



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 155

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 3, 2009

No. 162

## House of Representatives

The House met at 8 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,  
November 3, 2009.

I hereby appoint the Honorable EARL BLUMENAUER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,  
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

### MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 6, 2009, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 25 minutes and each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 8:50 a.m.

### HEALTH CARE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. As we know, health care is not a luxury; it is simply a necessity. And here in the United States we already have the best doctors, the best hospitals, the best patient care in the world. What we do not have is the best access to health care. That access lies in being able to obtain quality health care at a fair price.

All families deserve to know that their health care needs will be met. We

need to promote changes that make health care insurance easily accessible and affordable for all Americans. And we need to do this in a way that fixes what is broken in the system without destroying what works in the system.

What we need is real health care reform. Real health care reform means that no one should be denied coverage due to a preexisting health condition. Real health care reform means coverage should be portable and stay with you through job changes or career changes. Real health care reform means that there should be no discrimination based on age or gender. Real health care reform means expanding the health care options for all Americans by forcing insurance companies to compete for all of our business. Real health care reform means supporting effective prevention, wellness, and disease management programs. And, most importantly, real health care reform means all of these things without destroying the current health care system that over 80 percent of Americans have said they are happy with.

The Pelosi health care bill wants to raise taxes on all individuals by 2.5 percent if they do not purchase bureaucrat-approved health insurance. The Pelosi health care bill makes over \$162 billion in cuts to Medicare Advantage for seniors. The Pelosi health care bill will eventually force Americans to purchase their coverage through the Federal Government with no real competition. The Pelosi health care bill makes no effort to control the skyrocketing costs of health care or insurance premiums. Instead, the Pelosi health care bill finds convoluted ways to hide health care costs in taxes on individuals, businesses, and by making timely and professional care a scarce resource.

As a mother and as a grandmother, I know that American families are worried. In the average household, it is us women who are often tasked with

major and minor health care decisions. We choose our family doctors and take our kids and elderly parents to doctors' appointments. We stay home to nurse the sick children and our partners back to health. And we have seen every scrape, every cut, every blister that our family members have ever had. We know that families are in this together and we bind and look after our families.

Women know that if health care reform excludes even one member of our family, then it is unworkable. And we know the high cost of health care is the most important issue facing our Nation right now, because it is the most important issue facing our families.

Everyone deserves access to health care insurance. Everyone deserves health care treatment. And everyone deserves both at an affordable price.

The Pelosi health care bill is not the answer. We can, and indeed, we must, do better.

### THE TIME FOR HEALTH INSURANCE REFORM IS NOW

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. CHU). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. I guess I couldn't disagree more with my friend from Florida in referring to health care legislation. She's just described something I certainly don't recognize.

I rise today because the time for health care insurance reform has arrived. Premiums are dramatically increasing for working families in our country. The overall costs of health care are imperiling our Federal budgets and the quality of care itself. Individuals with previous existing medical conditions are being denied medical coverage every day by health insurers in this country.

This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g.,  1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H12199

The newly introduced bill, H.R. 3962, is a result of unprecedented participation by three House committees and more than 160 hours dedicated to open hearings, debates, and amendments. The bill and committee amendments have been available for review for more than 3 months, including on our respective Web sites, including my own. I have had more than 19,000 contacts from citizens in my district, each providing important input. I held a number of town hall meetings, including one televised nationally on C-SPAN, and I listened to the residents of the 11th District of Virginia.

I heard from my constituents that they're worried about previous existing medical conditions keeping them from obtaining medical insurance for their children. They're worried about the proposed changes to Medicare and what they might mean to them. I heard that the ever-growing cost of health insurance premiums is forcing some to choose between health care and financial ruin. They were insistent that the cost of whatever health insurance reform is adopted not add to the Federal deficit. And I heard that the potential surtax would be harmful to many families and small businesses, especially in my district.

One of the consistent themes of health insurance reform has been the outlawing of the insurance company practice of denying coverage and forcing families into financial distress as they try to afford treatment for things like childhood cancer, hypertension, asthma, diabetes, and many other conditions. Currently, 45 percent of us who are insured, who have health insurance, have such previous existing conditions. H.R. 3962 will ensure that no one can be denied coverage because of that previous existing condition.

The National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare, an organization dedicated to protecting the well-being of American seniors, recently expressed its support for this legislation. The bill will close the doughnut hole for Medicare part D, which currently costs many seniors thousands of dollars out of pocket each year; it will permit Medicare to negotiate lower prescription drug costs for recipients; and it will eliminate required deductibles and copayments for preventative screenings for our seniors. The committee noted that H.R. 3962 protects Medicare Advantage recipients from out-of-pocket expenses.

One of the drivers of cost in the current health insurance system is the lack of interstate portability. Individuals are not permitted to purchase out-of-State insurance plans, thereby restricting competition. This bill will allow States to create regional health care choice compacts that will provide for greater choice among insurance providers and lower costs due to increased competition.

One of my primary concerns for health insurance reform was that it not add to the deficit. President Obama

declared that he would not support health care reform that added one dime to the Federal debt. Over the next decade, the Congressional Budget Office has stated that H.R. 3962 will actually reduce the Federal deficit by \$30 billion.

The originally proposed surtax to fund reform troubled me, frankly, and my constituents, and I worked tirelessly along with other freshmen to address that issue. Although my district has the highest median household income in the country, we have many two-income families, as both parents often work in order to afford the high cost of living in our district, child care costs, and the ever-increasing health insurance expenses. The surcharge as proposed would have imposed an undue burden on many small businesses—the economic engine of our economy.

Earlier this summer, I was among a group of freshman Members invited to meet with President Obama, and we expressed our concern on the surcharge. Subsequently, we joined with other freshman Members in a letter to Speaker PELOSI urging her to increase the income threshold. I'm pleased to say that that's been done—to \$500,000 for an individual and \$1 million for a family. That improved level will affect less than three-tenths of 1 percent of Americans and exempts the vast majority of small businesses.

Madam Speaker, we need health insurance reform that is affordable; that maintains the freedom to choose one's doctor and insurance plan; that ends insurance company cherry-picking; and that helps small businesses afford health insurance for their employees. Americans cannot wait any longer. The time for responsible health insurance reform is now.

#### AMERICA DESERVES BETTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. One of the most sad expressions that we heard in this Congress was by JOHN BOEHNER, the Republican minority leader, March 15, 2009. "As I told my colleagues, we don't have enough votes to legislate. We are not in the majority. They," referring to his Republican colleagues, "ought to get the idea out of their minds that they are legislators. But what they can be is communicators."

Madam Speaker, that is an unfortunate misreading of the role of Members of Congress. It is much too narrow and limited, tragically so.

I spent 11 years in the minority in this Congress, and at times I must confess extraordinary frustration on some of what I thought were decidedly wrongheaded policies like the tragic consequences we are seeing played out on Wall Street and in Iraq today. But in the course of those 11 years, I never stopped looking for ways to work cooperatively to find a majority of people

on both sides of the aisle to make productive change for America.

Some of my proudest moments were as a member of the minority when we were able to take small, bipartisan steps that made a huge impact. For example, the passage of my Water for the Poor Act, that was bipartisan legislation in both the House and the Senate that now enshrines in Federal policy an active effort to provide safe drinking water and sanitation around the world to save lives, while it improves the role and image of Americans abroad.

There has been described by some commentators, including some of my friends on the other side of the aisle, a "take no prisoners" approach. It's disturbing, as one who authored the end-of-life provisions that were hijacked and blatantly lied about to deal with what they called death panels, to see that "take no prisoner" approach in action. Well, we exploded that myth and I'm pleased that we do have strong, voluntary end-of-life provisions in the bill to protect the wishes of American families about how their families would be dealt with.

But one of the myths is that this "take no prisoners" attitude is just directed towards the Democrats because the consequence of a "take no prisoner" attitude might be, if they're successful, destroying our efforts at health care reform, where we have come further than any time in our history. In that case, the prisoners will be the American public that will be sentenced to continuing a process where we have millions uninsured and others who are not protected by the insurance which they are paying for.

Sadly, "take no prisoners" has actually affected the minority itself, because this attitude of being dismissive of a constructive role of legislation, being dismissive of the truth, actually has resulted in holding them hostage to the lowest common denominator—the TEA Party, tin-foil-hat people who have a paranoid, limited view of what America is and can be.

In the end, Madam Speaker, America deserves better. I think it will get better. But I sincerely hope that Republicans choose to stop being communicators, especially misrepresenting what we have brought before the American people, roll up their sleeves, and work with us constructively to reform America's broken health care system with costs out of control and coverage too limited.

Madam Speaker, together, we can make progress. Together, we can legislate and work on things where there is a common vision and a common goal. Together, we can make our government work better and our communities more livable and our families safer, healthier, and more economically secure.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair

declares the House in recess until 9 a.m. today.

Accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 15 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until 9 a.m. today.

□ 0900

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WELCH) at 9 a.m.

#### PRAYER

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

Lord, You show mercy to all, and You despise nothing You have created. Since You know us through and through, You forgive the sins of Your people, because You alone can draw goodness out of anyone or anything, at any time.

You provide Your people with time so that they may change their course of action and return to You with all their hearts, for You alone are the Lord. You alone are ever faithful, Almighty God, both 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 Chair will lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore 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

After consultation among the Speaker and the majority and minority leaders, and with their consent, the Chair announces that, when the two Houses meet in joint meeting to hear an address by Her Excellency Dr. Angela Merkel, Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany, only the doors immediately opposite the Speaker and those immediately to her left and right will be open.

No one will be allowed on the floor of the House who does not have the privilege of the floor of the House. Due to the large attendance that is anticipated, the rule regarding the privilege of the floor must be strictly enforced. Children of Members will not be permitted on the floor. The cooperation of all Members is requested.

The practice of reserving seats prior to the joint meeting by placard will

not be allowed. Members may reserve their seats by physical presence only following the security sweep of the Chamber.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, October 29, 2009, the House stands in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 2 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

During the recess, beginning at 10:23 a.m., the following proceedings were had:

#### JOINT MEETING TO HEAR AN ADDRESS BY HER EXCELLENCY DR. ANGELA MERKEL, CHANCELLOR OF THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

The Speaker of the House presided.

The Majority Floor Services Chief, Mr. Barry Sullivan, announced the Vice President and Members of the U.S. Senate who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, the Vice President taking the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the committee on the part of the House to escort Her Excellency Dr. Angela Merkel, Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany, into the Chamber:

The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER);

The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN);

The gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON);

The gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA);

The gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO);

The gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN);

The gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER);

The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT);

The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CARNAHAN);

The gentleman from New York (Mr. MCMAHON);

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER);

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR);

The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE);

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MCCOTTER);

The gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS);

The gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY);

The gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER);

The gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN);

The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON); and

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

The VICE PRESIDENT. The President of the Senate, at the direction of that body, appoints the following Senators as members of the committee on the part of the Senate to escort Her Excellency Dr. Angela Merkel, Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany, into the House Chamber:

The Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID);  
The Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN);

The Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY);

The Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY);

The Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL);

The Senator from Arizona (Mr. KYL);  
The Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER);

The Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI);

The Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN); and

The Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE).

The Majority Floor Services Chief announced the Dean of the Diplomatic Corps, His Excellency Roble Olhaye, Ambassador from the Republic of Djibouti.

The Dean of the Diplomatic Corps entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seat reserved for him.

The Majority Floor Services Chief announced the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

The Members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

At 10 o'clock and 43 minutes a.m., the Majority Floor Services Chief announced Her Excellency Dr. Angela Merkel, Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany.

The Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and stood at the Clerk's desk.

(Applause, the Members rising.)

The SPEAKER. Members of Congress, I have the high privilege and the distinct honor of presenting to you Her Excellency Dr. Angela Merkel, Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany.

(Applause, the Members rising.)

(The following address was delivered in German, with a simultaneous translation in English.)

Chancellor MERKEL. Madam Speaker, Mr. Vice President, distinguished Members of Congress:

Thank you for the great honor and privilege to address you today, shortly before the 20th anniversary of the fall of the Berlin Wall. I am the second German Chancellor on whom this great honor is bestowed. Konrad Adenauer was the first when, in 1957, he addressed both Houses of Congress, albeit one after the other.

Our lives could not have been more different. In 1957, I was a small child of 3 years. I lived in Brandenburg together with my parents, a region that at the time belonged to the German Democratic Republic, the part of Germany that was not free. My father worked as a Protestant pastor. My mother, who had studied English and Latin to become a teacher, was not allowed to work in her chosen profession in the GDR. In 1957, Konrad Adenauer was already 81 years old. He had witnessed the German Empire, the first World War, the Weimar Republic and the Second World War. The National Socialists ousted him from his office as Lord Mayor of the city of Cologne. After the war, he was one of the men and women who built the free and democratic Federal Republic of Germany. There is nothing more symbolic of this Federal Republic of Germany than its constitution, the basic law, the grundgesetz. It was adopted exactly 60 years ago.

Article 1 of the basic law reads as follows, "The dignity of man is inviolable." This short and simple sentence—"the dignity of man is inviolable"—was the response to the catastrophe of the Second World War, to the murder of 6 million Jews in the Holocaust, to the hatred, destruction and annihilation that Germany brought over Germany and the rest of the world.

In only a few days will mark the 9th of November. On the 9th of November, 1989, the Berlin Wall fell. The 9th of November, 1938, however, also left an indelible mark on German and European history. On this day, the National Socialists pillaged and destroyed synagogues, set fire to them and killed innumerable people. It was the beginning of what later turned into the break with civilization that was the Shoah. I cannot stand before you today without remembering the victims of that very day and of the Shoah.

There is one guest in the audience today who personally experienced the horrors of Germany under National Socialism and whom I got to know personally some time ago—Professor Fritz Stern. He was born in Breslau in 1926—then a German city, today a Polish city—and in 1938, he was able to flee with his family from the Nazis at the very last minute. In his autobiography, published in 2006 under the title "Five Germanys I Have Known" Fritz Stern recounts the moment he arrived in New York Harbor in 1938, reaching a haven of freedom and security.

Ladies and gentlemen, it is wonderful that history willed that Fritz Stern, then a 12-year-old boy driven out of his native Germany, and myself, originally born in the GDR, now Chancellor of today's reunited Germany, meet here today before this august assembly under the same roof. This fills me with great pride and great gratitude.

In my wildest dreams, I would not have thought this possible 20 years ago, before the fall of the wall, for at the

time it was beyond my imagination to ever even travel to the United States, let alone stand here before you one day. The land of unlimited opportunity was, for me for a long time, impossible to reach. The wall, barbed wire and the order to shoot at those who tried to leave limited my access to the free world. Therefore, I had to rely on films and books, some of which were smuggled by relatives from the West to gain an impression of the United States. What did I see, and what did I read? What was it I was passionate about? I was passionate about the American Dream, the possibility for each and everyone to be successful, to actually make it in life through one's own personal effort. And like many other teenagers, I was passionate about jeans of a particular brand that you could not get in the GDR, which my aunt kindly sent me regularly from the West. I was passionate about the vast American landscapes that seemed to breathe the very spirit of freedom and independence. And immediately in 1990, my husband and I flew to America for the first time, to California. We shall never forget our first glimpse of the Pacific Ocean. It was simply gorgeous. And this, even though for me, America seemed completely out of reach until 1989.

Then on the 9th of November, 1989, the Berlin Wall fell, and this border, which had divided a nation for decades, keeping people in two different worlds, was now open. This is why, for me, today is, first and foremost, a time to say thank you. I thank all those American and Allied pilots who heard and heeded the desperate appeal of then-mayor of Berlin, Ernst Reuter, in 1948 who said, "You, the nations of this world, cast your eyes towards the city." For months, these pilots flew to Berlin for the airlift, saving the citizens from starvation. Many of these soldiers risked their lives; dozens lost their lives. We shall remember and honor them forever.

I thank the 16 million Americans stationed in Germany throughout the last decades, without whose support as soldiers, diplomats and generally as facilitators, overcoming the division of Europe would simply not have been possible. Also, we would be more than pleased, not only today but also in the future, to have American soldiers in Germany. You are ambassadors of your country to Germany, just as many Americans with German roots continue to be ambassadors of my country over here in the United States of America.

I think of John F. Kennedy who won the hearts of the Berliners when, during his visit in 1961 after the wall had been built, he reached out to the desperate citizens of Berlin by saying, "Ich bin ein Berliner." I think of Ronald Reagan who, far earlier than most, clearly saw the sign of the times and, standing in front of the Brandenburg Gate already in 1987, called out, "Mr. Gorbachev, open this gate. Mr. Gorbachev, tear down this wall." This appeal shall remain forever in my heart.

I thank George Herbert Walker Bush for the trust he placed in Germany and then Chancellor Helmut Kohl, offering something of immeasurable value to us Germans already in May 1989: "Partnership in leadership." What a generous offer, 40 years after the end of the Second World War. It was actually only last Saturday that we met again in Berlin, incidentally together with Mikhail Gorbachev. And to him, too, we owe a debt of gratitude.

Ladies and gentlemen, to put it in just one sentence, I know—we Germans know how much we owe to you, our American friends, and we shall never—I, personally—shall never, ever forget this.

The common quest for freedom released incredible forces all over Europe: the trade union Solidarnosc in Poland, the reformers around Vaclav Havel in Czechoslovakia, the first opening of the Iron Curtain in Hungary, and the demonstrations in the GDR every Monday. Where there used to be a dark wall, a door suddenly opened, and we all walked through it out into the streets, into the churches, across borders. Each and everyone was suddenly given a chance to build something new, to help shape things, to dare a new beginning.

I, too, saw a new beginning. I left my work as a physicist in the Academy of Science in East Berlin behind me and went into politics because I was finally able to do something to make a difference because I had gained the impression, Now things can be changed. Now you can do something. Ladies and gentlemen, 20 years have gone by since we were given this incredible gift of freedom, but still, nothing keeps me more involved, nothing spurs me on as much, nothing fills me with stronger positive feelings than the force of freedom.

Whoever has been so positively surprised in his or her lifetime holds many things to be possible. Or, to borrow the words of Bill Clinton when he was in Berlin in 1994, "Nothing will stop us. All things are possible." Yes, everything is possible. It is possible for a woman like myself to be here today. It is possible for a man like Arnold Vaatz, a dissident in Dresden during GDR times who spent time in prison because of this, to be here present today, a Member of the German Bundestag, the German Parliament and a member of my delegation. Yes, everything is possible. Also in our century, the 21st century, the age of globalization.

Back home in Germany, just as here in America, many people are afraid of globalization. We don't simply pass over this fact and these fears. We do see the difficulties. And yet it is up to us to convince people that globalization is the great global opportunity for each and every continent, for it forces all of us to work together with others. The alternative to globalization would mean shutting ourselves off against others. But instead of being a viable alternative, this would

only lead into isolation and misery. Thinking in terms of alliances, thinking in terms of partnerships, however, this will take us into a good future.

Ladies and gentlemen, America and Europe have certainly had their share of disagreements. Some may sometimes consider the other to be too hesitant or too fearful or, from the opposite perspective, too headstrong and too pushy. And yet I am deeply convinced that Europe will not find a better partner than America, nor will America find a better partner than Europe. For what brings Europeans and Americans together and keeps them together is not only a common history, what brings Europeans and Americans together and keeps them there are not only shared interests but common global challenges which exist among all regions of the world. This alone would not be sufficient to forge this very special partnership between Europe and America and to make it last. There is more to it. What brings Europeans and Americans together and keeps them close is a common basis of shared values. It is a common idea of the individual, and its inalienable dignity. It is a common understanding of freedom and responsibility. This is what we stand up for in this unique trans-Atlantic partnership and in this community of shared values that is NATO.

Thus, partnership and leadership is filled with life, ladies and gentlemen. It was this basis of values that ended the Cold War, and it is this basis of values which enables us now to stand the test of our times, and we need to stand this test of our time. Germany is united. Europe is united. That is something that we've been able to do.

Now today's generation needs to prove that it is able to meet the challenges of the 21st century and that, in a sense, we are able to tear down walls of today. What does this mean? Well, it means create freedom and security. It means create prosperity and justice, and it means protecting our planet. And here again, America and Europe are called upon in a very special way to do that, even after the end of the Cold War. Therefore, what is important is to see to it that we tear down walls in the minds of people, walls that separate different concepts of life that make it difficult time and again for us to understand each other all over the world. This is why the ability to show tolerance towards others is so important.

For us, our way of life is the best possible way, but others do not necessarily feel that way or think that way. There are different solutions to create a peaceful coexistence and tolerance; and showing tolerance means showing respect for the history, the tradition, the religion and the cultural identity of others. But let there be no misunderstanding; tolerance does not mean anything goes. There must be zero tolerance towards all those who show no respect for the inalienable rights of the individual and who violate human

rights, and zero tolerance needs to be shown when there is a risk of weapons of mass destruction falling, for example, into the hands of Iran and threatening our security.

Iran needs to be aware of this. Iran knows our offer, but Iran also knows where we draw a line. A nuclear bomb in the hands of an Iranian president who denies the Holocaust, threatens Israel and denies Israel the right to exist is not acceptable. The security of the State of Israel is for me nonnegotiable, now and forever. Incidentally, not only Israel is threatened but the whole of the free world. Whoever threatens Israel also threatens us. This is where the free world meets this threat head-on; if necessary, through tough economic sanctions. And this is why we, in Germany, will do everything we can in order to lend our support to the Middle East peace process, with the aim of establishing a two-state solution, a Jewish State of Israel and a Palestinian state living peacefully side by side.

We also stand up against the threat of international terrorism. We are aware of the fact that no country, no matter how strong, can do this alone. We all need partners. We are only strong if we are joined by others in a community of partners. Since we share then-President George W. Bush's views after the attacks of 9/11 that we had to prevent Afghanistan from ever harboring such a threat to the world again, Germany has been present there on the ground since 2002, with the third-largest troop contingent. We want to make the concept of an integrated or networked security successful. This means that civil and military commitment are inextricably linked.

The international community's mission in Afghanistan is, without any doubt, a tough one. It demands a lot from all of us, and it now needs to be transferred to the next phase as soon as the new Afghan Government is in office. Our objective must be a strategy for transfer of responsibility which we intend to develop together during a joint U.N. conference at the beginning of next year. We will be successful if we, as we have done up to now, continue to travel this road together every step of the way. Germany stands ready to shoulder its responsibility.

There is no doubt that NATO is and remains the crucial cornerstone of our common security. The security concept is continuously further developed and adapted to meet the challenges of the day, but its foundation and its clear compass for peace and freedom remain unchanged. We Europeans, I am convinced, may contribute even more in the future, for we Europeans are currently working on giving a new contractual basis to our European Union. The last signature has just been put on this document. This will make the European Union stronger and more capable of action, thereby turning it into a strong and reliable partner for the United States. We can build stable

partnerships on this sound basis, first and foremost, with Russia, China and India. For, ladies and gentlemen, the world we live in today is both freer and more integrated than ever before.

The fall of the Berlin Wall, the technological revolution and information and communication technology, and the rise of China, India, and other countries to become dynamic economies, all of this has changed the world of the 21st century into something completely different from what we knew in the 20th century. This is a good thing, for freedom is the very essence of our economy and our society. Man can only be creative when he's free, but what is also clear is that freedom does not stand alone. It is the freedom in responsibility and freedom to show and shoulder responsibility. For this, the world needs an underlying order. The near collapse of the international financial markets has shown what happens when there is none, when there is no underpinning order. If there is one lesson the world has learned from the financial crisis of last year, it is that a globalized economy needs a global order and a global framework of rules. Without global rules on transparency and supervision, we will not gain more freedom but rather risk the abuse of freedom and, thus, risk instability.

In a way, this is a second wall that needs to fall, a wall standing in the way of a truly global economic order, a wall made up of regional and exclusively national thinking. The G-20 is key to this cooperation among the most important industrialized countries and emerging economies. Here, too, cooperation between the Americans and the Europeans is a crucial cornerstone. It is not an exclusive but an inclusive cooperation. The G-20 have shown that they are capable of action, and we need to resist the pressure of those who almost led the nations of this planet to the abyss. The long and short of it is that international economic policy needs to be more sustainable because this crisis was also the result of a way of thinking that was too short term. As a consequence, millions of people all over the world may lose their jobs and are threatened by poverty and hunger.

To achieve prosperity and justice, we have to do everything to prevent such a crisis in the future. This also means not giving in to the temptation of protectionism. This is why the Doha negotiations and the framework of WTO are so important. The success of the Doha Round would send a very important message of openness for global trade, particularly in the current crisis. And just as much, the Transatlantic Economic Council can fulfill an important task in preventing the race for subsidies and giving incentives to reduce barriers to trade between Europe and America. Please, do let us jointly work for a global economic order that is in the interest of both America and Europe.

Ladies and gentlemen, global challenges can only be met by comprehensive international cooperation. This is also true for the third great task we need to stand up to in the 21st century, the wall that seemingly separates the present from the future. This wall bars from view the needs of future generations. It prevents us from doing what is urgently necessary to preserve the basis of our very life and our climate. We can already see now where this wasteful attitude towards our future leads: icebergs are melting in the Arctic; in Africa, people become refugees because their environment has been destroyed; the global sea level is rising.

I am delighted to note that President Obama and you, in your daily work, consider the protection of our climate to be a very important task. We all know that we have no time to lose. We need an agreement at the climate conference in Copenhagen in December. We need an agreement on one objective: global warming must not exceed 2 degrees Celsius. To achieve this, we need the readiness of all countries to exact internationally binding obligations. We cannot afford missing the objectives in climate protection that science tells us have to be met. This would not only be irresponsible from an environmental point of view, it would also be technologically shortsighted, for the development of new technologies in the field of energy offers great opportunities for growth and innovative jobs.

No doubt about it, in December the world will look to us, to the Europeans and to the Americans. And it is true, there can be no agreement without China and India. But I am convinced once we, in Europe and America, show ourselves ready to adopt binding agreements, that we will also be able to persuade China and India to join in. Then in Copenhagen, we shall be able to overcome this wall separating the present and the future in the interest of our children and grandchildren and in the interest of sustainable development all over the world.

Ladies and gentlemen, I am convinced that just as we found the strength in the 20th century to bring about the fall of the wall made of concrete and barbed wire, we shall now show that necessary strength to overcome the walls of the 21st century, walls in our minds, walls of short-sighted self-interest, walls between the present and the future.

Ladies and gentlemen, my confidence is nurtured and comes from a very important source, a very special sound, the sound of the Liberty Bell in Schöneberg Town Hall in Berlin. Since 1950, the bell, cast after the original American Liberty Bell, hangs there in the belfry. A gift from American citizens, it is a symbol of the promise of freedom, a promise that has been fulfilled. On the 3rd of October, 1990, the Liberty Bell rang again, signaling the unification of Germany, the greatest moment of joy for the German people.

On the 13th of September, 2001, it tolled out again, 2 days after 9/11, the greatest day of mourning for the American people.

(Spoken in English:)

The freedom bell in Berlin is, like the Liberty Bell in Philadelphia, a symbol which reminds us that freedom does not come about by itself. It must be struggled for and then defended anew every day of our lives. In this endeavor, Germany and Europe will also in the future remain strong and dependable partners for America. That, I promise you. Thank you very much.

(Applause, the Members rising.)

At 11 o'clock and 20 minutes a.m., Her Excellency Dr. Angela Merkel, Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany, accompanied by the committee of escort, retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The Majority Floor Services Chief escorted the invited guests from the Chamber in the following order:

The Members of the President's Cabinet;

The Dean of the Diplomatic Corps.

#### JOINT MEETING DISSOLVED

The SPEAKER. The purpose of the joint meeting having been completed, the Chair declares the joint meeting of the two Houses now dissolved.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 23 minutes a.m.), the joint meeting of the two Houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The House will continue in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1200

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PASTOR of Arizona) at noon.

#### PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS HAD DURING RECESS

Mr. WALZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings held during the recess be printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 3949, by the yeas and nays;  
H. Res. 398, by the yeas and nays;  
H. Res. 866, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

#### VETERANS' SMALL BUSINESS ASSISTANCE AND SERVICEMEMBERS PROTECTION ACT OF 2009

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3949, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. WALZ) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3949, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 382, nays 2, not voting 48, as follows:

[Roll No. 835]

YEAS—382

Aderholt	Carter	Franks (AZ)
Adler (NJ)	Cassidy	Frelinghuysen
Akin	Castle	Fudge
Alexander	Castor (FL)	Gallegly
Altmire	Chaffetz	Garrett (NJ)
Arcuri	Chandler	Giffords
Austria	Childers	Gingrey (GA)
Baca	Chu	Gohmert
Bachmann	Clarke	Gonzalez
Bachus	Cleaver	Goodlatte
Baird	Clyburn	Graves
Baldwin	Coble	Grayson
Barrow	Coffman (CO)	Green, Al
Bartlett	Cohen	Green, Gene
Barton (TX)	Conaway	Griffith
Bean	Connolly (VA)	Grijalva
Becerra	Cooper	Guthrie
Berkley	Costa	Hall (TX)
Berman	Costello	Halvorson
Berry	Courtney	Hare
Biggert	Crowley	Harman
Bilbray	Cuellar	Harper
Bilirakis	Culberson	Hastings (FL)
Bishop (GA)	Cummings	Hastings (WA)
Bishop (NY)	Dahlkemper	Heinrich
Bishop (UT)	Davis (CA)	Heller
Blackburn	Davis (IL)	Hensarling
Blumenauer	Davis (KY)	Herger
Blunt	DeFazio	Herseth Sandlin
Bocchieri	DeGette	Higgins
Boehner	Delahunt	Hill
Bonner	DeLauro	Himes
Bono Mack	Dent	Hinojosa
Boozman	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hirono
Boren	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hodes
Boswell	Dicks	Holden
Boucher	Dingell	Honda
Boustany	Doggett	Hoyer
Boyd	Donnelly (IN)	Hunter
Brady (TX)	Doyle	Inglis
Braley (IA)	Dreier	Inslee
Bright	Driehaus	Israel
Broun (GA)	Duncan	Issa
Brown (SC)	Edwards (MD)	Jackson (IL)
Brown-Waite,	Edwards (TX)	Jackson-Lee
Ginny	Ehlers	(TX)
Buchanan	Ellison	Jenkins
Burgess	Ellsworth	Johnson (GA)
Burton (IN)	Emerson	Johnson, E. B.
Butterfield	Engel	Johnson, Sam
Buyer	Eshoo	Jones
Calvert	Etheridge	Jordan (OH)
Camp	Fallin	Kagen
Campbell	Farr	Kanjorski
Cantor	Filmer	Kaptur
Cao	Fleming	Kennedy
Capito	Forbes	Kildee
Capps	Fortenberry	Kilpatrick (MI)
Cardoza	Foster	Kilroy
Carnahan	Fox	Kind
Carson (IN)	Frank (MA)	King (IA)

King (NY)	Mitchell	Schock
Kirk	Mollohan	Schrader
Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Moore (KS)	Schwartz
Kissell	Moore (WI)	Scott (GA)
Klein (FL)	Moran (VA)	Scott (VA)
Kline (MN)	Murphy (CT)	Sensenbrenner
Kosmas	Murphy (NY)	Serrano
Kratovil	Murphy, Tim	Sessions
Kucinich	Murtha	Sestak
Lamborn	Myrick	Shadegg
Lance	Nadler (NY)	Shea-Porter
Langevin	Napolitano	Sherman
Larsen (WA)	Neal (MA)	Shimkus
Larson (CT)	Neugebauer	Shuler
Latham	Nye	Shuster
LaTourette	Oberstar	Simpson
Latta	Obey	Skelton
Lee (CA)	Olson	Slaughter
Lee (NY)	Oliver	Smith (NE)
Levin	Ortiz	Smith (NJ)
Lewis (CA)	Pastor (AZ)	Smith (TX)
Lewis (GA)	Paulsen	Smith (WA)
Linder	Pence	Snyder
LoBiondo	Perlmutter	Souder
Loeb sack	Perriello	Space
Lofgren, Zoe	Peters	Stark
Lowe y	Peterson	Stearns
Lucas	Petri	Sullivan
Luetkemeyer	Pingree (ME)	Sutton
Luján	Pitts	Tanner
Lummis	Platts	Taylor
Lungren, Daniel E.	Poe (TX)	Teague
	Polis (CO)	Terry
Lynch	Pomeroy	Thompson (CA)
Mack	Posey	Thompson (MS)
Maffei	Price (NC)	Thompson (PA)
Manzullo	Putnam	Thornberry
Marchant	Quigley	Tiahrt
Markey (CO)	Radanovich	Tiberi
Markey (MA)	Rangel	Tierney
Marshall	Rehberg	Titus
Massa	Reichert	Tonko
Matheson	Reyes	Tsongas
Matsui	Richardson	Turner
McCarthy (CA)	Rodriguez	Upton
McCarthy (NY)	Roe (TN)	Van Hollen
McClintock	Rogers (AL)	Visclosky
McCollum	Rogers (KY)	Walden
McCotter	Rogers (MI)	Walz
McDermott	Rohrabacher	Wasserman
McGovern	Rooney	Schultz
McHenry	Ros-Lehtinen	Waters
McIntyre	Roskam	Watson
McKeon	Ross	Watt
McMahon	Rothman (NJ)	Waxman
McMorris	Roybal-Allard	Weiner
	Royce	Welch
Rodgers	Ruppersberger	Westmoreland
McNerney	Rush	Wexler
Meek (FL)	Ryan (WI)	Whitfield
Melancon	Salazar	Wilson (OH)
Mica	Sanchez, Loretta	Wilson (SC)
Michaud	Sarbanes	Wittman
Miller (FL)	Scalise	Wolf
Miller (MI)	Schakowsky	Woolsey
Miller (NC)	Schauer	Wu
Miller, Gary	Schiff	Yarmuth
Miller, George	Schmidt	Young (AK)
Minnick		

NAYS—2

Flake

Paul  
NOT VOTING—48

Abercrombie	Gordon (TN)	Pascarell
Ackerman	Granger	Payne
Andrews	Gutierrez	Price (GA)
Barrett (SC)	Hall (NY)	Rahall
Brady (PA)	Hinche y	Ryan (OH)
Brown, Corrine	Hoekstra	Sánchez, Linda T.
Capuano	Holt	T.
Carney	Johnson (IL)	Sires
Clay	Kingston	Speier
Cole	Lipinski	Spratt
Conyers	Maloney	Stupak
Crenshaw	McCaul	Towns
Davis (AL)	Meeks (NY)	Velázquez
Davis (TN)	Moran (KS)	Wamp
Deal (GA)	Murphy, Patrick	Young (FL)
Fattah	Nunes	
Gerlach	Pallone	

□ 1228

Messrs. BROUN of Georgia, SNYDER and MURPHY of New York changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.” So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained on Tuesday, November 3, and consequently missed rollcall vote No. 835 on H.R. 3949, the Veterans’ Small Business Assistance and Servicemembers Protection Act of 2009. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on H.R. 3949.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Speaker, had I been present for the vote to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 3949 as amended I would have voted “yea.”

RECOGNIZING 60TH ANNIVERSARY OF BERLIN AIRLIFT’S SUCCESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 398, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. WALZ) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 398. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 367, nays 0, not voting 65, as follows:

[Roll No. 836]

YEAS—367

Aderholt	Campbell	Edwards (MD)
Adler (NJ)	Cao	Edwards (TX)
Akin	Capito	Ehlers
Alexander	Capps	Ellison
Altmire	Cardoza	Ellsworth
Arcuri	Carnahan	Emerson
Austria	Carson (IN)	Engel
Baca	Cassidy	Eshoo
Bachmann	Castle	Etheridge
Bachus	Castor (FL)	Fallin
Baird	Chaffetz	Fattah
Baldwin	Chandler	Filner
Barrow	Childers	Flake
Bartlett	Chu	Fleming
Bean	Clarke	Forbes
Bece rra	Clay	Fortenberry
Berkley	Cleaver	Foster
Berman	Clyburn	Foxx
Berry	Coble	Frelinghuysen
Biggart	Coffman (CO)	Fudge
Bilbray	Cohen	Gallegly
Bilirakis	Conaway	Garrett (NJ)
Bishop (GA)	Connolly (VA)	Giffords
Bishop (NY)	Cooper	Gingrey (GA)
Blackburn	Costa	Gohmert
Blumenauer	Costello	Gonzalez
Bocci eri	Courtney	Graves
Bonner	Crowley	Grayson
Bono Mack	Cuellar	Green, Al
Boozman	Culberson	Green, Gene
Boren	Cummings	Griffith
Boswell	Dahlkemper	Grijalva
Boucher	Davis (CA)	Guthrie
Boustany	Davis (IL)	Hall (TX)
Boyd	Davis (KY)	Halvorson
Brady (TX)	DeFazio	Hare
Braley (IA)	DeGette	Harman
Bright	Delahunt	Harper
Broun (GA)	DeLauro	Hastings (FL)
Brown (SC)	Dent	Hastings (WA)
Brown-Waite,	Diaz-Balart, L.	Heinrich
Ginny	Diaz-Balart, M.	Heller
Buchanan	Dicks	Hensarling
Burgess	Dingell	Hergert
Burton (IN)	Doggett	Herseth Sandlin
Butterfield	Donnelly (IN)	Higgins
Buyer	Doyle	Hill
Calvert	Driehaus	Himes
	Duncan	Hinojosa

Hirono	McHenry	Sanchez, Loretta
Hodes	McIntyre	Sarbanes
Holden	McKeon	Scalise
Honda	McMahon	Schakowsky
Hoyer	McNerney	Schiff
Hunter	Meek (FL)	Schmidt
Inglis	Melancon	Schock
Inslee	Mica	Schrader
Issa	Michaud	Schwartz
Jackson (IL)	Miller (FL)	Scott (GA)
Jackson-Lee	Miller (MI)	Scott (VA)
(TX)	Miller (NC)	Sensenbrenner
Jenkins	Miller, Gary	Serrano
Johnson (GA)	Miller, George	Sestak
Johnson, E. B.	Minnick	Shadegg
Johnson, Sam	Mitchell	Shea-Porter
Jones	Mollohan	Sherman
Jordan (OH)	Moore (KS)	Shimkus
Kagen	Moore (WI)	Shuler
Kanjorski	Moran (KS)	Shuster
Kaptur	Moran (VA)	Simpson
Kennedy	Murphy (CT)	Skelton
Kildee	Murphy (NY)	Slaughter
Kilpatrick (MI)	Murphy, Tim	Smith (NE)
Kilroy	Myrick	Smith (NJ)
Kind	Nadler (NY)	Smith (TX)
King (IA)	Napolitano	Smith (WA)
King (NY)	Neal (MA)	Snyder
Kirk	Neugebauer	Souder
Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Nye	Space
Kissell	Oberstar	Speier
Klein (FL)	Olson	Stark
Kosmas	Oliver	Stearns
Kratovil	Ortiz	Sullivan
Kucinich	Pastor (AZ)	Sutton
Lamborn	Paul	Tanner
Lance	Paulsen	Taylor
Langevin	Perlmutter	Teague
Larsen (WA)	Perriello	Terry
Larson (CT)	Peters	Thompson (CA)
Latham	Peterson	Thompson (MS)
LaTourette	Petri	Thompson (PA)
Latta	Pingree (ME)	Thornberry
Lee (CA)	Pitts	Tiahrt
Lee (NY)	Platts	Tiberi
Levin	Poe (TX)	Tierney
Lewis (CA)	Polis (CO)	Titus
Lewis (GA)	Pomeroy	Tonko
Linder	Posey	Tsongas
LoBiondo	Price (NC)	Turner
Loeb sack	Putnam	Upton
Lofgren, Zoe	Quigley	Van Hollen
Lowe y	Radanovich	Visclosky
Lucas	Rangel	Walden
Luetkemeyer	Rehberg	Walz
Luján	Reichert	Wasserman
Lummis	Reyes	Schultz
Lungren, Daniel E.	Richardson	Waters
	Rodriguez	Watson
Lynch	Roe (TN)	Watt
Mack	Rogers (AL)	Waxman
Maffei	Rogers (KY)	Weiner
Manzullo	Rogers (MI)	Welch
Marchant	Rohrabacher	Westmoreland
Markey (CO)	Rooney	Wexler
Markey (MA)	Ros-Lehtinen	Whitfield
Marshall	Roskam	Wilson (OH)
Massa	Ross	Wilson (SC)
Matheson	Rothman (NJ)	Wittman
Matsui	Roybal-Allard	Wolf
McCarthy (NY)	Royce	Woolsey
McClintock	Ruppersberger	Wu
McCollum	Rush	Yarmuth
McDermott	Ryan (WI)	Young (AK)
McGovern	Salazar	

NOT VOTING—65

Abercrombie	Farr	McMorris
Ackerman	Frank (MA)	Rodgers
Andrews	Franks (AZ)	Meeks (NY)
Barrett (SC)	Gerlach	Murphy, Patrick
Brady (TX)	Goodlatte	Murtha
Blunt	Gordon (TN)	Nunes
Boehner	Granger	Obey
Brady (PA)	Gutierrez	Pallone
Brown, Corrine	Hall (NY)	Pascarell
Camp	Hinche y	Payne
Cantor	Hoekstra	Pence
Capuano	Holt	Price (GA)
Carney	Israel	Rahall
Carter	Johnson (IL)	Ryan (OH)
Cole	Kingston	Sánchez, Linda T.
Conyers	Kline (MN)	Lipinski
Crenshaw	Lipinski	Schauer
Davis (AL)	Maloney	Sessions
Davis (TN)	McCarthy (CA)	Sires
Deal (GA)	McCaul	
Dreier	McCotter	

Spratt Towns Wamp  
Stupak Velázquez Young (FL)

Dicks Lamborn  
Dingell Lance  
Doggett Langevin  
Donnelly (IN) Larsen (WA)

Quigley Wolf  
Radanovich Woolsey

Wu Young (AK)  
Yarmuth Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1235

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 836, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 836, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 836, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. DREIER, Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 836, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on H. Res. 398, Recognizing the 60th Anniversary of Berlin Airlift's Success.

NATIONAL VETERANS HISTORY PROJECT WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 866, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. WALZ) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 866. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 389, nays 0, not voting 43, as follows:

[Roll No. 837]

YEAS—389

Aderholt Boozman Chaffetz  
Adler (NJ) Boren Chandler  
Akin Boswell Childers  
Alexander Boucher Chu  
Altmire Boustany Clarke  
Arcuri Boyd Clay  
Baca Brady (TX) Cleaver  
Bachmann Braley (IA) Clyburn  
Bachus Bright Coble  
Baird Brown (GA) Coffman (CO)  
Baldwin Brown (SC) Cohen  
Barrow Brown-Waite, Conaway  
Bartlett Ginny Connolly (VA)  
Barton (TX) Buchanan Cooper  
Bean Burgess Costa  
Becerra Burton (IN) Costello  
Berkley Butterfield Courtney  
Berman Buyer Crowley  
Berry Calvert Cuellar  
Biggert Camp Culberson  
Billray Campbell Cummings  
Bilirakis Cantor Dahlkemper  
Bishop (GA) Cao Davis (CA)  
Bishop (NY) Capito Davis (IL)  
Bishop (UT) Capps Davis (KY)  
Blackburn Cardoza DeFazio  
Blumenauer Carnahan DeGette  
Blunt Carson (IN) Delahunt  
Bocchieri Carter DeLauro  
Boehner Cassidy Dent  
Bonner Castle Diaz-Balart, L.  
Bono Mack Castor (FL) Diaz-Balart, M.

Dicks Lamborn  
Dingell Lance  
Doggett Langevin  
Donnelly (IN) Larsen (WA)  
Doyle Larson (CT)  
Dreier Latham  
Driehaus LaTourette  
Duncan Latta  
Edwards (MD) Lee (CA)  
Edwards (TX) Lee (NY)  
Ehlers Levin  
Ellison Lewis (CA)  
Ellsworth Lewis (GA)  
Emerson Linder  
Engel LoBiondo  
Eshoo Loeb sack  
Etheridge Lofgren, Zoe  
Fallin Lowey  
Farr Lucas  
Fattah Luetkemeyer  
Filner Luján  
Flake Lummis  
Fleming Lungren, Daniel  
Forbes E.  
Fortenberry Lynch  
Foster Mack  
Foxy Maffei  
Frank (MA) Manzullo  
Franks (AZ) Marchant  
Frelinghuysen Markey (CO)  
Fudge Markey (MA)  
Gallegly Marshall  
Garrett (NJ) Massa  
Giffords Matheson  
Gingrey (GA) Matsui  
Gohmert McCarthy (CA)  
Gonzalez McCarthy (NY)  
Goodlatte McClintock  
Graves McCollum  
Grayson McCotter  
Green, Al McDermott  
Green, Gene McGovern  
Griffith McHenry  
Grijalva McIntyre  
Guthrie McKeon  
Hall (TX) McMahan  
Halvorson McMorrison  
Hare Rodgers  
Harman McNeerney  
Harper Meek (FL)  
Hastings (FL) Melancon  
Hastings (WA) Mica  
Heinrich Michaud  
Heller Miller (FL)  
Hensarling Miller (MI)  
Herger Miller (NC)  
Herseeth Sandlin Miller, Gary  
Higgins Miller, George  
Hill Minnick  
Himes Mitchell  
Hinojosa Mollohan  
Hirono Moore (KS)  
Hodes Moore (WI)  
Holden Moran (KS)  
Honda Moran (VA)  
Hoyer Murphy (CT)  
Hunter Murphy (NY)  
Inglis Murphy, Tim  
Inslee Murtha  
Israel Myrick  
Issa Nadler (NY)  
Jackson (IL) Napolitano  
Clay Neal (MA)  
Jackson-Lee Neugebauer  
(TX)  
Jenkins Nye  
Johnson (GA) Oberstar  
Johnson, E. B. Obey  
Johnson, Sam Olson  
Jones Oliver  
Jordan (OH) Ortiz  
Kagen Pastor (AZ)  
Kanjorski Paul  
Kaptur Paulsen  
Kennedy Pence  
Kildee Perlmutter  
Kilpatrick (MI) Perriello  
Kilroy Peters  
Kind Peterson  
King (IA) Petri  
King (NY) Pingree (ME)  
Kirk Pitts  
Kirkpatrick (AZ) Platts  
Kissell Poe (TX)  
Klein (FL) Polis (CO)  
Kline (MN) Pomeroy  
Kosmas Posey  
Kratovil Price (NC)  
Kucinich Putnam

Quigley Wolf  
Radanovich Woolsey

Rahall  
Rangel  
Rehberg  
Reichert  
Reyes  
Richardson  
Rodriguez  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Rooney  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothman (NJ)  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (WI)  
Salazar  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Scalise  
Schakowsky  
Schauer  
Schiff  
Schmidt  
Schock  
Schrader  
Schwartz  
Scott (GA)  
Scott (VA)  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano  
Sessions  
Sestak  
Shadegg  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Shimkus  
Shuler  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Snyder  
Souder  
Space  
Speier  
Stark  
Stearns  
Sullivan  
Sutton  
Tanner  
Taylor  
Teague  
Terry  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiahrt  
Tiberi  
Tierney  
Titus  
Tonko  
Tsongas  
Turner  
Upton  
Van Hollen  
Visclosky  
Walden  
Walz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watson  
Watt  
Waxman  
Weiner  
Welch  
Westmoreland  
Wexler  
Whitfield  
Wilson (OH)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman

NOT VOTING—43

Abercrombie Gerlach Nunes  
Ackerman Gordon (TN) Pallone  
Andrews Granger Pascrell  
Austria Gutierrez Payne  
Barrett (SC) Hall (NY) Price (GA)  
Brady (PA) Hinchey Ryan (OH)  
Brown, Corrine Hoekstra Sánchez, Linda  
Capuano Holt T.  
Carney Johnson (IL) Sires  
Cole Kingston Spratt  
Conyers Lipinski Stupak  
Crenshaw Maloney Towns  
Davis (AL) McCaul Velázquez  
Davis (TN) Meeks (NY) Wamp  
Deal (GA) Murphy, Patrick

□ 1243

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, today, November 3, 2009, I missed a series of three votes. I missed rollcall votes Nos. 835, 836, and 837.

I request that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD reflect that had I been present and voting, I would have voted as follows:

Rollcall vote No. 835: "yea" (On agreeing to H.R. 3949).

Rollcall vote No. 836: "yea" (On agreeing to H. Res. 398).

Rollcall vote No. 837: "yea" (On agreeing to H. Res. 866).

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, November 2 and Tuesday, November 3, I was unable to cast my vote on six suspension bills due to a need to cast my vote in the election in Pennsylvania.

Had I been present, I would like the RECORD to reflect that I would have voted:

"Yea" on rollcall vote 832, "yea" on rollcall vote 833, "yea" on rollcall vote 834, "yea" on rollcall vote 835, "yea" on rollcall vote 836, "yea" on rollcall vote 837.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 3691

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 3691.

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

There was no objection.

HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of national health care reform. The 29th

District in Texas, which I represent, has one of the highest numbers of uninsured individuals in our country, where nearly 40 percent of the residents are uninsured.

Last week, the melded House version of the health care bill was reintroduced as H.R. 3962, the Affordable Health Care for America Act. H.R. 3962 creates a national health care exchange in which individuals and small businesses can purchase health insurance plans for themselves and employees. Our goal is to build on the system of employer-based health care coverage that 60 percent of Americans currently enjoy and allow those who have employer-based insurance to keep that coverage.

If enacted, H.R. 3962 will provide insurance coverage to 230,000 currently uninsured residents in our district and improve the employer-based coverage for 217,000 residents. Under this legislation, 177,000 households would qualify for affordability credits to purchase health insurance.

In our district, 16,600 small businesses would be able to obtain health insurance for their employees, and 14,600 small businesses will qualify for tax credits to help them offset the cost of obtaining health care. That's why we need national health care reform.

□ 1245

#### GIVING AMERICANS THE RIGHT KIND OF HEALTH CARE

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

Ms. JENKINS. As a woman in the sandwich generation, I've spent numerous hours making health care decisions for my two teenagers, as well as two aging parents who have both suffered from cancer and other medical emergencies. From monitoring vaccines, to paying hospital and prescription costs, to reviewing insurance coverage, I understand the concerns folks have with their health care system.

That is why I am glad Republicans have solutions: solutions to provide access to care, regardless of preexisting conditions; solutions to cover the uninsured; solutions for tort reform to reduce the cost of defensive medicine.

Democrats have other ideas. The Pelosi health care plan will force folks off their current health care coverage, lead to longer waiting lines, increase premiums, higher taxes, fewer options, and will further bankrupt our Nation.

Please, let's give Americans the right kind of health care reform.

#### MOURNING THE LOSS OF WILLARD V. OLIVER

(Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I rise to mourn the loss of Willard V. Oliver, one of the last sur-

viving Navajo Code Talkers. The Code Talkers saved the lives of countless Americans in World War II and the Korean War by using Dine to communicate sensitive military intelligence without risk of interception by the enemy. Mr. Oliver spent more than 2 years fighting his way across the South Pacific as one of those esteemed marines.

Willard Oliver passed away on October 14th after a life marked by heroic service to his people and to his country.

In speaking of his service, Mr. Oliver said, "I am proud to be a Code Talker, and I know we counted for something great."

Today, I am proud to honor him and all Navajo Code Talkers for their bravery and sacrifice on behalf of this country. His and their contributions to our great Nation must never be forgotten.

#### DOING HEALTH CARE REFORM THE RIGHT WAY

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

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, the American people want health care reform, but they want the right kind of reform. They want to know that we are not going to raise taxes on job creators when the economy is just coming out of a recession. They want to know that we are not going to change the health care that they have now. They want to know that Medicare will be there for them.

As a mother of three, I can remember nights when one of our children would have a cold and I would put my ear to their chest to hear the rattle or to hear if they were developing croup. And that is what we have been doing with this health care reform. The Republicans have been putting their ears to the chest of the American people to find out what they want. And what they want, they want reform the right way, not a \$1 trillion plan that will lead to uncertainty and that will have certain people lose their health care.

We need to do health care reform, but we need to do it the right way.

#### PAYING FOR VALUE IN HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. WALZ. Mr. Speaker, I am proud that this House has finally showed the courage to tackle one of the most important issues in our country, the rising cost of health care. I want to recognize that this piece of legislation takes a huge step forward in addressing the issue of paying for value in our health care system.

The current payment system rewards volume and quantity of care, rather than quality of care. We spend hun-

dreds of billions of dollars every year on procedures that do not improve patients' health. We need to change the incentive system. We need doctors and hospitals to work together to coordinate care.

In my district in southern Minnesota, the Mayo Clinic has created just such a culture, where doctors coordinate with each other and look for the best quality results. There are other institutions around the country doing the same thing. These organizations all do it a little differently, but the one thing they have in common is a culture of patient-centered care based on high quality and low cost.

These cultures can be replicated in every hospital in the country, and the way we get there is by changing the incentive system. I am very proud that the provisions in this bill to address value and geographic disparity in Medicaid are there. We have a chance to reform American health care and provide good-quality, high-outcome health care for all Americans.

#### COMMONSENSE IDEAS REGARDING HEALTH CARE

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

Mrs. BIGGERT. It seems like all we hear in Washington about health care today is "public option" and "government-run program," so I thought it was interesting in a recent questionnaire, 47 percent of my constituents most want Congress to focus on reducing costs. Only 10.5 percent are most concerned with the public option, and I would be willing to bet that these numbers are similar all over the country.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that we should get back to the health care issue most important to Americans: reducing costs. Let's support commonsense changes, like medical malpractice reform and association health plans. We should also focus on eliminating the waste, fraud, and abuse that is so rampant in our medical system. With the money these reforms save, we will be able to expand coverage and be sure no one is denied health care coverage because of a preexisting condition or because they can't afford premiums.

These are simple, tested, commonsense ideas that don't take 1,999 pages to explain. Let's give the American people what they want, Mr. Speaker.

#### PUTTING PATIENTS FIRST

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

Mr. KAGEN. Mr. Speaker, this House of Representatives is the people's voice, and we are about to deliver exactly what they have been asking for: reforms in our health care system, reforms that were asked of us by our people back home in our districts. Ideas, great ideas come from our people, including closing the doughnut hole in

Medicare part D, reforming medical malpractice to make sure it is affordable for every practitioner and their patients, and to negotiate finally for deeper discounts from prescription drug companies.

We are also going to eliminate the antitrust exemption that the Wall Street-run health insurance corporations have been benefiting from for several decades. We are also going to begin to look at purchasing health care policies across State lines.

This is what the people want: They want private doctors and private hospitals. They want to be in charge of their health care again.

We are going to put patients first in this House of Representatives.

#### HEALTH CARE AND SENIORS

(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, many seniors from my area of south Florida are concerned about the \$1 trillion Pelosi bill. The Pelosi bill is poised to hurt seniors by endangering their Medicare benefits. Seniors, after decades and decades of hard work and sacrifice, deserve nothing less than the best quality health care that we can provide. Any health care reform legislation must not endanger this solemn promise.

According to CBO, the Congressional Budget Office, the Pelosi plan will cut Medicare benefits by \$162 billion. The Pelosi bill will force seniors to pay up to 20 percent more for their Medicare prescription drug coverage. It will also inflict massive cuts on a popular program, Medicare Advantage, that will force many seniors out of their current coverage. So not only do we take away benefits from our seniors, but we will make them pay more for what little they are left with.

This is not what seniors deserve. Seniors deserve to have their Medicare benefits protected. Whatever shape health care reform takes, this Chamber must never forget our pledge to our seniors.

#### WELCOMING AMERICAN INDIANS AND ALASKA NATIVES TO WASHINGTON

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to welcome the many American Indians and Alaska Natives who are here in Washington to address the needs of Indian Country. For the first time, leaders from the 564 federally recognized tribes will interact directly with the President and Cabinet members in the first annual White House Tribal Nations Conference.

President Obama, the administration officials, and many Members of Con-

gress are engaging tribal leaders in an unprecedented conversation to hear firsthand about the needs and opportunities facing Indian communities and families.

Tribal leaders are also here to commemorate the historic opening today of the Embassy of Tribal Nations' permanent home in our Nation's Capital for their family of sovereign tribal governments.

Migwetch—thank you—as we would say in Minnesota. Thank you to all the tribes who are here to participate and work on Indian issues together.

#### DOING HEALTH CARE REFORM THE RIGHT WAY

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

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, when I am at home in the district, I am not getting questions about health care. I am getting questions about jobs. People are saying, what are you doing to help create jobs?

Unemployment nationally is at a 26-year high. In my district, it is between 11 and 15 percent, and small business people say to me all the time, new taxes on businesses that can't afford health coverage is not going to help. We all know that leads to fewer jobs and lower wages for workers.

Health care reform is important, but the country can't afford it under the proposed bill. Half of the tax dollars collected by the health care bill's new surtax are from small business. It is terrible for innovation and kills ingenuity, which made America great.

It is the American people that keep this country growing, and they want health reform done the right way, that lowers cost and is affordable.

#### PROTECTING INNOCENT AMERICANS FROM EXECUTION

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced H.R. 3986, the Effective Death Penalty Appeals Act, to protect innocent Americans from execution. Under current law, a death row inmate can be stranded in a procedural no-man's land condemned to die, even if there is compelling new evidence of innocence.

Justice Stevens recently wrote that the law as it stands is arguably unconstitutional. It is also wrong. My bill would empower Federal courts to entertain and grant habeas corpus petitions for death row inmates who present new evidence that demonstrates probable innocence.

This bill will help us discern the innocent from the guilty when the stakes are highest. I look forward to broad support for this bill.

I will also say that health care, this new proposal, H.R. 3986, is fabulous reform to this problem.

#### PROPOSED HEALTH CARE REFORM WILL HURT WOMEN

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

Ms. FALLIN. Mr. Speaker, for many women and their families, higher health care costs means the difference between receiving care or going without it. Unfortunately, the Pelosi health care bill raises taxes on health care and empowers the Federal Government and bureaucrats to decide what kind of health care families and women will have versus empowering people to make their own personal decisions. It also undermines a woman's ability to make the best decisions for her family.

According to a report, studies have shown that more than 52 percent of women have foregone necessary care because of the cost. They have foregone care from filling prescription drugs, skipping a medical test, or even failing to see a doctor when they needed medical help.

We know when the Federal Government takes over care, whether it is a bureaucratic system or a socialized system, that it also leads to rationing of care. This bill increases taxes while also causing higher insurance premiums and will hurt women and children and their families. But House Republicans support reasonable health care reform that lowers costs and will ensure access to care for all Americans.

#### NO LONGER BEING FOOLED BY THE PARTY OF NO

(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, one of the scariest themes of Halloween has been the continuation of myths about our health care legislation that is being made by opponents of reform. These TEA-bagger myths have been debunked time and time again, yet some in this Congress continue to perpetuate them. Why? Because they have no alternative plan of their own.

If they had a comprehensive plan that would actually address our Nation's health care crisis, it would have been put forward, or maybe they would have enacted it during the years that they ran Congress and the White House. But when you don't have a plan, you have nothing else to talk about.

We all know we cannot continue the status quo: Americans with health insurance today, never knowing if it will be there when they need it; millions of Americans today without any coverage; all the while, costs keep climbing and insurance companies keep getting richer.

So what do some folks do? They distort our plan and use scare tactics and try to fool the American people. But the American people support our plan, which ensures that we all have access

to quality, affordable health care, and they won't be fooled anymore by the Party of No.

□ 1300

#### HIGHLIGHTING THREE CONCERNS ABOUT THE HEALTH CARE REFORM BILL: ABORTION, SENIORS, AND THE CONSCIENCE CLAUSE

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

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk today about some of the concerns I have with the current health care bill, specifically abortion, our seniors, and the conscience clause for medical professionals.

As this bill is drafted, it opens the door to the public funding of abortion. A majority of Americans are opposed to funding abortions. For decades the Federal funding of abortion has been prohibited by the Hyde amendment. Some will argue the Capps amendment does the same thing, but it does not. It allows for plans, specifically the public option, to have abortion coverage paid for with our tax dollars.

This bill also cuts more than \$500 billion from Medicare, putting our Nation's seniors' health at risk. Almost \$170 billion will be cut from the Medicare Advantage program alone. This will adversely affect 17,000 seniors in my district.

And, finally, it appears to erode the conscience clause protections for our medical professionals. No health care provider should ever have to choose between his or her morals, faith, and his or her job.

Health care reform should be about protecting lives, not jeopardizing them.

#### WE MUST MAKE HEALTH CARE A RIGHT, NOT A PRIVILEGE

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

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, we are at a historic moment in our Nation's history.

After a half century of debate, the time has come to make health care a reality for every single American. We must make health care a right and not a privilege. People are dying without health care. This week we must say, No more. No more.

People are losing their homes because they are without health insurance. This week we say, No more.

The American people cannot wait a moment longer. Every day that we wait, 14,000 Americans lose their health insurance.

We have a good bill before us. We have resolved our differences. We have been struck in the paralysis of analysis, and this must end and end now. Now is the time to act. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., once said, "Of all the

forms of inequality, injustice in health care is the most shocking and inhumane."

We must not perpetuate this injustice. The spirit of history is upon us. We have been called to lead. Now is the time for the Congress to act.

#### THE HEALTH CARE DEBATE: A GOVERNMENT-CENTERED PLAN VERSUS A PATIENT-CENTERED, TAXPAYER-FRIENDLY PLAN

(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, the American people, especially women, are listening and watching; and they are paying close attention to how we define problems, how we address problems, and how we as a body get around to solving problems that they're concerned about. And I think they're really learning so very much.

They are learning that we have a philosophical difference in how we choose to address these problems. Some of my colleagues want to see this played out in the health care debate where they would choose to have a government-centered plan, and then there are those of us that would like to have a patient-centered, taxpayer-friendly way to address this.

And we do have lots of ideas. We, as Republicans, have brought forward so many ideas and so many bills that would do just that, to address the health care and medical concerns of our constituents.

What they want is more affordable cost, ease of access, making certain that we address access to affordable insurance for those that have preexisting and existing conditions. And we can do that and be friendly to the American taxpayer.

#### THE HEALTH CARE REFORM BILL AND THE INPUT FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, the House Democrats have held over 3,000 public events, town halls, forums for people to give us their ideas on health care. I'm sure my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have held countless more events. I personally have held 28 events in my district in Colorado, town halls, telephone town halls, Congress on Your Corners. The input from the American people has made this bill a better bill.

This bill before us, the John Dingell bill, costs over \$100 billion less than the initial House bill. It reduces our deficit by over \$30 billion over 10 years. Yes, we need to do more to reduce our deficit, but this bill is an important start. That's something I heard from my constituents, and we're acting upon it by incorporating that into this bill.

Other suggestions from my constituents included making sure that we have interstate competition. There are provisions for that in the bill. Tort reform, President Obama challenged us to do that. We have put tort reform in this bill. The bill is better for small businesses.

The input from millions of Americans across the ideological spectrum has made this bill better. And I would like to thank the American people for helping to write the Democratic health care reform bill.

#### THE HEALTH CARE BILL IS A CRUEL HOAX

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

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I come from Macomb County, Michigan. That county is also known as the home of the Reagan Democrats. It is certainly a proud heartland not only of Michigan but the heartland of America, I think. And as a mother and as a grandmother, I am incredibly concerned about the enormous amount of debt that this administration, through a number of bills and now especially this health care bill, is placing on future generations.

One of the most disingenuous claims that have been made over and over again, Mr. Speaker, is if you like your current health care plan, you can keep it.

Well, here's a headline in my local paper just the other day: "Employers Ready to Dump Health Care." "Under the House bill, paying an 8 percent penalty is cheaper than providing coverage." This was a survey that was done by our Macomb County Chamber of Commerce, and what they found is that an overwhelming majority of local companies stated they would drop their existing employee insurance coverage or avoid offering future health care benefits if this bill that the House is considering today passes.

This bill is a very cruel hoax. That is the reality. A business decision that is going to be made will dump these people out on the public plan.

#### HEALTH CARE REFORM: HOW IT WILL BENEFIT WOMEN

(Ms. CHU asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. CHU. Women of America, Republicans want you to believe that our health care reform bill is poison, that doing nothing is better for the Nation. But it is the status quo that is poison.

Today, women are forced to settle for less health care at a higher price. We pay as much as 50 percent more than men, a practice of discrimination that is legal in 38 States. But this bill prohibits insurance companies from charging women more for the same coverage.

Today, women are turned away from buying insurance due to so-called preexisting conditions such as domestic

violence, pregnancy, and C-sections. But this bill makes it illegal to deny coverage due to any preexisting condition, including breast cancer.

Today fewer than half of America's women can get health insurance through work because they stay at home, work at small businesses, or work part time. But through this bill, every woman can buy coverage through the exchange that will cover maternity and preventative care.

This is why women in America need this health care reform bill and why I strongly support this legislation.

#### THE MAJORITY'S TRILLION DOLLAR HEALTH CARE PLAN

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

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, as the House prepares to address the latest proposal by the majority to have the government take over our health care system, I want to say that there are many things wrong with this trillion dollar health care plan.

It's bad for our economic health. It's a prescription for larger deficits, higher taxes, more job losses.

But worst of all is what it does to women, families, seniors, and small businesses. Women make two-thirds of the health care decisions in our country. As mothers, wives, and daughters, we work to protect the family members around us. In fact, the vast majority of America's health care professionals are women, 90 percent of the nurses; and almost a third are doctors. If PELOSI's health care proposal becomes law, women will no longer be able to make those responsible decisions for their families. Government bureaucrats will.

There's no doubt that we need changes in our health care system. But let's not take away power from moms and turn it over to the government and call that reform.

#### IN STRONG SUPPORT OF HEALTH INSURANCE REFORM

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

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of health insurance reform for many reasons but especially for how it helps the 50 million Americans living in rural areas.

There are three main problems people in rural America face when it comes to the current health care system: lack of choice of affordable health insurance, lack of access to health care providers, and certainly a lack of access to quality health care and preventative care.

Our health insurance reform bill, H.R. 3962, addresses all of these issues and more for rural Americans.

Fifteen percent of people living in rural areas live in poverty, and one in

five uninsured Americans lives in rural areas. This bill will extend coverage, and the public option will give choice to Americans living in rural areas. This bill will make coverage affordable. It will invest in our health care infrastructure by training thousands of new doctors, nurses, and other health care providers and will put them on the ground where they're needed, especially in our rural areas.

Finally, this bill gives all Americans free access to preventative care and encourages and rewards high-quality care. It is what we need in rural America and across the country.

#### REJECT THE PELOSI HEALTH CARE PLAN AND START OVER ON RESPONSIBLE HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, for months millions of concerned citizens voiced their strong opposition to a government takeover of health care. Yet last week Speaker PELOSI unveiled her latest plan for a government takeover of health care.

The Pelosi health care plan does nothing to control the rising costs of health care. But struggling businesses that can't afford to provide health insurance coverage to their employees face higher taxes.

According to an economic model developed by President Obama's chief economic adviser, an estimated 5.5 million jobs could be lost as a result of the taxes included in the Pelosi health care plan.

At a time when several States are struggling with double-digit unemployment, pushing policies that will raise taxes and increase job losses is the wrong direction to take our country.

It's time for Congress to reject the Pelosi health care plan and start over on responsible health care reform.

#### THE HEALTH CARE BILL

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

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, Democrats are going to deliver on what American families and businesses have been asking for when it comes to their health: one, meaningful, secure, and stable insurance; two, improved Medicare for our seniors; and, three, vital consumer protections.

For families with health insurance, health reform will provide coverage you can count on. All Americans will have affordable options even if you change your job or if your employer does not even offer health insurance. Under the revised health bill, families will not have to worry about insurance companies canceling their coverage because someone in their family gets sick or is diagnosed with cancer or another

illness. Health insurance companies will no longer be able to bar you from insurance just because you've had cancer that is in remission or you're recovering from a heart ailment. We will ensure that our neighbors are not forced to go bankrupt after a serious illness strikes. What is insurance for after all? It must be meaningful.

American families have been doing everything right in paying their premiums and copays even as those costs have risen astronomically. Our health care bill says that, in return, families must have coverage that is meaningful, stable, and secure.

#### WHAT WSJ HAS TO SAY ABOUT THE PELOSI HEALTH BILL: "THE WORST BILL EVER"

(Mrs. LUMMIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Speaker, I lament hearing that people who attend TEA parties are somehow uninformed or misinformed Americans. They're hard-working Americans who are informed and have taken the time to become informed, and they know what's in this bill.

But if you think that they have been misled into thinking that this bill is an extreme bill by those of us who are in the Republican Party, listen to what the Wall Street Journal says. Go to wsj.com.

They call this "the worst bill ever." "Epic new spending and taxes, pricier insurance, rationed care, dishonest accounting: the Pelosi health bill has it all."

And it concludes by saying: "Critics will say we are exaggerating, but we believe it is no stretch to say that Mrs. PELOSI's handiwork ranks with the Smoot-Hawley tariff as among the worst bills Congress has ever seriously contemplated."

This is not TEA Party extremists; this is the Wall Street Journal.

#### A NEW HEALTH CARE BILL

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

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Mr. Speaker, finding a uniquely American solution to ensuring that all Americans have access to meaningful, affordable health coverage has been an unfulfilled goal for decades. Action now is both a moral and economic imperative for our Nation.

Health care legislation before the House builds on the hard work done by three health care committees over many months and responds to feedback from the American people. It builds on America's public-private system. And it is paid for.

The legislation meets the goals of health reform: enhanced protection for those with health coverage; new, affordable choices for individuals and small businesses; strengthened Medicare for our seniors; improved delivery

of care with better health outcomes for all Americans; and the containment of rapidly rising costs of health care.

The status quo is unaffordable and unsustainable. Passing health care reform benefits all of us: families, seniors, businesses, and the Nation. I look forward to voting for this historic legislation and meeting the goals of health care reform for all Americans. Now is the time to act.

□ 1315

#### HEALTH CARE

(Ms. GRANGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. GRANGER. Madam Speaker, on September 12, taxpayers sent an unequivocal message to lawmakers that smaller government, limited regulation, responsible spending, and keeping government out of people's lives are principles that too many in Washington need to be reminded of.

Hundreds of Texans took to the streets of Washington, D.C., to protest Big Government and the devastating policies the Obama administration and this Congress are pursuing. Their voices were heard and we had better not forget what they say.

Now we need everyone's voice more than ever as we are asked to pass a \$1.2 trillion government takeover of our health care system. Through town hall meetings and the thousands of e-mails and letters we receive each week, my constituents have been clear: They don't like this bill.

It's now Congress's responsibility to listen to our districts and respond, representing the constituents who sent us here. They're speaking loud and clear—and they expect a response.

#### HEALTH CARE

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

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, for the past 6 months I have talked with my constituents in southern Nevada about the need for health care reform that lowers cost, improves access, increases choice, and strengthens Medicare. I have solicited input from my constituents by sending them health care surveys, encouraging them to share their health care stories, and holding Congress on the Corner.

From roundtable discussions with doctors, providers, and small business owners, to town halls, I have listened to the concerns Nevadans have about our current health care system as well as the proposed reforms. One thing is clear: The status quo just is unacceptable.

The legislation introduced in the House last week requires a comprehensive examination, and I will continue to carefully review all aspects of the bill. But I'm pleased that the legisla-

tion includes important provisions that will help Nevada's seniors, young adults, women, and small businesses.

From ending discrimination based on preexisting conditions to strengthening Medicare by reducing waste and closing the doughnut hole, there are a number of very positive aspects of this bill which I strongly support. It's time to give them a serious look.

#### HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, the American people have said that the number one thing they're concerned about with regard to health care is the cost of health care. The Speaker's 1,990-page government takeover of health care raises the cost of insurance for American families and it will add to our already exploding debt.

The cost of the Speaker's bill is now at \$1.3 trillion and counting. It's a debt that will be paid for by our kids and our grandkids. And, to make matters worse, it will increase taxes, impose job-killing mandates, and cut seniors' Medicare benefits.

There's a better way. Republicans have outlined a plan to lower cost and expand access at a price our Nation can afford. This includes letting families buy health insurance across State lines; allowing small businesses to pool and offer health insurance to their employees at much lower cost, just like big businesses and unions can today; giving States the tools to create innovative reforms that lower costs; and ending junk lawsuits that contribute to higher health care costs.

Given all that's at stake, the American people deserve to see the Republicans' smart, fiscally responsible plans debated here on the House floor side-by-side with the Speaker's 1,990-page bill.

I hope we will see that debate and vote as soon as possible.

#### HEALTH REFORM AND THE AFFORDABLE HEALTH CARE FOR AMERICA ACT

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

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I can't stand here today and tell you that this legislation will solve every health care problem we face as a Nation, but I can tell you this. There's 460,000 Nevadans that have no health insurance at all. In my district alone, this bill will provide coverage for 163,000 of my fellow Nevadans.

It's not just the uninsured that will benefit. In Las Vegas, more than 200,000 households will receive credits to make insurance more affordable and over 16,000 small businesses will be provided with a tax credit to make it easier for them to provide coverage to their employees.

The bill improves coverage for seniors by closing the doughnut hole, eliminating copays for preventive services, and extending the solvency of the Medicare program for another 5 years. It eliminates preexisting conditions as a reason to deny coverage. It lifts the lifetime limits. I have 10-year-old children who are juvenile diabetics in my office that have already exceeded their lifetime caps. This bill eliminates that.

The current health care system is unsustainable.

#### HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. PENCE. The American people want health care reform that lowers the cost of health insurance rather than increasing the cost of government, but it looks like that's exactly what they're getting in the Pelosi health care bill.

Here are the numbers: 1,990 pages; \$1.2 trillion in the Pelosi plan in new Federal spending over the next 10 years; \$729.5 billion in new tax increases. It's just extraordinary.

Within the confines of the bill, 43 entitlement programs are created or expanded; 111 additional offices, bureaus, commissions, programs, and bureaucracies; and this legislation uses the mandatory legal language—the word “shall”—3,425 times. And this isn't a government takeover of health care? Give me a break.

The Pelosi health care plan is a freight train of big government, higher taxes, and mandates—and it must be opposed. The American people deserve a better plan.

You can go to [healthcare.gov](http://healthcare.gov) and start getting the details of a plan that will lower the cost of health insurance instead of growing the size of government.

#### WHERE IS THE REPUBLICAN HEALTH REFORM BILL?

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

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, it will be interesting to go to that Web site and find what is the so-called Republican beginning of a proposal, because 139 days ago the Republican leadership promised to introduce their own health reform bill and yet we are still waiting.

Since the mysterious Republican plan hasn't been introduced, the American people can't really see what's in it. It's all being written behind closed doors. What little we do know of what they are planning should bring a smile to the faces of insurance company CEOs.

Their leader, Mr. BOEHNER, admitted the other day that their collection of bills does not end discrimination based

on preexisting conditions. Nowhere in their collection of bills do they help more Americans afford health care. Nowhere in their collection of bills do they end discrimination from insurance companies' practice of dropping coverage if you get sick.

Four months ago, Democrats made public our health care reform proposal by posting it online for anyone to see. Since then, there have been multiple committee hearings during which the Republicans had ample opportunity to debate the bill and offer amendments.

Republicans won't even let the public see their bill. What are they hiding? Will they include Representative BROWN's proposal to privatize Medicare? How about dismantling the entire Medicare system?

Americans deserve to know.

#### HEALTH CARE

(Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. This bill is a disaster for American families—it allows bureaucrats to make important medical decisions instead of doctors and patients.

As a wife, mother, and caregiver to my late husband, I—like 85 percent of women in America—am the primary care decision-maker in my home. I was for him as well as for my children. We need a health care system that provides quality, affordable health care so that we can have peace of mind in knowing our families are well taken care of.

Unfortunately, the bill that we will have before us later this week is one that empowers government bureaucrats and undermines a woman's ability to make the best health care choices for her and her family.

The bill creates 111 new Federal bureaucracies and 43 new entitlement programs. Instead of reforming health care, this bill expands government. Health insurance premiums will rise, taxes will increase, and seniors will lose many Medicare benefits.

When the Democrats wrote this health care bill, they not only left Republicans out of the process, but they left out consumers.

#### HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, Clara Peller demands health care reform now. Twenty-five years ago, nobody knew who Clara Peller was, but she soon became famous because she was the one in those Wendy's ads who introduced the famous phrase, "Where's the beef?" And for our friends on the Republican side of the aisle, that's the question we would all like to know: "Where's the bill?"

If you're hearing so much conversation about the Democratic health care

bill, there's a very good reason for that. There is no Republican bill, despite promises month after month after month to reveal what that bill would contain. There's no CBO score of the Republican bill.

So how do we know that there's a bill that's going to affect Americans? Well, we know that bill will be mostly about preserving the status quo. And I would like my friends to tell my constituent, Hannah Rodriguez, who has a cleft palate and has been waiting years for her parents to save up the money for her corrective medical procedure because it's considered cosmetic surgery under her current policy, why she should wait longer for health care reform.

#### HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. SULLIVAN. Last week, my colleagues on the other side unveiled the latest version of their plan for government-controlled health care that, according to CBO, will cost \$1.2 trillion. Simply put, that's \$2.2 million of taxpayer money for every single word in this bill.

This 2,000-page bill creates 111 new government programs and is full of tax increases and government mandates.

This bill is bad for patients, bad for doctors, bad for seniors, bad for small businesses, and terrible for our economy.

This bill will raise taxes on the American people, cut Medicare for seniors by half a trillion dollars, add to the already out-of-control Federal deficit, and will leave personal medical decisions to bureaucrats in Washington instead of families.

Mr. Speaker, there's another way. We believe health care reform begins by bringing all stakeholders—patients, doctors, citizens and hospitals—to the table where everyone has equal input. Our plan will lower cost, increase access, and improve the quality of care your family will receive.

#### HEALTH CARE

(Mrs. DAVIS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, in America, if you get overcharged on a telephone or cable bill, you have recourse to get your money back. If a mechanic does an unnecessary repair, there are agencies that can help you. On the government level, we work to defend consumers and guard against markets being too concentrated. That was one of the goals when I chaired the Consumer Protection Committee in the California State assembly.

And yet when it comes to health care, strong consumer protections just don't exist and Americans are suffering because no one is looking out for them. That's why the Consumers Union,

which Americans trust for information on major purchases, calls our health care system a "consumer crisis" and endorses our efforts to reform the system.

Once the bill's provisions take effect, no insurance company can deny or drop your coverage. Every insurance company would have to provide a minimum set of benefits, including prescription drugs, hospital care, and mental health. This reform will give Americans the reliability and security they deserve.

□ 1330

#### HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, Politico reported last week that the Democrat health care reform legislation has more pages than War and Peace, and nearly five times as many words as the Torah, costing over \$2 million per word.

The Republican Conference reports that over 100 new Federal bureaucracies are created in the bill. The Wall Street Journal Opinion Page stated that "the bill may be the worst piece of post-New Deal legislation ever introduced."

America deserves better, and the American people demand more from their leaders on something that is so important to every American family. There is a better way to maintain care for those with health insurance, while decreasing the number of uninsured Americans.

We should start with some common-sense reform, such as prohibiting insurers from excluding preexisting conditions, allowing insurers to offer plans across State lines, enacting tort reform, and allowing small businesses to pool together to purchase health plans for their employees.

Mr. Speaker, it is not too late for us to work together to craft responsible legislation and decrease costs.

#### HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, we are in the final days here in the House debating health care reform that will lower costs for families and businesses and give people more choice. We are closer than ever to delivering what people have been clamoring for: access to lifesaving health care.

And last night we learned a little more about this mythical Republican alternative. We learned that the Republicans are going to potentially propose some collection of bullet points that deliver the status quo for people who have a preexisting condition, for people who are under the threat of losing their coverage if they get sick. And

for the millions of Americans who will not be able to afford health care insurance, this Republican plan says sorry, you are out of luck.

This Republican plan that exists somewhere out in the ether today might be good for a fantasy movie, but it is not offering anything for those of us that live in the real world. Because here in the real world, people get sick and live paycheck by paycheck and can't afford the current status quo.

Let's give people real reform, not fantasy reform that leaves people right where they started.

---

#### HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, during the August work period, I had the privilege of visiting many of the plants and factories in my district. At one plant, a worker approached me and said he didn't understand what we were doing here in Congress. He said he had to have a job that put a roof over his family and food on the table. He is worried about health care, but the first two took priority.

People back home get it. They ask very direct questions about health care. How are we going to pay for it? Will it cost more than I pay now? Will I have the same coverage and doctor? Will it cost more jobs? How much more in taxes will I pay?

The Congressional Budget Office scores Speaker PELOSI's bill at over \$1 trillion. New taxes on small businesses and individuals will run over \$729 billion.

Being close to the Canadian border, I have been approached by Canadian doctors who are now practicing in Ohio. They can't understand why the Democrats are taking this course. They tell me this same thing: Why do you think we came to the United States?

---

#### HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. WU. Mr. Speaker, reforming health care insurance is the focus of this Congress this fall. And what does health insurance reform mean for middle-income Americans? It means an insurance company can no longer decide to deny you coverage or jack up your rates because of a preexisting condition. It means it will be against the law for insurance companies to drop your coverage when you get sick. It means that insurance companies will no longer be able to place an arbitrary cap on the amount of coverage you have in a given year or in a lifetime. It means there will be a yearly limit on how much you can be charged for out-of-pocket expenses because no one should go broke if they get sick.

What this means for middle-income Americans is they will no longer be ground between the roulette wheel of

health or sickness and the machinations of the insurance industry. What health insurance means is that millions of Americans who are insured today will have more security and stability.

---

#### HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, the Pelosi health care bill hits States when they are hurting the most by mandating a \$34 billion expansion of Medicaid. I served in State government and have helped write budgets, and I know firsthand this expansion creates a serious problem for Kentucky's already stretched resources and will leave fewer dollars available for our schools and universities.

Last week, Dr. James Ramsey, president of the University of Louisville and a renowned professor of public finance, predicted the next budget period in Kentucky will be "a bloodbath" and said a high price will be paid for inadequate funding of all State programs.

Phil Bredeesen, the Democratic Governor of Tennessee and a health care expert, said he is most concerned with the financial impact on the States, and he said "this is the mother of all unfunded mandates."

There are many reforms that will make health care more affordable and accessible without giving huge debts to our children. Forcing State governments to look to our schools and universities for the money to meet this mandate is not acceptable. Our children deserve better.

---

#### HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support the revised Affordable American Health Care Act. We need comprehensive health care reform for people like Mary in my district.

When her husband retired from his job, they both lost their health insurance. They had COBRA for 18 months, but it ran out. Mary had to look for alternative coverage. Unfortunately, she has a preexisting condition. Mary, Mr. Speaker, has rheumatoid arthritis. She suffers and has had countless rejections from one insurance company to another and it has been very difficult for her.

Under the revised Affordable Health Care for America Act, Mary and other Americans would not suffer from preexisting conditions. Finally, as early as next year, they would receive fair health care that they deserve.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3962.

#### HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3962 is almost 2,000 pages long. In a bill that long, you expect lots of things to be opposed to, and I am. Here is a short, partial list of some of the things I am against.

I am against 5.5 million people losing their jobs. I am against 114 million people losing their private health insurance as a result of this legislation. I am against a new entitlement that creates \$1 trillion in new spending that we can't afford. I am against stripping \$500 billion out of Medicare funding that would otherwise go to Medicare. I am against \$729.5 billion in new taxes over the next 10 years on Americans.

Mr. Speaker, there is one thing I am for, and that is for starting over. Scrap this monstrosity. Let's start over with real health care reform, not this health care takeover.

---

#### HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, even though insurance companies make money not providing health care, the so-called reform bill gives so much power and money to the insurance companies that we are giving far too much for the few benefits which the bill may confer.

The insurance companies get at least another 26 million new customers. They will receive at least another \$50 billion in new revenue. They will be able to raise premiums 25 percent even though in each of the last four consecutive years the industry raised premiums by double digits.

As long as there are for-profit insurance companies, there will be no effective way to protect consumers against ever-escalating premiums, copays, and deductibles unless the insurance companies know that people at the State level will always have a choice to reject the insurance companies and establish a single payer, not-for-profit system.

That is why the Kucinich amendment should be put back in the health bill, not just to protect the rights of States to pursue single payer, but to protect the rights of consumers to be free of the economic death grip of the insurance companies.

---

#### MEDICARE ADVANTAGE CUTS

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, President Obama promised Americans that under his health care reform bill they would be able to keep the coverage they currently have. Unfortunately, the Pelosi

health care bill we will consider later this week effectively eliminates the popular Medicare Advantage health plans that millions of seniors rely on for medical, vision, and dental care.

In my district, nearly 30,000 seniors are enrolled in one of these plans. The average enrollee saves \$800, they have a lower hospitalization rate, and they report greater satisfaction with their plan. The Congressional Budget Office maintains that these cuts could "lead many plans to limit the benefits they offer, raise their premiums, or withdraw from the program."

There are a total of \$500 billion in cuts to various Medicare programs. I don't think seniors would call reducing their benefits health care reform. I don't think seniors would call cutting home health care, cutting hospice care, cutting nursing home care health care reform. We don't need to destroy Medicare Advantage to reform health care.

This week, Republicans will offer a simpler, better proposal which offers real health care reform without taking benefits away from our Nation's seniors.

#### HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, Prime Minister Angela Merkel was in this Hall just a few hours ago. She represents a country where they have had health care security for 126 years. Americans have been waiting for 100 years; and when the Republicans took over the last time, they knocked out Mrs. Clinton's plan and they bragged about it. And for 12 years, they made not one single proposal that they would bring to the floor for a vote. They want the status quo. They like what is going on. And if folks back home like what is going on, stick with them, because they are never going to change anything.

What they say about this is, Not so fast. One hundred years is too fast? Well, they say, But we have something we're just about to bring out here on Thursday. Not so fast, right. Wait until the last minute after all of the debate, and then say, Not so fast. The American people want it done now.

#### WHO WROTE THIS BILL?

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

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, we should pay special attention to the sections drafted under the supervision of the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee.

Chairman CHARLIE RANGEL supervised the drafting of 70 pages of this bill, pages 296 through 366. This is the same Congressman under investigation by the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct on five separate counts: using official resources to raise money;

problems with apartment leases; undisclosed ownership in Dominican Republic Yacht Club; compliance with the storage rules of the House; and problems with his financial disclosure and income tax.

This bill raises your taxes, but ethics is investigating whether RANGEL paid his. Leaders may respond with two spins: Chairman RANGEL had nothing to do with writing this bill, or, he has no ethics problems.

A 2,000-page bill and a coming manager's amendment that will be a chamber of horrors of special deals, supervised by a Congressman under five separate ethics investigations, that is what we will vote on this week.

#### HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Mr. PIERLUISI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Affordable Health Care for America Act. This bill lives up to its name. Most importantly from my perspective, this bill does justice to the 4.4 million American citizens living in Puerto Rico and the other U.S. territories. Too often in the past, the territories have been treated as an afterthought in important legislation. Thanks to the efforts of leadership, that is not the case with this bill.

While the legislation is not perfect, it constitutes a giant step forward. The bill addresses the unprincipled funding disparities that the territories have always faced under Medicaid. It also provides funding to enable Americans of modest means residing in the territories to purchase subsidized coverage through the health insurance exchange. It makes my constituents eligible for the worthy consumer protections established in the bill.

I hope the Senate will follow the House's lead, and I will continue to work with our allies in that Chamber to ensure that their bill treats American citizens in the territories in a fair and just manner.

#### HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, if you get dressed in the dark, you are probably going to make some poor clothing choices that will open you to ridicule. Well, the same rule applies when you write bills in the dark.

President Obama said last year that the health care reform negotiations would air on C-SPAN. That way, he said, Americans could see who was fighting for them and who is siding with the special interests.

Based on the President's very own formula, we must assume that the Democrat-only, closed-door dealmaking on health care must have put the special interests at the fore-

front. It appears certain that one of those special interests at the table behind the closed doors was the trial attorneys. Maybe that is why the negotiations were secret. They can claim attorney-client confidentiality.

But those trial attorneys must have charged by the hour, because the Democrats gave them quite the payoff in this legislation. This bill will override States' malpractice reform laws and it will prevent States from capping attorneys' fees or damage rewards.

Isn't it ironic that it was President Obama who warned us that this would happen.

□ 1345

#### REPUBLICAN PARTY IS ON THE WRONG SIDE

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

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the Republicans controlled this Chamber from 1993 until 2006, they controlled the Presidency until 2008; and now, 11 months into a national health care debate, they are just figuring out that we have a health care crisis in this country. How long will it take them to shake the grip of the insurance industry before they even come up with a realistic plan?

Let's look at what our friends on the other side of the aisle are going to vote against. They're going to vote against us increasing the age to 27 where kids can stay on their parents' insurance. They're going to vote against citizens of the United States not being denied health care coverage because of a pre-existing condition. They're going to vote against us saying that no one in America will ever go bankrupt again because of a health care catastrophe in their family. That's what they are going to vote against.

It's very simple: once again the Republican Party is going to be on the wrong side of the vote, on the wrong side of health care reform, and on the wrong side of history.

#### HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3962 states in section 1 that the legislation builds on what's broken in today's health care system and repairs at the same time. I agree that improvements need to be made in the existing health care system, but placing individuals under one umbrella doesn't build on what's working or repair what's not.

The bill includes a government-run public option that cuts Medicare and Medicare Advantage programs and raises taxes on middle class families. In addition, the bill does not protect the interests of small business, nor

does it adequately address defensive medicine. And in the midst of States struggling with financial constraints, it will burden them with more unfunded mandates from the Federal Government.

This latest proposal may be a different name, but even with a new name, the legislation remains a government takeover of health care.

#### FIRST-TIME HOMEBUYERS TAX CREDIT

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

Mrs. DAHLKEMPER. Mr. Speaker, last week, we received news of our first GDP growth we've had in a year. Our GDP increased by 3.5 percent last quarter, which was better than expected. This is welcome news and shows that our economy is finally moving in the right direction.

We still have a long road ahead to reach economic recovery. We must continue to help our families and communities find immediate relief. That's why I support an extension of the First-Time Homebuyers Tax Credit. This \$8,000 tax credit has helped produce more than 130 sales in Erie County in my district alone, and many more throughout western Pennsylvania.

I hope to see this tax credit extended so we can continue to give a boost to the housing market and help more Americans reach the dream of homeownership.

#### HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my concern about the consequences and costs of the majority party's proposed government takeover of health care.

Despite the lack of bipartisanship and the absence of the transparency promised by Speaker PELOSI, the House is poised to vote this week on a bill that will give control of one-sixth of our economy to the Federal Government. Sadly, the \$1.3 trillion price tag is not the only cost of this risky proposal. The bill also saddles Americans with 111 new boards, offices, commissions and programs, all of which will be required to implement Speaker PELOSI's takeover.

Further, this bill imposes hundreds of billions of dollars in new taxes on small businesses, individuals who cannot afford health coverage, and employers who cannot afford to provide coverage that meets Federal bureaucrats' standards.

Mr. Speaker, these costs are far too much to ask the American people to bear. It is time to press the reset button and come together to create a

health care proposal that meets the needs of every American and saves our economy from additional burdens we cannot afford.

#### WE ARE GOING IN THE WRONG DIRECTION

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

Mr. TERRY. It is about the spending. People back home are asking me, How much is enough for you? Another \$1.2 trillion bill in this national takeover of our health care. I think this is the third \$1 trillion bill of this year at a time when we have almost a \$2 trillion deficit this year.

Now, we can't raise enough tax dollars, we can't cut Medicare enough from our seniors to cover this cost. Everyone but the best Kool-Aid drinkers around know this bill is going to add to our national debt. Soon—and maybe by next year at the rate that this Congress is spending—our national debt will equal the size of our GDP, which is what the economists say is the tipping point that is going to drag our economy down. What does this mean? It means that my children and your children are going to pay this off with fewer opportunities than we have today.

We are going in the wrong direction for the dream for our children in America.

#### HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, we've heard lots of stories today, and it has touched our hearts. We know there are people out there suffering because we've got some major problems with our health care system. We know that there are uninsured people because the costs are just too high, they're priced out of the market, or they've got a pre-existing condition. We know that, for example, there is not interstate competition that goes on that boosts up the cost, along with the fact that we have excessive litigation in our society.

We could have fixed these issues so that everybody could be covered. The Republicans were willing to do it, but we were frozen out of this whole system because the Democrats didn't want to reform the system; they wanted to transform our current health care system into a government-run, bureaucratic Federal program.

And they are doing that at the expense of seniors, where \$400 billion is being taken out of their Medicare funds at the expense of small business and, yes, at the expense of all those people who are currently insured who will be thrown into this government-run system which will be inferior to the ones they have now in the private sector.

This is a travesty. We should have worked together on this, but the Democrats wouldn't do it.

#### HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my serious concerns about the health care bill that's being rushed to the floor. This 2,000-plus-page bill has hundreds of new pages that no one yet has had a chance to read, much less understand.

There are over 110 new Federal programs and bureaucracies, each with its own new costly mandates. This bill taxes you if you have health insurance, it taxes you if you cannot afford to have health insurance, and it taxes you if you are a small business and you cannot afford to give health insurance to all of your employees. It has over \$730 billion in new job-killing taxes.

What Americans need today more than anything else is new jobs, but this bill will result in the loss of another 5.5 million jobs. Congress can't even figure out how to make its own workweek, much less change the whole health care system. Let's use a little common sense around here for a change.

#### HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. OLVER. We often hear that America has the best health care system in the world; but the cold, hard facts don't agree. Between 1997 and 2002, when researchers compared preventable deaths from diabetes, cancer and heart disease, among others, in 19 industrialized countries, the United States placed last, dead last. 75,000 lives could have been saved had the United States achieved just the average preventable death rate of its counterparts. Since 2002, another 75,000 deaths could have been prevented.

The Affordable Health Care for America Act will reduce preventable deaths. H.R. 3962 completely bans preexisting condition exclusions by 2013 and ends copays and deductibles for preventive care under Medicare and Medicaid. And H.R. 3962 will train many more primary care providers and pay them better for their service.

Our current health care system is failing us. We need health reform now.

#### HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, everyone in America understands the need for health care reform, and so do I. Unfortunately, the new \$1.2 trillion, 2,000-

page bill, H.R. 3962, still cuts Medicare by one-half trillion dollars to our seniors and creates a new entitlement program.

The bill provides disincentives to States and punishes them if they impose caps on noneconomic damages or limits contingency fees to trial lawyers in medical liability cases. This takes us backwards, not forwards.

There is a job-crushing employer mandate and tax increases on small businesses in the form of surtaxes on income. This is a job killer, make no mistake.

There is a medical device tax that punishes innovation and imperils manufacturing jobs at companies like B. Braun and Olympus in my congressional district. In fact, many of them refer to this tax as the death tax. When is enough enough?

#### LET US GO FORWARD; LET US NOT GO BACKWARD

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

Mr. McCOTTER. Mr. Speaker, we do not live on a government-run globe; we live in a people-powered world. The massive, radical change that is presented by the health care bill brought forward by this majority constitutes the policies of the past.

Within the communications revolution in the globalized marketplace, one thing is certain: human beings, at a greater extent than at any other time in history, are now able to control more of their lives and their own decisions. True health care reform must not resist these times; they must meld with these times. We need patient-centered wellness through transparency, technology, and a humane and compassionate understanding and help for our fellow citizens. This bill will not do it.

Fundamentally, this bill will bury the American people beneath Big Government at the very time they have a greater chance of empowering themselves and making their own decisions. Let us go forward; let us not go backward.

#### REPUBLICANS HAVE A BILL

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, we heard a good friend across the aisle just a little bit ago say, Hey, where is the Republican bill? You don't have one scored by CBO? Well, I'm sure he didn't know, but some of us have bills, we have many bills. I've been trying for 2½ months to get a score from CBO, but I've been shut out. I haven't been able to get a score. And it is a bill that will give coverage to everyone; it will make sure seniors have complete coverage like they've never had before; it would be a savings for people.

But the Democrats have a bill. They cut a deal with pharmaceuticals, forc-

ing people with HSA to buy prescriptions instead of over the counter, cut a deal with some insurance companies so they will have liability limitations, cut a deal where States will be bribed to eliminate caps on attorneys' fees and caps on damages, cut a deal with unions. It appears that there's not adequate requirements for identification, then it's a deal for illegals, and also for abortion.

This is not the bill we should be supporting. Let's get a new bill. We've got it.

#### HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, they say the definition of insanity is trying the same thing over and over again and expecting a different result, which perfectly describes the House Democrats' health care reform bill.

For months now, I have been trying to explain in every forum possible how this bill is taking the worst parts of the universal health programs in Tennessee and Massachusetts and combining them into one monstrosity of a program. Unfortunately, passing theory that sounds good but has failed is more important to our Democratic colleagues than actually getting reforms that work.

This is why it matters: the reforms being proposed will decrease access, decrease quality and increase cost of care for the vast majority of Americans. I can say this unequivocally as a physician and as a Tennessee resident who has experienced TennCare firsthand. Small businesses that are dealing with the worst recession in years will have to lay off workers and cut back on wages to deal with these new mandates. Individuals who are scrimping and saving to get by will see their taxes and costs increase.

Some good will come of this bill, but the bad results that we know from experience will happen should be reason enough to scrap this bill and try to agree on a bipartisan bill that will work.

□ 1400

#### HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, one of the most troubling realities of the Nancy Pelosi health care bill is a new tax on medical devices. The so-called wheelchair tax imposes a new 2.5 percent tax increase at the very time American families don't need and don't want a tax increase.

Yes, the Pelosi bill includes a new 2.5 percent excise tax on the sale of medical devices in the United States. It will cover everything from bandages to

prosthetics, from glucose monitors to crutches, from hearing aids to pacemakers, and even thermometers to syringes.

Weren't we told that there wouldn't be even one dime—not one dime—of a tax increase for those earning less than \$250,000 a year?

This bill adds a tax increase that will hit each and every American. It will affect jobs in this country, and it will affect your ability to buy the very things that you need for your children, for your parents, for your own families.

Think about all of the medical devices that you use within your family.

#### H.R. 3962—THE AFFORDABLE HEALTH CARE FOR AMERICA ACT

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose Speaker PELOSI's government takeover of health care.

This bill, which weighs in at nearly 2,000 pages and at more than 20 pounds, will raise taxes on individuals and small businesses, cut health care for seniors, raise health care premiums, ration care, and give Federal bureaucrats more power over decisions that should be made by our constituents and by their doctors. The bill raises taxes by \$730 billion, and it costs nearly \$1.3 trillion. We literally cannot afford this government takeover of health care. There is a better way.

We should, instead, be lowering health care costs by enacting medical liability reform, strengthening association health plans, allowing the purchase of health insurance across State lines, and eliminating waste, fraud, and abuse in Federal health care programs.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose Speaker PELOSI's health care bill.

#### HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, as we continue to discuss the health care bill, this monstrous health care bill, one thing is clear: American families simply cannot afford this attempt at a government takeover of health care.

The proposed plan is the wrong prescription for our country. This monstrous piece of legislation is a prescription for tax increases and for job loss, but most importantly and unfortunately, with the government's dictating health care terms and choices, we're going to see a lower standard of care for our families.

By forcing this mammoth overhaul on hardworking Americans, this majority is hoping to create a health care system that increases taxes on small businesses, that reduces benefits for

seniors, and that piles insurmountable debt upon our children.

Republicans have offered a more responsible, incremental approach to improve our health care system in a way that controls costs and that provides the quality of care that Americans deserve.

Despite months of town hall meetings at which millions of Americans voiced their opposition to a government takeover of health care, the majority still doesn't get it. The American people deserve more. They want more.

#### HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, as we enter now an historic moment in our country's progress towards creating a fair, a more just, and a better economy for ourselves and for our children, I want to offer for the record a quote—a fee quote—from a business in my district with 60 employees which underlines why we need to move forward. This is one of the good guys. He employs 60 people with good wages and benefits, and for 2010, he has been told that his health insurance premiums are going up 32 percent.

We have heard for months now about how we're moving too fast and about how we've got to take our time, but the fact of the matter is that it is time to act so we can have an economy that can address creating new jobs without taking on enormous new benefit costs, which is the reality today, particularly for small businesses and for the self-employed.

If you care about growing this economy, if you care about giving the risk-takers of America the opportunity to go out and to pursue their dreams, we have got to create a stable marketplace, which H.R. 3692 will do with a national health insurance purchasing exchange.

#### HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, the Pelosi health care plan raises premiums, raises taxes, cuts Medicare, and costs over \$1 trillion. If you need more reasons to be concerned about it, there are 1,990 pages that will give you all kinds of excuses.

The good news is they're about 20 votes short. The bad news is it's time to make a deal in Washington. So, if you're a swing Democrat and if you need a road or a bridge or a new building or a Federal earmark in your district, walk down the hall, see the Speaker, put your vote on the bargaining block, and you, too, can be won over in terms of government-sponsored health care.

This is no way to run a republic. There are alternatives—targeted, market-oriented reforms that will not raise taxes and that will not cut Medicare.

#### SELF-DEFENSE IS NOT A CRIME AGAINST HUMANITY

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of House Resolution 867, which opposes the enforcement and further consideration of the Goldstone Report.

I have been to Gaza. I have seen the desolation and poverty in which the people of Gaza survive. I have also been to Israel. I have seen Sderot, which is where civilians have been hammered relentlessly by rockets from Gaza. I have seen the fortified recreation center there, complete with bomb shelters—the only place children feel safe to play.

This decades-old battle is complex, and it deserves to be examined, but what we cannot do is turn the victims into the perpetrators. We cannot forget history. For 8 years, Hamas has continuously fired thousands of rockets at innocent Israeli civilians. Israel finally struck back, defending itself against an opportunistic enemy.

I am grateful to Chairman BERMAN for his leadership on this issue.

Note: Self-defense is not a crime against humanity, and we must not let a deeply flawed report destroy progress made in the peace process.

#### H.R. 2607—THE SMALL BUSINESS HEALTH FAIRNESS BILL

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this week, the House is going to vote on the Democrats' latest plan for Pelosi's government-run health insurance. The bill is 2,000 pages long, weighs 20 pounds, and costs more than \$1 trillion. With over 400,000 words in it, that comes out to \$2.5 million a word. The bill creates 111 new bureaucracies which will decide what kind of government-approved health care is best for your family and you.

Speaker PELOSI wants America to believe this is the only way to reform health care, but I know there is a better solution. That's why I introduced the Small Business Health Fairness bill. My bill, H.R. 2607, allows small businesses to band together to purchase health insurance so they can enjoy the same bargaining power that large corporations and labor unions have at the purchasing table.

We know that buying in bulk reduces the price tag, and health care is no different. Government-forced health care is not the way to solve the problem.

#### HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, in our efforts to reform our Nation's health care system, it seems like a lot of different solutions have arisen, and now we know what the insurance companies' solution is. It's the 32 percent solution.

You heard my colleague Mr. COURTNEY talk about one of his constituents. I'd like to read you a little bit of a letter from one of mine—a letter from Gregg Wagner, a Realtor in Louisville:

"Today, I received my annual premium increase. My new premium with Anthem Blue Cross/Blue Shield increased 32 percent. I have an individual policy with a \$2,500 deductible. It is interesting to note that Anthem did not spend one penny on me in the last year. Nothing. This has followed 15-25 percent increases in the last 8 years. This is one of the reasons that 30 percent of Realtors in the United States do not have health insurance."

Mr. Wagner, the Realtors are not alone. Millions of Americans face this unsustainable health insurance system where, if they can get coverage, it's pricing itself beyond their reach. We need change. We need competition and choice. That's what the Affordable Health Care for America Act does.

#### HEALTH CARE

(Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, if you were to write a reform of the health care system for America, you wouldn't have the Pelosi bill. If you were to write the health care bill for liberal San Francisco, you'd have the Pelosi bill.

Why?

It would cost too much. It would tax too much. It would be heavy on government. It would be wild on bureaucracy. It would contain 3,425 separate uses of the word "mandate." 3,425 times the government is going to tell you what to do. 3,425 times we're giving power to the Federal Government to get between you and your government.

In America, it makes no sense. It may make sense in liberal San Francisco, but in my district, it doesn't. For the rest of the United States, it doesn't. Let's save America from this fate. Let's save the American system.

#### HEALTH REFORM

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, as this House, this Congress, takes up the debate during this historic opportunity

to address and to fix our Nation's health care crisis by passing universal health care, I'd like to take a minute to talk about a family from Rhode Island.

Barbara, from Cranston, is a devoted mother of two remarkable boys, one of whom has hemophilia. A 3-month supply of his life-sustaining medication costs \$60,000, never mind the costs of doctor visits or of hospitalizations. She came to my office to advocate for her son, casting little attention to her own condition—multiple sclerosis. Despite her challenges, she knows she is one of the lucky ones because she has insurance coverage, but without health care reform, she is forever held hostage by insurance companies' annual and lifetime caps and by barriers on pre-existing conditions.

There are countless families like Barbara's who are struggling to afford to keep the coverage that they have or who are struggling to afford to get coverage in the first place.

It is time to pass health insurance reform. The bill before us is fundamentally going to change the system in America from health care's being a privilege for only those who can afford it to its being a right for everyone. We need to act now.

---

#### HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, as we debate this great debate, with regard to one thing, we're not keeping our eye on the ball. This is about people.

In 1965, I was in northern Europe, working for a group that was laying a pipeline across northern Europe. I got my nose broken and I got sent to the doctor. They had government-run, Pelosi-style health care. I stood in line for 2½ hours to reach the doctor. I went into a nurse's room and told her my name. She passed it through another window to a doctor. I walked in the doctor's office.

He said, What's wrong with you?

I said, I think my nose is broken.

He grabbed it and wiggled it. It started to bleed. He said, It's broken. Go through that door.

I walked through that door. They handed me a prescription, and I walked out. Everybody who stood in line for 2½ hours got the same style of health care.

Americans want relationships with their doctors—with their doctors. That's not the health care Americans want, but that's the Pelosi health care plan, and that's the future of health care in America if we go forward with this government-run, Pelosi-style health care. This is something Americans should stand up against.

□ 1415

#### HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, it's hard to reform health care. You have got to take on some of those powerful special interests in America. Perhaps that's why it's been 139 days since the Republican leadership announced they would have an alternative, but they don't have one yet.

Perhaps it's because at the heart of this is the insurance industry. Most people don't know, but the Republicans do know very well.

The health insurance industry is exempt from antitrust law. They do not have to play by the same rules as any other American business. They can and do collude to jack up rates. They can and do collude to divide markets and exclude competition.

They can do anything they want, and it's legal. They are outside the antitrust law of the United States of America. The Democratic bill will repeal this unfair antitrust exemption, bring real competition to this industry for the first time since the 1940s. The Republicans don't want to touch that with a 100-foot pole or maybe a \$10,000 contribution.

---

#### IMPACT ON PHYSICIAN-OWNED HOSPITALS

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

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3962, the Pelosi health care bill, would have a significant impact on the Texas economy and existing physician-owned hospitals and the quality of health care in my home State of Texas.

Texas leads the Nation with 50 physician-owned hospitals. But under this bill, these hospitals will be prohibited from adding beds or otherwise increasing capacity. Medicare payments to any new doctor-owned hospitals would be prohibited.

According to a January 2009 study by Health Economics' Study Group, physician-owned hospitals employ over 22,000 Texans and have a net economic impact of \$2.3 billion on the Texas economy. The Pelosi health care bill will have a significant impact on the economy and, more importantly, the quality of care that these hospitals provide our communities.

It's wrong to pay for government health care by punishing these providers.

---

#### HEALTH CARE

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, 90 percent of the children of America, at some point in their life-

time, certain populations of the children will be on food stamps.

I am very proud of Speaker PELOSI. This is not Pelosi health care; this is America's health care. This is the input of Americans from all around the Nation. Ninety-six percent of Americans will be covered by this health care, and no woman will be denied insurance because of a preexisting condition such as pregnancy.

What an outrage. I have been working on the physician-owned hospitals issue now for almost 4 years. We are engaged in providing opportunities for physician-owned hospitals to expand, to be able to provide services for general acute care services in this bill.

I know we are going to be victorious. I know that the hospitals need to be covered. I know that we are not going to lose jobs.

This is a bill that serves all of America. I am glad that my colleague had the opportunity to be in European-style health care. That is not what it is, but it is going to allow people in America to live, and not the 18,000 that die every year because they do not have health insurance.

Pass health reform now.

---

#### HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak about the majority's move to overhaul our health care system this week.

From what I can see, Mr. Speaker, the version of health care reform that this majority is bringing forward is a horrible, horrible step. The bill is something unseen before; it's a trillion-dollar attempt to overhaul the system we know with one that we don't.

Mr. Speaker, the Republicans will stand united against this bill. Mr. Speaker, we will do so because, one, the American people have spoken out, and they see that this is an extreme attempt to try to address what's really wrong with our system, and it doesn't match what the mainstream common-sense American wants.

Number two, Mr. Speaker, contrary to the suggestions on the other side, we do have a better way. We will be offering our Republican plan. That plan will reduce health care costs. It is well documented. The majority is unconcerned about reducing costs for the people who have insurance in this country.

---

#### HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, The Wall Street Journal ran an editorial on the Speaker's health care bill entitled "The Worst Bill Ever," an understatement, to say the least.

To quote The Wall Street Journal: "Mrs. Pelosi's handiwork ranks with

the Smoot-Hawley tariff and FDR's National Industrial Recovery Act as among the worst bills Congress has ever seriously contemplated." Let's make no mistake, the Democrats' government takeover of the health care industry is an attempt to finish what FDR and the Progressives could not, a cradle-to-grave omnipotent government. It will extend the recession just as surely as FDR's programs prolonged the Great Depression.

The middle class and small businesses will bear the brunt of government's takeover of 16 percent of our economy to the tune of almost \$730 billion in new taxes and an additional \$1.2 trillion in new spending. One thing is for sure, Mr. Speaker, America is getting sick, sick of this Congress' government-knows-best attitude.

#### HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. LEE of New York. Mr. Speaker, let's look at the numbers on the Democratic health care bill being rammed through Congress this week.

At almost 2,000 pages, this new bill creates 111 new offices, commissions, programs and bureaucracies. It creates more than 3,400 new duties for bureaucrats in Washington. It also will eliminate millions of jobs in the private sector and an unprecedented expansion of the Federal bureaucracy.

Instead of listening to what Americans want and working on meaningful reform, the Democratic leadership came up with a bill that will cost taxpayers more than \$1.2 trillion and do nothing to make health care more affordable in this country. This is on top of the \$9 trillion deficit we are expected to have over the next decade in this country.

Controlling costs should be our number one priority for this administration. Unfortunately, my colleagues from across the aisle continue to ignore meaningful, medical liability reform, which this year alone could save over \$11 billion. We should be listening to what the American public wants and is demanding: real tangible methods of reform.

#### HEALTH CARE

(Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, last week, the Speaker introduced her so-called health reform bill that will cost over \$1.2 trillion and will be paid for by massive taxes on small business and cuts to Medicare.

With unemployment at 10 percent and small businesses throughout the country struggling to survive, it is irresponsible to pass legislation that will place a higher tax burden on small businesses. President Obama has

pledged to let the Bush tax cuts expire. So small businesses can expect at least two tax hits in 2 years.

A radio journalist from back home asked me this morning if measures are being taken in Congress to alleviate unemployment. My reply was, no, unfortunately there is a kind of war on free enterprise going on in Washington right now. Until that war is ended, unemployment will not drop. We should be encouraging job growth and not destroying jobs with bills like this so-called health reform.

#### HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, the reviews are starting to come in on House Speaker NANCY PELOSI's health care reform proposal, and those reviews are pretty serious.

In my home State, the Richmond Times Dispatch calls the bill grotesque; but perhaps the best description that I have seen, the most accurate description I have seen, is in The Wall Street Journal, that wrote an editorial on Sunday calling this legislation the worst bill ever.

How could anyone conclude otherwise? This 1,990-page runaway train of more than 400,000 words, creating more than 53 new government agencies and programs, is not the change that the American people asked for. This bill is going to raise the cost of health care to the overwhelming majority of Americans. It's going to make our health care system more complicated than it already is, more costly than it already is.

There are simple reforms that we could adopt if we would pay attention to what the American people want.

#### DEMOCRATS' HEALTH CARE BILL

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

Mr. BROWN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of all South Carolinians who will be harmed by the Democrats' \$1.3 trillion proposed health care bill, H.R. 3962.

The majority's health care bill will increase the health care costs, use taxpayers' dollars to pay for abortions and create bigger government in the form of 111 new bureaucrats. Worse yet, in the First District of South Carolina, this bill would increase taxes for 8,700 small businesses, cut benefits for over 11,000 seniors and burden South Carolinian veterans with a debt that they will never be able to repay.

Republicans have focused on the concerns of the American people and have created a strong Republican alternative that advocates smaller government and increases health care coverage while decreasing costs. The

Democrats in Congress must listen to the people and work with us to create a health care plan that South Carolinians and all American families want and need.

#### HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. PLATTS. Mr. Speaker, in my district, I am often asked do I think health care reform will pass this session. My answer is always, I certainly hope so. The status quo should be unacceptable to everyone.

However, Speaker PELOSI's reform proposal is not the right reform. Our overriding principle should be first "do no harm." Unfortunately, in my humble opinion, Speaker PELOSI's proposal will do significant harm.

Just two examples: The Speaker's proposal seeks to cut funding from Medicare by over \$400 billion, making access to quality health care more difficult for our Nation's senior citizens. Second, it raises taxes on small businesses, making it more difficult for employers to cover their employees with health insurance.

There is a better way. The Republican alternative is about lowering the cost of health care for all Americans, about ensuring the portability of health insurance, and ending the denial of health insurance due to preexisting conditions. Remember, first do no harm.

#### HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the Pelosi health care bill raises taxes, especially on small businesses. Small businesses will be hit with up to an 8 percent surcharge for those who cannot afford health insurance.

Mr. Speaker, the Pelosi health care bill cuts Medicare and reduces benefits to seniors. The 10 million seniors who now enjoy coverage under the Medicare Advantage program will lose that coverage.

Mr. Speaker, the Pelosi health care plan will add to the government's long-term deficit problems. It plants the seeds for a number of entitlement programs that will never in the long run be paid for but will add to the Nation's debt. Mr. Speaker, the Pelosi health care bill is 1,990 pages, a government takeover of the health care system.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the Pelosi health care plan. Let's mend our current health care system. Let's not end it.

#### HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, with the new health care bill that spends \$1 trillion and creates over 100 new bureaucracies and projects, I believe all the focus is in the wrong place.

The bill still raises taxes on small business, hitting many with a 5.4 percent surtax when they are struggling in a tough economy. The bill imposes a new tax on medical devices, which will increase costs for patients by adding costs on hearing aids, bandages, and wheelchairs. This will also result in lost jobs for medical technology companies that employ over 20,000 people in my State of Minnesota.

The bill will hurt seniors with \$500 billion of cuts to Medicare, including eliminating Medicare Advantage programs for over 19,000 seniors in my district. Mr. Speaker, we shouldn't ram through a 2,000-page bill on the backs of small businesses and seniors.

There is a better way. We should be working on commonsense reforms that will actually lower premiums for families, individuals, and small businesses.

#### GOLDSTONE REPORT

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

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. Speaker, I stand in strong support of House Resolution 687, which condemns the United Nations Human Rights Council-passed Resolution 9/L.1 and the fact-finding mission which led to the Goldstone Report. The lopsidedly anti-Israel Goldstone Report blatantly ignored so much of what came before Operation Cast Lead.

Palestinian troops, including Hamas, have been responsible for launching more than 10,000 rockets and mortars at Israeli cities. In November 2008 alone, over 120 rockets and mortars were fired at Israeli cities, injuring hundreds of people. Furthermore, Israel did all it could to avoid causing civilian casualties and Hamas did all it could to cause them. Goldstone's mission failed because this simple truth was never acknowledged, confirmed or written.

Israel is our fellow democracy, our true and tried ally. Supporting it is essential to the stability of the Middle East.

Any democracy that chooses to treat Israel as a suspect state to impose on Israel false accusations and daunting deadlines for a peace agreement should know that its actions ultimately do damage to the shared values that all democracies espouse.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Congress of the United States to stand against the Goldstone Report.

□ 1430

#### THE TALE OF TWO LAWS

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker: It came on two pages, It has withstood the ages; The word "shall," is only 10 times mentioned,

But enough to get one's attention. No taxes did this law raise, To this day it continues to create much praise;

Two great religions does it claim, The "Law of the Ten Commandments" is its name.

A current writing, 1,990 pages long, Has a socialist philosophy that is all wrong;

Difficult for the people to understand,

And troubling what big government doth demand.

Over 3,445 "shalls" it does loudly shout,

New massive taxes does it proudly tout;

Written in secret by the bureaucrats, For exclusive use of the taxacrats.

The Congressional bill called "Health Care Reform,"

Is illusionary, the authors are still ill-informed;

Government ought not take over America's health biz,

And that's just the way it is.

#### PROVIDING HEALTH CARE TO ALL AMERICANS

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

Mr. ENGEL. Well, as President Ronald Reagan used to say, there you go again. The same crowd that opposed Medicare and Medicaid in the 1960s, who told us that that would bring socialized medicine to the United States, are now opposing health care for all, saying once again it will bring socialized medicine and all kinds of ills.

We have 46 million or 47 million Americans that don't have health coverage, and that will grow to 50 million, 60 million, and 70 million, so people that have coverage now will lose their coverage if we do nothing.

So this Democratic majority is going to do something. We are going to pass a comprehensive health care bill that will ensure that virtually all Americans will have health care. We are going to pass a bill that will make sure that the insurance companies can't refuse to cover you because they say you have a preexisting condition. We are going to make it so the insurance companies don't continue to collude amongst themselves to keep health care premiums high. We are going to make it so that we have affordable health care for all for the American people.

The American people should reject the lies and scares and fear tactics. We are going to have health care for all, and it is going to be good for the American people.

#### DOING BETTER ON HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, a couple of minutes ago there was a Member on the Democratic side who I sensed had a twinkle in his eye when he was trying to make the assertion that there were no Republican alternatives to this bill, because anybody that has been around this place knows that that is a joke. There are 50 Republican bills and 100 amendments that were offered by Republicans, so the notion that the GOP is showing up late is complete nonsense, and I think the twinkle in the eye is witness to that.

But here is the part that is no joke. The part that is no joke is that this bill, Mr. Speaker, creates 111 new bureaucracies that Speaker PELOSI is going to foist on our constituents.

We all know what it is like to get the constituent panic call when they can't navigate through some labyrinthian bureaucracy, and now there is going to be 111 new offices, departments, commissions and so forth that our constituents are going to have to deal with. They are ill-equipped to deal with an aggressive Federal Government that is going to take over one-sixth of the economy.

We can do better. Let's vote against this bill.

#### A BETTER WAY TO REFORM HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, there are so many different reasons why the American people are opposing the "Pelosi Government Takeover of Your Health Care" bill: 111 different offices, bureaus, commissions, and programs to get between you and your doctor, preventing you from getting the health care you need when you need it; 3,425 uses of the word "shall," to ensure that bureaucrats take away your choices and drive up your health care costs; \$150 billion cut from the Medicare Advantage program, endangering seniors who rely upon the program.

But, Mr. Speaker, let me give you 1 trillion more reasons to oppose this plan: a minimum \$1 trillion cost, on a country that is already going bankrupt. We have had our first \$1 trillion deficit. Under President Obama, we will triple—triple—the national debt in just the next 10 years.

Mr. Speaker, you cannot improve a nation's health care by bankrupting it, its families, and its children. This must be rejected.

#### PROVIDING HEALTH CARE THAT AMERICANS DESERVE

(Mr. McHENRY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, the American people continue to reject the notion that when it comes to health care, government knows best. Except this Congress and this Speaker of the House reject that. They say government can do whatever it darn well pleases. So we are presented with a 1,990-page bill that redefines health care and one-sixth of our economy.

Hundreds of millions of Americans will be forced out of their current plans. Medicare cuts will mean fewer benefits to seniors. Bureaucrats will restrict health care services. Taxpayers will fund abortion. Illegal immigrants will receive taxpayer-funded benefits. Federal and State taxes will go up as a result, and furthermore, the cost to health care will continue to rise.

There is a better way, a different plan than the Pelosi health care bill. That is what I will support. It will control the cost of health care by capping medical malpractice lawsuits and help individuals get the type of health care that they truly deserve.

#### IN SUPPORT OF THE AFFORDABLE HEALTH CARE FOR AMERICA ACT

(Ms. TSONGAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Affordable Health Care for America Act. This bill represents tireless negotiation, compromise, and input from Americans all across the country. We have been trying to reform our health care system since Harry Truman's Presidency, so this bill by no means represents brand new ideas; rather, it has been a work in progress for decades.

Attempts to reform our health care system in the past have failed because of false claims that this is socialized medicine. And, of course, these are the same arguments that the bill's opponents are making today. But it won't work this time because the American people are tired of unaffordable premiums, of unfairly losing coverage, and the fine print that prevents them from getting the care they need. It gives the power back to the patient by creating a more transparent, more competitive health insurance market.

In a country as wealthy as ours, no one should have to face losing their life or seriously compromising their health because they cannot access, cannot afford, or have been denied health care coverage.

#### REFORMING HEALTH CARE IN AN UNDERSTANDABLE WAY

(Mrs. EMERSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, before we debate the 1,990-page health care bill that my colleagues and I are all trying to read this week, let me share

with you how this bill defines a check-up, known in this legislation as a "primary care service." I will quote from page 1,056.

"The term 'primary care services' means evaluation and management services, without regard to the specialty of the physician furnishing the services, that are procedure codes (for services covered under title XVIII) for services in the category designated Evaluation and Management in the Health Care Common Procedure Coding System (established by the Secretary under section 1848(c)(5) as of December 31, 2009, and as subsequently modified by the Secretary)."

Now, that is a checkup. And all that section of the bill really says is we are going to define it in the future.

If I have time, Mr. Speaker, I try to read every bill, and as this legislation goes, it is pretty darn complicated. But what we need to accomplish is very simple: We need to lower the costs of health care in order to improve access to the system. It doesn't take 1,990 pages. We could do it in 19 pages. And we ought to do it in terms that the American public can understand.

#### DEMAND FEDERAL FUNDING FOR ABORTION BE BANNED IN ANY HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the administration and congressional Democrats are currently wheeling and dealing behind closed doors attempting a government takeover of our Nation's health care system. Additionally, the Democrat scheme provides a back door to allow for the government funding of abortion.

Since 1976, Federal funds have been barred from being used for abortions, and Democrats are refusing to continue this policy. Some of my colleagues will tell you their plan doesn't fund abortion, yet, on page 171, section 303 states that at least one plan participating through the new government-run exchange must cover abortion services. In addition, the bill contains explicit language saying "nothing in this act shall be construed as preventing" the public option from paying for all elective abortions.

The public option will be a Federal program using Federal funds. The American taxpayers will be forced to send part of their hard-earned dollars to Washington every year to end the life of an unborn child.

I call on my colleagues in this House to demand that Federal funding for abortion is banned in any and all forms of health care funding.

#### STRENGTHENING HEALTH CARE SYSTEM THE RIGHT WAY

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

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, isn't it ironic that as many Americans are celebrating the freedom to choose by casting votes across America on this election day, the House will begin consideration of a bill that threatens the freedom to choose their own health care plans.

The Pelosi bill will allow government takeover, raises taxes on hardworking Americans and small businesses, and get this, takes away half a trillion dollars worth of health care from our seniors. It includes a tax on wheelchairs, hearing aids, and pacemakers.

This is not the right solution to improve our health care system. What we need is real improvement, and that is let's lower the costs; real medical malpractice reform; lower the risk pools by allowing small businesses to band together; allow people to purchase insurance across State lines; allow States to create high-risk pools that lower the cost and provide coverage for uninsured and underinsured.

We must work together to get this done for the good of Americans across this country.

#### HEALTH CARE AND THE ECONOMY

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

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, when we come to real health reform, we need to take cost out, not add it, as this monstrosity of a bill does. There is consensus in the House for real reform that would reengineer the Center for Medicare Services to bring it into this century, provide real private market reform, and end junk lawsuits once and for all against our doctors.

But Speaker PELOSI permits none of this, squelching over 45 real health care reform bills that have been introduced. Instead, the Pelosi bill is based on a job-killing \$800 billion tax on small businesses that the Obama administration says will cost 5 million jobs, cuts senior benefits by half a trillion dollars doing so-called reform on the backs of seniors, and creates 111 new government agencies. That is not reform.

Let's stop this bill, go back to square one, and give the American people what they are demanding, which is the protection of their health freedom and real reform today.

#### TAKING AWAY FREEDOM TO CHOOSE YOUR HEALTH CARE PLAN

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, freedom to choose your own health care plan is what is at stake here. The drumbeat for entitlement, for government control of health care, for a health choice commissioner who will decide himself

essential benefits, for setting a precedent that will devolve into a rationing of medicine through politics, this is driven by an appetite for a government-run economy that is blind to the consequences.

One of those consequences is a \$1.3 trillion cost in this bill. Another is the job-killing mandates and the cuts to senior Medicare plans, including a gutting of Medicare Advantage that is in this bill. The cost of the tax increases on business. How high can we stack these taxes? We have one of the highest corporate tax rates in the world. We will see the consequence in higher unemployment.

Should health care be nationalized, medical rationing is inevitable, and we will see the adverse effects on economic growth and opportunity, unfortunately, that will be left.

#### ENACT STUPAK-PITTS AMENDMENT ON HEALTH CARE BILL

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, each year, Planned Parenthood kills more than 300,000 children by abortion, yet yesterday another Planned Parenthood director resigned over abortion. Abby Johnson, director of a clinic in College Station, Texas, said she had a change of heart while watching an ultrasound of an actual abortion in real-time.

Self-described as "extremely pro-choice" but now pro-life, she said she knew it was time to quit in September when she watched an unborn child "crumble" as the baby was vacuumed, dismembered, and destroyed.

Many, including and especially self-described extremely pro-choice Americans like Abby Johnson, are beginning to recognize the ultra-ugly truth about abortion—it kills babies and wounds their mothers. Thus, we must protect both victims of abortion by enacting the Stupak-Pitts amendment to the health care bill.

I appeal to the Democrat leadership, make the Stupak amendment in order, and, please, no phony compromises, because there is nothing benign or compassionate about abortion.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CUMMINGS). Members should heed the gavel.

□ 1445

#### QUALITY HEALTH CARE FOR AMERICANS

(Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of

quality, affordable health care for all Americans. And finally we are actually going to get it done for the American people.

For 139 days my friends on the other side of the aisle have promised health care reform, and now we think they have a bill but we haven't really seen it, and it's not real reform. So let's talk about what we're going to do for the American people and not just what is wrong and saying "no."

We're going to end discrimination for preexisting medical conditions. If you have experienced domestic violence or you've had an underlying condition, you will be able to get health care for yourself and your family. You won't be able to be dropped because you're sick. You won't have copays and deductibles for preventative care. This is what health care reform really means for the American people.

And it's going to be affordable. It will provide credits for folks if your income doesn't quite get up there or you work for a small employer and the employer can't quite afford health care.

We want to make sure that all the American people have the ability to achieve quality, affordable health care.

#### HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I have reviewed this bill, and it is a jobs killer.

Before I came to Congress, I was a small business person. I know what is to start small businesses and to run them, and I know how difficult it is to sustain those jobs.

This Congress, the Democrat majority, rather than trying to find ways to help the people who are struggling with unemployment right now and to help small businesses create jobs, is finding a way to hinder them by penalizing employers who can't afford to provide health insurance for their employees.

If we want to make sure they have access to health insurance, let's find ways to allow association health plans, to allow people to buy health insurance across State lines to get costs down, to pass tort reform, and do other meaningful things that make access more practicable.

But first and foremost, let's don't kill jobs in an economy that's already struggling with 10 percent unemployment. And that's what this bill does.

It's time for this Congress to get out of the way, to stop job-killing and start trying to help small businesses create new jobs.

#### HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, someone with a lot of time on his hands, or

more likely somebody with a pretty good search engine, found that the 2,000-page Pelosi health care bill uses the word "shall" more than 3,000 times. Now, that's an average of more than 1.5 times per page.

It seems about the only page where the word "shall" is not used is the page that states that Members of Congress "may" enroll in the government-run insurance option. No "shall" here, just "may." In other words, what's good for the country isn't necessarily good for Congress.

I'd encourage anyone who is watching or listening out there to call the Speaker and ask her why. If this government-run insurance option is so good, why aren't Members of Congress required to enroll in it as well?

#### HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we're the people's House. The other body is called the House of Lords, but we are here to represent the people who sent us here.

I quote a great speech from Governor John Connally of Texas when he was first elected Governor back in 1963. I served in the Texas Senate. I was in the crowd as he was speaking to a group of school board trustees, telling them to run their own schools, to make their own decisions, not the Nation, not the State, but they should make the decisions. They're there just like you're here.

He told a story about ancient mariners that were adrift, shipwrecked off the coast of South America. Unknown to them, their raft had drifted into the fresh waters of the mouth of the Amazon River. They prayed for help.

Ship ahoy, rang out their cry. There came a voice from the waters far, Drop your buckets where you are.

Don't vote to dim the lives of future generations, of future taxpayers. This bill is a generation killer; the victims are our grandchildren.

#### HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. Speaker, health reform is a moral and national imperative.

As a physician, my experience in treating uninsured patients at public hospitals teaches me that empowering patients is the best way to lower costs and improve patients' health. Patients are the best guardians of health care dollars. Real reform empowers patients to make wise decisions for their wallets and their health.

Unfortunately, this bill introduced last week empowers government, not patients. And this 2,000-page bill, and this is half of it, a trillion dollars, is concentrating power in Washington,

taking it away from States and citizens. For example, it creates 111 boards, bureaucracies, and commissions and has \$730 billion in taxes.

This government-centered plan won't work. In fact, the Congressional Budget Office says that it increases the cost to patients and taxpayers.

The patient-centered alternative offered by Republicans will save patients money, save taxpayers money, and expand access to quality care.

#### HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, later this week we will be voting on legislation that dramatically revamps our Nation's health care system. The 1,990-page, \$1.055 trillion Democratic health care proposal is a measure that raises individual and business taxes and reduces funding for Medicare.

The bill, if signed into law, will be harmful to New Jersey's taxpayers, senior citizens, and businesses. And as such, I will be voting against Speaker PELOSI's health care bill.

Instead, I will be supporting a fiscally responsible alternative that includes medical liability reform, small business insurance pooling, and letting families and businesses buy insurance across State lines, ideas that have strong bipartisan support but are absent from the Democratic plan.

The Republican alternative is the only health care reform measure that improves what is working in our health care system and fixes what is broken in a fiscally responsible manner without raising taxes or increasing our ever-growing debt and deficit.

#### HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, as we're up here discussing this, there are folks in the Democratic caucus trying to better understand the support that exists for this bill.

This bill is not Speaker PELOSI's bill, and it's not the Democrats' bill. Mr. Speaker, this is America's bill. We are the only industrialized Nation in the world that doesn't have a plan to take care of health care for its citizens. America is catching up to the 21st century to where other countries have been in the 20th.

In my community our emergency room at our public hospital is about to close because they're so far in debt because they have so many people that don't have insurance and can't afford to pay. They take them, but they can't afford to pay it with the property taxes that are ever-rising.

This bill will help keep emergency rooms and trauma centers open. It will say to people that have preexisting conditions in America, and that's peo-

ple give or take my age and older, 60 and up, in that area, and even younger people can get insurance, that there won't be a limit on the amount of monies that you had before. And it will say to the insurance companies they don't make the rules, the people make the rules. And we will have insurance that's affordable and available and save our country economically and save individuals as well.

#### HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, my friend from Tennessee has just described this as America's bill, not the Pelosi health care plan.

It is, in fact, Americans who are going to have to shoulder the burden if, God forbid, it becomes public law.

The American people, when they think about health care reform, are not thinking about taxpayer funding of abortion on demand. They're not thinking about a \$500 billion cut in Medicare. They're thinking about greater transparency. These are the kinds of concerns that rank-and-file Democrats have joined with Republicans in raising.

The American people want many of the things my friend from Tennessee has just advocated. They want us to deal with preexisting conditions. They want us to ensure that there's an opportunity for children, young people up to the age of 25, to continue to be on their parents' plan. They want people to buy insurance across State lines. They want us to bring about a step-by-step approach. That's exactly what the American people want. That's exactly what our alternative does. That's what this House should do.

#### HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, 85 percent of the American public are happy with the insurance they have; 80 percent of them know that it costs too much. But all of them understand that when you try to do what the Democrats are talking about doing and adding a trillion dollars of expense, they understand we can't afford it.

I have 30 grandchildren. I'm concerned about passing this cost on to my children and my grandchildren.

This is a bill that we start paying for now, that the taxes start paying for it now, and it doesn't even start covering people for 4 years.

What's the rush? Why don't we do something that's good? Why don't we have a Republican solution for improving and portability for American health care?

We support tort reform that curbs frivolous lawsuits. We support allowing

negotiating across State lines and group purchasing power, which will lower the cost of insurance. We support choice of coverage without the government forcing people into government-run health care.

I strongly oppose the Democrat big-spending health care bill.

#### HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, Washington is attempting to take over our health care system, roughly 16 percent of the economy.

In the shadow of an approximately \$12 trillion national debt, I am deeply concerned about the financial direction our country is taking. Our annual deficit set an all-time record this year of \$1.4 trillion, three times the previous record. Our future obligations are over \$50 trillion, and we have no plan to pay any of it back. This is unsustainable.

While people in my State of Colorado and all over the country are struggling, the Federal Government has the audacity to propose raising taxes by another \$730 billion for health care. Besides higher taxes, the health care plan is largely paid for, if you can call it that, by raiding Medicare, another entitlement program that is nearly insolvent.

If Congress were a publicly traded company, it would be looking at huge civil and criminal penalties for shoddy bookkeeping.

#### HEALTH CARE

(Ms. SUTTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, over the course of this last year, I've had many meetings with constituents and heard their views about health care reform. Among those with whom I met were Dash and Cathy Sokol of Lorain, Ohio. Dash is 56; his wife, 53. In February of 2007 Dash was diagnosed with prostate cancer. And as he fought that cancer, Cathy was diagnosed with breast cancer.

The Sokols have health insurance coverage through his job at the steel mill; but as both were receiving treatment, the costs nonetheless began to add up. Their out-of-pocket spending became overwhelming, and they're now using their pension funds to pay for the medical bills instead of having funds for retirement.

Cathy told me how guilty she feels about all of that and that their family has to pay out of this because their insurance coverage isn't adequate. And there are a lot of Americans who need better health care insurance.

When the Sokols came to my office, they brought stacks and stacks of invoices, explanations of benefits. They talked about how they're trying to pay their bills, and they are doing it, slowly but sure. But he worries and he lives

in fear that his job will go away at the mill and he won't be able to get coverage. That's why we need health care reform.

---

#### HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, health care reform should be focused on lowering the cost of health care and health insurance. Yet Democrats are pushing a bill that would increase costs by having the government take over our Nation's health care system.

Under the Democrat bill, seniors will be forced to pay more for fewer Medicare benefits. Families will pay more out of their pockets for health care, and it will be more expensive for small businesses to offer health benefits.

On top of these higher individual premiums and prices, the Democrat bill increases government spending by over \$1 trillion in the first decade.

We need to lower costs and give families and individuals more choices, not increase costs and restrict choices through a government takeover.

One of the clear ways to reduce costs is to end lawsuit abuse. Frivolous lawsuits drive up the cost of health care for everyone. Yet on this issue Democrats are on the side of lawsuits.

Mr. Speaker, legislation that increases spending over a trillion dollars while increasing the costs paid by seniors and families is legislation that I cannot support.

---

#### HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, Americans hate being told what to do. It's just part of our collective DNA. We like freedom. We like the ability to choose. We like the ability to make decisions on our own. And what most Americans find troubling about this bill is it's 2,000 pages of the government getting between them and their family and their doctor.

Mr. Speaker, you're probably familiar with the old line: for most Americans when they're traveling down the highway and they see the sign that says 55, for most Americans that's not the limit; that's the challenge. That's just the way we look at things. And here we have this bill that's now going to tell us how we as individuals and as families and small business owners are going to get our health care. That's what Americans find troubling. That's why they're opposed to that. And that's why we need real reform and not this 2,000-page takeover of health care in our country.

□ 1500

#### HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, millions of Americans are concerned with spending; and the spending contained in this bill and the more than 3,000 references to the word "shall" concerns Americans, especially as it relates to their tax dollars. This tax on medical devices, in my reading of the bill, looks like the sicker you are, the greater the tax you will pay. That is a huge concern to me.

When I look at the challenges that we face with needing to streamline government, with needing to first streamline Medicare and Medicaid and find this fraud that's out there first before we go about depending on the money that we find, we can make a lot of progress, rather than implementing 111 new agencies, commissions and bureaucracies in general. Mr. Speaker, we owe Americans better than this; and we can do better.

---

#### HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday a member of the Mennonite Amish community called my office very concerned that if this bill passes, they're going to be fined because of their religious conviction. The members of this community do not buy health care insurance, and they don't cost the taxpayer anything. This community takes care of all of their health care needs. There is a conscience clause on page 300 of the bill. I read that. It's not clear to me whether they'd be protected or not.

But one thing is very clear to me: that those who wrote this bill didn't communicate with this community. This is a big community. We know there are problems. We know there are issues. This is just one more reason to reject this bill, start over and get it right because clearly they didn't get it right here.

---

#### HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, the majority of my constituents believe the United States has the world's best delivery of health care services. I concur. These same constituents are not averse to reform, but they fear the Pelosi health care plan will leave the gate wide open for the introduction of an overwhelming governmental involvement. I believe that fear is well founded.

Our health care system, Mr. Speaker, may well need some adjusting, some fine-tuning. What it does not need is a major overhaul. The Pelosi plan is, indeed, a major overhaul and should be rejected.

---

#### HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. PUTNAM. Well, the verdict is in. The Speaker's health care bill accounts for nearly 2,000 pages and \$1.055 trillion. It raises \$730 billion in new taxes. Businesses who cannot afford to cover their employees and individuals who cannot afford insurance would face \$167 billion in new taxes, and \$500 billion in new taxes would be on the backs of mostly small businesses. The bill would slash Medicare and Medicaid services to home health care providers, to nursing homes, to hospitals, to doctors, and it would impose a \$5 billion unfunded mandate on our States in the form of a new Medicaid burden at a time when our States can ill-afford it. The State of Florida alone would have a price tag of \$5 billion.

This bill is bad for the consumer. It's bad for patients. It's bad for our health care professionals. It is an expensive, unfunded burden on our States, and it is a stripping of freedom that is uncalled for in this era.

---

#### HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, during such tough economic times, I find it incredible that the majority party insists on passing a health care bill that could destroy small businesses, the very backbone of our American economy. But that is exactly what this proposed legislation is going to do. It would institute a surtax of 5.4 percent on high-income earners, and over half of this tax is going to be paid by small businesses. The surtax would push the highest marginal tax rate to 45 percent of income, a rate we haven't seen since 1986. It requires small companies to provide a health plan that meets government standards. If a business can't afford it, the government will charge yet another tax of up to 8 percent.

It is destructive for American small businesses; it's dangerous for American taxpayers; and it's a disaster for the American people. And now we learn—no amendments to the bill. Shame on you, NANCY PELOSI. Americans deserve better.

---

#### HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, if I were talking to America, I would say, This is NANCY PELOSI's answer to health care. It's going to cost \$2.25 million per word, and we don't even have the manager's amendment yet, which is probably going to add another 600 or 700 pages to this. This is going to cut Medicare and Medicare Advantage by about, oh, \$460 or \$470 billion. Seniors are really going to feel it. It's going to end up rationing health care, maybe for everybody, but certainly for seniors. The taxes are going to go through the roof, and nobody's read this turkey. Nobody. They'll tell you they have. We've got a reading room right now; we're going to go through it. But even when we read this, we still don't have the manager's amendment.

We don't need this rush to judgment. We need to get it right. We need to take our time and get a real bill that's going to help the American people, not something that's going to cost an arm and a leg.

#### HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, we need the facts about this massive 2,000-page prescription for government-run health care. Financial experts at the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services and other independent analyses have found that the Democrat plan for government-run health care will not only fail to reduce skyrocketing health care costs, it will actually increase them. Now with a vote looming on one of the most important bills to come through this Chamber in our Nation's history, I'm urging Speaker PELOSI to allow time for a proper analysis on how her bill will affect us in the long term instead of keeping Congress and the American people in the dark on the impact of government-run health care.

#### HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, health care reform is important, but it shouldn't come at the expense of the public's number one concern: the gut-punch of joblessness. The massive plans now under consideration threaten to disrupt one-sixth of our economy through tax hikes and punishing regulations. This is all in the service of a health care bill that is a budgetary train wreck. This bill forces drastic changes on a deeply divided public. It promises radical government intrusion in every sector of health care. It will have the effect of breaking the President's promise that you can keep what you have. It will not bend the cost curve down. It will burden the States with

huge new mandates. It will send insurance premiums through the roof. It cuts Medicare, seriously threatening popular Medicare Advantage plans; it allows for government funding of abortion; and there is no real liability reform.

We need health care reform, but we can do better than this. We must do better than this.

#### TROOPS IN AFGHANISTAN

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

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I returned yesterday from a 4-day visit to Afghanistan to meet with the troops and our military leaders as part of a bipartisan congressional delegation. It's clear to me that our soldiers are performing at a high level in a challenging environment. Their dedication and spirit is strong as they work to prevent al Qaeda from regaining a foothold. It's also clear that we need to increase the number of troops there to help them succeed. I believe firmly that this is the best means of protecting the United States and our people from terrorist attacks. There is no question that the Taliban is a destabilizing force with ties to al Qaeda. The Taliban is a threat to the national security of America. We need to provide the resources to our troops to ensure that their counterinsurgency strategy is successful. The new troop level should be determined by whatever is needed to accomplish the mission. Congress should give strong consideration to our military leaders in answering this question.

Let me close by saying that I'm very proud of all the men and women serving in Afghanistan. They are highly skilled, motivated, and I am confident that with the additional troops, they can achieve their mission. They are genuine heroes.

#### HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. BAIRD. My colleagues, I have enjoyed the comments by my friends from the other side of the aisle. I just would rise today to point out one thing. The largest expansion of an entitlement program in the history of the United States of America since our creation happened under the watch of the Republican majority. It happened on a piece of legislation that we had less than 30 hours to read, there were no amendments allowed, and it increased the debt per decade by more than \$750 billion. The amount of Federal borrowing from foreign countries doubled under the watch of many of my colleagues here.

Now I am pleased that they're concerned about fiscal responsibility. Speaker PELOSI has pledged that the

bill will be available online, plus the manager's amendment, for 72 hours. We had less than 30 on the Medicare bill. We are at least trying to pay for this legislation. We will not, with this legislation, increase the debt \$750 billion, as did the Medicare prescription drug bill, passed by the former majority party.

Americans need health care reform. My friends on the other side of the aisle had 12 years to try to do something constructive, and they failed.

#### HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. AUSTRIA. Mr. Speaker, this week marks a defining moment for this Congress and our Nation, with an \$11.9 trillion national debt that continues to grow as government encroaches into every aspect of our lives. We're about to vote on a nearly 2,000-page bill. We've heard all the details of this bill. It will increase the health care premiums for millions of Americans who are happy with their current coverage. It will cost nearly \$1 trillion, placing even more debt on our children and grandchildren. It will force businesses, large and small, to provide health care for their employees or pay fines to the government. It would unbelievably cut \$170 billion from the Medicare Advantage Program to pay for this bill, putting nearly 10 million seniors enrolled in Medicare Advantage at risk of losing their health care coverage. In Ohio, there are nearly 500,000 seniors on Medicare Advantage and nearly 30,000 of them are in my district alone.

Mr. Speaker, we all agree that our health care system can and should be improved. Unfortunately, Members of Congress are not listening to the American people, that more government is not the answer.

#### HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, before the Federal Government got heavily into health care in the mid-sixties, medical care was cheap and affordable for almost everyone. Doctors even commonly made house calls. We took what was a very minor problem for very few people and turned it into a major problem for everyone.

The people want medical care that is less expensive and less bureaucratic. The bill that we will apparently vote on later this week is 1,990 pages of bureaucratic gobbledygook. It will make health care even more expensive and even more bureaucratic. As Senator JOE LIEBERMAN said on Face the Nation, this bill "will actually hurt the economic recovery and our long-term financial situation."

The pattern seems to be that the Federal Government makes a problem

so bad that the only solution people can see is for the government to take it all over. But a famous man once wrote that there is a simple solution to every human problem, one that is neat, plausible and wrong. This bill is the socialist approach, and all it will do over the long haul is make a bad situation even worse.

---

#### HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. REHBERG. Supporters of Speaker PELOSI's 2,000-page government takeover of health care are fast to cite opinion polls in their favor and dismiss anyone who objects if they have legitimate concerns. However, they are much slower to demonstrate the coverage of their convictions by holding public town hall meetings. Americans have a right to be heard, so I have hosted 17 town hall meetings in Montana since August. This weekend in Billings, more than 500 people came to voice their concerns. They weren't there at the request of the insurance industry. Out in rural America, people are speaking out against this bill. I heard them loud and clear at my listening sessions. It is time for the rest of Congress to listen, too. Our authority comes from the people, and we must not ignore them.

□ 1515

---

#### HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, there are people all across this country who are very worried that Congress is about to do something that will do great harm to the quality of their lives and will change America forever. They want us to do something to bring down the cost of health insurance. They want us to do something to make it easier for the uninsured and the hard to insure to get coverage. But, they want no part of a 1,990-page bill with 111 new Federal programs and offices, with new taxes, with Medicare cuts, all at a cost of more than \$1 trillion.

The Democratic majority may be able to twist enough arms to ram this monstrosity through the House, I don't know. But they are leaving the American people behind. This is no way to deal with an issue as important as health care. This bill must be stopped so real, commonsense reform can begin.

---

#### HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring the voices of my constituents in Virginia's First District to

the House floor. Here are the words of some of my constituents.

Elizabeth from Williamsburg said, "Please consider small business owners when evaluating the health care proposals. My business ends up with an 8 percent profit margin, so an 8 percent of payroll contribution penalty rate would be significant."

John from Newport News says, "Over the 20 years I managed health care plans for corporations, managing cost increases was paramount not only for my employer, but also for my employees. I know how hard I worked at managing health care expense and have zero confidence that the government can handle the job. The bottom line is that more government involvement in our health care system is not the answer."

Sandra from Seaford said, "I am not in favor of a government-run health care bill. I want to choose my own health insurance. I am opposed to passing a health care bill for the sake of passing a bill. I am opposed to a health care bill that will cost trillions of dollars over the next 10 years, and I am not in favor of being penalized because I do not take part in a government health care bill."

Mr. Speaker, they have said it better than I could.

---

#### HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, it is nice to see you in the Chair again, and I think you are getting the short straw in your caucus when we give these 1-minute speeches.

It is always nice, Mr. Speaker, when the veil lifts and you finally get to understand something. I have been puzzled since 2007 when the Democrats became the majority party in the House of Representatives, when gas prices went from \$2.22 to \$4.14 over the summer. I was puzzled why they passed such meaningful legislation as National Train Day and so forth and so on.

But two that caught my eye was the bill honoring cats and dogs and then the Monkey Safety Act. I thought they were chastened in this Congress, as we saw the unemployment rate go from this level to this level, and if I had a bigger chart, it could keep on going up.

But again, there is sort of a theme. While people are losing their jobs in America, they again passed the Monkey Safety Act and the Shark Conservation Act. I am thinking to myself, What's their fascination with animals? And it wasn't until I read Speaker PELOSI's government takeover of health care bill, if you go over to page 1,255, it makes veterinary students eligible for up to \$283 million in Federal scholarship and student loan forgiveness.

What's with the animals?

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair asks all Members to heed the gavel.

---

#### HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, we do need health reform in this country, but not this plan. We need a plan that uses common sense to fix what is broken and keep what is good. Eighty-five percent of Americans have health insurance, and 85 percent of those people are satisfied with what they have.

President Obama has said over and over that no one will lose their insurance if they are happy with it. And just a couple of weeks ago he said that seniors on Medicare Advantage will have to go on regular Medicare, and that means 38,000 seniors in my district will lose their current Medicare plan.

I have many small business owners who have come up to me and said they will be forced to abandon their current plans and go on the public option, not because they want to but because, if they don't, it will hurt their businesses.

Finally, on page 94, it will prohibit families and businesses from changing plans unless the plan has been approved by the health czar. That is not freedom. This is not the plan that America wants. Let's vote this bill down.

---

#### HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in South America there is a tenacious parasitic plant that attaches itself to trees. As it climbs to the top of the tree canopy seeking the light, the plant thrives. But eventually, in the end, it kills the tree.

That is what an unfunded mandate by the Federal Government does to States. Putting more people onto Medicaid arguably is a good thing that takes people off the roles of the uninsured. But the Pelosi health care bill will cost all of the States an added \$34 billion in new burdens.

My Pennsylvania colleagues and I warned our Governor back when we thought people at 133 percent of the poverty level would be eligible for Medicaid. That would have cost the State \$2.2 billion over 10 years. Now we are looking at those at 150 percent of poverty level. That will add 15 million to the Medicaid program nationwide.

Tennessee Democratic Governor Phil Bredesen called it "the mother of all unfunded mandates."

We may soon be saying our prayers for many of our States, when a program intended to help poor women,

children, and the disabled turns out to be the death knell for a number of State budgets.

---

#### HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, when the Democrats finally unveil their manager's amendment later this week, we will have 72 hours to look at it and decide whether we want to vote for it. But one thing we know for sure, it will cost at least \$1 trillion; more than we are spending today on health care, more than we are spending in the Federal budget. One trillion dollars over 10 years.

As I look around the gallery, Mr. Speaker, I see many folks about my age, but I also see some constituents who are young, just getting started. Do they want to spend an average of \$10,000 a person right now if this bill becomes law? I think not.

Republicans have a better idea. We will unveil our Republican leadership alternative later today or tomorrow. It will actually save money. And by the way, it will cover preexisting conditions. And by the way, it won't have all of the mandates. And by the way, it won't have the health choices administrator telling us what is good for us rather than our doctor telling us what is good for us.

Vote against the Democratic plan and vote for the Republican alternative.

---

#### HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, if there is one common denominator in Congress this year, it is the substitution of government for the individual. With the stimulus, the multiple bailouts, cap-and-tax, and now health care, instead of you making the decision, the government makes it for you.

We have seen time after time, when you substitute a government-run program for individual choice, the cost goes up and the quality goes down. When it comes to health care, there is nothing more important than quality and choice. Given the choice, I will always place my faith in the individual, not in the government, and this time is no different.

The American economy is the world's largest. It is three times larger than the Japanese, our closest competitor. It is larger than the economies of Japan, China, Germany, and Great Britain combined. We got there through innovation, choice, competition, and individual initiative and responsibility, not government control and management. Let's keep it that way.

#### HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, when I graduated from medical school at the Medical College of Georgia, I swore to do no harm. Mr. Speaker, the Pelosi health care insurance bill will destroy America. It will destroy the quality of care for everyone. It will destroy jobs. In fact, experts tell us 5.5 million people will lose their jobs. It will destroy private insurance. In fact, it is estimated 114 million people will be forced off their private insurance under a government policy.

Mr. Speaker, it is going to destroy our economy and cost over \$1 trillion. It will destroy our States' budgets, and it is going to destroy our own home budgets for everyone through higher taxes and through higher private insurance premiums. It will destroy our children's and grandchildren's future.

Mr. Speaker, we the people in America must demand that we destroy the Pelosi health care insurance bill.

---

#### HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, the amazing thing with this whole insurance health care reform debate is we could fix health care. We could do it in this country. It is not that complicated. We could make it so we could buy health care across State lines. We could make it competitive and bring down prices and make sure that everybody has access to health care. But the health care problems in this country that are fixable are like a leaky faucet in somebody's house. This Congress could fix that leaky faucet, but we're not going to do that. The Pelosi health care bill says, let's burn down the house. Let's just burn it down. Forget about fixing it. Let's tear it down and we will replace it with some monstrosity that will not resemble a house like what we had prior to it.

We don't need to burn down the house. We need to fix that leaky faucet. We could fix health care in this country. We could make health care affordable, accessible, and cheap. We don't need to burn down the house, which is what the Pelosi health care bill does.

The Republicans will have a much better alternative to this which is being unveiled today. That is what we need to vote for.

---

#### HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, "The reforms I am proposing will not apply to

those who are here illegally." These words were spoken by the President on September 9 right at this podium. He pointed out that he was proposing to insure 30 million, not the 47 million that we hear today.

Was the difference between the two the fact that the President committed not to provide benefits to illegals in this country?

The sad fact about the situation is that the proposal that PELOSI has given us is one that does not guarantee to the American people that those illegally in the country will get benefits in this country even though they are violating our law. Why has PELOSI abandoned the Systematic Alien Verification for Entitlements program, the SAVE Act, is because she wants to include that 17 million that are here illegally.

The commitment the President has made at this podium should be kept by this House, both sides of the aisle. So stand by the SAVE Act. It is a system that works. It is functional. It has been the standard. Why abandon it now?

---

#### HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, this may be the most important vote, the most important debate we will ever engage in as Members of Congress. We are at a turning point in this country. Under this liberal Congress, this liberal President, Congress has moved to take over so many aspects of American life, there is not much left.

The one piece they really want control over is our health care. From cradle to grave, the government will decide what procedures you get, how much the doctor will be paid, and when the doctor can do it. That puts the doctor in control of our health care system.

At a time of record debt and deficit, with a deficit over a trillion and a half dollars, with a national debt over \$12 trillion, The Wall Street Journal editorial—and if you don't read anything else, I would encourage people to read yesterday's Wall Street Journal editorial which points out in an analysis you can document, they have carefully researched PELOSI's health care bill which she unwrapped last Thursday, may well be the worst piece of post-New Deal legislation ever introduced. In a rational political world, this 1,900-page runaway train would have been derailed months ago.

---

#### HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. INGLIS. Mr. Speaker, lacking a collaborative process, we unfortunately must simply oppose the Pelosi health

care bill. This bill has within it a public option to which Members of Congress aren't subject. It has a comingling of taxpayer funds for abortion services, tax increases, benefit cuts, especially for Medicare Advantage. And, in leaving the \$245 billion doctor fix out of the bill and put in a separate bill, it really makes a mockery of what the President said here when he said not one dime will be added to the deficit.

The bill also has no appreciable attempt at medical malpractice reform and actually tries to avoid State limits imposed by State legislatures.

Mr. Speaker, this bill simply must be voted down, we start over and try to find a collaborative process, and come up with something that will work for America.

□ 1530

#### HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. A Supreme Court Justice once wrote; "The Constitution protects us from our own best intentions. It divides power precisely so that we may resist the temptation to concentrate power in one location as an expedient solution to the crisis of the day." Now, he wasn't talking specifically about the health care bill, but there has never been an effort to try and concentrate power as an expedient solution to the crisis of the day as the Pelosi health care bill.

We are not the only ones working on this issue; States are as well. Massachusetts has a system, it's pricey, but they seem to enjoy it, but it wouldn't meet the needs of Utah. Utah has a reformed system that's based on our demographics. It wouldn't fly in Boston. The problem is, if the Pelosi bill were to pass, all of these State efforts would be stopped.

There are things we can do to help the costs come down: Tort reform, allowing interstate competition and block grants to States for high-risk pooling. Those things would be good if indeed we were allowed to do them, but they're not part of the Pelosi bill. All this does is concentrate power in Washington and would, to paraphrase P.J. O'Rourke, have the same effect as giving alcohol and the keys to the car to a teenage boy.

#### HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, the first month I was practicing law, I had a client that came into my office and he gave me a single sheet of paper. It said, "Do everything we talked about. And remember, money is no object." I took that sheet and I went into the managing partner's office and I showed it

to him. And he smiled and he said, Randy, the reason money is no object is because he doesn't have any money; he spends his father's money. And then he looked in his drawer and he pulled out a sheet of paper and it said this: "I'm tired of his reckless spending. Be on notice, he is hereby cut off. Enough is enough."

Mr. Speaker, if you don't read anything else in this bill, please read the section between the lines that says this, Money is no object. And the reason it's no object is because they're not spending their money. They're spending our senior citizens' money, our jobs' money, and the money of our grandchildren. And I believe the American people are sending them a single message: We're going to cut off their reckless spending. Enough is enough.

#### HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, as the Nation awaits consideration of Speaker PELOSI's health care bill, all 1,900 pages of it, we now learn from the Congressional Budget Office that its price tag has now climbed to \$1.2 trillion. That's \$1.2 trillion over 10 years, not the smaller amount that the supporters claim it will cost.

Over 13,000 of my New Jersey constituents have weighed in with me on health care reform, about 90 percent of whom worry that a government takeover would jeopardize their own private health insurance, and planned cuts to Medicare Advantage in the Pelosi bill for seniors, Medicare cuts for payments to doctors and hospitals, and their anger and anxiety rises even more.

Mr. Speaker, more Washington mandates, more taxes, and less control over their lives, people back home have a right to be very worried and angry.

#### HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, Speaker PELOSI has more than 250 votes in the House of Representatives and she only needs 218 to pass legislation. The Democrats in the other body control 60 votes out of 100. The Democrats have the White House. They can pass legislation to take over the health care system in spite of what the American people are saying and in spite of what the American people are asking for.

Because, you see, the American people do want health care reform; they want to lower the costs; they want to be able to deduct all their health care expenses from their taxes. They want tort reform. They want us to address defensive medicine costs. They want to shop around across State lines so they can get a cheaper price. And they want health savings accounts. But the bot-

tom line, Mr. Speaker, is they want the freedom to control their health care, the freedom to choose their own doctor.

Whatever they pass here, Mr. Speaker, I will work to repeal, and I will work for the health care reform that the American public wants to keep them in control of their health care.

#### HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, last week, the Democrat leadership introduced their ever-evolving health care bill, a patchwork of deals cut to garner enough votes to secure a political victory.

In this bill, the trial lawyers win big. My home State of California has enacted commonsense trial practice reforms that have lowered medical liability costs for our residents. Since the enactment of reforms, malpractice rates in California have grown at one-third the rate of States without malpractice reforms, a savings which is passed on to patients. However, this bill would force States to repeal effective liability reforms in favor of unlimited payoffs for trial lawyers or States will lose out on Federal funds for their health care systems.

Health care reform must not reward frivolous lawsuits that drive up the cost of health care to the detriment of doctors, health care professionals and, most importantly, patients. Let's prove that Congress is more serious about the health of the American people than it is about the financial health of trial lawyers.

#### HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, when I came to Congress over 1 year ago, I was hoping to work across party lines in the spirit of bipartisanship because that's what the people in my district in Florida expected. But ever since I got here, the Democratic majority has locked Republicans out of the debate time and time again. And now here we are talking about what The Wall Street Journal calls the "worst bill ever."

The Pelosi health care bill cuts Medicare, increases taxes on businesses, individuals and employers, and it's a \$1.2 trillion boondoggle that will complete a government takeover of the health care system, even though the majority of Americans don't want it.

I don't know what the majority was doing over the August recess, but I was holding town hall meetings with hundreds of my constituents and friends; and the message was clear, we are a free people that chose to be governed, not the other way around. Enough is enough.

## HEALTH CARE

(Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this 2,000-page health care bill is not a health care reform bill. It's a monstrosity. It contains three-quarters of a trillion dollars in tax increases on small businesses and the middle class, which will lead to more people losing their jobs. It contains half a trillion dollars in cuts to Medicare for our senior citizens. This bill increases the Medicaid costs on our already hard-hit States, which will inevitably have the result of cutting education funding and funding for our first responders on the State level. This bill actually increases the cost of health care, Mr. Speaker.

You know, the American people understand that this bill will make the Wall Street bailout, known as TARP, the government takeover of the car industry, and the failed stimulus pale in comparison.

Mr. Speaker, the American people have already rejected this bill. Congress needs to listen to them and do the same.

## HEALTH CARE REFORM AND ABORTION

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

Mr. CAO. Mr. Speaker, health care reform is an issue of paramount importance, and we must be deliberative in solving the main question, which is: How can we make our health care system affordable, accessible, and accountable? Unfortunately, the health care reform forum has not been used to address the problem of affordable health care, but to expand the controversial issue of abortion.

When President Obama addressed a joint session of Congress on September 9, he said, "Under our plan, no Federal dollars will be used to fund abortion, and Federal conscience laws will remain in place." The health care reform plan presented by Speaker PELOSI does not reflect the long-standing policies that ban Federal abortion funding.

America needs responsible health care reform, and it should not be a vehicle for expanding the abortion agenda. The majority of the American people, including those in my home district of Louisiana, are against the Federal funding of abortion. Real health care is about saving and nurturing life, not about taking life.

## HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, everyone agrees that health care is too expensive, and it is not af-

fordable to every American. Everyone also agrees that the American health system is the best in the world for innovation and invention. And polls have shown that most people are happy with their health care. That's why people from all over the world come here to receive health care.

So why are we talking about dismantling our great health system, one-sixth of our economy, and replacing it with a government-run health program that will cost \$1.5 trillion in borrowed money that will be paid for by our grandkids?

We need to work together to bring down the actual costs of health care. Republicans have such a plan: cap lawsuits, giving Americans a real choice by letting them purchase insurance across State lines, allowing small businesses and individuals to join together and pool to purchase less expensive coverage.

We need to keep the best system in the world. Don't throw the baby out with the bath water.

## WHAT'S AT STAKE

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

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, Congress is about to make a decision that will impact every American for the rest of their lives. Simply stated, what's at stake is the freedom to make our own decisions about our own health care. PELOSI's bill forces every American to purchase our insurance through a government-run exchange. It forces us to purchase only those policies that meet all of the requirements set by the new health czar or be fined for failing to do so. And it forces us to pay for all the cost overruns through higher premiums or higher taxes.

Where does it all lead? In 1993, the government introduced a public option for student loans, but only a fraction of the public opted in. So last month, the House voted to give the government monopoly control over all student loans. That's about to happen to our health care unless 40 Blue Dog Democrats decide to stop them. Please, call them today.

## HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, the Wall Street Journal said it best, this bill may well be the worst piece of post-New Deal legislation ever introduced. My constituents of the Texas 24th District agree. They have told me loud and clear, time and time again, that they do not want this government takeover of our health care system.

This legislation creates 111 new Federal programs, bureaucracies, commissions and boards; and this is just counting the ones that are in the original

bill. I am sure that when the manager's amendment is introduced, there will be many more.

We need a patient-centered approach to health care reform. We do not need to mortgage the future of our children by saddling them with a \$1 trillion debt. Let's not punish our seniors, our families, and our grandchildren by passing this bill.

## HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Madam Speaker, there is a difference between the right way and the wrong way on health care reform, and the American people know it. Results from a survey on my Web site just came back the last few days. We asked the question what the people in the 19th Congressional District thought about their current health care system versus the one being proposed by Speaker PELOSI. Eighty-eight percent of the people who took my survey believe that their current health care system is better than the one in this bill. Speaker PELOSI, this is the worst bill ever.

H.R. 3962 will cost \$1.2 trillion over the first decade, and that's after using some smoke and mirrors with the numbers, not the \$894 billion that the Speaker claims; or, simply put, this is bending the cost curve in the wrong direction.

This bill permits Federal programs to be spent on abortion services. It includes a government-run plan that will force tens of millions of Americans off their current coverage. In navigating the new health care system, the bill creates 111 new programs and bureaucracies. These are not the positive solutions the American people are looking for.

Mr. Speaker, let's start over.

## HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. WOLF. Uncle Sam is saying, Don't let debt defeat a great Nation.

America is going broke. We must carefully weigh the implications of a costly new government spending program at a time when the country already owes \$56 trillion of entitlement obligations to China and to Saudi Arabia.

I am deeply concerned about the national debt, which has doubled since 2000 and is nearly \$12 trillion for the first time in history. Any plan put forward must control costs, not add billions of dollars to an already ballooning deficit.

America is going broke. Is this the legacy Congress wants to leave to our children and our grandchildren? Don't let debt defeat a great Nation.

□ 1545

## BETTER WAY TO LOWER HEALTH CARE COSTS

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

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, the Democratic leadership in Congress continues to push a flawed, massive government takeover of health care that is going to cost more than \$1 trillion. What's more, their health care overhaul will drive up health care costs for families and small business, and it will disrupt the doctor-patient relationship. States already straining under runaway budgets will be forced to cut services or to raise taxes when they're forced to raise Medicaid eligibility.

As a doctor, I saw the problems with our current health care system, and I saw the amazing innovation which makes the U.S. the envy of the world. Let's build on what works. We can achieve commonsense solutions in a bipartisan way, but the Pelosi health care bill focuses on where we disagree.

House Republicans put forward a commonsense plan to revitalize the American health care system—to lower costs for families and businesses and to improve quality. Our plan puts patients first, and it puts doctors and patients back in control of decision-making. Our plan makes health care more affordable and more accessible, with patients being able to see the doctors of their choice.

We can do better. Adopt the Republican plan.

## HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, of course there is no Republican plan for health care. I rise today to discuss the unconscionable economic cost of doing nothing, which is their plan.

Without health insurance reform, small businesses will pay \$2.4 trillion in health care over the next decade and up to \$800 billion in additional costs to them. Without reform, health care costs will rise from 18 percent of GDP today to a staggering 34 percent by 2040. Without reform, government spending on Medicare and Medicaid will nearly triple from 6 percent of our GDP to 15 percent of our GDP by 2040. Without reform, Federal, State, and local governments paid \$42.9 billion in 2008 to reimburse the costs of uninsured visits to emergency rooms, placing a tax burden of \$627 a year on every family in America, and that, without reform, will triple by 2030. Without reform, Mr. Speaker, the average employer-sponsored health insurance family deductible grew almost 50 percent from 1999 to 2006.

These are unconscionable cost increases, and we cannot sustain them. We need reform now.

## HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, one of the more Orwellian aspects of the Pelosi health care bill is that, amongst its 1,990 pages, it uses the word "shall" 3,425 times. That is 3,425 times that this bill compels somebody somewhere to do or to not do something, and that doesn't even include several hundred mentions of the word "must" or "require."

Yet, with all of those compulsions in there which are telling Americans what to do, there is an interesting use of the word "may," and that's relative to Members of Congress—to us. We may be a part of the government option, not must, not require, not shall, but we may participate in the public option—in the so-called public option—or in the government-run health care plan.

It is another case where this Democratic Congress is saying, Do what I say, not what I do.

## HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. SCHOCK. Mr. Speaker, last night, I hosted a town hall back in my district with over 1,000 of my constituents in attendance. I felt that was a better use of my time than was rushing back to this Chamber to vote on resolutions honoring dogs.

The final question of the night last night came from a 9-year-old constituent in my district named Joshua who asked me a very simple question: Do you support what President Obama wants to do with health care?

I told Joshua that I spent the first 9 months of my term in office trying to figure out exactly what it is the President wants to do on the issue of health care.

It is precisely this confusion of goals, of conflicting messages and this lack of communication from the majority which has all Americans still trying to figure out what exactly the President wants versus the Speaker of the House's bill before Congress.

We need to do this right. It's too important to get it wrong, and Republicans, Democrats, Independents, and the American people deserve to be in the room.

## HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, we've been advised that the House of Representatives may have only 3 hours of debate on this 1,990-page bill plus, perhaps, another 1,000-page manager's amendment. That comes out to \$500

billion an hour which will be spent of the public funds.

We should be debating this bill for weeks and months so that the American people know exactly what's in it and so that Members of Congress can be very exact in explaining it to our constituents and so that we can learn how deep and broad this bill is. In fact, there is even a provision which provides for reimbursement to veterinarians. Perhaps it's a mistake in the bill, but that's why we have to read it thoroughly.

## HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Mr. Speaker, when I listened to thousands of my constituents on tele-town halls this past summer and held town halls with 5,000 constituents in August, the overwhelming and consistent message they told me was to find real solutions.

My constituents told me we need to improve health care, but H.R. 3200 is bureaucracy; it's deficit spending; it's taxes; it's intrusion into the personal health care decisions between our doctors and ourselves moved in the wrong direction.

I don't think any one of my constituents told me that Congress needs to double down on H.R. 3200, but that's what the new 1,990-page Pelosi health care bill is. It is version 2.0 in the government's taking over of the health care of Americans. It creates government bureaucracies that make health care decisions for us. It costs over \$1 trillion, and it uses Medicare cuts on seniors and new taxes on Americans and small businesses to pay for them.

We want solutions that will give us the ability to purchase health insurance across State lines. We want solutions that will help people who can't get insurance because of preexisting conditions. We want solutions that don't use Medicare to pay for non-Medicare spending, and we want solutions that will control health care costs.

## HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, the Democrat bill we may be voting on later this week is not the prescription for what's ailing this country.

The CBO, the Congressional Budget Office, confirmed the Democrats' bill spends well over \$1 trillion, far more than even the President asked for. Nearly half of the people who get coverage in the bill will get it through Medicaid. This isn't health care reform. It's welfare expansion. It's the expansion of a program that is already financially unsustainable and that is crushing State budgets.

The Democrats' bill includes more than \$700 billion in tax increases, many

of which will be paid by middle class families, including penalties on people who don't buy insurance, penalties on employers who can't afford to cover their workers, and new taxes on Federal spending accounts, health savings accounts, insurance premiums, and medical devices.

The bill also includes about \$500 billion in Medicare cuts that will reduce seniors' access to doctors and to hospitals, and it will force millions out of their Medicare Advantage plans.

House Republicans support taking the first steps towards comprehensive reform that is focused on driving down costs for health care for all Americans.

#### EXPRESSING PRO-LIFE CONCERNS WITH PELOSI HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Speaker, as a strong believer in the dignity of all human life, I have worked to defend the rights of the unborn, but the Pelosi health care bill does not protect those rights.

The newly created public option will be authorized to fund elective abortions. The Pelosi health care bill does not include the pro-life language, which was offered and rejected in committee, to prohibit the Federal funding of abortion and of plans that include abortion. As the bill is written, Federal funds will pay for elective abortions.

This goes against a longstanding rule that government insurance programs, such as Medicaid or the Federal Employees Health Benefits, cannot cover elective abortions. Health care reform should be about improving the quality of life, not about taking it.

The National Right to Life Committee has expressed its concerns with this legislation as have thousands of residents from the Third District of Arkansas.

The respect for life needs to be a core value of our Nation, and it needs to be reflected in our national policies and health care reform.

#### HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I oppose the government takeover of our Nation's health care system. It would have a disastrous impact on women and their families. As moms, doctors, nurses, caregivers, and taxpayers, women play a critical role in the health care debate. Eighty-five percent of women are the primary health care decisionmakers in the home.

Women overwhelmingly support health care reform, but they don't want reform that will increase their health care costs, that will ration care or that will undermine their ability to make the best health care decisions for

their families. Speaker PELOSI's bill empowers government bureaucrats; it increases taxes, and it raises health insurance premiums while using Federal dollars to fund abortions.

Mr. Speaker, I support reform solutions that let women, not your government, take over, continue to decide what is best for their families.

#### HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, last evening, I did a telephone town hall meeting, and I talked to thousands of my constituents. We had a poll. We asked the question:

Do you support the health care reform bill that was just introduced by Speaker NANCY PELOSI?

The results were overwhelming: 76 percent of the people responded "no." The reason is that what people are concerned about are the costs in health care today, and the people at home understand the fact that this is only going to raise their costs. The government-run plan, the takeover plan of our health insurance, actually is going to cost more than what private insurance costs today.

This isn't what was advertised. This isn't what people want. They don't want the government coming in, taking over their health insurance, changing their policies for them without their permission, cutting benefits to people on Medicare—people who need those benefits desperately. They're going to take those benefits away. This is not what the people wanted, and we're going to vote this bill down.

#### HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it's an honor to be here today after months and months of discussing the health care reform proposals with the people of America and particularly with those in my district in south Florida.

It's great to be here to talk about how, finally, we're going to deal with preexisting conditions and about how, finally, people who have mental illnesses and chronic illnesses won't have arbitrary caps on their insurance and about how, finally, small businesses, which are the heart of our total economic system, will be able to pool their purchasing power to bring their costs down.

Medicare is one of the most important programs in our country. It's about fixing the doughnut hole to reduce the costs for prescription drugs, which is the lifeblood of many Americans within our senior citizen population. This is what the American people want. I am very proud that we are

fixing the Medicare system and that we are making it last even longer than has been alleged by those on the other side.

It's about time we do something right to fix health care. This is the proposal.

#### HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, we need to strengthen health care. We need to improve health care outcomes for all Americans, and we need to reduce costs, especially for families and small businesses, while protecting vulnerable persons. The question is how.

The current bill is very risky. It is nearly 2,000 pages and will cost \$1.3 trillion. It shifts the cost of what we have been doing to more government-run health care without reducing the cost drivers that have gotten us into the very circumstances we find ourselves in. It reduces the funding for important Medicare programs. It increases burdens on small businesses. It passes on costs to States, and it will reduce health care liberties for millions of Americans, including forced payment for abortion services.

The solutions: We should shift our health care culture to the focus of prevention and wellness. We should allow for commonsense reforms like the portability of insurance, the buying of insurance across State lines, the creating of new insurance risk pool models for small businesses and families, of appropriately addressing preexisting conditions, and of expanding opportunities for health savings accounts.

No one disputes the diagnosis. Our health care system must be strengthened. Let's get it right, Mr. Speaker.

#### HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I support changing and improving our health care delivery system, and there is a lot that can be done. Unfortunately, H.R. 3962, the Speaker's health care bill, does too much and too much wrong.

This nearly 2,000-page bill will create 111 new government boards, bureaucracies, and commissions. Additionally, the bill uses the word "shall," which is the government's way of saying people must do something, a whopping 3,425 times.

Instead of turning our entire health care system on its head and increasing government, we need to implement reforms that eliminate unnecessary costs in our system. Further, history shows that a government-run health care plan will be way more expensive than what is estimated today. The experience with health care entitlement programs is that they end up costing so

much more than ever thought. In 1967, experts predicted that the then-new Medicare program would cost \$12 billion in 1990. Actual Medicare spending in 1990 was \$110 billion.

Instead of growing government, increasing bureaucracy, and creating more requirements, we must invest in wellness and prevention and promote cost savings and personal responsibility. All of that will improve opportunities for Americans.

□ 1600

#### HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this latest attempt at a government takeover of health care that has been proposed by Speaker PELOSI.

Now, this 1,990-page bill that has just been filed a few days ago by the Speaker adds up to over a trillion dollars of new spending. If you break this spending down, how much does this really cost? \$530 million per page, \$530 million per page.

What's in this bill? Sure enough, they still have components that allow a health care czar to take away your health care plan even if you like it. They still have over \$700 billion in new taxes on the backs of small businesses and families. Yes, as senior citizens know well, they still have over \$500 billion in cuts to Medicare.

Now, with all of these horrible provisions, this has nothing to do with health care reform. It is clearly an attempt at a government takeover of health care. In fact, this bill at \$530 million per page has been called the worst bill ever by The Wall Street Journal. Let's do real reform.

#### HEALTH CARE

(Mrs. BACHMANN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, there is one thing that we need to know about this health care bill that Speaker PELOSI is putting before the American people. It's what President Barack Obama's economic adviser Christina Romer said: simply this, if this bill passes it will mean 5.5 million job losses.

That's probably why the Wall Street Journal has called this the worse bill ever. Epic new spending and taxes, pricier insurance, rationed care, dishonest accounting, the Pelosi bill has it all, but even worse, in an already downbeat economy, 5.5 million jobs lost. Let's go with the positive alternative, which the Republicans have been happy to share with the President.

Let's pass a positive alternative for the American people and not have job loss.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

#### OPPOSING ANY ENDORSEMENT OR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS FACT FINDING MISSION ON THE GAZA CONFLICT

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 867) calling on the President and the Secretary of State to oppose unequivocally any endorsement or further consideration of the "Report of the United Nations Fact Finding Mission on the Gaza Conflict" in multilateral fora, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

#### H. RES. 867

Whereas, on January 12, 2009, the United Nations Human Rights Council passed Resolution A/HRC/S-9/L.1, which authorized a "fact-finding mission" regarding Israel's conduct of Operation Cast Lead against violent militants in the Gaza Strip between December 27, 2008, and January 18, 2009;

Whereas the resolution pre-judged the outcome of its investigation, by one-sidedly mandating the "fact-finding mission" to "investigate all violations of international human rights law and International Humanitarian Law by . . . Israel, against the Palestinian people . . . particularly in the occupied Gaza Strip, due to the current aggression";

Whereas the mandate of the "fact-finding mission" makes no mention of the relentless rocket and mortar attacks, which numbered in the thousands and spanned a period of eight years, by Hamas and other violent militant groups in Gaza against civilian targets in Israel, that necessitated Israel's defensive measures;

Whereas the "fact-finding mission" included a member who, before joining the mission, had already declared Israel guilty of committing atrocities in Operation Cast Lead by signing a public letter on January 11, 2009, published in the Sunday Times, that called Israel's actions "war crimes";

Whereas the mission's flawed and biased mandate gave serious concern to many United Nations Human Rights Council Member States which refused to support it, including Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cameroon, Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, the Republic of Korea, Slovakia, Slovenia, Switzerland, Ukraine, and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland;

Whereas the mission's flawed and biased mandate troubled many distinguished individuals who refused invitations to head the mission;

Whereas Justice Richard Goldstone, who chaired the "United Nations Fact Finding Mission on the Gaza Conflict", told the then-President of the UNHRC, Nigerian Ambassador Martin Ihoeoghian Uhomoibhi, that he

intended to broaden the mandate of the Mission to include "all violations of international human rights law and international humanitarian law that might have been committed at any time in the context of the military operations that were conducted in Gaza during the period from 27 December 2008 and 18 January 2009, whether before, during or after", a phrase that, according to Justice Goldstone, was intended to allow him to investigate Hamas attacks on Israeli civilians;

Whereas Ambassador Uhomoibhi issued a statement on April 3, 2009, that endorsed part of Justice Goldstone's proposed broadened mandate but deleted the phrase "before, during, and after", and added inflammatory anti-Israeli language;

Whereas a so-called broadened mandate was never officially endorsed by a plenary meeting of the UNHRC, neither in the form proposed by Justice Goldstone nor in the form proposed by Ambassador Uhomoibhi;

Whereas, on September 15, 2009, the "United Nations Fact Finding Mission on the Gaza Conflict" released its report;

Whereas the report repeatedly made sweeping and unsubstantiated determinations that the Israeli military had deliberately attacked civilians during Operation Cast Lead;

Whereas the authors of the report admit that "we did not deal with the issues . . . regarding the problems of conducting military operations in civilian areas and second-guessing decisions made by soldiers and their commanding officers 'in the fog of war.'";

Whereas in the October 16th edition of the Jewish Daily Forward, Richard Goldstone, the head of the "United Nations Fact Finding Mission on the Gaza Conflict", is quoted as saying, with respect to the mission's evidence-collection methods, "If this was a court of law, there would have been nothing proven.";

Whereas the report, in effect, denied the State of Israel the right to self-defense, and never noted the fact that Israel had the right to defend its citizens from the repeated violent attacks committed against civilian targets in southern Israel by Hamas and other Foreign Terrorist Organizations operating from Gaza;

Whereas the report largely ignored the culpability of the Government of Iran and the Government of Syria, both of whom sponsor Hamas and other Foreign Terrorist Organizations;

Whereas the report usually considered public statements made by Israeli officials not to be credible, while frequently giving uncritical credence to statements taken from what it called the "Gaza authorities", i.e. the Gaza leadership of Hamas;

Whereas, notwithstanding a great body of evidence that Hamas and other violent Islamist groups committed war crimes by using civilians and civilian institutions, such as mosques, schools, and hospitals, as shields, the report repeatedly downplayed or cast doubt upon that claim;

Whereas in one notable instance, the report stated that it did not consider the admission of a Hamas official that Hamas often "created a human shield of women, children, the elderly and the mujahideen, against [the Israeli military]" specifically to "constitute evidence that Hamas forced Palestinian civilians to shield military objectives against attack.";

Whereas Hamas was able to significantly shape the findings of the investigation mission's report by selecting and prescreening some of the witnesses and intimidating others, as the report acknowledges when it notes that "those interviewed in Gaza appeared reluctant to speak about the presence

of or conduct of hostilities by the Palestinian armed groups . . . from a fear of reprisals”;

Whereas even though Israel is a vibrant democracy with a vigorous and free press, the report of the “fact-finding mission” erroneously asserts that “actions of the Israeli government . . . have contributed significantly to a political climate in which dissent with the government and its actions . . . is not tolerated”;

Whereas the report recommended that the United Nations Human Rights Council endorse its recommendations, implement them, review their implementation, and refer the report to the United Nations Security Council, the Prosecutor of the International Criminal Court, and the United Nations General Assembly for further action;

Whereas the report recommended that the United Nations Security Council—

(1) require the Government of Israel to launch further investigations of its conduct during Operation Cast Lead and report back to the Security Council within six months;

(2) simultaneously appoint an “independent committee of experts” to monitor and report on any domestic legal or other proceedings undertaken by the Government of Israel within that six-month period; and

(3) refer the case to the Prosecutor of the International Criminal Court after that six-month period;

Whereas the report recommended that the United Nations General Assembly consider further action on the report and establish an escrow fund, to be funded entirely by the State of Israel, to “pay adequate compensation to Palestinians who have suffered loss and damage” during Operation Cast Lead;

Whereas the report ignored the issue of compensation to Israelis who have been killed or wounded, or suffered other loss and damage, as a result of years of past and continuing rocket and mortar attacks by Hamas and other violent militant groups in Gaza against civilian targets in southern Israel;

Whereas the report recommended “that States Parties to the Geneva Conventions of 1949 start criminal investigations [of Operation Cast Lead] in national courts, using universal jurisdiction” and that “following investigation, alleged perpetrators should be arrested and prosecuted”;

Whereas the concept of “universal jurisdiction” has frequently been used in attempts to detain, charge, and prosecute Israeli and United States officials and former officials in connection with unfounded allegations of war crimes and has often unfairly impeded the travel of those individuals;

Whereas the State of Israel, like many other free democracies, has an independent judicial system with a robust investigatory capacity and has already launched numerous investigations, many of which remain ongoing, of Operation Cast Lead and individual incidents therein;

Whereas Libya and others have indicated that they intend to further pursue consideration of the report and implementation of its recommendations by the United Nations Security Council, the United Nations General Assembly, the United Nations Human Rights Council, and other multilateral fora;

Whereas the President instructed the United States Mission to the United Nations and other international organizations in Geneva to vote against resolution A-HRC-S-12-1, which endorsed the report and condemned Israel, at the special session of the Human Rights Council held on October 15-16, 2009;

Whereas, on September 30, 2009, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton described the mandate for the report as “one-sided”;

Whereas, on September 17, 2009, Ambassador Susan Rice, United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations, ex-

pressed the United States’ “very serious concern with the mandate” and noted that the United States views the mandate “as unbalanced, one-sided and basically unacceptable”;

Whereas the “Report of the United Nations Fact Finding Mission on the Gaza Conflict” reflects the longstanding, historic bias at the United Nations against the democratic, Jewish State of Israel;

Whereas the “Report of the United Nations Fact Finding Mission on the Gaza Conflict” is being exploited by Israel’s enemies to excuse the actions of violent militant groups and their state sponsors, and to justify isolation of and punitive measures against the democratic, Jewish State of Israel;

Whereas, on October 16, 2009, the United Nations Human Rights Council voted 25-6 (with 11 states abstaining and 5 not voting) to adopt resolution A-HRC-S-12-1, which endorsed the “Report of the United Nations Fact Finding Mission on the Gaza Conflict” and condemned Israel, without mentioning Hamas, other such violent militant groups, or their state sponsors; and

Whereas efforts to delegitimize the democratic State of Israel and deny it the right to defend its citizens and its existence can be used to delegitimize other democracies and deny them the same right: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives—

(1) considers the “Report of the United Nations Fact Finding Mission on the Gaza Conflict” to be irredeemably biased and unworthy of further consideration or legitimacy;

(2) supports the Administration’s efforts to combat anti-Israel bias at the United Nations, its characterization of the “Report of the United Nations Fact Finding Mission on the Gaza Conflict” as “unbalanced, one-sided and basically unacceptable”, and its opposition to the resolution on the report;

(3) calls on the President and the Secretary of State to continue to strongly and unequivocally oppose any endorsement of the “Report of the United Nations Fact Finding Mission on the Gaza Conflict” in multilateral fora, including through leading opposition to any United Nations General Assembly resolution and through vetoing, if necessary, any United Nations Security Council resolution that endorses the contents of this report, seeks to act upon the recommendations contained in this report, or calls on any other international body to take further action regarding this report;

(4) calls on the President and the Secretary of State to strongly and unequivocally oppose any further consideration of the “Report of the United Nations Fact Finding Mission on the Gaza Conflict” and any other measures stemming from this report in multilateral fora; and

(5) reaffirms its support for the democratic, Jewish State of Israel, for Israel’s security and right to self-defense, and, specifically, for Israel’s right to defend its citizens from violent militant groups and their state sponsors.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CUMMINGS). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I would inquire whether the gentlewoman from Florida is opposed to the resolution. If she is not, I request the time in opposition to the resolution, because I am, in fact, opposed to the resolution.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I do not oppose the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota will be recognized for 20 minutes in opposition.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to divide my debate time equally with the ranking member, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include material on the resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. KLEIN).

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support H. Res. 867, a resolution that calls on the Secretary of State and the President to unequivocally oppose further consideration of the Goldstone Report in international arenas.

This resolution sends a clear message to the international community. The Goldstone Report does nothing to advance peace and security in the Middle East. Rather, it serves to reinforce the deep mistrust that pervades the region and excuses the actions of terrorist groups and their state sponsors.

The Goldstone Report ignores the facts. The terrorist threat surrounding Israel’s defensive actions in Gaza require a decisive response, and any sovereign nation would have and should have done what Israel did.

In fact, Richard Goldstone himself said, if this was a court of law, there would have been nothing proven. The Goldstone Report disregards what it means to fight against terrorists who use human shields and have no regard for human life. The findings and conclusions of the report have ominous consequences for the United States and other countries who seek to prevent terrorist threats from taking root around the world.

We cannot allow the Goldstone Report to set a precedent. The stakes are too high. This report was not guided by a commitment to human rights but, rather, motivated by a bias against Israel.

Now is the time for the United Nations to immediately turn its attention to the very real human rights violators around the world. Human rights victims are pleading for the world’s attention. I would urge U.N. member states to devote time and thoughts to the realities of human rights around the world, not Israel.

Israel, with strong democratic and judicial institutions, can make any

necessary determinations about how to move forward from here, and it is doing so.

I would like to thank Chairman BERMAN and Ranking Member ROS-LEHTINEN for their leadership in authoring this resolution and bringing it to the floor. This is a true example of the importance of bipartisanship, because the U.S.-U.N. resolution is strong.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, if I could ask unanimous consent to extend the debate time in light of the fact that we have three factions asking for time. I would ask for unanimous consent to extend equally the debate time, because we have so many requests for time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain that request from the manager.

Mr. BERMAN. Could the gentlewoman, on her unanimous-consent request, which is not going to be entertained, yield to me?

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I yield to the gentleman from California for the purpose of talking about debate time, not taking from my time.

Mr. BERMAN. I am told that as much as I would like to, because I am flooded with requests for time, and I think it's worthy of a longer debate that because of the schedule, the long delay today and the 1-minute, the fact that tonight is an election night and a number of people have to get back to their districts, I cannot make such a unanimous-consent request.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This past winter, Operation Cast Lead in Israel exercised its right as a sovereign nation and its obligation to defend its citizens, and its very existence, against attacks by Hamas and other violent extremist groups in Gaza.

Israel did so while taking extraordinary measures to minimize the risk of civilian casualties. Indeed, as Colonel Richard Kemp, former commander of the British forces in Afghanistan, has stated: "During Operation Cast Lead, the Israeli Defense Forces did more to safeguard the rights of civilians in a combat zone than any other army in the history of warfare."

Then, in January, the Human Rights Council, dominated by dictatorships, voted to authorize a so-called fact-finding mission. Notably, most free democratic nations did not render their support for this sham. The mission's mandate had nothing to do with fact-finding and everything to do with persecuting Israel for defending herself. The mandate prejudged Israel's guilt, targeted only Israel, and Richard Goldstone agreed to head this mission.

Mr. Goldstone claims that he got the Human Rights Council president to modify the mandate. Well, my colleagues, just as the Speaker of the House cannot unilaterally change a resolution once adopted, neither could the president of the council change the

mandate without the council's approval. Claims of a revised mandate are false since the council did not take any action to approve any modifications.

Fast forward to September, Mr. Speaker, when the so-called fact-finding mission released its report. Indeed, it's a 575-page hatchet job commonly known as the Goldstone Report.

While this report contains sweeping accusations that Israel had deliberately attacked civilians, in contrast the report disregarded evidence that Hamas and other such groups in Gaza used innocents as human shields and deliberately launched attacks from schools, from hospitals, from mosques. To fully appreciate the Goldstone Report's bias, one need only look at the testimony of an Israeli doctor whose clinic was hit by a rocket launched from Gaza.

The doctor, who was severely wounded in the attack and had already undergone seven operations to address her injuries, says, "Judge Goldstone, in July you invited me to testify. I told you my story.

"I testified in good faith.

"But now I see your report. I have to tell you: I am shocked.

"Judge Goldstone, in a 500-page report, why did you completely ignore my story?"

"I feel humiliated.

"Why are there only two pages about Israeli victims like me, who suffered thousands of rockets over 8 years?"

"Why did you choose to focus on the period of my country's response, but not on that of the attacks that caused it?"

Mr. Goldstone claims that the report never sought to deny Israel its right to self-defense, but the report sought to cast Israel's actions in response to rocket and mortar attacks from Gaza, not as carefully targeted defensive measures, but as the deliberate infliction of violence on civilians.

This is not surprising. The fact-finding mission includes a member who, even as the operation was taking place in January of 2009, signed a statement entitled, "Israel's bombardment of Gaza is not self-defense, it's a war crime."

Indeed, this statement began by categorically rejecting Israel's right to defend herself against such attacks. Further, the words "self-defense" or similar terms never appear in the report. The report recommended further action by multiple U.N. bodies, including the General Assembly, the Security Council and International Criminal Court. The Human Rights Council has already used this report to condemn Israel. No surprise there.

Tomorrow, the General Assembly will likely do the same. As Israel is being ostracized at the U.N., violent extremists in Gaza continued to fire rockets and mortars at innocent Israelis, 265 of the last 9 months alone. Just yesterday, militants in Gaza fired another rocket, which exploded near an Israeli residential area. No surprise there.

Israel's military intelligence chief testified yesterday that Hamas has test-fired a rocket with a 60-kilometer range, far enough to hit the Tel Aviv area, threatening up to 3 million Israelis.

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

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

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

Mr. ELLISON. I would like to thank Chairman BERMAN and Ranking Member ROS-LEHTINEN for their openness and professionalism in this debate.

□ 1615

Mr. ELLISON. I rise today to urge my colleagues to oppose H. Res. 867, a resolution that condemns the Goldstone Report regarding the conflict in Gaza. This resolution should be opposed because it suppresses inquiry, inquiry that is the hallmark of democratic societies.

The resolution contains factual errors and undermines Israel's ability to conduct its own investigation. The resolution goes against President Obama's foreign policy direction. I ask my colleagues to review the facts about the Goldstone Report's integrity and the content of his report.

First, what is there to fear about Judge Goldstone? Judge Goldstone has a stellar reputation. He is famous for apprehending Nazi criminals in Argentina and for serving as a chief prosecutor for the United Nations International Criminal Tribunals. He is a self-described Zionist. He serves as a trustee at Hebrew University in Jerusalem. Judge Goldstone has said that bringing war criminals to justice stems from the lessons of the Holocaust.

Unfortunately, the debate about the Goldstone Report has been diverted by serious problems with the original U.N. resolution called for in the report. I agree that the first U.N. resolution calling for an investigation of the Gaza war was one-sided and focused unfairly on Israel. Let me repeat: I agree that the original U.N. resolution was unfair. But Judge Goldstone pushed back. He succeeded in expanding the scope of the mission to include an examination of actions of both Hamas and Israel.

So what does the Goldstone Report really say? Four sections of the report deal with abuses by Hamas, including the launching of rockets into civilian towns in Israel. The report explicitly states these rocket attacks are war crimes. The report recounts actions by Israel in Operation Cast Lead that harmed the civilian population in Gaza.

I repeat the point I started with. The word "inquiry" is an essential hallmark of democracy, and Israel is strong enough to withstand an investigation of its actions in the Gaza war. Hamas should investigate its actions as well and be held to account.

What if Israel would have participated in the review from the beginning? It could have pointed out that the United Nations Human Rights Council has a history of unfairly singling Israel out for criticism. It could have pointed out the consequences of the Hamas rocket attacks.

Let's consider the following question: Why are we going to pass a resolution without holding a single hearing? Why is the House voting for a resolution which condemns a report that few Members have fully read?

House Members should know that Israeli leaders, like Deputy Prime Minister Dan Meridor, a Likud party member, and National Infrastructure Minister Uzi Landau have called for Israel to conduct its own investigation.

I urge Members to oppose this resolution because it will undermine President Obama's commitment that all countries, including our own and our allies, should be accountable for their actions. This resolution complicates the President's current Middle East initiative.

I conclude with a letter written by Israeli human rights groups who oppose the resolution. "We are concerned that H. Res. 867 may derail the momentum towards an Israeli investigation. Resolution 867 contains factual inaccuracies, both about the Goldstone Report and the measures taken by Israel to date, that must not guide choices by policymakers. We urge interested parties and Members of the House to show their support for the internal democratic conversation taking place in Israel today and to call on Israel to demonstrate that it can ensure genuine accountability at home."

When nations like the United States, Israel, South Africa, and others have pursued truthful investigation, however uncomfortable, their people have emerged stronger. The House of Representatives is poised to condemn the Goldstone Report today because the report says that both parties to the conflict engaged in possible violations of international law. What is the logic of the action? How does it advance the cause of peace in the Middle East?

I urge my colleagues to look closely at the Goldstone Report, which is right here on this table, and what actions truly advance the cause of peace.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to a member of the committee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I rise to support the resolution.

We should reject the Goldstone Report, which is part of an ongoing effort at the U.N. to single out Israel and to deny Israel the same rights accorded to other nations.

For example, of the 34 motions adopted by the so-called U.N. Human Rights Council since its inception in 2006, 27 of them are directed at Israel. I might say that these paragons of democracy on

this Human Rights Council are Libya, Syria, and other dictatorships.

The report equates Israel's long-delayed acts of self-defense with Hamas' 12,000 intentional, indiscriminate attacks on Israeli civilians since 2001.

The report ignores the well-documented, unprecedented efforts by Israel to limit civilian casualties in Gaza neighborhoods where they were being used as human shields by the terrorists.

Finally, the report fails to assign appropriate responsibility to Hamas for its decision to base itself and its military operations in heavily civilian-populated areas.

This Congress should stand by the only democracy in the Middle East, Israel, and should reject the biased Goldstone Report.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am so honored to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR), our well-respected and esteemed Republican whip.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady from Florida.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of this resolution. More importantly, I stand to support the right of democracies to defend their citizens against terrorism.

For years, without provocation, Hamas and other terrorists in Gaza launched thousands of deadly rockets at Israeli civilians. The attacks laid siege to entire swaths of Israelis. By last December, Israel said enough was enough.

When it entered Gaza, Israel found a ruthless enemy hiding in civilian areas. Hamas committed blatant war crimes by using the Palestinian people as human shields. But the one-sided and biased Goldstone Commission isn't concerned with any of this. Its report equates a democracy's defensive strikes on armed targets with a terror group's deliberate efforts to kill and sacrifice innocent people.

The Goldstone Report does not contribute to the ongoing peace process. The cases of Gaza and Lebanon show that every time Israel makes concessions of peace, it results in increased terrorism. Why would Israel agree to deal if it knows the international community will demonize it should it have to respond to terror?

Mr. ELLISON. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in opposition to H. Res. 867. The United States has a responsibility to engage in tough and in honest diplomatic efforts for peace as a purveyor of human rights and the rule of law in the Middle East and throughout the world.

The Goldstone Report raises many questions, its most critical recommendation being that both parties, mind you, both parties conduct their own impartial investigation to find answers.

Neither a dismissal nor an endorsement of the Goldstone Report will change the facts on the ground for Israelis and Palestinians who continue to struggle for a life of normalcy and peace.

Indiscriminate rocket attacks launched by Hamas against Israel have terrorized and killed innocent Israelis, leaving entire communities in grips of fear. The United States and the international community have consistently condemned these attacks and reaffirmed Israel's right to self-defense.

The tragic deaths of innocent civilians in Gaza and the devastation brought upon their homes, schools, and infrastructure has worsened a humanitarian crisis that cannot be ignored. Residents of Gaza and the West Bank continue to lack appropriate access to the most fundamental needs, including food, fuel, water, sanitation, education, health care, and the basic materials needed to rebuild their communities.

The urgency and the gravity of these harsh realities on both sides require that Congress act always with an eye toward peace and reconciliation. In the words of President Obama in Cairo in June of 2009, he said, "All of us have a responsibility to work for the day when the mothers of Israelis and Palestinians can see their children grow up without fear."

As Members of Congress, we can never hesitate or shy away from defending the United States' indispensable role in the peace process if we hope to achieve these goals. This resolution does not bring us closer to realizing a two-state solution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlelady's time has expired.

Mr. ELLISON. I yield an additional 5 seconds.

Ms. LEE of California. It doesn't lead us to securing Israeli peace and security nor Palestinian peaceful coexistence and for their citizens a life of respect.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

(Mr. MORAN of Virginia asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to explain why I will vote "no" on House Resolution 867, which calls on President Obama and Secretary of State Clinton to "oppose unequivocally any endorsement or further consideration" of what has become known as the "Goldstone Report."

The United States' connection to the State of Israel is both strong and deep; we are connected through decades of history, culture, business and geo-political interests. We care about the people of Israel who strive for what we have struggled for in the United States—the ability to live in security, peace and prosperity. The well-being of our friends in Israel was, is and will remain an American priority. As Israel's closest ally, we have an obligation

to see to it that Israel and its neighbors reach a peaceful end to ongoing conflict.

The situation in Gaza is a tragedy, both for Israelis who for too long suffered from indiscriminant rocket attacks and for the hundreds of innocent Palestinians in Gaza who lost their lives, their loved ones, their homes, and their faith in the international community during Israel's military offensive last December.

And so now the world is grappling with the report on the Gaza war, submitted by the highly respected Judge Richard Goldstone—a self-described Zionist, a trustee of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem and a man widely known for his integrity, fairness, and conscientiousness, who investigated war crimes in Yugoslavia, Rwanda, and Kosovo and who uncovered Nazi war criminals in Argentina.

But, rather than deal seriously with the contents and recommendations of the report, rather than ask Judge Goldstone to testify before Congress, so we can debate specifically what sections may be valid or flawed, we are seeking with this resolution to foreclose all discussion and action on the report by our President and our Secretary of State, in every multinational forum.

One of the arguments supporters of this resolution make is that the report is one-sided, representing only the Palestinian point-of-view. That argument would have some validity if not for the fact that (a) the report strongly accuses Hamas of indiscriminate rocket attacks on Israeli citizens, referring to their actions as a "war crime" and (b) the Israeli Government chose not to participate, going so far as to block Judge Goldstone and his team from entering Israel to conduct their investigation. This forced Israeli citizens who were invited to testify in front of Judge Goldstone, including Noam Shalit, the father of imprisoned IDF soldier Gil'ad Shalit, to travel to Switzerland and Jordan to provide their perspectives on the Gaza operation.

This resolution is a deliberate diversion, taking Congress' attention away from what should be our main focus. The bottom line is that the Israeli-Palestinian conflict is a tragedy that begs for real engagement and real solutions. The resolution before us today offers neither. Instead, it seeks to deflect our attention from what we should be considering: how to reinvigorate the stalled peace process and help Israelis and Palestinians navigate a path towards a two-state solution. I challenge Congress and the committees of jurisdiction to invest their time and resources into more constructive efforts that further the cause of peace.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to a distinguished member of our committee, the gentlelady from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY).

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership on this issue, and I thank my friend ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN for introducing this important resolution.

Today, the American people stand with the State of Israel and all other peace-loving nations and people who face the threat of terrorism and are forced to defend their innocent citizens from terrorist attacks.

In 2005, Israel withdrew from the Gaza to allow the Palestinians to begin building a state. They didn't. Instead,

Hamas used the Gaza to terrorize the Palestinian people and as a launch pad to rain missiles on Israeli cities, 8,000 rocket attacks in a 3-year period. The U.N. was silent.

In the fall of 2008, even more rockets fell on innocent Israelis and the situation became untenable. And the U.N. was silent. Only when Israel retaliated in order to protect its own citizens did the U.N. speak up, to condemn Israel.

For those who suggest that Israel used disproportionate force, I say Israel used extraordinary restraint: missile after missile, injury after injury, death after death, and year after year.

Today, we stand up for justice and the right of all nations to act in self-defense, to protect innocent civilians and end the horrors of terrorism. Let's put the blame where it belongs, with Hamas and the terrorists, not Israel.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I would like to yield 1 minute to my good friend from Indiana, Mr. BURTON, the ranking member on the Subcommittee on the Middle East and South Asia of our Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Israel has been our friend forever. They have been attacked again and again and again. So what did they do? Ariel Sharon tried to reach out in a peaceful way to give Gaza back to the Palestinians. And what happened? Hamas goes in there and starts launching missile after missile after missile at innocent people, blowing them up, trying to kill them. They want to destroy Israel, as does Iran. So what happens?

The Human Rights Council of the United Nations 27 times has issued decisions against Israel, and the Goldstone Report is just another in a long line. This is something that we should not tolerate. There shouldn't be one vote, not one vote in this place against Israel.

And the people who are making these comments on the other side of the aisle really bother me, because Israel has been such a great friend of ours and they have been trying to reach peace over there forever. And, instead, they keep getting rocket attack after rocket attack, and then they are criticized for human rights problems because they defend themselves.

If we launched missiles into Michigan, I guarantee you, Michigan would be really ticked off at us and would want to stop it and would do everything they could to stop it.

We ought to support Israel.

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Speaker, I yield 1¾ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT).

Mr. DELAHUNT. I thank the gentleman.

Well, I do support Israel, and I intend to vote "present" on this particular resolution because, like most Members, I haven't had time to read 575 pages.

We often speak about process in this body and it is a concept we all em-

brace, at least rhetorically. But on this occasion, we only have the rhetoric, and the process has been totally inadequate.

This resolution came to the floor on suspension without a hearing, despite the willingness of Judge Goldstone to come before the United States Congress and answer any questions that we might pose to him. And that judge, by the way, is highly regarded in the international rights community for his courage, impartiality and scholarship. He has participated in a number of high profile inquiries, including investigation into Nazism in Argentina.

As the gentleman from Minnesota indicated, he is a self-described Zionist. As both the Chair of the full committee and the Chair of the Subcommittee on the Middle East indicated, they have the utmost respect for Judge Goldstone.

He has expressed his strong concerns about this resolution, and he said this: "I have strong reservations about the text of the resolution in question, text that includes serious factual inaccuracies and instances where information and statements are taken grossly out of context." Last night, we received in the form of a "Dear Colleague" a response by Chairman BERMAN and ACKERMAN that attempted to refute it.

Clearly, we need more discussion and more debate. An opportunity to have that discussion should have occurred prior to this resolution coming to the floor.

□ 1630

This is not about bias against Israel. The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. LEE of California). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman 10 additional seconds.

Mr. DELAHUNT. We know that exists. This is not about Hamas. They have committed horrific acts of terrorism against citizens. This is about us. This is about us.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I would like to yield 1 minute to my good friend, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), a member of the Agriculture, Transportation, and Veterans' Affairs Committees. A busy man.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Madam Speaker, the Goldstone Report is a dangerous document that makes no distinction between terrorism and the acts of a nation to defend its people. For years terrorists launched rockets at Israeli civilians. Israel responded with a defensive measure to clear a terrorist threat and protect the lives of its citizens.

The Goldstone Report ignores Israel's right to self-defense. Despite Israel's efforts to avoid civilian casualties and its humanitarian assistance to civilians, the report unfairly accuses Israel of war crimes. Israel sought to limit its actions to military targets. Yet terrorists hid behind civilians, near hospitals, schools, and mosques.

Every nation should be alarmed at the report and its implications. All nations, including Israel, have the right to defend their people.

I urge my colleagues to stand with Israel in recognition of this right, this basic right, of self-defense.

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from the State of Washington (Mr. BAIRD).

Mr. BAIRD. I thank my colleague from Minnesota for his leadership.

My friends who have described the Goldstone Report, as a colleague just did, I'm not sure if they have read it. I have read it. It is not at all silent on whether or not Israel had a reason to respond. It specifically talks about the unacceptability of Hamas rocketing Israeli citizens.

Here's a picture of Israeli kids in Sderot, hiding, practicing how to deal with those rockets. It is absolutely unacceptable that any people have to undergo this kind of attack; and the Goldstone Report is, in fact, quite clear on that. And contrary to this resolution and contrary to what some of my colleagues said, it is explicit about suggesting that Hamas may have engaged in war crimes.

But there is another side to this story. I have twin 4-year-old boys at home. When I kiss them goodnight, they look for all the world like these three little Palestinian children. I don't know that father, but I can imagine his grief.

We must not say that this Congress will unequivocally oppose any consideration of a report by a jurist of this integrity and this reputation. Those children deserve someone to ask why they died, just as these children in Sderot deserve someone to say they must not be rocketed. And the Goldstone Report does both. It does both.

Unlike most of my colleagues here, I have been to Gaza and I have read in its entirety the Goldstone Report. And I will tell you he says many things that, though unpleasant, are true and must not be obstructed.

There used to be a school in Gaza called the American International School. The motto of that school: "Peace, Understanding, and Leadership Through Education."

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

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. BAIRD. This is a picture of what happened to that school. This is a picture of what happened to that school.

Do not pass this resolution. Support this fine jurist. Give justice, true justice, a chance to be heard.

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I'm proud to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE), a member of the Agriculture, Education, and Veterans' Affairs Committees. Another very busy man.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Resolution 867, which condemns the United Nations Human Rights Council's decision to endorse the views of the Goldstone Report. Among its conclusions was an assertion that the Israeli military campaign was aimed at civilians in Gaza rather than the terrorist group Hamas. The assertion itself is outrageous, but the fact that it was endorsed by an arm of the United Nations should be a cause for concern for anyone who's concerned about terrorism or human rights.

In criticizing Israel's behavior and not even mentioning Hamas in this resolution, the council essentially endorsed Hamas's decision to use Gazans as human shields to protect themselves from retaliation for their rocket attacks into Israel.

The fact is that the Human Rights Council is no better than its predecessor at the U.N., the Human Rights Commission, when it comes to anti-Israeli rhetoric. I think the resolution correctly urges the Obama administration and Secretary Clinton to strongly condemn this report, but I further urge them to reconsider their decision to participate in and fund the HRC. This body has proven time and again that they are incapable of acting without bias and simply gives a forum for anti-Israeli and anti-U.S. voices to be heard.

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. JOHN DINGELL.

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

Mr. DINGELL. This is a bad bill. It's a bad resolution. It is unfair. It is unwise. It contributes nothing to peace. It establishes a bad precedent, and it sets up a set of circumstances where we indicate that we're going to just arbitrarily reject a U.N. finding and a U.N. resolution and that we're going to have that as a precedent. This is bad.

What we must do here is to make the United States a fair, honest, respected broker. This does not do this. It leaves the United States in real danger of losing the ability to participate actively in the creation of a lasting peace of benefit to both Israel and to the Palestinians.

If you're a friend of Israel, if you're a friend of world peace, if you're a friend of peace in the Mid East, if you're a friend of the Palestinians, if you want to look to the well-being of the United States, you should reject this resolution. It is a bad proposal. There have been no hearings on it. We do not know what underlies all of the circumstances, and I urge the House to reject it.

Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H. Res. 867. This resolution, though non-binding, sends a signal to the world that the United States Congress is not serious about pushing the Israelis and the Palestinians toward a peaceful resolution.

It is true that the body that mandated the Report of the United Nations Fact Finding Mis-

sion on the Gaza Conflict, known as the Goldstone Report, has been no friend to Israel. Indeed the United Nations Human Rights Council has consistently passed one-sided biased resolutions against Israel while, at the same time, allowing documented, blatant human rights violators to preside over that body without criticism. It is right for the United States and other friends of Israel to question and call out the why six of ten special sessions of the U.N. General Assembly have been about Israel, while none have been called on Tibet or Darfur.

However, we must ask ourselves, does this resolution bring us closer to peace in the Middle East? Does it spur negotiations between the Israelis, Palestinians, and other parties, or does it marginalize and itself choose sides? We must ask, are we undermining President Obama's, Secretary Clinton's, Special Envoy Mitchell's efforts to serve as an honest broker, bring the two sides together, and achieve peace, by passing this resolution?

Madam Speaker, Israel, unequivocally, has a right to defend itself against those who seek to destroy it. We know that Israel was relentlessly attacked by rockets and mortars leading up to the Gaza war. They made the calculation that they could not allow Hamas to continue this violence and abuse.

However, neither Israel nor Hamas, nor any other country or other non-state political act is exempt from international human rights laws or free of consequence for violations of them. If nothing else, the Goldstone Report should serve as a document from which Israel and Hamas, and the rest of the international community can use to ensure that future human rights violations do not take place in civilian areas and that their militaries and fighters are actively working toward minimizing civilian casualties in the future.

Madam Speaker, time and again we acknowledge the urgency of this conflict. The Obama Administration is working feverishly with both sides toward a peaceful resolution, a two-state solution. Let us not undermine this effort today. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting "no" on this resolution.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. Today we journey from Operation Cast Lead to Operation Cast Doubt. Almost as serious as committing war crimes is covering up war crimes, pretending that war crimes were never committed and did not exist.

Because behind every such deception is the nullification of humanity, the destruction of human dignity, the annihilation of the human spirit, the triumph of Orwellian thinking, the eternal prison of the dark heart of the totalitarian.

The resolution before us today, which would reject all attempts of the Goldstone Report to fix responsibility to all parties to war crimes, including both Hamas and Israel, may as well be called the "Down is Up, Night is Day, Wrong is Right" resolution.

Because if this Congress votes to condemn a report it has not read concerning events it has totally ignored

about violations of law of which it is unaware, it will have brought shame to this great institution.

How can we ever expect there to be peace in the Middle East if we tacitly approve of violations of international law and international human rights, if we look the other way, or if we close our eyes to the heartbreak of people on both sides by white-washing a legitimate investigation?

How can we protect the people of Israel from existential threats if we hold no concern for the protection of the Palestinians, for their physical security, their right to land, their right to their own homes, their right to water, their right to sustenance, their right to freedom of movement, their right to human security of jobs, education, and health care?

We will have peace only when the plight of both Palestinians and Israelis is brought before this House and given equal consideration in recognition of the principle that all people on this planet have a right to survive and thrive. And it is our responsibility, our duty to see that no individual, no group, no people are barred from this humble human claim.

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Speaker, I'm pleased to yield 1 minute to the majority leader, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. I thank the chairman for yielding. I thank the ranking member, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, for introducing and working with the chairman on this resolution.

I rise to voice my objection to the unfair, unbalanced, and inaccurate report of the United Nations fact-finding mission on the Gaza conflict, otherwise known as the Goldstone Report.

The report not only paints a distorted picture of Israel's legitimate efforts at self-defense, in my opinion, but it epitomizes the practice of singling Israel out from all other nations for condemnation.

The Goldstone Report does little to build confidence that the U.N. or its Human Rights Council can deal with the Israeli-Palestinian conflict in an evenhanded manner. I agree with those who spoke before me that it ought to, but the Goldstone Report does not give us much confidence that that's what's happening.

For one, the Human Rights Council's mandate for the report specifically targeted Israeli actions, ignoring, ignoring the deliberate Hamas attacks on civilians that provoked Israel's self-defense in Operation Cast Lead.

The report's lead author himself, Justice Richard Goldstone of South Africa, objected to that one-sided Band-Aid. Let me repeat that. Goldstone himself, when the commission issued its report, objected to that one-sided mandate that they issued. But notwithstanding his objection, it was not formally altered.

Similarly, former U.N. High Commissioner for Human Rights, whom many of you know, Mary Robinson, not

known as a great defender of Israel, Mary Robinson, who has criticized Israel's record in the past, also objected to this one-sided mandate. In her words, and I quote Mary Robinson: "Unfortunately, the Human Rights Council passed a resolution seeking a fact-finding mission to only look at what Israel has done, and I don't think that's the human rights approach," said Mary Robinson.

□ 1645

Secretary of State Clinton agrees. She said this:

"We believe that the mandate for the Goldstone Report was one-sided and that many of the recommendations are appropriately dealt with by the institutions within Israel."

And, indeed, if they were not, I would be here to say that we ought to support the United Nations' actions. The Goldstone Report largely neglects the context within which Israel's action took place. Why is that context so vital, and why is the report so empty without it? Because for years—for years—Israel has been the target of asymmetrical warfare for terrorists who hide behind civilians and aim to kill civilians. For 8 years before Operation Cast Lead, Hamas, aided by Iran and others, launched deadly rockets and mortar fire into Israel, even after Israel dismantled its Gaza settlements, even after it withdrew its military. More than 6,000 rockets have fallen indiscriminately on southern Israel's cities and towns. I can't imagine there is one of us in this Chamber that if Canada or Mexico rained down six missiles on our civilian population—not 6,000 on our population—that there would be a Member here who would not want decisive response to stop that assault. Each was intended to kill the maximum number of civilians. These rockets did not target military targets. They targeted civilians. How do I know? I've been there, and I have seen the effectiveness firsthand of the fear that has been put in the minds of the people of Sderot and others.

In the Israeli town of Sderot, I saw children who had lost literally the ability to speak, who no longer had control over their bodily functions, who were condemned to play in an armored playground from fear of the rockets that could kill with only seconds' warning. There is no military establishment in Sderot. Families, children. That is the context of which the Goldstone Report makes such short shrift.

Tragically, civilians in Gaza suffered and continue to suffer. They suffer in major part from the determination of their imposed leaders to pursue indiscriminate terror. I have had a discussion with my friend Mr. KUCINICH, for whom I have a great deal of respect. We ought to have great empathy for the Palestinian people who have been put at great risk by their leaders pursuing terrorism. We ought to have empathy for those children who live in the camps in Gaza. Terrible condition. I've

been there. Is there anybody here who doubts that if those children living there for decade after decade after decade were European children or American children or Jewish children that they would still be there in those camps? I say to you, not the case. Why are they there? Because the Arab community does not want to absorb them, and their leaders will not seek a meaningful peace. That is why they're there.

Hamas, like its state sponsors, is notorious for using men, women and children as human shields and political props. As Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice put it earlier this year, "Hamas has held the people of Gaza hostage." They still do. Should we have empathy for those young people and not so young people held hostage? Absolutely, we should. Should we act to help their plight? Absolutely, we should. But that does not mean we ought to rationalize terrorists who attack children in Sderot or any other place. Hamas continues to hold them hostage, likely subjecting the Goldstone Report's Palestinian witnesses to intimidation and threats, a possibility that the report does not take into account, of course.

Unlike Hamas and its sponsors, Israel is a democracy with an independent judiciary, and all of us know that that judiciary frequently has said to the military and to the Israel Government, you cannot do this. You did it wrong. You're going to be held accountable. There is nothing like that in Gaza, little like that in the West Bank, although the West Bank is getting better. Its security is increasing. Abbas and Fayad are making progress. It is fully investigating its military for any—I am going back to Israel now—for any human rights violations that may have been committed in Gaza. That is appropriate. They ought to do that. Tragically, we know that when men and, indeed, women go to war, that there are those who do not always act properly on both sides. We need to hold that conduct accountable.

I believe in the integrity of Israel's investigations because I believe in its legitimacy as a democratic state, but I do not accept the legitimacy of singling out Israel for biased censure. It is essential to hold every nation to international norms of behavior in peace as well as in war. Israel must be held to the same standards as any other nation. It holds itself to such standards, I would add, even when its enemies do not. Indeed, few nations constrain themselves more than Israel, but no other nation has so many in the U.N. eager to condemn it, irrespective of facts and justification.

Soon, the U.N. General Assembly will vote on endorsing the Goldstone Report. Goldstone himself said that their report was not a fair report, but by doing so and by condemning Israel, the U.N. would also be threatening the just self-defense of any state endangered by asymmetrical warfare.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself my remaining time.

We must recognize what is at stake here. The Goldstone Report asked for this matter to be considered by the International Criminal Court, equating Israel with the genocidal regime in Sudan. Today enemies of freedom seek to haul democratic, political and military leaders of Israel before an unaccountable court for defending their nation against Hamas, but how long before U.S. officials will have to face the same persecution for defending our Nation against al Qaeda or any other such threat?

Madam Speaker, the way forward is obvious. We must support the right of all democracies to defend ourselves and our citizens. We must reaffirm our support for Israel and her efforts to defend herself from violent Islamic militants and their state sponsors. We must oppose any attempts to grant consideration or endorsement to this irredeemably biased Goldstone Report.

House Resolution 867 achieves these goals, and 170 of our colleagues who co-sponsored it agreed. My colleagues, we have a choice to make: stand with free democratic nations or send a message to those who seek Israel and America's destruction that they can continue unhampered as the U.N. and its apologists sweep under the proverbial rug incessant attacks like the ones Hamas and other violent extremists launched from Gaza against Israel. The choice is clear. Support this resolution.

Mr. ELLISON. May I inquire as to time, Madam Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 6¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. ELLISON. I yield 1¼ minutes to the gentlelady from Minnesota, Congresswoman MCCOLLUM.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Madam Speaker, this resolution harms U.S. national security interests in the Middle East. The U.S. is attempting to be an honest broker in the Israeli-Palestine peace process, yet this resolution is blatantly biased, and it damages U.S. credibility.

This resolution seeks to hide the ugliness of the Gaza war by covering up violent excesses committed against innocent civilians by both Hamas and the Israeli Defense Forces. Why does the U.S. House want to reject an accounting of Hamas' terrorism against Israeli civilians, as if thousands of rockets were not fired at Israel? And why would this resolution want to deny that hundreds of Palestinian women and children and elders were needlessly killed?

American-made white phosphorous shells were used by Israel in civilian areas, causing horrible burns to Palestinian children, yet this resolution refuses to seek the truth. The report Congress is burying today was led by a former chief prosecutor who has faced far tougher actors than the critics in this Chamber, critics who have not held one single hearing.

There must be only one standard for respecting human rights, a single

standard by which we must hold ourselves and our friends and our adversaries accountable.

Madam Speaker, this resolution harms U.S. national security interests in the Middle East and American leadership for human rights and humanitarian law. And, while the U.S. attempts to be an honest-broker in an Israeli-Palestinian peace process this resolution is blatantly biased and damages U.S. credibility.

This resolution seeks to hide the ugliness of the Gaza war by covering-up the violent excesses committed against innocent civilians by Hamas and the Israeli Defense Forces.

Why does the U.S. House want to reject an accounting of Hamas's terrorism against Israeli civilians as if thousands of rockets were not fired at Israel?

Why does this resolution want to deny that hundreds of Palestinian women and elders were needlessly killed by the IDF?

American-made white phosphorous shells were used by Israel in civilian areas causing horrible burns to Palestinian children, yet this resolution refuses to seek the truth?

The report Congress is burying today was led by a former chief prosecutor for war crimes in Rwanda and the former Yugoslavia, a jurist of exceptional experience who has faced far tougher actors than his critics in this Chamber, critics who have not held a single hearing or conducted a single fact-finding mission on the subject of his report.

There must be only one standard for respecting human rights, a single standard by which we must hold ourselves, our friends, and our adversaries accountable. Establishing situational standards for respecting human rights is dishonest and only encourages actions that destroy human dignity and life.

Therefore I agree with U.N. Secretary Ban Ki-moon who recently said at the Anti-Defamation League's annual dinner that he is "a friend who is acutely aware of Israel's security needs." But on the issue of the Goldstone report Secretary Ban said, "When human rights are violated anywhere in the world we need accountability."

Today, I would ask my colleagues to vote for human rights and accountability by voting against this resolution.

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Speaker, I plan to be the last speaker. Correct me if I am wrong, but I understand that under the rules, I have the right to close, so I will reserve my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. ELLISON. I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS).

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my sincere disappointment that my colleagues and I are once again in a very untenable position on such a critical issue facing our country, our ally Israel, the Palestinian people and the global community.

House Resolution 867 is just the wrong resolution yet again at this time. The U.N. General Assembly takes up this business tomorrow, and I think it's really important for us to note that the Congress gets one shot, one shot, to address the shortcomings of the mandate for the inquiry, the pitfalls of the Goldstone Report, and one

shot to call on the Palestinians and Israelis to conduct their independent investigations and to stand for human rights and international law.

David Ben-Gurion once said, "Without moral and intellectual independence, there is no anchor for national independence," and I think we should heed that today. I say it's the wrong resolution because it's our opportunity actually to get it right in a new direction for the Middle East. Regrettably, in this flawed process, we are tarnishing the reputation of one of the greatest advocates for human rights of our time, Justice Richard Goldstone. As a member of the Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission, I believe we should have and the oversight committees of jurisdiction should have extended to Justice Goldstone the courtesy of inviting him to present his findings on the record. We didn't. We did not extend to the Israeli Government the courtesy of explaining on the record the shortcomings they find in this report.

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

Mr. ELLISON. I yield the gentlelady an additional 5 seconds.

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. I want to just communicate that it's really important for us to get it right, and I appreciate the leadership of Chairman BERMAN. I look forward to us working in the future for something that actually does lead to peace.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my sincere disappointment that my colleagues and I are once again in a tenable position on such a critical issue facing our country, facing our ally Israel, the Palestinian people and the global community.

This resolution, H. Res. 867, is the wrong resolution at this time. The U.N. General Assembly takes up this business tomorrow. Our Nation will be speaking in defense and support of Israel. It is important to note, that while we are united in our support for Israel and the Palestinian people, this Congress gets one shot to address the shortcomings of the mandate for the inquiry and the pitfalls of the Goldstone report. We also get only one shot to call on the Palestinians and the Israelis to conduct their own independent inquiries, to stand up in defense of human rights and international law, and to investigate wrongdoing by all parties with the objective of ensuring that it does not happen again.

David Ben-Gurion once said, "without moral and intellectual independence, there is no anchor for national independence." I believe that Israel operates under that spirit today; I am encouraged that there is a robust dialogue within the country over the Gaza war. It is important that this dialogue continues and Israel is allowed to pursue the rule of law unhampered. Now is the appropriate time for the Palestinians to take additional steps to eschew violence and operate with moral and intellectual independence. This will provide additional support to their calls for national independence. They can do this by conducting their own inquiry and investigate the allegations against entities in Gaza.

I say this is the wrong resolution because it fails to call for independent investigations by

the Israelis and Palestinians. This was our opportunity to get it right and when this resolution passes, we will have gotten it wrong. It will be a missed opportunity to move closer to achieving a two-state solution. Regrettably, in this flawed process, we are tarnishing the reputation of one of the greatest advocates for human rights of our time, Justice Richard Goldstone. As a member of the Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission, I believe we should have, and the oversight committees of jurisdiction should have extended to Justice Goldstone the courtesy of inviting him to present his findings on the record. We didn't. We did not extend to the Israeli Government the courtesy of explaining, on the record, the shortcomings they find in this report. By not taking these actions we have now been forced to consider a poorly constructed resolution at the eleventh hour just before our U.N. delegation presents its case to the General Assembly. Further, this resolution actually calls on the administration to not go to the U.N. tomorrow as it is so broad that it calls on the President and Secretary of State to "oppose unequivocally any endorsement or further consideration of the Goldstone report in multilateral fora". Unfortunately, these mixed messages and inconsistencies damage this resolution and the lack of due diligence risks a diminished reputation of this body in the international arena.

As I stand right now I want to communicate to the United Nations that enough is enough: It is inappropriate to create a mandate that is so easily impeachable. However, I find it difficult to abide with a resolution that I find so deeply flawed and as one-sided as some suggest of the Goldstone Report.

I know that these issues are difficult, and I want to thank Chairman BERMAN; while I disagree with many points in this resolution, I appreciate his leadership on this issue. I appreciate that we will be standing united behind our President as we work toward a lasting two-state solution to find peace for Israel and her people and a homeland for Palestinians.

Mr. ELLISON. I would like to inquire as to the time remaining.

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

Mr. ELLISON. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, let's be clear about what we're debating here. Nobody in this Chamber disputes Israel's right to defend itself against attacks by Hamas and other terrorist organizations, and neither does the report issued by Justice Goldstone. The report instead examines the conduct of the war by both sides, including a detailed chapter on the savage rocket attacks launched from Gaza into southern Israel, which it describes as "serious war crimes" and possibly "crimes against humanity."

Nobody here is defending one-sided mandates either:

But in the interest of full disclosure, critics should note that Justice Goldstone insisted on a rewritten and balanced mandate before he took on the assignment.

Nobody here is disputing the obligation of the U.S. to insist that any reso-

lution debated by the U.N. be fair and balanced and to vote against or veto it otherwise. But there is a crucial distinction between criticizing the way in which the Goldstone Report was handled at the U.N. and criticizing the very existence of the report in the first place, which is exactly what this resolution does. Conflating the two does a disservice to a respected jurist who has devoted his life to upholding international norms of justice and human rights, and more importantly, it may damage future efforts to hold countries accountable through international investigations.

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

Mr. ELLISON. I yield the gentleman 15 additional seconds.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Finally, bringing this resolution up at this time and in this manner could have implications for the possibility of internal investigations into the conflict by the parties themselves. That is a central recommendation of the Goldstone Report as well as the Obama administration and prominent Israeli officials and Israeli human rights organizations. Israel is a strong and resilient democracy. Successfully investigating this episode could only make it stronger. We shouldn't pass a resolution now which could actually slow or stop the wheels of justice.

Mr. ELLISON. I yield 1¼ minutes to the gentleman from California, Congresswoman CAPPAS.

Mrs. CAPPAS. I thank my colleague for yielding, Madam Speaker.

I rise to express my opposition to the resolution before us. Sadly, I think that in this body's haste, we've overlooked some of the depth of unspeakable tragedies that have occurred during the war on Gaza. Innocent Israeli and Palestinian lives were lost. We owe it to all victims' families to vow to do everything in our power to prevent further tragedy. Instead, we have a flawed resolution before us.

As an example, the text of the resolution focuses on the original mandate of the report, not the mission that was actually carried out by the investigators. I am disappointed the committee chose to ignore the fact that Justice Goldstone did not agree to take on the investigation until it was agreed to that the conduct of all parties would be investigated. This is just one of many parts of the resolution.

The United States will remain a true friend to our ally Israel without passing a resolution that has questionable accuracy and motives. So let us call for an open and honest debate with the reputable Judge Goldstone. Let us not act in haste to pass a resolution that will in no way achieve our ultimate goal of achieving a lasting peace for Israelis and Palestinians.

□ 1700

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, this resolution should not be coming before us. I agree that there is an anti-Israel bias at the United Nations. But at this moment in history, it should be the responsibility of every Member of this House to help bring the parties in the conflict in the Middle East back to the negotiating table.

We need to resurrect and advance a peace process, so that rockets never again fall on innocent Israeli civilians and the terror of Gaza is not repeated. This resolution does not do that. This resolution heightens the rhetoric of division.

Regardless of what you think of the Goldstone Report, it makes an important recommendation: that it is incumbent upon both Israel and the Palestinians, in particular Hamas, to carry out credible investigations into actions by their forces that led to the harm and loss of civilians.

I regret that we are not calling upon all parties to return to the peace table so that the rockets and bombs may be silenced in the Middle East, once and for all.

I regret that this resolution is on the House floor increasing the politicization and the polarization and the heated rhetoric so characteristic of the crisis in the Middle East.

So, Madam Speaker, I will vote "no" today on this resolution.

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Speaker, I am going to take the balance of my time to close. As I do, I would like to first of all have entered into the RECORD a letter from Israeli human rights organizations, including B'Tselem, Gisha, the Public Committee Against Torture, Rabbis for Human Rights, and Yesh Din, Volunteers for Human Rights.

In regards to: House Resolution 867 regarding the Goldstone Commission report on Operation Cast Lead.

To: Interested Persons.

From: Israeli Human Rights organizations.

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN: We appeal to you as representatives of the human rights community in Israel regarding House Resolution 867.

From day one, the Israeli human rights community has consistently called for Israel to conduct an independent and impartial investigation into the conduct of its forces during "Operation Cast Lead" in the Gaza Strip. Today, this call is increasingly echoed by Israelis across the political spectrum. Deputy Prime Minister Dan Meridor (Likud), Minister of Improvement of Government Services Michael Eitan (Likud), Minority Affairs Minister Avishay Braverman (Labor), and National Infrastructure Minister Uzi Landau (Yisrael Beiteinu) have all called for such an inquiry, as has Aryeh Deri, former leader of the Shas party. The US State Department has called for such an inquiry as has National Security Advisor James Jones.

Such an investigation, provided it meets international standards for scope and independence, would put an end to the polarizing international debate around the Goldstone Report and show that Israel is a law-abiding state that can ensure accountability at home.

However, we are concerned that H. Res. 867 may derail the momentum towards an Israeli investigation. Resolution 867 contains factual inaccuracies, both about the Goldstone

Report and about the measures taken by Israel to date, that must not guide choices by policy makers.

We urge interested parties and Members of the House to show their support for the internal democratic conversation taking place in Israel and to call on Israel to demonstrate that it can ensure genuine accountability at home.

Sincerely,  
B'Tselem.

Gisha.  
Hamoked—Center for the Defence of the Individual.

Public Committee Against Torture in Israel.

Rabbis for Human Rights.

Yesh Din—Volunteers for Human Rights.

I would also like to enter into the RECORD the Goldstone Report itself. This voluminous document, 574 pages, which I hope Members will take the opportunity to read.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLISON. I can't yield with the short time I have.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. You asked unanimous consent to put the Goldstone Report in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. ELLISON. The point is I have already received unanimous consent and do intend to enter the document into the RECORD. But what I ask for, from all sides, it is clear that everybody in this body is very concerned about peace in the Middle East. We all have to assume best intentions from everyone, and we have to look to this issue with a mind toward helping Israel and the Palestinians to come to a lasting peace. Two states, two people, in security, side by side.

I don't think this resolution helps us achieve that. So I will be voting "no," and I urge my colleagues to do likewise.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. If my colleague would yield, I would like to know how much it will cost the taxpayers to put 575 pages of the Goldstone Report in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. BAIRD. Madam Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BAIRD. Is it not the conditions under which this is considered that Members would have an opportunity to introduce extraneous material without having to ask unanimous consent at the moment of request? We already have that, I believe. In other words, the gentlelady's objection is irrelevant.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. General leave has been obtained.

Mr. BAIRD. Meaning what, if I may ask. My belief is we had unanimous consent at the outset.

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

Mr. BAIRD. I have a further parliamentary inquiry. With respect to

the Parliamentarian, "general leave may be obtained" is cryptic, and I would like a straight answer. My belief is that the conditions of this, at the outset of this debate, Members were given the authority to introduce extraneous material, and without having to request unanimous consent. In other words, the gentlelady's objection is irrelevant.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. General leave has been obtained, but each submission of extraneous material is subject to certain page limits.

Mr. BERMAN. Parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California may state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BERMAN. Is it not correct that I sought and received unanimous consent for extraneous material to be introduced into the RECORD related to this resolution?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BERMAN. Further parliamentary inquiry. Is it not correct that with the exception of items introduced of more than a certain page, wherein the cost has been to be established and leave sought, that large items can also be put into the RECORD as part of that unanimous consent request?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. General leave is subject to certain page limits for extraneous material.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Parliamentary inquiry, Madam Speaker.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Is it correct that after a certain number of pages, there will be a cost estimate for the printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD? This report is 575 pages, and I am wondering the cost to the taxpayers for the printing of this biased report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. General leave is subject to certain page limits. Extraneous material in excess of those limits may be further assessed on cost.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I just want to be clear, when you asked under general leave for unanimous consent, that I will object to that for the printing in the RECORD.

Mr. BAIRD. Parliamentary inquiry, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. BAIRD. Is it my understanding that the gentleman from Minnesota lost time because of the parliamentary inquiry?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. No, the time of the gentleman from Minnesota had expired.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BERMAN. The question is raised by several of the opposing speakers: Why are we doing this now? What's the rush? And the only rush, because I would prefer we have more time, I pre-

fer we have more discussion, is that tomorrow the General Assembly, in its rush to adopt a resolution to send this matter to the Security Council and to the international criminal courts if there is not an investigation within 90 days, is speeding to a judgment, and I personally think it is very important for us to act on this matter before the General Assembly meets, debates, and votes.

Secondly, there have been glowing tributes, and I am sure they are deserved, to the record, the resume, the judgment, the reputation of Justice Goldstone. Several of my favorite Supreme Court justices voted in a decision called *Korematsu* to pick up Japanese Americans who resided in different parts of the United States and put them into detention camps. They are still my favorite justices, but they made a mistake. A wonderful jurist can issue a flawed report, and I would suggest this is such a situation.

Next, let's talk about the Human Rights Commission. The U.N. Human Rights Council is obsessed with Israel. They have had 24 negative resolutions on Israel in its 3 years of existence, which totals more than every other resolution on any other country regardless of their human rights record. Total, 24 on Israel; less on all of the other countries of the world. It is the only country which is on the permanent agenda of the Human Rights Council, and it is discussed every year automatically. The only country.

Now, we corrected what I think were some inaccuracies in the initial language regarding the mandate, and we recognize the efforts. Never, as my ranking member points, to formally change the mandate, but for Justice Goldstone to operate. But I would not rest my opposition, my support for this resolution, and my disagreement with the opponents simply based on the reputation and conduct of the Human Rights Council. The fact is I too believe the report is flawed.

I am going to take a couple of moments to quote from this coming week's *New Republic* an article by Moshe Halbertal. I want to quote two paragraphs which I think reflect better than I can say on my own the problem here and ask my colleagues to come to grips with this.

He writes, "The commission that wrote the report," that is the Goldstone Report, "could have performed a great service if it had concentrated on gathering the testimonies from Gaza and assessing them critically, while acknowledging (as the Goldstone Report failed to do) that they are partial and incomplete."

By definition, they did not talk, for reasons that we all know, they did not talk to the Israeli forces that were involved in the crimes this commission found them to have committed.

"This would have forced Israel to investigate various matters, provide answers, and take appropriate measures."

Continuing, "But instead, the commission opted to add to its findings

three unnecessary elements: the context of the history that led to the war; its assessments of Israel's strategic goals; and long sections on Israel's occupation of the West Bank. Why should a committee with a mandate to inquire into the operation in Gaza deal with the Israeli-Palestinian conflict at large?

"The honest reader of these sections," and I have read those sections, "cannot avoid the impression that their objective is to prepare a general indictment of Israel as a predatory state that is geared toward violating human rights all the time. It will naturally follow from such a premise that the Gaza operation was yet another instance of Israel's general wicked behavior. These long sections are the weakest, the most biased, and the most outrageous in this long document. They are nothing if not political. In Goldstone's account of the history that led to the war, for example, Hamas is basically described as a legitimate party that had the bad luck to clash with Israel. The bloody history of the movement—which, since the beginning of the Oslo accords, was determined to do everything in its power, including the massacre of civilians, to defeat the peace process—is not mentioned."

We are in a very strange situation. Israel has conducted numerous investigations on this issue. I would like to see Israel conduct a formal inquiry on this particular issue. But until we in this Congress come here and recommend that some outside commission recognize the U.S. military because a number of civilians died in the asymmetrical war or when we dealt with Taliban forces in Afghanistan, or other issues that come in an asymmetrical war where the soldiers wear no uniforms and there is no front, don't start telling us that democratic allies like Israel have to have these investigations. Their process will produce the right result, I truly believe.

I urge an "aye" vote for the resolution.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Madam Speaker, the United States and Israel have shared a close relationship of friendship, cooperation, and strategic alliance that serves as an example to the rest of the world. I believe it is imperative for the United States to unequivocally reject the findings of the Goldstone Report, in order to preserve and nurture this relationship.

The U.N. Human Rights Council has long been recognized for its anti-Israel bias, so it comes as little surprise they would rubber-stamp the "Goldstone Report" and its findings of "crimes against humanity" with regard to Israel's activities in Gaza. To quote Israel's Ambassador to the U.S., Michael Oren, "Israel basically was the equivalent of being summoned to a court in which its guilt was already presumed . . . I can't think of any country in the world which would participate in such a farce of justice."

Indeed, while this report condemns Israel's actions, it ignores the precipitating causes of Israel's self-defensive actions, concluding that Israel's military operations were "deliberate and systematic," and directed at the people of

Gaza as a whole, failing to acknowledge Israel's right to defend itself against terrorism, namely the thousands of rockets launched daily at its citizens. Moreover, the Goldstone Report ignores the extraordinary steps taken by Israel to minimize civilian casualties, often putting its own soldiers at greater risk to do so.

Madam Speaker, it is unfortunate that recent years have been marked by escalating armed conflict between Israel and Hamas; however, I believe the United States should stand steadfast in its commitment to a free and secure Israel as the Middle East comes to embrace the liberties and freedoms of democratic societies.

Mr. PASCRELL. Madam Speaker, I rise today regarding H. Res. 867 condemning the United Nation's Goldstone Report on last winter's conflict in Israel and the Gaza Strip, which the House of Representatives considered today. I am unable to attend today's legislative session, but had I been present I would have voted "aye."

The right of our close friend and ally Israel to defend itself from rocket fire originating in the Gaza Strip is without question. Since 2000, over 9,000 rockets have fallen on the residents of southern Israel, who live in constant fear of this violent terrorism. Since Hamas took over the leadership in Gaza, the number of rockets fired has increased considerably, and the range of these rockets is ever expanding.

The situation in the Gaza Strip remains unsustainable. The ongoing blockade and the damage to the territory inflicted during the recent conflict have caused great hardship to many innocent Palestinian's living in Gaza. This situation is only made worse by Hamas, who embed themselves in private homes, schools, mosques, hospitals, and use innocent Palestinians as human shields during the conflict.

Judge Richard Goldstone has previously investigated war crimes in the former Yugoslavia and Rwanda. His report on the Gaza war contains many accusations of troubling actions taken by both sides during the recent conflict. I have extreme reservations regarding the history of the United Nations Human Rights Council and it is troubling that their original mandate focused solely in Israel and ignored Hamas' clear violations of international law. I applaud Judge Goldstone for his insistence on changing that mandate to include investigations of both sides, however the pattern of bias exhibited by the UNHRC is troubling and difficult to ignore. Therefore, I would not support any further action by the United Nations that unfairly singles out Israel, and would urge the administration to work to actively defeat any such attempts.

I believe many of the allegations in the report are serious, and the most appropriate course of action to take would be for the Israelis and Palestinians to each commission independent investigations into their countries respective conduct during the war. The war in Gaza last winter brought terrible suffering to both the Israelis in southern Israel and Palestinians in Gaza and this cannot be ignored.

The recent conflict makes it clearer than ever that the endless cycle of violence has done nothing to bring peace or security to the region. I applaud the Obama administration for their commitment to a two state solution that represents the best chance for a lasting peace

between the Israelis and Palestinians. I urge both sides to start negotiations as soon as possible.

Mr. COSTELLO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my concern over the Report of the United Nations Fact Finding Mission on the Gaza Conflict and in support of H. Res. 867.

On October 16, 2009, the United Nations Human Rights Council endorsed the findings of the Report of the United Nations Fact Finding Mission on the Gaza Conflict, commonly referred to as the Goldstone Report. The Goldstone report unfairly documents the events that occurred during Operation Cast Lead, or the Gaza conflict, from December 27, 2008, to January 18, 2009, determining that Israel deliberately attacked Gaza civilians.

As a member of the Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission, I am deeply committed to ending human rights violations and holding the perpetrators accountable for their actions. However, I join my colleagues and over 15 member states of the United Nations Human Rights Council, who believe that this report is biased and deeply flawed.

As a cosponsor of H. Res. 867, I agree that the Obama administration should not endorse the Goldstone Report because it unfairly castigates Israel's actions during the Gaza conflict. For example, the report recommends that the U.N. General Assembly establish a reparation fund to compensate Palestinians who have suffered loss during the Gaza conflict. However, the report ignores any need that a similar escrow fund be established for Israelis who have suffered years of violence and destruction at the hands of Hamas and other militant groups in Gaza.

Finally, the report fails to recognize the repeated violent attacks committed against Israeli citizens and its unequivocal right to defend itself. Israel has the right and the responsibility to defend its people and ensure its security. That right should be fully acknowledged.

Madam Speaker, there is an urgency to reach a workable peace between Israel and Palestine. It is my hope that these two nations are able to find a lasting peace in the near term to circumvent further violent conflicts, and I believe this report does not move us closer to that goal. I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing the Goldstone Report and supporting H. Res. 867.

Mr. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H. Res. 867. This resolution, though nonbinding, sends a signal to the world that the United States Congress is not serious about pushing the Israelis and the Palestinians toward a peaceful resolution.

It is true that the body that mandated the Report of the United Nations Fact Finding Mission on the Gaza Conflict, known as the Goldstone Report, has been no friend to Israel. Indeed, the United Nations Human Rights Council has consistently passed one-sided biased resolutions against Israel while, at the same time, allowing documented, blatant human rights violators to preside over that body without criticism. The U.S and other friends of Israel have every right and every reason to be critical of the United Nations' treatment of Israel, when, for example, 6 of 10 special sessions of the U.N. General Assembly have been about Israel, while none has been called on Tibet or Darfur.

Therefore, we must ask ourselves, does this resolution, which opposes further consideration of the Goldstone Report, bring us closer to peace in the Middle East? Does it spur negotiations between the Israelis, Palestinians, and other parties, or does it marginalize and itself choose sides? We must ask, are we undermining President Obama's, Secretary Clinton's, and Special Envoy Mitchell's efforts to serve as an honest broker, bring the two sides together, and achieve peace, by passing this resolution?

Madam Speaker, Israel, unequivocally, has a right to defend itself against those who seek to destroy it. We know that Israel was relentlessly attacked by rockets and mortars leading up to the Gaza war. They made the calculation that they could not allow Hamas to continue this violence and abuse.

However, neither Israel nor Hamas, nor any other country or other nonstate political actor is exempt from international human rights laws or free of consequence for violations of them. If nothing else, the Goldstone Report should serve as a document that Israel, Hamas, and the rest of the international community can use to ensure that future human rights violations do not take place in civilian areas and that their militaries and fighters are actively working toward minimizing civilian casualties in the future.

Madam Speaker, time and again we acknowledge the urgency of this conflict. The Obama administration is working feverishly with both sides toward a peaceful resolution, a two-state solution which will benefit both parties, the United States and the Middle East region as a whole.

I urge my colleagues to join me in voting "no" on this resolution.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Madam Speaker, regrettably, I rise in opposition to H. Res. 867, a resolution condemning the recently issued "Report of the United Nations Fact Finding Mission on the Gaza Conflict," commonly known as the Goldstone Report.

I do not believe that the House should be asked to vote on this resolution when it has not come before the Committee on Foreign Affairs for even one hearing and was brought to the House with little notice under procedures typically reserved for noncontroversial legislation. Given the subject matter of this resolution and the diverse range of views expressed on it from many organizations and individuals, including individuals in my own congressional district, I do not believe this resolution can be described as noncontroversial.

The military conflict in the Gaza Strip last winter resulted in devastating consequences to innocent Israeli and Palestinian civilians. It is critical that the international community evaluate the events of last December and January in a factual, unbiased manner. To this end, I am pleased that H. Res. 867 recognizes the numerous problems in the original resolution passed by the United Nations Human Rights Council authorizing the Goldstone Report, as that original resolution wrongly singled out alleged Israeli abuses and ignored the harm caused by Hamas' rocket and mortar attacks on the Israeli people.

However, I have serious reservations about other aspects of H. Res. 867.

No congressional hearings have been held on H. Res. 867 or the Goldstone Report. On an issue of such importance, Congress must do its due diligence and ensure that we have

a full understanding of the facts before being asked to vote to condemn the report and its authors.

Furthermore, I am concerned that H. Res. 867 implicitly criticizes the Goldstone Report because of the initial Human Rights Council resolution. Justice Richard Goldstone, who oversaw the Goldstone Report, is a distinguished jurist with a long record of support for human rights. Most notably, Justice Goldstone was a prominent critic of the abhorrent apartheid regime in South Africa. As H. Res. 867 notes, to his credit, Justice Goldstone extended the original mandate for the Report of the United Nations Fact Finding Mission on the Gaza Conflict to include an evaluation of Hamas' rocket attacks on civilians in southern Israel, among other issues.

Regardless of one's ultimate evaluation of the report, it is important to recognize the changes that Justice Goldstone was able to make to it and evaluate his report on its own merits.

I fully support efforts to provide clarity, honesty and accuracy to the debate about the conflict in Gaza, just as do many of my constituents who have contacted me this week urging me to oppose this resolution. Hastily voting on a resolution to condemn this report without the ability to properly evaluate its findings does not serve this purpose.

Also, I do not believe that this resolution aids the important effort of achieving a two-state solution to help end the ever-present violence and strife in the region. President Obama has taken admirable steps to bring the two sides to the negotiating table, after years of neglect under the Bush administration. Yet, this resolution today does not aid the administration in that effort or further the peace process. In fact, I believe this resolution undermines the ability of the United States to further push both sides toward serious peace negotiations.

The House can play a constructive role in promoting peace and understanding in the Middle East and I look forward to supporting such efforts. Regrettably, due to the concerns I have stated above about specific aspects of this resolution and the process under which it has been brought to the House, I must oppose the resolution.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, it is with great disappointment that I rise today to address H. Res. 867, a resolution calling on the President and the Secretary of State to oppose unequivocally any endorsement or further consideration of the "Report of the United Nations Fact Finding Mission."

Like many of my colleagues, I support the rights of countries—including Israel—to defend themselves. When a democratically elected and peace-seeking nation is forced to take up arms, it is within its rights and obligations to protect its own land and people.

Sadly, the resolution we consider today goes far beyond that principle. H. Res. 867 will only serve to drive a wedge between the parties and will derail the Administration's efforts towards a peaceful resolution to the ongoing conflict.

While the "Report of the United Nations Fact Finding Mission on the Gaza Conflict" is far from perfect, it should not be used as a political tool to block the peace process or to promote distrust and division.

Any action Congress takes should serve to promote a negotiated peace that will end the

violence that threatens to overtake the region and irreparably scar generations. I fear that the resolution before us today only fans the flames of discord and moves us no closer to the common goal of security and prosperity.

It is my hope that in the future Congress will have the opportunity to consider legislation that is balanced and that—at its core—promotes a smart security policy for the U.S. and its allies in the region. Unfortunately, this resolution does not.

Mr. PAULSEN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support for the resolution before us calling for the unequivocal opposition to any endorsement or further consideration of the Report of the United Nations Fact Finding Mission on the Gaza Conflict.

This report, more commonly known as "the Goldstone Report" continues the U.N.'s misguided treatment towards Israel.

Madam Speaker, this report and its findings have been skewed from the start. Former United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, Mary Robinson, condemned the mandate to initiate the report as being one-sided and "guided not by human rights, but by politics."

Therefore, the results are not surprising. The report gives a one-sided account of the conflict and does nothing to promote or bring about stability in the region.

While seeking to condemn Israel with outrageous accusations, nowhere in the misguided report does it recognize the fact that Israel has a right to defend itself from violent terrorist attacks.

Adopting this resolution will go a long way in sending a message to the U.N. that the American people will not stand for this biased and misleading action.

I want to thank Chairman BERMAN and Ranking Member ROS-LEHTINEN for their thoughtful work on this resolution. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" and move towards real, meaningful peace in the Middle East.

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support for H. Res. 867, a resolution calling on the President and the Secretary of State to oppose unequivocally any endorsement or further consideration of the "Report of the United Nations Fact Finding Mission on the Gaza Conflict in Multilateral Fora."

Madam Speaker, this past August, I had the opportunity to visit Israel with my husband Brian. There, I saw firsthand how real the struggle for survival really is. I realized that when surrounded by enemies and people who think nothing of suicide bombing innocent civilians and launching hundreds of rockets across the borders, self-defense becomes paramount. Action becomes necessary when diplomacy and words fail. And, despite decades of attempts to engage its enemies, action continues to be necessary to protect this small, but strong nation.

The Goldstone Report is just another attempt by Israel's enemies to delegitimize it—this time using the pretense of a "United Nations fact finding mandate."

Biased from the start—mandating the fact finding mission to "investigate all violations of international human rights law and International Humanitarian Law by . . . Israel, against the Palestinian people," the mission intentionally ignored the use of human shields by Hamas and the indirect support of Syria and Iran.

American courts have long recognized the right to act in self-defense. Only a biased United Nations report could find the Palestinian attackers morally equivalent to the Israeli defenders.

When I left Israel in August, I pledged to work tirelessly on behalf of the Israeli people to ensure their survival. I am glad to speak out against this overtly biased report and I urge my colleagues to join me fighting for the Israeli people.

Mr. FARR. Madam Speaker, this resolution before us today, House Resolution 867, does nothing to advance the cause of peace and understanding between the Israelis and Palestinians.

In a recent meeting with Jewish constituents, I heard a comment that I thought was moving for its simplicity and power. My constituent told me, "Israel will not have peace and security until Palestinians have hope."

This resolution does nothing to give hope to the people of Palestine that a better, peaceful future is possible and therefore does nothing to give greater security to the people of Israel. It is a hasty and unconstructive measure that fails to establish a foundation upon which a future peace and prosperity will be constructed.

House Resolution 867 has too many flaws and questionable conclusions for me to support it. I think the Committee should have given the Goldstone report a hearing and taken the opportunity to ask Justice Goldstone questions about his mandate, his findings and his conclusions.

I would ask that Justice Goldstone's letter to Chairman BERMAN and Ranking Member ROS-LEHTINEN be included in the RECORD.

In this letter, Justice Goldstone clarifies that he demanded and received an expanded mandate to include the attacks on Israel. The report includes more than 150 instances where it explores the rocket attacks against Israel. And as a matter of fact, the Goldstone report found that rocket attacks constituted "indiscriminate attacks upon the civilian population of southern Israel".

I recognize a history of bias against Israel at the United Nations and I believe that one-sided resolutions against Israel have no place in an honest debate. However, it should be noted—and it is not in the resolution before us today—that Justice Goldstone dedicated scores of pages to expose war crimes and human rights violations perpetrated by Hamas and other Palestinian armed groups for the first time ever.

This resolution suffers too many instances of inaccuracy. It too often gives an account of the Goldstone report that is incomplete and therefore ends up being misleading. I don't believe this moves us closer to peace and for these reasons I cannot support the resolution.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Madam Speaker, I strongly support the resolution and want to express my deep appreciation to the Chairman, Mr. BERMAN, and to the Ranking Minority Member, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, for their efforts to bring this resolution before the House.

In April 2009, the U.N. Human Rights Council set up a Commission to condemn Israel. To the surprise of no one, it did exactly that. But for the grave subject matter, the Goldstone report, built heavily on testimony provided under the auspices of Hamas, would be laughable. In the self-righteous fantasyland inhabited by Judge Goldstone and his colleagues, there's no such thing as terrorism; there's no such

thing as Hamas (and if it does exist, it's certainly nothing to fear); there's no such thing as legitimate self-defense; and war is like a sporting event, rather than the most ghastly, destructive, chaotic phenomenon we human beings are capable of creating.

Had the report been submitted by a group of eager law students or the human rights club on a college campus, I would suggest that their efforts had been unfortunately wasted on the production of a pompous, tendentious, one-sided political diatribe. Notwithstanding all their alleged "facts" there's very little truth, and for all the so-called "context" they supply, there's very little wisdom.

As this diatribe actually carries the imprimatur of a part of the United Nations, there have been—as I feared when the report was first issued—a number of very unfortunate developments all based on the report is being mistaken for a credible piece of work, which it is not. In addition to the wasteful consideration of this thoroughly biased and fatally flawed document in several bodies of the United Nations, the report has also set off yet another round of offensive and sterile Israel-bashing that has brought peace no closer, that has produced no international consensus, and, along the way, that has further sullied and cheapened the reputation of the United Nations and the cause of human rights.

Certainly, the United States must do all that it can to ensure that no more time is spent on this distraction from the real work of making peace. The Obama Administration has rightfully denounced the Goldstone Report, which, if it was taken seriously, would make it legally impossible for this country, or any other country, to defend themselves from terrorists who hide behind civilians. Israeli Prime Minister Netanyahu has been forcefully arguing that international community can't possibly expect Israel to exchange "land for peace" if, when the peace breaks down, Israel is effectively prohibited from defending itself.

First of all, I think Prime Minister Netanyahu is completely right. And second, there's not even the smallest shred of a possibility that the Israeli public would agree to any peace agreement under the absurd operational restrictions that the Goldstone Report proposes to require of Israel's (and every other country's) armed forces.

The resolution makes clear the strong view of the House that the Obama Administration must do everything it can to quash the Goldstone report, both to protect our own right of self-defense, and to make clear to the world that they can have Goldstone, or they can have Middle East peace, but they can't have Goldstone and Middle East peace.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 867, a bipartisan resolution which calls upon the President and the Secretary of State to oppose the endorsement and further consideration of the "Report of the United Nations Fact Finding Mission on the Gaza Conflict" in multilateral fora.

The report, commissioned by the United Nations Human Rights Council, called for an investigation into war crimes and possible crimes against humanity by Israel during 22 days of fighting in Gaza and southern Israel in December 2008 and January 2009.

As a result, the fact-finding mission released an unbalanced 575-page report which unfairly focuses on Israel's conduct despite efforts by the report's chief author, Justice Richard

Goldstone, to broaden the mandate to include violations committed by Hamas and other militant groups.

In spite of its inaccuracies, the United Nations Human Rights Council endorsed the report and its recommendations and referred it to the United Nations Security Council, United Nations General Assembly and the International Criminal Court for further action.

A report that is not inclusive of all the facts and circumstances surrounding the conflict is an inconclusive report. It is unacceptable to consider a report which fails to provide a complete and accurate account of the Gaza conflict. To do otherwise undermines the inquiry process and denies the truth.

I urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 867.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 867, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

---

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3639, EXPEDITED CARD REFORM FOR CONSUMERS ACT OF 2009

Mr. MCGOVERN, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 111-326) on the resolution (H. Res. 884) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3639) to amend the Credit Card Accountability Responsibility and Disclosure Act of 2009 to establish an earlier effective date for various consumer protections, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

---

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2868, CHEMICAL FACILITY ANTI-TERRORISM ACT OF 2009

Mr. MCGOVERN, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 111-327) on the resolution (H. Res. 885) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2868) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to extend, modify, and recodify the authority of the Secretary of Homeland Security to enhance security and protect against acts of terrorism against chemical facilities, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

□ 1715

**ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER  
PRO TEMPORE**

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. LEE of California). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H. Res. 867, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 3157, by the yeas and nays;

H. Res. 736, de novo.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

**OPPOSING ANY ENDORSEMENT OR  
FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF  
REPORT OF THE UNITED NA-  
TIONS FACT FINDING MISSION  
ON THE GAZA CONFLICT**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 867, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 867, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 344, nays 36, answered “present” 22, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 838]

YEAS—344

Aderholt	Buchanan	DeLauro
Adler (NJ)	Burgess	Dent
Akin	Burton (IN)	Diaz-Balart, L.
Alexander	Butterfield	Diaz-Balart, M.
Altmire	Buyer	Dicks
Andrews	Calvert	Donnelly (IN)
Arcuri	Camp	Doyle
Austria	Campbell	Dreier
Baca	Cantor	Driehaus
Bachus	Cao	Edwards (TX)
Barrow	Capito	Ehlers
Bartlett	Cardoza	Ellsworth
Barton (TX)	Carmahan	Emerson
Bean	Carney	Engel
Berkley	Carter	Etheridge
Berman	Cassidy	Fallin
Berry	Castle	Fattah
Biggert	Castor (FL)	Flake
Bilbray	Chaffetz	Fleming
Bilirakis	Chandler	Forbes
Bishop (GA)	Childers	Fortenberry
Bishop (NY)	Chu	Foster
Bishop (UT)	Cleaver	Fox
Blackburn	Clyburn	Frank (MA)
Blunt	Coble	Franks (AZ)
Bocchieri	Coffman (CO)	Frelinghuysen
Boehner	Cohen	Fudge
Bonner	Cole	Gallegly
Bono Mack	Conaway	Garrett (NJ)
Boozman	Connolly (VA)	Gerlach
Boren	Costa	Giffords
Boswell	Costello	Gingrey (GA)
Boyd	Courtney	Gohmert
Brady (TX)	Crenshaw	Gonzalez
Braley (IA)	Crowley	Goodlatte
Bright	Cuellar	Granger
Brown (GA)	Culberson	Graves
Brown (SC)	Cummings	Grayson
Brown, Corrine	Davis (CA)	Green, Al
Brown-Waite,	Davis (IL)	Green, Gene
Ginny	DeGette	Griffith

Guthrie	Marshall	Royce	Luján	Speier	Welch
Hall (TX)	Massa	Ruppersberger	Obey	Tierney	Wu
Halvorson	Matheson	Rush			
Hare	Matsui	Ryan (OH)			
Harman	McCarthy (CA)	Ryan (WI)			
Harper	McCarthy (NY)	Salazar	Abercrombie	Gordon (TN)	Price (GA)
Hastings (FL)	McCauley	Sanchez, Loretta	Ackerman	Gutierrez	Sánchez, Linda
Hastings (WA)	McClintock	Sarbanes	Bachmann	Hall (NY)	T.
Heller	McCotter	Scalise	Barrett (SC)	Holt	Sires
Hensarling	McHenry	Schakowsky	Boucher	Meeks (NY)	Souder
Herger	McIntyre	Schauer	Brady (PA)	Murphy, Patrick	Stupak
Herseht Sandlin	McKeon	Schiff	Capuano	Nunes	Towns
Higgins	McMahon	Schmitt	Conyers	Pallone	Velázquez
Hill	McMorris	Schock	Davis (AL)	Pascrell	Wamp
Himes	Rodgers	Schrader	Davis (TN)	Payne	
Hinojosa	McNerney	Schwartz	Deal (GA)	Pingree (ME)	
Hodes	Meek (FL)	Scott (GA)			
Hoekstra	Melancon	Scott (VA)			
Holden	Mica	Sensenbrenner			
Hoyer	Michaud	Serrano			
Hunter	Miller (FL)	Sessions			
Inglis	Miller (MI)	Sestak			
Inslee	Miller (NC)	Shadegg			
Israel	Miller, Gary	Shea-Porter			
Issa	Minnick	Sherman			
Jackson (IL)	Mitchell	Shimkus			
Jackson-Lee	Mollohan	Shuler			
(TX)	Moore (KS)	Shuster			
Jenkins	Moore (WI)	Simpson			
Johnson (IL)	Moran (KS)	Skelton			
Johnson, Sam	Murphy (CT)	Slaughter			
Jordan (OH)	Murphy (NY)	Smith (NE)			
Kagen	Murphy, Tim	Smith (NJ)			
Kanjorski	Murtha	Smith (TX)			
Kennedy	Myrick	Smith (WA)			
Kildee	Nadler (NY)	Space			
Kilroy	Napolitano	Spratt			
Kind	Neal (MA)	Stearns			
King (IA)	Neugebauer	Sullivan			
King (NY)	Nye	Sutton			
Kingston	Oberstar	Tanner			
Kirk	Olson	Ortiz			
Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Ortiz	Paulsen			
Kissell	Paulsen	Pence			
Klein (FL)	Pence	Perlmutter			
Kline (MN)	Perlmutter	Perriello			
Kosmas	Perriello	Peters			
Kratovil	Peters	Peterson			
Lamborn	Peterson	Petri			
Lance	Petri	Pitts			
Langevin	Pitts	Platts			
Larsen (WA)	Platts	Poe (TX)			
Larson (CT)	Poe (TX)	Polis (CO)			
Latham	Polis (CO)	Pomeroy			
LaTourette	Pomeroy	Latta			
	Latta	Lee (NY)			
	Lee (NY)	Levin			
	Levin	Lewis (CA)			
	Lewis (CA)	Lewis (GA)			
	Lewis (GA)	Linder			
	Linder	Lipinski			
	Lipinski	LoBiondo			
	LoBiondo	Lowe			
	Lowe	Lucas			
	Lucas	Luetkemeyer			
	Luetkemeyer	Lummis			
	Lummis	Lungren, Daniel			
	Lungren, Daniel	E.			
	E.	Mack			
	Mack	Maffei			
	Maffei	Maloney			
	Maloney	Manzullo			
	Manzullo	Marchant			
	Marchant	Markey (CO)			
	Markey (CO)	Markey (MA)			
	Markey (MA)				

NAYS—36

Baird	Ellison	Miller, George
Baldwin	Filner	Moran (VA)
Blumenauer	Grijalva	Olver
Boustany	Hinchee	Pastor (AZ)
Capps	Johnson, E. B.	Paul
Carson (IN)	Kilpatrick (MI)	Price (NC)
Carson (IN)	Kucinich	Rahall
Clarke	Lee (CA)	Snyder
Clay	Lynch	Stark
Davis (KY)	Dingell	Waters
Dingell	McCollum	Watt
Doggett	McDermott	Woolsey
Edwards (MD)	McGovern	

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—22

Becerra	Eshoo	Jones
Cooper	Farr	Kaptur
DeFazio	Heinrich	Loebsack
Hirono	DeFazio	Lofgren, Zoe
Honda	Hirono	
Johnson (GA)	Honda	

NOT VOTING—30

Abercrombie	Gordon (TN)	Price (GA)
Ackerman	Gutierrez	Sánchez, Linda
Bachmann	Hall (NY)	T.
Barrett (SC)	Holt	Sires
Boucher	Meeks (NY)	Souder
Brady (PA)	Murphy, Patrick	Stupak
Capuano	Nunes	Towns
Conyers	Pallone	Velázquez
Davis (AL)	Pascrell	Wamp
Davis (TN)	Payne	
Deal (GA)	Pingree (ME)	

□ 1741

Messrs. COOPER and HONDA changed their vote from “yea” to “present.”

Mrs. DAHLKEMPER and Mr. LOEBSACK changed their vote from “nay” to “present.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mrs. BACHMANN. Madam Speaker, on November 3, 2009, I was unexpectedly detained and could not vote on H. Res. 867, calling on the President and the Secretary of State to oppose unequivocally any endorsement or further consideration of the “Report of the United Nations Fact Finding Mission on the Gaza Conflict” in multilateral fora. Had I been present, as a cosponsor of this resolution, I would have voted “yea.”

**MOMENT OF SILENCE IN REMEM-  
BRANCE OF MEMBERS OF  
ARMED FORCES AND THEIR  
FAMILIES**

The SPEAKER. The Chair would ask all present to rise for the purpose of a moment of silence.

The Chair asks that the House now observe a moment of silence in remembrance of our brave men and women in uniform who have given their lives in the service of our Nation in Iraq and in Afghanistan and their families, and all who serve in our Armed Forces and their families.

**ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER  
PRO TEMPORE**

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. LEE of California). Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

**MAX J. BEILKE DEPARTMENT OF  
VETERANS AFFAIRS OUT-  
PATIENT CENTER**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3157, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. WALZ) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3157.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 398, nays 0, not voting 34, as follows:

[Roll No. 839]

YEAS—398

Aderholt	Davis (IL)	Jones
Adler (NJ)	Davis (KY)	Jordan (OH)
Akin	DeFazio	Kagen
Alexander	DeGette	Kanjorski
Altmire	Delahunt	Kaptur
Arcuri	DeLauro	Kennedy
Austria	Dent	Kildee
Baca	Diaz-Balart, L.	Kirkpatrick (MI)
Bachmann	Diaz-Balart, M.	Kilroy
Bachus	Dicks	Kind
Baird	Dingell	King (IA)
Baldwin	Doggett	King (NY)
Barrow	Donnelly (IN)	Kingston
Bartlett	Doyle	Kirk
Barton (TX)	Dreier	Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Bean	Driehaus	Kissell
Becerra	Duncan	Klein (FL)
Berkley	Edwards (MD)	Kline (MN)
Berman	Edwards (TX)	Kosmas
Berry	Ehlers	Kratovil
Biggert	Ellison	Kucinich
Bilbray	Ellsworth	Lamborn
Bilirakis	Emerson	Lance
Bishop (GA)	Engel	Langevin
Bishop (NY)	Eshoo	Larsen (WA)
Bishop (UT)	Etheridge	Larson (CT)
Blackburn	Fallin	Latham
Blumenauer	Farr	LaTourrette
Blunt	Fattah	Latta
Bocieri	Filner	Lee (CA)
Boehner	Flake	Lee (NY)
Bonner	Fleming	Levin
Bono Mack	Forbes	Lewis (CA)
Boozman	Fortenberry	Lewis (GA)
Boren	Foster	Linder
Boswell	Fox	Lipinski
Boucher	Frank (MA)	LoBiondo
Boustany	Franks (AZ)	Loebsack
Boyd	Frelinghuysen	Lofgren, Zoe
Brady (TX)	Fudge	Lowe
Braley (IA)	Gallely	Lucas
Bright	Garrett (NJ)	Luetkemeyer
Broun (GA)	Gerlach	Lujan
Brown (SC)	Giffords	Lummis
Brown, Corrine	Gingrey (GA)	Lungren, Daniel
Brown-Waite,	Gohmert	E.
Ginny	Gonzalez	Lynch
Buchanan	Goodlatte	Mack
Burgess	Granger	Maffei
Burton (IN)	Graves	Maloney
Butterfield	Grayson	Manzullo
Buyer	Green, Al	Marchant
Calvert	Green, Gene	Markey (CO)
Camp	Griffith	Markey (MA)
Campbell	Guthrie	Marshall
Cao	Hall (TX)	Massa
Capito	Halvorson	Matheson
Capps	Hare	Matsui
Cardoza	Harman	McCarthy (CA)
Carnahan	Harper	McCarthy (NY)
Carney	Hastings (FL)	McCaul
Carson (IN)	Hastings (WA)	McClintock
Carter	Heinrich	McCollum
Cassidy	Heller	McCotter
Castle	Hensarling	McDermott
Castor (FL)	Herger	McGovern
Chaffetz	Herseth Sandlin	McHenry
Chandler	Higgins	McIntyre
Childers	Hill	McKeon
Chu	Himes	McMahon
Clarke	Hinche	McMorris
Clay	Hinojosa	Rodgers
Cleaver	Hirono	McNerney
Clyburn	Hodes	Meek (FL)
Coble	Hoekstra	Melancon
Coffman (CO)	Holden	Mica
Cohen	Honda	Michaud
Cole	Hoyer	Miller (FL)
Conaway	Hunter	Miller (MI)
Connolly (VA)	Inglis	Miller (NC)
Cooper	Insee	Miller, Gary
Costa	Israel	Miller, George
Costello	Issa	Minnick
Courtney	Jackson (IL)	Mitchell
Crenshaw	Jackson-Lee	Mollohan
Crowley	(TX)	Moore (KS)
Cuellar	Jenkins	Moore (WI)
Culberson	Johnson (GA)	Moran (KS)
Cummings	Johnson (IL)	Moran (VA)
Dahlkemper	Johnson, E. B.	Murphy (CT)
Davis (CA)	Johnson, Sam	Murphy (NY)

Murphy, Tim	Ros-Lehtinen	Stearns
Myrick	Roskam	Sullivan
Nadler (NY)	Ross	Sutton
Napolitano	Roybal-Allard	Tanner
Neal (MA)	Royce	Taylor
Neugebauer	Ruppersberger	Teague
Nye	Rush	Terry
Oberstar	Ryan (OH)	Thompson (CA)
Obey	Ryan (WI)	Thompson (MS)
Olson	Salazar	Thompson (PA)
Oliver	Sanchez, Loretta	Thornberry
Ortiz	Sarbanes	Tiahrt
Pastor (AZ)	Scalise	Tiberi
Paul	Schakowsky	Tierney
Paulsen	Schauer	Titus
Perce	Schiff	Tonko
Perlmutter	Schmidt	Tsongas
Perriello	Schock	Turner
Peters	Schrader	Upton
Peterson	Schwartz	Van Hollen
Petri	Scott (GA)	Visclosky
Pitts	Scott (VA)	Walden
Platts	Sensenbrenner	Walz
Poe (TX)	Serrano	Wasserman
Polis (CO)	Sessions	Schultz
Pomeroy	Sestak	Waters
Posey	Shadegg	Watson
Price (NC)	Shea-Porter	Watt
Putnam	Sherman	Waxman
Quigley	Shimkus	Weiner
Radanovich	Shuler	Welch
Rahall	Shuster	Westmoreland
Rangel	Simpson	Wexler
Rehberg	Skelton	Whitfield
Reichert	Slaughter	Wilson (OH)
Reyes	Smith (NE)	Wilson (SC)
Richardson	Smith (NJ)	Wolf
Rodriguez	Smith (TX)	Woolsey
Roe (TN)	Smith (WA)	Wu
Rogers (AL)	Snyder	Yarmuth
Rogers (KY)	Space	Young (AK)
Rogers (MI)	Speier	Young (FL)
Rohrabacher	Spratt	
Rooney	Stark	

NOT VOTING—34

Abercrombie	Grijalva	Price (GA)
Ackerman	Gutierrez	Rothman (NJ)
Andrews	Hall (NY)	Sánchez, Linda
Barrett (SC)	Holt	T.
Brady (PA)	Meeke (NY)	Sires
Cantor	Murphy, Patrick	Souder
Capuano	Murtha	Stupak
Conyers	Nunes	Towns
Davis (AL)	Pallone	Velazquez
Davis (TN)	Pascrell	Wamp
Deal (GA)	Payne	Wittman
Gordon (TN)	Pingree (ME)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1750

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HONORING PRESIDENT LINCOLN'S GETTYSBURG ADDRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 736.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 736.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 393, noes 0, not voting 39, as follows:

[Roll No. 840]

AYES—393

Aderholt	Crowley	Inglis
Adler (NJ)	Cuellar	Insee
Akin	Culberson	Israel
Alexander	Cummings	Issa
Altmire	Dahlkemper	Jackson (IL)
Andrews	Davis (CA)	Jackson-Lee
Arcuri	Davis (IL)	(TX)
Austria	Davis (KY)	Jenkins
Baca	DeFazio	Johnson (GA)
Bachmann	DeGette	Johnson (IL)
Bachus	Delahunt	Johnson, E. B.
Baird	DeLauro	Johnson, Sam
Baldwin	Dent	Jones
Barrow	Diaz-Balart, L.	Jordan (OH)
Bartlett	Diaz-Balart, M.	Kagen
Barton (TX)	Dicks	Kanjorski
Bean	Dingell	Kaptur
Becerra	Doggett	Kennedy
Berkley	Donnelly (IN)	Kildee
Berman	Doyle	Kirkpatrick (MI)
Berry	Dreier	Kilroy
Biggert	Driehaus	Kind
Bilbray	Duncan	King (IA)
Bilirakis	Edwards (MD)	King (NY)
Bishop (GA)	Edwards (TX)	Kingston
Bishop (NY)	Ehlers	Kirk
Bishop (UT)	Ellison	Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Blackburn	Ellsworth	Kissell
Blumenauer	Emerson	Klein (FL)
Blunt	Engel	Kline (MN)
Bocieri	Eshoo	Kosmas
Boehner	Etheridge	Lofgren, Zoe
Bonner	Fallin	Lamborn
Bono Mack	Farr	Lance
Boozman	Fattah	Langevin
Boren	Filner	Larsen (WA)
Boswell	Flake	Larson (CT)
Boucher	Fleming	Latham
Boustany	Forbes	LaTourrette
Boyd	Fortenberry	Latta
Brady (TX)	Foster	Lee (CA)
Braley (IA)	Fox	Lee (NY)
Bright	Franks (AZ)	Levin
Broun (GA)	Frelinghuysen	Lewis (CA)
Brown (SC)	Fudge	Lewis (GA)
Brown, Corrine	Gallely	Linder
Brown-Waite,	Ginny	Lipinski
Ginny	Garrett (NJ)	LoBiondo
Buchanan	Gerlach	Loebsack
Burgess	Giffords	Lofgren, Zoe
Burton (IN)	Gingrey (GA)	Lowe
Butterfield	Gohmert	Lucas
Buyer	Gonzalez	Luetkemeyer
Calvert	Goodlatte	Lujan
Camp	Granger	Lummis
Campbell	Graves	Lungren, Daniel
Cao	Grayson	E.
Capito	Green, Al	Lynch
Capps	Green, Gene	Mack
Cardoza	Griffith	Maffei
Carnahan	Guthrie	Maloney
Carney	Hall (TX)	Manzullo
Carson (IN)	Halvorson	Marchant
Carter	Hare	Markey (CO)
Cassidy	Harman	Markey (MA)
Castle	Harper	Marshall
Castor (FL)	Hastings (FL)	Massa
Chaffetz	Hastings (WA)	Matheson
Chandler	Heinrich	Matsui
Childers	Heller	McCarthy (CA)
Chu	Hensarling	McCarthy (NY)
Clarke	Herger	McCaul
Clay	Herseth Sandlin	McClintock
Cleaver	Higgins	McCollum
Clyburn	Hill	McCotter
Coble	Himes	McDermott
Coffman (CO)	Hinche	McGovern
Cohen	Hinojosa	McHenry
Cole	Hirono	McIntyre
Conaway	Hodes	McKeon
Connolly (VA)	Hoekstra	McMahon
Cooper	Holden	McMorris
Costa	Honda	Rodgers
Costello	Hoyer	McNerney
Courtney	Hunter	
Crenshaw		

Meek (FL)	Rangel	Smith (WA)
Melancon	Rehberg	Snyder
Mica	Reichert	Space
Michaud	Reyes	Speier
Miller (FL)	Richardson	Spratt
Miller (MI)	Rodriguez	Stark
Miller (NC)	Roe (TN)	Stearns
Miller, Gary	Rogers (AL)	Sullivan
Miller, George	Rogers (KY)	Sutton
Minnick	Rogers (MI)	Tanner
Mitchell	Rohrabacher	Taylor
Mollohan	Rooney	Teague
Moore (KS)	Ros-Lehtinen	Terry
Moore (WI)	Roskam	Thompson (CA)
Moran (KS)	Ross	Thompson (MS)
Moran (VA)	Roybal-Allard	Thompson (PA)
Murphy (CT)	Royce	Thornberry
Murphy (NY)	Ruppersberger	Tiahrt
Murphy, Tim	Rush	Tiberi
Myrick	Ryan (OH)	Tierney
Nadler (NY)	Ryan (WI)	Titus
Napolitano	Sanchez, Loretta	Tonko
Neal (MA)	Sarbanes	Tsongas
Neugebauer	Scalise	Turner
Nye	Schakowsky	Upton
Oberstar	Schauer	Van Hollen
Obey	Schiff	Visclosky
Olson	Schmidt	Walden
Olver	Schock	Walz
Ortiz	Schrader	Wasserman
Pastor (AZ)	Schwartz	Schultz
Paulsen	Scott (GA)	Waters
Pence	Scott (VA)	Watson
Perlmutter	Sensenbrenner	Watt
Perriello	Serrano	Waxman
Peters	Sessions	Weiner
Peterson	Sestak	Welch
Petri	Shadegg	Westmoreland
Pitts	Shea-Porter	Wexler
Platts	Sherman	Whitfield
Poe (TX)	Shimkus	Wilson (OH)
Polis (CO)	Shuler	Wilson (SC)
Pomeroy	Shuster	Wolf
Posey	Simpson	Woolsey
Price (NC)	Skelton	Wu
Putnam	Slaughter	Yarmuth
Quigley	Smith (NE)	Young (AK)
Radanovich	Smith (NJ)	Young (FL)
Rahall	Smith (TX)	

passage of H.R. 3157. Also, I would have cast a “yea” vote for H. Res. 736.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably absent yesterday and today from this Chamber. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall votes 832 through 840.

□ 1800

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

RECOGNIZING 60TH ANNIVERSARY OF RADIO FREE EUROPE/RADIO LIBERTY

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 641) recognizing the 60th anniversary of the founding of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 641

Whereas Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty (RFE/RL) was founded in 1949 by the National Committee for a Free Europe with the mission to promote democratic values and institutions by broadcasting unbiased and factual information and ideas to audiences behind the communist “Iron Curtain”, and transmitted its first program to the former Czechoslovakia on July 4, 1950;

Whereas many Central European and Russian leaders, including Vaclav Havel of the Czech Republic, and the late Boris Yeltsin of the Russian Federation, have testified to the important role RFE/RL broadcasts played in ending the Cold War;

Whereas the former President of Estonia, Lennart Meri, nominated RFE/RL for the Nobel Peace Prize in 1991;

Whereas Nobel laureate and former President of Poland, Lech Walesa, testified to the role played by RFE/RL in Poland’s struggle for freedom when he stated that its influence “cannot even be described. Would there be earth without the sun?”;

Whereas RFE/RL programs were so comprehensive that communist authorities relied on secret transcripts of the broadcasts for information they could not obtain from the local media they themselves controlled;

Whereas RFE/RL was subjected to efforts to undermine its operations through offensive actions launched by communist regimes and intended to discredit the broadcasts;

Whereas the Soviet KGB and Warsaw Pact intelligence services penetrated the radio stations with their spies, jailed sources, and even resorted to violence in attempts to intimidate RFE/RL staff;

Whereas RFE/RL Bulgarian Service correspondent Georgi Markov was murdered in

London in 1978, evidently by the Bulgarian communist intelligence service;

Whereas the Romanian communist security service detonated a bomb at RFE/RL’s headquarters in Munich, West Germany, in 1981, critically injuring six employees;

Whereas today, after having played a significant role in the collapse of communism in the former Soviet Union, RFE/RL continues to provide news, information, and open discussion of domestic and international issues to countries where free and independent media are not permitted, or are not yet fully established;

Whereas RFE/RL is available via FM, AM, shortwave and satellite radio, and employs a range of newer technologies including SMS text messaging, Facebook, Twitter, and other interactive social media;

Whereas RFE/RL broadcasts in 28 languages to 30 million listeners in Eastern and Southeastern Europe, Russia, the Caucasus, the Middle East, and Central and Southwest Asia;

Whereas during the June 2009 presidential election in Iran, RFE/RL’s “Radio Farda” provided 24 hour news coverage of the post-election protests;

Whereas beginning in 2002, RFE/RL began “Radio Azadi”, reaching nearly 50 percent of the Afghan people in the Pashto and Dari languages and making RFE/RL the largest international broadcaster in Afghanistan;

Whereas in August 2009, RFE/RL’s Radio Azadi hosted a historic presidential debate featuring President Hamid Karzai and his two top opponents, the first ever in Afghanistan’s to feature an incumbent Afghan President;

Whereas in early 2010, RFE/RL will begin Pashto language broadcasting to the Afghanistan-Pakistan border region, including the Swat Valley, promoting democratic values and institutions by providing the people of the region a source of independent and factual media to compete in the battle of ideas with those radical elements that have disrupted the peace in the Afghan-Pakistan border region;

Whereas RFE/RL employees and freelance journalists are subject to intimidation and oppression by the authorities of regimes in many countries to which RFE/RL broadcasts; and

Whereas RFE/RL has a proven history of promoting freedom and liberty in oppressive and autocratic regimes through news broadcasts based upon the principle that the first requirement of democracy is a well-informed citizenry: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes the 60th anniversary of the founding of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty (RFE/RL) and honors its contribution to promoting freedom and liberty around the world; and

(2) commends the employees and reporters of RFE/RL for their commitment to provide fair and unbiased news to people living under oppressive regimes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

NOT VOTING—39

Abercrombie	Grijalva	Price (GA)
Ackerman	Gutierrez	Rothman (NJ)
Barrett (SC)	Hall (NY)	Salazar
Berry	Holt	Sánchez, Linda
Blumenauer	Kratovil	T.
Brady (PA)	Meeks (NY)	Sires
Cantor	Murphy, Patrick	Souder
Capuano	Murtha	Stupak
Conyers	Nunes	Towns
Davis (AL)	Pallone	Velázquez
Davis (TN)	Pascrell	Wamp
Deal (GA)	Paul	Wittman
Frank (MA)	Payne	
Gordon (TN)	Pingree (ME)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1758

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, on November 3, 2009, I was unable to cast votes due to personal reasons. I was not present for rollcall votes 835 through 840. Had I been present, I would have cast a “yea” vote for final passage of H.R. 3949. I would have cast a “yea” vote for final passage of H. Res. 398. I would have cast a “yea” vote for final passage of H. Res. 866. I would have cast a “nay” vote for the final passage of H. Res. 867. I would have cast a “yea” vote for final

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 641, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution celebrates 60 years of broadcasting history and the continuing mission of an effective instrument of public diplomacy.

Radio Free Europe was established in 1949 by the National Committee for a Free Europe, an anticommunist organization, and made its first broadcast to what was then Czechoslovakia on July 4 of the next year.

From its start, the organization approached the Cold War as a war of ideas, pushing back on propaganda that was being spread by autocratic governments behind the Iron Curtain. As it grew and merged with Radio Liberty to reach more people, its purpose became all the more urgent as its broadcasts were banned and Communist authorities used jamming techniques to keep their citizens from tuning in.

In fact, those very authorities were said to have relied upon secret transcripts of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty programs so they could have better information about what was happening in their own countries than their own national media could provide.

After the Cold War ended, many paid tribute to the role that the American radio programs had played. Nobel Laureate and former Polish President Lech Walesa, who recalled listening to RFE/RL's broadcasts in secret, said their influence "cannot even be described," asking, "Would there be an Earth without the Sun?"

Today, RFE/RL is located in the very country to which it once beamed its first broadcast, now known as the Czech Republic. From its Prague headquarters, the organization serves as a surrogate broadcaster to places where uncensored or reliable information is hard to come by, where independent media are banned or not yet fully established.

Using AM, FM, shortwave, and satellite radio, as well as the Internet and newer social media tools, RFE/RL reaches an estimated 30 million people in Eastern Europe, Russia, the Caucasus, the Middle East, and Central and Southwest Asia.

Its programs in Farsi, under the banner of Radio Farda, are widely followed in Iran. Radio Azadi provides unbiased reporting of current events in Afghanistan. And next year, RFE/RL will begin Pashto-language broadcasts to the troubled Afghanistan-Pakistan border region, including the Swat Valley.

Mr. Speaker, as this resolution notes, "RFE/RL has a proven history of promoting freedom and liberty in oppressive and autocratic regimes through news broadcasts based upon the principle that the first requirement of a democracy is a well-informed citizenry."

H. Res. 641 congratulates the organization on six decades of helping to keep the spark of freedom alive in some of history's darkest hours and salutes the men and women of RFE/RL for their continuing commitment to the free flow of information.

I commend the author of this resolution, the ranking member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Ms. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, and encourage its support.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank my esteemed chairman for his words, and I join him in the declaration of support for the work of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty.

As we know, Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, also known as RFE/RL, was established 60 years ago and was a powerful voice for freedom in the battle of ideas against communist tyranny.

Former Polish President Lech Walesa and Vaclav Havel, the former President of the Czech Republic, have all testified that by means of its broadcast of unbiased and independent news programs behind the Iron Curtain, Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty played a vital role in the collapse of the Soviet Union and its communist allies. In fact, the Soviet KGB and the Warsaw Pact intelligence services, appreciating the threat posed by Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty to their communist regimes, conducted massive operations to foil its operations. They even resorted to violence.

Just two instances: For example, Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty's Bulgarian service correspondent was believed to have been murdered by Bulgarian intelligence services; and six Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty employees were critically injured when a bomb paid for by Romanian security services exploded at the headquarters of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty in Munich, West Germany.

Today, as our generation engages in yet another battle of ideas, Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty continues to prove its worth. Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty's broadcasts in 28 different languages reach people in 20 countries throughout southeastern Europe, Russia, the Middle East, and Central and South Asia.

Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty's Afghanistan service is now the most popular media program in that country, and it intends to expand next year to reach the Afghanistan-Pakistan border region, providing a much-needed source of independent and accurate news to compete with the shrill rhetoric of the extremists in that area.

Today, Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty and its personnel continue to suffer attacks, some mounted in new ways. Just last year, for example, a new style of attack, a cyberattack, was mounted against the Belarusian service of RFE/RL to prevent the broadcast of

a rally against the regime in that country.

But in the more traditional style of attack, an Iranian American journalist was convicted and sentenced in Iran to a year in prison, Mr. Speaker, and her 98-year-old mother was threatened with eviction from her housing unit because of the journalist's antirevolutionary work with RFE/RL's Iranian news service.

Also recently, a Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty journalist in Turkmenistan was tortured by authorities who tried to coerce him into signing a pledge that he would stop working for Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty's Turkmen service, and then they detained him against his will and put him in a government-run psychiatric center.

Journalists such as these, Mr. Speaker, who work for Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty are heroes, fighting with determination for freedom. I am proud to have authored this resolution in recognition of their brave efforts and proud of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty's six decades of service in the promotion of freedom.

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

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), the ranking member on the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation and Trade.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady for yielding, and I rise in support of this resolution, of which I am a cosponsor, and to note that for 60 years, Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty has been basically a free press for societies suffering authoritarian rule, and that is the intent.

The RFE/RL has said that this model of surrogate broadcasting irritates authoritarian regimes, inspires democrats and creates greater space for civil society, and that is the goal. Vaclav Havel and others have testified to the role that the radios played in bringing down the Iron Curtain.

As noted in the resolution, Warsaw Pact intelligence went to great lengths to silence these broadcasts. We have heard some of the examples of the correspondents who were murdered and the headquarters that were bombed.

RFE/RL has expanded its work to countries that are critical to today's national security challenges. Shortly after September 11, the House passed legislation establishing Radio Free Afghanistan, RFE's brand in that country. Actually, I authored that legislation. And today, with 50 percent market share, it is the most popular radio station in the country, offering an alternative to the Taliban's dark leaflets and the type of radio that people hear in that part of Central Asia and South Asia from the Taliban.

The Iranian regime has targeted RFE/RL broadcasts. They have spent a

lot of money to jam those broadcasts. RFE/RL has still managed to provide valuable coverage of the recent uprising there, allowing Iranian democrats to know that they are not alone in this world.

These broadcasts are all the more important now that the administration has muffled itself when it comes to the Iranian democratic movement. As it trims back on programs supporting democracy-seeking Iranians, one expert notes that the administration views the green revolution as a wrench in the works of nuclear negotiations with the Iranian regime.

These broadcasts could be greatly complimented by the White House bully pulpit. They aren't.

A divide between the broadcasters and the diplomats is not new, frankly. In the 1960s, Washington moved to improve relations with Ceausescu's Romania, despite its abysmal human rights record, but RFE kept a spotlight on Bucharest, irritating some of the diplomats. Today, it keeps a spotlight on Tehran's transgressions—the jailing, the abuse, the murder of those who abuse the regime.

Importantly, this resolution commends the employees and reporters of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty for their services and acknowledges their sacrifices. Just as the communist police took steps to prevent the truth from penetrating their house of lies, so has the Iranian regime.

The Iranian Government harasses the journalists for RFE/RL's Persian service, its headquarters in Prague, and their families back in Iran. Those inside Iran who might provide the station with information have been threatened. This fall, two young journalists with the service were killed and a third went into a coma when their car was struck by a truck outside of Prague.

This is the information war happening today. Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty and its sister surrogates are keeping us in the game. As technology evolves, they can and need to do better, while staying true to their support for freedom and respect for human rights and for the rule of law.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for those statements.

I have no further requests for time, Mr. Speaker, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I stand here today in support of H. Res. 641, which recognizes the 60th anniversary of the founding of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty. I support this resolution because of the incredible role that Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty played in helping to end the cold war.

In 1949, Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty, RFE/RL, was established by the United States to promote democracy in communist-controlled parts of Europe. RFE/RL broadcasted unbiased and factual information and ideas, providing valuable reporting and demonstrating the value of the freedom of the press. The information provided in the broadcasts was

more comprehensive than the information provided on state-controlled media sources, leading some Communist authorities to use secret transcripts to stay informed.

Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty played an important role in bringing about the demise of communism in Europe. Leaders from Russia and other former Soviet Union countries have extolled the virtues of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty. Former Polish President Lech Walesa famously said that RFE/RL's influence "could not be described." Former President Vaclav Havel of the Czech Republic and former President of the Russian Federation, Boris Yeltsin, have also described the significant role that RFE/RL played in bringing the end of communism in Europe. Its virtue was encapsulated by the former President of Estonia, Lennart Meri, who nominated RFE/RL for the Nobel Peace Prize in 1991.

During the cold war, Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty was subject to attacks by Communist governments of the Soviet Union. The Soviet intelligence agency and secret police, the KGB, as well as other Communist intelligence agencies infiltrated radio stations with spies and attempted to disrupt reporting by jailing and intimidating sources. Georgi Markov, an RFE/RL correspondent in Bulgaria, was murdered in London in 1978 by Bulgarian Communist intelligence service agents. In 1981, Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty was attacked when Romanian security agents exploded a bomb outside of the RFE/RL headquarters in Munich, West Germany. Such acts of violence by the Soviet Union and Eastern Bloc countries demonstrate the fear that the Communist leaders had for the democratizing influence of the free press.

Today, Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty continues to operate in Eastern Europe, Eurasia, and Asia. RFE/RL broadcasts in 28 languages to over 30 million listeners in 20 countries, including Ukraine, Russia, Moldova, Georgia, the Balkans, Belarus, Iran, Iraq, Kazakhstan, and Afghanistan. To this day, RFE/RL correspondents and employees are subject to violence and intimidation by regimes that consider the free press threatening.

In 1823, Thomas Jefferson said, "The only security of all is in a free press. The force of public opinion cannot be resisted when permitted freely to be expressed. The agitation it produces must be submitted to. It is necessary, to keep the waters pure." From the cold war to today, Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty has demonstrated Jefferson's words throughout the world. By bringing the free press to countries with repressive governments, RFE/RL has proven for over 60 years that governments that use censorship to protect their authority cannot stand forever.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 641, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the

Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

□ 1815

#### CONDEMNING THE ILLEGAL EXTRACTION OF MADAGASCAR'S NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 839) condemning the illegal extraction of Madagascar's natural resources, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 839

Whereas Madagascar is the world's fourth largest island, and home to up to 150,000 species of unique flora and fauna;

Whereas during the last 20 years, with the support of the U.S. Government and others, Madagascar has made substantial progress in stopping environmental degradation, effectively managing natural resources and preserving its unique biodiversity;

Whereas three-quarters of Madagascar's people live in rural areas and two-thirds live on less than \$2 per day, safeguarding these natural resources is essential to Madagascar's continued economic growth and development;

Whereas these natural resources contribute to economic development through the tourism sector, drawing an estimated \$390,000,000 per year;

Whereas, on March 17, 2009, Marc Ravalomanana was forced to resign as the democratically-elected President of Madagascar and Andry Rajoelina was installed as de facto head of state;

Whereas, on March 20, 2009, the United States condemned the removal of Marc Ravalomanana and the installation of Andry Rajoelina as tantamount to a coup d'etat, undemocratic, and contrary to the rule of law, announced a suspension of non-humanitarian assistance, and later terminated compact assistance through the Millennium Challenge Corporation to the de facto Rajoelina government;

Whereas two-thirds of Madagascar's people depend on natural resources for their sustenance and livelihoods, and decreased assistance for conservation efforts may have dire humanitarian consequences;

Whereas the African Union and the Southern African Development Community have suspended Madagascar's participation until constitutional order is restored;

Whereas in October 2009, the World Wildlife Fund (WWF), Conservation International, and the Wildlife Conservation Society condemned an interministerial order issued by the de facto administration granting sweeping authorization to export raw and semi-processed hard wood as "legaliz[ing] the sale of illegally cut and collected wood onto the market; allow[ing] for the potential embezzlement of funds in the name of environmental protection; and constitut[ing] a legal incentive for further corruption in the forestry sector";

Whereas natural resource degradation occurring under the de facto government includes—

(1) open and organized plundering of precious wood from natural forests, including World Heritage Sites such as Marojejy and Masoala National Parks;

(2) intimidation and menace of legitimate local community management structures,

and expropriation of revenue and benefits from them, causing suffering and impoverishment;

(3) intensified smuggling of endemic and protected species and species parts and/or products to the national and international markets;

(4) proliferation of destructive practices such as illegal mining and slash-and-burn agriculture within protected areas and environmentally sensitive areas;

(5) degradation of forests, pushing some rosewood and ebony species to the brink of extinction; and

(6) the degradation of the resource base that rural communities depend upon represents an immediate and future threat to local governance, local incomes, and food security; and

Whereas the vast majority of this precious wood is destined for global export markets: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives—

(1) strongly condemns the March 2009 coup d'etat in Madagascar and supports the people of Madagascar in immediately undertaking a democratic, consensual process to restore constitutional governance, culminating in free, fair, and peaceful elections;

(2) commends the African Union and the Southern African Development Community for taking strong action against anti-democratic forces in Madagascar and encourage their continued resolve to return Madagascar to the rule of law;

(3) strongly condemns the illegal extraction of Madagascar's natural resources and its impact on biodiversity and livelihoods of rural communities, including illegal logging, smuggling of wild species, and illegal mining;

(4) supports action by competent authorities and the people of Madagascar to stop this illegal devastation and bring those perpetrating these crimes to justice;

(5) calls upon importing countries to intensify their inspection and monitoring processes to ensure that they do not contribute to the demand for illegally sourced precious woods from Madagascar; and

(6) calls upon consumers of rosewood and ebony products to check their origin, and boycott those made of Malagasy wood, until constitutional order is restored.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 839, a resolution introduced by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) which condemns the illegal extraction of Madagascar's natural resources.

On March 17 the democratically elected President of Madagascar was forced from office in a coup and replaced by Andry Rajoelina, who remains in power today. Over the past 7 months, the political situation has remained tenuous as discussions between both sides continue over the possibility of new elections.

Meanwhile, policies pursued by the de facto Rajoelina government have done terrible harm to Madagascar's fragile ecosystem, which boasts up to 150,000 unique species of plants and animals.

On September 21, the government permitted 13 operators to export 325 containers filled with raw and semi-processed woods. The government reportedly earned almost \$12 million in taxes from these transactions.

The World Wildlife Fund, Conservation International, and the Wildlife Conservation Society condemned the decision as "legalizing the sale of illegally cut and collected wood onto the market." This decision came on top of months of illegal activities and violent actions in Madagascar's forests.

Since political turmoil began in January, local communities and officials have reported that armed groups have entered the previously protected Masoala and Marojejy World Heritage Sites and the Mananara-Nord Biosphere Reserve. The NGO Global Witness reports that 7,000 cubic meters of rosewood and ebony have been shipped out of Madagascar since the beginning of the year.

These actions harm not only Madagascar's environment but the local communities that depend on the forests for their income. Without this revenue, communities may be forced to resort to slash-and-burn agriculture, thus furthering damaging Madagascar's sensitive ecosystem.

I commend my friend and colleague Mr. BLUMENAUER for bringing this resolution and this issue before the Congress and urge my colleagues to join me in supporting it.

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in total support of H. Res. 839, which condemns the March 2009 coup in Madagascar and subsequent upsurge in the illegal extraction of Madagascar's natural resources.

Due to its geography, Madagascar hosts one of the most unique and diverse ecosystems on the planet. According to the World Wildlife Fund, 92 percent of Madagascar's reptiles, 68 percent of its plant life, and 98 percent of its land mammals are unique to Madagascar, existing nowhere else on Earth.

One need only take a page from the latest issue of National Geographic to be inspired to explore Madagascar's tropical rainforests, dry forests, spiny deserts, reefs, and estuaries, not to mention the impenetrable Stone Forest, a designated UNESCO World Heritage Site, where new species are being discovered on a regular basis.

With such unique biodiversity, ecotourism obviously holds great potential to help lift Madagascar's population out of its poverty. Realizing this opportunity, the government in 2003 set aside 3 percent of the island for national parks and reserves, while endeavoring to stem illegal logging and assist rural populations in developing sustainable farming methods.

In April 2005, the Millennium Challenge Corporation signed a 4-year \$110

million compact with Madagascar, the very first compact of the MCC, to assist poor rural farmers in transition from subsistence agriculture to a market economy, while promoting environmental sustainability. By all accounts, great progress was being made in reducing world poverty while promoting conservation.

Unfortunately, much of that progress has been dashed since March of 2009 when an illegal coup displaced the elected President of Madagascar in favor of a former disc jockey and mayor of the capital city who is not even old enough to hold office pursuant to Madagascar's own constitution.

The days leading to the coup and the months since have been characterized by deadly protests and serious human rights abuses. The donor community was forced to withdraw support from the government, and critical assistance including the MCC compact was terminated. Madagascar was also suspended from the African Union and the regional Southern African Development Community.

Illegal logging, mining, and smuggling of wildlife in officially protected areas has intensified, as criminal networks exploit political instability and impoverished Malagasy in rural areas struggle to survive.

H. Res. 839, as amended, condemns the coup and the subsequent upsurge in the illegal extraction of Madagascar's resources. It laments the impact these illegal activities are having on conservation and poverty reduction efforts and calls for a boycott of certain wood products until constitutional order is restored.

I commend the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for introducing this timely resolution, which deserves our support.

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

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the author of the resolution, who brought this to my attention less than 2 weeks ago, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I thank Chairman BERMAN for his courtesy and for the prompt action of the committee. I deeply appreciate the bipartisan support and the quick turnaround that we've had from both sides of the aisle on the committee. It is important to move quickly, and I deeply appreciate putting this on the agenda.

The irreplaceable role of healthy forests as havens for biodiversity, carbon sinks, and renewable resources demands that we fight against and reverse a global legacy of environmental pillaging.

Illegal logging and resource extraction is not just about environmental decimation, with watershed pollution, loss of biodiversity, and increased carbon emissions. It's about human loss as well, the local communities left devastated without resources for survival and for their future and beyond to everyone on the planet. We all benefit

from the medicines, the carbon captures, and species diversity that these forests provide.

For years it's been a personal project of mine to work against the illegal logging trade, to make sure that the United States can lead by example and stop our own demand for illegally logged wood. I was pleased that our Legal Timber Protection Act was incorporated into legislation and signed into law by President Bush last year. The United States Government is now empowered to ask where imported wood and plants actually come from to promote legal harvest. Yet the illegal trade continues.

Last month, with Chairman PAYNE and Chairman FALCONE, I introduced this legislation to condemn the illegal logging and extraction of Madagascar's unique and invaluable natural resources.

As has been pointed out by my two colleagues, Madagascar hosts some of the planet's greatest diversity. It's an island larger than the State of California. It broke off from the African mainland 160 million years ago, thus spawning the biological laboratory that my colleagues referenced, the diversity of plants and animals found nowhere else, massive moths, towering trees. There are more than a hundred species alone of lemurs.

Sadly, the majority of Madagascar's people are trapped in a cycle of poverty, less than \$2 a day. That's why the United States did step forward with the first Millennium Challenge program. And protection of these incredible and unique resources, only 10 percent of which remain, could be key to a sustainable and economically secure future.

As has been referenced on the floor, the political turmoil is putting the honest livelihoods of many, as well as our planet's greatest treasure, in extreme peril.

Political instability breeds corruption and mismanagement. Twenty years of partnership with the United States Government and NGOs that has resulted in more effective management and preservation is being undone in a matter of months. The de facto regime is using the endangered resources to boost its regime and has issued sweeping decrees allowing the harvest and export of woods from protected forests and World Heritage Sites.

The reports from Madagascar are dire and detail rampant illegal logging, mining, and resource degradation. Traffickers smuggle out record numbers of the world's rarest tortoises to Asian and European collectors. Poachers kill and roast scores of lemurs for restaurants. Armed loggers brazenly plunder protected forests, looting dwindling hardwood for furniture.

The media has detailed this ongoing destruction. Activities that not only deny access to basic resources to locals, they degrade the country's thriving ecotourism industry which brought in almost \$400 million badly

needed last year. The United States has condemned the current government, suspended all nonhumanitarian aid, and terminated assistance from the aforementioned Millennium Development Corporation compact.

I am pleased that we will join today with the World Wildlife Fund, Conservation International, and the Wildlife Conservation Society, all of whom have denounced this wholesale exploitation of these precious resources.

I am pleased, Mr. Speaker, that we are moving forward. I deeply thank the prompt action and bipartisan support for this legislation.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), the ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation and Trade.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution, which condemns the illegal extraction of Madagascar's natural resources, although it does so without identifying who's doing the extracting, which I think I'd like to comment on.

I have traveled to Madagascar; and as the co-chairman of the International Conservation Caucus, I have seen the pristine habitat of this island. It has got a very unique biodiversity, as has been mentioned. Ninety percent of the species there are endemic to that island, and that's one of the reasons a lot of people call Madagascar the "eighth continent." It is because it is so unique in this way. And the inhabitants of that island rely very heavily on that biodiversity and on biotourism as an industry. The biotourism draws about \$400 million a year. So preserving Madagascar's unique beauty is important not just from an ecologic standpoint; it's also very critical as an economic necessity, basically, for many of the inhabitants of that island. And, rightfully, this resolution condemns the act. It condemns the litany of natural resource degradation that's occurred.

But it's important that it mentions the plundering of precious forests. Unfortunately, from my standpoint there's no mention of who is doing the plundering or where these resources are being sold.

□ 1830

From my standpoint, this would be similar to condemning an act of terror without naming the terrorist.

This resolution would be greatly strengthened by including such information. Reports that I have read from Global Witness identify rosewood taken out of Masoala National Park as being for sale in China. That is the destination of the illegal logging.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution but also to take a closer look at China's role at resource exploitation in Africa and across the developing world. I chaired the Africa Subcommittee for 8 years. I can tell you, the picture of China in Africa is not

pretty, and this action in Madagascar is one more example of it.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support H. Res. 839 "Condemning the illegal extraction of Madagascar's natural resources." This timely resolution calls upon the leadership of Madagascar to undertake democratic reforms as well as immediately implement measures to protect their fragile and beautiful environment.

There are many beautiful places in this world, but few are as diverse as the island nation of Madagascar. Madagascar is the world's fourth largest island, covering over 144 million acres. This unique island has a wide range of ecosystems including rain forests, dry forests, volcanic mountains, and a large desert. The climate ranges from tropical along the coast to temperate inland to arid in the south. This environmental diversity supports an equally large range of biodiversity. The island is home to 150,000 species of unique flora and fauna, as well as thousands of animals found nowhere else on earth. According to the World Wildlife Fund, "approximately 92 percent of Madagascar's reptiles, 68 percent of its plant life and 98 percent of its land mammals, including lemurs, exist naturally nowhere else on Earth."

Madagascar is also home to over 20 million people who depend on the biodiversity to survive. For example, the Wildlife Conservation Society estimates that 150,000 people depend on the Makira-Masoala rainforest as their primary source of water. Approximately 80 percent of Madagascar's population lives below the poverty line, 70 percent of the population live outside cities, and many Malagasy people depend on subsistence farming; thus, the fate of the Malagasy people is closely intertwined with that of their environment.

Mr. Speaker, as this resolution points out, the livelihoods of the people, animals and plants on Madagascar are threatened by a political crisis that triggered a pillage of its valuable wildlife and forests. In mid-March 2009, President Marc Ravalomanana's government was overthrown by forces led by Andry Rajoelina. Mr. Rajoelina, a key opposition leader and sitting mayor of Madagascar's capitol city was upset with the President's conflict of interest between his extensive commercial interests and running the country. Ravalomanana was both the President of the government and the country's mammoth business conglomerate.

Protestors accused the President of wasting international aid money and striking a harmful land deal with Daewoo, Inc. of South Korea. Under the deal, Daewoo would own an area of farmland the size of Belgium.

During the coup, over 135 people died and thousands were injured in frequent clashes between protestors and police and army forces. The violence has crippled the island's \$390 million-a-year tourism sector, and unnerved foreign investors in Madagascar's mining and oil industries. The human rights of Ravalomanana's supporters are being threatened throughout the country. Many of his supporters that remain in the country are in hiding, have been beaten, or are in jail.

The Obama Administration has condemned Marc Ravalomanana's forced resignation as President of the Republic of Madagascar, and Andry Rajoelina's installation as de facto head of state, as tantamount to a coup d'etat, undemocratic, and contrary to the rule of law. By

designating the regime change as a coup, the U.S. has suspended all non-emergency foreign assistance. The African Union and other international organizations have similarly denounced the coup but, despite international pressure, a return to democracy seems unlikely.

This is a sad sequence of events for a country once lauded as a success story in Africa. Madagascar, as you may recall, was the first country to receive a contract from the Millennium Challenge Cooperation when, in April 2005, the Millennium Challenge Corporation signed a 4-year, \$110 million Compact with the Republic of Madagascar to raise incomes by assisting the rural population to transition from subsistence agriculture to a market economy.

Today, the new government threatens not only the fragile ecosystems, but the citizens of their own nation. This is why I strongly support this resolution that calls on people of Madagascar to immediately undertake a democratic, consensual process to restore constitutional governance, culminating in free, fair and peaceful elections, as well as denounce the illegal extraction of Madagascar's natural resources.

Mr. POE of Texas. We have no other speakers, Mr. Speaker, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 839, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

#### CALLING ON THE U.S. AND INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY TO ADDRESS THE NEEDS OF SRI LANKA'S TAMIL INTERNALLY DISPLACED PERSONS

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 711) calling on the United States Government and the international community to address the human rights and humanitarian needs of Sri Lanka's Tamil internally displaced persons (IDPs) currently living in government-run camps by supporting the release of such IDPs, implementing and facilitating an independent oversight of the process of release and resettlement, and allowing foreign aid groups to provide relief and resources to such IDPs, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

#### H. RES. 711

Whereas May 2009 marked the conclusion of the 26-year struggle between the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE), a State Department designated Foreign Terrorist Organization, and the Government of Sri Lanka, and the Government of Sri Lanka committed itself to caring for and ensuring the speedy return of the civilians internally displaced as a result of the fighting;

Whereas the Government of Sri Lanka is seeking to identify former combatants who were part of the LTTE and as part of the vetting process the Government of Sri Lanka has set up make-shift camps that initially housed over 280,000 internally displaced persons (IDPs) who fled their homes as the war drew to an end;

Whereas of those 280,000 internally displaced persons at the end of the war, approximately 10,000 of those individuals are being separately held by the Government of Sri Lanka as former combatants or on suspicion of having supported the LTTE;

Whereas as part of the United Nations Human Rights Council 11th Special Session on Sri Lanka held on May 27, 2009, the Government of Sri Lanka made commitments to the world to improve the conditions for the civilians housed in the camps and stated that the "bulk" of the IDPs would be resettled within 180 days;

Whereas as of October 23, 2009, over 51,000 IDPs have been released from the closed camps in the Vanni, and of those 36,000 have been returned to their districts of origin and found accommodation in their own homes or, pending return to their homes, with host families and in vacant houses of friends or relatives; and over 16,000 IDPs of special categories, such as the elderly, pregnant women and their families, priests, students, or people of special needs, have been released to host families or institutions;

Whereas as of October 23, 2009, some 220,000 civilian IDPs still remain in military-guarded camps in the four northern districts of Vavuniya, Mannar, Jaffna, and Trincomalee;

Whereas the Government of Sri Lanka has announced that it would facilitate in the next few weeks the voluntary return of over 40,000 civilian IDPs by the end of October and 60,000 per month of the remaining IDPs in the camps;

Whereas the Government of Sri Lanka has made some progress in easing camp congestion, registering IDPs, expanding access to humanitarian organizations, and demining the north, but much remains to be done to improve humanitarian conditions, particularly before the onset of the monsoon season;

Whereas the United States is urging the safe and speedy return of civilian IDPs, continued access for international humanitarian organizations, and the registration and provision of national identification cards to IDPs, to help promote freedom of movement; and

Whereas the United States supports the rapid release and voluntary return of all civilian IDPs as a critical element of national reconciliation in Sri Lanka: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives—

(1) urges the Government of Sri Lanka, consistent with its obligation to provide security for all of its citizens, to expeditiously allow freedom of movement for civilian internally displaced persons (IDPs) to leave their camps voluntarily and return in safety and dignity to their homes or, where that is

not possible, to live with host families or move to open transit sites;

(2) calls on the Government of Sri Lanka to ensure that IDP camps are truly civilian in nature and administered by civilian authorities, rather than under military supervision, and give full access to national and international humanitarian organizations and observers, including the International Committee of the Red Cross, in order to monitor the situation and to assist in the care of IDPs; and

(3) urges the Government of Sri Lanka to promote justice and political reconciliation for all parties, and engage in dialogue with all parties, including Tamils inside and outside Sri Lanka on new mechanisms for devolving power, improving human rights, and increasing accountability.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution and yield myself such time as I may consume.

This resolution calls upon the Government of Sri Lanka to expeditiously release its internally displaced Tamil population from military-guarded camps and begin the process of political reconciliation.

This past May marked the conclusion of a long and brutal civil war between the Government of Sri Lanka and the Tamil Eelam, or LTTE, a U.S.-designated foreign terrorist organization. While the United States and the international community welcome the end to this bloody war and congratulate the Government of Sri Lanka on its military victory, it is now time for the government to accelerate the process of releasing the hundreds of thousands of ethnic Tamils from the squalor camps where they have been confined.

By all accounts, the Government of Sri Lanka has made great progress in demining the northern part of the country to allow the successful return of the Tamil population. Now with the timeline it previously provided to the international community having come and gone, it must take the next step and provide the international community with a transparent and implementable road map for the release of the remaining IDPs.

For the safety of its own citizens who seek a return to normalcy, the Government of Sri Lanka should turn the camps over to proper civilian authorities and allow frequent, unconditional, and uninhibited access to the United Nations, the International Committee

on the Red Cross, and other aid groups. It is long past time for the Sinhalese and the Tamil populations of Sri Lanka to turn the page and, hand in hand, begin a new life together as citizens of a whole, peaceful Sri Lanka.

But doing so will require the Government of Sri Lanka to support a genuine reconciliation process, one that extends beyond local elections, and to make a determined effort to understand and address the legitimate concerns of its Tamil citizens.

I commend the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) for introducing this important and timely resolution, and I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting it.

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of House Resolution 711, as amended, a measure calling attention to the plight of internally displaced Tamil civilians in northern Sri Lanka.

Mr. Speaker, the United States and Sri Lanka share a long history of cordial relations, based in large part on common democratic traditions. The United States has been a friend to Sri Lanka, and there should be no doubt that we have stood with the people of Sri Lanka in the fight against terrorism.

As Members are aware, Sri Lanka waged a long and bitter conflict against the Liberation Tigers of the Tamil Eelam, called the LTTE, also known as the Tamil Tigers, a separatist group that has been designated by the United States as a foreign terrorist organization ever since 1997.

For nearly 30 years, the LTTE claimed to represent the aspirations of all Sri Lankan Tamils for a separate homeland and became notorious in the process for pioneering the suicide bomb jacket. They are responsible for at least a dozen high-level assassinations, including former Indian Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi, as well as over 200 suicide attacks.

During that struggle, the United States was a steadfast supporter of Sri Lanka's efforts to stop the flow of arms and financing to the LTTE by providing law enforcement assistance and providing training and equipment to help the Sri Lankan military defend itself against the terrorist actions of the LTTE.

After fierce fighting in late May, the world witnessed the cessation of fighting in Sri Lanka and the apparent conclusion of its long-running insurgency. This brutal conflict cost tens of thousands of Sinhalese and Tamil lives, uprooted countless Sri Lankans from their homes, left thousands maimed or wounded, and badly divided this nation.

In this regard, the United States remains deeply concerned for the welfare of the hundreds of thousands of internally displaced persons uprooted by the current fighting.

Congress joins with the executive branch in recognizing the tremendous loss of life and hardships endured by the civilians in northern Sri Lanka. To help address their many urgent needs, the United States has provided some \$56 million in humanitarian assistance in 2009.

Mr. Speaker, the Department of State has emphasized that while the Government of Sri Lanka has made some progress in easing camp congestion, registering internally displaced persons, called IDPs, and expanding access by humanitarian organizations, much more work remains to be done to meet its commitment to the return of the majority of displaced persons by the end of the year. This is particularly the case with monsoon season approaching.

We urge the government to allow robust humanitarian access to the displaced person camps and to work hand-in-hand with the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, the International Committee of the Red Cross, and the nongovernment organizations to ensure that civilian IDPs are accorded the rights and care meeting the highest international standards. The United States stands ready to help the government in these efforts.

Mr. Speaker, the defeat of the LTTE offers a chance for Sri Lanka to forge a new beginning and to ensure a lasting end of terrorism. To seize this opportunity, bold actions are needed to share power and assure all of Sri Lanka's communities a future of hope, respect, and dignity.

As a former U.S. ambassador to Sri Lanka has noted, "Through such actions, a truly united Sri Lanka can emerge—a Sri Lanka that is rooted in democracy and tolerance, where human rights are respected, where media can operate freely and independently, and where all Sri Lankans can participate freely in an open dialogue on the way forward for your country."

Mr. Speaker, I hope a successful reconciliation and healing process will emerge to help ensure a lasting end to terrorism in Sri Lanka and open a way for a brighter future for these people. The United States looks forward to working with Sri Lanka in that important endeavor. I support the adoption of this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS), the sponsor of this important resolution.

(Mr. DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me express my appreciation to Chairman BERMAN for yielding time and also for the expeditious manner in which this measure has been handled.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 711, a bipartisan resolution calling on the Sri Lankan Government

and the international community to address the human rights and humanitarian needs of Sri Lanka's Tamils. I urge all Members of the body to support it.

Mr. Speaker, May of 2009 marked the conclusion of the 26-year struggle between the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam and the Sri Lankan Government. As a result of this war, tens of thousands of Sri Lankan citizens have been displaced and are without homes.

The Sri Lankan Government believes that among their displaced citizens are former Liberation Tiger militants. As part of the vetting process, the Sri Lankan Government has set up make-shift camps to house over 280,000 internally displaced persons and allow the government to relocate these suspected militants. Allegations are being reported that the standard of treatment and the living conditions afforded to people in these camps is grossly inadequate.

Mr. Speaker, the United Nations Human Rights Council's 11th special session on Sri Lanka met on May 27, 2009, to address the internally displaced persons in government-run camps. During this session, the Sri Lankan Government made commitments to improve the conditions for the people housed in these camps and stated that the bulk of the people would be resettled within 180 days. After the first 150 days passing with no progress, the Sri Lankan Government has just released some 50,000 people, which is a good first step; although nearly 230,000 internally displaced persons still remain held in camps.

So, Mr. Speaker, I support this resolution that calls on the Sri Lankan Government to release their citizens and allow them to return to their homes and properties. I, again, urge my colleagues to support the internally displaced persons in their quest for freedom.

Again, I would like to thank Chairman BERMAN for his expeditious handling of this matter. I urge its support.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), the ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise as well in support of this resolution, calling on the U.S. Government and the international community to address the humanitarian needs of the Sri Lankan internally displaced Tamil community, and I think the needs are very great.

The Sri Lankan Government routed the Tamil Tigers, a U.S.-designated foreign terrorist organization, earlier this year. This terror group has left a rather bloody trail in South Asia, and that trail, frankly, has even led to our shores.

The Tamil Tigers perfected the use of suicide bombers. They invented the suicide belt. They assassinated two world leaders. They've pioneered the

use of women in suicide attacks. The Tigers have fund-raised in the United States. In recent years, the FBI has arrested men attempting to export shoulder-fired missiles and other sophisticated weapons to the group.

□ 1845

Frankly, the FBI reports the Tamil Tigers are among the most dangerous and deadly extremists in the world. An estimated 280,000 ethnic Tamil Tigers were displaced from their homes due to the fighting earlier this year, and they are now in refugee camps. The condition of these camps are grim. They are crowded. They are dirty. They lack basic necessities. NGO reports that come to us show severe water shortages. Many Tamils have had to line up for up to 5 hours to receive even meager food rations.

It is important that we continue to monitor the human rights conditions in these camps. Abuses must be checked. Although progress has been slow up until recently, I was very pleased to read a BBC report the other day that between 2,000 to 3,000 people are now leaving the camps every day. This is progress, although I am sure it is not fast enough for some.

On this point, I think we should be clear. The Sri Lankan Government should be working to release civilian displaced persons in an expeditious manner, not the terrorist population that may be 10,000 strong, hiding out in the camps. These are the same terrorists that used civilians as human shields and employed lethal force to prevent civilians from fleeing the previous fighting. The Tamil Tiger infrastructure must be rooted out even as we support the effort to release the civilian displaced persons in this expeditious manner.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 711, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

#### WORLD PNEUMONIA DAY

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the reso-

lution (H. Res. 863) recognizing the scourge of pneumonia, urging the United States and the world to mobilize cooperation and prioritize resources to fight pneumonia and save children's lives, and recognizing November 2 as World Pneumonia Day, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

#### H. RES. 863

Whereas pneumonia kills an estimated 4,000,000 people every year, according to the World Health Organization and UNICEF;

Whereas more than 150,000,000 episodes of pneumonia occur every year among children under the age of five in developing countries, accounting for more than 95 percent of all new cases worldwide;

Whereas of the 8,800,000 children under the age of five who die every year, up to 2,000,000 die from pneumonia;

Whereas pneumonia kills 1 child every 15 seconds;

Whereas pneumonia kills more children than any other illness;

Whereas an estimated 26 percent of neonatal deaths within the first month after birth are caused by severe infections, including pneumonia;

Whereas these deaths occur primarily in the world's poorest countries;

Whereas for every child who dies of pneumonia in an industrialized country, more than 2,000 children die of pneumonia in poor countries;

Whereas pneumonia is a preventable and treatable problem;

Whereas more than 1,000,000 lives could be saved each year through pneumonia prevention and treatment;

Whereas many childhood pneumonia deaths can be prevented with early diagnosis;

Whereas immunizing children against measles, whooping cough, Haemophilus influenzae type b (Hib), and pneumococcus could cut the rate of severe pneumonia in half;

Whereas studies indicate that in developing countries, only one in four caregivers know the two key symptoms of pneumonia, fast and difficult breathing, which indicate that a child should be treated immediately;

Whereas fewer than 1/3 of children suffering from pneumonia in the developing world receive antibiotics which are available for less than \$1;

Whereas health professionals agree that prevention and treatment of pneumonia must be a priority in broader, coordinated child survival strategies;

Whereas in the context of child survival strategies, pneumonia control requires a three-prong program of protection, prevention, and treatment;

Whereas preventing and treating childhood pneumonia is critical to reducing the mortality rate of children under the age of five; and

Whereas World Pneumonia Day is recognized on November 2 annually: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives—

(1) affirms its commitment to child survival and development programs that focus on protection, prevention, and treatment of pneumonia;

(2) salutes the health professionals and community health workers who are on the front lines in the world's poorest countries, extending preventative care and treatment

to children most at risk of contracting pneumonia;

(3) reaffirms the United States commitment to reducing child mortality; and

(4) recognizes World Pneumonia Day.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The United States has repeatedly affirmed its commitment to reducing child mortality. We have endorsed the U.N. Millennium Development Goals, one of which is to reduce by two-thirds between 1990 and 2015 the under 5 mortality rate.

We know about the scourge of hunger and the disastrous impacts of diseases like AIDS, malaria, and measles on children around the world. But many people are not aware of that more children die of pneumonia than anything else. Every 15 seconds, a child dies from pneumonia, about 2 million children each year.

It is estimated that more than 150 million episodes of pneumonia occur every year among children under the age of 5 in developing countries, accounting for more than 95 percent of all new cases worldwide. Yet pneumonia is preventable; it is a treatable illness. A life can be saved with antibiotics that cost less than a dollar. It is really outrageous that we have the ability to save lives and we don't because the money is not used for it.

Sadly, according to UNICEF, fewer than 20 percent of children suffering from pneumonia receive these antibiotics which they so desperately need. Despite the fact that pneumonia kills more children under 5 than AIDS, malaria, and measles combined, it has received far less attention and funding than any of them.

Pneumonia can be treated if recognized and diagnosed early. Yet fewer than 25 percent of caregivers in the developing world are trained to identify the two telltale symptoms of pneumonia: fast and difficult breathing.

To raise awareness of these distressing statistics and to build support for addressing the problem, World Pneumonia Day is recognized annually on November 2. That was yesterday. And yesterday, organizations and countries across the globe joined forces in support of the first-ever World Pneumonia Day.

I am proud to report in New York City where I live, more than 100 leaders

in science, politics, and global health, including the Earth Institute of Columbia University, convened a Global Pneumonia Summit.

The resolution before us, H. Res. 863, reaffirms our commitment into national child survival and development programs that focus on protection, prevention, and treatment of pneumonia.

I commend the distinguished gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. SHEA-PORTER) for introducing this resolution, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of this resolution. Pneumonia is the leading cause of death among children worldwide. In fact, the World Health Organization estimates that pneumonia kills approximately 1.8 million children every year under the age of 5. Most of those deaths occur in impoverished areas of countries in regions such as sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia, where infants are particularly vulnerable.

Ironically, despite its tremendous negative impact on child survival, pneumonia is actually a preventable and treatable illness. It is a tragedy that a treatable disease still causes so much pain and suffering around the world. It also is an illness that does not receive enough attention, despite the fact that among children, it can be addressed quite impressively through prevention and low-cost medical approaches.

In developing countries, for example, only one in five caregivers know how to recognize the key symptoms of the onset of pneumonia. As a result, half the children who are infected with pneumonia quite simply do not receive timely or adequate medical treatment and care. It is, therefore, possible to increase the rates of child survival by educating caregivers on the key symptoms of pneumonia and by broadening children's access to inexpensive antibiotics, among other things.

The World Health Organization reports that the number of lives saved could be more than doubled if such prevention and treatment interventions were universally delivered.

Mr. Speaker, reducing the occurrence of pneumonia is a critical step towards reducing child mortality. This resolution reaffirms our commitment to child survival through prevention and treatment of childhood pneumonia.

Finally, this resolution also commends those health care professionals who are serving on the front lines of this illness and recognizes November 2 as World Pneumonia Day.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. SHEA-PORTER).

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Chairman BERMAN

and Ranking Member ROS-LEHTINEN and their staffs for their support and work on this resolution. It is important for the House of Representatives to recognize the devastating toll that pneumonia takes on children around the world, and I am proud that we are considering this resolution today.

Yesterday marked the first annual World Pneumonia Day. Almost 100 global health organizations joined together to bring awareness to this terrible disease. The world's leading killer of children, pneumonia, is under-noticed, underfunded, and undertreated. This disease kills 4 million people each year, 2 million of them children. It takes the lives of more children under the age of 5 than measles, AIDS, and malaria combined. Every 15 seconds, a child dies of pneumonia.

The horror of this disease is that it is so preventable and treatable. Consider these facts:

Studies in developing countries indicate that only one in four caregivers know the two key symptoms of pneumonia: fast and difficult breathing. This leads to pneumonia going untreated, which is deadly;

Fewer than one-third of the children who develop pneumonia receive the antibiotics they need to fight the illness, even though the antibiotics are available for less than a dollar. Half of the cases of pneumonia that occur could be prevented by ensuring that these children have access to the vaccines they need.

Mr. Speaker, these facts paint a bleak picture. Millions of lives are being lost each year when they could be saved. They could be saved by international cooperation to educate and train caregivers. They could be saved if people could have access to the vaccines and medications they need.

My resolution affirms this body's commitment to saving these lives by supporting programs that focus on the protection, prevention, and treatment of pneumonia. It commends the health professionals across the globe who every day work in the world's poorest countries to treat and care for the victims of pneumonia. And it reaffirms the United States' commitment to reducing child mortality. Finally, this resolution recognizes World Pneumonia Day. In doing so, the House of Representatives joins with dozens of global health organizations working to raise the awareness of this disease and to focus resources on protection, prevention, and treatment.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to encourage international cooperation to combat this disease. Lives can and should be saved. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise before you today in support of H. Res. 863, "Recognizing the scourge of pneumonia, urging the United States and the world to mobilize cooperation and prioritize resources to fight pneumonia and save children's lives, and recognizing November 2 as World Pneumonia

Day". I would like to thank my colleague, Representative SHEA-PORTER, for introducing this resolution, as well as the co-sponsors.

As co-chair of the Congressional Children's Caucus, this legislation is very important to me. Pneumonia kills an estimated 4,000,000 people every year—one child every 15 seconds. According to the World Health Organization and UNICEF, more children die of pneumonia more than any other illness, burying more each year than AIDS, malaria, and measles combined. More than 15,000,000 episodes of pneumonia occur every year among children under the age of five in developing countries, accounting for more than 95 percent of all new cases worldwide. Of the 8,800,000 children under the age of five who die every year, up to 2,000,000 die from pneumonia.

An estimated 26 percent of neonatal deaths within the first month after birth are caused by severe infections, including pneumonia; these deaths occur primarily in the world's poorest countries. For every child who dies of pneumonia in an industrialized country, more than 2,000 children die of pneumonia in poor countries.

Pneumonia is a preventable and treatable problem; more than 1,000,000 lives could be saved each year through prevention and treatment, and many childhood pneumonia deaths can be prevented with early diagnosis. Immunizing children against measles, whooping cough, Haemophilus influenzae type b (Hib), and pneumococcus could cut the rate of severe pneumonia in half. In developing countries, studies indicate that only one in four caregivers know the two key symptoms of pneumonia, fast and difficult breathing, which indicate that a child should be treated immediately.

Despite all that can be done to prevent the disease, less than one-third of children suffering from pneumonia in the developing world receive antibiotics available for less than \$1. Health professionals agree that prevention and treatment of pneumonia must be a priority in broader, coordinated child survival strategies, requiring a three-pronged program of protection, prevention, and treatment.

The Millennium Development Goals—which the United States, in its wisdom, has pledged to support—call on us to continue our efforts to prevent and treat childhood pneumonia, and to reduce by two-thirds, between 1990 and 2015, the mortality rate of children under the age of five. That is why I join this esteemed body in affirming its commitment to international child survival and development programs that prioritize protection, prevention, and treatment against pneumonia; as well as reaffirming the United States' commitment to reaching the Millennium Development Goals, particularly for reducing child mortality.

It is also why I join the House in saluting the health professionals and community health workers on the front lines in the world's poorest countries who are extending preventative care and treatment to children most at risk of contracting pneumonia. And it is why, with this resolution, we recognize World Pneumonia Day.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr.

ENGEL) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 863, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

#### CONGRATULATING THE INTER-AMERICAN FOUNDATION

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 858) congratulating the Inter-American Foundation (IAF) on its 40th anniversary and recognizing its significant accomplishments and contributions.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

##### H. RES. 858

Whereas the IAF was originally created as an independent Federal agency to provide a new alternative model to traditional United States foreign assistance that promotes greater community-ownership and self-sustainability of development initiatives;

Whereas the IAF has enabled millions of marginalized and poor people in Latin America and the Caribbean to improve their lives through nearly 5,000 self-help grants for income and employment generation, civic education and citizen participation, access to credit and public resources, food security, environmental sustainability, and cultural and social development;

Whereas the IAF has proven that its people-to-people approach to foreign assistance, delivering aid funds directly to grassroots groups and local organizations of poor communities, is remarkably cost-effective, targeting aid funds to those with the greatest need and those who will use them best;

Whereas each year, hundreds of thousands of IAF grant participants benefit from improved nutrition, medical care, access to clean water, agricultural and vocational skills, microcredit loans, small business management training, increased educational opportunities, and knowledge of sustainable agricultural techniques and environmental practices;

Whereas many grassroots leaders supported by the IAF have gone on to leadership roles at the local and national levels;

Whereas the IAF's beneficiary-driven, responsive approach has fostered trust between Latin American and Caribbean citizens and the United States Government by listening and responding to needs the people have identified, partnering with community-based groups and investing in projects that utilize and validate local knowledge and expertise;

Whereas the IAF's status as an independent United States Government aid agency allows for a streamlined grant-making process, the flexibility to respond quickly and adapt to people's needs on the ground, and the ability to maintain a positive United States presence in the region;

Whereas the IAF continues to demonstrate the political, diplomatic, and strategic value of an independent United States Government

aid agency with the ability to reach those on the economic, social, and cultural fringes of society in neighboring countries, facilitating greater access to the licit economy, markets, and public policy decisionmaking processes;

Whereas the IAF's projects complement and strive to maximize the impact of other larger United States aid agencies operating in Latin America and the Caribbean by enabling an important link between poor communities and larger-scale development activities; and

Whereas the IAF was designed with strong bipartisan support and has maintained this balanced support throughout the four decades of its operations: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives—

(1) congratulates the Inter-American Foundation (IAF) on its 40th anniversary;

(2) recognizes that the IAF has demonstrated that its grassroots model for United States foreign assistance is effective; and

(3) declares that the IAF is a vital component of United States foreign policy in the Americas and of the United States development agenda.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

##### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in strong support of H. Res. 858, a resolution I offered congratulating the Inter-American Foundation, or the IAF, on its 40th anniversary, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I first of all want to thank Foreign Affairs Committee Chairman HOWARD BERMAN and Ranking Member ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN for their support of this resolution. And, I am particularly grateful to CONNIE MACK, the ranking member of the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, which I chair, for being my colead on this resolution.

Over the years, the Inter-American Foundation has enabled millions of marginalized and poor people in Latin America and the Caribbean to improve their lives through grants promoting income and employment generation, civic education and citizen participation, access to credit and public resources, food security, environmental sustainability, and cultural and social development.

During Democratic and Republican administrations alike, the IAF has been an important model of grassroots foreign assistance in Latin America and the Caribbean.

□ 1900

Furthermore, it is a vital component of United States foreign policy in the Americas and of the United States development agenda.

As chairman of the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee, I have had the pleasure of visiting Inter-American Foundation projects throughout the region in Latin America and the Caribbean, both places. In Ecuador, I visited with the Community Corporation and Action Foundation, CACMU, a women's microcredit cooperative where I saw firsthand the benefits reaped by IAF's relatively small investment. During that same visit, I also had the privilege of meeting with representatives of the Agro-ecology and Agro-tourism Foundation, a community organization focused on food security and natural resource management.

The IAF's work does not simply provide tangible benefits to the poor. It is also extremely useful in maintaining a positive United States presence in Latin America and the Caribbean.

As President Obama reengages with our neighbors in the hemisphere, the work of the IAF is more important than ever. In April, I had the pleasure of attending the Summit of the Americas in Trinidad and Tobago as the leader of the U.S. congressional delegation. At the summit, President Obama pledged that the United States would "be partners in helping to alleviate poverty" in the region.

One of the best ways that Congress can stand with President Obama in supporting a robust social agenda in the hemisphere is through continued strong support of the Inter-American Foundation. So I congratulate the IAF on its 40th anniversary, and I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today and join my colleagues in congratulating the Inter-American Foundation, the IAF, on its 40th anniversary. I would like to thank Congressman ENGEL and his staff for working to put this resolution together.

The foundation began as part of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1969 as an alternative to the larger USAID. The foundation presented a new model for funding grass-roots development with an emphasis on improving lives at the community level, not just on the national level. The foundation receives its funds through annual allocations by Congress and from the Social Progress Trust Fund. Since beginning its operations in 1972, the IAF has made 4,578 grants for more than \$586 million.

For 40 years now, the IAF has used small-dollar, targeted grants to make significant, long-lasting changes in the lives of people throughout Latin America and the Caribbean. By focusing on self-help development projects, the IAF encourages partnerships directed at improving the quality of life for poor

people and strengthening democratic practices.

While the economic benefits of these efforts cannot be dismissed, it is the sense of ownership at the grass-roots level and the pride these grants help to cultivate that has made the real difference in hundreds of thousands of lives.

Empowering people to take control of their own future, allowing parents to provide for their families, supporting communities to strengthen stability and prosperity, these are the keystones for strengthening democracy in the region.

As country after country in our hemisphere faces new and increasing challenges to their democracies, their institutions and the rule of law, our shared goal must be to advance U.S. interests and, in so doing, help to preserve and protect democratic institutions and fundamental freedoms around the world.

We must listen to the people of these nations and remain committed to our founding values and democratic principles. It is through the efforts of organizations like the Inter-American Foundation, the IAF, that we are able to do this.

I would like to commend and thank the Inter-American Foundation for its hard work and commitment and congratulate them on their 40th anniversary.

I rise in strong support of this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Texas for his good words.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 858.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

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

#### EDITORIAL COMMENTS OF BOB SCHIEFFER

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. Mr. Speaker, tonight I would like to read the words of Bob Schieffer. I watched his show, "Face the Nation," last Sunday, and I was very impressed with his editorial.

His editorial is as follows: "As the President tries to develop a new strategy in Afghanistan, I wonder if this is the real lesson that we've learned in Afghanistan so far: that nation-building, like charity, probably begins at home (at least the way we seem to be going about it in Afghanistan.)

"Now, don't get me wrong, terrorism poses a threat to America's national security, but is trying to build a Western-style nation in Afghanistan by funneling money to its leaders really the best way to combat terrorism?"

"I guess what set me off was that story about how we've secretly put the President of Afghanistan's brother on the CIA payroll. He's the one who's supposed to be mixed up in the drug trade. The idea was that, by doing that, he'll help us pave the way to building a democracy there. Now, that's good work if you can get it, but I don't see how that is making us safer.

"Whatever the size of the military force the President decides on for Afghanistan, I think he needs to be paying more attention to where the money is going for the non-military spending there. Incredibly, no one really seems to know."

Mr. Schieffer further stated: "To judge by what we've gotten from it so far, we'd be much better off with some nation-building back home. Our infrastructure is already a mess. We could start at the Oakland Bay Bridge where a 5,000-pound part of the top fell off into the traffic below. That would certainly make us safer for sure.

"In Afghanistan, we're having to relearn what we should have already known—that we can help others but we can't do it for them, and when we have to pay others to help themselves, I don't see how that helps anyone but the guy getting paid."

Again, that is from the editorial comments of Bob Schieffer this past Sunday on "Face the Nation."

Mr. Speaker, I want to say, in addition to what Mr. Schieffer said, I want to thank the President for taking his time and fully trying to understand the options and the trials facing our country in Afghanistan. Our men and women in uniform are very brave, they have done a great job for this country for the last 9 years, and yet we must be sure that we have a goal that can be achieved. And we must have a full definition of victory if we continue to send more troops into Afghanistan.

With that, Mr. Speaker, before I close, as I do each and every night on the floor, I ask God to please bless our men and women in uniform. I ask God

to please bless the families of our 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. And I ask God to bless the House and Senate. I ask God to give wisdom, strength and courage to the President of the United States. And I will ask three times, God please, God please, God please continue to bless America.

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

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

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.)

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

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

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.)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. BACHMANN addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. BIGGERT addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. BLACKBURN addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mrs. BONO MACK addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida addressed the House. Her remarks

will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. CAPITO addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. EMERSON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### HONORING CHENEY UNIVERSITY ON ITS 173RD FOUNDERS DAY

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

Mr. SESTAK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the 173rd Founders Day of Cheney University of Pennsylvania, our Nation's oldest Historically Black Institution of higher education, and its vision to prepare stellar, reflective, visionary leaders and responsible citizens.

At the time of its founding in 1837 by Quaker philanthropist Richard Humphreys, Cheney University served as a learning place for African Americans who sought an education that would prepare them to become teachers. To meet the needs of all qualified young people regardless of economic status, the university offered a free classical education on its Philadelphia campus. But in 1902, the university moved about 25 miles west of Philadelphia to George Cheney's farm, where it is located today in my district. By 1983, Cheney University joined the Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education.

Today, Cheney University has a diverse student body made up of bright, confident individuals who represent a variety of races, cultures and nationalities. In addition to becoming professionals in the education sector, Cheney graduates earn degrees in more than 30 disciplines and make their mark in careers that include journalism, medicine, business, science, law, communications, and government service.

Among the 10,000 talented graduates who have gone on to lead and make a difference in the world have been journalist Ed Bradley of the CBS program "60 Minutes"; Robert W. Bogle, publisher and CEO of the Philadelphia Tribune, the oldest newspaper continuously owned and operated by an African American.

□ 1915

Gladys Styles Johnston, chancellor of the University of Nebraska at Kearney; The Honorable Michael Horsley, Pennsylvania House of Representatives; The Honorable Thaddeus

Kirkland, Pennsylvania House of Representatives; Robert L. Woodson, founder and president of the National Center for Neighborhood Enterprise (NCNE); Samuel J. Patterson, CEO of Shepard Patterson Systems and Information Consulting Firm; and Ambassador Joseph M. Segars.

On November 6, 2009, Cheney University will celebrate its remarkable history and dedication to excellence in education by looking forward to a new generation of leaders. Through its Academic Success Center and small class sizes, Cheney University provides an academic environment in which students take on a variety of leadership positions at the university. There are more than 40 student organizations allowing students to take advantage of many extracurricular opportunities at the campus newspaper, television station, radio station, and in competitive athletics.

As Michelle Howard-Vital says of her Cheney students, "On campus, you will see hope and enthusiasm in the eyes of future graduates who will leave Cheney to compete for leadership positions in Pennsylvania, in the United States and around the world."

To honor Cheney University's ongoing commitment to leadership on its 173rd Founder's Day, educator, author, and motivational speaker Salome Thomas-El will address the university on the subject of leadership and character for the 21st century. In addition, Cheney University will honor The Honorable James R. Roebuck, Pennsylvania House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, in recognition of Cheney University of Pennsylvania's 173rd Founder's Day, I acknowledge the alumni, current students, faculty and staff, officers, advisory team, council of trustees, and President Howard-Vital for their collaboration and dedication to educating our next generation of American and world leaders at a marvelous university.

#### TOP TEN TAX INCREASES INCLUDED IN H.R. 3962

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, as anyone who has been paying much attention to what has been going on in Congress this fall will know, we have been talking about health care. What we had introduced last week was H.R. 3962, which I call a "tax increase bill" masquerading as a health care bill, and I want to outline some of the tax increases that are included in H.R. 3962 to back up my comments.

Number 1: Small business surtax, section 551, page 336, \$460.5 billion.

Number 2: Employer mandate tax, sections 511-512, page 308, \$135 billion. This violates President Obama's pledge to avoid tax increases on Americans earning less than \$250,000.

Number 3: Individual mandate tax, section 501, page 296, \$33 billion. This also violates President Obama's pledge.

Number 4: Medical device tax, section 552, page 339, \$20 billion. Again, it violates President Obama's pledge to avoid tax increases on Americans earning less than \$250,000.

Number 5: \$2,500 annual cap on FSAs, section 532, page 325, \$13.3 billion. It violates President Obama's pledge.

Number 6: Prohibition on pretax purchases of over-the-counter drugs through HSAs, FSAs, and HRAs, section 531, page 324, \$5 billion. This is another violation.

Number 7: Tax on health insurance policies to fund Comparative Effectiveness Research Trust Fund, section 1802, page 1162, \$2 billion. It violates the pledge.

Number 8: 20 percent penalty on certain HSA distributions, section 533, page 326, \$1.3 billion.

Number 9: Other tax hikes and increased compliance costs on U.S. job creators, \$56.4 billion; IRS reporting on payments; delay implementation of worldwide interest allocation rules; override U.S. treaties on certain payments by insourcing businesses; codify economic substance doctrine and impose penalties.

All of these are referenced by the section number and the page number so the American people don't have to rely on what we're saying.

There is one other, which is revenue-raising provisions for \$3 billion.

The total tax increases in the bill: \$729.5 billion. This information came from the Joint Committee on Taxation, Congressional Budget Office.

Mr. Speaker, what we need is reform in our health care system. Republicans have offered commonsense reform. Those commonsense reform items are not being allowed to be heard. They were voted down in committee over and over and over again by the Democrat majority. This is not what the American people want. They want to see reform in health care, not increased taxes and a job-killing bill that will do very little to help with their challenges in dealing with health care reform.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Oklahoma (Ms. FALLIN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Kansas (Ms. JENKINS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MILLER of Michigan addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MYRICK addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. SCHMIDT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. SCHMIDT addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

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

#### REPUBLICAN HEALTH CARE SOLUTIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POLIS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am going to be joined this evening by Republican freshman colleagues of mine, and this session will be cochaired by my fellow freshman from the great State of Minnesota, ERIK PAULSEN.

ERIK, thank you for joining me this evening, and our other freshman colleagues will be joining us shortly.

We're going to be talking about health care from the perspective of freshmen. We're going to be talking about some Republican alternatives to the large bill that the Speaker introduced last week and unveiled and that we're discussing this week. We'll be doing some comparisons between bills that Republicans have to provide bet-

ter solutions, to take incremental approaches, to address the most important concerns that the American people have about their health care system first, and about the need to take a very deliberate, careful approach to changing an American health care system that needs tweaking rather than throwing out and replacing.

I yield to my colleague from Minnesota, Mr. PAULSEN.

Mr. PAULSEN. Well, thank you. I thank the gentlelady for yielding and for organizing this little discussion tonight, and I know we're going to have some of our freshman colleagues joining us.

I think, first and foremost, it's important for me to outline—and I think you share this view. You know, no one is denying that our health care system is in need of reform. Certainly, as a freshman Member, I know that the Members of our class, actually both Republican and Democrat, know that there need to be changes in the status quo. I know the Republicans, in particular in the freshman class, have been very frustrated that the media may not center or focus on some of the proposals that we actually have offered because, as you indicated, there are some very incremental approaches and piecemeal approaches which actually could be done and could be done bipartisanship to show success and progress in helping lower premiums for families, for individuals, and for small businesses.

As most of the public is well aware now, I think, just as early as last week, we had dropped on our desks a 1,990-page bill, which is a huge, mammoth bill, and we can bring that up a little later for a prop. It is a big piece of legislation, and I know we're going to be voting on that later this week.

I think I've come to realize in my first few months in office, as probably you have, that Washington is a place where actions are often taken without properly weighing the consequences and the impact of those actions. I think the bill that has been laid before us is very misguided in that it's going to have a heavy tax load put on the small business community. It's going to tax medical device companies in particular and medical device products, which impacts my district very greatly and the jobs there. We'll talk a little bit more about that in a little bit.

Our goal also is to make sure we are providing adequate coverage and are lowering the costs of health care premiums for all Americans—for individuals, families, and small businesses—because it is a pocketbook issue; but I think the approach that the majority is taking is a very misguided approach, and we're going to have some discussion about that tonight and about some of our alternatives, which, I think, make absolute common sense.

I would like to yield back.

Mrs. LUMMIS. I look forward to having our colleagues join us so we can discuss some of those.

We have been maligned as a party for not having a health care solution to counter the Pelosi approach and the Obama approach to health care; but in fact, we have over 53 bills that you can read online which will address health care reform. We offer and challenge the Democrat leadership, who controls this Congress, to pick and choose from among the better ideas that Republicans have and to bring some of those bills through committees and to the floor so we can debate them openly in a transparent manner.

They were not crafted behind closed doors as was the Democratic bill. They were crafted in the traditional manner with the help of legislative draftsmen and -women to address specific components of our health care system in a way that they can be aggregated into a larger reform package or addressed individually if we prefer. So we can have a healthy debate on a variety of subjects.

Even the Chicago Tribune noted recently that Republicans have a number of great ideas. Here is an excerpt from a recent editorial in the Chicago Tribune:

GOP proposals contain smart ideas to increase choice and competition in the health insurance market. These excellent ideas could expand coverage for the uninsured without cratering the Federal budget or curbing the competition and innovation that drive the U.S. health care system.

My colleague Mr. PAULSEN is on the Financial Services Committee, and I am on the Budget Committee. Among the things that he and I have seen in our committee work in the last 10 months is that we are aggregating more debt than George Washington through George W. Bush combined and that, while our colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle criticize Republicans for spending too much and criticize their inheriting a deficit, in fact, since we arrived in Washington—we freshmen along with the Pelosi Congress—they have increased the deficit, doubling it in 5 years and tripling it in 10. So it is not an excuse that they inherited a deficit.

Indeed, they did, and indeed, Republicans predating Mr. PAULSEN and I did overspend, but you don't solve an overspending problem by making it two times worse in 5 years and three times worse in 10 years. Our approaches to the health care bill are to advance solutions that will not add a dime to the deficit.

How many people believe that the \$1 trillion-plus Democratic health care bill is not going to add a dime to the deficit? In fact, a poll recently showed that more people believe we'll discover life on other planets than the Democrats' health care bill will not add to the deficit.

The Republican bills, however, do not add a dime to the deficit. Here are three of them that I'd like to highlight this evening. As I said, there are 53 on a Web site that I'll provide to you later in this discussion.

One of them is H.R. 3400, Empowering Patients First Act. The prime sponsor is Representative TOM PRICE, a physician from Georgia. It is the product of the Republican Study Committee.

The bill uses a mix of new tax credits and deductions to make the purchase of health care feasible for all Americans. The bill expands the individual health insurance market, using association health plans and interstate health insurance shopping to give people more choices. The bill encourages the creation of State-based portals so people can compare plan prices and benefits. For those with preexisting conditions, the bill redirects unspent stimulus funds towards State-based high-risk pools. Importantly, this bill is fully offset through redirecting stimulus funds, stepping up efforts to root out waste, fraud and abuse in our entitlement programs, reducing defensive medicine through medical liability reform, and capping discretionary spending.

□ 1930

This bill scores in the favorable column.

Another bill, sponsored by Representative JOHN SHADEGG of Arizona, entitled Improving Health Care for All Americans Act, has many of the taxation provisions incorporated into it that were eventually added into H.R. 3400. Then the Patients' Choice Act, which is a fun one to highlight, because it takes a little bit different tack, is sponsored by Representative PAUL RYAN. The bill provisions include some reforms that are badly needed to Medicare and Medicaid without decreasing benefits.

I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. PAULSEN. Thank you for yielding.

Well, I think, as you just mentioned, there is no doubt that there have been other Republican plans that have been offered. There are a variety of bills, 50-some bills that have been out there. In fact, all of these, nearly all of these pieces of legislation have actually been introduced prior to this mammoth nearly 2,000-page bill that has been dropped on our desk just last week.

I want to go back to some of the comments you made earlier about the deficit, because as someone who came to Washington fully acknowledging and recognizing that Republicans were part of the problem on deficit spending many years ago, that is no reason to continue to do the same.

Seeing ourselves now face our very first trillion-dollar budget deficit is of great concern to me. I know it is of great concern to my constituents, for their children and their grandchildren, thinking the share of the national debt for each person now has gone up to about \$38,000. Compared to when I was born, it was about \$1,500 per person.

At some point we are going to have to pay back that debt, and that's a heavy burden that's going to fall, un-

fortunately, on our children and our grandchildren. The bill that is being proposed by the Speaker does not address health care costs.

You mentioned earlier there is not a good track record of government introducing legislation and having it be cost-effective or innovative. The reality is, if you look back at 1965, congressional forecasters predicted at that time that Medicare would cost about \$12 billion in 1990.

Do you know what its actual cost came in at? The actual cost came in at \$90 billion. Today, just like Social Security, it is now on a path to insolvency due to runaway costs. We have massive problems with existing entitlement programs. It doesn't seem to me to make a lot of sense to have a new entitlement program that the government doesn't have a good track record on.

Mrs. LUMMIS. The gentleman from Minnesota has four really cute little girls, and I carried one of their Scooby-Doo backpacks through the Minnesota airport while we were transferring planes trying to get back to Washington for votes. A lot of us have kids or grandchildren that will be affected by this legislation because they will be paying for it for years to come.

One of the things we all learned from our parents in this baby boom generation is the importance of handing a better America to your children, and that is something that I don't want to be responsible for being the first generation to renege on. That's why I am so much more supportive of these Republican bills than of the Speaker's bill.

Among the things that are in the Republican bills that are so important are meaningful tort reform. I say this with a caveat; I am one of those Republicans who would rather see tort reform done at the State level. I think we see more innovation and creativity. We see some States that want to have caps on noneconomic damages. We see some States that want health care panels, States that want to make sure that expert witnesses, within the certain specialty that is charged with malpractice, are the ones that are designated as witnesses. There are a whole variety of ways to address tort reform.

I prefer that it be handled at the State level, but I have signed on to several of these bills that have State tort reform provisions even at this Federal level because I think they take a much better approach to the overall subject of health care reform. In other words, the Republican plan has meaningful tort reform. Oddly, the Speaker's bill contains a provision that says they will give out grants for innovations in tort reform but not to States that have placed a cap on noneconomic damages.

If you talk to some of the former legislators, now Members of Congress, who are from States that enacted caps on noneconomic damages and medical malpractice cases, you will learn that their medical malpractice premiums

for their physicians dropped, thereby allowing their physicians to either charge their patients less or stay in practice in small communities where they don't have as many patients to spread out the costs of that extremely expensive malpractice insurance premium.

Then we have interstate health insurance shopping. This is really what I think is going to be one of the most exciting keys to reducing the costs of health insurance, because it's going to create more competition. Coming from the smallest population State in the Nation, Wyoming, and not being able to buy insurance across State lines for health care the way I can for automobile insurance, I don't have the options, because of our little small pool of citizens, to spread the costs.

It's going to be very important that we have the ability to shop for health insurance across State lines and that we do it in a transparent way. I see these ads on TV for car insurance. Well, there is a little sign that you look at that compares one company's premium to another, to another. You can go online and shop and compare and put in the kinds of factors that you want in your automobile insurance.

We should be able to do that for health insurance. We should be able to buy our health insurance premiums that way, and the Republicans' bills will allow that to happen.

Then, further, association health plans, the Republican plans have it; the Democrat plan does not have it. Association health plans, once again, would allow groups with some common interest to pool, to create a larger pool, whether it's your church denomination, your Rotary Club, your alumni association or any other group that wanted to form an insurance pool for purposes of providing health insurance to their member participants.

This I call kind of an equivalent to what's available in the banking community. You have commercial Main Street banks, and then you have some credit unions. I kind of associated this kind of association health care plan with the notion of a credit union.

These are things that we have that would increase and stimulate competition in the private sector, and these are in the Republican plans. They are not in our colleagues', who are members of the Democratic Party, plans.

Now I would like to call on one of our colleagues who is from the State of Colorado. MIKE COFFMAN is here this evening from my neighboring State of Colorado.

I yield to you and thank you for attending this evening's discussion.

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Thank you, Representative LUMMIS.

What I think is of concern to those of us from Colorado, and I think many people across the country, is what is the impact upon jobs and employers. There is a concern about small business in particular.

There is a provision in the Pelosi bill, the Pelosi health care reform bill, that

has a surcharge on small businesses and employers. Now, granted, it has moved up to where it was in the first version, H.R. 3200, where it was if somebody had the average annual payroll between \$250,000, and then it started as a surcharge at 2 percent up to \$400,000 on an average annual payroll, with an 8 percent surcharge, that number has been moved up a little bit; but I think it's still going to be devastating to the economy. With \$750,000 and above it's an 8 percent surcharge, and then it's graduated a little bit down below that.

To put a surcharge on employers, a payroll tax, if you will, on employers that are just trying to keep their doors open, to keep making, to be able to make the payroll that they have, I think, is going to be a devastating job killer to this economy. I think we ought to focus on job creation and not job killers.

Mrs. LUMMIS. The gentleman is correct. In fact, we have found that studies determined that 5.5 million more jobs will be lost as a result of the taxes placed on small businesses under the Democrat version of the bill. Furthermore, there is a double whammy for small business. For businesses under 500,000 in payroll, there is not a big hit. But, of course, a lot of businesses in my State of Wyoming, there are 1,400 in my State of Wyoming that will be hit because they pay these taxes at the individual tax return, but they are small businesses that pay payrolls of more than \$500,000. That means 1,400 businesses in Wyoming are going to be slapped with that tax.

I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. PAULSEN. Thank you. Maybe I will ask the gentleman from Colorado a question, because he makes a really good point about this bill, that the proposed 1,990-page bill by the Speaker is bad for small business. Why would the Congress in a tough economy want to further penalize small businesses when they are struggling to get by and a third of all small businesses are going to be impacted by this surtax that you had mentioned?

We want to help small businesses grow, knowing that they are the engine of economic growth for this country, and we are making it tougher and tougher on them. Why would Congress even consider that?

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. The majority of small businesses, they are the job creators. They are the engine for job creation in this country, these really small businesses. Whether we like it or not, the reality is that oftentimes start-ups don't have the cash flow to support health insurance. I started a small business in Colorado and for the first 7 years was not in a position to offer health insurance. When I could, it was at a 50/50 split with the employee.

What this legislation says is that's not even good enough, that you have to be able to pay 72.5 percent of a federally approved plan through the insur-

ance exchange or, for a full-time employee, 65 percent of the family. Anything less than that, you are going to be hit by a surcharge.

You know, the reality is that oftentimes small businesses just—I mean, if you are struggling just to keep your doors open, and you get hit with a payroll tax, it's not like an income tax, that if you make a profit, you pay the tax.

This is, you are going to pay this whether you are losing money or not. This is whether or not you are going to have to lay off employees or not. It's a very bad direction to go, and it's certainly not in the Republican version. It's, unfortunately, in the Democrat version that we will be voting on later this week.

Mr. PAULSEN. Just to mention, I mean, it sounds like it just defies common sense. With unemployment at near 10 percent—I know there are going to be some new job figures that will be released in the very near future—but it defies common sense of why we would really hit the small business community even harder and make it tougher for them to raise jobs.

As the gentlewoman mentioned earlier, the Republicans have a proposal to allow small business to pool together through these associated health care plans to actually help small businesses provide health insurance for their employees.

Mrs. LUMMIS. That will do wonders in my State of Wyoming where a lot of people are small business people, in fact, mom and pop sole proprietors, ranchers, that are just the mom and the dad in the family, and they have individual insurance policies that they purchased as an individual because they are it, they are the business. Under the Democrats' bill, those are the very people who are going to be completely foreclosed from being able to purchase individual health insurance plans after 2013.

We have been joined by our colleague from the State of Pennsylvania. GLENN THOMPSON has with him a very large stack of paper. Representative THOMPSON, what is that?

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. This is a health risk, a serious health risk, for those of us who are carrying it around and, frankly, for the country. This is the Nancy Pelosi health care bill, 1,990 pages, and that's just part one.

Part two, I am sure we will see within the next 24 to 48 hours; that will be the manager's amendment. That will be all the buyouts, the bribes, the deals that are being made right now by the Speaker and my Democratic colleagues to buy their votes to support this.

I don't know what to expect. I don't know if my colleagues have a guess. We do a guess here in terms of the number of pages, this manager's amendment, which, frankly, will be all of the deals that are made. How many pages do you think the manager's amendment might be when we see this in the next 24, 48 hours?

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. I think it's about a couple of inches thick, would be my guess. The manager's amendment to the cap-and-trade, I think, was several hundred pages. I am speculating, but this is double the size of cap-and-trade. So let's go for 600 pages.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Six hundred. Do I have another bid?

□ 1945

Mrs. LUMMIS. The rumor I heard was 800.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. The gentlewoman from Wyoming says 800 pages. How about my good friend from Minnesota?

Mr. PAULSEN. Well, I am going to just gander a guess. It is going to be several inches thick, which is too thick for us to read in a short period of time, unfortunately, and probably for the public to have that right to know.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Now, that was a rather safe guess; a rather safe guess.

Yes, that manager's amendment is coming. And there are lots of just flawed approaches to health care here. Speaking as someone who worked in that field for almost 30 years as a manager in rural hospitals and a skilled nursing facility and many different settings, I want to talk just briefly about some of those, because it has to do with one of the charts you had up there about the promise to not add a dime to the debt, not a dime to the deficit.

This bill was based on the premise of Medicare growth being held at 4 percent. Now, why is that important? Well, Medicare is a significant amount of money, so 4 percent of Medicare is a lot of money. But let's talk about reality here, and that is what this bill lacks is a good dose of reality.

Medicare growth rates have been steady at 7 to 8 percent a year. That is just the reality of it. If you think about it, those in the baby boomer generation who are now retiring, becoming qualified beneficiaries under Medicare, that is a significant number of people adding to the Medicare rolls from this point forward. So, 7 to 8 percent.

If we just look back a year to 2008, the Medicare growth last calendar year alone was 9 percent, 9 percent, and yet this bill was based on holding Medicare at 4 percent. I think that is pretty flawed math. That is not even fuzzy math. That is just wrong.

We know that this is built on half a trillion dollars in new taxes, and you talked about some of those. Small businesses. Taxes on individuals who choose not to buy in, to buy insurance, are penalized. Medical devices will be taxed as an excise tax.

The other part of the funding mechanism is a half a trillion dollars in Medicare cuts. We have talked about that during other forums here, when already Medicare systematically has been underfunded from almost the day it was created. Medicare only pays today about 80 to 90 cents on every dollar of

health care costs that a hospital or doctor has. And to do another half a trillion dollars in Medicare cuts, that is just wrong. The people that are going to suffer from that are the providers and older adults. This will bankrupt hospitals.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Reclaiming my time, I would echo some of your concerns in saying that in rural areas Medicare is not reimbursed at the same rates as it is in urban areas. So hospitals and physicians in rural areas receive less compensation for Medicare patients than they do in urban areas; so much less that in Casper, Wyoming, a town in central Wyoming, only about one-third of their actual out-of-pocket expenses are reimbursed from the Federal Government when they treat a Medicare patient.

Well, the hospital, because it is a quasi-public hospital, is going to keep taking those patients. But private physicians don't have to keep taking those patients, and when they are undercompensated, some of them choose to no longer take Medicare patients. And in a State that has a dearth of physicians anyway because we have such a small pool of patients, we are losing more and more access to doctors, even today.

My concern under the Democrats' bill is that we will be worse off as a State in terms of the number of physicians who will take Medicare patients and the hospitals that will take Medicare patients because of the poor reimbursement levels and decisions that are being made by the majority party in Congress to make further cuts in Medicare.

I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Thank you, Congresswoman LUMMIS.

One of the things that concerns me is how seniors are treated in this bill, and I think you certainly mentioned some of the things. But half of the bill is paid for by cuts to Medicare, roughly half, and that is stripping hundreds of billions of dollars out of the Medicare system. So a couple of things concern me.

There are going to be cuts certainly to Medicare Advantage. Many of the 10 million seniors that we know that are on the Medicare Advantage program will lose their coverage.

But what concerns me is the solvency of the system. If in fact there are savings in the Medicare system through looking at waste, fraud and abuse, as the proponents mention, that money really needs to stay in the Medicare system for seniors, because the actuaries or the trustees of the Medicare system are projecting that Medicare will run out of funding in 2013. So what we ought to be concentrating on, and there seems to be no discussion, is what is going to happen to the seniors in Medicare. Will they simply move into the public option? And then the public option, we defer to bureaucrats in the bill to define what are essentially the procedures, the treatments that are authorized.

So they are going to be making that decision, and on what basis are they going to be making that decision? Is it going to be on the quality-of-life issues in terms of maybe end-of-life care isn't important? We don't know these things. But I think the seniors ought to be real concerned about what is going to happen to their Medicare system, their Medicare plans under this particular proposal.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Before I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota, I wanted to remark on something I learned today. The Republicans had a little reading room where we could go and read the bill and share ideas, and especially learn from ranking members of the various committees who have been studying these concepts at least, even though they haven't seen it in bill form, for not only months, but years.

One of the things that I learned today in that session is that the enforcer in the Democratic bill is actually the IRS. One would think that with 111 new government agencies that the enforcement mechanism for providing health care, what is supposed to be a very positive notion, would not be the IRS.

What thinks the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. PAULSEN. Well, I thank you for yielding. I just want to go reference back to the comment that the gentleman, my good friend from Pennsylvania, had made on the tax on medical devices.

I have the privilege of being the co-Chair of the House Medical Technology Caucus. So just about 2½ to 3 weeks ago I conducted a field hearing in Minnesota in my district and we heard directly from those that would be impacted by this very onerous tax, because the Senate originally proposed a \$40 billion tax on medical devices, and now the House, Speaker PELOSI's bill, the 1,990-page version has a \$20 billion tax.

I want to tell you what we heard directly from people. One, we heard directly from small companies. I have a medical alley in my district that employs about 20,000 people in this sector, this economy, and these are folks that are producing these new lifesaving technologies that really give families and individuals the peace of mind that they are going to be taken care of in their elder years, or for their children, for instance.

Some of these companies, one in particular that just turned profitable, was very direct in saying, You know what? If we get hit with this tax, unfortunately, we are going to have to take that reduction in payroll. That is where the tax is going to hit us is in payroll and in layoffs and out of research and development.

So we are actually stifling innovation. It is an innovation tax.

Then we heard from a venture capitalist who is involved in new startups to try and get these little companies going again, some that have five employees, some that have nine. They are

hoping to come up with the “next best thing.”

We are putting another nail in the coffin for them, as it was explained. We are making it that much tougher, because it is kind of a lottery right now. It is so difficult for a company like this to get the venture capital and then bring a product to market.

Finally, we heard from patients. We heard from patients that would be directly impacted. In particular, there was one individual that has an artificial limb, a prosthetic, that now as a patient we are making health care more expensive for him by having a tax on his products. And the tax that we have now as part of the Pelosi bill is going to put a tax on wheelchairs, on hearing aids, on the bandages that hospitals purchase. So it is absolutely a move in the wrong direction. It is going to make health care more expensive.

Mrs. LUMMIS. And, in fact, we also learned today that the bill runs counter to the President’s promise that this was not going to tax people who make less than \$250,000 a year. Because of the taxes that the gentleman from Minnesota just described, 90 cents out of every dollar that applies in this bill in additional costs will fall on people that fall in exactly that category, the \$250,000 and less income earners.

I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Well, I thank the gentlelady from Wyoming.

I think innovation is one of the things that our health care system fosters in this country. When you look at the advancements that we have had, whether it be in medical devices or lifesaving technology, diagnostic, invasive, noninvasive, lifesaving interventions, that comes out of the type of health care system that we have today. It is the way it has been designed and the way it works. It provides those encouragements.

I have a number of similar small businesses that started very small, I don’t know if they started in somebody’s garage, but started as small operations, and they developed tremendous innovations, innovations in terms of prostheses for individuals who have lost limbs.

Actually, one of them is an incredible small company developing a limb that is not just a powered limb, which is the cutting edge for a prosthesis, an artificial leg, but this one actually self-charges. In the use of it, that friction builds up the power.

The application of it is just tremendous, starting with our wounded warriors who rehabilitate and return to the field. This is an artificial limb and you don’t have to plug it in at the end of the day. It recharges while you use it. We wouldn’t get that innovation.

Any time we tax something, we repress it. We hold it back. We destroy it. This tax on medical devices is just, well, I agree, it would be a nail in the

coffin of innovation for health care in this country.

Mr. PAULSEN. If the gentleman would yield, he raises a good point, because having visited Pennsylvania and knowing there are some technology sectors right in your district in particular, and there are many States, and maybe that is because some States don’t have these medical device technologies growing, they are not being incubated. It is Massachusetts, it is California, it is Tennessee and Minnesota, which surprises me, because the Speaker being from California is proposing this tax. It is actually going to hurt many of these devices.

Again, we talked about the nature of the economy, almost 10 percent unemployment. We are going to be making it tougher to have very well, high-paying jobs, tougher for those companies to keep those jobs. It just doesn’t make any sense to me.

Mrs. LUMMIS. One of the math items in this bill that just doesn’t add up is the fact that they are going to be paying for 6 years of benefits under this bill with 10 years of revenue collections. And yet when we get, then, to that magical 11th year where we need to be able to pay for it as we go, obviously we won’t be able to just stop providing benefits and have the taxes run for 4 years where we don’t tap into them before we involve ourselves in the benefit component of the program again.

So that is a one-time in the first 10 years type of financial balancing act or financial gimmick that is being used in this bill to make it sound like it is in some way financially balanced. It is not, and it will suck more out of this economy in the second and ensuing 10 years and in decades when once again our children are going to be paying for it.

So, this bill really does defer to our children and grandchildren huge financial obligations that the people in this room feel is not only unnecessary, but highly inappropriate.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. If the gentlelady will yield, you are going down a tremendously important road here in terms of what this legacy of costs that we are passing along to our children and our grandchildren and great-grandchildren at this point is, on top of all the other deficits that have been accumulated by this Democrat-led Congress since January.

I had the opportunity to spend some time this morning with a former Congressional Budget Office director. And going back to the point of the flawed math here, of saying that growth in Medicare will be held at 4 percent, when we know that it is an average of 7 to 8, 9 percent last year, his estimates are this cost will actually be at somewhere around \$1.8 trillion in terms of math.

To give us some idea, I just want to point to a project that actually is literally under our noses. It was a project that did not occur on our watch. This

was years past, and it is a beautiful place to visit and we take our constituents there, the Capitol Visitor Center.

□ 2000

I certainly encourage people to come to Washington to visit that, but there is a prime example of estimates that were made, and in the end it was 300 percent more expensive than what the original cost estimates were. So even if we’re at a trillion or \$1.2 trillion or \$1.8 trillion, and we know that we cannot afford that, where could these costs go once this legislation passes? Just based on the example of a project that we should have pretty good oversight on because it was being constructed right under our noses.

Mrs. LUMMIS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota to introduce our colleague from Tennessee.

Mr. PAULSEN. I will yield to the gentleman, but in particular, my colleague from Tennessee, whom I have learned a great deal from, one of the things that I appreciate about you is you’re a former mayor and you know how to get things done, and certainly I think Members of Congress could take some lessons from you. Coming from this great State of Tennessee, you’ve got some of those medical technology companies in your great State. And we should hear from you as a physician as well. You’ve got a very unique perspective, and you can offer a lot to this Congress.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

I would like to start out by saying that I don’t think there’s a conflict at all either from the Republican side or the Democrat side that we have a need to reform health care in this country, because costs are not sustainable on the current path. I don’t think anyone disagrees with that. And, secondly, it’s a noble goal and an attainable goal, I believe, to cover our citizens with health care. I believe we can do that in this country. I don’t think this bill is the one that does it, and I go back to an experience that I’ve had in Tennessee.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania was talking about the cost of the Visitors Center. Let’s go over the costs of health care in this country and estimates by government people, by the CBO and others. Let’s go back to 1965, and I do believe that this is the single biggest debate on a social issue since the civil rights movement in the 1960s and Medicare in 1965. In 1965 the estimate was Medicare would cost \$3 billion to \$4 billion a year, and that’s what it cost. The estimate in 1990, 20 years later, it was going to be a \$15 billion program. What was the actual cost? Over \$90 billion. And today our Medicare program is over \$400 billion.

Let’s also dial back to Medicaid. The Medicaid program, the government insurance for low-income people and infants and children, has gone up 37 times since its inception.

In TennCare we had the argument that I hear and, again, I dealt with it as a physician and also as a mayor. In the early 1990s we had a lot of people in Tennessee who were uncovered. So we wanted to cover as many of our people as we could. So we got a waiver from Washington to experiment with a managed care plan called TennCare. And HHS, the Health and Human Services here in Washington, exempted us from the current Medicaid plan.

When we started this plan, we started with eight different companies that would go after your business on a competitive basis, and this was going to hold costs down. We would compete among these plans.

So what actually happened in Tennessee was this: in 1993 the State spent \$2.6 billion on our TennCare program. Between there and 2004, 10, 11 budget years later, that had risen to almost \$8.5 billion. It had over-tripled in price, where we thought the costs would be less than that. We thought it would hold costs down.

What actually happened with the public option? Well, what happened with the public option was this: 45 percent of the people who got on TennCare had private health insurance, and they made a perfectly logical decision. It was cheaper, it had first-dollar coverage, it was a very generous plan. So they dropped their own private health insurance coverage and got on TennCare.

Now, I just got the numbers this afternoon, and they are what I thought they were. In our State our TennCare plan pays about 58 percent of the cost of actually providing the care. Medicare pays 91 percent in Tennessee of the cost of providing the care, and the uninsured pay somewhere in between. And what happened in our State was those costs got shifted to private insurers.

Well, the State was then left with—almost every new budget dollar that came to the State of Tennessee was used for health care, not for K-12, not for roads, not for other things, colleges and so forth. So what did the Governor, who is a Democrat, and the legislature, which is now Republican, what did they do? Well, they rationed care. And how did they ration care? They cut the rolls. And every year that we had a raise, it was almost double digit. The year that broke the bank was a 19 percent increase in costs in 1 year.

So we have seen the public option. We have seen the competition. And the problem with any public plan is it doesn't pay the cost of the care. And when you do that, three things happen for somebody: one is you decrease access because you don't have someone who will take those patients on that don't pay the cost of the care. Number two, when you decrease access, you decrease quality of care because the patients can't get to a physician other than through an emergency room. And, three, somebody else, that's the private insurers in our State, pay more money.

So we had decreased access, decreased quality, and increased costs. So that's what I'm fearful of here that will happen with this.

There is a better way. I mean, I can sit down with the expertise in this room right now and we can write a plan with our Democratic colleagues in 30 minutes. A quick example of that is the current Baucus plan calls for increasing access to 91 percent of our population. Now 85 percent of our population is covered. You can do two things that will get you to 91 percent on one page, and that is, number one, allow young people, like I've had children in my own home that have had to do this, that don't have health insurance when they graduate from high school or college, to stay on their parents' plan until they're 26 years old. This current bill, the Democrats have had that in there, and I agree with that 100 percent. And, number two, simply sign up the people who already qualify for Medicaid or SCHIP, and you will get to 91 percent. So it's a fairly simple thing to do without a lot of government bureaucracy, new plans, czars, commissioners, and so on that's so complicated right now. I'm sure some of you have tried to wade through this bill, and some of it's almost incomprehensible.

I thank you for yielding.

Mrs. LUMMIS. We are all freshmen who have been talking here. Many of us served in some capacity either in our State legislature, in your case as a mayor, a couple of State treasurers; so we know how State government works. And what we see, as States could not print money, we had to live within our means. So when the Federal Government places an unfunded mandate, meaning they require States to provide a service and then don't provide the money for the State to provide the service, the State has to come up with the bucks. And this has been called the "mother of all unfunded mandates" by the Democrat Governor of your home State of Tennessee.

And those of us who are here—I know that you were leader in your Minnesota legislature—tried to find good legislation that was sitting around and had been introduced by Members of either party. And in honesty, in my legislature, if a Democrat had a great idea, and we were Republican legislators, we'd go steal their ideas and put Republican names on it and sponsor it. It was the best form of flattery. The ideas were coming up.

And you know who did that maybe better than anybody I have ever seen on a national scale was Bill Clinton. He took what was cultivated in the States and nurtured in the States a plan to reform welfare, and he slapped his name on it and he made it his. And he worked with Republican Members of this Congress to reform welfare.

We could do that today. We have 53 bills out there that our Democratic colleagues could say, hey, this is a good idea or I like the idea of letting

young people stay on their parents' insurance until they're 26 years old. That helps them out, especially in these tough economic times when it's hard to find a job. There are ideas out there that would solve these problems.

Yet we are faced with a bill that is almost 2,000 pages long that we're expecting a big additional amendment to, that was drafted behind closed doors, that has some nonsensical language in it that people can't understand that we only get 72 hours to read. It all seems like a bad dream. But it's the American Congress. And there are so many better options out there. I just am so frustrated with the majority party that they won't look through our 53 bills that they could read online and say that's a good idea, let's put a Democrat's name on it and make it our idea. We'd be delighted.

I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I thank the gentlewoman from Wyoming for yielding.

Just to make your point, something that I promised I would do when I came here as a local mayor, I had dealt with unfunded mandates until I had had them up to here on the local level. The State has to deal with these. And I made a decision I'm not going to vote for an unfunded mandate that the Federal Government puts on local government or State government.

And our Governor right here that you mentioned, Governor Bredesen, who is a Democrat, by the way, and is very knowledgeable in health care, I have great respect for him and the knowledge that he has. He's had to make some tough decisions. He has looked at this current plan and evaluated it from the viewpoint of the State of Tennessee. I think it's September of next year, 2010, the money that the States get from stimulus is gone. It's over with. So he's looking at this unfunded mandate to us.

And let me just tell you how critical it is in our State right now because of jobs. We are losing jobs in the State. The unemployment rate is above 10 percent, and we're a sales tax-based State. We don't have a State income tax. And he has estimated that this particular plan, H.R. 3200, now 3962, that's out there will conservatively cost our State \$735 million in the first 5 years. And if it has the same benefit package, which remember the commissioner will decide what an adequate benefit package is, it will cost the State as much as \$3 billion to \$4 billion.

Let me tell you the dire straits we're in. The SCHIP program right now, the State Children's Health Insurance Plan, known in Tennessee as CoverKids, we can't enroll any other kids in there because we can't afford the current plan. So if we come down with another unfunded mandate, we don't know what we're going to do in the State.

Mrs. LUMMIS. We are now down to the speed round, which means we have

2 minutes left for each Member of this discussion to summarize.

And I would like to start with the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I just want to build quickly on affordability. And our Democratic colleagues have recognized this with this bill, and I just call attention to page 25, section 101, which is the national high-risk pool. These are the folks we should be doing something for. They're high risk, preexisting conditions. They have a difficult time accessing health insurance. And the language that's built into this, our Democratic colleagues recognize this isn't going to be sustainable. We're not going to be able to fund this. Within the legislative language it says, given once the money is spent and goes beyond the premiums checked, it allows the Secretary of Health and Human Services, if all are exhausted, to do three things: cut benefits, increase premiums, and create waiting lists. Page 25, section 101.

I think that's a general acknowledgment early in this bill. And if we can do that type of rationing for folks who are most at risk, who we should be doing health insurance reform for, what does it mean for the rest of us?

I thank the gentlewoman for coordinating tonight.

Mrs. LUMMIS. You are well under your time. Thank you for participating.

I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. I thank the gentlewoman from Wyoming for yielding.

One concern certainly that I have is that we are, I think, not focused on all that we have in terms of a safety net. For instance, in my home State of Colorado, there is a high-risk insurance pool called Cover Colorado. We have a premium tax on all insurance products, whether it's health care or it's property and casualty, some of which goes into the general fund, some of which goes into a subsidized health insurance plan for people with preexisting conditions that can't otherwise reasonably get insurance but don't qualify for a public plan because of their income or their assets. So they are covered under this program where they are charged a flat 140 percent of what the average premium cost is in Colorado.

□ 2015

We have 183 community health clinics in Colorado. If you look at the community health provider network Web site for Colorado, they saw over 400,000 patients—not patient visits but patients in the State of Colorado—where they got preventive care, primary care, dental services and mental health services, mostly at taxpayers' expense, all for the uninsured and underinsured. We have Medicaid for the poor and disabled. We have Medicare for the elderly. So there is a tremendous safety net right now. To include emergency room

care for those that don't have any form of insurance or are not on a plan and walk in, they're required by law to receive all appropriate screening and subsequent treatment. So I think we need to be aware of what the safety net is right now.

Mrs. LUMMIS. I thank the gentleman from Colorado for participating this evening, and I yield now to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I thank the gentlelady from Wyoming. Just a couple of brief things that we hadn't touched on maybe as much. Certainly I am one of the few people in this Congress who have had to go down to the emergency room at 3 or 4 o'clock in the morning and see someone who doesn't have health insurance coverage or has a malignancy that needs care. I have seen it and have dealt with it. Certainly what we would like to do is make sure that we can find a way to help those folks that don't have coverage right now. We have got 85 percent of the people in this Nation who have coverage, and what are they worried about? The cost. I will tell you now that we will never get the costs under control in this country without liability reform. Unless you have medical malpractice reform in some reasonable way—and one of the problems that we have in malpractice reform is that we don't have a way to adequately compensate someone who's been injured.

Right now in this system, in Tennessee, the system that we had doesn't do that. Since the inception of our malpractice company, owned by the physicians in Tennessee, since 1975, over half the dollars that have been paid out have been paid to attorneys and not to the injured party. Less than 40 cents of every dollar that we pay has been paid to someone who's been injured. There is something wrong with that. So we have to look into this as a Nation and decide how we're going to proceed. Certainly people are injured and do need compensation for their injuries. But the system we have now is broken. It needs to be fixed. This particular bill does nothing for that.

I will yield back the remainder of my time so that others can speak. I appreciate you having me on with you tonight.

Mrs. LUMMIS. We are blessed to have three physicians in our Republican freshman caucus who have been gracious in educating us about the medical practice in their parts of the country. It's a great privilege to serve with them in Congress and also the gentleman from Pennsylvania who spoke earlier, who has managed health care in his State. We are deeply grateful for his participation.

I thank the gentlemen from the Republican freshmen for participating in this evening's effort. I can tell you that the women in the Republican Conference have been discussing health care as it relates to women this week, and we'll be doing so again tomorrow.

I will look forward to pursuing that discussion again tomorrow. But to wrap things up this evening for the remainder of our time, I would like to turn it over to my colleague and cohost for this evening's Special Order by the Republican freshmen, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PAULSEN).

Mr. PAULSEN. I thank the gentlelady for helping coordinate the opportunity for all of us tonight as freshmen to express some of our concerns and certainly opposition and reservations to the bill that has been put now before us that we will likely be voting on later this week. We talked about why this bill is bad for the American public. I just want to recap. Number one, we talked about why this bill is bad for small business. It raises their taxes. It's going to cost jobs. We've talked about why this bill is bad for individuals. It mandates that they will have to buy coverage or else they're going to have to pay a penalty. We've talked about—not at great length but why the bill is, indeed, bad for seniors. That is no doubt. I talk to a lot of seniors in my district that are under Medicare Advantage right now, and they are very concerned about having to give up the health care plan that they're under right now. These Medicare Advantage plans, they offer a lot of what the President himself in this very Chamber talked about, good services that benefit a lot of these seniors, going for regular checkups without having to pay an additional copay, having vision care, having dental care. That is what Medicare Advantage plans offer. And to cut Medicare by \$500 billion, to me, makes absolutely no sense.

If you really think about it—and my good friend from Tennessee, the doctor, mentioned earlier—some of the good provisions we should be supporting, like allowing young adults to be put on their parents' policies—I mean, that's common sense, and we support that initiative. We just wish that we could hit the reset button and not have a 1,990-page bill where we would have just a provision where we could do that, as well as allowing the small businesses to pool together. We can absolutely cover preexisting conditions. That is something we absolutely should do and we support doing. So there are some good things that we should focus on. Unfortunately, those aren't the priorities of this bill, unfortunately. And ultimately, the American want people want to have the peace of mind that they can get the coverage that they need when they need it, and they want to ensure that they—not the government, not special interests, not Members of Congress—are not going to stand between a patient and their doctor.

In short, I think we all agree that the bill before us is the wrong approach. It's a very dismissive wave of the hand by Congress to those who have raised the voice on this most personal issue in their lives. There's no other issue that affects families more personally than

health care, whether it is taking care of your children, thinking about how you're going to care for your parents or grandparents down the road. There is a better way, as you mentioned. There is a better way, and the gentlelady from Wyoming had gone through a great detail of other proposals that are out there that, quite honestly, there's bipartisan support for. The truth is, with the right reforms, we can absolutely control health care costs and lower premiums. This bill does not lower health care premiums. It will be a massive intrusion from the Federal Government on our individual and personal economic freedoms, though.

I yield back for our closing.

Mrs. LUMMIS. I thank the gentlemen from Minnesota, from Tennessee, from Pennsylvania and from Colorado for joining me this evening. People from all over the United States will be paying a house call on Speaker PELOSI on Thursday at noon this week on the Capitol steps. We will be there to greet them and hopefully discuss with them our concerns about the Democratic approach and to offer better solutions.

I thank the Speaker this evening for his kind attention and tolerance of his fellow freshmen Republicans' efforts this evening.

#### THE ECONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DRIEHAUS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. DRIEHAUS. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I appreciate very much listening to my Republican colleagues. I, too, came in in the freshman class, along with my Republican colleagues, and I came to the floor tonight, Mr. Speaker, to talk about the economy and to talk about regulatory reform and what we're doing to address the foreclosure crisis here in the United States. But I can't allow some of the comments that I just heard go without challenge.

I heard it said that we've only been given 72 hours to read the bill. Now I think, Mr. Speaker, you probably remember back at the end of July, there was a push to try to vote on the health care plan. I, along with you, I believe, and many others suggested that the American people have time, that they have time to read the health care bill, that we have time to digest this. We went home. We held town meetings. I don't know about the other Members of Congress. I know I had more than 100 meetings on health care during that time period. So we have had far more than 72 hours.

But then they said, We need 72 hours for this particular bill. So the bill, itself, which is simply a modification of bills that we have been discussing, that we've been hearing in committee, bills that we have been meeting on for months was introduced on Friday. I put

it on my Web site. Many people put it on their Web site. There has been plenty of time. If you want to oppose health care, then obviously that is up to you to oppose health care. But let's not hide behind this thing about 72 hours. We have had months to discuss this. We will have far more than 72 hours to look and review the bill at hand.

I also want to talk about small businesses, because I know, Mr. Speaker, you and I have worked very closely on this in protecting small businesses in the health care reform bill. As you recall, the bill as originally introduced had a threshold of \$250,000 for payroll. That is, any small business that had more than \$250,000 in payroll would be subject to a surcharge, a surcharge where they pay their fair share. That has been increased in this bill to \$500,000, a significant increase for small businesses. I don't know what businesses my colleagues from the Republican side are visiting, but I can tell you when I go out to small businesses, be they Democrat or Republican, they're talking about their premium increases. They're talking about their premium increases of 20 percent, of 30 percent. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, this is all about small businesses. This is about protecting small businesses. Because right now in the State of Ohio, the State I hail from, less than 50 percent of small businesses are able to provide health care to their employees; less than 50 percent. It's because of those rising costs. So while they say it does nothing for individuals, well, they're absolutely wrong. If you're an individual working for a small business and the employer cannot afford health care, this bill helps you; it helps you, and it helps your family. If you're an individual with a preexisting condition, you happen to be ill and you need to get health insurance, you can't do it right now. Does this bill help those individuals? Absolutely. If you're an individual that has health insurance and you happen to get sick, and you need to draw upon that health insurance, right now you can be cut off. This bill says, No. You can't do that any longer. The insurance company can't stop covering you for your illness. So this bill is all about helping small businesses and helping individuals.

I would encourage my colleagues to read the bill. Yes, it's long. But we're beyond chapter books at this point. We are able to read long bills. It's long because this is a comprehensive piece of legislation, and I think it deserves debate. It deserves far more than rhetoric. But rhetoric is what you tend to hear when you come down to the House floor. Rhetoric is what you tend to hear when Republicans line up and give 1-minute speech after 1-minute speech after 1-minute speech, be it about energy or health care or the economy. The other side of the aisle is big on rhetoric, but they're not big on solutions, nor are they big on taking re-

sponsibility. They act as if they weren't here. They act as if they weren't in charge since 1994, that they weren't elected in the Newt Gingrich majority, that they didn't have power until 2006. But the fact of the matter is that they were the party in party. They were the party in control. They were the party as this housing crisis spiraled out of control. They were the party as the rising costs of health care kept mounting and mounting and mounting and harming our small businesses and harming our economy.

#### THE U.S. ECONOMY

For the 8 years prior to being elected to Congress, Mr. Speaker, I was a State representative in Ohio. I come from a working-class neighborhood in Cincinnati, and I saw house after house being foreclosed on. Now I didn't know what was happening in 2001. I didn't know what was happening in 2002. So we put together a housing task force, and we started asking questions. We started looking into some of these loans that were being floated to my neighbors, to folks in my neighborhood to figure out why these houses were going into foreclosure. And it was interesting. We found that people who never should have qualified for loans were suddenly qualified. People that couldn't even document that they had the income to purchase a home were qualifying for home loans. Then, of course, they couldn't afford to pay the mortgages, and those were the houses being foreclosed on. We call these subprime loans. When people who can't afford to pay their bills, people who have poor credit scores are able to get a loan, those are subprime loans, as opposed to people who do pay their bills and they do have high credit scores. Those are prime loans.

So we looked at this, and we looked at some of the practices of the financial institutions, and we just scratched our heads and said, Well, how is it that a financial institution can float a loan to somebody that can't prove their income, can float a loan to somebody that has a poor credit history, yet they're purchasing an \$80,000 home, they're purchasing a \$120,000 home? How is this happening?

Well, the answer is, Mr. Speaker, it was all about what was going on on Wall Street. It was all about what was going on on Wall Street because what was going on on Wall Street was that people were making a lot of money, and they were making a lot of money off of these products that are called derivatives or mortgage-backed securities or credit default swaps.

□ 2030

The world had changed in the area of mortgage finance in the early 2000s. The world had changed dramatically. What had happened was this. Where in the past if you wanted to buy a home, you wanted to achieve the American Dream, you would go down to your bank, you would go down to the sav- ings and loan, and you would talk to

the loan officer. They would work with you to negotiate a mortgage. They would work with you to negotiate that loan, and then they would hold on to the mortgage paper. And this is important. They held the mortgage paper as part of their portfolio. It was their investment portfolio. It was a long-term investment on the part of the financial institution.

But what we found out was that the world had changed. No longer were these financial institutions holding on to that paper. In many cases, no longer were they the local bank or the local savings and loan. They were out-of-town entities who had never seen your house, and who had never looked at the appraisal. The reason they were closing those loans was because of those mortgage-backed securities on Wall Street. You see, they were able to close those loans and they would immediately sell them. They would sell them on the secondary market, and then they would bundle the loans into thousands of mortgage loans that were sold on Wall Street as a security, a mortgage-backed security.

So what happened? Well, the folks that were closing the loans, because they were no longer holding the paper, because they no longer had any skin in the game, they were qualifying everybody that walked in the door. They were qualifying everybody that walked in the door at the highest prices they could possibly get. So, rather than saying, you know, we are going to put you in a 30-year fixed because it is a more stable product or a 15-year fixed because it is a more stable product, we are going to get you in this 3-year, adjustable-rate mortgage. And, oh, by the way, this rate, yes, it is a good rate right now, but it is going to adjust in 3 years. Oh, and there is this little prepayment penalty that is also in the loan. So, yes, I know it is a stretch for you right now, you who are a subprime borrower, you who don't have a steady job, and you who may be making a stretch to make this loan payment every month, yes, I know it is a stretch, but you can qualify. You can achieve the American Dream.

The reality was this, in those 2 or 3 years when that interest rate started adjusting, and in some cases it was adjusting every 3 or 4 months, when it started adjusting, that stretch was no longer a reality for many of those families. They tried to get out. They wanted to renegotiate, but they couldn't renegotiate because they had this prepayment penalty of a thousand dollars or \$2,000. So if they couldn't afford their \$600 a month loan, they are not going to be able to afford the \$1,000 or the \$2,000 in the prepayment penalty. So they give up. They throw up their arms and walk away. That is a foreclosure. That was happening time after time after time in my neighbor and neighborhoods across Ohio and across the country.

So what do we do? Well, we in the State legislature said wait a minute,

we have to do something about this. We have to stop this predatory behavior. And we tried. We tried in the State of Ohio. But in the State of Ohio, like so many other States, we had very little authority because the financial institutions were regulated by the Federal Government.

So we turned to the Federal Government to help us out. This is where we get back to who was in charge. In 2001, Stephanie Tubbs Jones, a tremendous Congresswoman from Ohio, introduced predatory lending legislation. And we had predatory lending legislation introduced in every session of Congress after that. So in 2001, we could have done something. In 2002, we could have done something. In 2003, we could have made a difference. In 2004, we could have enacted predatory lending legislation. In 2005, we could have protected those homeowners. In 2006, we could have done something about it.

There were millions of homes going into foreclosure, but this body stood silent. This body, controlled by the Republican Party, stood silent, and they didn't address the foreclosures. They didn't address the runaway greed on Wall Street in the form of mortgage-backed securities and derivatives that were leveraged up to 30 and 40 times. They didn't address any of it. They said the markets will work it out. We don't need government intervention.

But when housing prices went south and the investors in those mortgage-backed securities soon learned, you know, those mortgages aren't worth much, all of a sudden the bottom fell out of the market. And that inaction, it is that inaction that caused this recession.

This was a recession precipitated by the financial markets. It was precipitated by what was going on in mortgage finance, and it caused the near collapse of our economy. It caused the near collapse of financial institutions across the globe.

So at the end of last year, in September of last year, the Congress was asked, President Bush pleaded with the Congress to pass a bailout for the banks, a bailout that many Americans never wanted to see. But the reality was that things had gotten so bad that but for the intervention of the Federal Government, we could have had the collapse of the financial markets globally all due to the inaction of the Federal Government.

That's where we were. And so now we hear Republicans come down to the floor of the House and act as if the world just began in January of 2009, acting as if all of these problems started just this January. I liken it to this, Mr. Speaker. When I go out and talk about the mortgage crisis and the calamity that has occurred, I say it is like somebody causing a 20-car pileup on the highway and then we show up with the tow truck to try to clean things up, and they start yelling at us for blocking traffic.

You see, we have been elected to clean up the mess, we being elected to

clean up the mess caused by the inaction. That is what we are doing. That is why in the Financial Services Committee we are working on regulatory reform. That is why this Congress has passed predatory lending legislation. That is why this administration has worked to save thousands of homes across this country.

I am joined tonight, Mr. Speaker, by my friend, also a new legislator, from the State of Connecticut, JIM HIMES, who has been a tremendous member of the Financial Services Committee, bringing both experience on Wall Street as well as in the neighborhoods.

JIM, why don't you talk a little bit about from your perspective and what you have seen.

Mr. HIMES. I thank the gentleman from Ohio, STEVE DRIEHAUS, for yielding and for organizing this discussion on this important topic, which is how we restore prosperity to the U.S. economy, how we generate jobs to replace those that have been lost in this, the most challenging recession that we have seen in decades.

I am glad that the gentleman from Ohio talked about foreclosures. I represent Bridgeport, Connecticut, which is a wonderful city that also happens to have the highest density of foreclosures in the State of Connecticut. Bridgeport is a city full of people who were on the verge of becoming middle class homeowners, who were nurses and teachers and scraped together the money to buy their first home. And now we talk about these foreclosures. These are families that find themselves having lost the money that they scraped together to become American homeowners, and worse, having lost their homes. If you don't have a stable home, you do not have the foundation that you need to access the American Dream.

Our home is that spot that determines where we work. It determines the community in which we are a member. It is just about everything in terms of building that foundation for economic prosperity. And as we saw, there were far, far too many shenanigans in the mortgage market. The gentleman from Ohio and I have been working very hard in the Financial Services Committee on something that is technical, it is esoteric, it is unglamorous, it is never going to appear on a campaign bumper sticker, but it is terribly, terribly important, and that is reforming this Nation's financial services regulatory regime which failed us miserably. It failed us absolutely miserably in the last 10 years.

This is technical work. We are talking about really toeing a very tough line here between making sure that our banks and our financial services institutions are here, employing Americans, paying taxes in cities like Stanford and New York City and Chicago and Los Angeles, innovating, being a world beating industry, but of course never again putting us in the position that

we find ourselves in today, millions of jobs lost and billions of dollars of taxpayer money brought to the table in the last Congress to bail out these institutions because had they not been bailed out, we would have seen a global financial meltdown.

People forget what it felt like 9 months ago when we really worried that the major financial institutions of this country and of the world, frankly, could go under. Think about what that means. A major bank simply goes under. That bank is a lender to small businesses that make payroll. Except when the bank goes under, all of a sudden the payroll money is not there, and the workers of that small business go to the ATM and there is nothing there. That is global financial crisis, and that is what, obnoxiously, this government had to bail out.

So how do we prevent that from ever happening again? The gentleman from Ohio and I, we have spent hours and hours listening in Financial Services, listening to the minority party tell us what we are doing is going to cost jobs, that this is the end of capitalism, that this is not a market economy, and they are dead wrong about that. They are dead wrong about that because they forget about something critical to our entire financial services business. They forget that without the faith of the American consumer, the American investor, the American bank customer, without that faith, we do not have a banking sector.

I have been sitting in Financial Services now hours and hours and hours listening to this, this is the end of capitalism, this is going to kill jobs. We have seen this movie before. We have seen exactly this movie with exactly this script with exactly the same players. It happened in 1933 and 1934 when this government, the government of the United States, last set about to rise from the wreckage of an economic catastrophe caused by, amongst other things, financial irresponsibility, and this House was left to pick up the pieces.

This House put in place in 1933 and 1934 the fundamental legislation that came to be what governed our banks and our securities companies for the next 70 years. And if you look at what was said in 1933 and 1934, you could be here today. You would have heard about the death of capitalism and how this didn't make sense in a market economy and about how jobs would be lost; and they were wrong then, as they are wrong now.

In fact, in 1933 and 1934 when regulatory laws were passed, with which I am deeply familiar, having spent some time in the banking sector, when those laws were passed, we created that thing which is necessary for a robust capitalist system to survive. We created a level playing field in which your average American family, your average American business could have confidence.

And what happened after 1933 and 1934, after seeing decade after decade of

financial crisis, every 7, 8, 9 years, starting in 1933 and 1934, we saw, and the regulations that this House put into place contributed mightily towards the single longest period of prosperity in American history and in human history. Why, because people had faith. Why, because until regulations were loosened, there were no mortgage brokers saying you have no income, you have no job, no problem, we have a mortgage for you. We didn't have securitized products whereby you took paper that you knew was questionable and you bundled it all up, you got yourself a AAA rating and you sold it down the road.

□ 2045

It's like musical chairs, right? You get paid, and it doesn't matter because the problems, the time bombs are in somebody else's portfolio. These were things that developed as our regulatory apparatus failed to keep pace with changes in the financial services industry.

What we are doing now, if we do it right—and I have confidence that we are doing it right—we will restore that faith, we will restore that confidence and once again set us up for the kind of prosperity that we saw for decades after 1933 and 1934.

What are we talking about here?

Mr. DRIEHAUS. Well, you know, I just want to echo your comments, Congressman, because what I see is fierce defense of the status quo by the Republicans, and I think it's important to remind people what the status quo has brought us.

I mentioned earlier I come from Cincinnati, Ohio. Just last year, this is what Hamilton County looked like in terms of the foreclosure map. You can see there were thousands of foreclosures in Hamilton County. There were thousands of foreclosures across the State of Ohio. And when there is a foreclosure next door or when there is a foreclosure across the street, it doesn't just affect the family and the financial institution that agreed to that mortgage. It affects the neighbor next door; it affects your property value; it affects the schools when kids have to be pulled out of the schools; it affects the small businesses down the street when doors are shuttered, when windows are shuttered in neighborhoods. It costs entire neighborhoods.

Mr. HIMES. That is such a critical point. I would just like to emphasize that is such a critical point. There has been so much discussion about the irresponsibility of some homeowners who bought houses they couldn't afford, who had mortgages they knew they couldn't repay sold by people who knew there wasn't a chance that they were going to get repaid.

Many of those criticisms are exactly right, and we have a whole other conversation to have about how we make the American household more responsible, save more, take on less debt, be more responsible like our grandparents

were. That is a whole other conversation that we need to have.

But the point is so important that this isn't just about individual irresponsibility; this is a public community problem. As the gentleman says, when you see a foreclosure on a block, every other property value on that block goes down. This has been shown time and time again by the economists.

So irresponsibility, if it was that, affects the neighbors. And there is no way that this Congress, when faced with that kind of a problem to the community, should stand silent and watch people's property values go down and neighborhoods crumble, dark houses, lack of commerce. We have to stand up and say we have to put a stop to this.

Mr. DRIEHAUS. But, again, I go back to this time period when we saw thousands of foreclosures across our States and we were begging the Federal Government to do something about it. And what is the response we hear today from the Republicans who were in charge at that time? They blamed the Community Reinvestment Act, passed in 1977, a bill that incentivized financial institutions to make loans, to make good loans in the neighborhoods where loans weren't going. The Community Reinvestment Act didn't say make bad loans. It said make good loans, and we, the Federal Government, will give you credit for making loans in those communities. It has worked well, and it has served our communities well.

You have worked in community development just like I have, and we know how valuable the Community Reinvestment Act is to those communities. But the Republicans, in order to hide from the failure of inaction, want to point to an act passed in 1977 and say somehow that this Community Reinvestment Act was forcing banks to loan into these neighborhoods. Ben Bernanke, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve, said that's ridiculous, that just didn't happen. And the Community Reinvestment Act has served us well. But enough, enough of the blame. There is so much blame that is offered in this Chamber.

What do we know? The fact is we were elected to do something about the crisis. We were elected to clean up that pileup on the road. So when we came in with this administration, this administration acted very aggressively in terms of addressing foreclosures. We passed a very aggressive bill that cracks down on predatory lending.

The administration, working with the Department of Housing and Urban Development and working with the Department of the Treasury, has initiated a foreclosure prevention program that has already saved hundreds of thousands of homes in the United States. We passed a credit card bill that protects consumers and protects consumers against credit card companies who are increasing interest rates and increasing fees on consumers.

We just, last week, passed the Consumer Financial Protection Act, which again brings financial protections to consumers around financial products. You know, it was often stated in the State of Ohio that you had more protections purchasing a toaster than you did a house. In many cases that's true because we do have consumer protections when it comes to products, and we do have consumer protections when it comes to toys; but we didn't have much in the way of consumer protection when it comes to the most valuable purchase of your life in the case of many of us.

Mr. HIMES. So many of the ideas that are incorporated into the legislation that we have been working on are fundamentally commonsense ideas. This notion that you should be able to sell a mortgage to someone who doesn't have an income or who is unwilling to show you the documents that verify his or her income, what flavor of insanity is that? Why is it controversial that a consumer finance protection agency should take a hard look at that? This is common sense.

You know that derivatives, which so few people understand, but people know that derivatives, credit default swaps at AIG were a huge contributor to the meltdown. AIG was writing contracts, making bets that it didn't have a prayer of honoring when things went bad. So you look at that and you say, gosh, they didn't have a regulator, nobody was looking at it. And there are whole swaths of financial services that didn't have regulators. There were plenty of areas that did, but there's AIG writing credit default swaps without any oversight.

So in the derivatives bill—and for the life of me I don't understand why that one became a partisan issue. We didn't say you can't do derivatives; we didn't even put limits on the amount of derivatives that you could assume. We did say, however, that if you're going to buy yourself derivatives, you're going to clear those derivatives on a clearinghouse if the clearinghouse will take it. You're going to trade them on an exchange so that there is transparency, so that we know who's doing what to whom, what the price is, what the volume is, so we get to see and the regulators get to see and the markets get to see who's taking what kind of risk.

This is a fundamental notion of a market economy, transparency and good information, which is at the heart of that derivatives bill, and somehow that was opposed. Common sense, critical to the markets—going to be awfully important to making sure that an AIG never occurs again—and yet it was controversial.

Mr. DRIEHAUS. Well, talking about the credit default swaps at AIG, not only did you have the people engaging in the sale of credit default swaps, which they knew they could never honor, but they were getting bonuses for doing it. There were perverse incen-

tives at play at AIG and at other financial institutions that incentivized payment structures for the sale of these very instruments. So when we wanted to look at executive compensation, we were criticized by the other side. And we said, look, we're not trying to take away people's pay; we believe in fair pay for hard work. But what we don't believe in is these compensation packages that incentivize incredibly risky behavior when the individual engaging in the practice doesn't have any skin in the game.

Mr. HIMES. You're right about that. There was so much hysteria about the discussion around compensation, that somehow the U.S. Government is going to start determining what people should be paid. And the reality is, in all honesty, this House from time to time contributes to that kind of hysteria. But here's another example of just pure common sense.

All we're saying, and I think all the Federal Reserve and the Treasury and those who are concerned with compensation, all we're saying is this: we're saying exactly the same thing that shareholders and owners of every company believe to the core, which is, if you're an executive and you create good value in the long term, you're a long-term value creator, get paid well. That's the American way. But you don't get to be paid well for failure. You don't get to be paid huge for taking enormous risks that look good on day two, but which bring the system down on day 10. The interest of this institution has been exactly the interest that shareholders have: let's make sure that the system is set up to reward people for good, long-term value creation.

People get very concerned about the TARP and the compensation within the TARP. Very special case. And I know that everybody in this Chamber hopes that we never see another TARP again. The TARP of course made the government a major shareholder in many institutions which, of course, as I have been saying, gives you a pretty significant vote on compensation. But again, common sense going forward, let's make sure our executives are rewarded for that which benefits the shareholders, good long-term value creation.

Mr. DRIEHAUS. And as you know, we are now looking at the systemic risk that is involved in all of this, that is, what is the risk inherent with some of these products? What is the risk inherent with some of these institutions that have been deemed too big to fail? Shouldn't we regulate that? Shouldn't we regulate those institutions? Shouldn't we regulate those products so that they don't get too big that their failure could bring down the economy? Shouldn't we regulate those instruments, those financial instruments that if they fail would cause hundreds of thousands of foreclosures across the United States? Isn't that in the best interest of the people of the

United States, to step in and actually regulate this behavior? That's what we're taking on right now.

But every step of the way, Congressman, every step of the way when we tried to protect consumers from the credit card companies, so many Republicans said no. When we tried to establish the Consumer Financial Protection Agency to protect consumers who were trying to buy homes, the Republicans said no. When we're looking at systemic risk, we're now hearing it on the other side: no, let the status quo rule. The status quo has brought us the worst recession in our lifetimes.

Mr. HIMES. And this is another good example of common sense.

At the core of what we are trying to do is to make sure that no institution ever gets bailed out again with taxpayer dollars, that we never again see an institution too big to fail. So what are we saying? Are we coming up with something new and radical? No. What we're saying is that if you are large and interconnected and create some systemic risk, you will be more closely scrutinized by the regulators than if you're just a small community bank. You will be required to hold more capital against your activities. Commonsensical stuff.

And maybe most important—and this is where we get to doing away with the concept of too big to fail—if you make bad decisions, if you as a systemically important institution are in danger of failing, we're not going to do something radical; we are going to do something that this country has been doing for 70 years, unwinding, in an orderly fashion, the operation of that bank.

The FDIC has had resolution authority and has been unwinding failed banks in a calm and orderly way for decades. And now we are saying, if you blow it, you fail, but you're going to do it in such a way that there is no risk that you bring down the financial system. That is hardly anything other than a nod of our hats to what has been so successful in this country for decades.

Mr. DRIEHAUS. In the end, Congressman, this is about protecting jobs because this recession has cost millions of jobs across this country. We have millions of families suffering today because of the inaction of Congress, the inaction of the Federal Government when it came to the runaway greed on Wall Street. We've paid the price, so now we are picking up the pieces. But we see unemployment in the double digits. We are now seeing some improvement when it comes to those unemployment rates; we are seeing fewer people losing their jobs.

But we are joined now by our good friend, Congressman JOHN BOCCIERI, my colleague from Ohio. And certainly in northern Ohio just as southern Ohio we have seen tremendous job loss. But we are about action. We are about picking up the pieces and trying to put it back together, as opposed to the inaction of the other side.

Mr. BOCCIERI. Well, I thank the gentleman from Cincinnati. And I thank him for his previous work in the State legislature together as we tackled the very insidious predatory lending practices that were plaguing our part of Ohio.

□ 2100

I think that we have got to break this down for the American people and explain to them that what is happening on Wall Street is affecting their pocketbooks today. When you walked into a bank or when you walked into a lending institution in Canton, Ohio, and when you asked them for a loan several years ago for a mortgage on a new house, they made it relatively easily, and oftentimes they would loan at 120–130 percent of the value of that asset, of that home, oftentimes hedging that risk or putting that risk in that note and then selling it to some investment bank on Wall Street.

Now, when they sold that, when that small mom-and-pop lending institution sold that loan and sold that note, they then bundled these things together on Wall Street. Then we had folks who were betting on these mortgages lasting a long, long time, but there were also folks—bad actors—who were betting that people were not going to be able to pay their mortgages. They were betting on Americans failing. I think that that is what we have got to tackle in this regulatory reform—making sure that this does not happen again.

You know, we look at it on the oil market and on the commodities market. We have folks who are betting on the price of oil going up and who are betting on people failing to pay their mortgages. Is there a bet that Wall Street won't make against the American people? I think enough is enough, and we have got to stand for reforms that are going to make sense.

I agree, like my colleagues here, that the government should set the out-of-bounds markers. We should set the goalposts. We should allow the free market to operate in between but be a good referee. When someone goes out of bounds, throw the flag and say that they committed a penalty. Now, we can have this debate, a robust debate, about where we put these markers. Do they start here or do they start in a much wider fashion? Yet we have got to find some way to make certain that the regulatory reform is going to catch these bad actors and will not allow them to bet against the American people. I think we owe that to the people we represent.

Mr. DRIEHAUS. Well, I think the point is well taken because this is about creating boundaries.

You know, we often have this discussion back home about free markets and capitalism and about allowing free markets and capitalism to thrive. That's what we're all about. We support that and we support that wholeheartedly, but when the behaviors of certain actors on Wall Street or when

the behaviors of people acting within the free market cause harm to the public good and cause harm to neighborhoods, it is the job of the government to step in and say, Hold it. Wait a minute. It's okay if you make a profit. It's okay if you sell your goods. It's okay if you produce those goods, but if it's causing harm to the people we are sent here to protect, then maybe we need to intervene. Maybe we need to regulate in a reasonable fashion. That's what we've been doing on Financial Services. It's all about commonsense regulation. It's about stepping in and protecting consumers.

On the other side, all we hear is "no." It's just like health care. It's just like energy. Yeah, they'll step up and say, Yeah, this is a problem. Oh, yeah, this recession is a problem. This double-digit unemployment that we see in our States, yeah, that's a problem.

When it comes to solutions, the book is really thin on the other side.

You know, yeah, we introduced big bills on health care. We introduced bills on energy to protect our energy security across the United States. Yeah, we introduced several bills to regulate properly the financial markets.

We're doing the work of the people, and we're fixing what is broken. The other side is saying, Let's leave it broken because the solution is not something we want to see. That's the problem.

Mr. BOCCIERI. Well, we know what they're against, but what exactly are they for? Are we going to fix our energy crisis that we have in the country? Are we going to fix the economic situation we find ourselves in? Are we going to stand up and fight for the American people or are we just going to push for the status quo and allow these things to happen?

Let us be clear. There are some very good people who work on Wall Street. There are some very conscientious people who work in our financial markets, but there are also some folks who have been pushed and moved and who have accelerated their behavior by greed, by avarice. That is what we want to catch. This is what we want to prevent. Can you imagine this?

You know, as for folks who traditionally want to hedge on the price of a barrel of oil or on the price of gasoline, we want to allow them to do that—the folks at aviation and trucking companies in Ohio who want to hedge and lock in a price of fuel today—but when we allow big corporations, national governments, multinational corporations, and big pension funds to bet on the price of oil going up, that no longer is reflective of a very conscientious market.

Quite frankly, what we've found is that artificially we're driving up the price of a barrel of crude oil even though we have more supply than we did years ago. Demand is down. People aren't driving as much because of the economic situation, but we find our-

selves at a point where gasoline prices are on the rise because of what is happening on Wall Street. People now are starting to bet that the recovery is coming soon, and they're betting that the price of oil is going to go up. We've got to stop this.

Mr. HIMES. You know, there's a point that can't get lost here, and I'm conscious, as we're having this discussion, that we're all fathers.

You know, there is blame everywhere to be had for where we are today, and we, day to day, are focused on what we can do better as a government—to better regulate, to better create opportunity, to make these products more understandable to people so that they can make good decisions—but it does at some level come down to good decisions, and we shouldn't let that point, particularly as fathers, go away.

I reflect, as we sort of not just take up financial regulatory reform but as we talk about energy policy and as we talk about health care, if we as families had the same kind of values that our grandparents had—saving and shying away from debt. Of course, we can help on this stuff, right? We've made it awfully easy in this country for people to get into debt without ever knowing about it. Yet, if we were healthier, if we were more responsible about how we used energy and if we were more responsible about when and how we took on debt, like the other problems I've been talking about, we would take huge problems, and we would make them, Mr. Speaker, much more addressable problems.

I'm very interested in this question: How do we as legislators assist in that process?

I don't know that there is a good answer. I do know that, as fathers, there is a good answer. We as a country, I think, need to look back at our grandparents' generation and say, You know what? They got some things right. We need to work with our own families and with our own communities to just say basic things: If it looks too good to be true, it probably is. You'd much rather have some money in the bank than have to go into debt. That's a key point that we, I think, need to get right in this country as well.

I notice that we're joined by our colleague from Virginia, Congressman PERRIELLO.

Mr. PERRIELLO. Thank you very much, Mr. HIMES.

I just want to pick up on what you said about the Greatest Generation. I think part of what made the Greatest Generation great was the concept of deferred gratification—the concept of responsibility. I am going to step up and take care of my family. I am going to save ahead of time. I am going to take that opportunity of the GI Bill, that unprecedented opportunity, to invest in my own education and to help move my family into the middle class.

You look throughout history at empires in decline, and you see this idea—the bread and circus period—in the empire of Rome, and you say, What is it

about that? Well, it's the difference between being a culture of instant gratification—I want it for me right now—and a culture of deferred gratification, or a culture of responsibility.

I think what we've seen in the last few years in this country is really a deterioration of culture and not just of policy and of the market. We really have to point the finger in all sorts of different directions—at the private sector, at the household sector, at people buying homes they couldn't afford, at the government sector of turning the other cheek—and not in the good way but in the way of saying, I'm going to ignore what's happening on the other side. We know right now what we need is this new era of responsibility, which isn't antimarket; it's pro-market.

What I hear from so many of my friends who are in the investment community is that I'm sick and tired of being the responsible investor who makes the right decisions, who doesn't take the high-risk investment, and then I see my colleagues or my peers who did take the high-risk, high-return investment get bailed out.

This has to be about a system of rules and predictability that encourages responsible investing. That includes the diversified portfolio, as we all know, whether it's a few thousand dollars of our personal money or whether it's someone taking a larger amount to invest for other people. This is that moment where we can say we want those rules of predictability, where we want to close those loopholes so that we're rewarding good behavior and responsible investing in the same way that, in the energy sector, we need to start rewarding innovation, not rewarding the status quo.

What that means is, instead of always being focused on how can we cash in on other people's misfortune or hedge against that risk, it's how can we create a system that is going to perpetuate the very balance that we need in our market in order to move things forward.

So I think what you and others have been saying tonight is crucial in terms of that sense of not just a shift in policy but a shift in each of us as consumers, as politicians and others, about whether we're going to reward the responsibility of the deferred gratification that the Greatest Generation understood and which will make us stronger than ever before and whether we're going to recreate that comparative advantage.

With that, I yield.

Mr. DRIEHAUS. Well, Congressman, I appreciate the remarks about responsibility because we started this off by talking about responsibility.

You know, it strikes me that the four of us are freshman Members of Congress. When we started running for Congress 2 years ago, none of us knew that we would be walking in the door in January with record job loss in the United States, that we would be in the middle of the worst recession that we

have seen in our lifetimes and that we would be walking into a catastrophe. Now, we could run away from that, and we could say these are tough responsibilities, and we need to just say "no" and pretend like none of that responsibility falls on us or we could do something about it.

I think that I, like all of you, came here to fix the problems. We came here to step up to that responsibility. We came here to protect those American families who were losing their jobs, those American families who were losing their health care, those American families who knew that Congress for so many years had protected the barons on Wall Street but failed to protect them around their kitchen tables.

We hear all the time on the other side that it's not their fault. They weren't here. They weren't in power for 14 years or 16 years or however many years that was. Apparently, they weren't here. Well, it is our job as Members of Congress to take responsibility, and that's what we're doing.

So, when we look at commonsense regulatory reform around financial institutions, when we look at protecting consumers, when we look at stepping up and at modifying mortgages to keep people in their homes, when we look at stepping up and at addressing issues like health care or energy, it is all about our taking responsibility. It is all about this Congress' stepping up and working together to achieve the common goals that help all of our families across this country. We can say it's not our responsibility, and we can take a backseat and just say "no," but that's not what we were elected to do. We were elected to lead, and I think that is what we are doing in Financial Services.

Mr. BOCCIERI. I further agree, if the gentleman will yield for just a moment, that we do have a responsibility to the American people and that we will be judged by action or inaction, quite frankly. In these troubling economic times in which so many Ohioans find themselves, as Teddy Roosevelt said, in a moment of decision, the worst thing that you could do is nothing. I think there is this call to action from the American people to this legislative body to make sure that we set the boundaries, that we set the out-of-bounds markers, that we set the goalposts, and that we make sure that the referees that we appoint are doing a good job.

I have friends who have worked on Wall Street who have said, if we would have just enforced the regulations that we have, this would have been averted, that this catastrophe could have been averted. We have the housing sector and we have the commercial markets now showing signs of breaking, but we have got to have swift action, and we have got to make sure that there is a steady stream and that there is an equal playing field for the least among us—for those folks who are investing in Wall Street and in the markets. We

have to make sure that their investments are protected, that their pensions are there for them when they retire, and we have to make sure that folks aren't gambling on their futures. In my humble opinion, that's what it's all about.

You know, I follow Senator WEBB quite a bit. He has quoted Teddy Roosevelt quite often in one of his most recent books. He has said frequently, as Teddy Roosevelt has said, that the welfare of each of us is dependent upon the welfare of all of us and that we have got to make certain that we are creating this level playing field for the least among us, like my grandparents who arrived here on the shores of America with nothing but the belief and the hope that, if they worked hard, if they persevered and if they gave back to their community, that America was a place where their dreams could be realized. That's what the American Dream is about.

We have a responsibility to make sure that that playing field is level, is equal, so that it's not a slippery slope. It is so, when they begin their climb, their ascent, up the socioeconomic ladder, that America affords opportunity and prosperity. That's what this is about, and that's what the decisions that we are striving for are all about. So I appreciate the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. DRIEHAUS. Mr. PERRIELLO.

□ 2115

Mr. PERRIELLO. Well, I would just echo, I think you and I both come from similar roots from the mother country in Italy, the motherland, but also what we took from that immigrant experience of our grandparents was that idea that if you work hard and play by the rules, there will be an opportunity for you in this country. When this country rewards hard work and responsibility, this country is better than any on Earth.

But when we get away from those fundamental ideals of American hard work and responsibility, we undermine so much of what makes us different, what makes us special. I was meeting with various members from the EU who were here today in part because Chancellor Merkel was speaking to us. They were talking about that quintessentially American spirit of innovation and entrepreneurship.

The great threat to that in our society right now is not one administration or one policy. It's when the influence on this body and that on the other side of this building is such that it rewards what has worked for the last 20 years instead of what we could be 20 years from now. Capitalism is based on the idea of innovation, on the idea of competition and yet too much in our system we see a rewarding of what has worked, not what could work in the future.

If we are going to deliver for the middle class and the working class of this

country, for districts like yours and mine that once had strong factories and manufacturing bases, we must have the courage to think again about not just the financial sector policy, but an industrial policy, an agricultural policy, a jobs policy for this country.

But the first piece of that has to be putting in place the rules that will allow lending to begin flowing again, not just on the macro-level, but to the small and medium-sized businesses that create two-thirds of the job growth in our areas in Ohio and Virginia. But the key to that is predictability. Predictability means that we have a system of rules that people can work within. Entrepreneurship works within a system of predictability.

We need to have that system of accountability so that those who act according to those rules are rewarded for their innovation and success. That is a quintessentially American idea.

Here we are challenged today because both parties in the Congresses before us have failed to live up to that standard. Many on Wall Street have failed to live up to that standard. But as Congressman DRIEHAUS mentioned, the line we will draw is not between the right and the left, but between right and wrong, not between one side of the aisle or the other, but whether we will solve the problem.

What we will hope people will judge us by is did we step up to the challenge of the time and try to solve that problem. I believe the people on this floor tonight are dedicated sincerely to the idea of problem-solving, not to ideology or to the next election cycle.

Mr. DRIEHAUS. Congressman, I very much appreciate your efforts in those regards. Congressman HIMES, if you want to wrap us up, I yield the floor to you.

Mr. HIMES. Thank you, my good friend from Ohio, my two good friends from Ohio and Virginia. It's a pleasure to be out here tonight with you.

We have talked about a lot of important issues, and one of the reasons I feel proud to be in this Chamber with you and with our colleagues is because we are in a moment of crisis, no doubt about it. We were called in a moment of crisis to lead.

When you lead in a moment of crisis, you lead constructively. You take some risks. You acknowledge, as I know that each and every one of us does, that we won't get this perfect. Very little of what has been produced in history in this room has been perfect; but it has been done constructively, it has been done with the spirit that we will get it right over time, and it has been done by people taking some risks.

In a moment of crisis, it is not leadership to say no. It is not leadership to simply snipe at those who are trying to solve the problems, the problems that affect every American family, the problems that mean that families don't have jobs. They worry about whether their kids will be educated. These are

the things that we are trying to address, and it is just a fine moment that we have been called upon now to push these things to try to restore the opportunity that is so important to American families and to the sense of the American Dream.

Mr. DRIEHAUS. Gentlemen, I appreciate you coming down to the floor this evening. This is about solutions. This is about stepping up to responsibilities. This is why we were elected.

We hear so often on the other side the naysayers come down and talk about what won't work. They don't talk about the responsibility, the common responsibility we have. They run away from the years that they were in charge.

But this is about stepping up to responsibilities and making a difference. While it's not always perfect, we are doing what's right by the American people and doing what's right by the families that elected us to represent them.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back.

#### VACATING 5-MINUTE SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the 5-minute Special Order of the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) is vacated.

There was no objection.

#### DOCTORS CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank you very much, and I am proud to spend the next hour as the party of naysayers, as our young colleague from the other side of the aisle just described us. We have, Mr. Speaker, on occasion been accused of being the Party of No.

I have a number of colleagues with me this hour, one of them being my good friend and fellow Georgian, fellow physician, Dr. PAUL BROWN. He and I on a number of occasions just this past Monday, yesterday, I guess, did a number of events together in our great State of Georgia.

We said to editorial boards and television stations, we are the Party of No, guilty as charged; but we don't spell it n-o, we spell it k-n-o-w.

Maybe we do on occasion spell it "no" when we say, Mr. Speaker, we say to the Speaker, NANCY PELOSI, that, heck, no, we don't want this form of health care change to one-sixth of our economy with the Federal Government literally going into the exam room with a bunch of bureaucrats and coming in between a doctor and a patient.

Dr. BROWN and I, Mr. Speaker, and many of our colleagues on this side of the aisle who are part of the GOP Doctors Caucus, there are about 15 of us, 12 M.D.s, some dentists, optometrist, a

clinical psychologist and author, we are very proud of our almost 400 years of clinical experience, Mr. Speaker.

We are very disappointed, of course, that we were not able to offer some of the knowledge, the k-n-o-w part of knowledge, to this debate.

We sent letters, of course, along with many of our colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle to President Obama, especially after hearing from him in the so-called State of the Union when he really took the opportunity to use this Chamber and to call together a joint session to speak to the Nation on health care and made some very distinct promises in regard to the need for medical liability reform, as an example, which we don't see one word of, essentially, in H.R. 3962.

What little bit, what little tiny piece of medical liability reform, adds an insult, Mr. Speaker, to those States that have already enacted, successfully, I might add, medical liability reform like our State of Georgia, like the great State of Texas and the great State of Florida, when it goes on to say these grants, this little minuscule amount of money in the millions, not billions or trillions, which is more applicable to H.R. 3962, when they say none of these grants are eligible for States that have already enacted any meaningful medical liability reform that limits contingency fees for trial lawyers, or has any caps on non-economic judgments, awards.

That's the only medical liability reform, Mr. Speaker, that has ever been proven to be effective in the great State of California that, of course, enacted that legislation called MICRA back in 1978. It's pretty frustrating; it really is.

We are here tonight, Mr. Speaker, to speak to our colleagues on both sides of the aisle. We want to do that in a very respectful way and, again, as I say, to try to impart knowledge to the issue. We have a lot of ideas in regard to what could be done to help improve the greatest health care system in the world that's not perfect. We recognize that, and I think all Members, Mr. Speaker, recognize that in both Chambers. We are willing to work in a bipartisan way given the opportunity. Unfortunately, we have not been given that opportunity.

That's why we keep taking advantage of what little opportunities we have like these Special Orders late at night, or maybe 1-minute. I think on our side of the aisle we have 178 Republicans in this House of Representatives, and I think 120 gave 1-minute speeches today talking about the Republican alternatives, a way to do this, to help make sure that we bring down the cost of health insurance, for those who, if it's 10 million, I don't know the total number, of 300 million people in this country who cannot afford health insurance. We want to bring down the price of the cost of health insurance so they can have access, but also to bring down the cost of health insurance for

the 85, 88, 90 percent of people that do have it, but it's just a little bit too expensive.

We can do that and that's what we are going to be talking about tonight, Mr. Speaker, about ideas, bills, individual bills. I think there are something like 53. I have introduced legislation over and over. This is my seventh year, my fourth term as my great constituents from the 11th of Georgia know, that would save, as a Congressional Budget Office, not me doing the number crunching, but the non-partisan, Director of the Congressional Budget Office, Doug Elmendorf, hired by Speaker PELOSI, said that, you know, medical liability reform could save \$54 billion over 10 years. I mean, that is a significant chunk of money.

We all know that a real concerted effort on reducing waste, fraud and abuse could save another \$20 billion. From our perspective, from the Republican alternatives that we are offering, we wouldn't spend more than that amount of money. But we would make those two integral parts of the reform that we would offer, and that we have offered, we will continue to talk about.

We don't spend \$1.1 trillion of taxpayers' money when this country is already \$11.2 trillion in debt and that we just got through with the fiscal year, I guess, 2009 fiscal year with a \$1.4 trillion deficit, Mr. Speaker, four times the largest previous deficit in the history of this country.

To say that, oh, well, look, we have got the numbers here and the Congressional Budget Office says this plan of ours is going to save, over a 10-year period of time, it's going to save \$100 billion; but to save 100 billion, we are going to spend 1.1 trillion.

You know, when you do the subtraction, I think that makes you, what, 900-and-some-change billion dollars in the hole.

My Georgia Tech math, six quarters of calculus, I believe my high school arithmetic would tell me that that's not a real good deal for the American taxpayer. We are here tonight to talk about this, Mr. Speaker.

I am proud to have some of my colleagues from the GOP Doctors Caucus, and I want to yield to them. We will engage in a colloquy, and we will have a meaningful hour this evening so that Members on both sides of the aisle, and if there are any folks out there in the good old USA watching, I know there are some elections going on today, Mr. Speaker, that a lot of folks are very interested in, and maybe they will be tuned into that. But in any regard, we appreciate the opportunity.

I yield to my good friend and physician colleague from the great State of Georgia who represents Athens and my hometown of Augusta, Georgia, and a fellow classmate at the Medical College of Georgia, family practitioner, my good friend, Dr. PAUL BROWN.

□ 2130

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Dr. GINGREY, I appreciate greatly your doing this

Special Order tonight, and I appreciate your yielding me some time.

When I spoke on the floor this morning in 1-minutes, I started off my speech by saying when I graduated from the Medical College of Georgia in Augusta, Georgia, and got my MD degree, we in the medical college all swore to the Hippocratic Oath. One of the clauses in the Hippocratic Oath was "I will do no harm."

The Nancy Pelosi health care insurance bill, it is not about health care. It is about insurance, and, actually, it is about power. It is not even about health care. But the Nancy Pelosi health care insurance bill will actually do a tremendous amount of harm for me and all of our medical colleagues who continue to practice medicine, so it is going to destroy the quality of care.

It is also going to destroy the Federal budget. Dr. GINGREY, as you were talking about, it is going to spend over \$1 trillion in what I am describing as voodoo economics or zombie economics that CBO utilized in scoring this bill, because they made some assumptions that are just totally untenable. They are just not going to happen. Since they are projecting the growth of Medicare is going to be half of what it has been historically, that is not going to happen. They haven't counted into the scoring a lot of issues that are going to balloon the costs to the American people.

So the Pelosi health care insurance bill is going to destroy our economy, and it is going to create a tremendous debt. It is going to destroy people's private health care plans that they have today. If you continue to buy private health insurance, the American public's premiums are going to double and triple. So it is going to destroy the budgets of families all across America.

It is going to destroy the State budgets, because it is going to have a tremendous unfunded mandate on the States because of the large expansion of Medicaid; thus, the States are going to have to go get that money from somebody, and they are going to increase taxes. They are going to have to. They have no other choice but to increase taxes.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. If the gentleman will yield for just a second, Dr. BROWN, in that regard, Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman from Georgia, this Medicaid increase in NANCY PELOSI's health reform bill, H.R. 3962, what kind of dollars are we talking about here? What kind of burden are we talking about, unfunded mandate that that would put on the State, and how does that come about?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Well, in increasing the Medicaid rolls that the State government has to fund, the Federal Government is going to help by giving money to the States, but the States are going to have to come up with the matching.

Just in our State of Georgia, it is estimated the State of Georgia is going

to have an extra \$1 billion that Georgians are going to have to come up with in increased taxes just for this Federal mandate on our State alone. It is billions and billions of dollars on every State in this country, so it is a huge burden on the States.

So it is an unfair taxation that is pushed off on the States, and every person, even the middle class, who our President said he was going to protect, the middle class is going to be burdened with a tremendous tax burden because of the mandates.

Some of them aren't direct taxes. As I have already mentioned, their health insurance premiums are going to really double or triple. That is really a tax, because it is a cost shifting from the private insurance.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. If the gentleman would yield back to me just for a second, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to ask the gentleman, why is that a problem for the States? Mr. Speaker, you and I both know that here in the great Congress, these Halls of Congress, if we want to spend money, if we want to overspend, we just print more money out. I think we have red ink of about \$275 billion, and that is why today in the Federal Government we have this debt of \$11.2 trillion. Can't the States do the same thing?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. No, sir. Well, thank you, Dr. GINGREY. The States are prohibited from printing money under the Constitution. Actually, we should be preventing the Federal Reserve from printing money like they are doing, and the Congress has the authority to do that, if we just take that power back from the Federal Reserve, and I, as an original intent constitutionalist, think we should do that.

It is our prerogative as Members of Congress to manage the money instead of the Federal Reserve, and it shouldn't be the Federal Reserve doing it. We should be doing that here in Congress.

But the States can't do that, so they are going to have this tremendous economic burden. Our Governor, Sonny Perdue, is struggling trying to make the budget come out in black ink in our State. Because we have a balanced budget amendment to our State constitution, the State of Georgia cannot spend more money than it brings in, technically, under our constitution.

So if we as a Federal Government put a tremendous burden of \$1 billion on the State of Georgia, which is already struggling, already furloughing workers, they are not replacing workers, State services are being cut, teachers' salaries and furloughs and cuts are being put in place, and we add \$1 billion to the State of Georgia, an economic burden, that money has got to come from somewhere.

The Federal Government is not going to give it to Georgia. It is not going to give it to Louisiana. It is not going to give it to Texas, New York, Vermont, or Minnesota. The States are going to have to come up with those dollars, and the only way they can do that is

through higher taxes, as well as cutting more services than what they are doing now.

You take States like Michigan, where the unemployment is so high, raising taxes is going to further wreck their economy. So this is going to destroy the American economy as well as the States' economies.

We are going to be destroying lives with this bill, because this bill, the way it is written today, is going to allow taxpayers' dollars to pay for abortions. Now, the Democrats have put some mumbo-jumbo language in there, and it is really a ruse. What they have done is they say private funds can be utilized to pay for abortions through the public insurance system. They call it the public option. But it is not an option; it is a mandate.

It is actually something that the leadership of the Democratic Party, from the President to many of the leadership in their own party, have said that this is just a step to a single party payer health insurance program. So it is going to destroy private insurance here in America too.

So what this Nancy Pelosi health insurance bill is going to do is destroy everything that is good, and good with our health care system. And what is most important, it is going to destroy the quality of care our seniors are getting, because they are going to get the short shrift of all of this.

They are going to draw the short straw, because the Democrats put something in the bill, something that is called comparative effectiveness research in the stimulus bill, and now they have set up a panel that is going to use that comparative effectiveness to determine how best to spend the dollars. And when you have limited dollars, they are going to decide is it better to spend the money on a well person who is 25 versus a sick person who is 70.

So the seniors' health care provision is going to be destroyed. We are going to have more people pushed, because Medicare Advantage is going to be destroyed, we are going to have more people pushed off on the Medicare system, which is going to further increase the burden on the current Medicare system. So we are going to have further rationing of care, particularly for the seniors. So they are going to be told they can't get tests, they can't get surgeries, they can't get medications that they need, and it is going to be absolutely disastrous for seniors.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. If the gentleman would yield, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to have the opportunity to ask the gentleman to share with us a little bit. He is mentioning about this comparative effectiveness research council and how, based on, hopefully, Mr. Speaker, qualified, good, solid research, and to not only recommend to our doctors across the country, the 850,000 of them, many of whom are primary care doctors, and we will hear from another primary care doctor,

JOHN FLEMING, with us tonight from Shreveport, Louisiana, in just a few minutes.

To suggest is one thing, Mr. Speaker, but to mandate based on comparative effectiveness research, which our hard-working men and women, taxpayers of this country, are paying for that, and many, many, if not most of them are making less than \$250,000, by the way, Mr. Speaker.

But what I wanted to ask Representative BROWN to share with us is not only the fact that our seniors, as he suggests, Mr. Speaker, and I agree with him, could get thrown under the bus by this rationing that comes from this comparative effectiveness research study that says, oh, that won't work. Let's do something cheaper, and, you are too old and it is not going to be cost-effective so you don't get it.

But I would like for Representative BROWN, if he would, Mr. Speaker, to share with us about these pay-fors. Ms. PELOSI and President Obama says it has got to be paid for. He won't add one dime to the deficit. It has to be paid for. I would like for Dr. BROWN to talk to us a little bit about where some of this money is coming from, this \$1 trillion so this health care reform is paid for.

I yield back to the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Thank you, Dr. GINGREY. The pay-fors are through higher taxes, particularly on small business, as well as individuals who are considered rich. We are supposed to be treated equal under the law, but a lot of our colleagues on the other side don't think that is factual any more, that we need to be treated unequally under the law, which is totally unconstitutional and is against the 14th Amendment to the Constitution, basically.

But what it does is this is going to destroy jobs because of the mandates upon small business. There are a lot of taxes and a lot of fees, and there are even fees and taxes on individuals who don't take their employer-offered health insurance. So it is going to force everybody in this country basically to take whatever insurance is dictated by the health care czar panel here in Washington.

So taxes, the only way they get to any semblance of controlling the amount of money that this bill calls for, which is way over \$1 trillion—and, in fact, I think that is going to be very low. When we saw Medicare presented, the Congressional Budget Office miscalculated. Their calculation was almost one-tenth of what the true cost was over the decade following passage of Medicare, and I think that is what we are going to see with the Pelosi health insurance bill, too.

But there are tremendous taxes on everybody in this country. And it is going to be a tax on the middle class, because they have got to tax durable medical equipment. That is going to go up. They are going to tax the Cadillac insurance plans. So that means people

who have good insurance, privately provided today, that is going to go up. There are going to be taxes on small businesses.

Right now, the bill says if an individual makes over \$500,000 or a couple over \$1 million a year, that is adjusted gross income, that they are going to have a big tax on them. Well, a lot of those people are actually small business men and women, and that is their adjusted gross.

They are filing their personal income tax return as a Sub S corporation or as a limited liability partnership, like a lot of physicians, accountants, and lawyers have. Small businesses, they are going to be taxed, taxed, taxed, and that is the reason that the experts say 5.5 million jobs are going to be destroyed. People are going to lose their job because of this Nancy Pelosi health insurance plan.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. If the gentleman will yield back to me, Mr. Speaker, I thank him so much for bringing that factual knowledge to us.

Absolutely, this figure that he just quoted, Mr. Speaker, of 5.7 million, I think, additional jobs would be lost because of this bill, it is not something that Representative BROWN just pulled out of the air. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the Chief of the Council of Economic Advisers to the President, Christina Roma, is the one that said that. That is where my good friend and colleague from Georgia, Representative PAUL BROWN, got those figures from.

He mentioned one other thing, before I go on to our colleague from Louisiana, and I am sure that we will talk about this as we go on this evening, the health choices commissioner, a very powerful new czar under this program, would say to the employers across this country, you can have anything you want. You can offer any health insurance policy plan you want, Mr. Speaker, as long as what Henry Ford said many years ago, you can get any color of T Model Ford that you want, as long as it is black.

□ 2145

I draw my colleagues' attention to this poster I have regarding that assembly line way back in the early part of the 20th century.

I thank the gentleman from Athens.

At this point I want to yield to a fellow member of the GOP Doctors Caucus from Shreveport, Louisiana, and that is my good friend Dr. JOHN FLEMING.

Mr. FLEMING. I thank the gentleman, Congressman GINGREY, again, a physician colleague as well as a congressional colleague; of course Dr. BROWN as well and others. We have done this a number of times. It's always enjoyable and important for the American people to see the physician perspective.

What I would actually like to do is to go over the fact that it's been said many times by Democrats here and everywhere that we are the party of

“no.” We offer no solutions. And I have to remind people constantly that I ran on a pro-reform campaign to be elected to Congress last year. So it’s very important to me as a physician to see true reform, not a government takeover of health care, but reform of what is really an excellent system. And we have had several plans that we are ready to offer, but now that we are getting to a point where there is actually going to be a Democrat plan on the floor perhaps this week or the next week that will be voted on, we’re now ready to offer our substitute. And I wanted to contrast and compare for a moment how these two plans differ, and I will just hit the high points.

Number one, the Pelosi plan cuts Medicare by \$500 billion. That’s a half trillion dollars. It cuts it out. No explanation. No plan. No strategy. We have had Medicare for 45 years. No one knows how to reduce fraud, waste, and abuse any more than it has. In fact, we know that the larger the entity, the higher the fraud, waste, and abuse is. Our plan does not cut a dime out of Medicare.

The CBO estimates in PelosiCare that it will cut over \$150 billion to Medicare Advantage, the private option of Medicare, which 25 percent of Americans, seniors, if you will, have chosen. It will take that program out completely. That will knock about 6 to 11 million seniors off of Medicare Advantage. And not only will they lose preventative health, the eyewear, and all the other benefits that go with it and the efficiencies and the preventative health, as I say, but they will be required to go out in the market and buy Medigap coverage; that’s additional coverage. Our plan does not touch Medicare Advantage. It keeps it fully intact.

Here’s a very interesting one: the CBO says that under PelosiCare that part B premiums will increase by \$25 billion, and part D, the medication part, will increase by 20 percent. Again, ours does not increase those costs one iota.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Reclaiming my time for clarification, in regard to the Medicare Advantage program that the gentleman from Louisiana was just talking about, I wanted to ask him, Mr. Speaker, if under those Medicare Advantage plans, which, by the way, some 20 percent, 11 million seniors, 20 percent of seniors under Medicare—for some strange reason, Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, they pick that as their delivery system of choice because of some of the reasons the gentleman from Louisiana outlined. And I wanted to ask the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, if that in many cases does not also include prescription drug coverage, which would obviate their need for paying a monthly premium under part B.

And I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FLEMING. Thank you. Yes, you’re quite correct, many things that go beyond the standard Medicare. And

Americans have learned that that is a good bill. It’s private insurance using Medicare dollars. In fact, many of us would like to see us, instead of having more government running of health care, to actually have current government programs run in the private sector, where things can be done far more efficiently.

Also, there is a mandate, all employers, essentially all employers, will be imposed an 8 percent payroll tax under PelosiCare, absolutely. Under our plan, no mandate, no individual mandate, no employer mandate.

As pointed out, as many as 5.5 million jobs will be lost as a result of increased taxes, which will add to, of course, the overhead for average businesses.

Now, get this: currently businesses are at a marginal rate of 35 percent taxation. When the Bush tax cuts expire in the next year, that will jump to 39 percent. But added to it with the Pelosi health bill, there will be another surtax added of 5.4 percent, which will then take it up to 45 percent. So we’re looking at a 10 percent increase in marginal tax rates. Now, tell me that that will not cause joblessness. There’s no way around that.

Also employers will be required to pay at least 72.5 percent of the premiums. There will not be the flexibility that they have today to pay less if they can’t afford more.

Will PelosiCare have medical malpractice reform? Not only will it not have it, but the so-called pilot studies that will be offered out there, a measly few million dollars to do that, the only States that can do that are States that do not have laws that restrict lawyer fees or awards or rewards—should I use the word “rewards”—awards for damages. So that means that we can, of course, reform medical malpractice as long as we don’t do anything to lawyers, which, of course, is the biggest interest group, I think, in this bill to begin with.

There are many things, Mr. Speaker, that are going to just blow the budget out. And I would say in summary that everyone, middle class and above, is going to be affected by this in a negative way.

And here’s how they are going to be affected: they’re either going to be paying higher insurance premiums, or they’re going to be paying higher taxes or both. And the government will be deeply involved in every decision in life. Their lives will be managed by the Federal Government, micro-managed, if you will. And if you’re a senior, you’re going to have increasing difficulty in finding a provider, a hospital or a doctor. It’s already true with Medicaid, the other government-run program, which, by the way, is going to increase to 25 percent of human beings in this country from where it is today.

And most people who are on Medicaid cannot find doctors as it is. Where are these doctors going to come from? Because you see, Mr. Speaker, the prob-

lem is, and again look at Cuba, look at North Korea, look at Canada, look at the United Kingdom, they all have universal coverage, but universal coverage doesn’t mean you’re going to get treated. Only one out of six people in Canada has a family physician. So the answer is always in these countries that are government-run systems, yes, you’re not going to have to pay that; yes, it’s fully covered; but you’re just going to have to wait a couple of years to get it.

And some things that are common in the vernacular in Canada and the U.K. is, yes, you have cancer, but, no, we’re not going to treat it, we’re going to watch it. You will never hear a doctor say that in the U.S.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Reclaiming my time, before we go to the other doctor from Louisiana, I think the gentleman from Georgia wanted to engage maybe in a colloquy and ask a question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Thank you for yielding, Dr. GINGREY.

What I wanted to bring up, Dr. FLEMING, is that during the August break I went up to Canada and talked to folks about their universal health care system. And the American public need to understand what their situation is up there. I found women in their 40s and 50s who’ve never been told that they needed a pap smear, never been told they needed one. Never had one. Why? Because the doctors won’t take the time to counsel with them and won’t take time to do the pap smear because doctors have to rush people through the office so quickly just to see the capitated amount just to make a decent living.

The average time spent, I was told by many, many patients up there, was 5 minutes with a doctor, 5 minutes. I was told that if you have high blood pressure, diabetes, and high cholesterol, you have to make three appointments to see the doctor and they’ll just give you medicines for those three things one at a time. You can’t go counsel with your doctor for any period of time.

But most importantly, and back to the reason I asked you to yield a moment or two, is that in Canada they pay a tremendous amount of taxes. Even the lowest income people pay a tremendous amount of taxes to pay for their health care system. They have a provincial and national sales tax just to pay for their health care of 7 percent in British Columbia, where I was, a 7 percent sales tax just to pay for national health insurance. Plus on top of that, they have an income tax. I was told by a guy making under \$50,000 a year, he said he paid 60 percent of his income, 60 percent of his income was paid in taxes to help pay for their national health insurance program.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I certainly know of what the gentleman from Georgia speaks.

I had an opportunity last year to visit in Taiwan, the country of Taiwan, our great friends. And they also, like the U.K. and Canada and some other countries, have this government-run single-payer, sometimes referred to as national health insurance. They have a very similar program, Mr. Speaker, to what Dr. BROUN was just referring to. And when I was visiting in Taiwan, I made sure that I had an opportunity to visit with the Minister of Health; and I asked them to describe the system to me, and Dr. BROUN has just done a great job of sort of a mirror image of what goes on in Canada. And I also had an opportunity to ask some of the Taiwanese citizens about the national health program and what they thought about it.

And, Mr. Speaker, here is just a little bit of what they said, their response. And I think my colleagues need to understand this so they can share this information, and I hope they will on both sides of the aisle, with their constituents:

They said we really like this system, this national health insurance system, here in Taiwan, which has been in place since 1997.

And I said, What's so good about it?

And, Mr. Speaker, their response was, well, kind of like what Dr. BROUN said, We only have to wait about 5 minutes. The queue is very short. They really get you in quickly, and you get to be seen by a doctor, and in general on average that visit takes about 5 minutes. And, Mr. Speaker, also they said almost every time you leave the office, you have a handful of several prescriptions, which is really good, according to them.

Mr. Speaker, of course I'm a physician and I know that in my practice, and my colleagues, I'm sure, experienced the same thing, people want to ask you questions. And a lot of time that's spent you can't charge them for and you don't want to charge them for it, but you want to be able to give them time to ask questions. I said, well, how about if you want to ask the doctor a question?

And, Mr. Speaker, the response was, Well, they don't really encourage that because they have a quota of seeing a certain number of patients a day, and if they sort of drag behind and take more than 5 minutes, then their evaluation at the end of the year, Mr. Speaker, is not so good.

So it's a mess is what it is. It's an absolute mess. And the reason, Mr. Speaker, my colleagues even bring it up is because this idea, in our opinion, in our humble opinion, of having a public option competing with the private market is so that the big arm—I should say the big foot—of Federal Government can get right there one step away from taking over the entire health care system in this country; and we then, within a very short period of time, 3 to 5 years, have a system very similar to the U.K. and Canada and Taiwan.

The American people don't want that, I submit to my colleagues; and

that's why we're fighting this tooth and nail and will continue to until we defeat it.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. I will yield to the gentleman, and then I will yield to Mr. FLEMING so he can finish up and then Dr. CASSIDY as well.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I just wanted to come back to the point that I just was making so that the Speaker himself can understand and the American people who are listening here can understand that the lowest income workers who are trying to make a living, struggling today to make a living and make ends meet, maybe they do or don't have insurance today, they're going to pay a heavy, dear price in increased taxes by this bill, the Pelosi health care bill.

□ 2200

It is going to destroy their own personal budgets because of this bill if it ever gets passed into law.

I want to remind, Mr. Speaker, if I can speak out to the American public, I would tell them that the Republicans are the Party of Know, K-N-O-W, because we know how to lower the cost of health care. We have 53 bills that have been introduced. Some of them are comprehensive, such as my bill, H.R. 3889, which is totally private, doesn't increase taxes for anybody. It doesn't put mandates on anybody or anywhere and totally looks to the private sector and will lower the cost of health care. We have many Republican bills that will help lower the cost for everybody if our bills could just be heard on the floor.

But the American people need to demand that the Pelosi bill be defeated, destroyed, so we can go back to the drawing board, we can go back to the table and work in a bipartisan way and have Democratic and Republican ideas, and we can find something that is right for America that will lower the cost of health care.

The Pelosi health care bill will skyrocket the health care costs for everybody, skyrocket taxes, and we have to stop it.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. I yield to Dr. FLEMING for any concluding remarks. I would welcome my colleagues to remain on the floor and let's continue this discussion. We have, I think, another 20 minutes.

Mr. FLEMING. I thank the gentleman. To conclude my comments, I was comparing and contrasting the Pelosi bill with the Republican bill. The bottom line, Mr. Speaker, is there are only two ways you can control costs. There is the Nancy Pelosi way where you have an extremely large governmental system that disconnects the patient and the doctor from the cost and it leaves it to the government, it leaves it to a very, very distant decisionmaker in the Federal Government to make decisions about our personal lives and put in force things that affect

us that we have no control over. That is one way to do it, and that is ultimately leading to rationing and long lines, like Canada and the U.K. do it.

The other way is a patient-centered perspective, which is the way the Republicans address it, and that is to leave the decisions between the doctor and the patient.

If you stop there, you are not going to control costs. The way you control costs is to engage both the doctor and the patient into the cost. That is not to say that the patient pays all of the costs or even most of the cost. It is just to say through a health savings account and perhaps other methods, the patient is aware what is being spent and there is a certain reward for making good decisions as a consumer. And in order to do that, you have to connect the patient with the cost in some way, and that is where health savings come in, and you have to have transparency and clarity, which we do not have today. And if we do that, then we make very savvy consumers out of patients, and we have the doctors and patients do buy into it. All of the right decisions can be made in the exam room, and you don't need this giant bureaucracy to do that and create long lines. To sum it up, care delayed is care denied.

With that, I thank you.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, at this time I want to yield to our other colleague, a member of the GOP Doctors Caucus from Louisiana, the Baton Rouge area, a gastroenterologist, our good friend, Dr. BILL CASSIDY.

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. Speaker, what strikes me about this process is there actually is common ground here. We can agree on the goals we want. We want to lower cost and increase access and have quality care; but I think the problem we are addressing is there is a philosophical divide as to how we approach that.

I liked what Dr. FLEMING said when he spoke about if we can empower patients, we can lower cost. One example of empowering patients and lowering cost is health savings accounts, which the Republican alternatives all strengthen and the Democratic alternative weakens.

A health savings account, imagine what is currently the case where a family of four puts up \$12,000 a year. At the end of the year, if they haven't used any resources, they put up another \$12,000, and the year after they put up another \$12,000, but in a sense it is starting over every year. In a health savings account, you sluice off some of that money and put it into a banking account and the family controls that account. The patient is empowered to make wise financial decisions. If at the end of the year they have money left over in that account, it rolls over to the next year. They actually can hang onto it.

Two examples of how this works, a friend of mine back home, a woman

with some wealth, has a policy that pays for everything. As it turns out, she doesn't care what it costs because her insurance policy pays for everything. She said she doesn't look to see if her doctor gives her a generic or a name brand drug or what the bill is. She knows insurance will pay for it. She doesn't go through her itemized list to see if all expenses are appropriate.

Contrast that with another fellow. I mentioned to him about the power of health savings account. He says, I have a health savings account. My doctor writes me a prescription and I know from experience, I tell him that it costs me \$159. Notice he didn't say \$160; he said \$159. Because it is his own money, he is looking at the itemized deductions. He said, I have a health savings account. Do you mind writing me something less expensive?

The doctor says, I'm sorry, tears it up, and writes him a generic that costs \$20. The system just saved \$139, not because a bureaucrat in Washington, DC said thou shalt, but rather because someone looking after his own financial interest made the best decision for his health care.

We know this works on a systemic basis. The Kaiser Family Foundation did a study. They compared a family of four, their expenses with a health savings account and a wraparound catastrophic policy, with a family of four which had a traditional insurance policy. The family of four with the HSA catastrophic, they paid 30 percent less for their coverage than the family of four with the traditional insurance policy, and both families, if you will, were equally likely to access preventive services.

So we see by controlling costs, we increased access to quality care, and we did it by bending the cost curve.

What concerns me about the bill advanced by Ms. PELOSI is, according to the Congressional Budget Office, the inflation rate for these bills is 8 percent per year. Now, President Obama says we have to have reform because costs will double in 10 years if we do not. As it turns out, with the reform we have been presented, costs more than double in 10 years. At a minimum, reform should not cost more than status quo, but actually it does. And if we don't control costs, we know that if we don't control costs, access is denied.

Now, we can always make that up by increasing taxes, but when you start off with a bill that increases taxes by \$730 billion, it doesn't leave a whole lot of room, Mr. Speaker, for increasing taxes any more. At some point your increased taxes drive up costs, which decreases access, which means you have to spend more and you increase taxes even yet more. It is not wise public policy.

So in closing, I will yield back after saying that I think our Republican alternatives concentrate the power with the patient. It is patient centered, empowering patients. Contrast that with

the bills that are before us which, frankly, concentrate power in Washington, D.C., by collecting taxes, 111 bureaucracies, boards and panels, which will again take power away from the woman with her doctor in the exam room in her hometown and transfers it to Washington, D.C., where someone will attempt to dictate how that interaction takes place.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments and for yielding back to me. I wanted to comment on one point he made in regard to the health savings accounts and the catastrophic coverage, the low monthly premium that is affordable, especially for a lot of young people in the job market for the first time and they are paying off their student loans and God knows what other debt they have got. It is a great thing, and it encourages personal responsibility.

□ 2210

Mr. Speaker, I want to make sure my colleagues know that one of the key components of the Republican alternative is to say that companies like Safeway that have these programs where if an employee shows personal responsibility and works very hard at wellness, at keeping themselves healthy—like if they're smoking, to stop, if they're overweight, to lose weight, if they have high cholesterol, to change their diet—to do things that would keep them healthy—as an incentive to them, Mr. Speaker—and this is part of the Republican alternative—the employer, like Safeway and other companies, is able to reduce the out-of-pocket cost to the employee; and the out-of-pocket cost could be the monthly premium or a reduction of the deductible or the copay.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, under current law—HIPAA I think is the law—you can't cut that out-of-pocket expense more than 20 percent. Well, why not? Why not? If you have employees that have skin in the game, so to speak—I guess that's certainly true in regard to the specialty of dermatology—but if they are taking personal responsibility, then we say that an employer ought to be able to increase that discount to those employees up to 40 or 50 percent. Why not? There is not one thing in H.R. 3962 in regard to personal responsibility.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Louisiana. Also, I see my colleague from Athens is still here. I think he probably, Mr. Speaker, wants to talk about something in the bill called the health choices administrator, a very, very powerful—yes, another czar created by this bill, the health choices administrator. I want to yield to Dr. BROWN and let him speak to that because I think he's got a slide that he would like our colleagues to pay attention to.

I yield to Dr. BROWN.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Dr. GINGREY, thank you so much for yielding.

This is the health care czar. The President said, if you have insurance and you like it, you can keep it. Nothing could be further from the truth; it's a boldfaced lie. The reason it's a boldfaced lie is because this bill requires the health care czar and his panel—this dude is going to be confirmed by the Senate, but the panel is going to be appointed by the President with no confirmation—they're going to be making health care decisions for everybody. And everybody, even private health insurance plans, have to be approved by the boss. So if you have health care insurance today and you like it, forget it because it's going away unless the boss says it's okay.

So the Democratic health care plan, the health insurance bill that NANCY PELOSI has given us, you can have anything that you want if the boss approves it. And I thank Dr. GINGREY because this is his slide here.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. If the gentleman would yield back to me for just a second.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. You bet.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I know the gentleman from Georgia knows of what he speaks because some of my colleagues may not be old enough to recognize that poster, that caricature of the health choices administrator; but, Mr. Speaker, I want to introduce you to Boss Hogg—H-o-g-g I believe it's spelled, from Hazard County, Georgia—or H-a-w-g, I'm not sure. But anyway, I appreciate the gentleman from Augusta and Athens, my good colleague, physician colleague and classmate from the Medical College of Georgia, sharing that poster with us. And I thank him for being with us tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that our time is drawing to a close. We've probably got about 5 more minutes. I'm going to be spending the rest of the time concluding tonight.

I also want to ask our colleagues to direct their attention to a few posters that I have, a few slides. This first one, of course, is—at the very outset what I wanted to emphasize was that the Republican Party, the loyal minority, if you will, does have a second opinion, and that's what we've been talking about here tonight.

I think the most important part of our second opinion—and we listened very carefully, by the way, during the August recess, during those town hall meetings when so many seniors turned out, many of them fragile, so many veterans, many of them of the Vietnam era, World War II, with just multiple health problems and disabilities. They were so concerned about getting their Medicare cut or being thrown under the bus, so to speak, when the government takes over and starts rationing. And what they told us loud and clear is patients don't want government-run health care. They don't want it. They've seen government-run Indian health care, as an example. They've seen many things that the government

has run and made a thorough mess of. And this is life and death, this is life and death. And that's why they don't trust the government to run it.

Mr. Speaker, our President, it seems to me, is not listening to the American people. In this next slide I want to point out that what they're saying and what they continue to say—in fact, this coming Thursday you're going to see—I don't know how many are going to come to Washington for what my colleagues refer to as a "house call," a house call on Washington; but this is not the physicians making the house call. This is the American public, this is the patients, these are our constituents making a house call on Thursday at noon.

I'm not sure whether we are going to have the opportunity to have them gather on the east steps where they can be seen by all, and all Members coming and going as we come to the floor and debate and vote on this, the most crucial issue that's been before us, I don't know, maybe in the history of this Congress, certainly in the 7 years that I've been here. But we're going to see a lot of people coming from all across this country. Whether they're constituents from Democratic districts or Republican districts, they're going to be here, they're going to be here. My colleague is going to talk about that, I think, in this next hour.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to all my colleagues, you ought to tell your constituents to come. Get on a bus, drive up here, bring a caravan and tell the Members of Congress and the President and this administration what it is you want and what you don't want. And I know they're going to be saying no government-run health care. They're going to be saying don't cut seniors' care to pay for health reform. We can't even get an annual physical under Medicare. We don't have any catastrophic coverage. We have to pay a \$900 deductible before we can even go in the hospital under Medicare. And they're going to say don't raise the deficit. I think they think that \$1.4 trillion is quite enough deficit for 1 year.

And they're going to say, Mr. Speaker, give us choices, but don't give us mandates. Don't force our young sons and daughters who are straight out of college to have to pay \$900 a month for health care they don't need. Allow them, health choices administrator, allow them to pick a high deductible, low monthly premium with catastrophic coverage during the years that they are taking care of themselves and taking personal responsibility.

And they're also going to say, Mr. Speaker, and I will say this in conclusion, they're going to say we want you Members of Congress, Democratic majority, Republican minority, we want bipartisan compromise. We think that you ought to go back to the table, take a clean sheet of paper, throw away these 1990 pages. We know you destroyed a lot of trees, but let's start over again with one sheet of paper and

do it in a bipartisan way and think first and foremost about the American people and not the next election.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2220

#### A TIME FOR AMERICANS TO RECLAIM THEIR FREEDOM

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate being recognized to address you here on the floor of the House.

This is a big night for a lot of Republicans across the country, and as we're watching things unfold, the American people have come out to the polls today across the eastern part of the United States, and their voices are being heard. As our voice has been heard sometimes in the echo chamber in the House of Representatives, now the real voices of the people have been heard through the ballot boxes in places like Virginia and in New Jersey, and we wait to see how it unfolds above and beyond that.

This is, Mr. Speaker, a time for choosing. This is a time for the American people to step up and to reclaim their freedom.

The American people understand what has happened in the last year, in a little more than the last year. They understand that there was a Secretary of the Treasury who came to this Capitol and who demanded a \$700 billion TARP fund. A lot of us said "no," and everybody here on the floor, I believe who I'm looking at, said "no." Then along came the nationalization of three large investment banks—AIG, Fannie Mae, and Freddie Mac—and then General Motors and Chrysler. Then behind that came a \$750 billion economic stimulus package that may have saved some government jobs but that hasn't created anything that has to do with the way you create wealth in a free enterprise society.

Right behind that came the very ill-thought-out, worst piece of economic burden that has ever passed the House of Representatives—cap-and-trade. The American people saw that go through them like a freight train—one car after another, after another, after another. At about the time they lifted their heads up to see what happened, another car hit them.

Then they looked around, and we had an August break, and this Congress went home to get away from the humidity and the heat in Washington, DC. When we went out, we had hundreds and hundreds of town hall meetings, and tens of thousands—in fact, hundreds of thousands—of Americans came out for their voices to be heard.

At the core of all of that—of all the squabble, of all the tension that we saw and heard and that a lot of us looked

right directly in the eye—was the American people who wanted to preserve and protect their freedom—our freedom, Mr. Speaker.

They continually said, What can I do? What can I do?

I said, Come to town hall meetings. Pick up the telephone. Write letters. Go see your Member of Congress. Look him in the eye. Tell him that you want to hang onto your freedom.

If there was anything that I said in a town hall meeting that resonated with the people in the Fifth District of Iowa was that I will oppose any bill that diminishes our freedom. Well, we have a bill that looks like it's coming to this Congress very soon that diminishes our freedom. It's 1,990 pages.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA).

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I thank my colleague from Iowa for yielding.

I think you've laid out very well at a macro level what we've seen happen over the last 9½ to 10 months as we've had a new administration, a new Senate, and a new House come into session. That's at the macro level.

I think the other thing that's really connecting with people is what they see happening at a grassroots level after Chrysler and General Motors went bankrupt and then after Chrysler and General Motors used the protection of bankruptcy to take away private property rights—to go into a whole range of dealerships without any transparency to their customers or to even the dealers, themselves.

They all of a sudden said, In 3 weeks, 5 weeks, you're no longer going to be a dealer for Chrysler.

GM had a nicer word for it. They said, You're going to be in a wind-down.

Well, I was just in one of those wind-down dealers last week. It's not a wind-down. They're out of business. It was a loss of freedom. You know, many of these individuals had invested millions of dollars into the business, some of them within the last couple of years, believing that, when they were investing in the contracts that they had with these folks, the contracts protected their freedoms and that they protected their business relationships. All of a sudden, through bankruptcy, that freedom and that protection, under bankruptcy law and franchise laws, were gone.

That's exactly, I think, one of the reasons we're here tonight. We're talking now about the freedom, about the responsibility and about the opportunities that those car dealers lost when GM and Chrysler went through bankruptcy. It's the type of freedom that each and every one of us faces. We're going to lose that same kind of opportunity if we pass this massive health care bill because, when I look at it—you and I—we know what's wrong with health care. We've got to fix pre-existing conditions. We've got to have

more competition. We need to do some of those things.

This is all about power and where that power will be. I started reading this health care bill over the weekend. I read 300 pages. Then you start going through it, and you start trying to figure it out, and you realize that what the Speaker and others have done is not what's going to be in health care. That health care bill simply says that it's no longer your decision and that it's not my decision. It's not your decision. It's not my decision. Those health care decisions are now going to be the decisions of the House of Representatives and of the Senate. More importantly, they're going to be the decisions of those buildings down the street—down Independence Avenue and down Constitution Avenue—which we call the "Federal bureaucracy." We'll have a bureaucrat standing between you and me and our doctors and our health care decisions.

I think one of the things we're going to talk about tonight is the opportunity that the American people are going to have to come to Washington on Thursday to voice their opposition to this massive takeover through the Pelosi health care bill or to go to their congressional offices in their districts or to start calling Washington—to call those Members who are going to make a difference as to whether this Pelosi health care bill becomes law or as to whether we stop it dead in its tracks and we have a vote for freedom.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time and thanking the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. Speaker, I want to reiterate this: that the dye has been cast in this Congress for some time. The Speaker has been leveraging votes on this 1,990-page bill that may see a several-hundred-page manager's amendment drop in on us at any time. Even as we speak, it could happen.

With all that leverage that has been taking place behind the scenes and with all the negotiations that have taken place in the White House, in the Speaker's office and in Harry Reid's office, there has been no Republican at the table, not one.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Excuse me. Does the gentleman mean that this has not been a transparent process?

Mr. KING of Iowa. It has been completely opaque. It is not a transparent process, and it is not consistent with the word, with the pledged oath of the President of the United States, which was that there would be an open, transparent process that would be negotiated on C-SPAN.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Exactly how much of the economy are we going to re-shape?

Mr. KING of Iowa. We're looking at 17.5 percent—round it up to 18 percent—of the economy swallowed up by the Federal Government—and the gentleman from Michigan didn't say it—under the thumb of the health choices czar, who is the guy who would write all the rules after the legislation would be drafted. The rules would be written after that, and he would then set the

terms for every health insurance policy and company in America.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. How many times in this bill does it say the health care commissioner shall, will or must? Those are all decisions that will not be made here through the legislative process.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I happen to know the answer: 3,425 times.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. How many times?

Mr. KING of Iowa. It says "shall" 3,425 times, but the one time that it says "may" is quite interesting, which is that the Members may enroll in the Federal policy. It's not Members of Congress shall live under the laws they pass. They may if they choose.

The gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. AKIN. So the Members of Congress may, but everything else is "shall." There are 3,400 "shalls"——

Mr. KING of Iowa. And 25.

Mr. AKIN. Packed into a 2,000-page bill.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Those are decisions that the health care administrator, commissioner or czar will make. We transfer that authority. We've taken it from the American people. We've put it into Congress.

We've said, Those are no longer your decisions. We shall make those decisions. Then we say, No. Wait a minute. We shall not. We shall transfer that over to a commissioner because we sure don't want to have responsibility for it.

So it's kind of like a framework of health care reform, saying, You'll know the details later on as some appointed but not elected and not accountable commissioner makes those decisions.

Mr. AKIN. So, in coming back to the theme of freedom, every "shall" is just like another death bell which is tolling for a little freedom that just died. Every "shall" is one more little freedom that just died. It is one person with one's doctor who's making a health care decision but who won't make it anymore because there's not going to be an insurance person there, second-guessing. No. It's going to be worse than that. It's going to be a government bureaucrat saying, I'm sorry, Steve. You're just a little too old.

Just having a moment to join my friends here, I think that I would be derelict in my duty if I didn't recognize my good friends, Congressman HOEKSTRA and STEVE KING.

□ 2230

You have been one of the people that's called, it's called a House call, it's like a doctor going to a house call, except we are asking for the people who aren't sick to come to Washington D.C. and try to straighten things out on Thursday at 12 o'clock. You are one of the people organizing that, and PETE has been working on it too.

This is really kind of a grass-roots thing, isn't it. I mean, this is not something that the leadership has been pushing particularly or anybody said to do. This is just a sense that we want to allow the many people we know that love this country and love freedom to

have a chance to in some way express their opinion about this subject, because this is like some train that's lost any kind of way to talk to it on the telephone; and it is just going with the Governors off of it, full steam, full throttle down a track that's disappearing in empty space. We are just going to jump into this abyss of the government can run it somehow.

When I think of the beginning of this country and I think about freedom, such a special place America is. You know, there are all of these crazy people that came to America.

One of my favorites is this group of pilgrims, 100 of them. They came over with a dream. People say they came for religious freedom. They didn't come for religious freedom; they had religious freedom in good old Holland.

No, they came here because they wanted to build a new civilization unlike anything history had ever seen before. These people were nuts. Within the first couple of months, half of them died. When the *Mayflower* captain said it's time to go back to England in the spring, half of his crew was dead and he told his bosun to wind in that anchor cable and set the yardarm square to the wind, and that *Mayflower* sailed over the horizon and disappeared as a speck.

There are these 50 people or so standing on the shore, on the rocky shore line of cold, old Massachusetts, New England, because they had a dream in their heart. They had a dream of building a new nation. A number of years later you have Bradford writing that perhaps we have kindled a candle that will light up even as a candle could light other candles, can light up even a light to a new nation.

All these other crazy people, this one guy started building light bulbs and he built a couple hundred of them and nothing worked. He was just crazy enough to keep on doing it until Thomas Edison built it. America has been built, one idea at a time, by the people who had freedom.

Mr. KING of Iowa. It's the vitality in America that we want to preserve here. There is something unique about being an American. We aren't just an extension of Europe; we aren't just an amalgam of all the donor cultures that are here. We got the cream off the crop of every one that sent people to America.

That vitality that comes from having a dream, that gave them the vision to find a way to get on a ship to come here, and they didn't all stay here. Some of them couldn't cut it in this competitive meritocracy that we have created. Some of them went back, not very many. But the ones that stayed were the best that any of the donor countries had to offer.

That dream of freedom, founded upon the rule of law, the right to property, the constitutional foundation, the pillars of American exceptionalism, is

what is at stake here in this Congress this week in the biggest way that I can remember in my lifetime.

That's why, Mr. Speaker, we have called for the American people to come to this city, come to this Capitol. We are gathering together at noon on Thursday, and we are asking everybody in America that can get here, if you are close enough to drive, they need to drive.

If they need to get on a plane, do that, and join us at noon, in the afternoon and thereafter go find Members of Congress, look them in the eye. Let them see the whites of your eyes. Let them look into your pupils and look into your soul.

Tell them don't take away our freedom with this 1,990-page bill, the one that there is no one can understand; but it's noon on Thursday. Those that can't make it here need to go to the district offices as close to their home as they can or into the districts of the people that are sitting on the fence and tell them, save my freedom, or I will take your job. That's the message that needs to come.

Those that can't go out that day need to pick up the phone and jam the phone lines. This can be done. This bill can be killed. It needs to be killed for the sake of freedom, for the freedom that was found with the pilgrims when they came here, for the freedom that was fought for with every generation of Americans, for those that are buried out at Arlington and around the world. We can't be turning America into a socialist state.

Those companies that I mentioned at the beginning that have been nationalized, that's one-third of our private sector. If that 18 percent of the health care industry, one-sixth of our economy is added to that, we are at or over half of the private sector nationalized in the last year. We can't stand that.

By the way, there are flash cards that are there, that are put out by USCIS, Citizenship and Immigration Services. In those flash cards you will have to learn this if you want to become an American. One will be Who is the Father of our Country? "George Washington" on the other side.

You can go down through the list. But there is one that has a question that says, What is the economic system of the United States? Back side, "free enterprise capitalism." I would like to see if many of those in the administration today could actually pass that test.

I am convinced they don't believe in it. This is about freedom, and we need to gather here in this Capitol Building on Thursday, at noon, at the building, around the building, around the grounds, in the congressional offices. The call needs to go out to everybody in America.

For 2 months they said, what can I do? What can I do? The answer is, Come to this city. Help us all out.

The gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. AKIN. You know, there are different sorts of levels of threats that we

run into in Congress. You are an expert on the intelligence community. You take a look in the Midwest, you have these big towering cumulus that come across in June and July and you say is this something that's dangerous or whatever it is, and you take a look, Do we have threats from terrorists? Is that a problem? Is North Korea a problem? We sort of weigh these things.

I would have to say that so many people back in my district and so many of the people that I respect here in the floor would rate where we are right now, Steve, they would rate this as probably the biggest internal threat to America since the Civil War. That's kind of where I have come down. I mean, if you want to talk about American danger, I might say go back to the Cold War and Ronald Reagan and whether the Soviets are going to push the button.

But if you talk about internal threats to America, this idea of the government taking over these sectors, one of the things, there is a couple of things chilling about it. One of the things is tell me any time in the history of America when the Federal Government has taken something over that we have ever backed up from it. We never go backwards.

As soon as something gets socialized, it's permanently built into our culture. We can never get rid of it.

If we ever allow the Federal Government to run that sixth of the economy that's health care, how are we ever going to get back from that?

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I think you have got three examples here exactly building off of your point: 1956, the country and Congress decides that we are going to do the interstate highway system. You know what? I think that actually worked. We now have an interstate highway system that works for the country.

But over the last 53 years, the system has become corrupted. Why? Because it's now Washington getting in.

In my district, with Michigan's money, they say, oh, by the way, on average for the last 53 years, we are going to take a dollar of your money, and we are going to give you 83 cents back.

Mr. AKIN. Bargain.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. What a great bargain. It's a great bargain for West Virginia because they are getting \$1.74 back, but that's our money.

Now they are coming into Michigan and they are saying we are not building interstate highway systems any more. We are telling you to build bike paths; we are telling you to do this. So in the last couple of years what have we had to build, a crumbling infrastructure, we have had to build a turtle fence, rest areas.

Mr. AKIN. Wait, there has got to be a story here. A turtle fence. I assume this is to keep stampedes of turtles off the roads?

Mr. HOEKSTRA. It's to keep stampedes from crossing the interstate. Like I said, our infrastructure in

Michigan is not that great. We need to rebuild it.

Mr. AKIN. Is it environmentally acceptable to have a turtle fence, do you think?

Mr. HOEKSTRA. We allow them to get to the creeks and the rivers, but again it's this loss of freedom. It's Michigan's money coming to Washington, then coming back and saying you are going to get less of what you sent, and then we are going to tell you how to spend it. We are now building a bicycle path, a bike path over an expressway; and it's kind of like, that's nice to have, but it's not an essential.

The second example is, and you and I are here, you like this one—

Mr. AKIN. The turtle fence, was the bridge for turtles too or not?

Mr. HOEKSTRA. No. The bridge was for bicyclists, and I have not seen a lot of bikes on that road.

Mr. AKIN. The reason I am hung up on this is because I keep a record in my mind of some of the dumbest ideas that I see legislatively. This health care bill has got one, actually. It's the wheelchair tax. Now, what person that ran for public office would want to do a wheelchair tax?

We will get to the turtle fence.

□ 2240

Mr. HOEKSTRA. That is a bad idea. So we found a system that worked for the interstate highway system, but over 53 years it has grown into this bureaucracy that no longer works to build what it was intended to do.

The second example, as you and I were here, 2001, it is kind of the same debate we had on health care. We had a President who came in and said, My number one priority is what? Education. No Child Left Behind. And who could argue with that? Who wants to leave any child left behind?

Some of us had a vision that said, you know, the most effective way to make sure we don't leave a child behind is not to give the authority, but to return the authority that is inherent with parents to raise and educate their kids. But we had a President who had another idea.

He said, well, the way we are going to make sure we are not going to leave any child behind is that we are going to take that authority from parents, we are going to take that authority away from local school districts, we are going to take that authority away from the States, and we are going to move it all here to Washington.

I think about 390 people voted for it, because how could you vote against No Child Left Behind? Everybody was scared, you know. We are going to have to go home and people are going to say he voted to leave a kid behind. You and I voted "no."

Mr. KING of Iowa. When you name it "No Child Left Behind," then it gives it momentum. But what could you possibly name a 1,990-page socialized medicine bill to convince the American people it is a good idea?

Mr. AKIN. I can tell you what it was named by the Democrat Governor of Tennessee, because his State has tried this whole idea of the government running health care. So this is the Democrat Governor of Tennessee called it "the monster of unfunded mandates."

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Which is exactly what we found with No Child Left Behind. It became a huge power grab to Washington, a huge unfunded mandate, and, most importantly, it didn't work. And this is the exact model that we are now following with health care, except we now have a new President who says, My legacy is I am going to do health care.

Again, he is not enabling people to exercise the freedom and authority that the Constitution has given them. He is taking that freedom and authority from them, just like No Child Left Behind, moving it to Washington, and saying, Don't worry, Washington will take care of your health care. Everything will be fine.

Mr. KING of Iowa. It is pretty hard to take this President seriously when you look at a quote like this. This is a quote from the President. "Here is what you need to know. First, I will not sign a plan that adds one dime to our deficits, either now nor the future. Period." Date, August 9, 2009. I was watching the town hall meeting.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Actually, he was right. This plan will not add a dime. It will add \$1.2 trillion. I am not sure to the deficit, but it is \$1.2 trillion of new spending. He is right. It is not a dime; it is a whole lot more than that.

Mr. KING of Iowa. The gentleman from Michigan could be completely in tune and understand political speak so precisely. Not one dime. It could be 11 cents, 9 cents, or \$1.2 trillion, but not a dime.

Mr. AKIN. The question I have for my good friend from Iowa, how many dimes do you have to stack up to get to \$1.2 trillion? Could you get to the Moon?

Mr. KING of Iowa. I could tell you how much corn.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. He can tell you how many bushels of corn it will take, but don't ask him about dimes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Here is the corn. One trillion dollars of corn is this. We will raise about \$10 billion of corn in Iowa this year. If we can get it out of the field, we will have \$10 billion worth. One hundred years is \$1 trillion worth. One hundred years, all the corn we can raise, is \$1 trillion. The Obama deficit is \$9.7 trillion. That is all of the corn we can raise in 1,000 years.

So you can look at it this way: The deficit created by this bill, the \$1.2 trillion, would be about 120 years of all of the corn that we could raise in Iowa if we committed the entire amount, at today's market prices, marked up just a little because they have gone down over the last few weeks. That is what \$1.2 trillion is. We could pay this thing off in 120 years in Iowa if we gave you all the proceeds from our corn crop.

To put it into that kind of magnitude, for the national debt, the Obama deficit is 1,000 years of all of the corn we can raise in Iowa. And the overall national debt, national deficit added to the Obama deficit, is over \$20 trillion. That is all the corn we can raise from the time of Christ until today if we had today's yields and today's market prices.

That is what we are looking at. We are looking at something that is unsustainable, and the children and grandchildren yet to be born will be paying the interest, and maybe their children will start to pay the principal on this debt that is created.

Mr. AKIN. First of all, though, you've got to remember the Governor of Tennessee said this is a monster of unfunded mandates. So it is really not \$1.2 trillion, is it, because a lot is going to be passed on to the States. So it is really more than \$1.2 trillion. Then we are going to collect that with taxes, isn't that right? Like the wheelchair tax. I am still marveling at the political audacity.

Mr. KING of Iowa. A tax on oxygen bottles and all the medical equipment is there, but the tax on small businesses approaches half a trillion dollars too.

Mr. AKIN. \$500 billion on small business. And, of course, we are going to do that at a time when employment is strong, right?

Mr. KING of Iowa. We are doing this at a time when the economy is as wobbly as it has been in our adult lifetimes, and we have been adults for a while, the three of us.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. We have to put this, again, in focus. What taxes are we already looking at? They have said we are not going to extend the tax cuts that were done in 2001 that led to economic prosperity. Those are going to expire. There is a whole range of taxes that will go up for all Americans when those expire at the end of 2010-2011. We then have all of these taxes that they have put together.

Mr. AKIN. Is that dividends and capital gains? Are you talking about dividends and capital gains?

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Dividends. I think the marriage penalty comes back. The adoption tax credit goes away. This is Adoption Awareness Month. We have wisely put in tax policy that encourages and facilitates and provides a financial assist for families who want to adopt. That goes away, because that is a bad tax cut, according to folks, because everything that was done from 2001 through 2008, any type of tax adjustment was a terrible tax. So they want to get rid of that.

Then you put that with cap-and-trade, the carbon tax that has created a tremendous amount of uncertainty on business. Then, like you said, you put this new health care tax on top of small and medium-size business, and you put all the other taxes in place, there is no wonder why the economy is in such turmoil today, because every

business person today, if they are taking a look at whether they are going to invest or hire someone, they are going to be very, very reluctant to do it because they are seeing all of these taxes on the horizon and there is so much uncertainty.

Again, what is every tax? The same thing as in health care. Every tax is taking freedom away from the three of us, from our constituents, and moving it to Washington, because we then can no longer direct that spending. Washington politicians can.

Mr. AKIN. Now, Congressman, you are talking to a guy who made his whole life as a small businessman, Congressman KING. Let's just take a look at what we are piling on him in 10 months.

First of all, as you say, we are having all of these different taxes that had been cut are all going to be raised, but particularly for small businesses, dividends and capital gains. So if you are a small business man, you have to have some cash to run your business, especially if you want to add any new jobs. You have to be able to afford a new piece of heavy equipment. That is what you were doing, Congressman KING.

Now, what we are going to do is we are going to slam them with what—you call it cap-and-trade, I call it cap-and-tax, but it is one of the biggest tax hikes in the history of the country. But also included with it are all of these regulations about the carbon footprint of your building.

So now you have got all of the tax things that are expiring. You get cap-and-tax coming. So energy, you are going to get hammered on that. We say, but don't you worry about anything, because we have got some more taxes in this government-run health care system.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, to take us back and put this in a perspective, in 2006, Speaker PELOSI became the Speaker with a Democrat majority in this Congress. CHARLIE RANGEL became the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. We had this whole series of Bush tax cuts that went into law May 28, 2003, that stimulated the economy, and they were the right thing to do to bring us out of the downward decline that we were in.

And the chairman, CHARLIE RANGEL, went before news media after news media, pundit after pundit, and they asked him a whole series of questions: Which one of the Bush tax cuts will you save? Which ones do you want to eliminate? Which ones do you like? How would you configure these taxes?

There never was a straight answer out of the whole bunch. But in the process of elimination, over a period of about 5 weeks, it was determined that CHARLIE RANGEL didn't support any of these taxes. And in that period of time, by February, we saw industrial investment drop in this country dramatically, and that, I believe, was the first indicator of what was going to happen to our economy.

Since that period of time, capital is smart. It will always do the rational thing. Well, when capital sees that it gets a tax increase, it invests less, takes less risk, because there is less return on that investment.

That started in 2007, February 2007, and it has been in a decline ever since, until such time as we end up with the Henry Paulsen \$700 billion TARP money in this government that decided they want to borrow trillions of dollars and buy up the private sector of the United States.

□ 2250

By the way, one can go to the Web site, the socialist Web site, dsausa.org, the Democratic Socialists of America, and there's the playbook for much that's happened, and that's been posted and hanging out there for some years now. But they'll argue that, first, they're not communists. There's a difference. Socialists don't want to nationalize the barbershop. They just want to nationalize the Fortune 500 companies, the oil industry, the refinery industry, and the energy industry. And they don't need to do it all in one fell swoop. They can do it incrementally. A lot of Americans think it's happening almost in one fell swoop. But the playbook's there on that Web site.

The people that are running this country do not believe in free enterprise. They believe in a managed economy that's run, and it's on the Web site of the socialists, companies run for the benefit of the people affected by them. Guess who that is? That's the workers or the customers, not the investors. That's why the investors got aced out in the car companies, as we heard from Mr. HOEKSTRA earlier.

That's the backdrop, Mr. AKIN.

Mr. AKIN. Just going back to what I'm saying about some poor guy that's a small businessman out there in this environment, and you see this wave after wave of tax increases, and you don't know when the waves are going to stop, and you don't know what's going on and how you're going to run your company. It reminds me of an expression from a State right next door to yours. You're from Iowa. We're just a little bit east over in the State of Missouri. But we have an expression that I think adequately expresses if I were a small businessman in that Missouri. We say, "hunker down like a toad in a hailstorm." And I think that's where our small business people are. They're not thinking about building that addition or adding that extra machine tool or coming up with an innovative new process. They're thinking about how am I going to survive this storm?

Mr. KING of Iowa. Speaking of the turtle and the toad, the fence for the turtle, there's a reason and we've seen the film on why you can't supposedly put a fence on our southern border, and that's a little video of this toad that hops along and hops up and bumps his

little nose on a fence, and, therefore, we surely couldn't have one to protect America because this toad can't figure out how to hop around it.

So hunker down like a turtle in a what?

Mr. AKIN. "Hunker down like a toad in a hailstorm."

Mr. KING of Iowa. Or a turtle that's lying up against a fence.

The gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. You put it all together, and I think this is what we started seeing in August. In August we had people who were frustrated about programs that had been around like No Child Left Behind, massive amounts of money but also massive amounts of unfunded mandates that weren't working, and parents recognizing that, wow, now Washington's telling me which schools are good, which ones are bad, which teachers are good, which ones are bad. It's kind of like I knew that before. I didn't need Washington to tell me that.

Then they saw what you articulated, Mr. KING, so eloquently earlier where we did this massive stimulus bill that's not creating jobs. You've got cap-and-trade. You've got this health care. And I think this is why they came out in droves during August and saying stop, we want our freedom.

And this is why we need people to do one of three things or four things on Thursday at noon. Number one, if you can be in Washington and join us, come here and stand up and express your vote for freedom. And I think it's happening tonight in Virginia, and it happened in New Jersey, and I'm not should exactly what happened in New York, but in those two States that's exactly what people did. This Tuesday they stood up for freedom in Virginia, and they stood up for freedom in New Jersey.

Join us here on Thursday. If you can't come here, go visit your Congressman's district office and express in person your vote for freedom. And if you can't go there, then get on the phone and, you're right, target those Members who are on the fence and say we need your vote for freedom and not for massive new government bureaucracy.

And I think as we were talking and organizing this session for Thursday, someone came up and they gave us the fourth idea that says if you can't do one of those three and you're driving, and we don't want you to get on your cell phone and call your Congressman, then at least what you can do at noon on Thursday is start honking your horn for freedom. So do one of those four things on Thursday afternoon, and people will start getting the message.

But it's not only Thursday. This vote may happen Friday. It may happen Saturday. We're not sure exactly when. But keep that effort going and build the momentum that we started in August, that you started in August at the grass-roots level. It has been reinvigorated. It's been going on for the last couple of months, but now we need to

accelerate it back up. Get it going again on Thursday, Friday, Saturday, and Sunday until we come back and we do a sensible, commonsense reform of health care that says for the 85 percent of us who have health care and are relatively happy with it, we're really not going to mess with that. We're going to focus on those problems that we have identified in health care for those 10 to 15 percent of the American people who can't get health care. We're going to address those problems. But we're not going to mess with the rest of the system.

Mr. AKIN. It just seems like the problem is just like the cap-and-tax. I mean, that was the one that had the 300 pages of amendments passed at 3 o'clock in the morning. And I remember from this very podium that I'm speaking from our colleague, Congressman GOHMERT from Texas, with his droll sense of humor inquiring of the Chair. He said, Madam Chairman—there was a lady in the Chair at that time—is it customary that there be a copy of the bill in the Chamber when we're debating it and discussing it? So there was a discussion with the Parliamentarian who said, yes, there is, it's common that there is. He came back about four times and said, Could you tell me whether to go north, south, east, or west? I can't find a copy of the bill here. And, of course, the bill was still being collated at the time.

Now, that was another example of we have got a solution and we're just going to use the excuse—

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, I'd like to—

Mr. AKIN. But this is the same thing. This is just like that. If really CO<sub>2</sub> were the problem, we could have fixed the problem easily.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, I don't think it really does justice to what actually happened on this floor. It has to be brought to a close, and that is to give full credit to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT). He took that Parliamentary inquiry with the Speaker to the point where he said, Madam Speaker, if the House of Representatives passes a bill that doesn't exist, then is it possible to message a bill that doesn't exist to the United States Senate? And apparently it was, because that is what happened. A bill that didn't exist was passed. That was cap-and-trade. It was messaged to the United States Senate. Not one person in this Congress read that bill, let alone understood it. I know. I don't have to ask because it didn't exist at the time it was passed on the floor of the House of Representatives.

Now I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. AKIN. Well, I guess my point was the objective was already predetermined. It's a massive takeover of all kinds of basically building code stuff, telling you you've got to have an electric outlet in your garage. You know, this sort of incredibly detailed stuff that the Federal Government thinks

we much better know how you ought to build your garage and have an electrical outlet in it. But the objective was all of this controlling stuff and a huge tax increase, which was the objective all along.

This health care situation strikes me as the same thing. The objective from the beginning is get the government to run it, and we'll use any excuse that we can to justify the fact, but we already know the solution and the destination, and that is we just believe in the government running this thing.

And there are a lot of people on the Democrat side that are completely open and honest and say that's their objective, and there are other people that are trying to obscure the fact that that's where they're going. We'll do it in some incremental steps, or we'll make it so that you can opt out. You can't opt out of the taxes, but you can opt out of the health care or whatever. But the bottom line is we want the government to run it.

That kind of reminds me of something. And I know that a couple of you are historians. There was a country that believed, and we heard it argued on this floor, that health care is a right, and there was a country that took a look and said, you know, you ought to have a right to shelter because in the cold, harsh climate of this country, if you don't have shelter, you will die. And you ought to have a right to food because you'll starve to death if you don't have food. And you ought to have a right to health care and you ought to have a right also to education. So that country, because they thought those were fundamental rights, had the government providing those things for their citizens.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Was there a right to escargot?

Mr. AKIN. I don't know whether that might kill you or not, but the point is that country is out of business. It was called the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the USSR. But that was their basic philosophy, that the government should do housing and food and health care and education. And here we are going along after we laughed at them and watched that complete mess that they made of their country, the poverty it left people in, and we say, well, now we want the government not to do just food stamps and housing but we want the government to do all, all of medicine in America.

Mr. KING of Iowa. The thing that's forgotten by the other side is that they're creating a dependency society, a society that the more dependent people can be, the more government can grow, the stronger their political power is, Mr. Speaker. That's a piece over here.

□ 2300

We are about independence and the vitality of that. You can't beat the guy that has a vested interest. The entrepreneur who started a business, who risked their capital. Like me, I had a

negative net worth of \$5,000. There was a way to go down from there. I had to make it work. I made no provision for failure. A lot of nights I worked all night and the next day to hold it together. When that happens, you can't beat that person that is determined that way. But if government replaces all of the needs and all of the wants and sets the safety net out there and turns the safety net into a hammock, the vitality of a nation is diminished.

We have, if this bill should pass, it takes away another incentive for personal responsibility and it says to the person who is not responsible, you don't need to figure out how to climb up from here because we will deliver. We will do a delivery of anything it is that you want.

It reminds me of FDR's "Four Freedoms" speech, and that is cut into the wall down at his monument, and I don't go there very often. And he got it a little wrong, four freedoms: Freedom of religion, freedom of speech. They are freedoms. They are constitutional freedoms. But the other two were freedom from want and freedom from fear. Freedom from want and freedom from fear, and some of America has been duped into thinking somehow those are rights. They are not rights at all; those are wants. Now we have gone to the point where we have catered so much to the people of this country and the lust for political power that we have said to people, You should have a constitutional right to freedom from fear of want. So don't worry, we'll give you everything you want. You don't have to fear not having what you want, a complete nanny state being created in this great gulp of socialism of one-sixth of our economy, 17.5 percent of our economy, and the freedom not just from cradle to grave, from conception to the grave. That is because this bill funds abortion. I don't think there is any way that the Speaker allows an amendment to come to this floor that will pass because you can't create a whole national health care act and make this thing work the way things are scenarioed today.

This bill funds abortion. This bill funds illegals, gives them a health insurance policy, and it takes care from the time people are conceived, if they are fortunate enough to be allowed to be born, even though the subsidy will be there to promote abortion, it takes care all of the way up and makes children out of us all. A great diminishment of American freedom.

And it would, if the Founding Fathers could stand in here tonight, the tears would be running down their cheeks thinking of what is staged to happen in this Congress. That is why we need the American people to come to this city and be here by noon on Thursday, gather together, come to the Capitol, surround this place, bring your passion and your love for this country, bring your patriotism, and bring your signs while you are at it.

Mr. Speaker, the American people need to come here, to this Capitol, and

we do the press conference at noon on Thursday. It will have a list of people that have migrated from across this country. People are coming from the Pacific Ocean. There are buses are coming in from State after State, converging on this city. People are dropping what is important. It is as if Paul Revere had ridden across America and said, Here is the call. Here is the call of your country.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. The gentleman was with us in one of our colleague's office's an hour ago, and one of the other Members answered the phone and said, You know what? That was two people from Oregon and they thought they got the wrong office because they were calling at 9:30 at night and someone actually answered.

Mr. KING of Iowa. And it was a Member of Congress.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. And it was a Member of Congress. And they said, We were talking about this House call on Thursday, and we are coming. We think it is important to be there. Where do we need to be?

So I think you are absolutely right. We have heard about people coming from New Jersey. We know there are people coming from the area here. As people start thinking about this—and it is encouraging that people in Oregon are getting the message. They are going to take the time. They will probably have to leave Wednesday. They will have to leave tomorrow to be here Thursday at noon. They will be out there on the east front. I guess we have to call a press conference, although some might call it a rally, although I guess the speech police here on Capitol Hill and the House of Representatives forbid us to use the term "rally"; is that correct?

Mr. KING of Iowa. There has been a little bit of that PC speech police effort, but I submit that this is a free country and we do have First Amendment rights. If we want to call it a rally, we can call it a rally.

We can call the American people to come to this city and listen to the model of the people from Oregon who are willing to drop everything and head to the sound of the microphone, some would say head to the sound of the call to this mission to save freedom.

At the core of everything that we have said here tonight is the threat to American freedom, and it can be saved by the American people and no one else. And nothing that we say in the debate, no Member of Congress can come up with a new argument that is going to sway the people that have gravitated towards their power and their political base, or their fear perhaps of maybe losing a chairmanship, or their desire to get a gavel and be a Chair, or somebody who needs a project in their district, all of those things have to be taking place.

But what can happen is real American people can let these Members of Congress know that they want to hang onto their freedom. If they are willing

to come from the Pacific Ocean, from the Midwest, from Michigan, across, up and down the Atlantic seaboard, to come into this city, the Members of Congress are going to have to hear and they are going to listen.

And, by the way, I don't believe it will be something that a bill comes to the floor with the American people all around the outside of this Capitol and that the bill gets voted down on this floor. It doesn't really work that way. It would be more likely the majority leader coming to the microphone and saying, We have a few technicalities to work out on this bill, please stay tuned, and he will walk off the floor.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. If the gentleman would yield, the real sign of success is that the bill doesn't come to the floor. The real statement of success is that we do have a bill that comes to the floor.

Mr. AKIN. A good bill.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. A good bill that recognizes the ultimate and the necessity that we give freedom and power back to the American people and that we don't take it from them.

If you are doing 1,900 pages, that is saying we are taking your freedom. You don't need 1,990 pages to say, You know what, we are going to make it easier for you to exercise your freedom in these areas.

Mr. AKIN. Would it be okay, I would like to come back to that call just an hour or two ago from the people in Oregon.

I am thinking, you know, there are not that many people out there that can afford to just drop whatever they are doing, cancel their plans, buy an expensive airplane ticket, come to a strange city, figure out if you are going to get a rental car and survive the traffic.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Take the subway.

Mr. AKIN. You know, that is a pretty high threshold. And yet the thing that I love about this country is all across America when you fly back at night in those airplanes and you see those lights across the countryside, all of those lights of people who love freedom in this country, and they are willing to just do that and say, Stop. And they come down here and they feel powerless and they feel small, and yet they come down here and they want to say, Don't you guys remember about freedom? And don't you remember what this country is about? Why is it that you have this absolute, instinctive desire to always build more government and take our freedom away? When has that ever produced good results?

I just think that is why Ronald Reagan loved this country, because he saw all of those different people that were Americans that loved freedom. He didn't see all of the political shenanigans, the false promises. I won't spend a dime more, I will spend \$1.2 trillion more instead. He didn't see that. He just saw all those freedom-loving people out there just chasing the dream that was in their hearts.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. The other thing that they are telling us, they are saying before you take on health care, why don't you fix what you have already taken and figure out, you know, No Child Left Behind, the way it was designed and implemented, after 8 years, more people here believe it doesn't work, but a whole lot of people in the grass roots America are saying, That doesn't work.

It is kind of like why don't you go back and maybe devolve the authority of No Child Left Behind and let's take a different approach and do some of the things with some of these other programs. You know, before you take on this massive responsibility, fix what you have already put into place.

Mr. AKIN. But government never gives up power, though.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. That is the problem. And before you take this on, why don't you get back to a balanced budget.

You know, it is the commonsense things that people, it gets to be a phrase that is overused, but it is the things that people are doing around their kitchen table.

□ 2310

Today, I ran into some friends of mine from the company where I used to work, and there the industry is down about 30 percent, the office furniture industry. What they have done is the workers at the company, they have all had to sacrifice. They work 9 out of 10 days, and the 10th day is a day off. It's a day that they don't get paid for. That is an automatic 10 percent reduction in their pay. At the same time, they are also not getting the same level of profit sharing, contributions to 401(k)s, their health care premiums or their deductibles have gone up. They're figuring that they maybe have lost 15 to 20 percent of their discretionary income over the last year. Do you see that in Washington? We haven't made those decisions to get back to a balanced budget.

Mr. KING of Iowa. We have grown government instead.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. We have grown government. We are a growing industry, and we're growing it on the backs of our kids and grandkids.

So my constituents are saying—and all across the State, because we tried this in Michigan, we tried to grow Michigan's economy and make us more competitive by increasing taxes, increasing regulations and all those types of things. And guess what? Mr. President, you don't have to go talk to your economist to figure out if your strategy is going to work. All you need to do is look at Michigan. It doesn't work.

What we now need to do is we need to get back to the basics here, that's what my constituents are telling me, get back to the basics, don't try to take on more, because you can't even handle what you've got.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I just went in and looked at a Web site, Constitution

Daily, and it has on it this: 682 Federal agencies. Now, think about what that means. You have subagencies, departments of 682 regulators. And one thing that you will never see is a single company, not one company, a Fortune 500 company, a small little business, not one company in America would be foolish enough to put on their Web site or announce that they are in compliance with all the regulations that can be generated by 682 Federal agencies, let alone the State agencies that are there, plus the taxes that are on top of that and all the bureaucrats that have to be paid for out of the profit of the private sector companies.

There are two sectors to this economy. There is the private sector that produces goods and services that have value. And the way you determine that value is, are people willing to pay for that service and it is essentially rooted in the necessities of life. And then the surplus income goes to recreational and those kinds of investments. That's the private sector.

The other sector, the government sector, is—and that's where I am not very charitable—I say that's the parasitic sector. It drains the vitality of the private sector. And this government has been growing and growing the public sector, the government part, increasing taxes, hiring more regulators for the 682 agencies, and they want to create new agencies. There are 111 new agencies. So our 682, what would that be, 793 agencies? I have the list here of 111 new Federal bureaucracies created by the Pelosi health care bill. It's on both sides.

Mr. AKIN. Is that a record?

Mr. KING of Iowa. The Committee for the Establishment of the Native American Health and Wellness Foundation, that's the last one.

Mr. AKIN. I've got to believe that's a record, isn't it? Have we ever passed a bill that created 1,100—

Mr. KING of Iowa. I would submit that no one has ever conceived of a number this big before or a bill this big before. I think it's not only a record; it's beyond the imagination of anybody at this point.

Mr. AKIN. On Thursday at 12 o'clock, Congressman KING, are you going to be out there on the steps of the Capitol?

Mr. KING of Iowa. I will be on the steps of the Capitol at noon on Thursday. I will be there with a large group of patriots, yourselves, gentlemen—Mr. HOEKSTRA and Mr. AKIN—myself, MICHELE BACHMANN and others. We will be there standing up for freedom, Mr. Speaker, and so will the American people, and so will Jon Voight and so will Mark Levin. We are going to see a gathering of patriots that speak up and speak out to preserve and protect the freedom that our Founding Fathers and everyone who has put on a uniform to defend this country has defended in one way or another, and many patriots that didn't put on a uniform that stood up for America.

And I can imagine blue collar people, white collar people, retired people,

young people looking across at Washington, D.C. that have been wondering, what can I do, what can I do, and deciding, I'm going to climb in my car, my Detroit-made car or Michigan-made car—

Mr. HOEKSTRA. We hope so.

Mr. KING of Iowa. And drive that across the countryside, whatever it takes, park here and take the Metro in because parking is going to be hard, but join these people coming here to the Capitol here in Washington, D.C. And some of them will decide they can't quite afford the time and they will go to district offices, inside the offices, out on the streets. I know that there is going to be a ceremonial reading of the bill in at least one location outside a district office. That will take at least 48 hours for anyone to fast read through this 1,990-page bill.

Mr. AKIN. But if you do, there are a lot of interesting trap doors, smoke and mirrors in that bill, a lot of very interesting things. One of them that I thought was absolutely amazing, we talk about tort reform, that is, limiting the punitive damages. Different States have passed that and have the effect of dropping their medical insurance costs in the State by as much as 20 percent is my understanding. At least Texas had a very good effect by dropping that.

This bill has a different kind of tort reform. It says any State that has done tort reform, you can't have any of the medical benefits that your taxes are going to go for. So it's a reverse tort—

Mr. KING of Iowa. Well, furthermore, if I could just briefly, and then yield back to the gentleman from Michigan, but it also says in tort reform that if States are going to try any of these pilot projects, they can't limit attorneys' fees or impose caps on damages. So how are you going to reform tort if you can't limit attorneys' fees or impose caps on damages? It is: you can fly, but we're going to cut your wings off.

The gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. One interesting thing, they talk about this being a national health care bill, and we know all the gyrations that the Speaker is going through right now to get those last few votes. Can the gentleman from Iowa tell me how they got the votes of the Congress persons from Hawaii?

Mr. KING of Iowa. I do not know, and I would be happy to yield.

Mr. AKIN. That sounds like a good—you got me. What's the story?

Mr. HOEKSTRA. The bill doesn't apply to Hawaii.

Mr. AKIN. It doesn't apply to Hawaii?

Mr. HOEKSTRA. It doesn't apply to Hawaii. Hawaii is exempt.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Hawaii is exempt from 1,990 pages?

Mr. HOEKSTRA. It is within the first couple of hundred pages because Hawaii has done kind of their own thing. But go to the bill, I believe it's in the

first 300 pages. I read it over the weekend.

Mr. AKIN. I wonder what Hawaii real estate is going to do if this thing were to pass?

Mr. KING of Iowa. You know, I may just go to Hawaii if this thing passes.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Remember, they may have done some bad things at the State level, but Hawaii is exempt.

Mr. AKIN. So the only people exempt from the bill then is Congress and Hawaii.

Mr. KING of Iowa. That would be it, Mr. AKIN. I mean, I don't know if that's all the answers; but that comes to mind for me, too.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. But these are the kinds of surprises that you will find as you read through 1,990 pages. Because, again, this is not about the quality and quantity of health care; this is about getting the votes to grab that from the American people.

Mr. KING of Iowa. But is Hawaii also then exempt from the tax increases? And are they exempt from the lack of tort reform and exempt from all of these pieces that are bad?

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I think that's on page 492, and I haven't gotten there yet.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Are they exempt from funding for abortions? Are they exempt from funding for illegal aliens? Are they exempt from lawsuit abuse, tax increases, or Medicare cuts?

Mr. HOEKSTRA. The commissioner shall decide that.

Mr. KING of Iowa. The commissioner shall decide, one of 3,425.

Mr. AKIN. Is it commissioner or czar? Did they change that? Is it a czar or a commissar or a commissioner? What are they calling this one?

Mr. KING of Iowa. I call him a commissar. I think that's the appropriate name for someone like that.

Mr. AKIN. That covers them all, yes.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I thank our colleagues for doing this and remind the American people, this is the opportunity on Thursday on a number of different levels to make their voices heard.

I thank my colleague for yielding and leading this Special Order tonight.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentlemen from Michigan and Missouri.

Mr. AKIN. And also, Congressman KING, thank you for being part of calling the invitation, taking the initiative just as a Member of Congress to call the people of America to come to their Capitol Building and express their opinion.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Well, we stand together in our call for freedom and the call for the American people to exercise that freedom and come to this Capitol. And that is Thursday at noon, day after tomorrow. Let your voices be heard. And if thousands of Americans come to this city, we will be able to save our freedom and be able to own the health insurance policy that you choose and keep the government's

hands off our health care. And those that can't come to this city, we ask them to come to district offices or pick up the phone. The American people shut down comprehensive amnesty 3 years ago twice; we can shut down socialized medicine. We can do it, and it starts on Thursday.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I thank the gentlemen that have joined me tonight, and I yield back the balance of my time.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HOLT (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

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

Mr. CUMMINGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SESTAK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MASSA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mrs. BACHMANN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. BIGGERT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. BLACKBURN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. BONO MACK, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. CAPITO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. EMERSON, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. FALLIN, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. GRANGER, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JENKINS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MYRICK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. SCHMIDT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, November 10.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, November 10.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, for 5 minutes, November 4, 5, and 6.

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

Mr. DEAL of Georgia, for 5 minutes, November 5.

#### SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The Speaker announced her signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 475. An act to amend the Servicemembers Civil relief Act to guarantee the

equity of spouses of military personnel with regard to matters of residency, and for other purposes.

S. 509. An act to authorize a major medical facility project at the Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center, Walla Walla, Washington, and for other purposes.

#### ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, November 4, 2009, at 10 a.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4424. A letter from the Secretaries, Departments of Agriculture and Health and Human Services, transmitting the Departments' report on Thefts, Losses, or Releases of Select Agents or Toxins for the period January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008, as required by the Public Health Security and Bioterrorism Preparedness and Response Act of 2002, Pub. L. 107-188; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4425. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the situation in or in relation to the Democratic Republic of the Congo that was declared in Executive Order 13413 of October 27, 2006, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4426. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 118-09, certification of a proposed amendment to a manufacturing license agreement for the export of defense articles and defense services, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4427. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 109-09, certification of a proposed amendment to a manufacturing license agreement for the export of defense articles and defense services, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4428. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 121-09, certification of a proposed permanent export license for the export of defense articles and related firearms, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4429. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 091-09, certification of a proposed technical assistance agreement to include the export of technical data, and defense services, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4430. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 115-09, certification of a proposed technical assistance agreement to include the export of technical data, and defense articles, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Con-

trol Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4431. A letter from the Staff Director, Commission on Civil Rights, transmitting notification that the Commission recently appointed members to the Indiana Advisory Committee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4432. A letter from the Staff Director, Commission on Civil Rights, transmitting notification that the Commission recently appointed members to the Arizona Advisory Committee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4433. A letter from the Staff Director, Commission on Civil Rights, transmitting notification that the Commission recently appointed members to the Hawaii Advisory Committee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4434. A letter from the Staff Director, Commission on Civil Rights, transmitting notification that the Commission recently appointed members to the Utah Advisory Committee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4435. A letter from the Staff Director, Commission on Civil Rights, transmitting notification that the Commission recently appointed members to the South Dakota Advisory Committee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4436. A letter from the Staff Director, Commission on Civil Rights, transmitting notification that the Commission recently appointed members to the Nebraska Advisory Committee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4437. A letter from the Staff Director, Commission on Civil Rights, transmitting notification that the Commission recently appointed members to the Michigan Advisory Committee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4438. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Upper Mississippi River, Mile 699.8 to 702.5 [COTP Sector Upper Mississippi River-07-012] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received October 15, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4439. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone Regulations; Gasparilla Pass, FL [COTP Sector St. Petersburg 07-185] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received October 15, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4440. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Homosassa River Raft Race, Homosassa, Florida [COTP Sector St. Petersburg 07-198] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received October 15, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4441. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Roma Lodge Italian Festival, Racine, Wisconsin [CDG09-06-138] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received October 15, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4442. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; St. Marys River, Sault Ste. Marie, Michigan [CGD09-06-140] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received October 15, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4443. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety

Zone; Nissan Xterra Midwest Championship, Milwaukee, Wisconsin [CGD09-06-142] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received October 15, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4444. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; 2006 Great Lakes Water Cross Tour, Sheboygan, Wisconsin [GD09-06-145] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received October 15, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4445. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Bay City Air Show, Saginaw River, Bay City, MI [CGD09-06-149] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received October 15, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4446. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Private Party Fireworks, Webster, NY [CGD09-06-150] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received October 15, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4447. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; General Motors (GM) Style Event, Detroit River, Detroit, MI [CGD09-08-001] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received October 15, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4448. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Missouri River, Mile 300.00 to 000.0 [COTP Sector Upper Mississippi River-07-013] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received October 15, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4449. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Upper Mississippi River, Mile 454.0 to 456.0 [COTP Sector Upper Mississippi River-07-014] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received October 15, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4450. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Upper Mississippi River, Mile 178.0 to 184.0 [COTP Sector Upper Mississippi River-07-015] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received October 15, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4451. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Missouri River, Mile 615.0 to 615.6 [COTP Sector Upper Mississippi River-07-016] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received October 15, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4452. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Upper Mississippi River, Mile 742.7 to 743.3 [COTP Sector Upper Mississippi River-07-017] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received October 15, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4453. A letter from the Chairman, National Transportation Safety Board, transmitting a copy of the National Transportation Safety Board's response to OMB's request for views on H.R. 3619, the "Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PERLMUTTER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 884. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3639) to amend the Credit Card Accountability Responsibility and Disclosure Act of 2009 to establish an earlier effective date for various consumer protections, and for other purposes (Rept. 111-326). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 885. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2868) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to extend, modify, and recodify the authority of the Secretary of Homeland Security to enhance security and protect against acts of terrorism against chemical facilities, and for other purposes (Rept. 111-327). Referred to the House 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:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia (for himself, Mr. NADLER of New York, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. WEINER, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas):

H.R. 3986. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to clarify the availability of Federal habeas corpus relief for a person who is sentenced to death though actually innocent; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLUNT (for himself, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BURGESS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. GINGREY of Georgia):

H.R. 3987. A bill to amend titles XI and XVIII of the Social Security Act to promote the use of health information technology to better coordinate health care; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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.

By Mr. BOCCIERI:

H.R. 3988. A bill to amend section 313 of the Tariff Act of 1930 to specify articles that qualify as commercially interchangeable merchandise for purposes of certain duty drawback; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. LUMMIS:

H.R. 3989. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study to determine the suitability and feasibility of adding the Heart Mountain Relocation Center, in the State of Wyoming, as a unit of the National Park System; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 3990. A bill to grant the Congressional Gold Medal to John H. Johnson in recognition of his outstanding contributions to the United States; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California (for himself, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HARE, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. PIERLUISI, and Mr. SABLAN):

H.R. 3991. A bill to ensure that American workers are able to follow, without financial harm, the recommendations of their em-

ployer and public health authorities to stay home when they have symptoms of a contagious disease that may put co-workers, customers, or the public at risk; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DRIBBAUS:

H.R. 3992. A bill to amend the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000 to provide compensation for certain persons injured in the course of employment at the Feed Materials Production Center (commonly referred to as "Fernald") or the Piqua Organic Moderated Reactor in Ohio; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, 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.

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 3993. A bill to require accurate and reasonable disclosure of the terms and conditions of prepaid telephone calling cards and services; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself and Mrs. SCHMIDT):

H.R. 3994. A bill to establish a program to reduce injuries and deaths caused by cellphone use and texting while driving; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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.

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.R. 3995. A bill to provide additional resources for Federal investigations and prosecutions of crimes related to the 2008 Financial Crisis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, 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.

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts:

H.R. 3996. A bill to improve financial stability, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, Agriculture, and Ways and Means, 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.

By Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California):

H.R. 3997. A bill to permit each current member of the Board of Directors of the Office of Compliance to serve for 3 terms; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 3998. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify the service treatable as service engaged in combat with the enemy for utilization of non-official evidence for proof of service-connection in a combat-related disease or injury; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CARDOZA (for himself, Mr. COSTA, and Mr. RADANOVICH):

H.R. 3999. A bill to direct the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation to initiate consultations under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 on the Central Valley Project and the California State Water Project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 4000. A bill to provide assistance to local educational agencies for the prevention and reduction of conflict and violence; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HELLER (for himself, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Ms. BERKLEY, and Ms. TITUS):

H.R. 4001. A bill to provide for environmental restoration activities and forest management activities in the Lake Tahoe Basin; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, and Agriculture, 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.

By Mr. HENSARLING:

H.R. 4002. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to clarify that any delay in changes to terms applies only to increases, not decreases; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. HINCHEY (for himself, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. ENGEL):

H.R. 4003. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study to evaluate resources in the Hudson River Valley in the State of New York to determine the suitability and feasibility of establishing the site as a unit of the National Park System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. RUSH (for himself, Mr. HARE, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois):

H.R. 4004. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of designating the study area as the Black Metropolis National Heritage Area in the State of Illinois, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HOLT:

H.R. 4005. A bill to place reasonable safeguards on the use of surveillance and other authorities under the USA PATRIOT Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, and Intelligence (Permanent Select), 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.

By Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona:

H.R. 4006. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for Indian veterans health care coordinators, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LEE of New York (for himself and Mr. HUNTER):

H.R. 4007. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to make grants to 5 States to establish medical malpractice tribunal pilot programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MYRICK:

H.R. 4008. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1639 Dickerson Boulevard in Monroe, North Carolina, as the "Second Lieutenant Samuel I. Parker Postal Carrier Annex"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 4009. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Home Rule Act to establish the Office of the District Attorney for the District of Columbia, headed by a locally elected and independent District Attorney, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. SCHRADER:

H.R. 4010. A bill to amend the Act of August 9, 1955, to authorize the Confederated Tribes of the Siletz Indians of Oregon to obtain 99-year lease authority for trust land; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas (for himself and Mr. GOODLATTE):

H.R. 4011. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, with respect to organized retail theft, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TIAHRT:

H.R. 4012. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a 5-year recovery period for new nonresidential real property, and a 10-year recovery period for qualified leasehold improvement property, placed in service after December 31, 2009, and before January 1, 2012; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TIAHRT:

H.R. 4013. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a 5-year carryback of operating losses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. BARTLETT,

Mr. INGLIS, Mr. COBLE, Ms. FOX, Mr. CALVERT, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. LATTI, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. WAMP, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mrs. MYRICK, and Mr. WOLF):

H. Con. Res. 207. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress regarding the victory of the United States in The Cold War and the Fall of the Berlin Wall; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CHILDERS (for himself and Mr. HARPER):

H. Res. 886. A resolution supporting the goals and purposes of National Teach Ag Day; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. ANDREWS (for himself, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. CASSIDY, and Mr. SCALISE):

H. Res. 887. A resolution recognizing the World Trade Organization member, Chinese Taipei's, accession to the Government Procurement Agreement on July 15, 2009, and extending hope and good faith that this will promote its domestic economy and position in the global economy; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, 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.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 24: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia and Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 43: Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. WALZ, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, and Mr. GERLACH.

H.R. 235: Mr. PIERLUISI.

H.R. 268: Mr. LATTI, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. CONAWAY, and Mr. PENCE.

H.R. 406: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 558: Mr. KENNEDY and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H.R. 571: Mr. STARK and Mr. SCHRADER.

H.R. 613: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 716: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 855: Mr. BACHUS.

H.R. 932: Mr. ARCURI.

H.R. 1086: Mr. SIMPSON.

H.R. 1126: Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut.

H.R. 1132: Mr. MACK and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 1175: Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

H.R. 1177: Ms. KOSMAS.

H.R. 1182: Ms. BERKLEY and Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 1220: Mr. MURTHA.

H.R. 1240: Mr. EDWARDS of Texas.

H.R. 1250: Mr. SIREN and Mr. WILSON of Ohio.

H.R. 1326: Mr. CLEAVER.

H.R. 1362: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 1441: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 1521: Mr. PENCE, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.

H.R. 1526: Mr. BERRY, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.R. 1548: Mr. CASTLE.

H.R. 1557: Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. POMEROY, and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona.

H.R. 1597: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona.

H.R. 1704: Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 1745: Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H.R. 1751: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 1770: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.

H.R. 1784: Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado.

H.R. 1816: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.

H.R. 1826: Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 1829: Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee.

H.R. 1835: Mr. HARE, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. SHUSTER.

H.R. 1837: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 1866: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 1884: Mr. HODES, Mr. CARNAHAN, and Ms. SCHWARTZ.

H.R. 1925: Mrs. HALVORSON.

H.R. 1941: Mr. WATT.

H.R. 1948: Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 1977: Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 2089: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 2160: Mr. YOUNG of Florida and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 2243: Mr. MCINTYRE.

H.R. 2246: Mr. CARNAHAN.

H.R. 2256: Mr. MINNICK.

H.R. 2365: Ms. SHEA-PORTER and Mr. HODES.

H.R. 2372: Mr. KLINE of Minnesota and Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 2377: Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 2378: Ms. KAPTUR and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.

H.R. 2446: Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN.

H.R. 2477: Mr. STEARNS.

H.R. 2607: Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. PITTS, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. CONAWAY, and Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.

H.R. 2619: Mr. BARTON of Texas.

H.R. 2698: Mr. HALL of New York.

H.R. 2699: Mr. HALL of New York.

H.R. 2708: Mr. MATHESON.

H.R. 2709: Mr. HARE.

H.R. 2717: Mr. HALL of Texas.

H.R. 2737: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. INSLER, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 2766: Mr. SARBANES and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 2831: Mrs. HALVORSON.

H.R. 2866: Mr. ROSKAM.

H.R. 2897: Mr. GRJALVA.

H.R. 2941: Mr. INSLER.

H.R. 2946: Mr. SPRATT.

H.R. 2999: Mr. MICHAUD and Mr. MORAN of Kansas.

H.R. 3078: Mr. SCHOCK.

H.R. 3104: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 3116: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 3217: Mr. GERLACH, Mr. ROYCE, and Mr. PLATTS.

H.R. 3251: Mr. MACK.

H.R. 3266: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 3339: Mr. SABLAN.

H.R. 3353: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 3401: Mr. LARSEN of Washington and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 3454: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 3464: Mr. BLUNT.

H.R. 3486: Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 3511: Ms. LEE of California and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 3554: Ms. KOSMAS and Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut.

H.R. 3560: Mr. BAIRD.

H.R. 3564: Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 3608: Mr. KAGEN.

H.R. 3623: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN and Mr. JOHN-SON of Georgia.

H.R. 3644: Mr. MCNERNEY and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 3656: Mr. HARPER, Mr. MASSA, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. EHLERS.

H.R. 3660: Mr. DENT.

H.R. 3715: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 3728: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 3735: Mr. ROONEY.

H.R. 3742: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. WU, and Mr. MELANCON.

H.R. 3745: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. STARK.

H.R. 3752: Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 3786: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 3787: Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 3806: Ms. JENKINS.

H.R. 3822: Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 3824: Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 3845: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 3851: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. PAYNE, and Ms. GIFFORDS.

H.R. 3855: Mr. FILNER, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. FALDOMAVEGA, and Mrs. CAPPS.

H.R. 3904: Ms. CHU and Ms. SUTTON.

H.R. 3922: Mrs. MYRICK.

H.R. 3926: Mr. DINGELL, Mr. MASSA, and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 3943: Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. EDWARDS of Texas, Mr. BACA, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. REHBERG, and Mr. PLATTS.

H.R. 3948: Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. MICA, and Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 3952: Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 3965: Ms. CHU.

H.R. 3970: Mr. PLATTS, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Mr. TIBERI.

H.R. 3983: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 3984: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H. J. Res. 11: Mr. TIAHRT.

H. J. Res. 42: Mr. SIMPSON.

H. Con. Res. 49: Mr. NYE.

H. Con. Res. 168: Mr. LAMBORN.

H. Con. Res. 206: Mr. LAMBORN.

H. Res. 542: Ms. JENKINS.

H. Res. 615: Mr. LUCAS.

H. Res. 664: Mr. AKIN, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. SKELTON, and Mr. BARTLETT.

H. Res. 700: Mr. SNYDER and Mr. TOWNS.

H. Res. 708: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H. Res. 711: Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts.

H. Res. 752: Mrs. BIGGERT.

H. Res. 762: Mr. ARCURI.

H. Res. 803: Mr. MAFFEI.

H. Res. 835: Mr. WAMP.

H. Res. 867: Mr. FLEMING, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. LEVIN, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGERN of California, Mr. COSTA, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. INGLIS, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. WAMP, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. OLSON, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. BOREN, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. SPACE, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. SCHAUER, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. SCHOCK, Mrs. EMERSON, Mrs. HALVORSON, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. HOYER, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. HARPER, Mr. ELLSWORTH, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CHANDLER, Ms. KOSMAS, Mr. CULBERSON, and Mr. SULLIVAN.

H. Res. 869: Mr. CAO and Mr. ROSKAM.

H. Res. 870: Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. TIAHRT, Mrs. BIGBERT, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. COBLE, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. McCOTTER, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. MICA, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. DREIER, and Mr. WITTMAN.

H. Res. 874: Mr. HERGER.

H. Res. 877: Mr. HERGER, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. WELCH, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. ISSA, Mrs. BONO MACK, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. FARR, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. STEARNS, Mr.

SCALISE, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. RADANOVICH, and Mr. HILL.

H. Res. 879: Mr. ARCURI.

---

#### 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. RANGEL

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Ways and Means in H.R. 3962, the Affordable Health Care for America Act, do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

##### OFFERED BY MR. TOWNS

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform in H.R. 3962, the Affordable Health Care for America Act, do not contain

any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

The amendment to be offered by Representative THOMPSON of Mississippi or a designee, to H.R. 2868, the Chemical Facilities Anti-Terrorism Act of 2009, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

The amendment to be offered by Representative HENSARLING or a designee, to H.R. 3639 does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9(d), 9(e), or 9(f) of rule XXI.

---

#### DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 3691: Mr. LINDER.