein in spending. We need courage to make the right decisions, even when they're hard. And we need to seize the challenge to provide services in these difficult times. We've got to make sure that every task of government is accomplished more efficiently and more effectively than it ever has been before, because if life is going to change in America, life has to change here in Washington. And this is the first step.

So I urge the adoption of this resolution.
Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. On the campaign trail for the last several months we’ve heard two things from people. We’ve heard: cut spending, cut spending, cut spending. And the other thing we heard consistently was: live by the decisions that you make in Congress. Well, today we have a great opportunity before us. We have an opportunity to do both—to start cutting spending—$35 million-plus in spending cuts—starting with us. It means that we start first and foremost by living with the decisions that we make. A 5-percent deduction in our MRAs gives us an opportunity to not spend the money so that other folks in families and small businesses have an opportunity when not paying taxes to invest more money in the future of their country and their families.

Second, as we consistently live under our own decisions, we tell the American people that we are simply “listening.” I heard constantly that the American people want a Congress that listens; that hears what they’re saying; that understands their pain and then does something about it. The first step in that direction is for us to start living within our own means and to tell the American people that we hear them.

If we want to restore the confidence of the American people in their elected officials, we must start by doing things like this—cutting ourselves first and asking the rest of the government to follow.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, at this time it is my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER), a member of the transition team.

Mr. GARDNER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, today I am glad to support a resolution that puts away the knives of politics and instead pulls out the shears of budget cutting. Thank you to the leadership and the committee members for your work on the transition committee to again restore accountability and transparency by leading by example in one of the most historic institutions this world has ever witnessed.

Throughout my time in the State legislature of Colorado and throughout the past several months I have talked to constituents around the Fourth Congressional District of Colorado about the need to lead by example—the need to start in our own backyard first to cut our budgets to make sure that we are leading by example. Just a couple of rows from here in this Chamber when I too had a 7-year-old daughter accompanied me to witness the transition of power. But that means nothing if we cannot lead by example. And I will have failed her as a 7-year-old child, and every child like her, if we do not lead by example—and we start today by cutting our own budgets.

The 5 percent cut to our budget is not massive, but it is monumental. And it’s something that we must all take seriously. Our efforts to start living like the American people. Around this country, citizens of the United States are looking to Congress for signs of hope—signs of hope that we have learned a lesson that this Congress has spent too much, grown too much, and that we will put our own house in order.

Mr. Speaker, today I have the honor of standing in support of a resolution that says to the American people we will indeed lead by example. We will begin in our house first.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, at this time it gives me a great deal of pleasure to yield 1 minute to the majority leader, the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR).

Mr. CANTOR. Thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. Speaker, our new majority will be a results-driven Congress with one clear goal: to create jobs and generate economic growth. Our defining principle will be “cut-and-grow.” Cut spending and job-killing regulations and grow jobs.

Our mission is urgent. For the economy to grow, families, businesses, and financial markets need to know that we are serious about cutting spending. If we don’t act, the threat of future tax increases, inflation, and higher borrowing costs will continue to serve as an anchor on the economy.

Beginning the new Republican majority by cutting our own congressional operating budgets will indeed set the right message. The days of families and small businesses tightening their belts while the Federal Government goes on a spending spree are over. This self-imposed 5-percent cut to our own House operating budgets is the first step in a probably very painful process where we have to understand and wrestle with this beast and where everybody is going to have to sacrifice, but it is the first step and a very necessary step to ensure that we are leaving our children a Union, a country, far better than the one we inherited.

So to the people of the 11th District of Illinois and to the people of America, let me say the freshman class and the Republican majority have heard your voices. We heard what you said on November 2. We are going to cut Federal spending and are going to cut spending and cut spending, and make you proud.

Thank you so much for the opportunity to address this issue.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to yield 3 minutes to another gentleman who served us well on the transition team, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KINZINGER).

Mr. KINZINGER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. HARPER), a member of the House Administration Committee.

Mr. HARPER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for yielding.
Mr. Speaker, I am eager to enact the Republican governing agenda that focuses on creating jobs, driving down spending and shrinking the size of the Federal Government.

Republicans will take swift action to turn around the failed economic policies of the last 2 years to the conservative principles to promote prosperity through individual freedoms and liberties. Our plan includes initiatives to pay down the national debt and put the current budget back on a path to a balanced budget. This goal can be achieved by employing fiscally conservative policies—just like this.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government is broke, borrowing 41 cents of every dollar that we spend. Nearly one in 10 American workers is unemployed while the Federal Government has added 100,000 new jobs. Washington continues to record trillion dollar deficits despite the fact that family budgets get smaller. The government cannot continue to grow while Americans’ wallets shrink.

As lawmakers, we must lead by example. For this past Congress, my first term as a Member of Congress, my office has come in under budget, voluntarily returning approximately 10 percent of the Members’ representational allowance. This gesture has not impacted the quality of our representation and our constituent services. During this time period, my office has replied to over 37,000 emails and letters and has connected with nearly 82,000 constituents via telephone.

I urge Congress to follow this example by providing taxpayers with a fiscally responsible operating budget. Our path to a balanced budget begins today, and it begins with this vote.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, at this time, it is my privilege to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mrs. MILLER), who has done great work in the past about the operations of this House.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I thank Mr. LUNGREN. I thank Mr. BRADY. I thank Mr. WALDEN and the members of the transition team, many of whom have spoken on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, clearly, it is time for us—we Members of Congress of the House of Representatives—with House Resolution 22 to show good faith and regard to tightening our belts. It has been said by other Members that cutting the Members’ representational allowance is kind of routine for a lot of the Members.

I know that, this past year, I returned something like $160,000 of the MRA to the Treasury and, over the course of my 8 years in Congress, in the aggregate, some $900,000. Quite honestly, that is more than a 5 percent cut. So it can be done, and many Members have done that as well.

We have concerns, of course, as to where that money goes to. Does it go to truly reducing the deficit and long-term debt?

I will be introducing, Mr. Speaker, legislation later on today that by law requires that that money that is turned back in goes back to the taxpayer. Your own resolution, Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 22, is something that I think will have wide, if not unanimous, bipartisan support.

As I say, the former chairman of this committee, Mr. BRADY, now the ranking member, of the current chairman’s committee, my good friend Dan Lungren from California, is of the same mind in regard to fiscal responsibility and doing what is right for the American people.

On November 2, they were telling us, Look, we are sick and tired of you guys who just keep throwing money at things, like the $1 trillion cost of the stimulus bill and another $1 trillion for the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act. Some people recognize that better than others, you know, when you’ve got $1.4 trillion worth of deficit for 2 or 3 years in a row, no wonder you add $5 trillion to the long-term debt, and you get up to something like $14 trillion.

So, Mr. Speaker, at a time when there is a 9.8 percent unemployment rate and when families across the country are forced to tighten their belts, I wholeheartedly believe that Congress should lead by example. That is what we are doing with this bill. I appreciate my colleagues giving me time to weigh in on this. I fully support it, and I look forward to being a member of the committee.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER), who has done great work in the past about the operations of this House.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we have a spending problem here in the Congress of the United States. We know it. All the Members here know it, and certainly the American people know it as well.

Over the past few years, we have run deficits of over $1 trillion each year, and we have driven our national debt over $14 trillion. We shrink, we get smaller.

On November 2, 2010, the American people spoke out in a very loud and clear voice: Stop the reckless spending.

The Republican majority elected on November 2 heard the call of the American people, and we will start the spending cuts today by cutting our own budgets by 5 percent.

You know, since my election to Congress, I have always tried to be a good steward of the money that is appropriated to my budget to serve my constituents. In fact, we will start the spending cuts today by cutting our own budgets by 5 percent.

You know, since my election to Congress, I have always tried to be a good steward of the money that is appropriated to my budget to serve my constituents. In fact, we will start the spending cuts today by cutting our own budgets by 5 percent.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Congress to follow this example by providing taxpayers with a fiscally responsible operating budget. Our path to a balanced budget begins today, and it begins with this vote.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman, my friend from the great State of Pennsylvania, who has worked on a bipartisan basis, most of the time, and what I mean by that is about 85 percent or 90 percent of the work we do on our committee has to do with making this place work, helping Members do the job that they were elected to do, to represent their constituents, and making sure this institution of the House of Representatives works. There is a sense of a pride of the institution that I think marks our committee, and we try in a very real way to work, both on the Democratic and Republican sides, to ensure the productivity of the membership here and to ensure that, frankly, the people get their money’s worth.

About 10 or 15 percent of what we have to do has to do with the time law, and I might say that that’s not always as obviously bipartisan, but we’ve always done it in the spirit of civility and always done it in the spirit of respect for one another, and for that, I would like to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, this is an important vote. In comparison to a trillion-dollar budget and trillion-dollar deficit people
might say this is a small amount. It is not a small amount. It is a serious 5 percent cut with respect to the operations of this House in very, very significant ways. It is a down payment on the future actions of this House with respect to the other operations of the House, but as we scan across the entire Federal Government, this marks the down payment on that new vision.

So I would once again like to thank the Congressman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN).

I have just discovered that I do have another speaker here, and with the indulgence of my friend on the other side, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WALSH).

Mr. WALSH of Illinois. I apologize. I snuck up on you there.

I rise today to support H. Res. 22 in the House. We were elected this past fall to do what we said we were going to do. An example is when it comes to spending and tightening our own belts. Following through on this key pledge that we made in the Pledge to America I think is vital. We’re taking the first step before we ask others to tighten their own belts, and it’s important and this is our first step, hopefully, in an ongoing effort to continue to cut costs.

This will impact each and every one of us, and I think it’s very important to the American people that they see we are talking the talk and walking the walk.

Mr. CONVERS. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise in strong opposition to the House Resolution 22, which would cut Congress’s budget by five percent in 2011 and 2012. The proposed cut undermines Members of Congress’s ability to serve their constituents and perform official duties.

Today, many communities around the Nation are recovering from the Great Recession. Members’ offices are flooded with phone calls from constituents who are facing foreclosure and having problems with their Social Security and Medicare. Furthermore, millions are looking toward Members of Congress for information on government programs, help on constituent casework, finding contracting opportunities with the federal government, and how to apply for federal grants. Lastly, it is imperative that constituents can voice their opinion on proposed legislation to our staff. Today’s draconian attempt to reduce Members of Congress’s budget would hamper their ability to fulfill these essential tasks for our fellow Americans.

At a time of economic crisis, a well functioning democracy cannot survive the “starve the beast” syndrome. Specifically, Congress needs talented staff to properly and judiciously advise Members on proposed legislation and help communicate our work to our constituents. A recent article in Politico found that the majority of congressional staff has not had an effective pay increase in many years. If we go down this road, eventually we will not be adequately staffed to fulfill the critical needs for Members of Congress.

The resolution today extends the failed mantra that government is the problem. In the run up to the Great Recession, many important federal regulatory agencies were severely underfunded and could not carry out their vital missions. The House of Representatives needs to reflect on this lesson and reject this failed right wing philosophy. I urge my colleagues to oppose today’s proposal.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, today I voted for H. Res. 22. I cut the House operating budget by 5%. It is important for the government to lead by example, especially during these tough economic times.

I would hope that having demonstrated that even the legislative branch itself is not exempt from budget cuts, that the Republican leadership would reconsider its decision to declare off limits major areas of government spending and savings.

Repealing the Affordable Care Act would be inconsistent with these efforts to reduce costs. The non-partisan Congressional Budget Office said that repealing health care would cost the American taxpayers $240 billion over the next 10 years. This is in addition to raising the average cost of health care for most Americans and leaving 32 million uninsured, and is something our economy cannot afford.

This is especially important when looking at defense spending. The Pentagon budget, growing at a rate far above inflation, is also the source of the greatest waste and inefficiency. GAO studies have documented tens of billions of dollars of waste, inefficiency and, in some cases, money that can’t be accounted for at all.

Even the Pentagon itself is making commitments for budget reduction and efficiency. Just today, Secretary Gates reached out to members of Congress to outline how he intends to trim $100 billion from within the Pentagon over the next five years. I hope these conversations don’t fall on deaf ears.

Every part of the budget deserves careful attention. I’m pleased that we’re starting with the legislative budget; I hope it will serve as a symbol that no part of the budget should be off limits, making the Defense Department the next source of inquiry, and not the last.

I look forward to working with all members, on both sides of the aisle, to help the government lead by example, lead by efficiency and improve our fiscal standing.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution to Cut Congress’s Budget. The American people are hurting and they deserve responsible leadership. This legislation, however, is an effort to deceive the American people into thinking that this new Congress is making a real effort to reduce the deficit. In fact this Congress is on a path to grow the deficit even further without providing any help to the American people.

As families are forced to tighten their belts, I wholeheartedly believe that Congress should lead by example. H. Res. 22 provides for a 5% reduction for each Member’s MRA, which I—as a new Member of the House Administration Committee—believe is a good starting point for us to rein in federal spending.

I know that some of my colleagues across the aisle will criticize this proposal for being an act of political theater or not going far enough, so I would ask them a simple question. If—as Members of Congress—we cannot support proposals to cut our own budgets, then how can the American people trust us to make much more difficult budget decisions down the road to reduce our massive debt?

Mr. Speaker, as families across the country continue to struggle financially, it is imperative that we show fiscal restraint, and there is no better place to start than here in the halls of Congress.

I ask all of my colleagues to support H. Res. 22.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution before the House today to reduce the budgets for Members’ offices as well as leadership and committee offices in the House of Representatives.

At a time when so many of our constituents are struggling to make ends meet in a difficult
California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN) of California. Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support this resolution. Let's make our repeal bill turn back the clock on the significant reforms we have made in the public health care repeal bill next week.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I demand yeas and nays. The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 408, nays 13, not voting, as follows:

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 8 I was unavoidably delayed. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes." Mr. RUNYAN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 8 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Mr. GERLACH. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 8 due to a bell malfunction in my office, I was unable to get to the floor to vote. Had I been in attendance, I would have voted "aye."

PERMISSION TO INCLUDE EXTRANEOUS MATERIALS

A message from the Senate by Mr. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a concurrent resolution of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

There was no objection.
107-306, as amended by Public Law 111-259, the Chair, on behalf of the Major-ity Leader, after consultation with the Chairman of the Select Committee on Intelligence, announces the appointment of the following individuals to serve on the National Commission for Review of Research and Development Programs of the United States Intelligence Community:

- Gilman Louie of California.
- Troy Wade of Nevada.

WELCOME HOME 101ST AIRBORNE DIVISION'S TASK FORCE RAKKASAN

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I humbly rise today to welcome home the heroic soldiers of the 101st Airborne Division's Task Force Rakkasan after a year's deployment in Afghanistan.

Mr. Speaker, this morning we read aloud the document we are all sworn to protect and defend. None defend that document and our freedom better than those deployed in harm's way. Many of the members of the Rakkasan have been deployed five times since September 11. They are part of the most deployed unit in the history of the U.S. Army. They have my profound gratitude for that service.

These brave soldiers served in and around Khost, Afghanistan. Together with their Afghan allies, they took 2,000 insurgents out of the fight and cleared the way for expanded Afghan governance. The Rakkasans arrived in a region that was controlled by the Taliban. They leave an area where children are free to go to school, play cricket, fly kites, all activities that children are free to go to school, play cricket, fly kites, all activities that are denied to the women and children of the Taliban. We will also remember those for their service and their sacrifice. We will also remember those deployed in harm's way. Many of them have been deployed in harm's way.

The Centers for Disease Control states that one out of every 110 children in the U.S. has autism. Autism impairs social interactions and communication skills. While some autistic children will grow up to function in society, others will require some level of professional care all of their lives.

Since its creation in 1992, the Dan Marino Foundation has raised over $30 million to support research, services, and treatment serving children and young adults.

I urge all south Floridians to participate and help make this first annual WalkAbout Autism event a success. Our combined efforts will help assure that all money raised here stays here and benefits children in our south Florida community.

Let's all WalkAbout Autism.

REMEMBERING TOM VANDERGRIFF

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

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in memory of Georgia State Patrol Trooper First Class Chadwick LeCroy, of Marietta, Georgia, my hometown, who was killed in the line of duty by an unrepentant thug on Monday, December 27. At the young age of 38, Mr. LeCroy was a highly respected husband, father, and public servant. He graduated from the 85th Georgia State Patrol Trooper School in August of 2008 and had been a highly respected law enforcement officer in the Atlanta area ever since.

Trooper First Class LeCroy is the 27th Georgia State Trooper to be killed in the line of duty, and he leaves behind his wife and two young sons. A hero like Trooper First Class LeCroy will not be forgotten, and I join his family and friends in mourning this momentous loss to them. I ask my colleagues to join me in remembering this loyal and heroic Georgian.

FIRST ANNUAL DAN MARINO FOUNDATION WALKABOUT AUTISM EVENT

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, January 29th, the Dan Marino Foundation will host its first annual WalkAbout Autism event at Sun Life Stadium in Miami from 10:00 to 2:00. One hundred percent of the proceeds will benefit our south Florida community-based programs that help children with autism and their families.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the following Members are recognized for 5 minutes each.

REMEMBERING TOM VANDERGRIFF

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Judge Tom Vandergriff was a Member of the House of Representatives from January 1982 until December 1984. He was defeated for reelection in November of 1984 by Dick Armey, moved back to Texas, and switched parties from the Democrat Party to the Republican Party. In 1990 he was elected county judge in which he served from 1990 until 2007. He passed away on December 30, 2010. His memorial service is tomorrow afternoon at the University of Texas, Arlington's Texas Center from 1 till 3.

Judge Vandergriff was a personal friend of mine. When I first was given part of Arlington in the redistricting process in 1992, I agreed to be my co-chairman for my campaign. He was just an absolute gentleman and helped in every way possible. One of the most unique things about Judge Vandergriff is that in his entire political career, which spanned from 1951 until 2007, he never held a political fund-raising event for himself. He did actually accept political contributions obviously but he never solicited and he never held an organized political event that he himself organized on his behalf. I think that was the kind of a modern political era to be as successful politically as he was without having to go out and do the numerous fund-raisers that most of us have to do.

We are going to miss Judge Vandergriff. He's got a lot of accomplishments a mile long. He was mayor of Arlington from 1951 until 1967. During his tenure as mayor, he was able to get the General Motors assembly plant located in Arlington; he helped get the Texas Rangers, which were then the Washing-ton Senators, to move to Arlington, and was able to attend the World Series this past October in which he saw the Texas Rangers first of all win the American League and then fight valiantly against the San Francisco Giants who ultimately won the World Series.

He wanted to be a broadcaster. He went to USC in Los Angeles, applied for a broadcasting job in 1947, and was not successful in getting the broadcasting job. It went to somebody named Chet Huntley, who later became an anchorman on NBC News. Judge Vandergriff returned to Texas to assume a role in his family's Chevrolet dealership with his father, which he maintained that dealership except for times when he was a U.S. Congressman in some capacity.

We're going to miss Judge Vandergriff. We give our condolences to his family. Again, he was a Member of Congress from 1982 until 1984 and he will be missed.

On December 30, 2010, Texas lost a lion. Tom Vandergriff, former mayor of Arlington, Texas, former County Judge of Tarrant County, and former Member of the United States Congress, which spanned from 1951 until 2007, he never held a political fund-raising event for himself. He did actually accept political contributions obviously but he never solicited and he never held an organized political event that he himself organized on his behalf. I think that was the kind of a modern political era to be as successful politically as he was without having to go out and do the numerous fund-raisers that most of us have to do.

We're going to miss Judge Vandergriff. We give our condolences to his family. Again, he was a Member of Congress from 1982 until 1984 and he will be missed.

On December 30, 2010, Texas lost a lion. Tom Vandergriff, former mayor of Arlington, Texas, former County Judge of Tarrant County, and former Member of the United States Congress, which spanned from 1951 until 2007, he never held a political fund-raising event for himself. He did actually accept political contributions obviously but he never solicited and he never held an organized political event that he himself organized on his behalf. I think that was the kind of a modern political era to be as successful politically as he was without having to go out and do the numerous fund-raisers that most of us have to do.

We're going to miss Judge Vandergriff. We give our condolences to his family. Again, he was a Member of Congress from 1982 until 1984 and he will be missed.
a selflessly devoted public servant who always put the people ahead of personal gain or ambition. Vandergriff was born on January 29, 1926, to W. T. and Charles Vandergriff in Carrolton, Texas. The family relocated to Arlington when Tom was 12. After graduating from Arlington High School, where he earned a bachelor’s degree in 1947, he married his high school sweetheart, Anna Waynette Smith in 1949. Blessed with a deep, sonorous voice that he used with perfect diction, he prepared for a career in radio and became a radio journalist. Many have their own stories to tell about Vandergriff, many humorous because he possessed a wonderful sense of humor. In many things he touched so many with acts of kindness large and small, and many inspirational because he inspired us, goaded us, and led us to be greater than we thought we were and achieved things we never thought possible. All in North Texas and better off today because Tom U.S.C. was here, and our children and grandchildren will have better lives even though they will never know him. Those of us who did will never forget him. He was a leader, and a good and faithful servant.

I now yield to Congresswoman Kay Granger of Texas who wishes to speak also on behalf of Judge Vandergriff.

Ms. GRANGER. Today we remember with great fondness Tom Vandergriff. He was a leader in everything he did. He was a man who saw challenges and tried to solve them. He found opportunities and made them work for us. He had a vision that he always reached for. He never accepted the status quo. He was always working for what ought to be.

As a successful businessman, a mayor, a Member of Congress and a county judge, he did so much to promote economic development and opportunities to make Tarrant County, Texas which it is today. Just think of this: Starting as, what he was called, the boy mayor, he was 25 years old. He served his community, helping Texas build General Motors, Six Flags Over Texas, the Texas Rangers, all to north Texas. He had a vision to anticipate the needs of a growing community and population. But more than that, he was a decent and kind man. His grace was not only by his actions but his personal character was exceeded only by his compassion for others. He was the epitome of a great public servant. He will be missed but not forgotten; and our thoughts and prayers are with his family.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Denton, Congressman Burgess.
Mr. BURGESS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As a member of the Tarrant County delegation, I also want to stand in remembrance of Tom Vandergriff and his 55-year career in public service. Thirteen years it took him to bring major league baseball to Arlington, Texas, and he took the team from Washington, DC that was then known as the Senators; had to fight two Presidents in a bipartisan fashion, both Lyndon Johnson and Richard Nixon.

Judge Vandergriff was the original representative from the 26th District of Texas when it was formed after the 1980 census. My fondest memory of Judge Vandergriff is, however, as the voice of the Texas Rangers. Along with Dick Risenhoover, he would do the broadcasts. They were spellbinding and exciting and kept me away many times from my graduate school studies.

To his family, we offer our prayers and condolences. Thank you, Judge Vandergriff, for 55 excellent years in public service.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I know we have a new protocol for recognizing former Members who have passed away. Is it appropriate under our rules to have a moment of silence for Judge Vandergriff? And if so, how would I request such a moment of silence?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would recommend that the gentleman from Texas consult with the leadership on such requests.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. So it would not be appropriate at this time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct, and the gentleman’s time has expired.

THE MINDLESS REPEAL OF THE ACCOUNTABLE CARE ACT

Mr. BURGESS. I am proud to have introduced a bill to prevent a repeal of the Accountable Care Act that was passed in the last session.

Under the health care reform law, we are going to take away your protection against insurance companies denying you coverage. It goes on and on and on, but I want to focus on one particular part of this bill. This bill has the largest middle class tax cut in history—take the largest tax cut for the middle class in history—because the tax cuts in this health care bill to help the middle class are used for giving credits to people when they buy insurance. People buy insurance, they get a tax credit. It is the largest one in history.

Let me say that again so you get it: They are going to vote next week. They are going to stand out here with a straight face and vote to repeal the largest tax cut for the middle class in history that will be worth $110 billion that they will take away from the middle class.

Now, a few weeks ago we passed a tax bill out of here and we had to give tax cuts to people who make millions and millions of dollars—millions. They said if you don’t give the tax cuts to the rich, we are not going to give them to the middle class. The entire Republican Caucus voted against tax cuts unavailable millions. Well, we should have learned from that that this repeal will be just more of the same—take $110 billion away from the middle class by taking a repeal of this law.

You don’t have to take it from me. This isn’t me making this up. Families USA, a nonpartisan group, has put out this information, and everybody understands it. Now, upstairs in the Rules Committee right now, I could be up there talking but I decided I will talk about the history of this because it is worth trying. It is worth doing.

In order to fulfill this mandate, we must fundamentally change the way we do business here in Washington. I have taken the first steps by introducing several legislative initiatives this week, and they are all centered around the pursuit of meaningful government reform.

Madam Speaker, transparency is an integral part of this package and a necessary element for real government reform. For the first time, the Constitution, a document critical to understanding our parameters and responsibility, was read right here in the House today, on the House floor.

I am proud to have introduced a bill as part of my initiative stating that any legislation brought to the floor must cite its constitutional authority. Many may find it surprising to know, Madam Speaker, that while votes taken on the floor of the House are available on the Net to view, or on the Web site, that is not necessarily the case for the committee.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Madam Speaker, under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Madam Speaker, my remarks will be about saving money, but I can’t help but take an opportunity to respond to the previous speaker, my good friend, the gentleman, the good doctor from the State of Washington.

I would say to him, Madam Speaker, and to my colleagues, when we repeal ObamaCare, which we will do in this House next Wednesday, parents will once again be able to afford a health insurance policy on which to include their adult children. That is what we will be doing.

As far as this $110 billion worth of savings we lose in repealing ObamaCare, Madam Speaker, we spent $1.1 trillion to save $110 billion. Hey, Madam Speaker, it is true that you can in fact go broke trying to save money.

With that, Madam Speaker, let me get on to my 5-minute discussion.

I rise today to encourage my colleagues to recall the conversations they had with their constituents during the recent campaign season. As we begin the 112th Congress, to remember that the American people spoke with a resounding voice, didn’t they, on November 2. They told us to abide by the Constitution, to rein in spending, bring about economic stability, create jobs, and end the culture of crafting legislation in the dark of night, 2,400 pages on the health care bill, outside of the view of the public.

In order to fulfill this mandate, we must fundamentally change the way we do business here in Washington. I have taken the first steps by introducing several legislative initiatives this week, and they are all centered around the pursuit of meaningful government reform.

Madam Speaker, transparency is an integral part of this package and a necessary element for real government reform. For the first time, the Constitution, a document critical to understanding our parameters and responsibility, was read right here in the House today, on the House floor.
hours, so the American people are kept better informed of what their Members are doing and how they are voting in committee.

Madam Speaker, the rejection by the American people of the Democrats' reckless spending emphasizes the importance of fiscal responsibility. Doesn't it? This is the reason I incorporated the Congressional Budget Accountability Act into my plan.

Each year, my colleagues and I receive a fixed budget for all office expenses. We call that the MRA, or the Members' Representation Allowance. This bill would codify that our unused MRA funds must be returned to the Treasury for debt and deficit reduction.

Along these lines, I have also included what is called the Fiscal Responsibility Act, which will preclude any Member of Congress from being eligible for a pay adjustment, a so-called COLA, if we have incurred a budget deficit in the previous fiscal year.

We have a bad must-pass budget amendment, Madam Speaker, but that doesn't mean we can't balance the budget, and I want to hold our feet to the fire. This is yet another way that we can do that.

Along that package, Madam Speaker, is a bill to prevent Federal employees from engaging in union activity on official time. It is amazing that this goes on, but we have estimated that in a 5-year period of time we could save the taxpayer over $1 billion and $1.2 billion in a 10-year period of time. Put simply, it is unacceptable that government employees paid with, yes, your tax dollars, are currently permitted to spend time during their workday performing union activities. I have already given you the savings.

Equally unacceptable is that legislators in Washington commonly attach provisions to unrelated must-pass bills. Let me give you an example, Military Construction-V

A couple of years ago, we passed that out of committee with an almost 100 percent bipartisan vote. The Democratic majority held that bill up for 100 days because they wanted to attach an unpopular bill, something like the Dream Act or Don't Ask, Don't Tell, some controversial bill, and put our veterans at jeopardy. They literally held them hostage. This bill, Madam Speaker, would say from now on, no attaching unpopular bills to good stand-alone bills, especially if they are for our veterans and the military.

Madam Speaker, in conclusion, while these bills may seem like a small start compared to the big challenges we have ahead of us in this Congress, the 112th, it is a pathway to start changing business as usual in Washington and fulfill the promises we made on November 2 to the American people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. Kaptur) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE PROSPERITY CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. McClintock) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McClintock. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my hope that historians will look back on the 112th Congress as the session that restored American prosperity and to express my strong resolution with the few tears of this House who have declared that every action of this body must be measured against this goal.

We speak of jobs, jobs, jobs, but jobs are merely a byproduct of prosperity. And prosperity is the product of freedom. Government does not create jobs or wealth. It merely redistributes them. Jobs and wealth can only be created through the free exchange of goods and services in a free market. Government's role is to create and protect the conditions which promote prosperity.

If I give you a dollar for a cup of coffee, what's going on in that transaction? I'm telling you that your cup of coffee is worth more to me than my dollar. And at the same time, you're telling me that my dollar is worth more to you than your cup of coffee. We make that exchange by matching our needs and resources and to make those exchanges that allow both to go away with something of greater value than we took in. Each of us goes away richer. That's the freedom that creates prosperity. That simple exchange, whether it's for a cup of coffee or a multibillion-dollar acquisition, is what creates wealth.

But now suppose some third party butts its nose into this transaction: Oh, no, the coffee has got to be between 110 and 130 degrees and it has to include a sugar cube. It must be consumed more than 25 feet from the point of sale. And on and on and on. Every one of these restrictions reduces the value of that exchange for the one or the both of us.

That's the fundamental problem that we face today. Our government has not only failed to protect the freedom that creates prosperity, but it has become destructive of that freedom. To create jobs, we must restore prosperity; and to restore prosperity, we must restore freedom. We must restore the freedom of choice that gives consumers the ultimate say over the output of our economy. In a free and prosperous society, consumers will buy or not buy with their own dollars on what kind of light bulbs they prefer or on how they want to get to work or what foods they like or how much water they want to put in their toilets or what kind of cars they want instead of what kind of housing they desire. These are the things that are actually worth and what our economy will actually produce.

Government is destroying the elegant simplicity of this process, and Congress must reverse this destruction. We must restore the freedom of individuals to enjoy the fruits of their own labor so that they can make these decisions for themselves once again. That's the personal incentive that is so destructive to prosperity. It destroys the freedom of individuals to make their own decisions over what to spend and where to invest their own money. It robs them of both the ability and the incentives for prosperity.

Presidents like Coolidge, Truman, Reagan, and Clinton, who have reduced government spending relative to GDP, all produced dramatic increases in productivity and prosperity and the general welfare of our Nation. And Presidents like Hoover, Roosevelt, Bush, and Obama, who have increased government spending relative to GDP, all produced long periods of economic recession and hardships. History now seems to be on the side of those who believe that government's role is to create and promote prosperity.

Along these lines, I have also incorporated the Congressional Budget Accountability Act into my plan. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. Engel) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DeFazio addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

REPEAL OF HEALTH CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DeFazio) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DeFazio addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)
At a time when we have so many pressing issues, I am really saddened that the majority wants to conduct this political charade. If there are problems with the health care law, we don’t have to repeal it. We could change parts of it. We could tweak it. We could put out of the bill what we don’t like and keep in the bill what we do like. But, unfortunately, the attitude and the decision has been made to try to repeal the whole bill.

My understanding of what the Rules Committee is discussing is the question of amendments to the bill. And we know no meaningful amendments, if anything, are going to be allowed. The Republican majority coming in says they’re going to have open rules. And we’re not going to have really an open rule on the first bill that they’re going to attempt to pass, which is a repeal of health care reform.

I think that the health care bill is a down payment on where we need to go. I think that we need to deliver good health coverage to the American people. And I think that my constituents and everyone else’s constituencies all across America, to me makes no sense whatsoever.

The big insurance companies have had it too big, too long. And my Republican colleagues, unfortunately, are right in bed with them. And I think that is something that the American people ought to see. Who do we care about, the big insurance companies, or do we care about the average American who is struggling day in and day out to get health care coverage? We have almost 50 million Americans without coverage. And it’s not only the people who are not covered now, but it’s working people who will find out in the days and months ahead if there is no health care bill, that they will be added to the rolls of people who are uncovered, and that people working hard will find out that the 50 million will swell to 60 million, 70 million, and maybe even more.

So it is going to affect all of us because the health care costs have been rising way, way beyond the rate of inflation, and that is why we needed to have health care reform.

I would say to my friends on the other side of the aisle: Let’s not posture politically. Let’s try to put our heads together and work in a bipartisan fashion to do something for the American people. If there is something in the bill that needs to be changed, then we should change it, but repeal is not the answer.

Every major bill, from Social Security, to the Civil Rights bills of the 1960s, to Medicare and Medicaid, all had to be tweaked after they were passed. All had to be changed a little bit. It is the same thing with this bill. We should not repeal it. We should fix it.

OMISSION FROM READING OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION—ARTICLE IV, SECTION 4; ARTICLE V

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereinafter in the Extensions of Remarks.

OVR HOME LAND, THE FORGOTTEN THIRD FRONT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, more border agents are being sent to the border. The border, as we all know, is violent, dangerous, and it is not safe. Drugs and guns and people and money cross back and forth across the border because two nations do not have operational control of that border. The border is desolate. It is hard. It is a war zone—but Madam Speaker, I am not talking about the border of the United States with Mexico. I am talking about the southern border, or the border with Pakistan and Afghanistan. That’s right. Border Patrol agents from the United States are going to Afghanistan to protect the Afghan border.
from the Taliban coming in from Pakistan. It is a war zone over there, and the Secretary of Homeland Security, Janet Napolitano, has said we are going to contribute Border Patrol agents to protect the border of Afghanistan. There are already 25 there, and more on the way.

Now, Madam Speaker, why are Border Patrol agents from the United States going to Afghanistan?

The marines and our soldiers and our troops over there can do the job. More importantly, we need the Border Patrol agents over here. “Homeland security” means that the Secretary of Homeland Security protects the American homeland, not the homeland of some other nation.

We need the help.

In fact, we need the military on our southern border. Our border is a war zone. Drugs and people and money crisscross our border with Mexico. It is a violent place. It is the third front. More recently, we have had several people murdered on the battlefront on our border. Let me relate three of those.

One of those was a 27-year-old female police chief in Mexico—right on the border with the United States. Chief Hermila Garcia was on the job for 51 days, and she was shot down, shot seven times by the drug cartels. A recent homicide on the border.

Border Patrol Agent Brian Terry was shot in the back while he was protecting our border. Ironically, he had been to Iraq and Afghanistan as a soldier, as a marine, and now he was back here, killed on our border.

Then David Hartley, a citizen, was murdered on Falcon Lake, in Texas, when he was with his wife, Tiffany, as they were viewing an old mission. Shot and killed by the drug cartels.

Our homeland is not protected adequately, and it is time that we put Border Patrol agents on our border but also that we put the National Guard on our southern border. It is the third front. Homeland Security should protect it.

And that’s just the way it is.

AFGHANISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. Jones) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Madam Speaker, today, I have a photograph of Tyler Jordan, whose father, Phillip, was a marine gunnery sergeant killed in Iraq. I saw this photograph about 5 years ago in a national paper, and I felt that I needed to have this photograph for myself to be able to be reminded of war and the pain of war.

On Tuesday, I had the privilege and humbling experience to visit the wounded warriors at Walter Reed. I saw those people, those heroes were experiencing from the severe injuries they received fighting for this country. That’s why today I show you the photograph of Tyler Jordan’s pain as he holds a folded flag at his father’s funeral. This boy’s pain and the pain of the heroes at Walter Reed are the reasons I’ve joined my colleagues in both parties in asking President Obama to bring our troops home.

Madam Speaker, this country has many problems. Maybe I am wrong, but sadly, it seems to me, the war in Afghanistan seems to be on the back burner.

Before Christmas, I read from a Washington Post article that quoted President Karzai as saying he now has three main enemies—the Taliban, the United States and the international community. I said in that article that, if he had to choose sides today, he would choose the Taliban.

There have been many articles written questioning the success of our troops in Afghanistan, but our troops have been there seven times by the drug cartels. So why keep them in a country, risking their lives, when the President of that country supports the enemy?

The Afghan Government is corrupt. Not one American life should be sacrificed for a dysfunctional, corrupt government.

In mid-December, President Obama released a review of the American strategy in Afghanistan that painted a positive picture of the progress being made there. This review is, at best, dubious. I agree with two national intelligence reports that were also released with a more realistic, negative assessment on the state of the war and our chance for success.

As I have said before, we are spending approximately $7 billion a month, which is $234 million a day, to fight a warless war for a corrupt government. Why do we continue to spend $234 million a day so that some other child has to know Tyler’s pain?

In closing, I would like to ask God, as I do every day on the floor when I speak, to please bless our men and women in uniform. I ask God to please bless the men and women in uniform. I ask God, in his loving arms, to hold the families who have given a child dying for freedom in Afghanistan and Iraq.

I ask God, please bless this House and Senate that we will do what is right in the eyes of God for the American people; and I will ask God to give wisdom, strength, and courage to the President of the United States that he will do what is right in the eyes of the American people.

And I will say three times: God, please, God please, God, please continue to bless America.

THE PEOPLE’S HOUSE SHOULD LISTEN TO THE PEOPLE: BRING OUR TROOPS HOME FROM AFGHANISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. Woolsey) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, this week as the 112th Congress begins, there is a lot of talk from the Republicans about ending business as usual and doing things differently than before. For all the change afoot, there’s one critical matter on which the new majority is fully embracing the status quo—the war in Afghanistan that is now nearly a decade old. This war has been going on so long that 55 percent of my colleagues weren’t here when it started.

We’ve heard plenty about changing the House rules, about changing the way we conduct the Nation’s business, about changing the relationship between the government and the people. We’ve even heard about how a new law that will provide affordable health care to all Americans is somehow the greatest threat to the Republic and the constitutional order.

But the subject of war—a disastrous war that has taken the lives of more than 1,400 Americans in Afghanistan and cost taxpayers some $366 billion—the new congressional majority is interested in no change whatsoever.

In his speech yesterday, Speaker BOEHNER spoke of giving government back to the people. In his speech he talked about honesty, accountability, and responsiveness. Look, if he meant that, he should be listening to the 60 percent of people who believe the war in Afghanistan is not worth fighting. A clear majority of Americans realize what so many in Washington refuse to acknowledge—that this war represents an epic failure, a national embarrassment, and a moral blight on our Nation.

On this matter of life and death, this issue that will determine how history judges the United States, most of the Representatives in the House, in the people’s House at that, have told the people that their point of view doesn’t matter, that we know better than what they know. As usual, the people are way ahead of their policymakers, just as they were 4 years ago on Iraq. They may hear reassuring platitudes from Washington about how we’re on track, but they can see the news for themselves. They can see that the security situation is in decline, that casualties are up, that the Taliban is strong, and that Afghan governance is ineffective at the very best and corrupt at the worst.

So I can’t think of anything more patronizing than to tell them not to worry their pretty little heads about that war, that we grown-ups in Washington have it all taken care of. We’re not bowing before them, Madam Speaker; we’re sticking our finger in their eyes.
Do we truly believe it's about them and not us? Do we truly believe that we are caretakers whose only legitimacy derives from our employers who elect us? If that’s true, then it’s time for the Representatives of the people’s House to start listening to the people.

With that, it’s time to bring our troops home.

SPENDING CUTS IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. AKIN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. AKIN. Madam Speaker, I appreciate an opportunity to talk about a subject that I think has been on a lot of Americans’ minds over particularly the last couple of years, and it’s the subject of spending cuts in the Federal Government.

Now, unless people are perhaps tuned in to some other planet, they realize that the Federal Government is spending more money than we take in, and so we’re going to have to make some adjustments. Therefore, the idea is that we need to do some spending cuts. So that’s what we wanted to talk about here for a little while, and I’m joined by some good friends and some very trusted Congressmen on this subject.

Just to try to frame what we’re talking about a little bit—and I usually have some charts to go along with this, but the charts haven’t been printed yet—if you take a look, these are pretty simple numbers. If you take a look at the spending projection for 2011, it’s $3.834 trillion, and the income projection is $2.567 trillion. The two numbers aren’t the same, as you notice, and basically we’re spending more than a trillion, close to a trillion, trillion and a half dollars that we don’t have. And that suggests, for most Americans that have some level of common sense, that we’re going to have to make some cuts in spending. So that’s the overall subject, and I think it’s one that gets everybody’s attention and that we need to give some thought to.

Now, obviously, right off the beginning of the bat, the new party, the Republicans, are running the House, and we’re trying to start off setting a good note. And, obviously, that note is spending cuts. There’s a fund that’s allocated to each Congress for them to run their office, to make their airplane flights, to pay phone bills, and things like that. We cut that 5 percent just as, in the sense, an indication of the fact that we’re serious about doing this spending cut. That certainly doesn’t get us to where we have to go, but at least it’s a start.

There are a number of different ways we can approach this subject, but one of the other things that we’ll be talking on this week, aside from the 5 percent cut in congressional budgets, is the fact that we want to get rid of this tre-

mendously expensive government takeover of the health care in America. It’s known as ObamaCare, I suppose. And I’m joined by good friend who has joined me on the floor many times in the past 2 years, a medical doctor from Georgia, Mr. GINGREY, and he is somebody who knows by heart, not only the medical profession but this bill which has the government taking over all of health care.

Now, as you can imagine, that would be expensive. It would be expensive to American citizens. It would be expensive to businesses and expensive to the Federal Government. So, one place we can start talking about spending cuts is what we’ll be voting on before too long, which is to get rid of this government takeover of health care, and for that reason, I would like to recognize my good friend. Dr.—Congressman—

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Missouri and I know that when he was referring to my medical expertise in regard to knowing that subject inside and out, no pun was intended when he mentioned that.

I do know a lot more about health care, probably, than I do about government spending, but one thing’s for sure, Madam Speaker, as the gentleman pointed out: We are spending too much money. And I think the figures today, this year, last year, we spent a third more than we took in. In my view, you know, we have a revenue stream from the taxation of the American people, and yet we went beyond that by $1 trillion of borrowed money; and, of course, of the nondomestic creditors, the largest one is China. They hold a lot of our debt. They happen to be, now, the second largest economy in the world at $9 trillion GDP.

We had a about $15 trillion GDP, but the thing that is so scary and frightening about that is we owe $14 trillion. This is our debt, and it is approaching 100 percent. So, you know, when we stand up, Madam Speaker, as we’re doing right now and talk about this issue, we’re almost in panic, and we should be because we’re right on the precipice, right on the edge of becoming part of the PIGS acronym—Portugal, Italy, Ireland, Greece, Spain.

And, you know, we point the finger at them. But goodness gracious, it’s like the Bible scripture that I’m sure the Representative from Missouri probably knows by heart. But it goes something like, if you’ve got a plank in your own eye, you’re not pointing out the speck in somebody else’s. We’ve got a plank in our own eye. And this is why in this 112th Congress, we have a huge challenge, don’t we, my colleagues? We have a huge challenge. We’re up to it. We’re up to it, and I hope that we’ll be up to it on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. AKIN. So let’s say that we get what you’ve been working for, and let’s just say by some great miracle that we were able to stop that ObamaCare. Now that would save a whole, whole lot of money, wouldn’t it, in terms of—

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Well, re-laxing the claim that the gentleman made to me, Madam Speaker, absolutely. The gentleman from Washington, our esteemed colleague, a physician, Mr. MCDERMOTT was on the floor a little earlier talking about, well, what we were trying to do in repealing ObamaCare, or the formal rec-ognition of the bill. Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

Mr. AKIN. I call it socialized medi-}

C.
spending cuts and the proper role of government. What better way to start it than reciting the Constitution today. And hopefully Members of this body listened and heard. They didn’t get up and just read a sentence or two or an amendment and then cut. They assumed it in their mind and are starting to understand what it means. Because for too long, the Federal Government has been kicking the can down the road on spending. Saying, Oh, elect me, elect me, and over the last several years. When you look at the data, it’s clear that deficit spending has occurred at an average, just in the last fiscal year, of probably $110 billion a month deficit spending.

Mr. AKIN. Oh, wait. And $110 billion a month. That used to be the deficit in a whole year.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Right.

Mr. AKIN. Wow, we are setting all kinds of records in the wrong direction.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. You are right. And that leads up to this discussion that we are hearing now in the media which I don’t know where they are getting it from. It seems every months talking about the debt ceiling. Well, the reason we’re approaching and about to pierce the debt ceiling is this deficit spending that has occurred from the previous leadership here in the House, we would say the administration who is still there.

And as we approach this debt ceiling, we have got to push spending cuts more and more and more. And I’m thankful that I just was sworn in for the second time yesterday—

Mr. AKIN. We’re glad to have you back again, and we thank the good people of Georgia for making a good decision there.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Well, thank you. But being appointed to the Appropriations Committee, it is clear, and I have made it clear to my constituents, that I am not going on as a spender. I’m going on as a saver. It seems for far too long we would seek every omnibus appropriations because they wanted to spend money. Well, guess what. It’s a new day, a new era. And it’s a just fresh day when you have Members going on to say, Here is how we are going to save money. So what a great debate we are going to have in the next several weeks.

Mr. AKIN. That’s good. Now, let’s get on to this just a little bit more. Let’s try to get into the details in terms of procedures now. Now you’ve got a new Congress. Republicans are in the majority, and we’ve got the problem. When you take a look at the numbers and we’re spending a third more than what we’re taking in, we know we’ve got to stop. But let’s go one of the things that people want to pin us down on, okay, you guys are such big mouths about cutting spending, what are you not going to fund? Because there is going to be some group that is going to get mad at you. So how are you going to it approach it?

And one thing that I know in State governments they do sometimes is they say. Well, what we’ve got to do is, we’re 10 percent over budget, so we need to cut 10 percent off of everything. That makes it seem to be fair. And that would be one way you might approach what we’ve got going on.

Mr. AKIN. Mr. GRAVES, you are absolutely right. I think what we’ve heard about repealing ObamaCare—yesterday I introduced the legislation again to defund it, to take away all authorizing funds going to the legislation as well, which is another step forward. You know, you need to roll some back. That’s a whole other discussion that we’ve all seen.

And then as we move back to those 2008 levels, and we might need to go even just a little bit further and begin cutting more and more and more. And I mean, are the decisions going to be difficult? Sure, they are. But that’s why your constituents and mine elected us to come here and make those tough decisions.

Mr. AKIN. Congressman GRAVES, let me lay out two ways you could approach it. If you’ve got just a little bit you’ve got to cut, you could maybe take a little bit from everything. But there’s another way you could look at it when you’ve got to cut one-third. One way you could do it would be to say, What are the essential functions that the Federal Government has to do, and what are things that we really don’t have to do because a State could do it or the private sector could do it?

I yield to the Chair.

The SPEAKER. THE SPEAKER. The Speaker administers the oath of office to them as follows:

Do you solemnly or affirm that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter, so help you God.

Congratulations. You are now officially Members.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER). The gentleman from Missouri may resume.

Mr. AKIN. So we were just talking about now you’ve got the situation with the Federal Government spending a third more than it takes in. So we’ve got to figure out some way of how we’re going to skin this cat.

And one way is to just try to take a certain 10 percent or whatever the percentage is, it would be 33 percent off of everything or whatever. Or what you could say would be, what are the things that we have to do, and what are the things that maybe are nice but we can’t afford it, and what are the things that may be actually unconstitutional. And I suspect when you’re one-third over budget, it’s going to be hard to just do a set percentage across the board. I’m hoping we get to go into, I think, some very interesting questions about what’s really constitutional and does the Federal Government really have to do that function? Maybe it’s an important thing to get done, but maybe the Federal Government shouldn’t do it. So I just wanted to throw it into your discussion.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Yes, I would be happy to just add a little bit more to that.

I think a few approaches you could take when you ask the question. Is it duplicative? Is it occurring somewhere elsewhere? Have we usurped the States in which I would think many Members of our conference here would probably agree. In some cases, the Federal Government has overstepped its bounds, and it’s time to remove ourselves from the States and allow the States to take over.

But you know, from a business owner’s perspective, what if you looked at the Department heads or the agency heads and you said, You go back and you cut 25 percent and you bring back your recommendations; and then you show us a budget estimate with 20 percent cuts and then one with 10 percent, empower those agency heads to make those decisions, to analyze their Departments and come back.

While we’re also on the theme of physicians, we’re taking a surgical approach as well as pulling out those unnecessary programs. So that would be some approaches I would take.

Mr. AKIN. Well, let’s get some great recommendations here. To reinforce what you’ve said, I didn’t have time to get some of the charts that we normally have printed, but here’s some examples.

We’ve got 342 economic development programs. Do you think we really need 342 of them? Talk about duplicative. That seems to make your point.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. With unemployment at what?

Mr. AKIN. 10 percent or whatever. 130 programs serving the disabled. Do we need 130? Maybe it would be better to consolidate, just do a couple of good ones.

And then 130 programs serving at-risk youth. And so these are all of these things where you say it doesn’t even make common sense. We have to really start getting into analyzing, should we even be doing it, and then, if we should, do we need hundreds of programs doing something that should be done with one or two.
I see that Dr. GINGREY is back at it again. He just couldn’t sit still when we talk about cutting things. So just welcome to the discussion.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding. And I know we’ve got two other colleagues on the floor that want to speak. I can only stay for a few more minutes because of a prior engagement, so thank you for giving me an opportunity kind of in front of the queue, if you will.

But tell me one of the things in regard to how you cut, is it by picking and choosing, or in one fell swoop across the board? You know, we just passed a bill, last vote of the day, in regard to our own budgets. And that was a 5 percent across-the-board cut, Madam Speaker, in our member representational account, our expense account that we’re allotted each year to pay the salaries of our staff members, and to have a round trip ticket to our district once a week. And those budgets vary a little bit, depending on, obviously somebody from California is going to have more travel expense than somebody like myself and Representative Gravanda. But we just basically voted to cut 5 percent.

And I, quite honestly, and this question that has come up, Madam Speaker, my colleagues talk about, well, how do you do it? I just think we more and more need to look at this thing and say there are no sacred cows. And let these Departments make their case for why maybe there shouldn’t be an across-the-board, 2 percent, 3 percent, 4 percent cut. I know I voted in favor of that every time it comes up on these appropriations bills. We didn’t get to vote on any in the 111th Congress because our Democratic colleagues didn’t get their work done. But this is something we need to really look at carefully.

I know that most people, Madam Speaker, are reluctant to talk about cutting Homeland Security and cutting national defense, particularly when we have two wars going on and certainly not wanting to cut the veterans benefits. But there’s waste, fraud and abuse and duplication of things across every spectrum of this Federal Government. If we’re going to get serious about it, we need to have an adult conversation.

And, Madam Speaker and my colleagues, includes entitlements as well, because if we don’t address entitlements, we’re looking at one-sixth of the budget; and we’re never going to get there just addressing that small portion of the budget.

With that, I yield back and continue to listen to my colleagues.

Mr. AKIN. Hey, Doctor, it’s a treat to have you on the floor. And I’m going to run over to, moving a little bit from Georgia to the West, to the great State of Utah, Congressman Bishop, you’ve joined us on the floor a number of times. And one of the questions that—let’s say that you were on the Budget Committee or something, and you’re trying to prioritize, how are you going to—guns and butter, how are you going to prioritize defense versus advancement for the arts or whatever it is? How do we crack this nut about trying to do both reasonably? I would appreciate your perspective.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Let me try and hit, for just one moment, two potential areas to address that particular question, and it goes back to the fact that we did read the Constitution on the floor today.

You know it’s amazing, as P.J. O’Rourke once said, that the Constitution is 16 pages, which is the operator’s manual for 300 million people. The operator’s manual for the Toyota Camry, in contrast, is four times as large, and it only sells five.

But you also contrast that with what we have done in the lame duck session help the Senate’s omnibus spending bill, it’s not 16 pages, it was 1,924 pages. Those are the kinds of issues we’re talking about. And I think if we really want an answer of how we make those decisions, we go back to the document that was originally written by the people who thought they were writing an enduring document.

The general welfare clause today usually puts the emphasis on the word “welfare.” When they wrote that thing, they put the emphasis on the word “general.” General welfare, Congress should do is that which affects all of us.

Monroe, Madison, Jackson vetoed road projects because they said those road projects didn’t meet the general welfare. What happened to the ground, Congress had a great deal of empathy for Savannah, but it did not actually appropriate any money for Savannah because they said giving money to Savannah would rebuild would simply help Savannah and was not general welfare.

Now, I made this speech once on the floor a couple of years ago, and I got a nice letter, kind of, from a lady in Alabama who took to task to task and listed all the programs that she thought were viable and good and she wanted continued. And I said, ma’am, you actually missed the ultimate point. The point is not should these programs be available for citizens. The point is, who should be responsible for providing those programs?

Not every idea has to germinate, be funded, be appropriated, be regulated from Washington. The States are equal partners in this endeavor. Instead, we divided our responsibilities together, we could provide better services for the people for a cheaper price.

Now, Mr. AKIN, if I could just give one second of a simple example. David Walker has a great book called “The Rebirth of Federalism,” where he simply made the effect that dangling money we don’t have in front of cash-starved States does not necessarily help out the States or us, or the taxpayers of Utah or anywhere else. But good on many other topics as well. And when we start talking about government, I’ve got to let you have a piece of the action, my friend.

I promised my good friend from Louisiana, Congressman Scalise, he has become, this last year or two, an expert on oil rigs and oil spills and every topic but good on many other topics as well. And when we start talking about government, I’ve got to let you have a piece of the action, my friend.

Mr. SCALISE. I want to thank my friend from up the Mississippi River in Missouri, Madam Speaker, for yielding to me and talking about this important issue, because there seems to be a lot of energy as we are talking about energy in this House. I think yesterday was so exciting to see not only the gavel ceremoniously
passed from NANCY PELOSI to now Speaker BOEHNER, but also that these principles that are in the Constitution be restored to the people.

This is the people’s House, and it should operate as the people’s House. And that’s where we bring it all back to those principles that we articulated today when we read the Constitution, a real uplifting experience. It is sad, unfortunately, to note as we look through history that this was the first time that the entire U.S. Constitution was read in this Chamber. I think this should be an event that occurs every new Congress so that we reestablish and remind ourselves just what we are up here to uphold.

As we talk about the spending issues of the country, I think one area that shows you where spending has gotten out of control is, if you go to the 10th Amendment of the Constitution, as I know my friend from Utah is such a proud proponent: “The powers not delegated by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.”

And yet, if you look, so many of the things that we are doing up here in Washington, this Federal Government has gotten so expansive in doing, have absolutely nothing to do with powers that were delegated in the Constitution.

In fact, one of the big debates we are going to have here this week, our first week here under this new Congress, is about this government takeover of health care that a Federal court just ruled is not constitutional. The Federal Government, under Federal court ruling now, does not have the authority to mandate that American citizens have to buy a private product as a condition of citizenship.

So I think the fact that not only today did we put our money where our mouth was in terms to cut our own budgets, because as we are talking about cutting all throughout government where there is duplication, where there are departments that shouldn’t even exist, these czars, these 30 or so shadow government figures that are running their own, almost, cabinets, that are operating, are shadow government figures that are running their own, almost, cabinets, that are running their own, almost, cabinets, that are running their own, almost, cabinets, that aren’t even issuing permits.

Mr. AKIN. I can’t help but just jump in a little bit.

It just keeps coming back to my mind, as you talk about the particular situation of the job-kill ing mandates that are coming from the administration, I keep thinking an awful lot of Americans must be starting to feel the same way I do: that the government is not a servant anymore; that it’s a fear-ful master.

We were warned by the forefathers that if you let your government, your Federal Government get out of control, it will become a fearful master. It seems to me that that’s kind of what is starting to happen. And I think the last election was an understanding across the whole country that this government needs to be put back in its proper place—being a servant of the people and doing programs that are constitutional instead of things that people just think of, wow, it would be a great idea if we mandate this or mandate that.

And here you have an example of an area that’s already had a tough hit from the oil spill, and we are going to take businesses that have done nothing wrong and we’re going to basically shut them down because of the mandate. Somehow or another, I just don’t see that as being government of the servant. Do you?

Mr. SCALISE. In fact, it’s exactly the opposite of the government being the servant of the people—being the oppressor. And as I mentioned, 12,000 jobs have already been lost in south Louisiana alone. And these aren’t my numbers; this is the White House. And the White House and the President’s response to that was well, they could just go just get unemployment.

These aren’t people who want to get on unemployment rolls. They are hard-working people who love and have a great, strong work ethic. They want to be contributing to America’s energy security. But it’s this administration that has shut them down and not allowed them to go back to work drilling safely.

And I’m not talking about BP. I’m talking about the companies who have played by the rules all along, who have never had any safety problems because they follow a higher standard. They are the ones that have been shut down and put out of work.

And not only is it affecting Louisiana in terms of the 12,000 jobs: it has now affected America’s energy security, because right now, nationally, this is a time, once you get out of the summer, where gas prices typically start falling again. But what are we seeing? We are seeing the opposite of that. Now gas prices are breaking over the $3-a-gallon mark in many States because, in part, this administration has changed our energy policies to mandate this or mandate that, put the government in the business of energy, reverse our trade balance. It sends billions of dollars and thousands of jobs to foreign countries out of America, and then it makes our country less secure, which is why we are approaching $100-a-barrel gasoline now, because the administration that said we are going to produce more oil in America, which means these Middle Eastern countries, many of whom don’t like us, other foreign countries are now producing the energy that we need, reverse our trade balance. It’s a great idea if we mandate this or mandate that.

Mr. AKIN. Congressman, you have talked about Louisiana, and I appreciate that perspective, and that’s the specifics.

If we sort of back up a little bit from what you have said and take a look, and the subject here that we are talking about today is cutting government. If you take a look at the Department of Energy, the Department of Energy was founded years and years ago with the purpose of making sure that we were not dependent on foreign oil.

Now, that department has grown with money and more and more buildings and bureaucrats and people in it. I’m sure with well-meaning intention. But as the Department has grown, we have become more dependent on foreign oil. Now, there is something in that equation that’s fundamentally not right. We have to take a really good look at this subject.

I am interested, too, and sometimes I point out to my constituents, I think
Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Thank you. Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. I think the history of this railroad—Northern Pacific, Central Pacific coming together and how the railroad system. In most of the history books that I do, that I have seen, when we taught high school history, they always talk about how this nation came together with the unifying of the railroads, the UP and the Central Pacific joining together and how the Federal Government subsidized that process and was the only viable way of getting that done. We provided the railroad system. I am going to run back over to Georgia in a little bit and jump over here to Representative GRAVES. Jump in, please.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Well, thank you for yielding some time. And, Madam Speaker, this should be the final few minutes of my discussion as I am going to leave and yield to the gentleman from Utah. I sort of want to follow up on what he said. But before I do, I want to point out that the Republican Study Committee, which I believe all of us are members of and actively participate in, is putting together a rescissions plan which has $2.6 trillion in cuts identified already that would occur over the next 10 years and an amazing set of proposals that, to me, as we stand here today in the majority, John Boehner as our Speaker that we nominated, we elected, and we are still talking about spending being the number one issue. That's how committed we are.

Going back to the gentleman's statement, he was referring to the Constitution and the general welfare clause in the Preamble there. I thought I would bring up an interesting point, because it says to "provide the general welfare." An interesting distinction there. And what a notion we have taken from a central government role to want to provide for everyone. But if you go one clause prior to that, it says, "provide for the common defense." Not "provide," but "provide"—common defense and "provide"—general welfare. Two distinct differences and clauses. And we have certainly mistaken that second clause there.

Mr. AKIN. That is such a good point. I don't think it does any harm to repeat that. Let's go back to it again. We are talking about the preamble to the U.S. Constitution, it sets the whole framework for what this country rests on, and you've got two words that are loaded with meaning. The first one is the general defense. That's national security. The general defense is general. It's security for every State, for every American, rich or poor, black or white, male or female. When Americans are secure, Americans are secure; and we use the word "promote" something that is general. And it's not to encourage it; it's to provide for that defense.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Clearly the word is provide for common defense. The next step goes back to the Federalist papers that were written to promote general welfare. Not provide. Promote the general welfare.

Mr. AKIN. Now I think there were Federalist papers that were written to help make that point and to define the fact that to promote general welfare is not a clause big enough to run tanks through and say that anything that seems like a nice thing to do for somebody is constitutional.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. You're right. I will wrap up with this, two quotes from two very different Presidents. Ronald Reagan once said: "Revenue is not the problem; spending is the problem." We all know that. But then another quote is this: "Increasing America's domestic consumption economically and internationally. Leadership means the buck stops here. Instead, Washington is shifting the burden of bad choices today onto the backs of our children and our grandchildren. America has a debt problem and a failure of leadership."

Mr. AKIN. Who was it who said that? Was that Ronald Reagan?

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. "Americans deserve better."

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. "End quote."

Mr. AKIN. Then-Senator Barack Obama on the Senate floor.

Mr. AKIN. So there's a big difference between Senate and Presidency apparently.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. A big difference.

But he is absolutely correct that America has a debt problem and a failure of leadership. Mr. President, here is your opportunity.

Mr. AKIN. And the interesting thing is that if you take George Bush's biggest deficit year, which was when Speaker Pelosi was here in Congress, 2009, his biggest deficit was one-third of the first Obama which was $1.4 trillion. So what is the connection between the quote and the action? I think what we need to do is take a very, very good look at what really is constitutional.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. I think the connection is in his quote—a failure of leadership.

Mr. AKIN. A failure of leadership. His own words.

Thank you, Congressman. It has been a treat to have you joining us here this afternoon.

I want to run back over to Utah to my good friend, Congressman Bishop. Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Thank you.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I am not going to try to convince the Congressman from Georgia talking about the difference between "provide" and "promote."

Let me just go with one historical example of how that works, because I think in one of your earlier questions it was said, How are we actually going to handle this spending problem? Part of it is we have to think outside the box and make some things that have been common assumptions not necessarily have to survive.

And instead of going with some issues that we're funding right now, which may be too close to people, let's go back to an example from the history books that I do, that I have seen, when we taught high school history, they always talk about how this nation came together with the unifying of the railroads, the UP and the Central Pacific joining together and how the Federal Government subsidized that process and was the only viable way of getting that done. We provided the railroad system.

One of the concepts, though, as I was reading another book that took a closer look on this issue is that not only did the Federal Government help with this railroad building craze but the idea that the Federal Government became involved changed the mechanism in which railroads were built and the kinds of ways they were built. We paid railroads for every mile of track that was laid, which meant you gave them more money if they went to a mountainous route than on flat land. So many of those routes took a very circuitous route because of some elevated terrain because they got more money than if they had just taken a simpler flat route. One of the, I won't mention which one but they refused to put up masonry supports. They put up wooden culverts only for their train tracks. In the winter they laid track over ice which meant as soon as the thaw came, the tracks disappeared. Much of our railway system had to be rebuilt within 2 years of its actual completion.

I live in the State of Utah and my only national monument is the Golden Spike National Monument in my district in which both the Union Pacific and the Central Pacific came and they passed one another continuing to lay track because they were paid for it by the Federal Government, until Congress finally told them not to track off and link up somewhere; and they picked Promontory Summit which is in the State of Utah in my county to finally link up.

Ironically enough, in 1893 James Hill built—maybe the Madam Speaker has the name of this railroad—Northern Railroad that went from Chicago to Seattle. He did that without any government subsidies going through private property for renting his lines even during the panic. It survived. It was functional. It was profitable.

Sometimes we make assumptions that only the Federal Government has the ability to do these things when in reality we don't. And we forget that once again if we were to make States a true partner with us in projects, States...
Medicaid, Social Security, are spending
spent a lot of money. We've gotten to
spending money, pretty soon you've
got enough of those machines going
into anything else in the budget at all.
These are some of the hard choices
that we have to face.
It seems to me, gentleman, as we
have made an emphasis on the Con-
tax situation in a relief package
that was passed yesterday, we have
created a new mandate that every bill
that comes to this floor has to have a
constitutional justification. I think
that's the start of where we really have
to get to outside the box with new
ideas. I think that for the first time
since the 1960s we have set aside a spe-
cific time during the day so that the
committees could function will allow
every Member on this floor to sit and
work in a committee to come up with
ideas that we can control or at least limit the runaway
spending that we have had.

Mr. AKIN. I need to stop and inter-
rupt just a minute here, because you
will never say this, but, Congressman
Bishop, you were one of the main peo-
ple that helped put that rule in place
and I think the whole country needs to
say a big “thank you” to you, because
what you are doing is trying to make
Congress just a little more efficient
and do a few commonsense things.
A lot of people might not say this
thinking outside the box, but the box is
small down here sometimes, and you
have provided us with the idea that we
are actually getting into some of these
questions and we are going to ap-
proach them in a systematic kind of
way. We are going to take time and not
have votes running all day long so peo-
ple can’t focus on their work, and say
now, systematically, what do we have
to do to deal with this problem.

Mr. AKIN. I yield back to the gentle-
man.

It was said by you, it was said by the
gentleman from Georgia as well as the
gentleman from Louisiana, it is the
spending. That is our problem. That is
what is hurting jobs, that is what is
hurting Americans, that is what is
bloating our budget. We need to zero in
on that, and until we do that, we will
never come close to meeting what the
American people expect the Congress
to do, nor what we really morally need
to do.

I yield back to the gentleman.

Mr. AKIN. Well, I think that Ronald
Reagan, you know, he had a way of
putting complicated things in simple words. He said we are buying more govern-
ment than we can afford. That is not a bad summary of the situation.
And it hasn't gotten better since Ronald Reagan was here—we are buying more government than we can afford.

I appreciate your historic examples. Of course, there is no way Congress can do the example of the postal roads that you made out when you are trying to basically do everything under the sun, be all things to all people. We are going to have to make some decisions saying this is a nice thing to do, but it could be done by a State government or it could be done by the private sector.

We have to label some of those choices and just say, look, there are some things that the private sector and the States cannot do and we better fund that first. Certainly, providing for the common defense is one that we are going to have to make, cause the other governments can't do that, and the individual citizens can't do that. Whereas when it comes to some of the other kinds of things, such as in the energy areas or education or insurance, that is why the old cliché that the government that is best is the one that is closest to the people. It is not necessarily that they are smarter or better; it is because they don't have the problem of size in a one-size-fits-all issue and they have the flexibility.

As you were talking about, especially with the entitlements, this is an area in which creativity is going to be the most important element. And some things, especially with the cost of Medicare, are driven by one-size-fits-all Federal mandates and Federal decisions, when allowing creativity could help us solve this problem.

I also want to say one other thing too when your comment about the general welfare. I don't think it is not because we are funding for the defense of the America today. The decisions we make, the plans we make for defense today will not come to fruition for another 10 to 15 years, and indeed, the ability for us to have diplomacy in the future depends on wise decisions that we make today.

I appreciate the gentleman from Missouri coming with this issue. This is something that the people care about, something that the Congress cares about. I think the fact that we just passed a 5 percent cut on ourselves with overwhelming bipartisan support says that this is the direction we should be taking, and we should continue to talk about this over and over and over again. I encourage you allowing me to be part of this.
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Mr. AKIN. It's just a treat, Congressman BISHOP, to have you here with us today talking about a very important subject, something that is on the front of the minds, I think, of many Americans, understanding that we are buying way too much government than we can afford. Certainly, the guiding compass and the guiding light for us has got to be the U.S. Constitution. And the fact is that we had hundreds of years of history, at least 100 years of history, where the Constitution has stood us in very good stead. And when we get away from our foundational documents and principles, that's when we really start to get into trouble.

The principle on defense that was just made—I have to underscore. I'm on the Armed Services Committee. We deal with defense issues day in and day out. And the problem in defense is that the things that are on the drawing board today won't be fielded for probably 10 years in the future. So decisions that we're making today are going to have their effect a long way out. And that's why we have to be particularly careful. The situation in defense is one that, as you take a look around the world, being challenged by China and Russia, we are not keeping up in those arms situations where we do not have the capability diplomatically to have options that were otherwise available before when we had put enough funding into defense.

And so as we see entitlements increasing way, way, way up and defense being cut down as a percentage of GDP, we are risking not doing the most fundamental principle of the U.S. Constitution, which is providing for the national defense. And our objective, of course, is not parity. We're not trying to be equal with other nations. Our objective is to be overwhelmingly superior. That's why we don't have wars, because of the fact that people say. We don't want to take on the United States. And it's why we can be a great Nation of peacekeeping, because of the fact that we have been strong and successful and set a good example for other nations.

So what we have before us is a very difficult question. It is the question of politics in America. If you take a look at all of the fights, the debates, the discussions that go on in politics in America, most of it revolves around this question, and that is: What should the Federal Government be doing? Should it be spending more or less? Should it be doing that at all? Or, are we doing a good enough job? The discussion and debate is about. And until we get back to the Constitution, until we start asking the question, "Is it necessary for the Federal Government to do this function?" we will never solve this problem of overspending.

The current Congress in the end this is my opinion, but one that I think other Congressmen that I have discussed this with, and that is we have another problem, and that is the House and the Congress is a producer of a lot of time. There are various fictions and ways that we have gotten accustomed to doing things which may not be very logical or practical.
I’ve been here 10 years. I have learned about authorization and appropriations and about the Budget Committee and the way we do things. But if we’re going to seriously get at this problem, other than shaving a few percent here or there, if we’re going to seriously get at the problem of having to radically reduce our appetite for spending, it’s going to require changes in the structure of this Congress. And that will be one of the things that you can see we’ve already started on and are continuing and pledging to continue to do—to take a look at our rules and how the organization is set up so that we can make those hard choices and decisions.

There has been a commitment that those decisions will be made in a transparent way; in a way that everybody who is elected to be a Congressman, so that every district in this country will have somebody that can stand up and have the opportunity to weigh in and have an opinion. You won’t see, as we had in the last Congress, bills that are being written in the Speaker’s office and brought to the floor and rammed through in the dead of night. You’re going to hear open debate, a lot of discussion, and a lot of ideas being discussed. I think that’s a good thing and a proper thing. But, ultimately, we have to deal with the question: What are the essential functions that must happen in Federal Government?

Now, I’ve just heard that there are going to be some very significant cuts in defense. That’s very concerning to me. Why would we be taking the Defense Department and doing major cuts there and no other department in government is being looked at? This is something that some of us will probably react to some because we believe we have to control spending, but why do you, the Department of Defense? We’re fighting wars. Why are you going to whack that budget when you have all these other budgets that have never been touched whatsoever? And so we have to take a look at those percentages. When you see entitlements going very, very high, defense budget going low, that signals that we’ve got to be careful about the choices we’re making, because the choices we make today, 10 years from now, your sons or daughters or my grandsons and my granddaughters may be affected by those choices.

So we start out a new Congress. I think, of the right foot. Emphasis on the U.S. Constitution; emphasis on the fact that we have to be responsible; emphasis on the fact that everybody in every congressional district is going to have a piece of the action; and the fact that we’re going to have to be responsible. We’re going to have to be cutting Federal spending. You can run, as we have in the first 2 years of the Obama administration, with $1.4 trillion deficit. And that will stop.

**REPEAL OF THE AFFORDABLE HEALTH CARE ACT**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader Mr. GARAMENDI. Madam Speaker, it’s a great privilege to be here on the floor with you. Congratulations to you and the other new Members of the Republican Party.

We have some extraordinarily important tasks ahead of us. This afternoon, I’m going to be joined by some of my colleagues. We’ve just heard a very useful discussion on the role of the Constitution and how it plays into it. And indeed, today we did spend about 3 hours reading through the Constitution, and I think it was to all of our benefit. We started off with the new Speaker actually reading the preamble. I think that’s a good place for us to start, because we’re going to discuss health care today and we’re going to discuss an effort by the majority party, the Republicans, to repeal the Affordable Health Care Act that was passed last session. And this issue has become a constitutional issue, and we’re going to read the preamble to the Constitution and Article I, section 8 is useful.

“We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for common defense, promote the general welfare—promote the general welfare—and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States.” And then later, in Article I, section 8, “Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.”

It’s about the general welfare of the United States that we’ll be discussing in this next hour, and that’s the welfare of the people of the United States. It speaks to us, the citizens—all of us—whether we are a newborn baby or a senior in the last of life—how do we provide for that general welfare? Last year, in a major step forward, the first time in more than nearly four decades, this Congress, together with the Senate and the President, passed the Affordable Health Care Act, a very, very important and extremely useful step in providing for the welfare—that is, the general welfare—of the American population. It’s a law that makes life better from birth to retirement. Part of this law, a very, very important part of it, deals with what we call the Patient’s Bill of Rights—the Patient’s Bill of Rights, vis-à-vis, the insurance industry.

I think all of us can go back to our districts, to our homes, and even to our own lives and find numerous episodes where the insurance industry has said, No, you cannot have this procedure; or, No, you cannot have coverage because you have a preexisting condition.

Today, we are going to talk about the Patient’s Bill of Rights and the Republican effort that is now underway in the Rules Committee in this building, as we speak, to write a rule that they will bring to the floor next week, without one hearing, to completely wipe out the extraordinarily important effort to provide for the general welfare of the American people. We are going to discuss that in great detail.

Now, for me, this is a very important point in my life. I spent 8 years of my life as the insurance commissioner in California, taking on the insurance companies, trying to force them to honor their commitments, to force the insurance companies to pay the claims ability—kiddies didn’t work. He was insured. His wife was insured. The pregnancy was insured. The delivery was insured. But that child, on the day the child was born with that pre-existing condition of kidney failure, was uninsurable under the parents’ policy.

That kind of action is prohibited by the Patients’ Bill of Rights. No more would that happen to men and women, families, pregnant women across this country who deliver babies that have some problem. Those babies will be insulated whatever the condition might be. Our colleagues on the Republican side will bring to this floor next Wednesday, without one hearing in any relevant policy committee, a repeal of the Patients’ Bill of Rights. What of the babies that are born in the future that have some issue? How will they be provided for?

The rest of the story is this family has spent 20 years now struggling to provide the health care services that their child needed. They have been close to bankruptcy many, many times. They have struggled through it. The child is no longer a child—a young adult—and under the law today, he has health insurance.

Is that what the American public wants from the Republican Party—the...
repeal of that Bill of Rights that guarantees coverage for that young man? I think not.

Let me now turn to our colleague from the great State of Virginia.

Mr. SCOTT, would you please share with us your views and how this is going to affect the general welfare of the American people.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Thank you, and I appreciate your hard work. That was defeating this Special Order so we can discuss the problems with repealing health care.

You have gone all through the need for health care during your life and how the bill provides assistance for those with preexisting conditions. It limits insurance company abuses, like what’s called a “recision,” when you have paid your premiums all these years and then finally get sick, and they want to cancel your policy right when you need it. There are lifetime and annual limits on benefits where they pay a certain amount, and once they get to that, you can be in the middle of a treatment, and they’re not going to go after another dime for the rest of the year that you are paying premiums for your own. We need to oppose the repeal of this provision.

There are many people with chronic diseases who hit up upon these limits very frequently.

You have talked about young people on their parents’ policies who are working, who finally get jobs. They don’t cover benefits. Up to 26 years old, they can stay on their parents’ policies.

We have talked about prevention, the importance of prevention. A lot of people, because of copayments and deductibles, can’t afford their annual checkups. This bill provides for annual checkups without copayments and deductibles.

For those senior citizens in the doughnut hole, where they get no benefits, adding insult to injury, they have to continue paying their premiums, and get no benefit. We have assistance for those.

It is outrageous that they would elect to try to repeal this. No hearings. No nothing. Just put a label on it and expect people to take that. We have people that live with pre-existing conditions who are in the military, and one of the things that they can get is a reuse. What are they going to tell those people?

One of the things that we want to make sure is that we have as many options as possible, including a public option if we can ever get there; but when we talk about repeal and replace, there is no replace tomorrow in the rule that they are suggesting. The only thing that they want to know what they’re going to replace it with and what they’re going to leave out.

Are they going to leave out the part where people with preexisting conditions are covered? Are they going to tell those in the doughnut hole to get back in the doughnut hole where they belong? Are they going to talk about those who can’t afford prevention to get prevention? Are they going to tell those who are going out of coverage because of the limits, “No, that’s enough. You’ve had enough, and you can’t get any more coverage”?

What are they going to tell all of these people?

We need to make sure that we keep this policy, all of these provisions, intact. I have no idea what they want to replace it with, but I think, if they went step by step and if the people looked at the provisions of the bill, they would elect to keep everything that’s in the bill today.

Now, there are some things that people don’t like. When you have a good plan, you have to pay for it. Unfortunately, they’re not paying for it. We were fiscally responsible. When we passed it, we were under PAYGO. They’ve repealed a lot of that so that they can go trillions of dollars in the ditch without paying for it. We paid for it. In fact, the CBO originally said that the first 10 years of the program would reduce the deficit by $140 billion. Now the estimate is $200-some billion in the next 10 years. So it is fiscally responsible.

There are things we can do better together than everybody out for their own. We need to oppose the repeal of this health care to make sure that people have the protections and the Patients’ Bill of Rights that they have under this legislation.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you very much.

You’ve raised about seven of the major issues that are involved in this repeal that will bring to this floor next Wednesday without one hearing in any relevant policy committee, a repeal that will affect every single American—that will affect their well-being, their health, their ability to get cheap insurance, and their ability to stay healthy.

We have an enormous issue before us and we want the American public to be aware of what’s going on here. It is the repeal of the Patient’s Bill of Rights.

Let me move on to one of our other colleagues from Tennessee, Mr. STEVEN COHEN, if you will join us, please.

Mr. COHEN. Thank you. I appreciate the opportunity to share with you, and I want to start first because this day has been a day that started with the reading of the Constitution which is a document that we all revere. I have a little pocket copy of it right here, and we revere it. We pledge when we take office to defend and support the Constitution, but we all know that it’s interpreted by our Supreme Court, and it’s Supreme Court history would have been better today for people to understand.

And you mentioned that the foundation of the particular health care bill is in the preamble: We, the people of the United States, to form a more perfect union, establish justice, et cetera, promote the general welfare.

Also, in article I, which is the legislative article, section 8, it says that the Congress shall have the power to regulate commerce among the several States; and further, it says in article I there’s no Bill of Rights in that article, there’s no references to the Constitution; and you mentioned that the foundation of the particular health care bill is in the preamble: We, the people of the United States, to form a more perfect union, et cetera.

Mr. SCOTT talked about and say that we have a right to have our children on our parents’ policies. Mr. SCOTT talked about and say that we have a right to have our children on our parents’ policies.

Do you know next week when the Republicans will try to repeal this opportunity for Americans to get health care and wipe out these pre-existing conditions clauses, et cetera, will they be coming under the idea that health care is not part of the general welfare? Will they be coming basically on a constitutional argument that they may make that this wasn’t allowed to require a person to buy insurance even though we can, of course, require a person to sign up for the draft? Is that a reasonable argument?

We have no idea what they’re going to say, or are they going to come and talk about these things that Mr. SCOTT talked about and say that we don’t think it’s good policy for parents to have their children on their insurance until they’re 26 or it’s not good policy for women with breast cancer to get treatment at a certain amount?

What are their tactics?

Mr. GARAMENDI. Well, I would assume that they will try to go into their interpretation of the Constitution and the very difficult argument of repealing the patients’ Bill of Rights and allowing the insurance companies to engage in gross discrimination based upon sex. Clearly, women are discriminated against by these insurance companies unless the Patient’s Bill of Rights are there to protect them. Similarly, the two examples that you gave, pre-existing conditions, I cannot imagine that they
would even attempt to successfully or even would be unsuccessful to argue that somehow these protections for the individual are not worth having. I think they will go into some obscure interpretation of the Constitution and say, there's going to be a debate on the floor. Unfortunately, there will be no hearings to precede that, and there will not be a discussion of the details.

Mr. COHEN. And they will control the amendments that will be permitted to be discussed on this floor. I know Speaker Boehner said we were going to be able to have amendments and be able to have good discourse.

Mr. GARAMENDI. As you know—I saw you in Rules Committee earlier today—it is my impression that the Rules Committee is going to prohibit any amendments on the floor. We'll see. I mean, that has yet to be decided by the Rules Committee. We don't know, but surely the one amendment I would propose is: don't do it, maintain the Patient's Bill of Rights, maintain these protections that we all need.

There's another reason in this situation that is not subject to the possibility of an incident that would become a reason for rescission. That's my experience. Eight years hammering the insurance industry, you have got to honor your contract. Yet because of the laws, they were able to wiggle out of an expensive incident.

Mr. COHEN. When I was a child, I had polio when I was 5 years old in 1954. I was fortunate. My father was a doctor, and so I had professional courtesy, but I'm sure he had insurance that covered my hospitalization. But there were years later, I think it was 11 years later I had a tendon-lengthening operation that was immediately related to my polio and it was necessary on my Achilles tendon. That wouldn't have been permitted necessarily if they could use the pre-existing condition such as polio to have denied coverage; and whether or not how my father dealt with that as well as whether he was a physician, I don't know; but I'd hate to see children in the same situation and parents in the same situation not be permitted to get that type of coverage later on.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I don't know if you were a Member of Congress at the time, but we all under this law would have the same protection. I'm sure the American public would have, and the question about rescission, and you're a prime candidate should you lose office, which you shouldn't, to be uninsurable if the Patient's Bill of Rights were repealed.

Under the Patient's Bill of Rights, if you were to leave Congress, you could get an insurance policy because the pre-existing condition that you have, polio, and an operation resulting from the polio would go into play as a pre-existing condition, and you would not be able to get an insurance policy.

Mr. COHEN. Let me, if I can, read something that I've prepared for today that came from a constituent's story. John Hopkins. He's a very important and active member in my community and contemporary. He sent me an email, and Mr. Hopkins requests I share this story with the House as we consider repealing the Patient's Bill of Rights. I want to share it with everybody here on C-SPAN.

John was diagnosed with two unrelated cancers during his life. If you know anything about cancer, getting it coupled with complications is almost unheard of, but it happened to John Hopkins. Midway through his first bout with cancer, he was, of course, dropped from his health insurance plan. He was left with a medical bill that wiped out his and his wife's entire retirement savings, as well as the value of their house. They were never able to repay the debt in their lifetime. When he was diagnosed with a second bout of cancer 2 years later, he had no health insurance because he was nowhere in the market who would offer him a policy because of the pre-existing condition.

He got some coverage in Tennessee because of a plan called Access Tennessee for uninsured, but it was limited to $250,000 a year. As we all know, annual limits are set to be phased out by 2014 because of this law, and life-time limits are already a thing of the past. A quarter of a million dollars may seem like a lot of coverage, but when somebody needs something like a bone marrow transplant to cure their leukemia, that single treatment would exceed the annual cap.

My Republican colleagues have decided their first priority as the new majority will be repealing the Affordable Care Act; and when they vote to do this, they will be voting for the following: denying Mr. Hopkins the ability to enroll in a health insurance plan that does not guarantee that he will be able to live for many years because he had high cholesterol, he had difficulties getting insurance, and it took him a long time to find private insurance because of that pre-existing condition. He just sent me this on Facebook. He wasfrieding me and he mentioned it, and I wanted to relate it.

There are so many people in this country who are getting benefits and will get benefits and many of the benefits don't go into effect until 2014, and that is this idea that the 12th Congress as its first act would do such harm to the general welfare of the American public is hard to fathom.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. COHEN, thank you so very much. Your closing sentence needs to be repeated. That the very first piece of legislation taken up by the new Republican majority in the 12th Congress is to repeal the Affordable Care Act; and when they vote to do this, they will be voting for the following: denying Mr. Hopkins the ability to enroll in a health insurance plan that does not guarantee that he will be able to live for many years because he had high cholesterol, he had difficulties getting insurance, and it took him a long time to find private insurance because of that pre-existing condition. He just sent me this on Facebook. He was friending me and he mentioned it, and I wanted to relate it.

There are so many people in this country who are getting benefits and will get benefits and many of the benefits don't go into effect until 2014, and that is this idea that the 12th Congress as its first act would do such harm to the general welfare of the American public is hard to fathom.

Mr. PALLONE. Well, first of all, let me thank you, my colleague from California, and each of the other speakers here for the contribution they have made tonight, and particularly when I listened to my colleague from Tennessee talk about those particular cases of individuals that were impacted because that's really what this is all about.

Again, it is amazing to me that the first act of this new Republican majority is to try to repeal a bill, health care reform, that really is making a difference for people on a personal level, particularly with the patient protections.

You know, I thought to myself when I was coming down here: Who benefits from repeal? Who could possibly benefit from repeal? Who is going to benefit from the repeal of the Patient's Bill of Rights? Is that the man or woman you talked about, all the people who are going to be harmed by it, who would benefit from it? And the only group I could think of that would benefit from the repeal are the big insurance companies because they would make more money. If you think about it, what do they want to do? They want to keep increasing premiums. I read that in your State—I don't know, you may have already mentioned it—Blue Cross/Blue Shield, whatever, is talking about a 50-some percent increase. I cannot fathom these double-digit increases.

And, of course, as this health care reform kicks in, it's going to be more and
more difficult for the types of increases that we’ve seen in premiums that these big health insurance companies have put forward. And the reason the insurance companies want to get rid of the Patients’ Bill of Rights and reimmerse all of these discriminatory practices, whether they’re preexisting conditions or reimmersing lifetime caps or, you know, the different protections that we’ve seen kick in, the reason they want to do that is also money-oriented. In other words, they want to save you money. You talked about the cancer patient.

I was up at the Rules Committee earlier, and Ms. Slaughter was talking about someone who had cancer and was treated and ran into the lifetime cap, and then the cancer recurred and she didn’t have any more coverage because she had hit the lifetime cap. And that’s a perfect example. They want to have lifetime caps. They want to have annual caps. They don’t want preexisting conditions. They don’t want anything to kick in on your policy because it saves them money. The way that they make profits and pay dividends to their shareholders is by raising premiums and having discriminatory practices that eliminate the people that cost money because they need health care. I mean, it’s that simple.

And already, and just in the last few weeks, provisions have kicked in that go against that. The President announced, I think around Christmas time, new regulations that say that any premium increase that’s over 10 percent will be scrutinized. And under the provisions of this bill and the new regulations, these increases are not allowed to go above 10 percent. On January 1, the provisions kicked in that said that 80 percent of your premium costs had to be used for benefits, couldn’t be used for insurance company profits, couldn’t be used to pay back dividend holders. So all of these initiatives that are already kicking in, they basically make it more difficult for the insurance companies to make a big profit, and the consequence of that is that health insurance becomes more affordable.

I was up at the Rules Committee earlier. It was interesting because, I think you mentioned, my colleague from California, or one of you mentioned that we, under this bill, under the health care reform that’s in place now that they want to repeal, we get the same health insurance, as Congressmen, as any other American.

You know, I still have people write to me and say, well, you know, You have your own policy, but you want to give me this lousy coverage that I’m going to get under the health care reform. And I have to write back and say, No, that’s not true. You may hear that on some TV station or something, but it’s simply not true.

We specifically wrote into the bill that we have to go into the exchanges just like everybody else. We are going to be different from other Federal employees, as Congressmen, because we go into the exchanges.

So, at the Rules Committee today, one of the Republican Members who is very supportive of repeal said that he specifically wasn’t going to take health insurance as a Congressman, and he wanted me to know that because he was voting for repeal. And I said, Well, that’s very nice and that’s commendable for you, but I, frankly, think that every Member of Congress who votes for health care as a Congressman, and he wanted me to know that because he was voting for repeal. And I said, Well, that’s very nice and that’s commendable for you, but I, frankly, think that every Member of Congress who votes for health care as a Congressman, and he wanted me to know that because he was voting for repeal.

And I know that some Members have already taken issue. There was one Congressman, who came to me, to the orientation, a Republican Member from Maryland who apparently was a big advocate for repeal. And he said that he was inquiring because his Federal health insurance didn’t take effect as a Congressman, until February 1. We were sworn in yesterday, but I guess it takes 30 days before the insurance actually kicks in. He was complaining about the fact that had he to wait until February 1 to get his health insurance, as a Congressman. Well, you know, again, if you want to vote for repeal next week, you shouldn’t be worried about when it’s going to kick in. You shouldn’t be taking it all, in my opinion.

So there is a lot of—I don’t know what the phrase is—smoke and mirrors or whatever the word is that is going on around here on the other side of the aisle in how they are viewing this. And my point is, you know, there is a lot of protection here for people. Don’t deny it to yourself. I don’t want companies to deny it to yourself. But more than that, think about who is helped by this repeal—only the big insurance companies. They are the only ones that are going to benefit.

I know you were the insurance commissioner, and so you know exactly what I’m talking about.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Well, Mr. Cohen, it just happens that we prepared this little blue chart here. Actually, it probably ought to be in the red. The repeal of the Affordable Health Care Act obviously deals with the Patients’ Bill of Rights, but it also deals with the deficit.

This week, the Congressional Budget Office, nonpartisan, not Democrat, not Republican, they answer to neither party. They answer to the general public. They said that the repeal of the Affordable Health Care Act will increase the deficit by $230 billion, $230 billion above the President’s numbers, and in the out years, the next 10 years, well over 1 trillion, $230 billion increase in the deficit.
Mr. COHEN. And that’s money we owe China; is that right? So it’s okay to issue these securities and pay the Chinese the interest to be able to finance it, and our children and their grandchildren will be paying this if they don’t have preexisting conditions where insurance companies are able to turn them away because of the illnesses they may have to stay alive to pay these taxes.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Our children, grandchildren, and indeed those of us that are living for another 10 to 15, 20 years, are all going to pay twice. We’re going to pay the insurance cost, the health care cost that’s not covered by the insurance programs. The example you gave of the individual with two bouts of cancer going to pay the full cost of that because the limitation goes back into place, so you get to pay for your health care, and you’re going to have to pay off the deficit also, makes no sense whatsoever. But, hey, that’s what they want to do, without one vote by any of the relevant committees.

Mr. COHEN. Consistency is the hobgoblin. Right? Thank you, sir.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I notice that our colleague from Maryland has joined us, Ms. Edwards.

Ms. EDWARDS. I’m so pleased to join you today and to talk about health care. And I feel very personally about health care, as somebody who went for a long time without any health care coverage and worried like Americans do all across this country. They did prior to our really investing in reform for the American people. And so I know that anxiety.

And I was thinking about some of our constituents, constituents in Maryland’s Fourth Congressional District, and around the country, who, today because of what was done in the last minute in the Democratic-led Congress in passing landmark health care reform legislation, are better off today. And we haven’t even fully implemented the benefits for the American people.

I think about a letter that I got from a gentleman who lives in my district in Olney, Maryland, a small town, Olney, Maryland. And he writes to me that his son, Mike, was 25 going on 26, and he could receive health care insurance coverage. But when he went to get his policy, we were working on health care reform, and many of us, very concerned about people who don’t have insurance and need coverage. But most Americans all across the country actually do have some form of health care. And you know what they’re worried about? They’re worried about those premiums going up at astronomical rates. And I’ve heard from my constituents, 20, 30 percent premium hikes.

Well, because of what we did in this health care package, insurance commissioners, like you were a commissioner, insurance commissioners all across the country now have the power vested in them to be able to actually say, you know what? We’re going to put a check on these companies. And so in States like California, a big State like California and Connecticut and Maine and Colorado and Maryland, all across the country, that’s what these insurance commissioners are doing. And they’re not saying the Feds do it for them; it’s the States.

And of course we heard here this morning, as we read the Constitution, a reminder that States are in a great position to look at what insurance companies are doing in their States, to regulate what’s happening in their States, and to say to them, you have to stop taking money away from consumers, away from patients by raising premiums excessively.

And so these are real accomplishments for the American people and for people who go to work every day and actually have health care coverage.

I heard us earlier discussing premium increase hikes, and I want to tell you something. I was working on health care reform, and many of us, very concerned about people who don’t have insurance and need coverage. But most Americans all across the country actually do have some form of health care. And you know what they’re worried about? They’re worried about those premiums going up at astronomical rates. And I’ve heard from my constituents, 20, 30 percent premium hikes.

Well, because of what we did in this health care package, insurance commissioners, like you were a commissioner, insurance commissioners all across the country now have the power vested in them to be able to actually say, you know what? We’re going to put a check on these companies. And so in States like California, a big State like California and Connecticut and Maine and Colorado and Maryland, all across the country, that’s what these insurance commissioners are doing. And they’re not saying the Feds do it for them; it’s the States.

And of course we heard here this morning, as we read the Constitution, a reminder that States are in a great position to look at what insurance companies are doing in their States, to regulate what’s happening in their States, and to say to them, you have to stop taking money away from consumers, away from patients by raising your premiums excessively.

And so these are real accomplishments for the American people and for people who go to work every day. And so I’m glad to be here actually talking about these benefits with the American people.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you so much. Thank you very much. And I appreciate your hard work and leadership on this. You’ve talked about the problems in health care with government. It’s just not a government problem. If you ask any human resources executive about the major problems they have and benefits package, it’s the ability to afford health care. Health care costs are going out of control. If you have an employee with a preexisting condition and he’s in the group, then they do the actuarial study, you start getting bills that you can’t pay. You ask any human resources executive about what’s happened to their insurance costs over the years. It’s just going through the sky. And if you look at the employee portion of health care, it goes from zero participation to a little bit more copays, more deductibles, more cost for the family, on and on and on. Everyone has a great deal of insecurity about their ability to do health care.

And then you look at the idea, what happens if you lose a job? If you have a preexisting condition, you will not be able to get health care until this bill passes.

With all this insecurity, your ability to get health care, your ability to be able to afford it. What we’re seeing is a lot of these problems, all of these problems in the future, what is the response from the other side about what to do about that kind of insecurity?

They say, well, just be strong and go without insurance like me. Well, that is not a particularly attractive solution for those that don’t have an alternative, don’t have a spouse where you can just jump, you know, you can say you’re not going to talk. If you want policy, I’m going to use my spouse’s policy; we have an alternative. Or if they’re so wealthy, they don’t need the insurance.

Most Americans aren’t in that situation. They need health insurance. And
this is what is provided. You have access to it, and it is affordable. Everyone in America will be able to afford health insurance in 2014 because those that can't afford it will have subsidies to make sure that they can. So everybody is able to get it.

If you make less than $88,000, you can get health care for less than 10 percent of your salary. That is not the case now. If you are in the $20,000, $40,000, $50,000 a year bracket, if you can get insurance, it's going to be a lot more than that.

So with this bill people have the security of health insurance that they don't have now. And the bizarre suggestion, just go without insurance, is not particularly nice when you have children that may have a little ear infection. Rather than have them lose their hearing, you can deal with it when it is a little infection, these problems don't grow out of control. We need that security. This bill provides it.

And in terms of seniors, seniors are particularly helped under this legislation. Those that can't afford the copays and deductibles can get their annual checkups without any copays and deductibles. We are helping people in the doughnut hole. It will take a little time, but eventually there will be no doughnut hole where they fall in and have to pay all of the drug costs. We provide more community health centers that will be better access. We are training more doctors and nurses so they will have more professionals. You have a chart that extends Medicare. Medicare is extended. We know that Medicare will go broke if we don't do anything. It extends the solvency of Medicare. It lowers prescription drug costs. All of these things that seniors have a particular interest in, all of that will be lost if this bill is repealed.

Mr. GARAMENDI. If I might interrupt you for just a moment, Mr. Scott.

You are into an issue, an area that is profound to the seniors of America. The discussion last year as this bill was passing was that somehow this piece of legislation would harm seniors by taking away Medicare benefits. It was not true last year. It is not true this year. However, if our Republican colleagues are successful in repealing it, they, the seniors, will be seriously harmed.

I want to make this point very, very clear and ask my colleagues to join us perhaps from their own personal experience in their districts. You started going through this list here. This legislation actually extends the solvency of Medicare by reining in the costs and by giving seniors specific pre-illness care so that they will be able to get preventative care free, free annual checkups. They can't get it today, but under this legislation seniors can get free annual checkups, which reduces the cost, because you get to the illness quicker.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. You said that people were scared about what might happen. They also said things about small business, this would bankrupt small businesses. First, small businesses are exempt from the requirements under the bill, so it can't possibly hurt them. But more important, the requirement to provide health care for their employees are given tax credits to help them do so. So it can't possibly be hurting small business. But for the senior citizens, they have all of the benefits that you have listed on the chart that will be lost if the bill is repealed.

Mr. GARAMENDI. You mentioned the doughnut hole, the prescription drug doughnut hole. Every senior that was in the prescription drug doughnut hole last year, 2010, received a $250 check to help them pay for their drugs. In going forward, the doughnut hole will be lessened and lessened, and eventually, 9 years from now, will disappear. There will be no doughnut hole.

You talked about the quality of care. Extremely important, quality of care. Thank you for bringing that up. More primary doctors, more geriatric care from nurses and doctors, an extraordinary important part of the legislation, not just only for seniors. You also mentioned the community-based and of course the preventative care. All of these things are there, and all of them will disappear if the Republicans are successful with their legislation next Wednesday that will be brought to this floor without one hearing to discuss any of these issues in a relevant policy committee.

Mr. COHEN. Please join us.

Mr. COHEN. Let me ask a question. I was just thinking here, it's an honor to be in the House of Representatives and with a Constitution that's so beautiful and profound and distinguishes us. All of those countries are considerably better than America, and America is placed at the bottom of the industrialized countries in terms of our health care, how healthy we are, how long we live, how sick we get. We are at the bottom. In fact, we are in developed countries in the statistics. We spend almost twice as much as any of those other countries.

So the Affordable Health Care Act goes after many, many things beyond the Patients Bill of Rights and the seniors issues. Thank you so very much for raising that issue.

We have about maybe 10 more minutes. Mr. PALLONE.

Mr. PALLONE. Well, I just wanted to talk a little bit about prevention, and particularly in terms of seniors, which you mentioned, and what it means in terms of people's health and also the cost to the government, because some of the things that we've mentioned with regard to seniors have already taken place.

This summer under the bill, seniors who fell into the doughnut hole got a $250 check. Beginning this year, they get a 50 percent discount on brand-name drugs if they fall into the doughnut hole in 2011.

You mentioned the copays for preventative care, whether it's your annual wellness treatment or other kinds of tests like mammograms or colonoscopies, for example. The reason that we are eliminating the 20 percent copay for these things, the reason we are trying to fill up the doughnut hole, is because if people get their drugs and they don't end up getting sick and going to the hospital, if they get these tests or they have the annual wellness checks, they stay healthy, they don't go to the hospital, they don't do anything. Because if people get their drugs and they don't end up getting sick and going to the hospital, if they get these tests or they have the annual wellness checks, they stay healthy, they don't go to the hospital, they don't do anything. Because if people get their drugs and they don't end up getting sick and going to the hospital, if they get these tests or they have the annual wellness checks, they stay healthy, they don't go to the hospital, they don't do anything. Because if people get their drugs and they don't end up getting sick and going to the hospital, if they get these tests or they have the annual wellness checks, they stay healthy, they don't go to the hospital, they don't do anything.
the Rules Committee today is—a lot of seniors tell me, they come up to me and say they are worried about the fact that Medicare may become insolvent and there wouldn't be enough money in the trust fund to pay for it. The bottom line is that the health care reform bill extends the judgment day, if you will, when the solvency problem becomes an issue much further. And if you have the repeal, the solvency problem hits us 6 years from now, in 2017, from what I understand.

So another problem with repeal is not only does it increase the deficit, but it also is only 6 years from now that we would have to deal with this Medicare solvency problem. And what is that going to mean? That is going to mean probably cutbacks in benefits for senior citizens. Because if you don’t have the money, you are going to have to cut back on the benefits. It is amazing to me how they can continue to talk about that.

The other thing they keep saying on the other side of the aisle, the Republicans say, well, the reason we want the repeal is because this health care reform is killing jobs. Nothing could be further from the truth.

The fact of the matter is that under this health care reform because the cost of health care premiums for employers will be significantly reduced, they will be able to hire more people. Part of the problem that we have with competition with other countries, you mention all these other countries, all these other industrial countries that have free health care, universal health care. That means that the employers don’t carry the burden of that. So when they hire someone if the government is paying for it, they don’t have to worry about that for their employees necessarily. If the cost of premiums go down, then the costs of hiring somebody goes down in the United States.

In addition to that, there are all kinds of jobs created in the health care professions because, as everyone gets covered and everybody needs a primary care doctor, you’re going to need more doctors, more nurses, more health aides because people will get that kind of preventative care. So there are jobs created with the preventative care in handling people, to make sure they stay healthy or they stay well.

It is unbelievable to me when they talk about repeal. What the Republicans should be doing is spending the first few days of this session talking about how to improve the economy and create jobs, not repealing health care. I think the American people have lived on. They don’t want to hear this. They want to know what this Congress is going to do to create jobs and improve the economy. We’ve already dealt with the health care issue and they want us to move on.

Mr. GARAMENDI. We have about, maybe 3 minutes, 4 minutes, and I am going to turn now to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

Mr. COHEN. I just wanted to add one thing. Thank you.

The gentleman from New Jersey brought up an issue, and he said that it was not true that it was costing jobs. There is some respected group, I think it’s called Fact Check. They are on national news giving the biggest lies told in politics in the last year. The number one biggest lie—this independent group—was the Republican mantra of government run or government mandated health care. It’s just a fact. That is the truth. And it came from the leaders on the other side, it came from these halls where they are immune from defamation suits. Because it’s not government run health care. It’s unheard of, unfathomable, that the other side would use the fact that they’re immune from prosecution in any other jurisdiction or court for words that aren’t true to do that and in politics to say it was government run health care, the biggest lie of 2010, and it comes to the floor next week.

Mr. GARAMENDI. We are going to wrap this up one. I see the gentleman from Kentucky is here and he will probably carry on with health insurance. Maybe a couple of us will be asked to join him.

We have really today focused on a broad range of issues: The patients’ bill of rights; the way in which the repeal would harm individuals who have pre-existing conditions; young children from infancy; the 23- to 26-year-old coverage.

We also discussed a little bit about how this affects business and, of course, we went into some detail about senior citizens. All of these are critically important issues. We will be discussing these in the days ahead. I do hope the American public will really pay attention, because this next week, particularly as we move towards Wednesday, is going to be absolutely critical for the American people. It’s a question about will all of us in America be able to get health care coverage that is affordable and provides us with the opportunity to have the health care that we need.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WEBSTER). Members are reminded that remarks in debate are properly addressed to the Chair rather than any perceived television viewing audience.

HEALTH CARE DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 30 minutes. 

Mr. KING. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I can tell you that I am pleased to address you, Mr. Speaker, here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives and welcome you to this great deliberative body which becomes instantly far more deliberative than it has been over the last 4 years. This is part of it.

As I deliberate and I listened to the gentleman from Tennessee, I have to make the point that when you challenge the mendacity of the leader, or another Member, there is an opportunity to rise to a point of order, there is an opportunity to make a motion to take up the gentleman’s words. However, many of the Members are off in other endeavors. I would make the point that the leader and the Speaker have established their integrity and their mendacity for years in this Congress, and I don’t believe it can be effectively challenged, and those who do so actually cast aspersions on themselves for making wild accusations.

I came to this floor, though, Mr. Speaker, to talk about the weather, and as I listened to the speeches that have gone on before in this previous half-hour or hour, it actually changed the subject for me. I think there are many things that need to be brought out and clarified, given this, that we have debated this health care bill. We debated this health care bill for close to a year. It was announced in Rules Committee earlier today that there were, I believe they said, 100 hours of markup in committee. Well, it wasn’t the bill that passed. It was 100 hours of debate and markup on a different bill. They switched bills at the end. That’s a matter of public record and fact, also.

But the American public understands what happened. They understand that the Speaker of the House said, We have to pass the bill—meaning ObamaCare. Mr. Speaker—in order to find out what’s in it. When that bill was passed, to set the record also straight, I don’t think there is another time in the history of this Congress that there was a bill of this magnitude—in fact I’m certain there is not—that passed the House of Representatives without the majority support of the House of Representatives for the bill that was before us.

It is a fact of record, it’s a fact of judgment, it’s a fact of history, that there had to be conditions that were attached in order to achieve the votes necessary to squeak that bill by and as I listened to the speeches on that day last March. If people forget, Mr. Speaker, what I’m talking about, it’s this: Remember, there was a switch on the floor, not the bill that came to the floor, not the bill that had hearings on it and had markup. But there were also conditions. We should remember there were the Stupak Dozen, the Stupak Dozen who said we insist that there be an amendment brought forward that will protect so-called conscience or conscience or conscience. The bill doesn’t fund abortion through a Federal mandate. They held out on that to get that vote. Little did I know up
I want to thank and congratulate MICHELE BACHMANN. I didn’t know it, she was awake in the middle of the night doing the same thing, and her bill draft came down within 3 minutes of mine, exactly the same words. That bill draft was filed in a discharge petition with this huge Pelosi majority in the 111th Congress, and the discharge petition gathered 173 signatures, bipartisan by the Pelosi definition at least, Mr. Speaker. And that was part of the foundation that I think actually did shake this country.

There was a statement made in the Rules Committee when they were deliberating on the rule for H.R. 2 that we had said that the sky would fall if ObamaCare became the law of the land, and they said the sky didn’t fall. Well, Chairman UPTON, now chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee, said, yes, it did. The sky did fall.

When you look at the 87 freshmen new Republicans seated over on this side, the nine freshmen Democrats on this side, I think that any political pundit would tell you there was a political earthquake in America that was brought about in large part by the imposition of this law, the first unconstitutional ObamaCare bill that is before this Congress now.

This Congress was elected to come here and repeal ObamaCare, get a handle on the debt and the deficit and lay the foundation so that private enterprise can start to have faith in the future of this country again and they can create the jobs under the framework that we are hopeful we will be able to bring through.

But we are truthfully not in a position yet where the House of Representatives can lay all of the economic foundation that is necessary for free enterprise to have enough faith and confidence to invest our capital in a robust fashion.

What we are in a position to do now with a new Congress and a new Speaker is to be able to play an effective defense against the existing majority in the United States Senate and the President of the United States, who has frantically been digging holes through his Keynesian economics-steroids theory and dug such a deep hole that we have watched NANCY PELOSI preside over an additional $5.2 trillion in debt, and that private enterprise can start to have faith in the future of this country again and they can create the jobs under the framework that we are hopeful we will be able to bring through.

And it has got to stop. The American people did this. They were looking at President Gulliver Obama, and they were the Lilliputians that came to the polls on November 2 and tied him up with all their little electoral ropes and said to the new freshmen class, join those incumbent Republicans that are there and any discerning Democrats from the Stupak Dozen under the presumption, unconscionably and completely outside the bounds of the separation of powers, the President of the United States could effectively amend legislation by executive order and promise he’s going to do so before the bill was even brought to the floor for a vote. That happened in this Congress.

Another condition of that was, this is a condition that came after the then-chair of the Rules Committee, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. S.ATON-TEE), I don’t think they should just deem that the bill passed so they didn’t have to go on record of voting for this bill; because they knew how bad it was. They knew how politically they were. They knew that Speaker PELOSI was making many of them walk the plank. A lot of those people are not here in this 112th Congress because of that action. But as I talked about why this bill didn’t have the support of the Congress and in the form that was before us, why the majority didn’t support it, the majority votes that day in its form, because there also had to be another deal on top of this. This was the deal that the Senate had negotiated with the President of the United States who made a commitment to have enough faith and confidence to invest our capital in a robust fashion.

That’s what we have before us with ObamaCare. And it became the law of the land on that date of March 30, 2010; ObamaCare became the law of the land, and they said the sky didn’t fall. Well, Chairman UPTON, now chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee, said, yes, it did. The sky did fall.

The American people have seen clearly. They washed the lenses off and they have looked down through the lens of the Constitution and fiscal responsibility and common sense and they were appalled at that liberty-stealing bill of ObamaCare, and they said repeal that monstrosity, because the destiny of America will be forever diminished unless we do.

This is the charge that this new Congress has. It is the voice of the American people, and it is the respect that we must have, and my gratitude for God’s gift to America, the freshman class that was elected in 2010 and sworn in this morning. Right here on this floor yesterday afternoon, and they will affect the agenda of this country for many Congresses to come; and it will be a responsible agenda that brings us to a balanced budget and begins to reduce the deficit that this country has, not just the deficit spending, but reduce the national debt.

We must get to the point where we can begin to pay down the national debt, and we start with this Congress. We start by rolling back the spending to 2008 levels. We started here today with a vote that cut our own budgets by 5 percent. It is not a lot of money; and, yes, it is symbolic, but it is the symbolism that compels us to follow through. If it is good enough now for those of us in this Congress that voted on that, it is also good enough to bring that policy back through the United States of America.

Well, so what I have heard is the Members on the other side of the aisle that still stand here and defend ObamaCare, the ones that are left, they have four talking points about the bill that they think are compelling, and they must believe that it offsets all of the horrible things about ObamaCare.

First they say that, well, remember, the President had all of these promises about what he was going to do with ObamaCare. And he is the first one that I know of that attached the word “ObamaCare” to it in a public way. It was at the Blair House during the health care summit, February 25, 2010, when the President of the United States referred to his own bill as ObamaCare. So that is the shorthand version for all this long thing. They don’t know why ObamaCare, they don’t know why. That is how everybody knows it, and that is how everybody understands it.
So under ObamaCare, they say there are four—they don’t list only four, they just give you the four—four redeeming components to ObamaCare that apparently offset all the horrible things about it, and these four redeeming conditions are these:

That it requires insurance companies all across America with a Federal mandate to provide for policies that must keep your children on there up until age 26. They think that is something that America has fallen in love with as a result of their own solution.

Now, I know there are Republicans that support the idea of insurance policies being extended to age 26; but, Mr. Speaker, what a lot of people don’t know in this country is there are at least two Members in this Congress that were elected before age 26, and had ObamaCare been implemented before they were elected to office, they would have, could have, been on their parents’ health insurance plan.

Now, I think that is a nice thing, when you wean them off of their parents’ health insurance plan and you transition them over and put a pin on their lapel and say, now, run the country. They haven’t had a single minute of their own insurance policy until we get here, and actually we have a responsibility for it here. We pay our chunk of the premiums, like any other Federal employee.

But I just think it is ironic that there would be such a strong argument that people elected to Congress could come here, walk in that door, come down here before the Speaker’s rostrum, raise their hand and take the oath of office, and at that moment still be on their own or and daddy’s health insurance policy.

I wanted my kids to grow up. When they turned 18, I told them my responsibilities are now done. I am going to nurture you and give you advice and counsel; I will help you where I can. But I am not obligated, guys. We did our best for the first 18 years. We will do our best for every year. We will love you all our lives, but you got to start pulling your own load. Now I look at three grown sons in their thirties, all married, five grandkids, each an entrepreneur in their own right, pulling their own load, and I am glad that they didn’t have to stay unwedded until age 26.

But if the insurance companies want to do that, you should be able to buy the policy. If States want to mandate, I think it is not a good policy, but they can do so constitutionally, and then if a person is tired of paying those kind of premiums, you can move to another State and vote with your feet. There are some States in the Union here that I would move out of because I can’t afford the health insurance in them. There are other States one could think about moving to because of the opposite.

Here is the second point: preexisting conditions. They always tie this preexisting conditions in with the word “discrimination” because it is like a civil rights code word. So if an insurance company says I don’t want to provide insurance policies to people who have preexisting conditions who wait until they get sick before they buy a policy, the health insurance purchasing equivalent that your house is on fire before you go buy property and casualty insurance, how many rational people, Mr. Speaker, in this country, would make that case that we ought to have a guaranteed issue for our house? Couldn’t we then just, you know, set up our little BlackBerry with an automatic send and wait for the fire alarm to go off, and on the way down the steps to bail out of the burning house, you just click “send,” and automatically they have to give you a policy so that your house could be rebuilt if it is on fire.

We wouldn’t do that. It is ridiculous because it defeat the logic of insurance. The logic of insurance is you want to be insured against a catastrophe, and you want to share that risk with other people who want to be insured against a catastrophe. It is true for fire insurance, it was true for flood insurance until the Federal Government took it over, and it needed to be true with health insurance.

But we will address preexisting conditions; and we will have a legitimate debate on preexisting conditions here in this Congress, in committee hearings, before any amendments offered amendments allowed and amendments offered and debated and voted up and down.

My position is that if the States want to prohibit the consideration of preexisting conditions, they may do so. Our State has a high-risk pool, and we fund part of those premiums with the high-risk pool out of the State treasury.

I think that’s a good idea. I have worked to develop that and expand that in my time in the State legislature. I think it’s worthy of consideration that the Federal Government could take a look at those State high-risk pools and find ways to help those States provide those kinds of backstops because there will always be people that are unfortunate. It won’t always just be those that are irresponsible. There are also those that are unfortunate. And so we need to take that into consideration. But to have the whole debate about just those that are unfortunate and not take into consideration those that are taxpayers, those that are funding, those that are the engine of our economy that are being discouraged by these kind of Big Government, socialized medicine, unconstitutional policies like ObamaCare.

Here’s the third one. A 26-year-old with insurance, preexisting conditions. Oh, yes, the discriminatory preexisting conditions policy. It’s not discriminatory.

It’s logical and rational. Would you say that it’s a discriminatory policy to not allow people to buy property and casualty insurance if their house is on fire? It’s not discrimination. It defies common sense. So I’m not going to let them get by with that word.

Here’s a another thing, though. Doughnut hole. They say they fixed the doughnut hole and we would unfix the doughnut hole. The truth is that low-income people have already a backstop for that doughnut hole. It’s not the hole that they say it is. Furthermore, they raise fees elsewhere to fill the doughnut hole. So it’s not fixed. It’s just another transfer. So some people are beneficiaries and other people pay the extra money. I am not particularly animated about that, although I thought we should not have had that doughnut hole created here in 2003.

In any case, their next argument is language in the bill. If States want to provide lifetime caps, let them do that. But if individuals want to buy policies that have lifetime caps because the premiums are lower, let them make that decision as well. But I envision the day that we have free markets that are engaged in this. We want to preserve the doctor-patient relationship. We want to preserve the free market effect of this so that when people make decisions about their health and their lives, they have some tools to work with.

I want to be able to in this Congress, this 112th Congress, advance the idea and seek to pass legislation that’s pretty consistent with our views. I would expand it a little more. He’s advanced the medical savings accounts. I would add we need to advance health savings accounts, HSAs. In 2003, with the expansion of part D, we put language in that established HSAs, health savings accounts. It allowed in the first year for a couple to establish a health savings account with a maximum amount in it of $5,150, indexed for inflation so it could grow. I don’t remember what those numbers are today, but that’s the calculus, from $5,150 on up.

Well, that’s a good deal. ObamaCare slashed that in less than half and capped the HSA maximum amount at $2,500. Why? Because they don’t want people to be independent, and they don’t want them to be able to make their own decisions. If they do that, then they might undermine this effort of reducing the dependency class in America, which is what ObamaCare is designed to do, because expanding the dependency class expands the Democrat Party, and that increases the political base. And it seems illogical to me. Well, the Speaker of the House I’ve just applied to, and now Mr. Speaker, they do understand that this is about politics. It’s about expanding the dependency class. And it’s about diminishing the independence and the spirit of Americans.

And so the lifetime caps piece is the fourth one. Twenty-six year olds, preexisting conditions, doughnut hole,
lifetime caps. That's the things they talk about. Four things. That's it? Do they redeem those 2,500 pages of disaster? Do they then override and trump the Constitution of the United States of America? I say no, Mr. Speaker. They must not, they should not. And I hear this debate also about an increase in our deficit of the number, I think it was $232 billion, if not anymore, it's when—we repeal ObamaCare. We do that deficit, and they want to know. Will you offset that deficit with spending cuts? Yes, sir. We will be happy to offset a deficit with spending cuts. But I would make this argument instead. When you have an unconstitutional bill in front of you, and if you're weighing $232 billion and you want to debate whether or not that's a reason or not to repeal an unconstitutional bill. You can set no price on the Constitution of the United States of America. If it's a trillion dollars, you repeal the bill because it's unconstitutional. And you don't sit back and twiddle your thumbs and wait for the court to resolve this for you. I'm glad that there's litigation going on in the judicial branch. I'm glad that Judge Hudson from Virginia on the constitutional component of the Interstate Commerce Clause. I'm glad there are efforts out there in the States to deny the implementation of ObamaCare. All of these things going on. But we take an oath to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States here yesterday. We took it all in good faith. We said so. And when we have an unconstitutional bill before us, Mr. Speaker, it is our obligation to repeal that bill. Our judgment of the Constitution is not a judgment that defers across and down the line of Independence Avenue. We don't go to the Supreme Court and genuflect and say, If you change the meaning of the Constitution, that oath applies. Our oath applies to our understanding and conviction of the text in the original understanding of the Constitution and the various amendments as they were adopted. That's what the Constitution has to mean or it is no guarantee whatsoever to the people in this country. They rose up and they changed this majority in this House, and they did so because they're a whole group of millions of constitutional conservatives, including Tea Party groups, and they and said, Enough unconstitutional activity, enough of this theft of our liberty. We are not going to pass the debt and deficit on to the succeeding generations. And it was $230 billion was the point, not $232 billion, to make it accurate. We took an oath. And so I looked it up. And I'd like to just close with this concept that was delivered by Tony Blankley shortly before Christmas this year. He wrote about an experience in China and how they were worried that if they don't keep the growth going in China that they will create expectations and the peasants in China will be unemployable. If you give them expectations, then you have to meet those expectations. Well, we in America, we trust in our expectations.

And so he writes this. He said what happened on November 2, was that the American people went to the polls and said, I want more liberty and less government. I want more liberty and less security about my future. And he puts it in these words. And I think they're excellent words. No other people in the world would have responded to economic danger by seeking more liberty and less government protection. No other people would have thought to themselves, if I have to suffer economically in order to not steal from my grandchildren, so be it.

I pray we would have come to that decision. The Constitution was read today. I'm glad 

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FLEISCHMANN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. Yarmuth) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. YARMUTH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and congratulations on your election.

It's a great pleasure to be here today. I could spend the next half hour responding to my colleague from Iowa. I think it's fascinating just that one comment, that he talks about reading the Constitution and then talks about how this is an unconstitutional bill. Well, obviously, he apparently stopped reading the Constitution for 30 minutes.

The Constitution was read today. I'm glad it was. It's always good to remind ourselves of this great foundational document that we all respect, that all of us—all 435 Members of the House—swore to protect and defend yesterday.

In the Constitution, in article I, section 5, it says each House may determine the rules of its proceedings. Yes-
If we repeal the Affordable Care Act, which the CBO says will save $1.3 trillion over the next two decades, that’s money that we aren’t going to have to borrow from somebody else. They say, oh, that’s not part of the budget. We don’t have to have four books, but that’s easy.

So it’s fascinating that they basically set up these two sets of books, and now they give the power to the chairman of the Budget Committee, who in this case is Mr. Ryan of Wisconsin—a very thoughtful, honest man. You’ve him the power, however, to make a decision that whatever the CBO says doesn’t matter. He can deem, or decide, exactly what the impact of any provision or any act of Congress is on the budget. One person.

Now, I come from Kentucky. We’re a big basketball State. Last week, we had a game, a big-game rivalry. Kentucky and Louisville played. It didn’t come out the way I would have liked it to. But I had to think, when we set up these games, it should be like Louisville and Kentucky playing and saying to Coach Pitino of Louisville or Coach Calipari from Kentucky, You get to make all the calls in this game. Our players are going to play. They’re going to play hard, but Coach Pitino, we’re taking the refs off the field. You’re the one who’s going to call fouls. You’re going to make all the decisions.

That’s basically what the Republican have done.

What they also said and decided in this process is that the health care reform bill—changing it, repealing it—will have no impact on the deficit, no impact on the budget. That’s fascinating because, for the last year and a half, when we debated the Affordable Care Act, they kept talking about how this was going to balloon the deficit, how it was going to explode the deficit. Trillions of dollars it was going to cost the American taxpayer. Well, now they say, No, it has no impact on the deficit because you have to understand, if it costs nothing to repeal it, then there was no cost to passing it.

So one has to question who has been honest in this debate. Who has been honest in this debate?

I understand that finding referees as to who is right and who is wrong and what facts are salient and which facts are accurate has been a difficult process. Mr. King said that if you know, all of a sudden, we keep talking about this, and expect a liberal light to go on in people’s heads. Well, we need some light on this subject because there have been billions and billions of dollars spent to create darkness about the impact of this bill, and that process proceeds today.

So I think, as we debate this proposal of the Republicans to do away with many of the benefits which we are so proud of and which millions of Americans have benefited from, now we should have the kind of discussion that is honest, that is open, and that sheds light on the subject. No one can do that better than my colleague from the great State of Maryland, Donna Edwards.

Ms. Edwards, Thank you for yielding.

Mr. Yarmuth.

Mr. Yarmuth. I thank the distinguished Congresswoman from Maryland for her comments, and I’m actually kind of glad that Congressman King brought up these major benefits which are now helping families across this country.

Ms. Edwards talked about the benefit of adding your son or daughter under 26 to your policy, and Mr. King basically poo-pooed that—I don’t know if that’s exactly a good legislative term, but he did. And then he talked about lifetime limits and how lifetime limits were not necessarily something that we should worry about in spite of the fact that almost a million Americans a year, histories that have turned 26 or 29 and gone bankrupt because they either had no insurance or their insurance was inadequate and they lost everything they had because of health care costs, because of a cancer diagnosis or serious accident. These are real-life stories. These are not abstractions.

And I understand that we have many colleagues on the other side of the aisle who believe, with almost a religious zeal, certain things like the perfection of the marketplace, in spite of the fact that we’ve seen time after time after time in this country, not too long ago with the financial system, how our markets often fail, how we have created certain things like the concentration of power and concentrations of economic power in this country that have basically distorted the marketplace, and that is very, very true in the area of health insurance.

We have many, many States in which one company, one company, one insurer will dominate the insurance market, 85, 90 percent of the insurance in...
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that protection in terms of procedure
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most road construction, bridge con-
multiyear projects which, of course,
yours in Kentucky or Maryland or Con-
der.

That is a mechanism which was set up
this country is the highway trust fund.

We are talking here about a sector of
the U.S. economy that's not in a reces-
sion; it's in a depression. The construc-
tion trade right now is dealing with
unemployment rates of 25 percent.
Rather than shrinking and inhibiting
the transportation and infrastructure
of this country, we should be investing
in it. And let's be very clear here.
There is not going to be any private in-
vestment that’s going to fill the gap
that’s being created by undercutting
the sanctity of the highway trust fund.

The fact of the matter is this is done
through public dollars, and every gen-
eration going back to, really, Jefferson
has understood that this is essential to
have an economy that can actually
thrive and grow. And as I said, we have
now left the highway funding of this
country subject to the whims of the an-
ual appropriations process. That is not
the kind of money planning can actually take place at State
DOTs, and it doesn’t surprise me that
the folks in Kentucky have contacted
you. The people at DOT in Connecticut
have certainly done the same, and all
across the country. Again, manage-
ment, labor, public sector groups that
care about highways, they are just in-
credulous, particularly at this time
with the weakness of this economy,
that this House has adopted that type
of rule.

Mr. YARMUTH. I thank the gen-
tleman. And reclaiming my time, the analogy
I used earlier was with families, and we
all know we’re in a difficult budgetary
situation. We know we’re running huge
deficits right now, and we know that
the money that we are spending, a
large portion of it we are borrowing be-
cause tax revenues can’t support it.
This Republican majority now has ba-
sically taken the position that they’re
willing to spend a lot of money and
put a cap on expenditures. And cer-
tainly I understand that’s part of their
honestly held philosophy, but if you’re

And that analogy seems to be work-
ing here, particularly with regard to
transportation as well and the invest-
ment that we have to make.

Mr. COURTNEY. That’s right. And families make that decision to make
capital investments along exactly the
same lines, whether it’s to fix a roof,
you know, put a new driveway in, buy
a house. Again, that’s done through fi-
nancing, debt financing. And it’s,
again, the way that particularly the
middle class kind of deals with those
challenges. But there’s no question
that in terms of our own country’s his-
tory, going back in time, again, even
during the Civil War when the finances
of our country were going from almost
day to day, Abraham Lin-
coln did not pull back in terms of the
need for us to invest in rail, land-grant
colleges.

Again, this was in the middle of the
worst conflict in the history of this
country, but yet he still saw the need
for us, as a Nation, to still continue to
invest in the future, and we borrowed
funds. Because those types of invest-
ments, investing in people through
education or investing in infrastruc-
ture comes back to benefit the econ-
omy long term, and the multiplier ef-
fect is much higher than the actual
pricetag of those initial investments.

Mr. YARMUTH. I thank the gen-
tleman. Again, I go back to these rules
that have been adopted now in the
House, and they basically give extraor-
dinary unprecedented power to one
person to set these budget limits to decide
the budgetary impact of an investment
in infrastructure or a health care law,
the repeal of a health care law or, for
instance, the repeal of many of the ad-

And it seems to me that, as I read
through the Constitution, the Found-
ing Fathers probably would dispute that
we would basically disenfranchise
434 Members of Congress in making
these incredibly important decisions
about how we raise revenue, which is
specifically a power that has been
given for initiation to the House of
Representatives, or to spend tax rev-
ue, that that kind of power would
vest in one person and that you would
set up a set of rules that sets up two
sets of books and say, If you drop
revenue, if you cut taxes, if you have a
problem with the budget implications;
but everything you spend has to be offset somewhere along the
line.
And I think in terms of not just investment in infrastructure but also investment in research, medical research which probably is the real answer to our long-term health care financing costs. If we can control or cure diabetes and cancer and make an impact on heart disease, then we'll really be able to protect and care for people. And I think we're really going to help us in the future. But to set up these kinds of rules which basically, again, disenfranchise not just 434 Members of Congress but, in the process, virtually every American can make a decision on how much money should be spent and invested in very, very important aspects of the general welfare.

And I would like to yield to the gentlewoman from Maryland, DONNA EDWARDS.

Ms. EDWARDS. I thank the gentleman for yielding. And it occurred to me as we heard this discussion—and thank you to Mr. COURTNEY for raising these issues with us, Mr. Speaker. Because of the time before that, I was thinking that while we should be spending our time focused on job creation—and we know that a core for job creation for the 21st century for this country is in our investment in our transportation infrastructure, really just being back to work. And instead, we are retiligating what the American people thought we had finished with—health care.

So here we are with a rule that then says to us, Even as the bipartisan debt commission has said that we need to invest in the Nation’s infrastructure—those are investments that create jobs, jobs where taxpayers are paying into the system so that we have revenue, so that we can invest in our infrastructure—that we are going to be constrained from doing it. And I am reminded that in the last Congress, in the 111th Congress, every Member, I believe, of our Transportation and Infrastructure Committee wrote to the President of the United States saying, We need to do a long-term transportation and infrastructure bill so that our States can begin to really put people back to work. And here we are in the 112th Congress, led by the Republicans who have put forth a rules package that will constrain the ability to create jobs in this country.

Mr. YARMUTH. I thank you for that contribution. And we've also been joined by the gentleman from Tennessee, Congressman COHEN, and I would like to thank him.

Mr. COHEN. Thank you, Mr. YARMUTH.

Indeed, the issues that Mr. COURTNEY brought forward in his 1 minute today were alarming to me because my hometown of Memphis depends upon transportation. That's what makes it America's distribution center, the roads, the rivers, the runways, and the rails. And if we don't have money to go into helping our airports—where Federal Express, now in your district, Mr. YARMUTH, UPS—because that's how we move products all over the world. From those hubs, we move commerce. And that is why it's so important that we have an FAA Reauthorization Act passed, a lot of which would be expenses to modernize the structure and the transportation bills that Mr. Oberstar, who was one of the great Members of this House but is no longer with us, last year to both stimulate the economy in the short run and in the long run, as Mr. COURTNEY said, with that multiplier effect by creating jobs. It's roads that take goods to market, that move raw materials. And I was hoping and do hope that we will have bipartisan efforts to have transportation, FAA reauthorization bills pass that will move this economy forward.

The economy is still in a difficult spot, and we can't really see that the economy is improving if we continue to cut spending, particularly in places such as transportation, infrastructure, and the airport infrastructures. That's so important. We can't allow that to be the case. And I was hoping and do hope that we will have bipartisan efforts to have transportation, FAA reauthorization bills pass that will move this economy forward.

So I thank my colleagues for joining me today.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded not to traffic the well while another Member is under recognition.

ISSUES FACING THE 112TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to address the House on this historic day, this historic day when we have had the entire body read the Constitution of the United States. As that process went on, there was some wonderment in the audience about why we were doing it and what it would mean. But as I listened to the different bipartisan Members reading the Constitution, I felt a gravity come through the institution that we began to listen to and hear and read the words of our Founding Fathers as they set us on this great experiment called the American Republic, the Republic which was turned loose for the first time, a government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

...I thank my colleagues for joining me today.

And on this historic day, we have to contemplate what our tasks are as the American Republic. For myself, I see the most important thing in front of us as being economic growth, jobs; and we have to wonder what we're going to do about that.

As I traveled around the district, after the election, we did—we had 18 counties, and we did 18 different town hall meetings, listening to the people of the district after the election. And the overriding concern is what are we going to do about jobs and what are we going to do about the economic future of the country.

I think people are alarmed at the policies that they have seen come out of Washington. They're alarmed at the spending. They're angry that Washington has not been listening, and they're just upset with the policies in general.

The last election sent two very clear messages: number one, you, in Washington are not listening to us; number two is that we don’t like what you’ve been doing.

So, as we contemplate the future, we have to try to get our hands around the...
economic growth question, and we have to ask ourselves why do we not have job creation at this time in our history.

As a business owner, I can tell you that the most important thing that we face is uncertainty. Now, that uncertainty originates from inside the government, so our government is doing the things which freeze our job creation in its place.

The uncertainty arises on two basic fronts. First of all, taxation, and second, regulation.

And so our friends across the aisle were just asking, why are we talking about the health care bill when that’s been debated and discussed? If we narrow it down to job creation, if we narrow it down to the economic uncertainty or certainty, I hear business owners every day saying, we’re going to have to lay off one or two people, maybe up to 10 percent of our workforce. Maybe we’re going to have to lay off more to get below that threshold because we cannot afford the mandates that are given to us in this health care bill.

So, number one, that’s taxation and uncertainty in one piece. The health care bill hires 16,000 IRS agents, but does not hire one doctor. You can always tell by the functionality, not by the name of a bill, what it does, but by the functionality. And when it hires 16,000 IRS agents and no doctors, you can probably imagine how more about taking the American public than it is about providing health care. And we’re seeing that play out in the job market across the United States.

People are frozen into place, wondering what it’s going to mean in additional cost for their companies. So rather than leaving those people on the payroll, they’re actually shrinking the payroll at a time when we need employment; 9% to 10 percent unemployment for extended periods of time is not what makes people secure about the future. So that’s one piece of the health care bill.

The second piece of the health care bill that is freezing job growth and job creation is its tracks in the regulatory environment. This is a time with baby boomers moving into retirement age, retirement age brings more expenses, more health care costs, and we should be seeing a growth in jobs in the health care industry as well. But instead that industry is frozen regularity. People don’t know what the future is going to bring, and so that job growth that should be occurring to take care of our seniors is actually frozen in place by the regulations in this bill.

So, again, let’s begin with the idea that we want to create jobs and grow the economy. We have to assess those things, those elements which are creating the impediments to growth, taxes and regulation. Then we can walk through our economy one section at a time to find the same thing is occurring, and we would begin to understand more clearly and more definitely that our government is the problem in job creation.

For instance, if we took a look offshore, we all saw the problems with BP. That was on the TV every day. And I think BP should be 100 percent account for those damages. It was my business—my wife and I had a service company, we fixed and repaired down-the-hole problems in oil wells. So we’re familiar with the things, the decisions that were being made by the company out there as that well progressed towards a catastrophic failure.

Now, I do not believe—even though I think BP should be accountable—I do not believe that we should have killed one job in relation to that. When an airliner crashes, we don’t stop all airlines. We bring the Nation’s best people together, we determine what happened, and we determine how to make it not happen again. That’s what we should be doing offshore. We should be bringing those best people together, letting them analyze the problem, and then making sure it does not occur again.

But instead, the Obama administration implemented a moratorium, and that moratorium shut down the drilling on the deepwater platforms. Those deepwater platforms cost billions to make, sometimes 15 years to manufacture them, and we have now shut them down; no economic activity at all.

Now, every business will tell you that they’ve got to have revenue from their investment. And so now those deepwater rigs are beginning to steam away at about two or three knots per hour to foreign countries. Some have already gone to Africa, South America; and those jobs will never occur offshore in the U.S. again. I think that that’s an over-response from the Obama administration, and I believe that one of the things this Congress should do is pull the pendulum back to the middle.

Yes, we should protect our environment. Yes, we should hold the companies accountable; but, no, we should not have killed one job. So I think in the early days of this Congress, we should make that a clear differentiation between the parties or between philosophical views of how to return the country. I think that we should make those clear distinctions that this group of people should be back on the payroll; and, yes, we should keep our environment, but we will hold those who make problems accountable.

And I think the American people are looking for that balance, that pendulum to come back toward the middle to where we say we can protect, we can preserve, and we can create jobs simultaneously. And that is one of my sincere hopes that we begin to do this in these early days.

There’s an economic truism that says when you raise taxes, you kill jobs. When you lower taxes, you create jobs. People would say, well, how do we create more jobs? The answer is, if you really want to do it, you should lower taxes. And that’s what this bill was saying right at the end in the lame duck session to extend the Bush tax cuts. It was saying that we should not raise taxes on any single American.

Now, you have the partisan debate that says we shouldn’t be lowering taxes on billionaires. Well, frankly, there are very few of those. Many of the people who fall in that $230,000-a-year and above income are simply small business people.

For instance, just last week, we had a dairy owner saying, you know, we run $1 million a month through my small dairy. We only have 50 or 60 employees, but it costs us $1 million a month to milk cows, to pay the feed and, hopefully, we get enough revenue. And yet these are people that you’re going to drive the taxes up on. As you drive taxes up on your job creators, what you do is you take away their ability to create more jobs.

Now, if any of you have any cash left in the bank, which I think that we should—this is my approach at this point, you wouldn’t know that cash in the bank has almost zero worth. You get 0.0025. You get one-quarter of 1 percent interest on your money in the bank. So any company today looking to reinvest its money to create cash flow, rather than holding cash in the bank.

But the uncertainty, the tax uncertainty and the regulatory uncertainty causes us to be uncertain about the future, and it causes us not to create jobs. And so we, in this body, have a tremendous obligation and a tremendous responsibility and even the—we can create the right perception, the right certainty if we’ll simply take the right steps to just cause the mental framework of America to say, yes, we now know where we’re going in the future; we now can invest with a certain amount of predictability.

And I think that it is our God-given responsibility at this point in our history to do everything we can to start rebuilding our economy. So there are those who would say, but we can’t do that. We might take jobs back from some foreign country.

The entire world’s economy takes its heartbeat from the U.S. economy. We’re about 25 percent of the world’s economy.

I was in Germany several years ago to visit the soldiers in Landstuhl who had been wounded. In the evening time we met with about 100 different German corporations and they said, please fix your economy. When you, the U.S., sneeze economically, we, the world catch flu economically.

So that gives you some understanding of our responsibility to fix our economy. So, systemically, I think that we should walk through each industry one at a time to see what this does to our ability to kill or freeze jobs. I think that once we look offshore and realize that we are killing those jobs, we are sending those jobs
to, say, Venezuela—I’m not sure who among us would want to do that, but that’s, in effect, what is happening—I think that we should do what it takes to bring those jobs back.

I think then, systemically, as we work our way through the country, we should ask ourselves about the 27,000 farmers in the San Joaquin Valley, 27,000 farmers that used to make their way, make their payments to the bank, make payroll, buy fertilizer, buy seeds, buy the equipment, and invest in repairs of the tractor. That’s the whole growing economy. But a couple of years ago, because of the 2-inch silverly minnow, that entire economic region was simply shut down; that is, we are choosing all on behalf of a species preservation and none on behalf of the human species’ job creation.

I think that the American people are expecting us to find the balance. I think they are expecting us to keep the species alive, maybe in holding ponds and maybe in the rivers, but I think they are expecting us to find a solution to the job creation in the country. And I think that we can do it better than by simply saying, by some judge’s order, that an entire economic subculture is simply going to disappear.

Now, the farmers haven’t been working in a couple of years. Many are on assistance. They are not making their payments for the land. The banking system is less stable in the region. And, in the process, we are importing food which is far less safe to consume. We are importing from Central America, South America, maybe Mexico, and we have no control over what pesticides they use. So we have been seeing increasing inputs of food into our economic system here in the U.S. which are less safe. We saw the lead poisoning from China. We see these things every day. Why we would do that, I beholding some rigid philosophical viewpoint is simply exasperating Americans at this point.

Another issue in which we should look, if we are systemically looking at the way our economy is being frozen in its tracks, is our entire timber industry. We used to have a thriving timber industry here in this country. In New Mexico, we had a thriving timber industry that was almost as big as the oil and gas industry. We employed 20,000 people in the timber industry at one point in New Mexico, like many of the other States, employs zero. We have nobody working in the timber industry.

Now, in full disclosure, during the last campaign I did have a guy come up and say, "That’s incorrect. We have eight." He said, "I started a small lumber mill, and we are processing small diameter trees and we hired eight people.”

But imagine what would be going on in New Mexico if we had our communities with those timber jobs that used to be there. Our tax base would increase, the number of jobs would increase. We would have people paying Federal income tax, State income tax. But instead, those economic potentials have been shifted away to another country.

Now, I love the Canadians, but I think that we should have the jobs in New Mexico that we shipped to Canada. The idea, when we put the spotted owl regulations into effect, was that we were going to send these jobs to third-world countries. That’s not what happened. They went to the economically closest neighbor, the one with the least transportation costs, and we gave the jobs to them.

I think that in this country people are tired of our government choking down the job base, the economic base for different regions, and we can work our way across the country and assess these.

I think the American people are expecting us in this new Congress, as we go through the Constitution as we read it on the floor, I think they are expecting us to redesign and reinvent government. I think they are expecting us to take a fresh look, do a forensic audit of everything, to see what is working properly and what is working improperly. And when we do that, I think they expect us to cause efficiencies to occur in the government and cause efficiencies in the regulatory framework to where we can protect the species, protect the environment, protect the worker, and have the job creation on the other side of the pendulum, find that spot in the middle where we can both.

I think Americans are alarmed, I think that they are afraid, and I think that they are angry over the way that Washington has been functioning. The last election said so. I do not think the last election was about Republican politics. I think it was a message that we want things to straighten up in America.

If we are going to straighten things up in America, the most important thing to do is job creation and economic growth. If we will grow our economy in that range, then all the problems begin to dissipate. The shortages and budgets in the Federal Government begin to dissipate. The shortages in our State budgets begin to dissipate. That is the only way we can protect a company save its way to prosperity.

So I agree with our leaders and I agree with the Republican Party that we should be looking at spending cuts and not at tax cuts. We should be finding more efficient, more effective ways to find governance. But I do not think we can find our way to prosperity in simply the budget cuts, but instead we have to look at tax certainty and regulatory certainty to create the economic growth that is there.

Now, I said earlier that tax cuts create jobs, and you might want to know how that actually plays out. One guy in Artesia, in New Mexico, Mr. Swift, said it most clearly. He said: “I drive bulldozers. For me to create one job takes $340,000. Now,” he said, “if the government is taxing away my profits, then it takes longer to accumulate the $340,000.” He said, as I mentioned earlier, “That money in the bank is absolutely no use right now. I would rather have it in the bulldozers. But the government takes it and taxes it away, and then it takes me longer to create a job.”

So you see this stagnant economy one job at a time because we are taxing too high, we are spending too frivulously as a government. And the American people are looking for solutions, and I think that we, as Republicans, have the right idea in tax certainty, regulatory certainty. And the job creation will begin then from the private companies.

Now, people have asked: What about the stimulus bill? Well, the stimulus bill was never going to create jobs, because what it does is it taxes away from that bulldozer operator who was going to create the job with his $340,000, and then it gives it that tax money over here to someone else. And they create jobs, but just for a short time, because if they only created jobs with that input of stimulus money, then that’s not a legitimate long-term job in the first place.

What we are looking for is sustained economic growth from jobs that come by private companies investing private capital. This is a capitalist society. Capital is the building block, and capital is generated by profits. As we tax away the capital, then we convert ourselves into a stagnant, nongrowing economy.

It’s all fairly basic, but it just gets confusing when we here in Washington want to take the money from our job creators and spend it ourselves. There is something in politics where it seems to thrive on taking your money and putting it here to create our idea of right and wrong. Let the American people free. Let the American people have their tax money back and they will begin to invest it in growth opportunities.

How many of us are involved in the stock market? We do not want to invest our money in uncertain stocks or uncertain bonds. So the idea of certainty plays out all the way through the investment spectrum. From just your basic small guy buying into the stock market to your small business person who wants to invest in a piece of equipment, a pickup truck, a new room in his office, a new office for someone to provide some service at, a new computer so he can bring on a new IT person. Those are all examples of private investment, private capital creating jobs in the private market.

Now people always say, Well, what about those jobs? If we raise taxes, we
can create more jobs over here in, say, teaching in our schools. Or maybe hire more government agents over here in the Department of Transportation or wherever.

Again the basis of any economy cannot be government spending. It has to begin in the private market. When we in the public sector, when we in government take more than generally somewhere in the range of 20 to 22 or 23 percent, what we do is we stifle growth of the economy.

You can look at the full state-run economies. The USSR was a good example. They were above 50, 60 percent. Their government took in that much of the gross domestic product. They eventually collapsed because there was no growth in jobs, no growth in revenue, and then we had a simple failure of the economic system.

Now as we convert from more a private market into a government market, we’re going to see the increased pressure on the cost of the economy because, again, we’re taxing away that ability for private firms to invest private capital. We can never take money from private companies, put it into the government and have the government to run it better.

I give an example that if the government thinks it can run a company, let’s set it fix the post office first. That’s a business operation that it’s in. Maybe you think the post office is running well, but many would disagree that it does.

Another example of why government shouldn’t be in business is Medicare, Medicaid. We have been told here in this body that Medicare loses about 20 percent to fraud every year. That’s about $90 billion. Another $60 billion a year on Medicaid fraud. That’s just fraud. That’s not waste. That’s people cheating the system.

The example was given by 60 Minutes a couple of years ago by a guy in Florida who was making $400,000 a month selling things he didn’t really own to clients of the Medicare system. Now they did exist and they had numbers. And so he had a store front because he said it was above 50 percent. So he had a store front but he said I never owned $400,000 a month. He said on this TV interview, yeah, you caught me and I’m going to jail for 12 years. But there are 2,000 people just like me here in Miami. While I’m in jail, I’m going to lease my list, my mailing list of Medicare patients, to someone else who’s going to do the same thing.

If a business were to do that, they would be out of business within the month. But government doesn’t ever go out of business. All they do is increase your taxes and you as a private citizen are sitting there trying to figure out around the dining room table how are we going to make ends meet and the government is simply pouring more money into a system that is leaking it so badly through the fraud and through the abuses that we’re never able to have the program function correctly.

The government at this point needs oversight. I expect that we need to deal with these leakage out of the system that are being taxed away from hard-working families struggling to make ends meet and maybe, maybe just going down a bit on their taxes where they’re not trying to sink underwater themselves.

One of the regulatory things that we should do is take a look at the way our banking regulators are operating. What our local banks are being told by the regulators that come from here in Washington, D.C., is that if you make one bad loan, we’re going to come take your bank away from you. What that has done is frozen our banks completely in their tracks. They’re afraid to lend because that might just be the loan that goes bad and then they lose their entire bank. We’ve seen examples like that across the country. And so our regulators right now again are creating great uncertainty among banks who would be giving the loans that would keep businesses going; but instead they’re afraid, they’re uncertain, they don’t make loans, and small businesses have the capital that they need to keep operating choked off by a regulatory framework that is wrong.

These are the things that I think compel us in this Congress to do the right thing. Americans are not expecting magic. They’re not expecting for us to do the unimaginable. Just start choking off the fraud, create a little certainty in the economy so that people can begin to hire, so that our economy will begin to grow, and as it grows, Medicare begins to work better again, Social Security begins to work better if we grow the economy, local and State budgets begin to work better if we grow the economy, and our national budget begins to work better if we choose as a Congress, and there will be many choosing here to obstruct, but without a doubt that it is somehow wrong to give tax cuts. If they choose to obstruct it, I think we have deep economic troubles lying ahead.

So for me, it’s an easy question. If we don’t grow, you have great troubles lying ahead, then let’s grow. Let’s pull out the stops, let’s find those balance points in regulation, let’s find the taxes where we can lower them to create more certainty and more job growth, let’s begin to pull those manufacturing jobs back to the areas around the world that have disappeared. We’ve driven them out through our overregulation and overtaxation. And I think when we do that, we will begin to see that this economy will grow and the world economy will grow along with us. If we choose not to do it, I think that we have those troubled waters ahead with higher unemployment, higher taxes, greater dislocation in our budgets nationally. I think then that we’re going to see more printing of money. As they print money, then we find that the money in your savings accounts begins to dissipate. We’ve seen almost $2.6 trillion printed in the last year and a half or two by Mr. Bernanke. I think that Americans are alarmed at the prospect of hyper-inflation.

So, Mr. Speaker, as I conclude tonight, I would just like for this body to really contemplate the risks on the one side that we face but the potential for optimism on the others. I believe that prosperity is possible, but I believe prosperity is a choice. It’s going to be a choice on the part of this body as we move forward through the next months.

So our friends on the other side of the aisle will complain about our concern. As they print money, then all we are trying to do is create tax certainty and regulatory certainty. All we’re trying to do is reverse a government takeover of part of the economy in order to create jobs. To me it makes sense. And I understand the arguments from the other side and appreciate that they come with a different point of view.

But I think Americans are looking for us to set aside the partisan differences that we have and to work as Americans. We run as Republican, Independent or Democrat. That’s accepted in the American political spectrum. But what’s not expected is that we come here and operate with those same partisan viewpoints.

So let’s set aside the partisanship now at this point, let’s begin to work as Americans to do the right thing, grow the economy, create jobs, give the younger generations a sense that they have a place in the future, that the things they are working for will actually materialize, that there is a ray of hope.

For myself, I have an absolute belief that our economy in the future is going to be better and that there are great days ahead. Winston Churchill’s quote gave me that belief. He says, “You Americans always do the right thing.”

“After you’ve tried everything else,” he says. We’ve been in the process over the last 50 years of trying everything else. Now it’s time for us to get serious and do the hard work of getting the government in control, shrinking the spending, lowering taxes, creating regulatory certainty, so that this free market can continue to grow and expand through the next generations.
HEALTH CARE AND THE DEFICIT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. WELCH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and welcome. I want to also thank the gentleman from New Mexico and welcome back. Your comments about trying to work together and bipartisanship, that all makes an awful lot of sense to me and I hope to all of us. But welcome back, sir.

We are going to have an opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to use this Special Order half-hour to talk about health care and also about the deficit. We do want to be bipartisan, but we also want to be real. Our job, as you know, is to legislate, and we will be judged by our actions, by our deeds, more than by our rhetoric.

Let me just say that the aspirations that have been enunciated by many of our Republican leaders are ones I quite admire; an open and transparent Congress, more open rules, fiscal discipline. But because of the epilepsy, some big group policy.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back to Mr. WELCH.

Mr. WELCH. I welcome the gentleman from Maryland, Congresswoman EDWARDS.

But what I am concerned about is something you just mentioned. The ideology and the radical approach that they are taking to repeal something that was put into place over the last 2 years but has been needed by this country for decades is something that I will fight for. But these positions are not what the American people want. They want practical, solid solutions where people are treated fairly and equally.

In the health legislation, the Affordable Health Care Act that we passed, the guts of that legislation is about treating people equally. What I mean by that is we stop discriminating against people with preexisting conditions. They are now free from that kind of discrimination. That is so important.

We talked a lot today about the Constitution. Well, prior to the Constitution we had the Declaration of Independence, and the Declaration of Independence starts with these words: ''All men are created equal.'' It probably should have added ''women'' at that point, but back then it was ''all men are created equal.''

That is carried forward in the 14th Amendment to the Constitution, and I have prepared a chart of this, of the language, which says no State shall deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

People with disabilities, people with preexisting conditions, with physical conditions, have been discriminated against because of those conditions and illnesses. That is wrong, it is immoral, and in my opinion it is unconstitutional.

In my district, I was standing at a gas station. A guy comes up to me and he says, You all have to pass that legislation. My daughter has Crohn's disease. I am in a roofing company. I want to start my own roofing company, but I can't because I have to stay here. Otherwise, she will be uninsurable because of her prior condition, and I am stuck in that job.

Well, this bill, the heart of this bill is to give freedom from that kind of discrimination against her prior illness, freedom to that roofer so he can go start his business. That is at the heart of the American way.

In my own situation, I have a daughter with epilepsy. She didn't ask to have epilepsy; that is just part of her makeup. But because of this epilepsy, she is uninsurable, unless she is part of some big group policy.

So in the Affordable Health Care Act, we have done away with that kind of discrimination. We have freed people from that kind of discrimination. The Republican majority, ideologically, radically driven, wants to take that freedom away, and I will fight that today, tomorrow, and next week.

With that, I yield back to my friend from Vermont.

Mr. WELCH. Welcome the gentleman from Maryland, Congresswoman EDWARDS.

Ms. EDWARDS. Thank you, the gentleman. I am so pleased to be here again. I have been here in the House on this floor for the last hour and a half because I feel passionately, as we all do, about health care. There is not one among us, either personally, as the gentleman from Colorado sees expressed, or one of our constituents, who doesn't have a health care story to share.

So I thought that I would actually share with you a story today. Mr. Speaker, from a constituent of mine who lives in the Fourth Congressional District in Maryland. She writes to me that her daughter graduated from college in 2008 and lost coverage under my—this is from her—my health insurance.

She got a job in August 2008 that provided her with health insurance coverage. When she lost that job in June 2009, as millions of Americans have lost their jobs, she was eligible for COBRA. And so, Mr. Speaker, she goes to the insurance provider and they tell her COBRA subsidy made it possible for her to continue with that insurance. But then when that subsidy ended in September of 2010, they had to make a difficult decision, she says, to continue to pay for her COBRA coverage until the end of 2010 when it expired. It was an affordability question.

She continues on: We knew she would become eligible for my insurance at the start of the plan year in January 2011.

And why is that? Because under the Affordable Care Act, she would be able to cover her daughter for her health insurance and would no longer have to pay COBRA that care.

She continues on: The unsubsidized COBRA premium was over $400 a month, actually closer to $500 a month, and it is going to cost me only $60 to $70 to add my daughter, now 24, to my employer plan. And some of her doctors, who were not in the network under her COBRA plan are in network for my plan, meaning we will not have to pay for their full cost of out-of-pocket costs.

Vicki—I won't say her last name—says to me: I am in the sandwich generation and help with the care of my stepmother who lives in Florida. She falls into the part D prescription doughnut hole every year, so now on January 1 her costs will be reduced because of the health reform legislation as well.

Mr. Speaker, what I am saying to you and what we say to the American people today is that this isn't about numbers and statistics; it is about real people like Vicki and her daughter and her stepmother that she cares for. It is about real people who, in their lives, work every single day or are trying to find work and they don't have health care coverage.

I want to fight to repeal the Affordable Care Act, because that would be like throwing ice water on the American people. With that, I yield back.
Mr. WELCH. I want to talk about this question of will promises made be promises kept. It was the recurring question that was asked by our colleagues on the other side of the aisle when we were in the majority. Sometimes it may be uncomfortable, because it’s a hard question. And we cannot be judged according to our deeds and whether they matched our promises.

But there’s this rules process under way on the health care bill. There are three issues that have come up. Number one, the fiscal issue. The Congressional Budget Office has said that this legislation will increase the deficit by $230 billion. And the Congressional Budget Office is the neutral arbiter. And we either—both—go by the CBO estimates, or we just say we’re going to play this game without a referee and we’re going to make up whatever numbers suit our political agenda. That is absolutely wrong. We cannot afford to add $230 billion to the deficit. My colleagues on the Republican side agree with us on the Democratic side that we cannot do that. It’s irresponsible to do it. And this legislation that repeals health care will add $230 billion to the deficit.

Secondly, there’s this question of the open process. As the Member from Maryland said, if we’re going to have an open process, there has to be an opportunity for every Member of Congress to have their amendments, yes-or-no, on whether we can continue protection to folks whether they have a preexisting condition or not.

Right now, the law is if you have cancer, you can go out and buy insurance. Right now, the law is if you have a son or daughter getting out of college or getting out of high school, going into the labor force, they can stay on your policy. But now, the law is if you have a mom or dad who’s on Medicare and you’re trying to get preventive care, they can get it for free. Right now, the law is that if you have diabetics or you have cancer, you have a serious long-term medical condition, there’s no lifetime cap to cover the medical care that you need.

The repeal legislation would take away from every single American who now enjoys those insurance protections. It’s going to be a very awkward way, suddenly, abruptly, and with nothing to replace it. That’s not right.

Now, this is real, by the way. Congresswoman EDWARDS gave a couple of stories—and we all have them in all of the districts, including those who are advocating for repeal. I spoke to Donna Watts who’s from Plainfield, Vermont. She works in Burlington, Vermont, with 20 other employees. Four of those people that she works with, along with her, now have their children on their health care. Her son high school, got a $10-an-hour job that came without health care, as most entry-level jobs do.

And the worst happened. He had a car crash: $20,000 in medical bills. Those are still largely unpaid—and this family takes seriously their obligation to pay their bills. They didn’t have insurance. With the passage of the legislation last year on health care reform, Donna Watts was able to put her son, Donnie, with 20 other employees. Four of those people that she works with, along with her, now have their children on their health care. Her son high school, got a $10-an-hour job that came without health care, as most entry-level jobs do.

And the other question. If this has not got a political agenda attached to it, we have gone from a campaign to governing. And the majority did a great job in the campaign and beat us up pretty good and have the majority now. But with that, of course, comes the responsibility of governing in a responsible way. If you’re acting responsibly when you see a problem, you fix it. You don’t abolish everything. You don’t abolish a banking system in order to correct the problems in the financial world. You don’t abolish all of the good things in this health care bill to deal with the things that need to be addressed.

So this is a very serious decision that’s being made. It’s going to be a template for the future of this 112th Congress. Are we going to actually deal with fiscal discipline even when that’s inconvenient with our political agenda? The answer to that for the American people has to be: Yes. Are we going to protect the progress that we have made that benefits all of our constituents when it comes to these insurance reforms, and are we going to have an open process in this body so that those of us who have a different point of view are going to have an opportunity for an up-or-down vote?

By the way, that’s not about giving us the opportunity to present our ideas, but about giving our constituents know where we stand. Because at the end of the day that’s the only basis upon which they can decide whether to send us back here or send us packing.

At this time I would like to recognize the gentleman from North Carolina, Representative PRICE.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I thank the gentleman for yielding and also for engaging in this dialogue with me. But now, the challenge that we’re facing to reduce this country’s deficit spending and reduce the accumulating debt and at the same time to make certain that quality, affordable health care are available to all of our citizens.

As the gentleman has pointed out very, very ably, those two challenges are intricately related. In fact, one of the main reasons for supporting health insurance reform is because we simply must reduce our deficit spending and debt. And one of the main contributors to our country’s escalating debt is the kind of increasing of health care costs that we have seen in recent years. It’s one of the greatest threats to families, to businesses, to the overall economy. Health care has become the fastest growing component of the Federal budget, as the gentleman well knows. Last year, health care accounted for 17 percent of GDP. That’s more than the average of other developed nations.

Now, the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act corrects the failures of the current system without compromising the many strengths of what we have today. It’s very disconcerting here in this first week of the new Congress to see our Republican colleagues not only going after the protections in the health care law, but also almost immediately abandoning their commitment to fiscal discipline.

Now, the figures that I saw this morning show that the Congressional Budget Office, the nonpartisan arbiter of budgets decisions for this body, the Congressional Budget Office has said that the repeal of health insurance reform as proposed by the Republicans would cost the Federal budget $230 billion over the next 10 years. That’s a revised estimate, I understand—even greater than was earlier thought. That is an astounding figure.

Our Republican friends have made a big show out of their commitment to deficit reduction, but they have made an exception. They have clearly made an exception for the repeal of health insurance reform. So not only is this bad health care; not only would it, for example, say to families who only now are being able to insure their children with preexisting conditions, No, we’re going to go back to the old way where that is not need to do this.

And it raises the other question, If we’re going to go back to the old way where that is not need to do this. And it raises the other question, If we’re going to go back to the old way where that is not need to do this. And it raises the other question, If we’re going to go back to the old way where that is not need to do this.

So it’s certainly bad policy in terms of health care. But then, to add insult to injury, adding $230 billion to this country’s debt burden over the next 10 years, and to do that without batting an eye, without any recognition that this has an impact on the deficit, that’s just almost unbelievable that the Republicans would be so audacious as to propose this in the first week of a new Congress.

And then to add another insult to injury, they’re violating their very own pledge of openness in the way this is going to be considered. I’m sure this gentleman has been watching, as I have, the Rules Committee all day today. It’s astounding. Yesterday, it was that the open rules, to open debate, to the offering of amendments. Today, they’re saying, We’re going to shut it down. It’s an up-
or-down vote. Maybe we’ll get around later to some of these other questions, some of the repair aspect of repeal and repair, but right now we’re just going to repeal it and let the chips fall.

That is horrible procedure. It’s a shutting down of this Congress before we even start. It’s horrible budget policy. It’s horrible health policy. It’s a very, very bad way to start this Congress.

I appreciate the gentleman for calling us together tonight to talk about this, because we need to talk about it. We need to think about it. We need to fight it in every way we can.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Thank you very much, Mr. PRICE.

I recognize the gentleman again from Colorado.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Well, I’d say to my friend from North Carolina that he was talking about the fact that seniors will see this doughnut hole, their prescription drug prices go back up, the costs go back up; but even, I think, more worrisome than that is the fact that, under the Affordable Care Act, those seniors receive $250 back.

In my district in Colorado, the suburbs of Denver, 31,000 seniors received this past fall $250 in assistance to payments of their prescription drugs. Even with that, we still save the $250 billion that you were talking about. Yet, when the Republicans repeal this in kind of an “all or nothing” situation, do those seniors have to pay that $250 back, each of them? I don’t know. I think they ought to be worried about that, and that’s why this is such an extreme measure.

They are taking away freedoms that belong to the people, that belong to Americans. They are doing it in a radical and ideological way. When they said during the campaign, you know, let’s put people back to work, and let’s not spend too much money, they’re spending more.

They’re taking away freedoms, and I am concerned that those seniors are going to have to pay that $250 back, per senior. The seniors should be concerned as well.

This is a radical act, Mr. Speaker and Mr. PRICE. We have got to fight it. I hate fighting these battles right out of the box, but if they’re going to take these kinds of radical positions, we have got to fight this.

With that, I would yield to my friend from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Thank you. I appreciate the gentleman’s courtesy for permitting me to speak just as I appreciate my colleagues coming to the floor to spotlight something that each and every American needs to be deeply concerned about.

I listened, for example, for the last 4 years, as a member of the Budget Committee, my dear friend and colleague Mr. RYAN talked about the skyrocketing problem of escalating entitlement under Medicare. Absolutely right. There are 79 million of the geezer baby boomers like me who are going to start collecting Medicare—10,000 a day starting this week and continuing for 19 years—and because of the development of more improvements in health care, not only are there more of us, but we are going to want more complex and expensive health care.

My Republican friends were talking about an entitlement crisis. The irony was—and we all heard it on the campaign trail—they talked about slashing Medicare, which they want to repeal starting next week. A great deal of irony. As the independent scorekeeper—the Congressional Budget Office—has pointed out and as you have repeated on the House floor, the legislation will, in fact, save several hundred billion dollars. More important than that, it puts in place reforms that will further reduce entitlement spending.

I know my good friend from Vermont is well familiar with the Dartmouth Atlas that deals with health care disparities around the country. I come from a part of the country where one of the problems we have is that Medicare needs to be reformed, which is what we started in this legislation. They’re relatively modest steps, but they’re going to save a couple hundred billion dollars. We need to do more. Rather than repealing these reforms, like stopping unnecessary hospital re-admissions—just that item costs over $12 billion a year—these reforms could enable us to bend the cost curve. If everybody practiced medicine the way it’s practiced in metropolitan Portland, Oregon, which is half the price of McAllen, Texas, or Miami, Florida, there wouldn’t be an entitlement crisis for decades to come.

I appreciate my colleagues focusing on the hypocrisy and on the recklessness of trying to repeal health care reform that makes a difference for 32 million uninsured Americans and that provides more benefit for the seniors. What is most important and under-appreciated is that it would reform Medicare so that, instead of driving us off a cliff over the next 20 years, it would, in fact, help us change how medicine is practiced for providers of incentives for value, medical value, rather than just volume.

Mr. WELCH. Thank you, the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time I have?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. WELCH. All right. Let me just ask the gentleman from North Carolina. Would you like to make any closing remarks and then yield to the gentleman from Colorado?

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I yield for the final word from the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Sure. I appreciate my friends.

You know, instead of amending or repairing, as Mr. PRICE from North Carolina described it, they want to repeal, just take it away.

Well, they’re taking away freedoms. They’re taking away the freedom from discrimination for prior illnesses, like my daughter with epilepsy, like the daughter who had Crohn’s disease, or the friend at the gas station. It’s taking away the freedom from cancellation because you get sick, you know, and lose your insurance. You know, it’s taking away the freedom to move jobs so you’re not stuck in a job, so you can move jobs and not fear losing your insurance. I mean, they’re taking away a lot—and maybe this $250 that went to the seniors. It is a radical move to take these freedoms away, and I hope they throw it out and don’t vote to repeal.

With that, I would yield back to my friend from Vermont for his final remarks.

Mr. WELCH. Well, I thank my colleagues for being here.

The bottom line is, anytime we pass a major piece of legislation, we should have the humility to acknowledge it can be improved—and we all do. We can make it better. We can make it stronger. But this total destruction that we have been fighting for decades to achieve on behalf of the American people: help for seniors with their prescription drugs, extending the financial viability of Medicare, changing and encouraging a new way of delivering health care services, moving away from fee-for-service, volume-driven to patient-centered, performance-based care, and then insurance reforms that put the patients in charge, which acknowledges that we are all in it together. This takes away the absolute unilateral power of for-profit insurance companies to decide whether your daughter or mine has health care.

Mr. WELCH. Thank you, the gentleman from Oregon. I yield for the final word from the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Sure. I appreciate my friends.

You know, instead of amending or repairing, as Mr. PRICE from North Carolina described it, they want to repeal, just take it away.

Well, they’re taking away freedoms. They’re taking away the freedom from discrimination for prior illnesses, like my daughter with epilepsy, like the daughter who had Crohn’s disease, or the friend at the gas station. It’s taking away the freedom from cancellation because you get sick, you know, and lose your insurance. You know, it’s taking away the freedom to move jobs so you’re not stuck in a job, so you can move jobs and not fear losing your insurance. I mean, they’re taking away a lot—and maybe this $250 that went to the seniors. It is a radical move to take these freedoms away, and I hope they throw it out and don’t vote to repeal.

With that, I would yield back to my friend from Vermont for his final remarks.

Mr. WELCH. Well, I thank my colleagues for being here.

The bottom line is, anytime we pass a major piece of legislation, we should have the humility to acknowledge it can be improved—and we all do. We can make it better. We can make it stronger. But this total destruction that we have been fighting for decades to achieve on behalf of the American people: help for seniors with their prescription drugs, extending the financial viability of Medicare, changing and encouraging a new way of delivering health care services, moving away from fee-for-service, volume-driven to patient-centered, performance-based care, and then insurance reforms that put the patients in charge, which acknowledges that we are all in it together. This takes away the absolute unilateral power of for-profit insurance companies to decide whether your daughter or mine has health care.
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate your consideration.

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 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.
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AFTER RECESS
The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. Webster) at 11 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION INSTRUCTING CERTAIN COMMITTEES TO REPORT LEGISLATION REPLACING THE JOB-KILLING HEALTH CARE LAW
Mr. DREIER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112–2) on the resolution (H. Res. 9) instructing certain committees to report legislation replacing the Job-Killing Health Care Law, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. R. 2, REPEALING THE JOB-KILLING HEALTH CARE LAW ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 9, INSTRUCTING CERTAIN COMMITTEES TO REPORT LEGISLATION REPLACING THE JOB-KILLING HEALTH CARE LAW
Mr. DREIER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112–2) on the resolution (H. Res. 2) repealing the Job-Killing Health Care Law Act and health care-related provisions in the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010; providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 9) instructing certain committees to report legislation replacing the Job-Killing Health Care Law, Act; and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under clause 5(d) of rule XX, the Chair announces to the House that, in light of the administration of the oath to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Sessions) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Fitzpatrick), the whole number of the House is 435.

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

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

Mr. Webster, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. Kaptur, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DeFazio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. McGovern, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. Poe of Texas, for 5 minutes, today and January 7, 11, and 12.

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

Mr. McIntosh, for 5 minutes, today and January 7.

Mr. Burton of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today and January 7.

Mr. Jones, for 5 minutes, today and January 7, 11, and 12.

Mr. Barton of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. Frank of Arizona, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. Goodlatte, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. Engel, for 5 minutes, today.

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 33 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, January 7, 2011, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.
Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker’s table and referred as follows:


26. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of 33 officers to wear the insignia of the grade of major general and brigadier general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

27. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department’s FY 2009 report on Foreign Language Skill Proficiency Bonus; to the Committee on Armed Services.

28. A letter from the Administrator, Rural Housing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Continuous Construction-Permanent Loan Program: Waiver of Federal Preemption Guaranteed Rural Rental Housing Program (RIN: 0575-AC80) received January 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.


30. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Safeguarding Child Support Information received December 30, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

31. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the 2010 Actuarial Report on the Financial Outlook for Medicaid, pursuant to Public Law 111-3, section 506(c); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.


34. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter from the department on the intention to implement the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia’s November 19, 2009 order to release; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

35. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of State, transmitting a report in accordance with Section 3 of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

36. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting the Commission’s Performance and Accountability Report for FY 2010; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

37. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Oceans, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration’s final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries Off West Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; Inseason Adjustments to Fishery Management Measures [Docket No.: 09042739-0602-01] (RIN: 0648-A44) received January 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

38. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration’s final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries Off West Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; Inseason Adjustments to Fishery Management Measures [Docket No.: 09042739-0602-01] (RIN: 0648-A44) received January 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

39. A letter from the Acting Chief, Trade and Commercial Regulations, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Correction: Completion of Entry and Entry Summary — Declaration of Value (RIN: 1515-
AD61 (Formerly 1565-A986) received December 28, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

40. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulation and Risk Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Administration’s final rule — Supplemental Security Income (SSI) for the Aged, Blind, and Disabled; Dedicated Account for Preventive Payments for Certain Past-Due SSI Benefits (Docket No.: SSA-2008-0050) (RIN: 0996-AE59) received January 5, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

41. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Medicare Program: End-Stage Renal Disease Quality Incentive Program (CMS-3206-F) (RIN: 0938-AP91) received December 30, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

42. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department’s report entitled “Department of Health and Human Services Study of Urban Medicare-Dependent Hospitals” (RIN: 0930-AD61) (Formerly 1505-AD87) received December 30, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

43. A letter from the Board of Directors, Office of Compliance, transmitting the biennial report recommending policy improvements for the Clean Air Act, pursuant to section 192(b) of the Congressional Accountability Act, pursuant to section 192(b) of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995, pursuant to section 192(b) of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995, pursuant to section 102(b) of the Independent Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

44. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the final rule — Medicare Program: End-Stage Renal Disease Quality Incentive Program (CMS-3206-F) (RIN: 0938-AP91) received December 30, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

45. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the final rule — Medicare Program: End-Stage Renal Disease Quality Incentive Program (CMS-3206-F) (RIN: 0938-AP91) received December 30, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

46. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the report titled “Titles XX, XXI, and XXII of the Social Security Act, with respect to the offense of fraud and misrepresentation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

47. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the report titled “Titles XX, XXI, and XXII of the Social Security Act, with respect to the offense of fraud and misrepresentation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

48. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the report titled “Health Care Fraud and Abuse Control Act, pursuant to section 102(b) of the Independent Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

49. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the report titled “An Act to authorize the leasing of restricted Indian lands for public, religious, educational, recreational, residential, business, and other purposes requiring the grant of long-term leases”, approved August 9, 1955, to provide for Indian tribes to enter into certain leases without prior express approval from the Secretary of the Interior; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

50. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the report titled “An Act to authorize the leasing of restricted Indian lands for public, religious, educational, recreational, residential, business, and other purposes requiring the grant of long-term leases”, approved August 9, 1955, to provide for Indian tribes to enter into certain leases without prior express approval from the Secretary of the Interior; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing in this volume of the Public Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

H.R. 196. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, with respect to the offense of stalking; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

H.R. 197. A bill to confer upon the United States State Court of Federal Claims jurisdiction to hear, determine, and render final judgment on any legal or equitable claim against the United States to receive just compensation for the taking of certain lands in the State of Colorado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 198. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a pilot program for the delivery of mental health services; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

H.R. 199. A bill to suspend, during the 2-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, any Environmental Protection Agency action under the Clean Air Act with respect to carbon dioxide or methane pursuant to certain proceedings, other than with respect to motor vehicle emissions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 200. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study of water resources in the RioTol-Colton Basin in the State of California; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

H.R. 201. A bill to amend section 12 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 to treat income changes resulting from welfare program requirements for families residing in housing received in lieu of subsidies under section 8 of such Act similarly to such changes for families residing in public housing or receiving tenant-based assistance under such section; to the Committee on Financial Services.

H.R. 202. A bill to extend the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000 to extend and increase the authority for the ombudsman under the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

H.R. 203. A bill to better provide for compensation for certain persons injured in the course of employment at the Santa Susana Field Laboratory in California; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

H.R. 215. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into certain leases without prior express approval from the Secretary of the Interior; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

H.R. 204. A bill to provide for a 5 percent reduction in the rates of basic pay for Members of Congress; to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

H.R. 205. A bill to amend the Act titled “An Act to authorize the leasing of restricted Indian lands for public, religious, educational, recreational, residential, business, and other purposes requiring the grant of long-term leases”, approved August 9, 1955, to provide for Indian tribes to enter into certain leases without prior express approval from the Secretary of the Interior; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

H.R. 207. A bill to provide for Indian tribes to enter into certain leases without prior express approval from the Secretary of the Interior; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

H.R. 208. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the reimbursement of mental health counselors under TRICARE, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 209. A bill to require the Archivist of the United States to promulgate regulations regarding the use of official designations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

H.R. 210. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to deem certain service in the organized military forces of the Government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines and the Philippine Scouts to have been active service for purposes of benefits under provisions of law applicable to veterans; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs; to the Committee on Armed Services.


H.J. Res. 10. A joint resolution proposing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

H.C. Res. 6. A resolution authorizing the use of the rotunda of the Capitol for an event marking the 50th anniversary of the inaugural address of President John F. Kennedy; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.C. Res. 7. A resolution proposing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

H.C. Res. 8. A resolution authorizing the use of the rotunda of the Capitol for an event marking the 50th anniversary of the inaugural address of President John F. Kennedy; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.C. Res. 9. A joint resolution proposing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.
PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. HUNTER introduced a bill (H.R. 211) for the relief of Roberto Luis Dunoyer Mejia, Consuelo Cardona Molina, Camilo Dunoyer Cardona, and Pablo Dunoyer Cardona; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California:

H.R. 196.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. AKin:

H.R. 197.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution provides, “. . . nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.” The United States Constitution, Article I, §8, cl. 1, vests Congress with the exclusive power “to pay the Debts . . . of the United States.” The Constitution, thus, grants to Congress the exclusive power and authority to define the jurisdiction of the Court of Federal Claims and “the power to waive the res judicata effect of a prior judgment entered in the Government’s favor on a claim against the United States. . . . Congress may recognize its obligation to pay a money judgment only by direct appropriation, but also by waiving an otherwise valid defense to a legal claim against the United States” United States v. Sioux Nation, 460 U.S. 519 (1983); Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe v. United States, 270 U.S. 476 (1926) and United States v. Realty, Co. 163 U.S. 427 (1896).

By Mr. GRIMM:

H.R. 198.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 4.

By Mrs. CAPITO:

H.R. 199.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3—To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes; and Article 1, Section 8, Clause 14—To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces.

By Mr. BACA:

H.R. 200.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. GALLEGLY:

H.R. 201.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution, amending conditional grants-in-aid under the spending for the general welfare.

By Mr. GALLEGLY:


Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of Section 8, Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. GALLEGLY:

H.R. 203.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8, Article I of the Constitution.

By Ms. GIFFORDS:

H.R. 204.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress is required by Article I, Section 6, of the Constitution to determine its own pay. This legislation is also consistent with the Twenty-Seventh Amendment of the Constitution.

By Mr. HEINRICH:

H.R. 205.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. NEUGEBAUER:

H.R. 206.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1—The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

Sixteenth Amendment—The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. PETRI:

H.R. 207.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H.R. 208.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, “To raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years: To provide and maintain a Navy.”

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 209.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. SPEIER:


Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HUNTER:

H.R. 211.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority for this legislation is found in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 4 which explicitly provides Congress the power to “establish an uniform Rule of Naturalization.”

By Mr. CARTER:

H.J. Res. 9.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 7, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CUELLAR:

H.J. Res. 10.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article 5 of the United States Constitution, see below, this legislation falls within Congress’s Constitutional Authority:

Article 5—The Congress, whenever two thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose Amendments to this Constitution, or, on the Application of the Legislatures of two thirds of the several States, shall call a Convention for proposing Amendments, which, in either Case, shall be valid to all Intents and Purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the Legislatures of three fourths of the several States, or by Conventions in three fourths thereof, as the one or the other Mode of Ratification may be proposed by the Congress; Provided that no Amendment which may be made prior to the Year One thousand eight hundred and eight, shall in any Manner affect the first and fourth Clauses in the Ninth Section of the first Article; and that no State, without its Consent, shall be deprived of its equal Suffrage in the Senate.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 2: Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. CANSECO, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. McKINLEY, Mr. REED, Mr. WALSH of Illinois, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Ms. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. TIPPTON, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. RUNYAN, and Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 21: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. ROGERS of Minnesota, Mr. BROUK of Georgia, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. WIRT, Mr. WALSH of Illinois, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. GIBBS.

H.R. 25: Mr. GRANGER.

H.R. 38: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. McCLENDON, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. AKIN, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. MARCHANT, and Mr. BROWN of Georgia.

H.R. 4: Ms. ZOE LOFRENE OF California and Mr. SERBANES.

H.R. 111: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 121: Mr. Graves of Missouri, Mr. Manzullo, Mr. Walsh of Illinois, Mr. Pearce, Mr. Forbes, Mr. McClintock, Mr. Hanna, Mrs. Miller of Michigan, and Mr. Gerlach.

H.R. 122: Mr. Lamborn, Mr. Olson, Mr. Bilbray, Mr. Gibbs, Mr. Franks of Arizona, Mr. McClintock, Mr. Pearce, Mrs. Schmidt, Mr. Hunter, and Mr. Schock.

H.R. 144: Mr. Petersen, Mr. Upton, Mrs. Adams, and Mr. Wittman.

H.R. 155: Mr. Garrett.

H.J. Res. 3: Mrs. Blackburn, Mr. McKeon, Mr. Roe of Tennessee, Mr. Olson, Mr. Pence, Mr. Bilbray, Mr. Posey, Mr. Young of Alaska, Mr. Hall, Mr. LaTourette, and Mr. Burgess.

H. Res. 9: Mr. Sessions, Mr. Scalise, Mr. Hurt, and Mr. Nugent.

H. Res. 11: Mr. Cohen and Ms. Lee of California.

H. Res. 15: Mr. Issa, Mr. Sensenbrenner, Mr. Marchant, Mr. Conaway, Mr. Franks of Arizona, Mr. Rogers of Alabama, Mr. Pearce, Mr. Walsh of Illinois, Mr. West, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. King of Iowa, Mrs. Schmidt, Mr. Hunter, Mr. Hulskamp, and Mr. Ribble.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. DREIER
The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Rules in H.R. 2 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF WASHINGTON
The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Natural Resources in H.R. 2 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. KLINE
The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Education and the Workforce in H.R. 2 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. DANIEL E. LUNGREN OF CALIFORNIA
The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on House Administration in H.R. 2 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF TEXAS
The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Judiciary in H.R. 2 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.
INTRODUCTION OF THE SCHOOL FOOD RECOVERY ACT

HON. THOMAS E. PETRI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 6, 2011

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation is to make clear that schools participating in the school lunch program are legally allowed to donate excess food to local food banks.

In 1996, Congress passed the Bill Emerson Good Samaritan Act, which protects donors who give to food banks in good faith from all liability except in cases of gross negligence or intentional misconduct. This landmark law has allowed businesses and civic organizations to donate critically-needed food to local food banks and food pantries.

Despite this law, many schools and school districts have been hesitant to donate excess food from school lunches, primarily due to a misperception that U.S. Department of Agriculture regulations don’t allow for excess food to be donated.

Loudoun County, Virginia, in Congressman Frank Wolf’s district, has expressed these reservations. That is why Congressman Wolf, an original cosponsor of this bill, reached out to work with me to help address this issue. I’m sure there are many other examples in congressional districts across the country.

This is unfortunate as excess food is being thrown away rather than provided to food banks to support those in need. In many cases, students who rely on school lunches also rely on support from local food banks.

The purpose of this bill is straightforward: to keep excess school food out of the garbage and get it into food banks. The bill will clarify that schools and school districts are permitted to donate excess food and that they are covered under the Good Samaritan Act when doing so.

HONORING NEW YORK PRESBYTERIAN HOSPITAL, THE NEW YORK BLOOD CENTER AND THEIR OUTSTANDING PARTNERSHIP FOR LIFE-SAVING BLOOD DONATIONS

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 6, 2011

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the New York Presbyterian Hospital and the New York Blood Center for their outstanding partnership to increase life-saving blood donations in our nation’s greatest city.

Thanks to donations from thousands of New Yorkers from all walks of life, this outstanding collaborative effort has helped provide nearly 14,000 blood donations over the past five years, representing an immeasurable contribution to saving and improving the quality of countless lives. The outstanding leadership of both Dr. Herbert Pardes, the Chief Executive Officer of New York Presbyterian Hospital, and Dr. Christopher Hillyer, the Chief Executive Officer of the New York Blood Center, have helped make this joint initiative so extraordinarily successful.

Under the leadership of Dr. Pardes, New York Presbyterian Hospital has done a spectacular job of encouraging its employees to donate blood. As a result, it is the largest hospital donor group in New York City and the third largest donor group in Manhattan. The hospital has increased the number of donations it generates every year for at least a decade. Each pint donated saves three lives. Last year, it generated more than 3,500 donations through its various blood drives, saving more than 10,000 lives. And for the first five months of this year, donations are up 50% over the same period last year. Blood donated by New York Presbyterian Hospital is distributed by the Blood Center to more than 200 hospitals in the greater New York metropolitan area.

Established in 1964, the New York Blood Center (NYBC) has become one of the nation’s largest non-profit, community-based blood centers. For more than forty-five years, it has provided donated blood, transfusion products and services to nearly 200 hospitals in the New York/New Jersey metropolitan area. In 2009, the NYBC set a personal record after receiving nearly 3,500 blood donations. It is also home to the National Cord Blood Center, the world’s largest public cord bank. The Cord Blood Center provides adults and children with life-threatening illnesses with stem cell transplants from unrelated donors.

New York hospitals need a diverse range of blood donations to match the diverse nature of New York’s population. With the help of the participation in blood drives of New York Presbyterian Hospital’s diverse employee population, the Blood Center is able to ensure that local hospitals have blood available to serve patients with sickle cell anemia and other diseases that disproportionately affect minority communities.

One of New York City’s most respected health care institutions, New York Presbyterian Hospital is the product of a partnership that was formed in 1998 between The New York Hospital, founded in 1771, and The Presbyterian Hospital, founded in 1868. As a merged institution, New York Presbyterian Hospital has provided first-rate medical care to untold numbers of New Yorkers. With two affiliated medical schools, New York Presbyterian is recognized as one of the greatest academic health centers in the world. With more than 13,000 employees and 2,298 patient beds, the hospital is ranked among America’s best by U.S. News and World Report. It has centers of excellence in AIDS care, digestive diseases, gene therapy, preventive medicine, reproductive and fertility medicine, vascular medicine and others. The William Randolph Hearst Burn Center is the largest...
and busiest burn center in the country. New York Presbyterian is also the first hospital to establish special centers and programs for women’s health.

The most important reason for the success of New York Presbyterian Hospital’s blood drive is the strong support of senior officials at the hospital. From the lowest clerk to Dr. Pardes, donation is part of the culture at New York Presbyterian Hospital.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in recognizing the New York Blood Center, New York Presbyterian Hospital, Dr. Herbert Pardes and Dr. Christopher Hillyer for their numerous contributions to New York’s health care system. This collaboration has saved numerous lives. New York Presbyterian Hospital and the New York Blood Center serve as a example of our nation’s health care system at its best.

FALL RIVER FIRE CHIEF FORD DOCUMENTS IMPORTANCE OF FEDERAL ASSISTANCE

HON. BARNEY FRANK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 6, 2011

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important things this Congress should be doing in 2011 is to continue the assistance we have provided to local communities, hard hit by a recession that they had no part in bringing about, so that they can maintain the essential public services necessary for the safety of their citizens.

Earlier this week, I received a letter from the Fire Chief of the City of Fall River, Paul Ford, which explains exactly how important this is. I ask that Chief Ford’s eloquent, persuasive letter, noting the lifesaving role played by the SAFER grant, be inserted here, and I hope that our colleagues will be instructed by it.

FIRE DEPARTMENT HEADQUARTERS
OFFICE OF THE FIRE CHIEF,
Fall River, MA, December 23, 2010.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FORD: As you are aware, the Fall River Fire Department has received a SAFER award which has allowed us to rehire laid-off firefighters and hire 46 new firefighters, bringing our compliment up to 2008 levels. This return of staffing levels has allowed us to reopen Engine 9, Engine 6, and Heavy Rescue 1.

The previously laid-off firefighters were assigned to fire companies on September 26, 2010, the start of the SAFER grant performance period. The new firefighters graduated from our training academy on December 17, 2010 and were assigned to individual fire companies on December 19, 2010.

Let me take this opportunity to share with you the following story to illustrate how the SAFER grant has had an immediate impact on protecting property and saving lives as a result of adequate fire staffing:

On the morning of December 21, 2010, a fire was reported in one of the city’s congested south-end residential neighborhoods. Upon arrival, Acting District Chief David Levesque was confronted with a six family, brick and frame, with fire showing in one first floor apartment. The fire had exited out into the interior stairway and was traveling upwards toward the second floor. Initial reports indicated that a person was trapped on the third floor.

Taking command of the fire scene, A/D Levesque initiated, combined fire attack and rescue operation. Engine companies were ordered to attack the fire on the first floor and check for extension and protect the second floor. Heavy Rescue 1 was immediately sent to the third floor for rescue operations.

Rescue 1, which had previously been out of service due to reduced staffing, had a crew of three firefighters. This included Acting Lieutenant Matt Camara and Firefighter Mark Medeiros, both of whom were laid-off and returned through the SAFER grant. The third member was Probationary Firefighter Glen Edington, also a SAFER awardee, serving his first tour of duty with the Fall River Fire Department.

Upon entering the structure and making their way to the third floor, all three members began a primary search of that floor. PPF Edington, utilizing a thermal imagining camera, located the victim lying on the floor. He and FE Medeiros followed their training, quickly removed the victim from the apartment and descended down two flights of stairs to awaiting medical rescue crews. At the time of this writing, while in critical condition, the victim is alive.

If this fire had taken place prior to the funding of the SAFER grant, neither they nor any Heavy Rescue crew would have been on scene that morning. The outcome for that victim and her family could have been much different.

Furthermore, the additional staffing afforded to this department allowed us to continue to protect the rest of the city’s citizens without calling in emergency overtime firefighters or utilizing the increased mutual aid responses we had come to rely on. This mutual aid, while appreciated, was further reducing the firefighting forces in those communities due to our decreased staffing levels.

This situation is a clear example of why adequate staffing is so vital to the mission of the fire service in general, and specifically to this city and department.

I thank you, on behalf of the citizens of this city and the members of this fire department, for your support with this much needed grant opportunity.

Sincerely,

PAUL D. FORD,
Fire Chief.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE LATE DR. MARY MARANGOS

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 6, 2011

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the late Dr. Mary Marangos, a longtime activist in the Hellenic American community and dedicated congressional staff member who passed away last month after a valiant struggle with breast cancer. A career educator and public servant, Mary Marangos touched the hearts and bettered the lives of countless individuals from all walks of life.

As the Member of Congress representing Astoria, New York, home to the largest population of persons of Hellenic descent anywhere in the United States, I have depended on Mary Marangos to serve as my eyes and ears in that thriving, bustling community for the last seventeen years. In addition, Dr. Marangos represented me at an international conference held in Cyprus and Greece in 2002, which was fitting, as she had been active in the Cyprus Liberation Movement since the island’s illegal occupation in 1974.

Mary Marangos was a whirlwind of activity in the Hellenic-American community of our Nation’s greatest city, leading me to bestow upon her the nickname “the Greek Cannonball.” She was active in and helped organize events for countless organizations such as the Association of Greek-American Women’s Issues Network of the Pancreanitic Association. She worked closely with local organizations such as the Greek-American Homeowners Association, the Cretan Association, and the Federation of Hellenic Societies on important activities such as citizenship and voter registration drives. She proudly accompanied me as we marched each year in the Greek Independence parade on Fifth Avenue in Manhattan, and was deeply involved in every aspect of the life of the Hellenic-American community, from being a booster of Greek-American social clubs to supporting arts and the humanities. It is an increasing awareness and appreciation of the splendors of Greek civilization, past and present.

Mary Marangos’ dedication to public service and helping others started much earlier than her tenure as a congressional staff member. She was an educator, administrator and coordinator at the vanguard high school level in the New York City public school system, serving as a coordinator of the GED program at the Vocational Training Center at LaGuardia Airport. She coordinated the AIDS Prevention Program on the high school level, training teachers on how to teach HIV prevention and holding conferences on the epidemic. Dr. Marangos also fostered staff development initiatives for elementary school teachers and administrators.

A graduate of New York City public schools, Mary Marangos earned a Bachelor of Science degree from the New York State Education Department, a Master’s degree in school administration and supervision from Fordham University, and a doctorate in International-Intercultural Developmental Education from Florida State University under a full fellowship from the U.S. Department of Education.

Mary Marangos was the loving and devoted daughter of Pantelis Marangos from Kalavasos, Cyprus and Despina Kyriacou from Lesvos, Greece and Cyprus. She was devoted to them and steadfast in her care of both in their later years.

Dr. Marangos has been an important leader of the Hellenic American community. Her assertiveness, intelligence, willingness to help are only a few of the characteristics that make her such a special person. Time and time again she has gone out of her way to help members of our community in need. She truly epitomizes the spirit of the Hellenic American woman—strength of character, activism, intelligence and compassion.

Mr. Speaker, I request that my esteemed colleagues join me in paying tribute to the late Dr. Mary Marangos for her extraordinary contributions to the civic life of our Nation.
IN RECOGNITION OF THE CON-
TRIBUTIONS OF RABBI JOSEPH
STAMM

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 6, 2011

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the extraordinary contributions of Joseph Stamm, who is celebrating his 25th anniversary at the helm of the New York County Health Services Review Organization (NYCHSRO). Mr. Stamm has been largely responsible for the unparalleled growth and success of NYCHSRO and its subsidiary, MedReview Inc. (MedReview).

NYCHSRO was among the first organizations registered as a certified Utilization Review agent in New York. NYCHSRO has conducted over 2 million peer reviews of clinically necessary and services rendered by medical practitioners at all levels of the health care continuum. Its clients include state and local governmental organizations, managed care organizations, health insurers and third party payors.

In 1998, under Mr. Stamm’s leadership, NYCHSRO created MedReview, which provides independent medical reviews and medical claims audits to self-insured plan sponsors. With offices in Cleveland, Denver, Orlando, Tampa and Thomasville, GA, today MedReview is one of America’s premier medical and claims-related auditing organizations, helping clients manage health care costs more effectively, and avoid overpayment. MedReview boasts that it manages to recover millions of dollars in claims overpayments annually. MedReview’s clients include some of America’s largest and most respected organizations including Corporate Express, Mack/ Volvo Trucks, Nissan, Oregon School Boards, ServiceMaster, USB Financial and Ingersoll Rand, as well as many non-profit and government organizations.

Mr. Stamm served in various other capacities at NYCHSRO/MedReview, starting out as Director of Ambulatory Care Review and Associate Executive Director for Planning and Development and then as Deputy Executive Director responsible for Hospital Review, Ambulatory Care, Medical Care Evaluation, Data and Home Care Review. Mr. Stamm was instrumental in developing and implementing monitoring programs for Medicaid, Medicare and the private sector at all care levels — inpatient, ambulatory, long-term health care and home care, both in the state and nationally.

Prior to his tenure at NYCHSRO/MedReview, Mr. Stamm spent several years at the New York City Department of Health in various capacities, including Director of Investigation and Enforcement, Director of Program Planning and Development and Assistant Director of Health Evaluation.

Mr. Stamm is a recognized expert in the medical review industry and is on the faculty of Columbia University School of Public Health. He has lectured nationally and internationally and has been published on health care-related topics in scholarly journals such as Mount Sinai Journal of Medicine, the New York Academy of Medicine Journal and the Journal of Community Health. He is also a member of a number of health care associations, as well as a fellow of the New York Academy of Medicine.

Mr. Stamm is a strong supporter of and a frequent visitor to Israel. In 2006, at the request of Assemblyman Don Hikind, he traveled to war-torn Israel on a fact-finding and humanitarian mission. The mission members met with mayors of northern Israel and the leaders of health care organizations such as Rambam Hospital, the largest hospital in the northern Israel. Mr. Stamm has also been very active in the Beitar Foundation and in 2007, he received the HaTov U’Meitiv Man of the Year Award at the Annual Beitar Foundation Dinner. Joseph Stamm received his rabbinical ordination from the Rabbi Jacob Joseph Yeshiva in New York, and earned his MPA from New York University.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my distinguished colleagues to join me in recognizing the many achievements of Joseph Stamm, a business leader, innovator and strong supporter of Israel and the Jewish community.

HON. BILL POSEY
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 6, 2011

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I bring to the attention of the House the loss of a husband, a father, and an industry pioneer. On January 3, 2011, Zachary S. Gibler passed away from injuries sustained in a biking accident. He was just 44 years old. Gibler is survived by his wife, Mary, and daughter, Rachel.

Zach Gibler was the Chairman and CEO of the nation’s largest LED lighting manufacturer, Lighting Science Group (LSG), which is headquartered in Satellite Beach, Florida and employs 400 workers. Specifically, the Lighting Science Group designs, develops, manufactures and markets LED light bulbs that are environmentally friendlier and more energy efficient than traditional lighting products.

Gibler had quickly become a leader in a budding industry that will play a key in our nation’s future. His pioneering efforts have grown operations in Florida from 35 employees to more than 400 in less than two years.

Known for his passion for helping those in need, Gibler hired many former NASA workers who had been laid off due to the transitions in our nation’s human space flight program and utilized their skills to manufacture American-made LED lights that are highly energy efficient and are very competitive to foreign-made LED competitors. Just walk into Home Depot or any other hardware store and you’ll find LED bulbs that are made by the Lighting Science Group—it’s an American product built by American workers.

In June of 2009, Zachary Gibler became CEO of Lighting Science Group and was made president just a few months later in September of 2009. Gibler was then named Chairman of the Lighting Science Group in May of 2010. He was a lighting industry veteran having previously held a variety of senior roles at Acuity Brands.

Gibler effectively worked to shape Lighting Science Group into the LED lighting manufacturer it is today, which is continuing to create additional, good-paying jobs in my home state of Florida and making a significant contribution to making America more energy efficient. Our thoughts and prayers are with Zach’s family and friends as they cope with this unexpected loss at the beginning of the year.

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 6, 2011

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay special tribute to the late Jerry Kurowyckyj, Sr., a dedicated community leader, activist, and local business owner in New York City, who passed away last year. Known as the “Mayor of Ukraine,” his extensive commitment to serving others was profoundly appreciated by the Lower Manhattan community he loved.

Sadly, New York has lost a neighborhood leader and a food-lovers icon.
For nearly three decades, Mr. Kurowyckyj helped manage his family-owned business, Kurowyckyj Meats, Inc., in Manhattan’s East Village neighborhood, a commercial and cultural hub for New Yorkers of Ukrainian and Polish descent during the post-World War II era. Founded in 1955 by Mr. Kurowyckyj’s father, the shop became an integral part of the neighborhood, and a mecca for gourmands throughout the tri-state area. Kurowyckyj Meats was acclaimed throughout New York not only for its delicious, fresh pork products such as bologna, frankfurters, rolled bacon, sweet or spicy sausages, smoked hams, and homemade kovbasa, but also for its personal customer service. It was praised by the New York Times as an “East Village haven” and written up gloriously in respected periodicals such as Gourmet and Food and Wine magazines. The shop was one of the last in the city to operate an original smokehouse, which lent a unique flavor to the store’s delicacies. Sadly, the store closed in 2007, a victim of changing times and tastes.

Mr. Kurowyckyj was remembered for his continuous generosity. Mr. Kurowyckyj made immeasurable contributions to the civic life of his community. For much of his life, Mr. Kurowyckyj was a dedicated and energetic member of New York’s Community Board 3, applying his strong leadership abilities and lifelong devotion to Lower Manhattan to maintaining and improving the quality of life in the neighborhood he loved.

Among his many volunteer efforts, Mr. Kurowyckyj dedicated his time and attention to several local institutions in the community, including the St. George Ukrainian Church. His enterprising initiative and dogged perseverance were instrumental in enabling the church to move into its current location on East 7th Street, and its site remains a testament to his efforts.

As a distinguished leader of his community, Mr. Kurowyckyj not only reached out to local residents, but to recent immigrants as well. Upon their arrival in the neighborhood, Mr. Kurowyckyj provided assistance and knowledge to help them establish themselves in New York. His compassion and individual attention exerted a strong positive impact on the lives of countless individuals.

Mr. Kurowyckyj’s proud devotion to his Ukrainian heritage is carried on today by his daughter, Oksana.

Ms. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to acknowledge the achievements of Bhupendra Patel, M.D., a man who has dedicated himself in service to others. The Chief of the Department of Medicine at the Mountain Sinai Hospital in Queens, Dr. Patel is also an important and inspirational voice for the thriving Indian-American community of our nation’s greatest city. A selfless advocate for his patients as well as a dedicated and generous philanthropist, “Bhupi” Patel is truly an example and role model for the community, and I am proud to call him my friend.

Dr. Bhupendra Patel has demonstrated a lifelong passion for the study and practice of medicine. Born and raised in Kenya, he earned an MBBS from Baroda Medical College in India. The political unrest there, coupled with immigration of many of his friends to the United States, inspired Dr. Patel to continue his medical education by serving as an Assistant Clinical Professor of Medicine at the renowned Mount Sinai School of Medicine in New York. Throughout his career, Dr. Patel has striven successfully to help serve the needs of the growing Asian-American community in New York City, serving as the President of the Gujarati Samaj of Greater New York and helping found the Nargis Dutt Memorial Foundation. As President of the Gujarati Samaj, Bhupendra Patel helped raise money for a new community center to serve the local Gujarati community. The Nargis Dutt Foundation that he helped found has committed itself to improving medical care for cancer patients throughout the city. A tireless advocate, Dr. Patel was persistent in his efforts to help build on earlier progress. Dr. Patel’s considerate contributions to medicine and philanthropy have been widely acknowledged; he has been honored by the Gujarati Samaj of Greater New York, the Indian Dental Association of the United States, and 100 Black Men, and was presented the “Outstanding Asian American” award by former New York Governor Mario Cuomo, as well as the prestigious 2008 Ellis Island Medal of Honor.

Mr. Speaker, in recognition of a lifetime of service to others, I request that my colleagues join me in paying tribute to Dr. Bhupendra “Bhupi” Patel, a great New Yorker and a great American who made immeasurable improvements to the quality of life for his fellow New Yorkers. Dr. Patel’s selfless and enduring dedication to serving others and to the civic life of our nation serves as an inspiration to us all.

Mr. Speaker, in recognition of a lifetime of service to others, I request that my colleagues join me in paying tribute to Dr. Bhupendra “Bhupi” Patel, a great New Yorker and a great American who made immeasurable improvements to the quality of life for his fellow New Yorkers. Dr. Patel’s selfless and enduring dedication to serving others and to the civic life of our nation serves as an inspiration to us all.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of a dedicated public servant, fierce consumer advocate, and my dear friend, State Senator Dave Aronberg.

A native of Miami, Dave attended Harvard College and Harvard Law School. Shortly after graduation, Dave began his work with the Office of the State Insurance Commissioner taking on foreign insurance companies that refused to honor World War II era policies issued to victims of the Holocaust. Dave’s passion for public service next took him to the office of the Attorney General, where he became an Assistant Attorney General. It was in this capacity that Dave was responsible for prosecuting consumer fraud and led the lawsuits against “Miss Cleo’s” fraudulent business holdings.

In 2000, Dave was chosen to participate in the prestigious White House Fellows program as a Special Assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury for international money laundering. During his fellowship, Dave represented the Treasury Department at a global summit on money laundering and the laundering of terrorist assets in Malaysia. He then traveled as part of an official White House delegation to meet with foreign officials and to visit refugee camps in both Pakistan and Afghanistan.

After his fellowship, Dave returned to South Florida and in 2002 was elected to represent the 27th District of Florida in the State Senate. During his 8 years in the Senate, Dave continued his advocacy for strong consumer protections, was a member of Florida’s Medicaid task force, and led the fight that successfully secured federal funding for the Everglades Restoration Project.
Recently, Dave has announced that he will continue his work for strong consumer protections by becoming Special Counsel to Attorney General Pam Bondi. As a special counsel, Dave will oversee the effort to eliminate pain clinics and "pill mills" in Florida. I would like to congratulate Dave on his appointment to the Attorney General’s office and wish him luck as he continues his dedication to public service and consumer advocacy. It has been a privilege working with him as an attorney, in the State legislature, and as a Congressman. I look forward to many years of continued service for South Florida alongside Dave.

IN HONOR OF NEW YORK CITY COUNCILMAN DANIEL DROMM

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 2011

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor New York City Council Member Daniel Dromm, a pioneering figure in the political history of Queens, the most diverse county in the nation. An educator, community organizer, union leader, and political activist, Daniel Dromm’s experience and dedication led voters in New York City’s 25th City Council District to elect him by an overwhelming margin last year to serve as their new Council Member. Last month, Councilman Dromm was honored by the Queens Lesbian & Gay Pride Committee at its annual Winterpride celebration in Astoria.

A graduate of St. Mary’s Elementary and Boys’ High School in Manhasset, NY and Marist College in Poughkeepsie, NY, Daniel Dromm went on to earn a Master’s Degree from City College of the City University of New York. Prior to his career as an award-winning New York City public school teacher, he served as Educational Director of the Grant Day Care Center in Harlem, where he developed his legendary organizing skills fighting for the poor to afford quality childcare, social services and quality education. He instructed and inspired thousands of students at PS 1990 in Queens. In 2006, Dromm was named “Outstanding Teacher of the Year” by his school’s principal and in 2009, he was chosen as “Educator of the Year” by the Sunnyside Kiwanis Club. In 1992, Danny courageously came out as an openly gay teacher, becoming a role model for equality—and front-page news in daily newspapers in our nation’s greatest city.

Deeply committed to civil rights and social justice, Dromm has established himself a fighter against prejudice, discrimination and violence as the founder and former co-chairperson of the Queens Lesbian and Gay Pride Committee. Fifteen years ago, he organized the first Queens LGBT Pride Parade and Festival, that took place every Pride in the first Sunday in June in the vibrant Jackson Heights neighborhood. Dromm co-founded the Queens Chapter of Parents, Families and Friends of Lesbians and Gays (P-FLAG), helped establish the Queens Pride House, and co-founded the Generation Q Youth Services Program in Astoria. His dedication to the communities he serves is broad and deep, inspiring his efforts on behalf of the Kiwanis Club of Jackson Heights, his tenure on the Board of Directors of the Corona-based Community Conciliation Network, his active membership in the 115th Precinct Community Council, and his volunteer duty with the Jackson Heights Beautification Group. He has been honored by the Sociedad Puertorriqueña de Queens for his commitment to the Latino community, and serves as a member of the NAACP Corona/East Elmhurst chapter. He has been honored by the Korean-American Association of Central Queens, by the Times/Ledger newspapers with its Community Leadership Award, and by the United Federation of Teachers with its Marsh-Raimo Award, a fitting tribute to a dedicated labor activist.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my distinguished colleagues rise to join me in honoring the extraordinary contributions to the political and civic life of our nation’s greatest city made by the pioneering political activist and elected official, New York City Council Member Daniel Dromm.

RULES OF THE HOUSE

SPEECH OF

HON. LAURA RICHARDSON
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 5, 2011

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H. Res. 5, the House Republican rules proposal for the 112th Congress. As some of my Democratic colleagues have argued before me, this rules package is fiscally irresponsible, will balloon the national debt, and threatens the stability of government services that are critically important to millions of Americans.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican proposed rules package sets our country down a path of unaffordable tax cuts and threats to supress long-term economic growth and job creation. While many of my new Republican colleagues were elected on the platform of reducing the deficit, the new rules introduced by the Republican leadership will significantly increase the national debt by changing the House pay-as-you-go rules, “PAYGO.”

The Republican minority House rules package adds to the deficit by exempting tax cuts and the deficit increasing effects of selectively repealing the health care reform law from the PAYGO rules. On the other hand, the Republican rules package prohibits the House from raising revenue or closing tax loopholes to help pay for new spending entitlements for low and middle income Americans.

Unlike the deficit neutral PAYGO rules that the 111th Congress operated under, the proposed rules package will allow for tax cuts to be cut without having to pay for them. But as the National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform has pointed out, “tax expenditures are simply spending by another name and should not be exempt from scrutiny.”

Substitute CUTGO for “PAYGO” for bad economics and worse policy. As the Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget has noted, “Replacing the two-sided PAYGO rules with a one-sided CUTGO rule will not only make it harder to offset legislation, but also exempt potentially budget-busting tax cuts from the deficit.”

CUTGO is unwise, irresponsible, will result in economic stagnation, and substantially increase the debt burden on our children and grandchildren.

In addition to its fiscal irresponsibility, the proposed House rules package fails to address homeland security jurisdiction despite repeated calls for reform from the 9/11 Commission and every Secretary of Homeland Security. Failing to consolidate legislative jurisdiction over homeland security in the House Committee on Homeland Security will continue to complicate oversight and review of critical homeland security issues.

I also oppose the proposed rules package for the 112th Congress because it severs the user-financed basis of the Highway Trust Fund and subjects necessary federal highway and transit investments to the vagaries of the annual appropriations process. This proposal will exacerbate the instability already being experienced by the U.S. transportation construction marketplace. Transportation projects are long-term in nature and require stable and predictable sources of funding. Subjecting them to the appropriations process creates a precarious and unaccommodating market for investments in infrastructure projects.

Finally, the Republican rules package disenfranchises residents of the District of Columbia and U.S. territories by ending the ability of delegates and the Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico to vote in, and preside over, the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union. This would deliver a tremendous blow not only to the symbolic vote of the delegates, but also to the voices of the five million residents of these areas who deserve to be heard.

Mr. Speaker, this ill-considered and fiscally irresponsible rules package was crafted by the new Republican majority in secret without meaningful involvement of the members on this side of the aisle. Had such an opportunity been afforded to the minority, this rules package would be far superior and fiscally sounder.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing H. Res. 5.

IN HONOR OF BARBARA FIFE

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 2011

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the achievements of the Honorable Barbara Fife, Director of External Affairs at the School of Public Affairs at Baruch College of the City University of New York, Co-Director of its Center for Innovation and Leadership in Homeland Security and Government, and a distinguished public servant who served as a Deputy Mayor of the City of New York. Last month, Ms. Fife’s sixteen years of devoted service to Baruch College were celebrated by her colleagues and friends.

An accomplished and respected public servant in her earlier career, Ms. Fife served as New York City’s Deputy Mayor for Planning and Development during the administration of former Mayor David Dinkins. As Deputy Mayor, she oversaw and was responsible for the operations of several major agencies of the nation’s largest municipal government, including the Department of City Planning, Housing Preservation & Development, Environmental Protection, Parks & Recreation, and Cultural Affairs and Libraries, as well as the
Rick Bender became President of the Washington State Labor Council in 1993, after serving as WSLC Vice President (1988–1993); Executive Secretary of the King County Labor Council (1991–1993); and Executive Secretary of the Seattle Building and Construction Trades Council (1987–1991). He is a member of Laborers Local 242 and Elevator Constructors Local 19, his career with organized labor as an apprentice with Cement Masons Local 528 in 1966. In addition to his exceptional service to organized labor, Rick also served the citizens of the State of Washington for many years as an elected member of the State Legislature. I was fortunate to serve with Rick in the Washington State Senate, where he was much respected for his expertise, his hard work, and his commitment to fairness.

Al Link also is a giant in the Washington State labor community. He served in numerous leadership positions in that community prior to his 1994 election as WSLC Secretary-Treasurer, including President of the Spokane County Central Labor Council (1989–94) and President of State Labor Council (1991–94), when he represented workers at the Kaiser Aluminum plant in Spokane. Al has been a member of the United Steelworkers of America since 1961.

Together, Rick Bender and Al Link provided bold leadership to the Washington State Labor Council as it achieved many proud accomplishments: they crafted a far-sighted and effective legislative platform to promote working families’ rights for state employees, protection and strengthening of Washington’s model unemployment insurance and workers’ compensation systems, promotion of innovative apprenticeship programs, and development of affordable health care and family leave policies.

Intent on highlighting labor’s importance to our democratic political process, Mr. Bender and Mr. Link created a groundbreaking grassroots political program featuring the “Labor Neighbor” program, a highly successful effort that became a national model for engaging union activists and volunteers in the election process and informing rank-and-file members of labor’s endorsesments.

They also led successful campaigns for pro-worker ballot measures, including the nation’s first indexed minimum wage law, which began as an initiative filed by Rick Bender; it was approved by the voters of Washington State in 1998 following an exciting campaign co-chaired by Rick and especially memorable because it relied entirely on volunteer signature gatherers.

Mr. Speaker, the formidable team of Rick Bender and Al Link leaves a vital legacy that will strengthen the lives of working people and their families for decades to come. On the occasion of their retirement from the Washington State Labor Council, I join thousands of union members, working families, and appreciative citizens across Washington State in thanking them for their vision, their bold leadership, and their dedicated service. We wish them good fortune and much satisfaction in the coming years.
President and CEO of Enterprise Community Partners, she also chairs the board of the Enterprise Community Loan Fund, a national leader in providing development capital, financial solutions, public policy advocacy, and technical expertise to create affordable housing.

Dolly Lenz is the Vice Chair of Prudential Douglas Elliman, one of the leading real estate firms in our Nation’s greatest city. The daughter of an immigrant from Spain, she has risen to dizzying heights in her profession and is truly a worthy recipient of Baruch College’s Alumna of the Year Award.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my distinguished colleagues rise to join me in paying tribute to Baruch College of the City University of New York and the five outstanding honorees it recognized at the 21st Annual Bernard Baruch Dinner.

HONORING THE 2ND PLATOON, COMPANY B, 2ND BATTALION, 162ND INFANTRY REGIMENT, 41ST INFANTRY BRIGADE COMBAT TEAM, OREGON NATIONAL GUARD

HONORING THE TERENCE CARDINAL COOKE HEALTH CARE CENTER

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 6, 2011

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the Terence Cardinal Cooke Health Care Center, a continuing-care facility founded more than three decades ago by the Archdiocese of New York. I am pleased to recognize the Terence Cardinal Cooke Health Care Center as it continues to provide medical support and rehabilitative services to residents and patients of all backgrounds, while simultaneously encouraging their independence and self-sufficiency. Tonight we celebrate the hard work of the Center’s generous staff, as well as the contributions to civic life of several noteworthy community leaders. I join you in saluting last year’s honorees for their devotion to quality health care.

A long-standing presence in the community, the Terence Cardinal Cooke Health Care Center has been committed to providing compassionate medical treatment since 1890. With respect for human life and dignity as its principal focus, the Center strives to maintain a broad range of high-quality services for its residents and patients in its long-term 729-bed facility and two outpatient clinics. The Center operates many clinical programs that address a wide variety of health issues, from developmental disabilities to chronic illnesses.

The Center provides comprehensive and innovative treatment to the community.

Last month, the Center held its annual Flower Ball at the Pierre Hotel in Manhattan. I congratulate last year’s honorees, Michael J. Brescia, M.D., Executive Director of Calvary Hospital; Victoria L. Sharp, M.D., Director of the HIV Center at St. Luke’s-Roosevelt Hospital Center; J. Anthony SanFilippo, M.D.; and David Kamp, President of Dirworks Landscape Architecture.

Each of last year’s honored guests is an exceptional civic leader whose life work reflects the Center’s mission. Almost 50 years ago, Dr. Michael Brescia helped develop the AV fistula, one of the most popular methods of vascular access for hemodialysis in the world. After assuming the position of Director of the HIV Center at St. Luke’s-Roosevelt Hospital Center in 1997, Dr. Victoria Sharp has tirelessly worked on behalf of those living with HIV/AIDS, including many of society’s most disadvantaged citizens and incarcerated individuals. Dr. J. Anthony SanFilippo has been a dedicated board member of the Terence Cardinal Cooke Health Care Center for many years and will receive the Partnership Award for his hard work, dedication, and extraordinary service. Over the years, David Kamp and his company have worked with the Center to provide them with the tools and expertise on a pro bono basis to render the gardens of the Center a welcome oasis of beauty and tranquility in a densely urban environment.

In serving the Center, each of the honorees has demonstrated remarkable dedication, and has been an inspiration not only to staff and patients, but to all New Yorkers. In devoting their time and energy so generously to others, they remind us that every individual can make a difference.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my distinguished colleagues rise to join me in paying tribute to the Terence Cardinal Cooke Health Care Center and its distinguished 2010 honorees.

HONORING THREE KINGS DAY

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 6, 2011

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask my colleagues to spend some time today to remember the Christian feast of the Epiphany, or as many in my community know it, Three Kings Day.

For millions around the world, especially Latinos, the final curtain on the holiday season doesn’t begin to fall until today, January 6. From El Barrio through Mexico, and the Caribbean all the way down to South America, communities find their own unique ways to celebrate the Biblical journey of Balthasar, Melchior, and Caspar.

Like Christmas, Three Kings Day is a day for kids and family, a time to not just exchange gifts, but also appreciate what we have. In the East Harlem section of my congressional district, the day has been marked for 34 years by a children’s parade organized by El Museo del Barrio. Mr. Speaker, seeing these children in costumes and coats walking the streets of Fifth Avenue, you would be instantly reminded about how special they each are and the special responsibility we have in making sure that they have just as many opportunities to succeed—if not more—than any of us standing in these great walls.

Balthasar, Melchior, and Caspar traveled on the wings of hope, believing that a better future lay in the hands of a humble child in the manger. They did not dismiss him because he was a carpenter’s son or because he was poor. They did not ask about his immigration status or whether his parents had proper paperwork. They crossed deserts and overcame hurdles because they believed that his future was as bright and limitless as the stars that adorned the sky.

Unfortunately, not enough of today’s children have been given such investment of time and energy. Despite the tireless work of so many parents and educators, far too many are falling through the cracks in schools that are ill-equipped to teach them the skills necessary for work and life.

So on this last weekend of the holiday season, let all of us remember the greatness that lies in each of our children. Let us renew our commitment to our next generation by developing partnerships that will equip them with the tools they will need to realize their goals and dreams.

Let us remember that acts of kindness and generosity should extend well into the year and that the future of this great land depends on the opportunities we create for our children to shine and reach their full potential.
Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the Honorable Conrad Foa, an outstanding New Yorker who has distinguished himself as a leader in the worlds of business, philanthropy, and civic and political affairs. A Member of the New York State Democratic Committee, Mr. Foa’s contributions to the community were recognized at the annual dinner gala of the Lexington Democratic Club last month. As the first “reform club” in New York City, the Lexington Democratic Club strives for inclusive civic participation in our nation’s greatest metropolis, and Conrad Foa is a proud heir to that great reform tradition.

As the Democratic State Committee Member representing the 73rd Assembly District on the East Side of Manhattan, and as a Member of Manhattan Community Board 8, Conrad Foa has distinguished himself as a dynamic and forceful leader for his community. He and his wife Linda were both born in Manhattan, as were both of their sons Justin and Barrett. As a lifelong resident of Manhattan’s Upper East Side, Conrad Foa has volunteered his time and effort to maintaining and improving the quality of life for his fellow Upper East Sider by twice running for a seat in the New York State Senate. In recognition of his outstanding leadership abilities, the Democratic voters of New York’s 73rd Assembly District elected Conrad Foa to the New York State Democratic Committee in 2006.

Conrad Foa has also distinguished himself as a premier leader in the insurance industry. As the principal of Chairman of Foa & Son, a leading insurance brokerage firm which negotiates insurance coverage on behalf of the consumer, he ushered his family-owned enterprise into the twenty-first century. The firm’s proud tradition is now being carried on by its President, Conrad and Linda’s son Justin, who is the fifth generation Foa to head the firm, which will be celebrating its sesquicentennial anniversary next year.

Conrad Foa’s leadership and achievements have been recognized on many occasions by his colleagues and peers. He is a past President and Director of the Insurance Brokers Association of the State of New York, and was instrumental in getting two pro-consumer bills passed to keep jobs and holding insurance premiums down. He was named a member of several prestigious and exclusive associations for business leaders, including the Young Presidents Organization, the World Presidents Organization, and the Chief Executives Organization. Mr. Foa is Founder of the International Executives Association and a past President and Director of Executives’ Association of Greater New York, a networking organization in New York City. A dedicated philanthropist, he also served as Member of the Board of Directors of the Federation of Protestant Welfare Agencies. He is a graduate of the Wharton School of Business at the University of Pennsylvania and received a Master’s Degree in Economics from The London School of Economics.

Despite all his activity in business, civic, and political life, Conrad Foa has always remained dedicated above all to his family. He and his wife Linda are the proud parents of their sons Justin and Barrett, an accomplished actor and performer, and doting grandparents to Justin’s son, Max.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my distinguished colleagues join me in recognizing the enormous contributions to our civic and political life made by the Honorable Conrad Foa, a great New Yorker and a great American.

HONORING THE ACADEMIC ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF DANIEL LAGE

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 2011

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to recognize a young man from south Florida, Daniel Lage, who has made headlines with his remarkable academic achievements. Daniel is one of only twenty-one students to win an award from the American Chemical Society in recognition of his outstanding research in chemical engineering. Daniel’s family history is a sadly familiar story for many of us in south Florida; that of being forced to flee the Castro dictatorship of Cuba for the land of freedom and opportunity: the United States.

I too come from this same background—and I know that the struggles of his family served to strengthen this young man’s passion to succeed.

There is no better path to success than that of a driven individual pursuing a sound education. I know that Daniel demonstrated his eagerness to learn and his matching intellect every day in the classroom. Through his hard work and with the support of his loving family by the time he graduated Guiller Preparatory School he had been named Valedictorian and had earned the prestigious Silver Knight Award. Later, Daniel was accepted into Harvard University, where he has pursued a degree in history and science and will graduate in May. Never forgetting his roots, Daniel has been the president of Harvard’s Cuban American Undergraduate Association and remains committed to the idea of a free and prosperous Cuba.

Daniel embodies the noble values, unshakable integrity, and sheer determination that we all should aspire to match. Many people and institutions have certainly taken note. Daniel has received the incredibly prestigious Rhodes Scholarship where he will study at the world renowned Oxford University in England. Winners are selected for many defining qualities including high academic achievement, personal integrity, and leadership potential. Impressively, he is one of only seventy Floridians to ever receive this scholarship.

At Oxford, Daniel expects to pursue a Master of Science—with a focus on different nations’ approaches to caring for the chronically ill. Sadly, this focus is not arbitrary, and again both he and my family share a solemn common bond. His grandfather, Eugene, was recently diagnosed with Alzheimer’s disease. I know firsthand the terrible effects of this debilitating disease on an individual. My mother, Amanda, has been fighting a losing battle against the disease over these last few years.

I know that my personal experiences with this horrific disease have prompted me to take action in the fight against Alzheimer’s; so too have Daniel’s experiences. He has partnered with the Alzheimer’s Association as an advocate and has every intention and expectation of becoming both a physician and a policy-maker in my future. I understand this deep-seated passion for geriatric medicine and certainly expect that he will resolve to play an important part in unlocking the mysteries of this terrible disease and finally finding a cure.

I know Daniel fully recognizes the immeasurable value of his ongoing education, and in doing so I am confident he will accomplish many great things for Florida and South Florida, our magnificent United States, and above all continue to make his family immensely proud.

So once again, Daniel, from a former Floridian certified teacher and a firm proponent of education as a lifelong journey. I congratulate you on all you have accomplished—you are a fine example of the best and brightest in south Florida and I wish you truly all the best on all you hope to accomplish in the future.

THE WALK FOR HEALTHCARE: HEALTHCARE STORIES FROM WEST VIRGINIA AND PENNSYLVANIA COLLECTED BY OGAN GUREL, M.D.

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 2011

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following stories, collected by Dr. Ogan Gurel.

“Tom described a situation in which he was buying two batteries for a scooter. Since he was paying out-of-pocket, they discounted the price $30 below the price they charged Medicare. ‘Something fishy is going on,’ he said.”—Tom—Chester, 7/14/09

“I met Sharyn at the DaVinci salon. No, I wasn’t going in for a pedicure, which, with the condition my feet were in wouldn’t have been easy anyway. Actually, she peeked out the door and asked, ‘Are you that doctor walking from Chicago to DC?’ and invited me in for a glass of water. Being busy with clinic every day was no opportunity to get any stories. But they all were supportive of the Walk. ‘We sure need healthcare reform,’ Sharyn said, as her co-workers gathered along with the clients reeling in their chairs nodded in agreement.”—Sharyn—Chester, 7/14/2009

“Gayla told me that she and her husband have been ‘very lucky,’ they’ve got employer-provided insurance through Verizon—‘pretty good insurance,’ she told me. But Frontier is buying the West Virginia assets of Verizon, so in the future they put it, they have no idea what it’ll mean for them. This is important because her stepson has cystic fibrosis (CF). At age 23 he’s a real success story. He’s done well enough to get himself off of the insurance standpoint, it’s gotten very complicated. Based on doctor’s orders, he’s strictly limited to very light work, at a maximum of 30 hours a week. So essentially, as Gayla told me, ‘He’s stuck with a part-time employment status. Insurance on his own is not a possibility,’ she added. ‘And he can’t go back, because he added too little.’ And while Verizon promised to cover him (as part of their employer-based coverage) even into adulthood, Gayla and her husband (they didn’t know if that agreement will be honored by the new company. She doubts that it will be. It sounds like there are so
have no insurance,' she said. 'And I work without medications coming into the ER two years later, told me she has no insurance. She'll only go to the doctor if absolutely necessary. 'Basically, she told me, 'healthcare is just not available.'''

Rhonda returned to Pennsylvania to take care of her elderly family. She's had self-pay insurance via Highmark, the major insurer in the Pittsburgh market. 'It's alright so long as you don't get sick.' Regarding the recent rate increases, she also wondered, 'you believe anything those execs put out, then you're a fool.' She had a situation last year of right upper-quadrant abdominal pain. She went to the ER, which was an ordeal. They started the work-up, a GI consult, surgery and the financial games, I never had a chance to breathe.' She told me she has no insurance. She'll only go to the doctor if absolutely necessary. 'Basically, she told me, 'healthcare is just not available.'''

Rhonda—Pittsburgh, 7/16/2009

"There was no way to bill so the insurance company could qualify for insurance through her employer because there was no work- ing,' she said. But according to her em- ployer, 'You're not working. 'The cracks in the system she was facing, seemed, from her perspective, few, if any, with no way out. When she heard public as- signation was no longer available for her, she called them, crying, 'Why have I been denied? 'You're not the only one, she thought, you make more than $200 a month.' So she makes do with a hodge-podge of different programs to make sure when the premium goes down, the bill down to $60 a month because the phar- macy has a special plan but her various other medical bills have accumulated to close to $6,000. "It's all a mess, all so com- plicated,' she told me. 'And if I really get hurt, I'm pretty much screwed.'''

Rhonda—Pittsburgh, 7/16/2009

"At the tail end of a monstrous thunder- storm, seeking some shelter, even though I was soaking wet anyway, I met Mary at the Wendy’s just west of Greensburg. She was the sister of one of the brothers who owns the restaurant. We had talked about the Walk and about health care reform. Mary shared with me the story of her son, Ryan, who had been diagnosed with multiple myeloma. 'So how much does the program cost? She had no idea. 'There was no way to bill so the insurance company could qualify for insurance through her employer because there was no work- ing,' she said. But according to her em- ployer, 'You're not working. 'The cracks in the system she was facing, seemed, from her perspective, few, if any, with no way out. When she heard public as- signation was no longer available for her, she called them, crying, 'Why have I been denied? 'You're not the only one, she thought, you make more than $200 a month.' So she makes do with a hodge-podge of different programs to make sure when the premium goes down, the bill down to $60 a month because the phar- macy has a special plan but her various other medical bills have accumulated to close to $6,000. "It's all a mess, all so com- plicated,' she told me. 'And if I really get hurt, I'm pretty much screwed.'''

Mary—Greensburg, 7/17/2009

John definitely notes that, 'the uninsured come to us in a more severe state. They don't have a family doctor and so in the ER people end up having to wait, because critical patients can enter at any time.' He told me it was not uncommon for them to wait six months to a year before seeking any medical attention.‘

John—Braddock, 7/16/2009

"As an EMT, Christina's seen diabetics without medications coming into the ER two to three times a day because they just can't get out of whack. They really don't have any health care access otherwise.'”

Christina—Braddock, 7/16/2009

"Zenia—Brookville—For years, a doctor regularly for her prescriptions. 'It's really hard, because I have no insurance,' she said. 'And I work hard. But since I'm part-time, Medicaid says I'm not eligible. But since she's working only 25 hours a week, she doesn't apparently qualify for insurance through her employer because they have a set number of hours.'"

Zenia—Brookville, 7/16/2009

"As I entered Pittsburgh, Deb, working the counter at the Milely's BP convenience store, told me she had no insurance, went to the doctor if absolutely necessary. 'Basically,' she said, 'I can't afford it.' She had a situation last year of right upper-quadrant abdominal pain. She went to the ER, which was an ordeal. They started the work-up, a GI consult, surgery and the financial games, I never had a chance to breathe.' She told me she has no insurance. She'll only go to the doctor if absolutely necessary. 'Basically, she told me, 'healthcare is just not available.'''

Deb—Pittsburgh, 7/15/2009

"Robin returned to Pennsylvania to take care of her elderly family. She's had self-pay insurance via Highmark, the major insurer in the Pittsburgh market. 'It's alright so long as you don't get sick.' Regarding the recent rate increases, she also wondered, 'you believe anything those execs put out, then you're a fool.' She had a situation last year of right upper-quadrant abdominal pain. She went to the ER, which was an ordeal. They started the work-up, a GI consult, surgery and the financial games, I never had a chance to breathe.' She told me she has no insurance. She'll only go to the doctor if absolutely necessary. 'Basically, she told me, 'healthcare is just not available.'''

Robin—Pittsburgh, 7/15/2009

"Ryan is a young American. 24 years old, 5'10", weighs 175. He is in rehab for a problem with his digestive system. He's been there since March of this year. 'I'm not a drug addict,' he told me. 'I just need to learn how to live normal. I can't get a job. I can't make enough to pay the rent. I can't make more than $200 a month.' So she makes do with a hodge-podge of different programs to make sure when the premium goes down, the bill down to $60 a month because the phar- macy has a special plan but her various other medical bills have accumulated to close to $6,000. "It's all a mess, all so com- plicated,' she told me. 'And if I really get hurt, I'm pretty much screwed.'''

Ryan—Braddock, 7/7/2009

"At the tail end of a monstrous thunder- storm, seeking some shelter, even though I was soaking wet anyway, I met Mary at the Wendy’s just west of Greensburg. She was the sister of one of the brothers who owns the restaurant. We had talked about the Walk and about health care reform. Mary shared with me the story of her son, Ryan, who had been diagnosed with multiple myeloma. 'So how much does the program cost? She had no idea. 'There was no way to bill so the insurance company could qualify for insurance through her employer because there was no work- ing,' she said. But according to her em- ployer, 'You're not working. 'The cracks in the system she was facing, seemed, from her perspective, few, if any, with no way out. When she heard public as- signation was no longer available for her, she called them, crying, 'Why have I been denied? 'You're not the only one, she thought, you make more than $200 a month.' So she makes do with a hodge-podge of different programs to make sure when the premium goes down, the bill down to $60 a month because the phar- macy has a special plan but her various other medical bills have accumulated to close to $6,000. "It's all a mess, all so com- plicated,' she told me. 'And if I really get hurt, I'm pretty much screwed.'''

Mary—Greensburg, 7/17/2009

Ryan Trump, shy but forthright, gracious and ambitious, had arrived. I was on the phone, still working feverishly to arrange transport of my bag. Too tired to be sick, I smiled at him. I was astonished that he was noting me following you on Twitter and I . . . and I just had to come and meet you. "I hung up the phone, and out of habit continued on for- ward a couple of miles. "I'm Ryan, Ryan Trump," he added. Oh yes! From Facebook! 'Yes,' he said, his face twisting, searching for words to describe a situation for which there was no precedent. "I can't believe this." What? 'That I met you here,' I chuckled. 'Crazy, isn't it?' Ryan and I had exchanged some e-mails during the past few weeks on Facebook, and it was strange indeed that an entirely electronic friendship had materialized here on the not-so-isolated Lincoln Highway east of Pitts- burgh. And so we talked—talked with amaze- ment about the GPS tracking technology that had brought Ryan to my very spot. We talked about healthcare. But I had to inter- rupt him. "Ryan, I have a problem. What does that?" My motel is about seven miles up, in Irwin. I have no pick-up to get there. Could you help out? 'That's the least I can do!" I added. "Ryan Trump, shy but forthright, gracious and ambitious, had arrived. I was grateful for the wonders of technology and even more for the personal, electronic, fellowship. And so, after a couple of hours of back-and-forth driving, Ryan and I
delivered the suitcase and myself to the motel in Irwin. But that was the present. The following evening I had dinner with Ryan and we talked about the past. The presence of Ryan while this is all going on, I have to say, I know, we spoke out of hope for the future. A future with healthcare for all, and not just for some. A future where the imagined infinite possibilities of the future may be realized if we really want it. Terry had referred to real health insurance but we could get care through the hospital. ‘That’s good, I replied. ‘I don’t think that’s a big pool and that it’s gone off. …’

He added that it was a big pool and that ‘it was very difficult. My mom’s got a heart condition, and she’s retired. And my credit score is probably garbage. Can’t do anything in life with that, you know.’ I figured, listening between the lines, that Ryan had, in fact, gotten some coverage as those who are still employed in the public sector have the freedom to change jobs without threat of having health insurance (BC/BS via the government form). That means that about a month of waiting check was $325 a week and health coverage from the state, a plan called Special Assistance from the state, a plan called Special Assistance. ‘And how’s it going with health insurance?’ I asked. ‘Well, you got aches and pains, but you think, do I deal with the hospital and not the insurance, or do I deal with the insurance and not the hospital? We had troubles with the bank. ‘That’s just the way it goes—you pay for the medications when you can.’ I shook my head. And how about for you? ‘What’s it like to not have insurance?’ I asked. ‘It would usually present itself to me as a shock, straight at me with those forthright, almost aggressive eyes, glanced down. ‘Well, you got aches and pains, but you think, do I deal with the hospital and not the insurance, or do I deal with the insurance and not the hospital?’

Eric did have a serious health issue last year. He got hit pretty hard at a job, and he told me of an injury he had a few years back. He got hit pretty hard at a job. He told me that the doctor basically said, ‘You got a gash on your head and some sort of shoulder injury.’ ‘I got 27 stitches in my head but they did nothing about my shoulder.’ I suppose I could understand his displeasure as with all that he got a bill for $3,200. ‘I still can’t afford the emergency room. ‘And how’s it going with health insurance?’ I asked. ‘Well, you got aches and pains, but you think, do I deal with the hospital and not the insurance, or do I deal with the insurance and not the hospital?’

He added that he wished he had been more flexible, had considered true medical necessity, in observing my mother the first night after her procedure, perhaps she should still be with us now.” "Terry—Greenburg, 7/19/2009

"I haven’t had health insurance since ’82,‘ Ed told me, when I asked him if he had any healthcare stories. ‘That’s when Bethlehem Steel closed down—so, no insurance, for me.’ I nodded. I understand. I don’t have insurance either. ‘I don’t think Ed really heard me as he got his jacket on and went straight at me with those forthright, almost aggressive eyes, glanced down. ‘Well, you got aches and pains, but you think, do I deal with the hospital and not the insurance, or do I deal with the insurance and not the hospital?’

Eric told me, when I asked him if he had any problems with the bank. ‘One more thing. I think much of these premium monies are being wasted.’ So how? I asked. ‘I went to a Pirates game and they care not if I can’t afford to go to these games. ‘Guess who sponsored all that?’ Who? ‘Highmark. That’s where health insurance premiums go—to advertising.’ And so my experience came full circle as I recalled the giant Highmark billboards scattered among Pittsburgh’s downtown when I had been there four days earlier.” Kay—Bedford, 7/20/2009

"‘I met with Eric in Jim’s living room (at the home where I stayed that night). Jim came full circle as I recalled the giant Highmark billboards scattered among Pittsburgh’s downtown when I had been there four days earlier.” Kay—Bedford, 7/20/2009

"I haven’t had health insurance since ’82,“ Ed told me, when I asked him if he had any healthcare stories. ‘That’s when Bethlehem Steel closed down—so, no insurance, for me.’ I nodded. I understand. I don’t have insurance either. ‘I don’t think Ed really heard me as he got his jacket on and went straight at me with those forthright, almost aggressive eyes, glanced down. ‘Well, you got aches and pains, but you think, do I deal with the hospital and not the insurance, or do I deal with the insurance and not the hospital?’

He added that it was a big pool and that ‘it was very difficult. My mom’s got a heart condition, and she’s retired. And my credit score is probably garbage. Can’t do anything in life with that, you know.’ I figured, listening between the lines, that Ryan had, in fact, gotten some coverage as those who are still employed in the public sector have the freedom to change jobs without threat of having health insurance (BC/BS via the government form). That means that about a month of waiting check was $325 a week and health coverage from the state, a plan called Special Assistance. ‘And how’s it going with health insurance?’ I asked. ‘Well, you got aches and pains, but you think, do I deal with the hospital and not the insurance, or do I deal with the insurance and not the hospital?’

Eric did have a serious health issue last year. He got hit pretty hard at a job, and he told me of an injury he had a few years back. He got hit pretty hard at a job. He told me that the doctor basically said, ‘You got a gash on your head and some sort of shoulder injury.’ ‘I got 27 stitches in my head but they did nothing about my shoulder.’ I suppose I could understand his displeasure as with all that he got a bill for $3,200. ‘I still can’t afford the emergency room. ‘And how’s it going with health insurance?’ I asked. ‘Well, you got aches and pains, but you think, do I deal with the hospital and not the insurance, or do I deal with the insurance and not the hospital?’

He added that he wished he had been more flexible, had considered true medical necessity, in observing my mother the first night after her procedure, perhaps she should still be with us now.” "Terry—Greenburg, 7/19/2009

"I haven’t had health insurance since ’82,‘ Ed told me, when I asked him if he had any healthcare stories. ‘That’s when Bethlehem Steel closed down—so, no insurance, for me.’ I nodded. I understand. I don’t have insurance either. ‘I don’t think Ed really heard me as he got his jacket on and went straight at me with those forthright, almost aggressive eyes, glanced down. ‘Well, you got aches and pains, but you think, do I deal with the hospital and not the insurance, or do I deal with the insurance and not the hospital?’

He added that it was a big pool and that ‘it was very difficult. My mom’s got a heart condition, and she’s retired. And my credit score is probably garbage. Can’t do anything in life with that, you know.’ I figured, listening between the lines, that Ryan had, in fact, gotten some coverage as those who are still employed in the public sector have the freedom to change jobs without threat of having health insurance (BC/BS via the government form). That means that about a month of waiting check was $325 a week and health coverage from the state, a plan called Special Assistance. ‘And how’s it going with health insurance?’ I asked. ‘Well, you got aches and pains, but you think, do I deal with the hospital and not the insurance, or do I deal with the insurance and not the hospital?’
And there seems to be no way out of her situation. ‘Fortunately,’ he told me, ‘we are covered through the state (ACCESS program).’ He seemed calm as he explained this predicament. ‘My wife just got diagnosed with Lyme disease. She’s on treatment — bite right here in our backyard.’ Eyes perks up among the others sitting about the grocery. He told me, ‘We’re paying cash for the lab bill.’ It had originally been estimated they would be able to get it discounted to $187. ‘The doctor’s bill was $30— and that’s just for the diagnosis,’ he added. ‘For the actual treatment, we’re depending on free samples.’” — Mike—Harrisonville, 7/21/2009

Jo.—Bedford, 7/21/2009

‘For the actual treatment, we’re depending on free samples.’” — Jim—Harrisonville, 7/21/2009

I would call myself a fiscal conservative,” Jim told me as we sat together discussing healthcare in his living room. ‘I believe that health savings accounts, HSAs, and patient involvement in the decision-making will be important to bring costs under control. He added that in his experience, once health benefits are provided, it’s very difficult to go back. He’s worked in government for 32 years and is currently retired. ‘Personally, I think the government plan, if made available to all, would work well. I think that would be easy to implement. It allows you to have a basic plan as a public good.’ Jo told me she’s seen examples of that and she ‘believes it’s a basic plan as a public good.’ Jo told me she’s come tiering. ‘Jim—Bedford, 7/21/2009

Sonny told me the story of a girl in town. ‘Chris works at the Days Inn in Frederick. Unfortunately, he told me, as he explained this predicament. ‘My wife just got diagnosed with Lyme disease. She’s on treatment — bite right here in our backyard.’ Eyes perks up among the others sitting about the grocery. He told me, ‘We’re paying cash for the lab bill.’ It had originally been estimated they would be able to get it discounted to $187. ‘The doctor’s bill was $30— and that’s just for the diagnosis,’ he added. ‘For the actual treatment, we’re depending on free samples.’” — Mike—Harrisonville, 7/21/2009

Jo.—Bedford, 7/21/2009

The Walk for Healthcare: Healthcare Stories from Maryland and Washington, DC, Collected by Ogán Gurel, M.D.

Hon. Dennis J. Kucinich

Ohio

In the House of Representatives

Thursday, January 6, 2011

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following stories, collected by Dr. Ogán Gurel.

‘Tamara told me, ‘She was lucky having health insurance.’ Knowing generally that lack of insurance was a problem, she didn’t have any particular personal stories to relate, though she spoke of her father being driven to the hospital by ambulance when he asked for a place to sit down and rest. She said, simply enough, that, ‘More should be done.’” — Tamara—Hagerstown, 7/22/2009

‘Patrick has been on and off insurance all his life. ‘More off than on,’ he further clarified for me. ‘My credit rating is trash because of medical stuff.’ And in the 80s he had a skull injury. ‘I actually had insurance but not everything was covered so I just couldn’t pay.’ He seemed relaxed for someone for whom the system seemed not to work—into debt, even with insurance, and now suffering the consequence of ruined credit. ‘But perhaps one gets used to such predicament,’ Patrick—Hagerstown, 7/22/2009

‘I would call myself a fiscal conservative,” Jim told me as we sat together discussing healthcare in his living room. ‘I believe that health savings accounts, HSAs, and patient involvement in the decision-making will be important to bring costs under control. He added that in his experience, once health benefits are provided, it’s very difficult to go back. He’s worked in government for 32 years and is currently retired. ‘Personally, I think the government plan, if made available to all, would work well. I think that would be easy to implement. It allows you to have a basic plan as a public good.’ Jo told me she’s seen examples of that and she ‘believes it’s a basic plan as a public good.’ Jo told me she’s come tiering. ‘Jim—Bedford, 7/21/2009

Sonny told me the story of a girl in town. ‘Chris works at the Days Inn in Frederick. He’s an insulin-dependent diabetic (that’s his
supplies he's proudly showing me). He has insurance but 'it sucks, only covers so much,' he told me. 'They don't cover even the supplies I have here. And if you go to the hospital for long periods of care, or see a specialist, it costs several hundred dollars.' He was previously under his parent's coverage but now his own insurance, which 'bad as it is,' he added, was upgraded. 'You think about the economy. 'But,' he said, 'I don't have much choice unless I get another job, and that's not at all easy these days.'”

—Chris—Frederick, 7/23/2009

"Frank's story centers around his fiancée. She's a breast cancer survivor. The chemotherapy, Frank, 'cured the cancer but devastated her body. She continues to have health problems,' he told me. These include diabetes and osteoarthritis for which she is treated with methotrexate and Embryl injections. She had been getting her medications through PAC (Physicians Assistance Care of Maryland) but, as Frank explained to me, 'only the diabetes medicines qualified and those she got through this program were less effective than what she was previously taking.' Now that she is working, she has worry-free, eligible for the plan (which requires an income of less than $1,400 a month). Her new job offers health insurance, but she gets so sick that she needs the policy, 'there'd be no money for anything else.' Getting health insurance, would 'make it impossible for her to live,' Frank explained. Even with this policy, the medications would be too expensive. Basically, Frank summarized for me, 'without health care, she has pain and suffering, can't get out of bed and so could lose the job.' That's terrible, I said. 'Oh, it could be worse I guess,' he replied, shaking his head.

—Frank—Frederick, 7/23/2009

"I met Doris over breakfast at the Days Inn. Howard told me that they've generally been OK, but even with insurance, 'deductibles have been increasing and out-of-pocket expenses also going up.' But Howard wished to share a story from twenty years ago. 'It actually relates to what's happening today,' he told me. He was between jobs, he explained, leaving him a position with health insurance for a higher-paying job that did not, however, offer health benefits. Soon after, his wife had a tuberculosis attending, Frank, who had been treated for TB, had the man who diapers (a huge chunk of change in those days), his daughter Dorothy told me—and he was able to negotiate a half-price delivery. She shook her head. 'That just doesn't make sense!'" Shayla—Gaithersburg, 7/25/2009

"Keith is one of the founders of the ubiquitous Food Not Bombs organization. His organization has protested around the world and now he's in front of the White House delivering his message to all those gathered. His story is simple: he's got fibromyalgia, which he says he acquired after being terrorized by the CIA during one of his several incarcerations. Though he had high expectations, 'he can never get health insurance.' Keith—Washington, 7/26/2009

"Doris, from the Bronx, NY, has a DC visit. 'No insurance, can't afford it.' She said, 'and doesn't even go to a doctor. I'm otherwise lucky,' she said, with a smile and went on without her friends.

—Doris—Washington, 7/26/2009

CELEBRATING THE GRAND OPENING OF TERRY'S HOUSE
HON. JIM COSTA
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 6, 2011

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Community Regional Medical Center on the occasion of the grand opening of Terry's House, a new, state-of-the-art facility in downtown Fresno. The new building will provide much needed support and housing to allow families to stay close to sick and injured loved ones in the hospital. Located in the heart of the Fresno medical district, this new 15,874 square-foot, two-story family home will be the first hospitality house in the Greater Fresno Area.

This residential facility is named in honor of Terry Richards who suffered and survived a serious trauma at the age of five when he was injured in a car accident. For nearly five months, his mother was forced to travel nearly 80 miles a day to visit him while he was recovering in the hospital. Currently, family members of patients must seek accommodations miles from the hospital, and many who cannot afford lodging sleep in waiting rooms, in their cars or try their best to find a spot in a bus. These loved ones have no alternative but to leave the hospital and make the long drive home. Now families have Terry's House, their home away from home, while their loved ones receive care.

Terry's House was made possible by the tireless work of Terry's Richards' brother, Tom Richards, a local community developer and CEO of the Penstar Group. With the dedication of Tom Richards, Leta Ciavaglia, the Terry's House Development Council, the Community Regional Medical Center Foundation and many generous members of the community, a family dream has become a reality.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud Terry's House and its many supporters for their efforts to create a facility which keeps families together during times of need. I ask my colleagues to join me in commending Tom and the community members of Fresno who have worked unselfishly to make the opening of Terry's House possible.

THE WALK FOR HEALTHCARE: HEALTHCARE STORIES FROM ILLINOIS AND INDIANA COLLECTED BY OGAN GUREL, M.D.

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 6, 2011

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following stories, collected by Dr. Ogan Gurel.

"Martha finds it shameful that America can't provide basic health care for its citizens, like any other developed country does. 'Civilized nations care for those in need,' she says. 'It has been a serious problem for all of us. The availability of health care insurance to employment status was a big problem. 'It doesn't make sense. If you get sick, you have a greater man's charge of being unemployed.' "—Martha—Chicago, 6/27/2009

"Addison, on the right, is Martha's older son. He's a student in college who, with evidence, told me that the family had he just voted for the first time. As he embarks on study abroad in Italy this coming fall, he is, despite his glowing patriotism, embarrassed that health care for all, as he has learned is the case in Italy, doesn't exist here in America. "—Addison—Chicago, 6/27/2009

"I met Ron along Martin Luther King Drive. He was working at painting a fence. He waved his hands towards the south side streets beyond and said, 'Yes, there's many people here without health insurance.' With a serious look, he turned back towards me. 'Yes, without health care.' He shared a story of an old lady from the neighborhood. She had a change in coverage that now made it too expensive to get her diabetes. 'It was all very fishy business,' Ron said, 'and now she's struggling, Ron tells me, on a serious look. Without her 'brand-new' private supplemental insurance, she is no longer eligible for the program and she has generally been OK, but even with insurance, 'deductibles have been increasing and out-of-pocket expenses also going up.' But Howard wished to share a story from twenty years ago. 'It actually relates to what's happening today,' he told me. He was between jobs, he explained, leaving him a position with health insurance for a higher-paying job that did not, however, offer health benefits. Soon after, his wife had a tubal attending, Frank, who had been treated for TB, had the man who diapers (a huge chunk of change in those days), his daughter Dorothy told me—and he was able to negotiate a half-price delivery. He was working at painting a fence.

"Brenda's story is about her father who died two months ago. She told her story with a mix of disbelief and quiet anger though she was hesitant to be able to share what she felt was a true health insurance horror story. Her late father had diabetes since 1996. His illness was complicated by neuropathy and foot infections, resulting in an amputation of one great toe. Earlier this year, his insurance company, Group Health, told him that they were dropping him for medical noncompliance although Brenda, who's a nurse, said this was patently a lie and they had medical proof, including doctor's attestations, that he was in compliance. And then he had a stroke, which was compounded with multiple complications. He came down with sepsis, had to have another amputation, this time below-the-knee. Though the parents said everything was OK, the operation was, in fact, a 'was a disaster,' Brenda told me. It turned out he was left unattended in the hallway, coded in recovery, and then was given something on a ventilator and admitted to the ICU. He never regained consciousness. He was taken to a Palliative Care unit and though he was put on a morphine drip, he survived for two more tortuous months. All during this time, people from the hospital kept coming to tell the family that she would be responsible for the bill. 'The total bill is $89,000 and still going up,' she said.

Brenda—Gaithersburg, 7/24/2009

"Shayla's story is simple: he's got fibromyalgia, which he says he acquired after being terrorized by the CIA during one of his several incarcerations. Though he had high expectations, 'he can never get health insurance.' Keith—Washington, 7/26/2009

"Doris, from the Bronx, NY, has a DC visit. 'No insurance, can't afford it.' She said, 'and doesn't even go to a doctor. I'm otherwise lucky,' she said, with a smile and went on without her friends.

—Doris—Washington, 7/26/2009

"Yes, without health care.' He shared a story of an old lady from the neighborhood. She had a change in coverage that now made it too expensive to get her diabetes. 'It was all very fishy business,' Ron said, 'and now she's struggling, Ron tells me, on a serious look. Without her 'brand-new' private supplemental insurance, she is no longer eligible for the program and they were hosting an outdoor BBQ in the heart of the Fresno medical district, this new 15,874 square-foot, two-story family home will be the first hospitality house in the Greater Fresno Area.

This residential facility is named in honor of Terry Richards who suffered and survived a serious trauma at the age of five when he was injured in a car accident. For nearly five months, his mother was forced to travel nearly 80 miles a day to visit him while he was recovering in the hospital. Currently, family members of patients must seek accommodations miles from the hospital, and many who cannot afford lodging sleep in waiting rooms, in their cars or try their best to find a spot in a bus. These loved ones have no alternative but to leave the hospital and make the long drive home. Now families have Terry's House, their home away from home, while their loved ones receive care.

Terry's House was made possible by the tireless work of Terry's Richards' brother, Tom Richards, a local community developer and CEO of the Penstar Group. With the dedication of Tom Richards, Leta Ciavaglia, the Terry's House Development Council, the Community Regional Medical Center Foundation and many generous members of the community, a family dream has become a reality.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud Terry's House and its many supporters for their efforts to create a facility which keeps families together during times of need. I ask my colleagues to join me in commending Tom and the community members of Fresno who have worked unselfishly to make the opening of Terry's House possible.
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‘As I walked along 23th Avenue (on the way to Gary), I heard a horn from the road. They slowed down, they weren’t you on TV last night?” And so I head over to say hello and get the next story of the day. With traffic zooming by on it, we didn’t have much time for chitchat. But he shook his head, ‘No, Roderick—Hammond, 6/28/2009.

‘As I walked along 23th Avenue (on the way to Gary), I heard a horn from the road. They slowed down, they weren’t you on TV last night?” And so I head over to say hello and get the next story of the day. With traffic zooming by on it, we didn’t have much time for chitchat. But he shook his head, ‘No, Roderick—Hammond, 6/28/2009.

‘As I walked along 23th Avenue (on the way to Gary), I heard a horn from the road. They slowed down, they weren’t you on TV last night?” And so I head over to say hello and get the next story of the day. With traffic zooming by on it, we didn’t have much time for chitchat. But he shook his head, ‘No, Roderick—Hammond, 6/28/2009.
Throughout the trip Scott was glowingly optimistic about getting a tornado and a few homes destroyed. Most of the kids were lucky, that the next trailer park up in Fort Wayne had a big turnout to honor them. "Last December Trushar had fallen down in an ice storm, breaking his left wrist. He's planning for a career in health advocacy, and is with my girlfriend. She works part-time education, and think more clearly.' He was very surprised at the opportunity to talk.' "Ed—Warsaw, 7/1/2009

As a student, however, he cannot afford, at least in a crueler world (which is not so good this year, Uprendra cannot afford health care insurance. He is not insured, nor is anyone in his immediate family. His insulin, when he can, as free drug samples from his brother, who is a retired doctor. I was humbled by his generosity, the company, and she has cancer. Her kidneys are failing. She has what she called a ‘muscle lock’ in her neck, which sounded to me like a cervical muscle spasm, perhaps even a herniated cervical disk—hard to tell. In any case, she's had no insurance and hasn't seen a doctor or been to a hospital for it. She remains in pain, housekeeping work is hard, and this is making it really tough around her. I know that this hotel staff is like family, and that they likely wouldn’t fire her for a situation that is undoubtedly compromising her productivity (which is quite common), she’d be out, replaced by someone else healthier, but also without insurance, Hina, in a way, is lucky.' Hina—Pt. Wayn, 2/2/2009

"It was in the service in the Philippines during World War II. He was later an electrician at the Harvard Cyclotron in Cambridge (on Oxford Street), he has had many medical problems but hasn’t had any difficulties being on Medicare. Some things are not paid for but by-and-large, he’s happy. He has often thought that universal health care insurance was provided by the government and that higher taxes were likely necessary. ‘If the government managed its budget better, there’d be money to pay for it,’ he added. He also said, ‘People without health care insurance live under handicapped conditions. With insurance, a wage-earner can be free to concentrate on his family, his education, and think more clearly.’ He was very happy I met with him and concluded, ‘I’m so surprised at the opportunity to talk.’ ‘Ed—Warsaw, 7/1/2009

"I felt I needed to come to us in a Mexican store down the street. I spoke with one of the counter people, who wished not to be identified. She told us that she did have insurance (through her husband) and that she was happy with the system and that she would not change anything. Then, next to the register, I noticed a posted sign with a picture of a young boy in a hospital bed pleading for $100,000 to help with a kidney transplant. Doesn’t that tell it all?’—Scott—Warsaw, 7/1/2009

"I’m unemployed,’ Scott told me, ‘and don’t have any insurance. But, I’ve been pretty healthy, ‘cept my teeth here—gotta work on that too.’ The difficult story is with my girlfriend. She works part-time and also no insurance. She makes too much for HIP (Indiana public assistance program) so that’s that. A few months ago, she had a kidney stone and the local hospital wouldn’t take care of her so they sent her to Indianaplis. The pain was so bad and she ended up having some operation there.’ He said that there was no way they could pay any of the bills being that they were barely making ends meet. We drove by the trailer park that was told to me how fort were lucky, that the next trailer park up in Columbia City had been recently hit by a tornado and a few homes destroyed. Through the window his trips, Scott and the $200/month, the health insurance offered to him. But he’s lucky because he gets coverage through his wife who’s a resident. In his medical school experiences, he’s come across many patients who lack medical care because of a lack of health insurance and this has inspired him to help to solve this problem.’—Cameron—Pt. Wayn, 7/3/2009

"Terri—U.S. citizen) would go back to India to have it done. The family ended up spending about $500 for various x-rays, the visit to the doctor was free, but he was told that if it had gotten worse, the surgery for it would cost about $25,000. If that came to pass, they decided that Trushar (who is a U.S. citizen) would go back to India to have the surgery.'—Pat, 7/2/2009

"Hina’s one of the workers at the hotel—doubles up as back-up front desk and housekeeping. In fact, it seemed like everyone had a hand in all aspects of the operation. Hina’s had what she called a ‘muscle lock’ in her neck, which sounded to me like a cervical muscle spasm, perhaps even a herniated cervical disk—hard to tell. In any case, she's had no insurance and hasn't seen a doctor or been to a hospital for it. She remains in pain, housekeeping work is hard, and this is making it really tough around her. I know that this hotel staff is like family, and that they likely wouldn’t fire her for a situation that is undoubtedly compromising her productivity (which is quite common), she’d be out, replaced by someone else healthier, but also without insurance, Hina, in a way, is lucky.’—Hina—Pt. Wayn, 2/2/2009

"It was in 2002 that Bonnie lost her job of 22 years. At that time, she had been on COBRA though, ‘it was incredibly expensive,’ she noted. ‘I recall paying $800/month through her husband’s union plan (he’s a carpenter). ‘If I got the insurance on my own, you know, ‘it’d cost $850 a month.’ She shook her head and said, ‘Even though I consider myself lucky, this is crazy!’’—Deb—New Haven, 7/3/2009

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 40TH WEDDING ANNIVERSARY OF THOMAS AND CAMILLE OGBIA

HON. MIKE ROGERS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 6, 2011

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to a very special occasion today—the 40th wedding anniversary of Thomas and Camille Ogbia. This event will take place on January 16, 2011, but family and friends are celebrating the event on January 14, 2011.

Thomas Henry Ogbia was born on January 24, 1947, in Stamford, Connecticut, to Henry and Rose Ogbia. His wife, Camille Caruso Ogbia, was born on January 18, 1946, in Southbridge, Massachusetts. They met and fell in love while attending college together at the University of Notre Dame. Mr. and Mrs. Thomas Ogbia were married on January 16, 1971, at St. Mary’s Catholic Church in Stamford, Connecticut. Together they raised two children, Thomas and Jenna.

Thomas and Camille currently reside in Naples, Florida, I salute this lovely couple on the 40th year of their life together and join their friends and family in honoring them on this special occasion.

RECOGNIZING THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN–FLINT

HON. DALE E. KILDEE
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 6, 2011

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the University of Michigan-Flint for being designated an ‘Engaged University’ by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. The Carnegie Foundation announced this classification yesterday and a
formal presentation will take place on the University of Michigan-Flint campus on Monday, January 10.

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching created the “Engaged University” classification to acknowledge the achievements, throughout the United States that have created institutional practices of community involvement. Universities apply for the classification and are granted the classification based upon their mission, culture, leadership, resources and practices. The University of Michigan-Flint was able to demonstrate the integration of curricular engagement, outreach, the exchange of knowledge, and partnerships, with the larger community to the benefit of both groups. The school has an established practice of honoring faculty for their involvement, encouraging students to extend the education process outside classroom walls, and utilizing the school’s resources to enhance the community.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in congratulating the chancellor, Dr. Ruth Person, the provost, Dr. Gerard Yorland, the faculty, staff, students and community for their vision, enthusiasm and commitment to this partnership. I commend the University of Michigan-Flint for their hard work and for receiving this classification from the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

THE WALK FOR HEALTHCARE: HEALTHCARE STORIES FROM OHIO COLLECTED BY OGAN GUREL, M.D.

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH
OHIO IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 6, 2011

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following stories, collected by Dr. Ogan Gurel.

Jean doesn’t want socialized medicine. But she also adds that the current system doesn’t pay (or reward) for preventative care. But it wasn’t clear to her how either the free-marketers or the socialists were going to solve that. ‘People have to take responsibility for their health,’ she told me.” Jean—Van Wert, 7/4/2009

Tamara, the driver at the Rooster truck stop near Middle Point, Ohio, has no insurance. ‘It’s just too much . . . that’s the situation.’ Tamara—Middle Point, 7/4/2009

Dee told me she had an uncle. He had a heart attack a few years back resulting in cardiac surgery and a bill for $145,000. ‘Dee. He’s in danger of dying, I’m told. But whether he was referring to his health troubles or the financial burdens. Dee told her uncle to change his diet, do yoga, lots of walking, in hopes of changing his lifestyle and health. And so he heeded her advice and actually, to do these things, went back to India. Returning some months later, he told me very clearly that does not like the Obama plan at all. But he also doesn’t like corporate interests driving reform. We do not change ‘it is incredibly expensive,’ he told me further, citing his father’s case. He had gotten a pacemaker and defibrillator and ‘Everything cost more than $200,000’ Roger—New Stark, 7/4/2009

Kara’s 19 years old and had most recently been just under her parent’s health coverage. ‘But after nineteen, they take you off,’ she told me, and she’s now in the process of re-enrolling in her own plan. During this switch, she’s actually without coverage. She said, ‘My current job is not enough to afford insurance and then, when I’m in college, two years from now, I’ll have to re-apply.’ She’s got asthma and fibromyalgia. It’s a real problem, she told me as she’s ‘really worried’ about pre-existing conditions disqualifying her or making her insurance too expensive.” Kara—Lima, 7/6/2009

She threw her hands up and exclaimed, ‘That’s a car payment!’ She looked me in the eye and continued, ‘And business not having insurance but I can’t afford it.’ She told me about her carpal tunnel syndrome, that she had had a hard time and a nuclear medicine scan to get in. ‘Today, I went to the MRI. Actually,’ she added, ‘HCAP, a state program, can take care of the actual MRI but not the reading. So,’ she said with a sigh, ‘I can’t afford it.’ Her husband doesn’t have health insurance either. ‘He’s got two bulging discs in his spine but can’t do anything about it. So he can’t work and spend everything reclining on the couch.’ Kate—Lima, 7/6/2009

Heather (on the right) is 23 and recently divorced. She had gone through the marriage and actually had significant gastrointestinal problems for which she had four surgeries. She had a gall bladder operation in Johannesburg, South Africa, that she had a mild stroke and a gastrointestinal problem. She was discharged from the hospital with no health insurance. ‘I still owe $140 a month and works odd jobs to pay for one of these. She lives one day at a time and hopes that there’ll be healthcare reform. ‘Some people like me can get the prescriptions we need.’ We met on a porch in Gomer (she was helping to clean up someone’s home) where she brought me some water as she was driving to her mother’s place.” Nancy—Gomer, 7/5/2009

Kara’s 19 years old and had most recently been just under her parent’s health coverage. ‘But after nineteen, they take you off,’ she told me, and she’s now in the process of re-enrolling in her own plan. During this switch, she’s actually without coverage. She said, ‘My current job is not enough to afford insurance and then, when I’m in college, two years from now, I’ll have to re-apply.’ She’s got asthma and fibromyalgia. It’s a real problem, she told me as she’s ‘really worried’ about pre-existing conditions disqualifying her or making her insurance too expensive.” Kara—Lima, 7/6/2009

She threw her hands up and exclaimed, ‘That’s a car payment!’ She looked me in the eye and continued, ‘And business not having insurance but I can’t afford it.’ She told me about her carpal tunnel syndrome, that she had had a hard time and a nuclear medicine scan to get in. ‘Today, I went to the MRI. Actually,’ she added, ‘HCAP, a state program, can take care of the actual MRI but not the reading. So,’ she said with a sigh, ‘I can’t afford it.’ Her husband doesn’t have health insurance either. ‘He’s got two bulging discs in his spine but can’t do anything about it. So he can’t work and spend everything reclining on the couch.’ Kate—Lima, 7/6/2009

Heather (on the right) is 23 and recently divorced. She had gone through the marriage and actually had significant gastrointestinal problems for which she had four surgeries. She had a gall bladder operation in Johannesburg, South Africa, that she had a mild stroke and a gastrointestinal problem. She was discharged from the hospital with no health insurance. ‘I still owe $140 a month and works odd jobs to pay for one of these. She lives one day at a time and hopes that there’ll be healthcare reform. ‘Some people like me can get the prescriptions we need.’ We met on a porch in Gomer (she was helping to clean up someone’s home) where she brought me some water as she was driving to her mother’s place.” Nancy—Gomer, 7/5/2009

Gloria’s husband died three years ago. She now has $1,600 a month between Social Security and the Ford pension. ‘It’s a good plan,’ with prescriptions at $2 each, she told me, ‘I don’t have a high deductible but I’m deep, was about her son. He had retired after 22 years of distinguished service in the Navy—the highly stressful submarine service. She died with him on the Soviet Navy. He had a quadruple bypass and also an abdominal aneurysm operation. All that went well,’ she said, ‘but he had a very tough time getting reimbursed, especially since his operations left him very sick and weak.’ He had to fight to reimbursed while lying in bed through the employer). ‘Government messes everything up,’ he said, ‘I can’t afford it.’ Her husband doesn’t have health insurance either. ‘He’s got two bulging discs in his spine but can’t do anything about it. So he can’t work and spend everything reclining on the couch.’ Kate—Lima, 7/6/2009

Grace, the youngest, hasn’t had any healthcare since she’s been home from college, two years from now, I’ll have to re-apply. ‘With an angry look on his face, Roger said, ‘I’ve seen other veteran’s have things messed up,’ he said, ‘it is really terrible with all the uninsured, it’s incredibly expensive, she can’t afford the MRI. ‘Actually,’ she added, ‘HCAP, a state program, can take care of the actual MRI but not the reading. So,’ she said with a sigh, ‘I can’t afford it.’ Her husband doesn’t have health insurance either. ‘He’s got two bulging discs in his spine but can’t do anything about it. So he can’t work and spend everything reclining on the couch.’ Kate—Lima, 7/6/2009

Joe, the flagger at the construction site, believes in individual responsibility and accountability. The government messes things up, he said, but he likes the Walk—you’re doing a good thing,’ and concluded by saying, ‘some change is definitely needed’ Joe—Newark, 7/4/2009

I met John, a traveling salesman, at dinner. He got coverage, for which he is grateful. ‘It hasn’t been a problem,’ he added, ‘I’ve been happy with the healthcare situation,’ he told me.” John—Van Wert, 7/4/2009

Steve, a financial consultant, wants the government out of healthcare. He believes that health insurance should be private (and through the employer). ‘Government messes everything up,’ he tells me. ‘Actually, I am making my living fixing up government accounts,’ he told me, ‘I believe that the healthcare system could be much more efficient.’ Steve—Lima, 7/6/2009

Reuben actually stopped by the roadside to talk with me. He told me of his nephew, who’s an Ob-Gyn doctor in Maryland. ‘His entire paycheck nearly all goes to
malpractice insurance," Reuben told me. "Insurance companies are trying to get everyone who can pay, even by coercion." He told me he thinks it’s important to keep the profit motive out of the health care business. "It’s devastating," he added. In terms of his own health insurance, as a child he survived Hodgkin’s disease but has recently been diagnosed with Hodgkin’s lymphoma. "It’s a risk factor of childhood Hodgkin’s disease," I told him. "Yes, I know. Though his insurance was ‘80/20,’ as he put it, he died. That’s just how ifs. If you’ve got nothing to lose, took a rest by the roadside." Reuben—Upper Sandusky, 7/8/2009

I met the direct director of the Lighthouse homeless shelter (where I had stayed while in Bucyrus). It was a nice, clean place which, as she told me, "helps people when their most in need. We got to be able to help them love, no criminal history, but they’re otherwise down-and-out." Her husband, 73 years old, is now on Medicare/SSI and had a complicated cardiac condition. He suffered a heart attack during a cath procedure and was taken by air ambulance to Columbus. He had a quadruple bypass and they ended up with 20 new valves. Medicare went to 80%. They lost all their retirement in the stock market and now survive only on Social Security. It’s been a struggle for me and my children,” Kim—Bucyrus, 7/9/2009

"This gentleman, IV melanoma with metastases to the brain. He had extensive treatments and his life was saved but the biggest problem, he told me, ‘Was the clerical and billing error. The paperwork and scheduling was horrible.' He summarized his very complicated story through the healthcare system as follows: ‘the clinical side was wonderful, the administrative a disaster.’” Mansfield, 7/9/2009

"I met Linda at the drugstore during one of my regular visits for antibiotic ointment. People who can’t afford it can get six or seven tubes at a time. She told me she’s OK now but previously had Aetna as her health insurance carrier. ‘It was a real problem,’ she said, as no prior visits were covered: ‘There was no choice, I had to go all the way to Columbus for my care.’” Mansfield, 7/10/2009

"I stopped at Mr. T’s coffee shop on the eastside of Mansfield. ‘I have no healthcare,’ Richard told me. ‘My doctor bills are $50 and they, Aetna, pays only 20%. We only need a little healthcare reform.’” Richard—Mansfield, 7/10/2009

"Glendale’s a World War II vet (Coast Guard) and who was working in the VA system, he’s had no problems with health care. He had a heart attack six years ago with a quadruple bypass but, ‘now,’ he said, ‘I’m doing fine.’ He’s been retired for 23 years, gets his medications from the VA and also receives Medicare and retirement benefits. ‘I hope they get that healthcare in this country worked out, there’s so many people without it,’ he said. ‘This is a man who fought for freedom; has his fight been in vain?’” Glendale—Mansfield, 7/10/2009

"On a hot afternoon, Jane’s store, Munchies, was a godsend. After downing water and ice cream, I asked her if she had any healthcare stories. She didn’t offer any, but, she said, ‘A lot of people for everyone to have some health care insurance without hardship . . . especially for our seniors,’ she told me. 7/9/2009

"On this hot afternoon, along the long road east of Mifflin, I began getting desperately thirsty. A generous family answered my knock on the door. They saw, at a glance, that I was a photographer. They invited me in and had me sit down. They offered me water and ice cream. I asked them how they could afford it with the high cost of food. They said they had a garden and a small vegetable plot. They also keep chickens and have eggs for sale. Their son has a part-time job. They told me they had no insurance. "And I’m not fully recovered!"” Kenster—Ashland, 7/9/2009

"I met Andrew at the Dairy Queen in Minerva. They have a complicated story. First, there are four members of the family. The youngest daughter who was too shy to get her picture taken (even with her parents and older sister holding the camera) is hidden behind the three. So she’s in the picture, but invisible (a parable for the uninsured). Her story will come soon enough.

First, Andrew. He’s a trucker, worked for CR England for four years. He got laid off in employment (when he had health insurance) he had an operation for a total hip replacement. ‘I have no insurance, I had no choice but this new job did not offer any healthcare insurance,’ he said. ‘I’ve had no insurance most of the last year,’ said Ida. She herself has diabetes and her husband has a spinal problem. They were very fortunate, she told me, because her husband ‘got his surgery at the Cleveland Clinic under a special program.’ It had been an extensive operation involving multiple spinal levels as well as titanium rods and metal plates. "But because the family lost their coverage,. . ." Andrew—Minerva, 7/12/2009
‘Joyce shared this story about her ex-husband. He had recently had an accident at work. This was covered by Workmen’s Compensation. The emergency visit went fine but he needed to be given two heparin shots in follow-up visits to the doctor. The doctor wanted $1,000 up-front even though they knew that Workmen’s Comp would cover it (although the receiving the reimbursement often took two months). ‘They wouldn’t give him the shots without the up-front payment,’ and it ended up that his boss loaned him the money. ‘See,’ Joyce added, ‘even when you do have insurance sometimes it doesn’t mean nothing.’”

Joyce—Lisbon, 7/13/2009

“For the past eleven years, Gary has had Type I diabetes (insulin-dependent diabetes). Up until recently, he has never had insurance. But thankfully, ‘the doctors have treated me,’ he said. He did tell me about a knee operation that cost him about $10,000. ‘But now,’ he said, ‘his wife has a job, which comes with insurance, and so I’m covered.’”

Gary—Lisbon, 7/13/2009

“In Tribute to General Carroll H. ‘Howie’ Chandler on the Occasion of His Retirement from the United States Air Force

HON. MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO
OF GUAM
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 6, 2011

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and commend General Carroll ‘Howie’ Chandler for his distinguished 36 years of service and commitment to the United States Air Force. General Chandler has dedicated his life to the service of this great Nation and I appreciate his leadership efforts with the Air Force particularly in the Pacific area of responsibility.

I had the privilege of working with General Chandler on several initiatives that directly improved the quality of lives of our men and women in uniform on Guam and the Western Pacific. He was instrumental in ensuring the Administration budgeted for several key military construction projects on Guam directly improved the quality of life for airmen at Andersen Air Force Base. His directive to renovate Building 21000 on Andersen Air Force Base will be critical to more effectively and efficiently using space and facilities to meet mission requirements.

Further, I particularly appreciated General Chandler’s leadership in granting local base commanders with the authority and flexibility to address a variety of local issues. Chief among those issues was resolution of access for landed private property landowners in northern Guam. General Chandler recognized the importance of empowering local commanders on the ground to identify solutions to longstanding problems that go a long way towards improving the civilian and military community relationship on Guam. He recognized the importance of working together as a key to strengthening bonds in the community.

General Chandler also recognized Guam’s strategic importance to our Nation’s defense. As Commander of Pacific Air Forces and then as Vice Chief of Staff of the U.S. Air Force, General Chandler has consistently demonstrated through allocation of resources that Guam and Andersen Air Force Base remain vital to the protection of our national interests and stability, through force projection, in the Asia-Pacific region.

Mr. Speaker, General Chandler has demonstrated exceptional meritorious service during his career with the United States Air Force and has become a distinguished leader to airmen stationed on Guam, Guam Air Guardsmen, and Guam people across this country. I wish the very best to General Chandler; his wife Eva-Marie; and their three children, Carl, Rose-Marie, and Thomas.

A TRIBUTE TO THOMAS S. ‘TOMMY’ SAMPSON

HON. BRETT GUTHRIE
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 6, 2011

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of a remarkable Kentuckian, Mr. Thomas S. ‘Tommy’ Sampson, Jr. Over the course of his life, Tommy truly exemplified what it meant to help others.

He dedicated his life to public service, serving as coroner, deputy sheriff, police chief and ambulance driver. Tommy is most widely known for being a pioneer in emergency medicine as the founder and longtime director of Shelby County’s Emergency Medical Services.

Throughout all his roles, Tommy was known for his kindness, cheerfulness and passion for helping others.

Tommy was not only dedicated to his community, but also to his family, and enjoyed spending time with his wife Beverly, his son Clark and daughter-in-law Melinda, and his grandchildren Jimmy, Collin and Madison.

While Kentucky may never again see one of its finest sons, the evidence of his legacy will be visible in the countless lives that he touched.

I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Tommy Sampson for his many great contributions to the Commonwealth of Kentucky. He will forever be appreciated and remembered by a grateful community.

IN HONOR OF DR. OGAN GUREL

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 6, 2011

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Dr. Ogan Gurel, M.D., for the Walk for Healthcare, in which he walked from Chicago, Illinois, to Washington, D.C., in June and July of 2009.

Dr. Gurel received his M.D. from Columbia University, where he started his career in health care. He has held a variety of jobs in the industry, including positions in medical research, media, and consulting. During his 700-mile, month-long journey, he spoke with ordinary people, many of whom were uninsured and struggling to pay for their health care, about what they thought of health care reform.

He collected their stories and took their pictures.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, please join me in honoring Dr. Ogan Gurel for the dedication and persistence he demonstrated in his Walk for Healthcare. Regardless of party or position on health care policy, Dr. Gurel’s trek of over 700 miles in one month is admirable, and the lives of the people he met along the way will be remembered forever through his monumental effort.

REMEMBERING TOM VANDERGRIFF

HON. JOE BARTON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 6, 2011

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I, along with Representatives Burgess, Granger and Marchant, wish to inform the House that on December 30, 2010, the great State of Texas lost a lion. Tom Vandergriff, former mayor of Arlington, Texas, former County Judge of Tarrant County, and former Member of the United States Congress, left this life at the age of 84. All of us in north Texas will miss him from the moment we heard of the loss. The loss is monumental.

Few people have had such a positive impact on the development and quality of life of north Texas, and no one has had a greater impact on Arlington. His friends and admirers still speak of his accomplishments, his dedication, his selflessly devoted public servant who always put the people ahead of personal gain or ambition.

Arlington history is generally divided into two epochs: BV and AV, Before Vandergriff and After Vandergriff. He first sought and won elective office in 1951 when he became the “boy mayor” of Arlington at the age of 25. At the time Arlington was a small town on the railroad midway between Dallas and Fort Worth. Vandergriff saw the town’s potential and set out to make it a center of prosperity in its own right while fostering a new spirit of cooperation within the north Texas region. Arlington, now the 49th largest city in the U.S. with 370,000 people, would never be the same, and neither would north Texas. Indeed, it was Vandergriff who coined the phrase, “Metroplex,” which is still the term usually applied to describe the Dallas-Fort Worth area.

His first major achievement was convincing General Motors executives to locate their new automobile assembly plant in Arlington. His family owned a Chevrolet dealership in town, which gave him access to General Motors Corp. Upon hearing that GM planned to build a plant in north Texas, he sold Arlington as a superior location by telling GM, as he would later tell the story, that if they put the plant in Dallas, it would make Fort Worth angry; if they put the plant in north Texas, he sold Arlington as a superior location by telling GM, as he would later tell the story, that if they put the plant in Dallas, it would make Fort Worth angry; if they put the plant in north Texas, it would make Dallas angry. He ended his pitch by convincing them that if they put it in Fort Worth, it would make Dallas angry. He ended his pitch by convincing them that if they put it in Fort Worth, it would make Dallas angry. He ended his pitch by convincing them that if they put it in Fort Worth, it would make Dallas angry. He ended his pitch by convincing them that if they put it in Fort Worth, it would make Dallas angry. He ended his pitch by convincing them that if they put it in Fort Worth, it would make Dallas angry. He ended his pitch by convincing them that if they put it in Fort Worth, it would make Dallas angry. He ended his pitch by convincing them that if they put it in Fort Worth, it would make Dallas angry. He ended his pitch by convincing them that if they put it in Fort Worth, it would make Dallas angry. He ended his pitch by convincing them that if they put it in Fort Worth, it would make Dallas angry.

The GM plant began a building boom in Arlington that has lasted more than 55 years. Knowing a small town on well water could not sustain rapid growth nor accommodate the needs of industry, Vandergriff convinced the people of Arlington that he could make Fort Worth angry; if they put the plant in north Texas, it would make Dallas angry.

The GM plant began a building boom in Arlington that has lasted more than 55 years. Knowing a small town on well water could not sustain rapid growth nor accommodate the needs of industry, Vandergriff convinced the people of Arlington that he could make Fort Worth angry; if they put the plant in north Texas, it would make Dallas angry.
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The GM plant began a building boom in Arlington that has lasted more than 55 years. Knowing a small town on well water could not sustain rapid growth nor accommodate the needs of industry, Vandergriff convinced the people of Arlington that he could make Fort Worth angry; if they put the plant in north Texas, it would make Dallas angry.

The GM plant began a building boom in Arlington that has lasted more than 55 years. Knowing a small town on well water could not sustain rapid growth nor accommodate the needs of industry, Vandergriff convinced the people of Arlington that he could make Fort Worth angry; if they put the plant in north Texas, it would make Dallas angry.
Today, Arlington is host to more than seven million visitors each year and is the second most popular tourist destination in the state, bringing millions of dollars in revenue to the city annually. The city’s entertainment district boasts Six Flags theme park, the Texas Rangers Ballpark, a new Dallas Cowboys football stadium, the National Bowling Congress and Museum, Hurricane Harbor water park, and clusters of shops and restaurants that make Arlington the City of Wow for millions of Texans. However, Vandergriff did not stop there. A devoted baseball fan, he determined to bring professional baseball to north Texas. The effort took years and saw hopes dashed time and again before he finally convinced owner Bob Short to move his Washington Senators to Arlington in 1972. The effort did not endear him to the people of the nation’s capital. On one of his many visits to meet with Short, he was unceremoniously kicked out of a taxicab when he made the mistake of telling the cabbie why he was in town. The Washington Senators became the Texas Rangers Ball Club, and Tom Vandergriff became the team’s biggest fan and supporter. When his beloved Rangers won their first American League Pennant by beating the New York Yankees in Arlington last October, Vandergriff was there in the ballpark to cheer them on.

Today, Arlington is host to more than seven million visitors each year and is the second most popular tourist destination in the state, bringing millions of dollars in revenue to the city annually. The city’s entertainment district boasts Six Flags theme park, the Texas Rangers Ballpark, a new Dallas Cowboys football stadium, the National Bowling Congress and Museum, Hurricane Harbor water park, and clusters of shops and restaurants that make Arlington the City of Wow for millions of Texans.

In his 26 years as mayor, two years as a member of Congress, and 16 years as County Judge of Tarrant County, Vandergriff championed two more causes relentlessly: regional communication and cooperation and helping the University of Texas at Arlington become a major institution of higher learning. Believing that everyone in north Texas would succeed if they worked together for the good of the region, Vandergriff spent decades finessing, cajoling, and winning over the leaders of other cities in the region. He led the effort to establish the North Central Texas Council of Governments which today is the Metropolitan Planning Organization for all of north Texas. He was a strong advocate for regionalism well into his eighties, and the economic might of the region is a testament to that effort.

Vandergriff’s efforts on behalf of his hometown university are equally impressive. When he became mayor, Arlington College was a tiny two-year institution affiliated with Texas A&M that was formerly a military school and then an agricultural college. Vandergriff knew it could be more, and if Arlington were to succeed as a city, he led the effort to make the college a four-year university. Working with then-governor John Connally, he succeeded when the college became a full university within the University of Texas system in 1964. Today, the University of Texas at Arlington is the largest UT campus outside of Austin and the fastest growing university in the state. It is quickly becoming a major research facility and contributes more to the local economy than any industry in the city.

There is more, of course, much more. In a life lived as fully and as well as his, there is always more to tell: his unwavering support and leadership of Arlington Memorial Hospital, his support and leadership of the Arlington Chamber of Commerce, his support of local public schools, his support of a long list of non-profit agencies, his decades as an active member of the United Methodist church, and his roles as husband, father, grandfather, and mentor to a very long list of aspiring leaders. All of this almost didn’t happen, at least not in Texas.

Vandergriff was born on January 29, 1926, to W. T. and Charles Vandergriff in Carrollton, Texas. The family moved to Arlington when Tom was 12. After graduating from Arlington High School, Vandergriff attended USCG where he earned a bachelor’s degree in 1947. He married his high school sweetheart, Anna Wayne Smith in 1949. Blessed with a deep, sonorous voice that he used with perfect diction, he prepared for a career in radio and broadcast journalism. After graduation he applied for and was a finalist in the competition for what he thought would be the job of his dreams, but he lost out to another young applicant. Vandergriff returned to Texas to join his father’s automobile dealership, disappointed and convinced that he was a better candidate for the broadcast job. The young man who got the job was Chet Huntley.

Chet Huntley would gain fame as an NBC news anchor and reach millions of listeners nationwide, but the loser in that early competition, Tom Vandergriff, would touch millions in north Texas in ways that were deeper and arguably more significant. Many have their own stories to tell about Vandergriff, many humorous because he possessed a wonderful sense of humor, many thankful because he touched so many with acts of kindness large and small, and many inspirational because he inspired us, goaded us, and led us to be greater than we thought we were and achieved things we never thought possible. All in north Texas are better off today because Tom Vandergriff was here, and our children and grandchildren will have better lives even though they will never know him. Those of us who did will never forget him.

Well done, good and faithful servant.
Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the achievement of Dave Huinker of Decorah, Iowa, who was recently presented the Heritage Award during the International Association of Fairs and Expositions (IAFE) 120th annual convention in Las Vegas, Nevada.

The IAFE is a non-profit organization dedicated to promoting the development and improvement of fairs and expositions around the world. Their influence covers more events than any other level. Although it was first organized in 1885 to represent a half dozen fairs, it has expanded to represent over 1,300 fairs, county and state fairs across the country and as an agricultural director to Decorah State Bank. Dave has also spent time as an auxiliary member of the Wisconsin County Fair Board and served on the Farmington County Extension Council.

The IAFE could not have chosen a better person to receive the Heritage Award. I commend Dave Huinker for his dedication to continuing and preserving these fairs and the rich culture that they represent. I want to congratulate him in being selected to receive this award. I wish him the best of luck in the future.
SUPPORT OF A RESOLUTION TO PERMIT DELEGATES AND THE RESIDENT COMMISSIONER TO THE CONGRESS TO CAST VOTES IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE ON THE STATE OF THE UNION

HON. MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO
OF GUAM
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 6, 2011

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution introduced by my good friend and colleague, Minority Whip STENY HOYER of Maryland that would restore the voting rights for the Delegates and Resident Commissioner during Committee of the Whole proceedings during the 112th Congress.

As I stated yesterday, the rules for the 112th Congress fail to provide for transparent, effective, and efficient decision making. The proposed rules change that is under consideration today by Mr. HOYER and Mr. H OYER would eliminate the opportunity for the Delegates and the Resident Commissioner to vote in the Committee of the Whole. This deprives our constituents with the understanding of how we stand on important issues. The fact that our vote in the Committee of the Whole is symbolic is further evidence of why such a right does not diminish the role of other Members of the House of Representatives; in fact, allowing us the right to a symbolic vote enhances long-cherished values of this body.

Moreover, affording us the right to vote in the Committee of the Whole ensures that equities of our constituents are considered in legislation that is pending or being debated by this body. In June 2009 the House of Representatives debated and voted on H.R. 2346, the Supplemental Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2009. The bill contained language that allowed the transfer of detainees from Guantanamo Bay to any of the territories and it did not provide the Governor of each respective territory with the right to be notified of any such transfer. Our right to vote in the Committee of the Whole afforded us the ability to raise this matter before the Committee of the Whole. It enabled the Delegates and the Resident Commissioner to express our concerns and to raise our request for a meeting with you to discuss this matter prior to January 5, 2011.

I will no doubt recall that we wrote last month to urge retention of this rule. We reiterated that this symbolic exercise of our country’s democratic principles has great meaning to our more than four million constituents, who fight and die alongside their fellow Americans residing in the 50 States to secure the right to vote for people residing in such distant lands as Iraq and Afghanistan.

While this issue has been viewed through a partisan lens in the past, largely because none of us is a member of the Republican Conference, we respectfully submit that this fact should not be used to preclude us from exercising our fundamental function of representative democracies, especially through a procedure which by its design can never be determinative of any vote.

Therefore, we ask that you retain this existing rule in the Rules package your Conference is preparing for adoption on opening day of the 112th Congress. Thank you for your attention to this matter. We look forward to continuing to work with you on behalf of our constituents, your fellow Americans residing in the U.S. territories.

Sincerely,

PEDRO R. PELRUISI,
MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO,
ENI F.H. FALEOMAVAEGA,
DONNA M. CHRISTENSEN,
GESORIO KILILI CAMACHO,
SABLAN.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C.

HON. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker-designate, House of Representatives,
The Capitol, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SPEAKER-DESIGNATE BOEHNER: Now that a summary of proposed Rules for the 112th Congress is circulating and we find that the rule enabling the Delegates and Resident Commissioner to vote in the Committee of the Whole is slated for elimination, we write to express our concern and renew our request for a meeting with you to discuss this matter prior to January 5, 2011.

There will no doubt recall that we wrote last month to urge retention of this rule. We reiterated that this symbolic exercise of our country’s democratic principles has great meaning to our more than four million constituents, who fight and die alongside their fellow Americans residing in the 50 States to secure the right to vote for people residing in such distant lands as Iraq and Afghanistan.

While this issue has been viewed through a partisan lens in the past, largely because none of us is a member of the Republican Conference, we respectfully submit that this fact should not be used to preclude us from exercising our fundamental function of representative democracies, especially through a procedure which by its design can never be determinative of any vote.

Therefore, we ask that you retain this existing rule in the Rules package your Conference is preparing for adoption on opening day of the 112th Congress. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

PEDRO R. PELRUISI,
MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO,
ENI F.H. FALEOMAVAEGA,
DONNA M. CHRISTENSEN,
GESORIO KILILI CAMACHO,
SABLAN.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C.

HON. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker-designate, House of Representatives,
The Capitol, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SPEAKER-DESIGNATE BOEHNER: As the Republican Conference prepares its package of proposed House Rules for consideration on opening day of the 112th Congress, we respectfully urge you to retain the rule that enables the Delegates and the Resident Commissioner to vote when the House resolves into the Committee of the Whole, and that provides for an automatic revote in the full House when the votes of the Delegates or the Resident Commissioner are decisive.

This rule has been found to pass constitutional muster by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. See Michel v. Anderson, 14 F.3d 623 (D.C. Cir. 1994). It has not impeded the work of the House during the three Congresses in which it has been in place: the 103rd Congress (1993–1994), the 110th Congress (2007–2008), and the current 111th Congress (2010-2011). The rule has been carefully crafted by the Majority to decide when it is appropriate for legislation to be considered in the Committee of the Whole and, more specifically, to subject to delegate voting. Therefore, if the Majority determines that a vote is better considered without delegate voting, the Rules Committee can report a rule that provides for voting to be structured accordingly—as occurred in several instances during the 110th and 111th Congresses. We deeply appreciate that your Conference did not seek to repeal or otherwise alter this rule when the Ranking Republican Member of the Rules Committee offered his Motion to Commit with instructions at the start of the 111th Congress. We hope that your proposed Rules package for the 112th Congress will be consistent with that prior position.

There are compelling reasons to retain the rule. First, we know that your Conference, like our Caucus, values and seeks to promote open and transparent government. Our constituents can more effectively hold us accountable if there is a record of how we vote on legislation considered by the House. Although we recognize that the vote conferred upon us by this rule is essentially symbolic, it has genuine meaning for those we represent. The rule obligates us to take public positions on issues of national importance that will affect the lives of our constituents. This enables our constituents to better evaluate the quality of our representation.

In addition, we believe this is an issue of fundamental fairness with profound moral implications. Our constituents are part of the American family. They pledge allegiance to the same flag and serve alongside their fellow countrymen in our nation’s armed forces. To deprive their duly elected representatives of this small privilege, which does no harm to this institution, would send a message of exclusion to Americans living in the territories and in the District of Columbia. We implore you not to send that message.

Sincerely,

REMEMBERING EDWARD STRINGER

HON. MIKE QUIGLEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 6, 2011

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember the courage and honor the life of firefighter Edward Stringer. Edward was killed in the line of duty on Dec. 23, when the roof of a burning South Shore building collapsed. He was 47 years old.

Edward often joked that he was the guy running into burning buildings when everyone else was running out. That was the case on the afternoon of the tragedy that took his life. Worried there might be a homeless man or woman seeking shelter from the cold in the abandoned building, his commitment to the Chicagoans he swore to protect was far stronger than any sense of self-preservation.

A 12-year veteran of the Chicago Fire Department, Edward worked out of the firehouse at 63rd and Dorchester. He was a lifetime South Sider, a proud Chicagoan and an American hero. His bravery will never be forgotten by the city he gave his life to protect.

May Mr. Stringer rest in peace.
Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the achievement of Ellsworth Community College in Iowa Falls, Iowa for the success of its agriculture program. This program was designed by assistant professor of agriculture Kevin Butt, and it was selected on December 1, 2010 at the National Association of Agricultural Educators (NAAE) convention in Las Vegas, Nevada to receive the National Association of Agricultural Educators Outstanding Postsecondary/Adult Agricultural Education Program Award.

Kevin designed the agriculture program at Ellsworth Community College shortly after he began working there in 2004. The goal of this program is to not only provide students with theoretical and scientific knowledge about agriculture, but also to provide those students with hands-on opportunities and situations where they can apply that knowledge. Through the implementation of this program, Kevin has succeeded in helping these students to develop their communication, leadership, and citizenship skills, all of which will be beneficial to their careers in agriculture and to their futures as civic-minded citizens.

The NAAE, which began in 1948, is a nationally-renowned organization that promotes agricultural education and the professional growth of agricultural teachers. Every year it selects six different programs, one in each of its six regions, to receive this award. Kevin’s program at Ellsworth Community College was selected from the third region, which includes the states of Iowa, Minnesota, Wisconsin, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Nebraska.

I commend Kevin Butt and Ellsworth Community College for their unwavering commitment to providing quality education to their students in the field of agriculture. I know my colleagues in the United States Congress will join me in congratulating them for their selection to receive this award. I wish them the best of luck in the future.
The Senate stands in recess pursuant to the provisions of S. Con. Res. 1, until 10 a.m., on Tuesday, January 25, 2011.

No committee meetings were held.

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 15 public bills, H.R. 196–210; 1 private bill, H.R. 211; and 7 resolutions, H.J. Res. 9–10; H. Con. Res. 6; and H. Res. 22–25 were introduced.

Additional Cosponsors:

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H. Res. 9, instructing certain committees to report legislation replacing the job-killing health care law (H. Rept. 112–1) and

H. Res. 26, providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 9) instructing certain committees to report legislation replacing the job-killing health care law; and for other purposes (H. Rept. 112–2).

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Simpson to act as Speaker pro tempore for today.

Administration of the Oath of Office: Representative DeFazio presented himself in the well of the House and was administered the oath of office by the Speaker.

Whole Number of the House: The Speaker announced to the House that, in light of the administration of the oath to the gentleman from Oregon, Representative DeFazio, the whole number of the House is adjusted to 435.

Reducing the amount authorized for salaries and expenses of Member, committee, and leadership offices in 2011 and 2012: H. Res. 22, to reduce the amount authorized for salaries and expenses of Member, committee, and leadership offices in 2011 and 2012, by a 2/3 yea-and-nay vote of 410 yeas to 13 nays, Roll No. 8.

Administration of the Oath of Office: Representatives-elect Sessions and Fitzpatrick presented themselves in the well of the House and were administered the oath of office by the Speaker.

Recess: The House recessed at 6:30 p.m. and reconvened at 11:31 p.m.

Whole Number of the House: The Chair announced that the whole number of the House was 435.
Senate Referral: S. Con. Res. 2 was held at the desk.

Quorum Calls—Votes: One yea-and-nay vote developed during the proceedings today and appears on page H68. There was one quorum call, Roll No. 7, which appears on pages H52–53.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 11:33 p.m.

Committee Meetings

Committee on Rules: Granted, by record vote of 7 to 4, a closed rule for consideration of H.R. 2. All points of order against H.R. 2 are waived. The rule provides that the amendment to H.R. 2 printed in part A of the Rules Committee report accompanying the resolution shall be considered as adopted. The rule provides that H.R. 2, as amended, shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against H.R. 2, as amended.

The rule provides for seven hours of debate in the House on H.R. 2 to be allocated as follows: 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the Majority Leader and Minority Leader; 90 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce; 90 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce; 90 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget; 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary; and 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Small Business.

The rule provides one motion to recommit H.R. 2 with or without instructions.

The rule further provides for consideration of H. Res. 9 under a structured rule. The rule provides that H. Res. 9 shall be considered as read. The rule provides one hour of debate on H. Res. 9 equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules, or their designees. The rule makes in order the amendment to H. Res. 9 printed in part B of the report, if offered by Representative Matheson of Utah or his designee, which shall be considered as read and shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. All points of order are waived against the amendment printed in part B of the report. The rule provides one motion to recommit H. Res. 9 without instructions. The rule provides for the consideration of a resolution, if offered by the Majority Leader or his designee, relating to the status of certain actions taken by Members-elect, under a closed rule. The rule provides 4 minutes of debate on the resolution equally divided and controlled by the Majority Leader and Minority Leader, or their designees. Testimony was heard from Chairman Upton, Chairman Kline, Representatives King of Iowa, Dingell, Markey, Eshoo, Schakowsky, Inslee, Weiner, Matheson, Castor, Murphy of Connecticut, Welch, Baldwin, Payne, Andrews, Woolsey, Hinojosa, Tierney, Holt, Davis of California, Grijalva, Courtney, Tonko, Chu, Nadler, Jackson Lee of Texas, Johnson of Georgia, Deutch, Yarmuth, Pascrell, Davis of Illinois, Van Hollen, Thompson of California, Kaptur, Larsen of Washington, Moore, Wasserman Schultz, Speier, Walz, Tsongas, Edwards, Heinrich, Peters and Garamendi.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY,
JANUARY 7, 2011

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on the Budget: to hold hearings to examine the United States economic outlook focusing on challenges for the monetary and fiscal policy, 9:30 a.m., SH–216.

House

No committee meetings are scheduled.
Next Meeting of the Senate
10 a.m., Tuesday, January 25

Senate Chamber

Program for Tuesday: Senate will be in a period of morning business.

Next Meeting of the House of Representatives
9 a.m., Friday, January 7

House Chamber

Program for Friday: Consideration of H. Res. 26—Providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2) to repeal the job-killing health care law and health care-related provisions in the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 and providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 9) instructing certain committees to report legislation replacing the job-killing health care law.
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