Most recently, the Forest Service has placed severe restrictions on vehicle access to the Plumas National Forest, despite volumes of public protests. Supervisor Bill Connelly, chairman of the Butte County Board of Supervisors writes that ''the restriction applies to such activities as collecting firewood, retrieving game, loading or unloading horses or other livestock and camping.''

He goes on to write: ''The national forests are part of the local fabric. The roads within the national forests are used by thousands of residents and visitors for transportation and recreation. These activities generate revenue for our rural communities which is critical for their survival.''

Mr. Speaker, this is not a small matter. The Forest Service now controls 193 million acres within our Nation, a land area equivalent to the size of Texas.

During the despotic eras of Norman and Plantagenet England, the Crown declared one-third of the land area of southern England to be the royal forest, the exclusive preserve of the monarch, his forestry officials and favored aristocrats. The people of Britain were forbidden access to and enjoyment of these forests under harsh penalties. This exclusionary system became so despised by the British people that in 1215 no less than five clauses of the Magna Carta were devoted to redress of grievances that are hauntingly similar to those that are now flooding my office.

Mr. Speaker, the attitude that now permeates the U.S. Forest Service from top to bottom is becoming far more reminiscent of the management of the royal forests during the autocracy of King John than of an agency that is supposed to encourage, welcome, facilitate and maximize the public's use of the public's land in a Nation of free men and free women.

After all, that was the vision of the Forest Service set forth by its legendary founder, Gifford Pinchot, in 1905: ''To provide the greatest amount of good for the greatest amount of people in the long run.''

In May of 2009 and April of 2010, some of my California colleagues and I sent letters to the Forest Service expressing these concerns. I've also personally met with senior officials of that agency on several occasions in which I have referenced more than 500 specific complaints of Forest Service abuses received by my office.

All that I have received to date from these officials are smarmy assurances that they will address these concerns, assurances that their own actions have belied at every turn.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for Congress to conduct a top-to-bottom review of the abuses by this increasingly unaccountable and elitist agency to demand accountability for the damage it has done and is doing to our forests' health, to the public's trust, to the government's revenues and to the Nation's economy, and to take whatever actions are necessary to restore an attitude of consumer-friendly public service, which was Gifford Pinchot's original vision, and for which the U.S. Forest Service was once renowned and respected.

HEALTH CARE ACT—SIGNED WITH BLOOD, SWEAT AND TEARS

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

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I was there when the President of the United States of America signed into law the health care act that is sought to be repealed. I was within 20 feet or so of the President; and at the time he signed it, there was a feeling of great jubilation, but also there was a feeling of great consternation because, as he signed it, in ink, I knew that it was written in tears, written in the tears of the many parents who saw their children with preexisting conditions and could not get insurance for the illness that their children had; signed in ink, written in tears, but it was also written in sweat, the sweat of the many persons who toiled for more than 50 years to get health care for all Americans; signed in ink, written in sweat, tears and in blood, written in the blood of the millions of people who suffered because they couldn't get health care, and also of the many who died because they could not get the insurance that would afford them health care.

I was there. I knew what the circumstances were. At the time the bill was signed, we were spending $2.5 trillion per year on health care; $2.5 trillion is $79,000 a second on health care. That was approximately 17.6 percent of our GDP. And by 2018 it would have become $4.4 trillion per year, which would have been more than 20 percent of GDP and $139,000 a second. Signed in ink, written in blood, sweat and tears.

I knew where we were at the time it was signed. In my State, we had 6 million uninsured, 1.1 million in Harris County, and 20 percent of the children in Texas uninsured when that bill was signed. Still in America we have millions that are not getting the proper attention that they need, but there is the potential to get it because of this bill.

At the time it was signed, we had more than 40 million people uninsured. The bill covered some 30-plus million people. We had 21 million people who were working full-time and did not have insurance; 45,000 people per year were dying because they didn't have insurance. That's one person every 12 minutes. Twenty-one million people were working full-time and did not have insurance. That bill brought people under the umbrella of health care and health insurance.

The greatness of America is not going to be measured by how many great buildings we build and how many people we can cut out of health care. It's not going to be measured by the people that we can put in the streets of life. The greatness of America will be measured by how we treat people in the streets of life. This bill addresses people in the streets of life, real people who can die because they don't get the health care that the richest country in the world can provide.

□ 1220

I respect those who vote however they choose. But as for me, I am going to stand with those people who need health care and who are going to get it under this bill because preexisting conditions no longer exist.

And for edification purposes, for those who do not know, pregnancy was a preexisting condition at the time the bill was signed. For those who do not know, children under the age of 26, many of them required to get health care because they couldn't stay on their parents' policies, they can now stay with their parents. The doughnut hole for seniors is being closed with this bill. The doughnut hole, for edification purposes, is that point in time when a senior has to pay for all of the pharmaceuticals that a senior might receive and need. And these pharmaceuticals are expensive. This bill addresses these things.

This bill is a lifeline for many persons in this country. I will support it and I will say more about it in the future. I stand with the American people who need health care.

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 hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

REINTRODUCTION OF TITLE X ABORTION PROVIDER PROHIBITION ACT

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

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, the largest abortion provider in America should not also be the largest recipient of Federal funding under title X.

Today, with the support of more than 120 of my colleagues, I introduced the Title X Abortion Provider Prohibition Act. I am grateful for the support of my colleagues within this House and the support of millions of Americans who long to see this Congress take this decisive action on behalf of our values.

The Title X Abortion Provider Prohibition Act would deny any family planning funds under title X from going to Planned Parenthood or other organizations that perform abortions. It would