



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 156

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, MARCH 19, 2010

No. 41

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. DEGETTE).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 19, 2010.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DIANA DEGETTE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer: Lord, our God, be our helper and protector. This Nation was born out of the dreams of freedom and the enlightenment of human potential. Help us, in our day, to realize fulfillment of the hopes and expectations of Your people.

“Faith is the confident assurance concerning what we hope for and the conviction about things unseen. Through faith we perceive that the world was created by the Word of God, and what is now visible came into being through the invisible.”

Lord, our Founders all died in faith. They did not obtain what was promised, but saw it from afar. They were always searching for a better and lasting homeland. Faith is therefore a hopeful pilgrimage to Your presence, 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 her approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. HERGER led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. There is one group of people we don't talk about enough with respect to the health insurance debate. That is young people. They're the most likely group of people in this country to go uninsured, but they get sick, and when they get sick, they often become saddled with debts that stay with them and their families for the rest of their lives.

With the health insurance reform bill this House will pass that all changes. We have included affordability credits that will help young adults who are at the beginning of their career and earning less income to get insurance. We aim to give people stability by guaranteeing affordable insurance marketplaces for those who switch their jobs, start their own businesses, or seek more education, as younger people are more likely to do.

And maybe most importantly, immediately on passage of the bill, we allow young people up to the age of 26 to stay on their parents' health insurance.

There is nothing more valuable in life than your health, but for far too many young people, protecting their health is simply too expensive.

Let's move forward on health insurance reform for them.

SLAUGHTER SOLUTION

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

Mr. HERGER. Madam Speaker, the Democratic leadership has been pushing the Slaughter solution rule to send the Senate health care bill to the President's desk without a separate House vote.

A vote for this rule is a vote for the Cornhusker kickback, a vote for the Louisiana purchase, and a vote for every other backroom deal in the bill. It's a vote for taxpayer-funded abortion. It's a vote to force Americans to buy from the same health insurance companies that the President has been attacking but at even a higher price.

Madam Speaker, Congress needs to understand that the American people won't be fooled. A vote for the Slaughter solution rule is a vote for the Senate's disastrous government takeover of health care. Vote “no.”

WOMEN AND HEALTH CARE

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Rising health care costs and inadequate coverage burden many Americans, women in particular. It's unfair and it's wrong.

Women can be denied and charged a higher insurance premium than men for just having what's called a pre-existing condition. Let me give you an example of what that preexisting condition is.

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.

H1659

In 2006, attorney Jody Neal-Post tried to get health insurance but was rejected. Why? Because of treatment she received after a domestic abuse incident. Her insurer told her that her medical history made her a higher risk, more likely to end up in an emergency room and need care.

1.3 million American women are victims of physical assault by an intimate partner each year, and 85 percent of domestic violence victims are women. We can help the one out of every four women who are victims of domestic violence by stopping them from being victimized again by their insurance companies.

We can protect our grandmothers, mothers, aunts, sisters, and daughters by ending this abusive practice now. Pass health care reform now.

UNCERTAIN CBO SCORE

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, the preliminary cost estimate from the Congressional Budget Office for the health care takeover is \$940 billion. It is bizarre. Some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are spinning this number.

How many Americans today actually believe that the number will hold at \$940 billion and will decrease deficits? I doubt there are very few people out there who are willing to count on Congress to actually hold the line on spending. That defies history and reality.

The facts are that even the CBO says this is uncertain, and the CBO has not extrapolated estimates further into the future because the uncertainties surrounding them are magnified even more.

The bottom line is that only in Washington can you claim that Congress will borrow a trillion dollars and somehow save money. The only certainty is NFIB projects this bill will kill 1.6 million jobs.

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

GUN SHOWS

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Speaker, this week we learned that one of the handguns used by the Pentagon police shooter originated in a Las Vegas gun show. As this incident reveals, anyone wanting to attack us would best be advised to shop at a gun show. That is because gun shows don't require sellers to have licenses or maintain records. This loophole fosters a Wild West environment where criminals and terrorists can flaunt local, State, and Federal laws just to get their weapons just like the Pentagon shooter.

A recent gun show audit revealed that 74 percent of sellers approached by investigators completed sales to people who appeared to be criminals or straw purchasers. Gun shows will sell to people who are so dangerous we won't even let them board an airplane.

If we're serious about protecting our Nation, we have got to get serious about closing the gun show loophole.

HEALTH CARE POLICE

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, if the health care bill passes, the IRS will "verify" that American citizens have "acceptable" health care insurance every month. I say "American citizens" because the bill bars imposing health care taxes and penalties on illegals who will receive health care under this bill.

The IRS will charge fines up to \$2,250, or 2 percent of your annual income—whichever is higher—for failure to buy that government-approved health insurance.

The IRS will need over 16,000 new health care police to snoop around in your bank account. That's more people than live in my home of Humble, Texas. The IRS health care police will have the power to confiscate tax refund checks. They can levy bank accounts, garnish wages, and could put you in jail for failure to pay the piper, for failure to buy those health care insurance premiums.

The health care bill costs too much, it taxes too much, and it invades people's privacy. Now we're going to have the health care police courtesy of the good old IRS.

And that's just the way it is.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Mr. SCHAUER. No one knows more than me the misleading information and outright lies presented by the health insurance industry to confuse the American people. They have spent over \$300,000 in slick TV ads in my district to do it.

Here's why on Sunday we must pass health care reform. To do nothing, to fail, will guarantee double-digit health insurance premium increases for middle class families and small businesses. I'm on the side of the people, not the powerful insurance companies.

In my district, this new law will enhance the insurance company coverage of over 400,000 people; extend coverage to over 30,000 uninsured people; improve Medicare for 109,000 beneficiaries, including closing the doughnut hole; give tax credits and assistance to up to 167,000 families and 12,000 small businesses to afford coverage. And get this, it will reduce the Federal budget deficit by \$138 billion in the first 10 years and \$1.2 trillion over the next 10 years.

It's time to put the American people first.

AMERICAN TRAFFIC SAFETY SERVICES ASSOCIATION

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

Mr. WITTMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the American Traffic Safety Services Association upon its celebration of its 40th anniversary this past year. Headquartered in Fredericksburg, Virginia, ATSSA represents 1,600 member companies and individuals in the roadway safety infrastructure industry and has been the Nation's leading voice in roadway safety.

Recently, ATSSA has committed to reducing American roadway fatalities from the current average of 40,000 to zero through its reauthorization policy Toward Zero Deaths.

Since 2006, ATSSA has trained over 15,000 work zone workers in safety and proper setup and maintenance of work zones, helping to reduce the number of deaths for work zone workers and motorists. ATSSA members also help ensure that travel is as safe as possible.

For the past 40 years, ATSSA has been improving roadway safety, raising awareness of the importance of roadway safety, and training Americans on proper roadway safety. It is my hope that they will continue those efforts for the next 40 years and beyond.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, now is the time to address our health care crisis. Today, too many families are suffering. Too many cannot afford their medication, lack of access to essential care, or can't get coverage because of a preexisting condition. This bill eliminates these tragic situations.

For those who oppose this bill, you will have to return to your districts and explain why you didn't close the doughnut hole for seniors; expand Medicaid funding; reduce waste, fraud, and abuse in Medicare; and increase physician reimbursements. You will have to explain why you voted against investing in community health and prohibiting annual and lifetime limits on plans.

In my district alone in Indianapolis, this bill will extend coverage to nearly 75,000 uninsured residents and will decrease costs for over 200,000 families. And it will provide tax incentives to over 15,500 small businesses to help them provide coverage for their employees.

Passing this bill is the right thing to do.

LISTEN TO YOUR CONSCIENCE

(Mr. SMITH of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, I know many Democrats who love our country, who are dedicated public servants, and who are men and women of integrity. In the coming hours and days, I hope they will listen to their conscience, what they know in their heart is right, and take some action to stop a corruption of the legislative process.

If a new health care system is worthy of being enacted, it is worthy of being debated and voted on in an honest and straightforward way. Anything less is a stain on Congress and diminishes our great country.

How we conduct ourselves goes beyond a single bill. It will signal to those across the land, and perhaps to those in other lands, whether we deserve their respect or have justified their ridicule.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has agreed to a concurrent resolution of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 54. Concurrent resolution recognizing the life of Orlando Zapata Tamayo, who died on February 23, 2010, in the custody of the Government of Cuba, and calling for a continued focus on the promotion of internationally recognized human rights, listed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, in Cuba.

□ 0915

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3644, OCEAN, COASTAL, AND WATERSHED EDUCATION ACT

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1192 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1192

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3644) to direct the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to establish education and watershed programs which advance environmental literacy, including preparedness and adaptability for the likely impacts of climate change in coastal watershed regions. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions of the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural

Resources; (2) the further amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, if offered by Representative Capps of California or her designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI, shall be considered as read, and shall be separately debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; (3) the amendment to the further amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules, if offered by Representative Flake of Arizona or his designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order except those arising under clause 10 of rule XXI, shall be considered as read, shall be separately debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question; and (4) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 1612) to amend the Public Lands Corps Act of 1993 to expand the authorization of the Secretaries of Agriculture, Commerce, and the Interior to provide service-learning opportunities on public lands, help restore the Nation's natural, cultural, historic, archaeological, recreational, and scenic resources, train a new generation of public land managers and enthusiasts, and promote the value of public service. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources; (2) the further amendments printed in part C of the report of the Committee on Rules, each of which may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be in order without intervention of any point of order except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI, shall be considered as read, shall be separately debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. During consideration of an amendment printed in part C of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, the Chair may postpone the question of adoption as though under clause 8 of rule XX.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART). All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. POLIS. I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend

their remarks on House Resolution 1192.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

House Resolution 1192 provides a structured rule for consideration of H.R. 3644, the Ocean, Coastal and Watershed Education Act, with 1 hour of debate in the House equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources.

The rule makes in order the amendment in the nature of a substitute that is printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules, if offered by Representative Capps of California or her designee, which shall be separately debatable for 20 minutes. The rule also makes in order the amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules, if offered by Representative FLAKE or his designee, which shall be separately debatable for 10 minutes.

The rule also provides for consideration of another bill, H.R. 1612, the Public Lands Service Corps Act of 2009, under a structured rule. The rule provides 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources.

The rule makes in order the further amendments printed in part C of the report of the Committee on Rules, each of which may be offered only by a Member designated in the report and shall be separately debatable for 10 minutes.

Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit for both H.R. 3644 and H.R. 1612.

I think this is a very fair rule. The rule provides for consideration of two bills under a structured rule. For H.R. 3644, two of the three amendments that were submitted to the House Rules Committee are made in order, including one Republican amendment and one Democratic amendment. For H.R. 1612, two of the six amendments submitted were made in order, both of which are Republican amendments. So for both of the bills combined, three out of the four amendments that are made in order under this rule are sponsored by Republicans.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule and the underlying bills, the Ocean, Coastal and Watershed Education Act and the Public Land Service Corps Act. The programs within both of these bills benefit districts all across our Nation, from Florida to Alaska, Texas to Minnesota and Colorado. So it is no surprise that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle across the country support these programs.

I would like to thank Chairman RAHALL for his leadership on this important issue and my colleagues, Representatives Capps and GRIJALVA, for their hard work on these bills.

Madam Speaker, we have before us two excellent pieces of legislation, one which would expand and reinvigorate an existing program, the Public Land Corps, by streamlining its management, modernizing its scope and providing new tools to help the program accomplish its mission, and another bill which would expand two National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration grant programs that are aimed at enhancing environmental education related to water resources upon which economic development and human health depend.

H.R. 1612 will help repair and restore our Nation's public lands while employing and training thousands of young Americans and promoting a culture of public service.

This legislation will help provide real employment and training to young people who need it, particularly in a recession, while improving the condition of our priceless natural and cultural resources. We live in a time when environmental science education is just as critical for a healthy environment as land conservation or wildlife protection. Our citizens are empowered by being informed and educated enough to make important decisions in their own daily lives about environmental issues based on sometimes complicated scientific evidence. We need to supply our children and the next generation across our country with enough scientific knowledge to tackle the environmental challenges that they will face in the coming years and to make educated choices as consumers.

This bill also takes a decisive step forward in finishing desperately needed work on our national park lands, forests, wildlife refuges and historic sites. As I have said previously, protecting and maintaining our public lands is one of the most important duties that we have as citizens. I was lucky enough to grow up in Boulder, Colorado, hiking in Mount Sanitas, as I did just last weekend when I was back, the Flat Irons and Flagstaff Mountain. If we don't defend America's truly great public lands, we run the risk of being the last generation to enjoy them.

America and Colorado are really defined by our natural character. America is beautiful and needs our help to remain so. We must not let our "spacious skies," our "amber waves of grain" and our "purple mountains majesty" become nothing more than forgotten lines in a song.

The bill recognizes the importance, as well, of our coastal and marine systems and our national marine sanctuaries. Those previously have not been eligible for Public Land Corps projects but are just as worthy and just as important a part of our national heritage for those who reside on the coast.

While Members of this body as well as the American public review the historic health care reform bill we will be taking up in the next few days, we have the opportunity to consider this vital

program that has bipartisan support providing our youth the education and experience they will need to find meaningful employment while gaining civic pride, scientific education and personal responsibility while maintaining and improving our public lands and National Park System.

This program will invest in our young people, reduce youth unemployment, and prepare young people for a lifetime of work experiences. At the same time youth will be repairing and restoring our National Park System and preserving it for the next generation, we also are able to whittle away at the massive backlog of work that has doubled over the last decade to levels around the \$10 billion mark of backlog work that needs to be done. The National Park System has been called America's best idea, and it is past time we give our best attention and respect to the National Park System that it deserves.

Preparing our park system for future generations and preparing young people to face the scientific and environmental challenges that are only beginning to come to fruition is an undertaking of great national importance.

H.R. 3644, the Ocean, Coastal and Watershed Education Act, formally codifies and authorizes two existing programs that have already made great strides in expanding ocean, atmospheric, and environmental literacy in the United States. These programs, the Bay-Watershed Education and Training, which we call B-WET, and the Environmental Literacy Grant, ELG, program deserve Federal recognition and funding for their good work providing educational opportunities from kindergarten all the way through 12th grade.

This legislation gives us an opportunity to consider these vital programs, programs which provide our youth the education and experience that they will need to find meaningful employment in advancing our Nation's progress in science, technology, engineering and math to help keep America globally competitive.

H.R. 3644 codifies two existing environmental education grant programs that were established through the annual appropriations process and are administered by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. Over the past 7 years, these two NOAA education programs have been essential towards advancing ocean and environmental education in the United States. Both programs are very popular in the education community, and in fact, requests for environmental literacy grants are 10 times greater than the appropriated funding levels can support.

Since 2002 and 2005, respectively, the B-WET and ELG programs have connected school children from kindergarten all the way through high school with their ocean and coastal environments. These programs help school children learn about the effects that everyday actions they take have on the environment.

Let's make no mistake about it. Our society is faced with a fundamental lack of scientific understanding, where special interests on all sides frequently undermine the vast scientific consensus on key issues simply by flashy public relations campaigns. We need to make sure that our country is the world leader in innovation and science in order to ensure that our country can overcome new challenges and protect its public health and natural wonders.

In addition to my time growing up in Colorado, I also spent a lot of time in San Diego growing up where the community is as physically, emotionally and economically tied to the ocean and coast as Colorado is to its mountains. Regardless of where someone lives in our great and vast country, whether it's the plains, the mountains, the forests, the coasts or the tundra, our Nation's public spaces, wildlife and environmental health are truly our greatest national treasures, an important part of our national character and who we are. And these pieces of legislation go a long way in our effort to protect them.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 0930

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank my good friend, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), for the time.

I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I would like to take a minute to contrast what the majority is doing today with what it is expected to do this weekend.

Today, the majority has brought forth a rule to provide 1 hour of debate for consideration of H.R. 3644, the Ocean, Coastal, and Watershed Education Act, and another hour of debate for H.R. 1612, the Public Lands Service Corps Act of 2009. That is a total of 2 hours of debate on bills that would direct the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to establish education and watershed programs to advance environmental literacy, and expand the authorization to provide service-learning opportunities on public lands and train public land managers. I thank my good friend for thoroughly detailing and covering what is in those bills.

If the majority proceeds as expected later this weekend, Madam Speaker, the House will prohibit, other than in the rule, all time to debate the Senate health care bill and will send it to the President for his signature. So that bill, the Senate health care bill, would become law even though the House of Representatives would never consider it, never debate the bill. The House, in fact, has never even held a committee meeting on the Senate health care bill.

On Sunday, it is expected that the majority will deem the bill passed, and in a few days it would be law, the signature issue of this President and this congressional majority.

You would think, Madam Speaker, that they would proudly embrace their signature accomplishment. You would think that they would welcome debate on it. But they do not, because they know that the Senate bill is fatally flawed. The American people deserve a full and complete debate in the House on the Senate health care bill, but they won't get it.

Again, let's juxtapose that reality with today's actions.

Today, 2 hours of debate on two non-controversial bills that cost \$300 million and absolutely no debate, no committee hearings on a bill that costs nearly \$1 trillion, covers one-sixth of our economy, and will affect every single American. That is unfair and inappropriate.

Last year, the majority rushed through a 300-page amendment at 3 in the morning that no one was able to read on cap-and-trade. At that time, the American people rightly stood up and demanded that Congress read the bill. After this weekend's action, the people will demand that Congress not only read bills, but that we debate and vote on bills.

It would seem like common sense, Madam Speaker. But with this majority, it often seems as though common sense is the least common of the senses.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. There will be, and I certainly look forward to joining my colleague from Florida, a debate this weekend on the health care bill.

I am glad to see, on issues of our national parks and oceans, we are able to come together. And there are certainly other issues where Members of the body don't agree, but there will be a debate and there will be a rule proposed for that debate. I personally believe there should be several hours of debate, and I am hopeful that there will be 2 or 3 or more hours, which would then give Members on both sides who desire to present their positions the ability to do that.

I do take some issue with the characterization that there has not been a vetting of these issues involved. There have been, over the past year, dozens of hearings, even, very recently, a bipartisan summit that the President convened on health care. There have been many ideas and amendments from both sides of the aisle that have been incorporated into the bill that our committee will be doing a hearing on tomorrow and referring, for consideration of the House as a whole, a rule to consider that important piece of legislation.

Both of these bills that we have before us today under this rule are supported by national, regional, State, and local advocates. They are supported by leaders in education, environment, conservationists, service communities, and business communities.

Through passage of these bills, we are able to bring together the desire of this Congress of a meaningful impact

on creating jobs for young people, training for young people to occupy the jobs of the future, and doing some lasting good in preserving the historic character of our open spaces.

The B-WET and ELG programs are exactly the kind of innovative learning that we need to cultivate an environmentally minded workforce that can compete in the increasingly green economy of the future. By teaching our children not only to enjoy but also appreciate the value and effect of our endangered national treasures, we can truly create a workforce, a community, and a society that values our environment and our national heritage and in which the environment and economy are increasingly intertwined.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend for supporting 2 or 3 hours of debate on one-sixth of our economy.

I would point out that, pursuant to House rules, the deeming, which is presumed will occur with regard to the Senate bill in the debate on the rule itself, that debate is limited to 1 hour. So I would assume the 2 or 3 hours total would be after that bill, the Senate bill, is deemed to have passed by the 1 hour of debate on the rule.

But suffice it to say, it is an improvement that, with regard to one-sixth of the economy, our friends are saying that we should have 2 or 3 hours. But we will continue pressing.

Anyway, I would ask my friend if he has any further speakers. I have none.

Mr. POLIS. I have no additional speakers.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, having said that, since there are no more Members on this side of the aisle who have requested time, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I have here a letter which I will quote, in part, and then submit from a number of environmental groups under the auspices of the Campaign for Environmental Literacy, a group that I have also had the opportunity to work with on education legislation. What I would like to read is a paragraph that describes ELG and B-WET's contributions to our country.

"The ELG program enables NOAA, as the Nation's leading expert on weather, climate, and ocean information, to partner with the Nation's top nonprofit organizations and educators to put this information to good use." ELG funds will allow "the American Association for the Advancement of Science to update climate education standards that are used to guide science education in classrooms and across the country to reflect state-of-the-art science."

"The B-WET grants programs support environmental education which promotes locally relevant, experiential learning in the K-12 environment."

I submit the entirety of the letter for inclusion in the RECORD.

CAMPAIGN FOR ENVIRONMENTAL

LITERACY,
Mar. 18, 2010.

Hon. LOIS CAPPS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE CAPPS: We write to you to indicate our strong support for passage of the Ocean, Coastal, and Watershed Education Act (H.R. 3644). This bill authorizes and strengthens the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's existing Bay-Watershed Education and Training (B-WET) and Environmental Literacy Grants (ELG) programs.

Over the past seven years, these two NOAA education programs have been essential to advancing ocean, atmospheric, and environmental literacy in the United States, a major goal of the U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy Report and the U.S. Ocean Action Plan. They have been well received by the ocean and environmental literacy communities, and in fact, ELG requests for proposals have been oversubscribed by a factor of 10.

The ELG program enables NOAA, as the nation's leading expert on weather, climate and ocean information, to partner with the nation's top non-profit organizations and educators to put this information to good use. For example, these grants have enabled more than 20 million people to gain access to compelling up-to-date weather, climate and ocean information through the Science on a Sphere and Ocean Today Kiosk from Alaska to Hawaii to California to Massachusetts. ELG funds have also allowed the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) to update climate education standards that are used to guide science education in classrooms around the country to reflect state-of-the-art climate science. In addition, ELG grants to the National Science Teachers Association have given thousands of teachers access to the most accurate scientific information on climate, corals and hurricanes.

The B-WET grants programs support environmental education which promotes locally relevant, experiential learning in the K-12 environment. A fundamental goal of the programs are to demonstrate how the quality of the watershed affects the lives of the people who live in it. B-WET programs have now expanded to include the Chesapeake Bay, California, Hawaii, Pacific Northwest, Gulf of Mexico and New England, and this bill will add five new regions as well. B-WET awards to state and local education organizations have provided opportunities to over 125,000 students and 6,200 teachers in 2008 alone.

It is important to now establish these programs in law, consistent with the education mandates provided to NOAA in both the America COMPETES Act (PL 110-69, Sec. 4002) and the Omnibus Public Land Management Act (PL 111-11, Sec. 12304). They are vital to NOAA's ability to execute the educational function of its mission. They have demonstrated their effectiveness, as well as their value to stakeholder communities. And as our nation begins to grapple with the complexities and challenges of a changing climate (and ocean and landscape), they are timely and highly relevant.

Thank you for your consideration of this request. For questions about this letter, please contact James Elder, Campaign for Environmental Literacy (978-526-7768, elder@FundEE.org).

Sincerely,

NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

American Fisheries Society (Gus Rassam, Executive Director);

American Fly Fishing Trade Association (Gary Berlin, President);

American Forest Foundation (Tom Martin, President);
 American Hiking Society (Gregory A. Miller, President);
 American Sportfishing Association (Mike Nussman, President & CEO);
 Association for the Advancement of Sustainability in Higher Education (Paul Rowland, Executive Director);
 Association of Zoos and Aquariums (Steve Olson, Vice President);
 Biodiversity Project (Jennifer Browning, Executive Director);
 Camp Fire USA (Pamela Wilcox, National Interim CEO);
 Challenger Center for Space Science Education (Daniel Barstow, President);
 Climate Literacy Network (Tamara Shapiro Ledley, Coordinator);
 Coastal States Organization (Kristen M. Fletcher, Executive Director);
 Consortium for Ocean Leadership (Bob Gagosian, President and CEO);
 Council of Environmental Deans and Directors (Stephanie Pfirman, President);
 Council on Environmental Education (Josetta Hawthorne, Executive Director);
 Earth Day Network (Kathleen Rogers, President);
 EarthEcho International (Philippe Cousteau, CEO);
 Earth Force (Lisa Bardwell, President);
 Ecological Society of America (Katherine S. McCarter, Executive Director);
 Federation of Fly Fishers (Leah Elwell, Conservation Coordinator);
 National Association for Interpretation (Tim Merriman, Executive Director);
 National Audubon Society (Judy Braus, Vice President for Education);
 National Council for Science and the Environment (Peter Saundry, Executive Director);
 National Estuarine Research Reserve Association (Matt Menashes, Executive Director);
 National Marine Educators Association (J. Adam Frederick, President);
 National Marine Sanctuary Foundation (Jason Patlis, President and CEO);
 National Project for Excellence in Environmental Education (Bora Simmons, Director);
 National Science Teachers Association (Jodi Peterson, Assistant Executive Director);
 National Service-Learning Partnership (Nelda Brown, Executive Director);
 National Wildlife Federation (Kevin Coyle, Vice President for Education);
 North American Association for Environmental Education (Brian Day, Executive Director);
 Ocean Alliance (Roger Payne, President);
 Ocean Conservancy (Vikki Spruill, President and CEO);
 Ocean Conservation Research (Michael Stocker, Director);
 Ocean River Institute (Rob Moir, President);
 Project WET Foundation (Dennis Nelson, President and CEO);
 SandyHook SeaLife Foundation (Mary M. Hamilton, Executive Director);
 Second Nature (Anthony Cortese, President);
 ServeNext (Zach Maurin, Co-Director and Co-Founder);
 Sierra Club (Jacqueline Ostfeld, National Youth Representative);
 Student Conservation Association (Dale Penny, President & CEO);
 Tag-A-Giant Foundation (Shana Miller, Director);
 The Ocean Foundation (Mark Spalding, President);
 The Ocean Project (Bill Mott, Director);
 Trout Unlimited (Charles Gauvin, President);

U.S. Green Building Council (Richard Fedrizzi, President & CEO);
 Wildlife Conservation Society (John F. Calvelli, Executive Vice President);
 Xerces Society for Invertebrate Conservation, Portland, OR (Scott Hoffman Black, Executive Director); and
 Youth Service America (Steven A. Culbertson, President & CEO).

CALIFORNIA

Aquarium of the Pacific, Long Beach, CA (Jerry R. Schubel, President and CEO);
 Los Angeles Conservation Corps, Los Angeles, CA (Bruce Saito, Executive Director);
 NatureBridge, San Francisco, CA (Susan Smartt, President);
 O'Neill Sea Odyssey, Santa Cruz, CA (Dan Haifley, Executive Director);
 Santa Barbara Zoo, Santa Barbara, CA (Rich Block, Chief Executive Officer);
 Wilderness Arts and Literacy Collaborative, San Francisco, CA (Conrad Benedicto, Director); and
 WildPlaces, Springville, CA (Mehmet Mc-Millan, Director).

CHESAPEAKE BAY REGION

Alice Ferguson Foundation, Accokeek, MD (Tracy Bowen, Executive Director);
 Green Jobs Alliance, Hampton, VA (Randolph G. Flood, Executive Director);
 Maryland Association for Environmental and Outdoor Education, Annapolis, MD (Bronwyn Mitchell, Executive Director);
 Pennsylvania Association of Environmental Educators, PA (Ruth A. Roperti, President); and
 Rivanna Conservation Society, Charlottesville, VA (Robbi Savage, Executive Director).

GREAT LAKES REGION

Binder Park Zoo, Battle Creek, MI (Gregory B. Geise, President & CEO);
 Buffalo Zoo, Buffalo, NY (Donna Fernandes, President and CEO);
 Chicago Zoological Society/Brookfield Zoo, Brookfield, IL (Stuart D. Strahl, President and CEO);
 John G. Shedd Aquarium, Chicago, IL (Ted A. Beattie, President and CEO);
 Minnesota Conservation Federation, St. Paul, MN (Steven Maurice, President);
 Save the Dunes Council/Save the Dunes Conservation Fund, Michigan City, IN (Debroah Chubb, President); and
 Toledo Zoo, Toledo, Ohio (Anne Baker, CEO).

GULF COAST REGION

Crosby Arboretum/Mississippi Native Plant Society, Picayune, MS (Janine Conklin, President);
 Florida Wildlife Federation, FL (Manley Fuller, President);
 Louisiana Science Teachers Association, LA (Jean May-Brett, Treasurer);
 Louisiana Wildlife Federation, Baton Rouge, LA (Randy P. Lanctot, Executive Director);
 Mississippi Environmental Education Alliance, Jackson, MS (Cynthia Harrell, President); and
 Southern Association of Marine Educators (Joan R. Turner, President).

HAWAII

Conservation Council for Hawaii, Honolulu, HI (Marjorie Ziegler, Executive Director).

NEW ENGLAND

Provincetown Center for Coastal Studies, MA (Richard Delaney, Executive Director); and
 Save The Bay (Narragansett Bay), RI (Jonathan Stone, Executive Director).

NEW YORK/NEW JERSEY

Audubon New York, Albany, NY (Albert E. Caccese, Executive Director);

Citizens Campaign for the Environment, NY & CT (Dereeth Glance, Executive Program Director);
 New York Aquarium, Brooklyn, NY (Jon Forrest Dohlin, Director); and
 Upper St. Lawrence Riverkeeper, NY (Jennifer J. Caddick, Executive Director).

PACIFIC NORTHWEST REGION

Arnold Creek Productions, Lake Oswego, OR (Doug Freeman, COO-Producer);
 Association of Northwest Steelheaders, Milwaukie, OR (Jay Burris, President);
 Center for Research in Environmental Science and Technologies, Wilsonville, OR (Bob Carlson, Director);
 Concord Elementary Community Garden, Milwaukie, OR (Margaret Thornton, Chair);
 Environmental Education Association of Oregon, Portland, OR (Traci Price, Board Chair);
 Friends of the Straub Environmental Learning Center, Salem, OR (John Savage, Board President);
 John Muir Elementary School, Seattle, WA (Awnie Thompson, Principal);
 Lower Columbia River Estuary Partnership, Portland, OR (Debrah Marriott, Executive Director);
 NatureBridge (Susan Smartt, President);
 Northwest Youth Corps, Eugene, OR (Art Pope, Executive Director);
 Oregon Coast Aquarium, Newport, OR (Gary N. Gamer, President);
 People For Puget Sound, Seattle, WA (Kathy Fletcher, Executive Director);
 Place-Based Education Northwest, Lewis & Clark College, Portland, OR (Gregory Smith, Founder/Coordinator);
 Rachel's Friends Breast Cancer Coalition, Portland, OR (Diane Lund-Muzikant, Board Chair);
 Sierra Club Inner City Outings—Spokane, Spokane, WA (Chris Bachman, Project Director);
 Siskiyou Field Institute, Selma, OR (Arnie Green, Executive Director);
 The Freshwater Trust, Portland, OR (Joe Whitworth, President);
 The Friends of Haystack Rock, Cannon Beach, OR (Tom Oxwang, Chair);
 Tualatin Riverkeepers, Tigard, OR (Monica Smiley, Executive Director); and
 Washington Wildlife Federation, Bellevue, WA (Mark Quinn, President).

WESTERN STATES

Arizona Wildlife Education Foundation, Mesa, AZ (Karen Schedler, President);
 Arizona Wildlife Federation, AZ (Ryna Rock, President);
 Colorado Alliance for Environmental Education, Golden, CO (Katie Navin, Executive Director);
 Colorado Wildlife Federation, CO (John Smeltzer, President);
 Environmental Education Association of New Mexico, NM (Barbara Garrity, State-wide Coordinator);
 Idaho Wildlife Federation, ID (Rob Fraser, President);
 Iowa Wildlife Federation, Des Moines, IA (Joe Wilkinson, President);
 New Mexico Wildlife Federation, NM (Ed Olona, President);
 Renewable Resources Coalition, AK (Anders Gustafson, Executive Director);
 SOS Outreach, Avon, CO (Arn Menconi, Executive Director);
 The Wellness Coalition, Silver City, NM (Sam Castello, Executive Director); and
 Wyoming Association for Environmental Education, WY (Susan McGuire, President);

ALASKA INDIVIDUAL SIGNATORIES

Nils Andreassen, Executive Director, Institute of the North;
 Bruce Botelho, Mayor, City and Borough of Juneau;

Dennis Egan, Senator, State Legislature;
Kirk Hardcastle, Research Tech, Alaska
Center for Energy and Power;
Frank Holmes, Commissioner, Haines En-
ergy and Sustainability Commission;
Albert Howard, Mayor, City of Angoon;
Leslie Isaacs, City Administrator, City of
Klawock;

Ben Johnson, Director of Operations, Pe-
tersburg Indian Association;

Lainda Jones, Economic Development Co-
ordinator, Central Council Tlingit and Haida
Indian Tribes;

Michael Kline, Division Manager, Ketchi-
kan Public Utility;

Mike Korsmo, President, Southeast Con-
ference;

Lisa Long, Director, Haida Corporation;
Bill Lucey, Director/Coastal Planner, Yak-
utat Salmon Board City and Borough of Yak-
utat;

Scott McAdams, Mayor, City and Borough
of Sitka;

Joe Nelson, Planning and Logistics Super-
intendent, City of Petersburg;

Merrill Sawford, Assembly Member, City
and Borough of Juneau;

Beverly Schoonover, Executive Director,
Juneau Watershed Partnership;

Tim Shields, Executive Director,
Takshanuk Watershed Council;

Maxine Thompson, President, Angoon Oil
Co.; and

Alicia Wendlandt, Director/Coastal Plan-
ner, Taiya Inlet Watershed Council.

In my experience before getting to Congress as well as in Congress, I was in the State Board of Education for Colorado before I arrived here, and I am on the Education and Labor Committee serving here. Environmental literacy and awareness is one of the most important aspects of teaching science in the schools. It can be an interdisciplinary approach that helps use examples from the environment to help teach math, science, even history through a lens that actually prepares students to be responsible consumers in the their own lives and to have responsible consumption habits that have a positive impact on the planet.

Madam Speaker, I have been amazed and impressed as I have gone to classrooms across Colorado where young children, 6-year-olds, 8-year-olds are convincing their parents to recycle. They are helping their parents to establish compost heaps in their yards. These are programs that not only have a positive impact on our planet, but a positive impact on the health of their families as well.

Given the success and popularity of these programs, educators across the country have been increasingly eager to take part as a result. One of the things we accomplish in these two bills is that we codify these formal programs within NOAA and establish them as models of innovative environmental education for the entire country to follow.

As part of our shared future, it is an important role for our public schools to help prepare our young people to succeed in the next generation and to preserve, through a legacy of individual responsibility, our planet.

And while there may be and there has been disagreement on both sides of the aisle about the top-down environ-

mental policies and regulations, I think people across the spectrum ideologically believe in the value of individual responsibility, and to inculcate the values of stewardship and preserving our environment as part of individual responsibility for the next generation can go a long way in a way that all Americans can feel good about towards preserving our natural heritage.

With regard to H.R. 1612, I want to be clear that it is not just a Parks bill. The bill restores our national forests, our wildlife refuges and other public lands, as well as our coasts and shores. H.R. 1612 protects our natural heritage; and, even more importantly, particularly as our Nation battles a severe recession and rising unemployment rates, H.R. 1612 creates an important program, the Public Land Service Corps—enhances an important program—that can help reduce youth unemployment while repairing and restoring our Nation's public lands.

Madam Speaker, I have seen the statistics with regard to the current youth unemployment rate, much higher than the overall unemployment rate, and I have heard it firsthand from my constituents in Colorado, wondering, it used to be an assumption that they would have access to a summer job, to an after-school job, increasingly finding it more difficult to be able to get those job opportunities. What better way to not only employ young people and give them job skills that can positively impact their future, but to create something of lasting benefit to all Americans.

I had the opportunity to join Boulder County's Youth Service Corps last summer, repairing some trail huts above Boulder. Not only was this terrific hands-on experience for the young people involved, but we actually made the trails wheelchair accessible in an area that previously had not been accessible to those who were in wheelchairs, above Boulder County, Colorado. It was great to see these kids working with their mentors and volunteers and members of the Parks Department to actually create something that not only would people be able to enjoy, but also to prepare and preserve our heritage for the next generation.

That is why these bills are important, and I think it is important that we, as a body in Congress, are able to come together around items that we agree on. There will always be some things that we agree on and some things that we don't, but preserving our national heritage and environmental literacy are two issues that I think are critical to our Nation's future. By emphasizing the value of individual responsibility, we could all feel good about preserving our national heritage.

This program invests in our young people, helps prepare them for the jobs of the future. The green technology sector has been one of the few sectors in my home State of Colorado that has

added jobs over the last 2 years. So while the State as a whole, like our country, has lost jobs, Colorado employs more people today in green and renewable energy than it did 1 year ago and than it did 2 years ago. And that is a trend that I believe will continue, not only in Colorado, but across our country. The type of preparation for those jobs in the future is consistent with the skills taught through environmental literacy and also in the Public Service Corps working to be stewards of our natural lands.

□ 0945

I'd like to urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in support of these very important bills and thank my colleagues for bringing them to us today.

H.R. 3644 has two Republican amendments and one Democratic amendment that were submitted. H.R. 1612 has six amendments that were submitted, all by Republicans—two of which were allowed. It really is exciting to be able to present these bills to this body here today, precisely because we are trying to and we have heard from our constituents that jobs is one of the key focuses that they want us to work on.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Would my friend yield?

Mr. POLIS. I'll yield for a question.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Actually, I was going to inquire, because I yielded my time back as my friend knows because we had no further speakers, but Mr. LUNGREN has arrived and would like to address the House.

Mr. POLIS. I will yield some of my time to Mr. LUNGREN in just a moment.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I would ask unanimous consent to reclaim our time, Madam Speaker.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. LUNGREN).

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I thank the gentleman for the courtesy on this floor. I admire courtesy and civility here. I just wish we had more of it on both sides from time to time, particularly as we are in these contentious days dealing with one of the most important issues of our time—the health care bill.

I would stand in support of all the things that the gentleman from Florida said about this rule making in order these two bills. It is not unusual for us to make in order two bills under a rule, but what I would suggest is that that is somewhat different than what we evidently are going to be asked to do later this weekend. As I understand it from the ranking member on the

Rules Committee, it is contemplated that we will have a rule that will be “self-executing” dealing with a substantial portion of the American economy, that is the entire arena of health care. I don’t think enough attention has been given to the difference between the appropriate procedure that we are enacting here versus that which is to go forward later this weekend.

I served in this body in the 1980s and then left and came back about 6 years ago. In the intervening time there was an effort, on a bipartisan basis, made by this House and the Senate, with the signature of the President, on a piece of legislation that was called the line-item veto. The line-item veto was a process that was contemplated which would allow the President of the United States to receive an appropriation bill from the Congress and then to look at that appropriation bill and find out and decide whether there were certain items that he thought were not appropriate, there’s too much spending in an overall appropriations bill. It would have given the President the right to sign the overall bill, but on the one hand, to take out, X out, line out certain items. And so this provided a constitutional question before the Supreme Court in the case of *Clinton v. City of New York*, because they had to wait until the President actually exercised the right presumably given to him by the legislation passed by this Congress.

And so the question was: Was that manner in which laws were passed consistent with the requirements of the Constitution? And the Constitution sets out the terms under which we’re able to pass laws. Essentially, it says three things must happen: It must pass the House of Representatives; it must pass the United States Senate; and it must be presented—it’s called presentment—presented to the President and signed by the President.

Interestingly enough, in the majority opinion written by Justice Stevens—I believe the longest-serving member of the U.S. Supreme Court at the present time—when he investigated it, he said this. He said, The Constitution requires that it be the exact text in all three circumstances. Those are his words. The exact text. He went on to say that if in fact a paragraph were absent from the law that the President signed, meaning the President exercised his line item veto and had taken it out, it would invalidate the constitutional requirement for passage of a law because it would not be the exact text.

So, as I understand it, contrary to the rule that we are debating here today, the contemplated rule to cover the health care bill will say something along the lines of: We incorporate a bill which will be deemed to have passed if we pass the rule; or other language to say: thereby passing. So then you will have the interesting question of whether or not we are acting on—that is, I as an individual Member of Congress representing my constituency—I am vot-

ing on the “exact text” as was voted on in the Senate, which then goes to the President for signature. And I would argue that if you cannot remove a paragraph from the “exact text,” as the Supreme Court told us, in any of the three aspects of the bill, that you cannot add text. And that is, if you have a rule which incorporates the bill, you naturally have other language that goes along with it, particularly if it makes reference to other subject matter.

And so in contrast to the rule we have here, which should be supportable under the circumstances that it does not violate the Constitution in any way, shape, or form, even though it is a little different than when we adopt a rule that permits two bills to come to the floor, in the instance of having a self-executing rule we will then be presenting to the Supreme Court a constitutional issue upon which they have not directly ruled. It is, however, my interpretation of their ruling in *Clinton v. City of New York* that it is the mirror image of what the court found to be unconstitutional. That is, if the exact text requirement cannot be fulfilled by removing a single paragraph from the text; similarly, if you add language to the text in the vote that is presented to the membership, it would be not the same thing, so that we would be prohibiting the Members of this institution, the House of Representatives, from their constitutional obligation to vote on the exact question presented in the other body so that that same exact question can be presented to the President of the United States for his signature.

Now I understand that some say, Aha, there’s another section of the Constitution which says that the House of Representatives and the Senate in their respective bodies shall be the sole arbiter of the rules of their Chambers. And that is true. But it is also true that we cannot, by our rules, do what is otherwise unconstitutional. And so Members should understand that while, unfortunately, when we debate rules often times there’s the absence of many of our Members here, because the rules process is considered to be technical, in some ways taken for granted, in other ways nonobjectionable, not rising above the ordinary, with all due respect to the members of the Rules Committee. In the instance of a self-executing rule, so-called, on one of the most controversial issues presented to this Congress, certainly in my years of service here, we cannot blithely dismiss legitimate questions about what our obligation is here. I have said on this floor before, and I continue to say, the Constitution is an inconvenient truth.

A couple of weeks ago, I had the opportunity to be in a meeting with Justice Scalia. Justice Scalia made an interesting point. He said, The essence of a democracy or a democratic republic such as ours is, majority rules. If majority rules, you don’t have a democ-

racy. But he said one of the unique things about America is that we have some limitations on majority rule. Those limitations are found in the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. They limit what the majority can do and protect minority rights. But he said, The interesting thing is, those limitations were imposed on the majority by the majority. In other words, it is through the adoption of the Constitution that the majority has limited itself. And he suggested that that should give caution to members of the court to not supersede their legitimate authority by finding new limitations on the majority that were not contemplated by those who adopted the Constitution, and if you need further limitations or protections of minority interests, the way to do that is to amend the Constitution, which is again done by the majority.

Similarly, I would suggest, that those of us who take an oath to uphold the Constitution as representatives of our constituents in this body must follow the dictates of the Constitution and the limitations of the Constitution. In some language in that case that I cited earlier, the 12-year-old case of *Clinton v. City of New York*, the court talked about how it may or may not be a good public policy that the law that was otherwise found to be unconstitutional, that the fact that it may or may not be good public policy is irrelevant to the question of whether it’s constitutional.

So the argument that we have presented to us here most recently in a nationally televised interview by the President of the United States, that whatever vote takes place is going to be on health care and therefore it’s okay, and he’ll sign it, forgets the inconvenient truth that the Constitution does not permit us to do that, and it does not permit the President to do that. So while a lot of people are talking about the fact we’re going to be here over the weekend—and that’s extraordinary—I would wish that we would concentrate on the more extraordinary question of whether we are following the Constitution. Because if in fact we circumvent the Constitution by “allowing” a bill to become law in which each Member of the House and the Senate did not have the opportunity to vote on the exact language, we are not punishing the Members of Congress; we are punishing our constituents, who have a constitutional right to have laws passed in the way that is articulated in the Constitution, which provides specificity as to how that is done so that the power of the Federal Government will be exercised in the limited sense that was given to it by the people through the Constitution.

And so while I support all of the comments made by the gentleman from Florida with respect to this rule and find this rule to be relatively non-controversial and to be more of the same, the rule that we are being told of

that we will consider this weekend is not more of the same, is not ordinary, is in fact extraordinary, and I would suggest such an extraordinary stretch that it will be rendered unconstitutional. Why would we follow a procedure that will call into question the very constitutional foundations of the contents of the bill if in fact it is such an important issue? If it in fact is something that needs to be dealt with with such urgency, ought we not to follow the Constitution in each and every aspect and ought we not be guided by the most recent decision of the Supreme Court on a law which we thought was a good law on a bipartisan basis, but which, unfortunately, the Constitution does not allow us to enact.

□ 1000

And I would hope that my colleagues who may not be here on the floor but may have an opportunity to review these remarks will take seriously my concerns. We may very well be preparing to embark on an unconstitutional journey which not only will take the healthy skepticism that our Constitution provides for government—not rejecting government, but we have a healthy skepticism of the power of government that is a part of our constitutional process—but we will turn it from a healthy skepticism to an unfortunately destructive cynicism. And if there is anybody who believes that is good for this country, I would suggest they are wrong.

This is a tough issue that we're going to have to deal with later this weekend. Let us at least do it in a constitutional way, and let us not pass something for the American people that will be called into question in court challenge after court challenge after court challenge and delay the impact or implementation of whatever we believe on a bipartisan basis ought to be the governing law with respect to the health care system.

So with that, I thank the gentleman for his time, and I thank the gentleman for his courtesy.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I thank my friend again for his courtesy, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Again, I would like to emphasize that the gentleman from California's criticisms are not about this rule or any rule that we have before us. Tomorrow the Rules Committee will be meeting to decide under what rule we will consider health care.

The gentleman has made some remarks with regard to a common practice that is within House resolutions referred by the Rules Committee that involves self-executing language. In 1996, the Republican-controlled House adopted a resolution to consider as adopted the conference report on line-item veto. I would also like read a quote from Thomas Mann who is quoted by USA Today. He is a scholar at the Brookings Institute, who said

that the "deem and pass" move is not very unusual, has been used 36 times in 2005 and 2006 by the Republican Congress, 49 times in 2007 and 2008 by the Democratic Congress.

I think what's important for people to know is that the Rules Committee doesn't have any special ability to do these rules unilaterally. They only exist by the good graces of a majority of the House. If a majority of the House wants to pass the Senate health care bill as part of a rule, they can. There will be a debate and a discussion over that Senate health care bill, and the Senate bill will be presented to the President and signed, if it passes, before the reconciliation bill reaches the Senate floor.

The House, under the Constitution, is given a great ability to do what it wants to do and to conduct its own affairs as it wants to conduct its affairs. Just as today we have a House resolution, 1192, and that House resolution provides for the consideration of two bills, those bills will only be considered by the House if this rule, this House resolution, passes the full House with a majority of the votes. It will be the same with any rule that is referred out of the Rules Committee tomorrow with regard to the consideration of health care. That rule will only have any force, any effect, if a majority of the House passed that rule and whatever is in that rule, just as they would consider any bill under the House of Representatives.

This rule is a very fair rule. These two bills, I believe, have bipartisan support, a strong consensus to help create jobs, prepare kids for our future, educate kids about the environment, and preserve our great natural resources.

I urge a "yes" vote on the previous question and on the rule.

I yield back the balance of my time and move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. POLIS. 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, this 15-minute vote on adopting House Resolution 1192 will be followed by 5-minute votes on two motions that the House suspend the rules previously postponed, on which the yeas and nays are ordered, to wit:

on H.R. 3671 and on H.R. 2788.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 236, nays 171, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 136]

YEAS—236

| | | |
|------------|--------|---------|
| Adler (NJ) | Arcuri | Baldwin |
| Altmire | Baca | Barrow |
| Andrews | Baird | Bean |

| | | |
|----------------|------------------|------------------|
| Becerra | Heinrich | Ortiz |
| Berkley | Herseth Sandlin | Owens |
| Berman | Higgins | Pallone |
| Berry | Himes | Pascarell |
| Bishop (GA) | Hinchey | Pastor (AZ) |
| Bishop (NY) | Hinojosa | Payne |
| Blumenauer | Hirono | Perlmutter |
| Bocchieri | Hodes | Perriello |
| Boren | Holden | Peters |
| Boswell | Holt | Peterson |
| Boucher | Honda | Pingree (ME) |
| Boyd | Hoyer | Polis (CO) |
| Brady (PA) | Inslee | Pomeroy |
| Braley (IA) | Israel | Price (NC) |
| Bright | Jackson (IL) | Quigley |
| Brown, Corrine | Jackson Lee | Rahall |
| Butterfield | (TX) | Rangel |
| Capps | Johnson (GA) | Reyes |
| Capuano | Johnson, E. B. | Richardson |
| Cardoza | Kagen | Rodriguez |
| Carnahan | Kanjorski | Ross |
| Carney | Kennedy | Rothman (NJ) |
| Carson (IN) | Kildee | Royal-Allard |
| Castor (FL) | Kilpatrick (MI) | Ruppersberger |
| Chandler | Kilroy | Rush |
| Chu | Kind | Ryan (OH) |
| Clarke | Kirkpatrick (AZ) | Salazar |
| Cleaver | Kissell | Sánchez, Linda |
| Clyburn | Klein (FL) | T. |
| Cohen | Kosmas | Sanchez, Loretta |
| Connolly (VA) | Kratovil | Sarbanes |
| Conyers | Kucinich | Schakowsky |
| Cooper | Langevin | Schauer |
| Costa | Larsen (WA) | Schiff |
| Costello | Larson (CT) | Schrader |
| Courtney | Lee (CA) | Schwartz |
| Crowley | Levin | Scott (GA) |
| Cuellar | Lewis (GA) | Scott (VA) |
| Dahlkemper | Lipinski | Serrano |
| Davis (AL) | Loeb sack | Sestak |
| Davis (CA) | Lowe y | Shea-Porter |
| Davis (IL) | Lujan | Sherman |
| DeFazio | Maffei | Sires |
| DeGette | Maloney | Skelton |
| Delahunt | Markey (CO) | Slaughter |
| DeLauro | Markey (MA) | Smith (WA) |
| Dicks | Marshall | Snyder |
| Dingell | Matheson | Space |
| Doggett | Matsui | Speier |
| Donnelly (IN) | McCarthy (NY) | Spratt |
| Doyle | McCollum | Stupak |
| Driehaus | McDermott | Sutton |
| Edwards (MD) | McGovern | Tanner |
| Edwards (TX) | McIntyre | Teague |
| Ehlers | McMahon | Thompson (CA) |
| Ellison | McNerney | Thompson (MS) |
| Ellsworth | Meek (FL) | Tierney |
| Engel | Meeks (NY) | Titus |
| Eshoo | Melancon | Tonko |
| Etheridge | Michaud | Towns |
| Farr | Miller (NC) | Tsongas |
| Fattah | Miller, George | Van Hollen |
| Filner | Minnick | Velázquez |
| Foster | Mollohan | Visclosky |
| Frank (MA) | Moore (KS) | Walz |
| Fudge | Moore (WI) | Wasserman |
| Gonzalez | Moran (VA) | Schultz |
| Gordon (TN) | Murphy (CT) | Waters |
| Grayson | Murphy (NY) | Watson |
| Green, Al | Murphy, Patrick | Watt |
| Green, Gene | Nadler (NY) | Waxman |
| Grijalva | Napolitano | Welch |
| Hall (NY) | Neal (MA) | Wilson (OH) |
| Halvorson | Nye | Woolsey |
| Hare | Oberstar | Wu |
| Harman | Obey | Yarmuth |
| Hastings (FL) | Olver | |

NAYS—171

| | | |
|--------------|--------------|-----------------|
| Aderholt | Broun (GA) | Conaway |
| Akin | Brown (SC) | Crenshaw |
| Alexander | Brown-Waite, | Culberson |
| Austria | Ginny | Davis (KY) |
| Bachmann | Buchanan | Dent |
| Bachus | Burgess | Diaz-Balart, L. |
| Barrett (SC) | Burton (IN) | Diaz-Balart, M. |
| Bartlett | Calvert | Dreier |
| Barton (TX) | Camp | Duncan |
| Biggert | Campbell | Fallin |
| Bilbray | Cantor | Flake |
| Bilirakis | Cao | Fleming |
| Bishop (UT) | Capito | Forbes |
| Blackburn | Cassidy | Foxx |
| Boehner | Castle | Franks (AZ) |
| Bonner | Chaffetz | Frelinghuysen |
| Bono Mack | Childers | Gallely |
| Boozman | Coble | Garrett (NJ) |
| Boustany | Coffman (CO) | Gerlach |
| Brady (TX) | Cole | Giffords |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|-----------------|---------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|---------------|
| Gingrey (GA) | Lungren, Daniel | Rogers (AL) | Baldwin | Harman | Obey | Bilbray | Gingrey (GA) | Myrick |
| Gohmert | E. | Rogers (KY) | Barrow | Hastings (FL) | Olver | Bilirakis | Gohmert | Neugebauer |
| Goodlatte | Mack | Rogers (MI) | Bean | Hastings (WA) | Ortiz | Blackburn | Goodlatte | Nunes |
| Granger | Manzullo | Rohrabacher | Becerra | Heinrich | Pallone | Boehner | Guthrie | Olson |
| Graves | Marchant | Rooney | Berkley | Herseht Sandlin | Pascarell | Bono Mack | Hall (TX) | Owens |
| Griffith | McCarthy (CA) | Roskam | Berman | Higgins | Pastor (AZ) | Boozman | Harper | Paul |
| Guthrie | McCaul | Royce | Berry | Hill | Paulsen | Brady (TX) | Heller | Pence |
| Hall (TX) | McClintock | Ryan (WI) | Biggert | Himes | Payne | Bright | Hensarling | Platts |
| Harper | McCotter | Scalise | Bishop (GA) | Hinchev | Perlmutter | Broun (GA) | Herger | Poe (TX) |
| Hastings (WA) | McHenry | Schmidt | Bishop (NY) | Hinojosa | Perriello | Brown (SC) | Hunter | Posey |
| Heller | McKeon | Schock | Bishop (UT) | Hirono | Peters | Brown-Waite, | Inglis | Price (GA) |
| Hensarling | McMorris | Sensenbrenner | Blumenauer | Hodes | Peterson | Ginny | Issa | Putnam |
| Herger | Rodgers | Sessions | Bocchieri | Holden | Petri | Buchanan | Jenkins | Radanovich |
| Hill | Mica | Shadegg | Bonner | Holt | Pingree (ME) | Burgess | Johnson, Sam | Rehberg |
| Hunter | Miller (FL) | Shimkus | Boren | Honda | Pitts | Burton (IN) | Jordan (OH) | Roe (TN) |
| Inglis | Miller (MI) | Shuler | Boswell | Hoyer | Polis (CO) | Calvert | King (NY) | Rogers (AL) |
| Issa | Miller, Gary | Shuster | Boucher | Insee | Pomeroy | Camp | Kingston | Rogers (KY) |
| Jenkins | Mitchell | Simpson | Boustany | Israel | Price (NC) | Campbell | Lamborn | Rohrabacher |
| Johnson (IL) | Moran (KS) | Smith (NE) | Boyd | Jackson (IL) | Quigley | Cantor | Latta | Rooney |
| Johnson, Sam | Murphy, Tim | Smith (NJ) | Brady (PA) | Jackson Lee | Rahall | Carter | Lewis (CA) | Royce |
| Jones | Myrick | Smith (TX) | Bralley (IA) | (TX) | Rangel | Castle | Linder | Schmidt |
| Jordan (OH) | Neugebauer | Stearns | Brown, Corrine | Johnson (GA) | Reichert | Coble | Luetkemeyer | Sensenbrenner |
| King (IA) | Nunes | Sullivan | Butterfield | Johnson (IL) | Reyes | Coffman (CO) | Lungren, Daniel | Sessions |
| King (NY) | Olson | Taylor | Cao | Johnson, E. B. | Richardson | Conaway | E. | Shadegg |
| Kingston | Paul | Terry | Capito | Jones | Rodriguez | Crenshaw | Mack | Shuster |
| Kirk | Paulsen | Thompson (PA) | Capps | Kagen | Rogers (MI) | Culberson | Marchant | Simpson |
| Kline (MN) | Pence | Thornberry | Capuano | Kanjorski | Ross | Davies (KY) | McCarthy (CA) | Skelton |
| Lamborn | Petri | Tiahrt | Cardoza | Kaptur | Rothman (NJ) | Diaz-Balart, L. | McCaul | Smith (TX) |
| Lance | Pitts | Tiberi | Carnahan | Kennedy | Roybal-Allard | Diaz-Balart, M. | McClintock | Stearns |
| Latham | Platts | Turner | Carney | Kildee | Ruppersberger | Dreier | McCotter | Sullivan |
| LaTourette | Poe (TX) | Upton | Carson (IN) | Kilpatrick (MI) | Rush | Duncan | McHenry | Terry |
| Latta | Posey | Walden | Cassidy | Kilroy | Ryan (OH) | Fallin | McKeon | Thompson (PA) |
| Lewis (CA) | Price (GA) | Wamp | Castor (FL) | Kind | Ryan (WI) | Flake | Mica | Thornberry |
| Linder | Putnam | Westmoreland | King (IA) | King (IA) | Salazar | Forbes | Miller (FL) | Tiahrt |
| LoBiondo | Radanovich | Whitfield | Kirk | Kirk | Sánchez, Linda | Fox | Miller (MI) | Upton |
| Lucas | Rehberg | Wilson (SC) | Kirkpatrick (AZ) | Kirkpatrick (AZ) | T. | Franks (AZ) | Miller, Gary | Walden |
| Luetkemeyer | Reichert | Wittman | Chu | Kissell | Sanchez, Loretta | Frelinghuysen | Mitchell | Westmoreland |
| Lummis | Roe (TN) | Wolf | Clarke | Klein (FL) | Kline (MN) | Gallely | Moran (KS) | Wilson (SC) |
| | | | Cleaver | Kline (MN) | Sarbanes | Garrett (NJ) | Murphy, Tim | Wolf |
| | | | Clyburn | Kosmas | Scalise | | | |
| | | | Cohen | Kratovil | Schakowsky | | | |
| | | | Cole | Kucinich | Schauer | | | |
| | | | Connolly (VA) | Lance | Schiff | | | |
| | | | Conyers | Langevin | Schock | | | |
| | | | Cooper | Larsen (WA) | Schrader | | | |
| | | | Cooper | Larson (CT) | Schwartz | | | |
| | | | Costello | Latham | Scott (GA) | | | |
| | | | Courtney | LaTourette | Scott (VA) | | | |
| | | | Crowley | Lee (CA) | Serrano | | | |
| | | | Cuellar | Levin | Sestak | | | |
| | | | Cummings | Lewis (GA) | Shea-Porter | | | |
| | | | Dahlkemper | Lipinski | Sherman | | | |
| | | | Davis (AL) | LoBiondo | Shimkus | | | |
| | | | Davis (CA) | Loebbeck | Shuler | | | |
| | | | Davis (IL) | Lowe | Sires | | | |
| | | | DeFazio | Lucas | Slaughter | | | |
| | | | DeGette | Luján | Smith (NE) | | | |
| | | | Delahunt | Lummis | Smith (NJ) | | | |
| | | | DeLauro | Lynch | Smith (WA) | | | |
| | | | Dent | Maffei | Snyder | | | |
| | | | Dicks | Maloney | Space | | | |
| | | | Dingell | Manzullo | Speier | | | |
| | | | Doggett | Markey (CO) | Spratt | | | |
| | | | Donnelly (IN) | Markey (MA) | Stupak | | | |
| | | | Doyle | Marshall | Sutton | | | |
| | | | Driehaus | Matheson | Tanner | | | |
| | | | Edwards (MD) | Matsui | Taylor | | | |
| | | | Edwards (TX) | McCarthy (NY) | Teague | | | |
| | | | Ehlers | McCollum | Thompson (CA) | | | |
| | | | Ellison | McDermott | Thompson (MS) | | | |
| | | | Ellsworth | McGovern | Tiberi | | | |
| | | | Engel | McIntyre | Tierney | | | |
| | | | Eshoo | McMahon | Titus | | | |
| | | | Etheridge | McMorris | Tonko | | | |
| | | | Farr | Rodgers | Towns | | | |
| | | | Fattah | McNerney | Tsongas | | | |
| | | | Filner | Meek (FL) | Turner | | | |
| | | | Fleming | Meeke (NY) | Van Hollen | | | |
| | | | Foster | Melancon | Velázquez | | | |
| | | | Frank (MA) | Michaud | Visclosky | | | |
| | | | Fudge | Miller (NC) | Walz | | | |
| | | | Gerlach | Miller, George | Wamp | | | |
| | | | Giffords | Minnick | Wasserman | | | |
| | | | Gonzalez | Mollohan | Schultz | | | |
| | | | Gordon (TN) | Moore (KS) | Waters | | | |
| | | | Granger | Moore (WI) | Watson | | | |
| | | | Graves | Moran (VA) | Watt | | | |
| | | | Grayson | Murphy (CT) | Waxman | | | |
| | | | Green, Al | Murphy (NY) | Welch | | | |
| | | | Green, Gene | Murphy, Patrick | Whitfield | | | |
| | | | Griffith | Nadler (NY) | Wilson (OH) | | | |
| | | | Grijalva | Napolitano | Wittman | | | |
| | | | Hall (NY) | Neal (MA) | Woolsey | | | |
| | | | Halvorson | Nye | Wu | | | |
| | | | Hare | Oberstar | Yarmuth | | | |

NOT VOTING—23

| | | |
|------------|--------------|--------------|
| Ackerman | Emerson | Lynch |
| Blunt | Fortenberry | Ros-Lehtinen |
| Buyer | Garamendi | Souder |
| Carter | Gutierrez | Stark |
| Clay | Hoekstra | Weiner |
| Cummings | Kaptur | Young (AK) |
| Davis (TN) | Lee (NY) | Young (FL) |
| Deal (GA) | Lofgren, Zoe | |

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1038

Mr. WITTMAN, Ms. GRANGER, Messrs. ROSKAM and BARTON of Texas changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER BASIN PROTECTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3671, 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 gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3671.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 289, nays 121, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 137]

YEAS—289

| | | |
|------------|---------|----------|
| Adler (NJ) | Andrews | Bachmann |
| Alexander | Arcuri | Bachus |
| Altmire | Baca | Baird |

| | |
|----------|------|
| Aderholt | Akin |
|----------|------|

NAYS—121

| | |
|--------------|-------------|
| Austria | Bartlett |
| Barrett (SC) | Barton (TX) |

NOT VOTING—20

| | | |
|------------|--------------|------------|
| Ackerman | Fortenberry | Roskam |
| Blunt | Garamendi | Souder |
| Buyer | Gutierrez | Stark |
| Clay | Hoekstra | Weiner |
| Davis (TN) | Lee (NY) | Young (AK) |
| Deal (GA) | Lofgren, Zoe | Young (FL) |
| Emerson | Ros-Lehtinen | |

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1049

Mrs. MYRICK and Messrs. BOOZMAN and HERGER changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. KING of Iowa and WITTMAN changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

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.

DISTINGUISHED FLYING CROSS NATIONAL MEMORIAL ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2788, 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 gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2788.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 410, nays 0, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 138]

YEAS—410

Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Billirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Boccheri
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Bralley (IA)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite,
 Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chandler
Childers
Chu
Clarke
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)

Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Foster
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Graves
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guthrie
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinche
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Inglis
Insee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee
 (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy

Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lowe
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
 E.
Lynch
Mack
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris
Heller
 Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olson
Ortiz

Owens
Pallone
Pascarella
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Roskam
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce

Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda
 T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Shock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stearns
Stupak

Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Taylor
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wamp
Wasserman
 Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
 Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—20

Ackerman
Blunt
Buyer
Clay
Davis (TN)
Deal (GA)
Duncan

Emerson
Fortenberry
Garamendi
Gutierrez
Hoekstra
Lee (NY)
Lofgren, Zoe

Olver
Ros-Lehtinen
Souder
Stark
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). One minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1058

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.

□ 1100

OCEAN, COASTAL, AND WATERSHED EDUCATION ACT

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Speaker, pursuant to H. Res. 1192, I call up the bill (H.R. 3644) to direct the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to establish education and watershed programs which advance environmental literacy, including preparedness and adaptability for the likely impacts of climate change in coastal watershed regions, as amended, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland). Pursuant to House Resolution 1192, the bill is considered read.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill is adopted.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 3644

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Ocean, Coastal, and Watershed Education Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds the following:

(1) The United States faces major challenges, such as mitigating and adapting to the impacts of climate change, stewarding critical coastal and marine resources including fish and wildlife habitat while sustaining the commercial and recreational activities that depend on these resources, and improving resilience to natural disasters, that collectively threaten human health, economic development, environmental quality, and national security.

(2) Communities in coastal watersheds are particularly vulnerable to these increasingly urgent, interconnected, and complex challenges and need support for teacher professional development and experiential learning among students of all ages.

(3) These challenges can be met with the help of comprehensive programs specifically targeted to engage coastal watershed communities, schoolchildren, and the general public to develop engaged and environmentally literate citizens who are better able to understand complex environmental issues, assess risk, evaluate proposed plans, and understand how individual decisions affect the environment at local, regional, national, and global scales.

(4) The intrinsic social and conservation values of wildlife-dependent and other outdoor recreation can play an important role in outdoor educational programs that address the myriad of coastal and ocean concerns, as well as instill a sustainable conservation ethic that will enable them to face those challenges to the betterment of both the environment and coastal communities.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this Act is to advance environmental literacy, develop public awareness and appreciation of the economic, social, recreational, and environmental benefits of coastal watersheds, and emphasize stewardship of critical coastal and marine resources, including an understanding of how climate change is impacting those resources, through the establishment of—

(1) an Environmental Literacy Grant Program; and

(2) regional programs under the B-WET Program.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term "Administrator" means the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

(2) BAY-WATERSHED EDUCATION.—The term "bay-watershed education" means environmental education focused on watersheds, with an emphasis on stewardship of critical coastal and marine resources, including an understanding of how climate change is impacting those resources.

(3) B-WET PROGRAM.—The term "B-WET Program" means the Bay-Watershed Education and Training Program of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, as in effect immediately before the enactment of this Act and modified under this Act or any subsequently enacted Act.

(4) ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—The term "eligible entity" means a State agency, local agency, school district, institution of higher education, or for-profit or non-profit nongovernmental organization, consortium, or other entity that the Administrator finds has demonstrated expertise and experience in the development of the institutional, intellectual, or policy resources to help

environmental education become more effective and widely practiced.

(5) ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION.—The term “environmental education” means interdisciplinary formal and informal learning about the relevant interrelationships between dynamic environmental and human systems, and which results in increasing the learner’s capacity for decisionmaking and stewardship regarding natural and community resources.

(6) ENVIRONMENTAL LITERACY.—The term “environmental literacy” means the capacity to perceive and interpret the relative health of environmental systems and the interrelationships between natural and social systems and technology, and to assess options and take appropriate action to maintain, restore, or improve the health of those systems.

(7) HIGH-LEVERAGE PROJECTS.—The term “high-leverage projects” means projects supported by grants authorized under this Act that use Federal, State and nongovernmental financial, technical, and other resources in such a manner that the potential beneficial outcomes are highly magnified or enhanced.

(8) STATE.—The term “State” means each of the several States of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, any other territory or possession of the United States, and any Indian tribe.

SEC. 4. ENVIRONMENTAL LITERACY GRANT PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall establish a national competitive grant program, to be known as the “Environmental Literacy Grant Program”, under which the Administrator shall provide, subject to the availability of appropriations, financial assistance to—

(1) expand the adoption of coastal, ocean, Great Lakes, and climate on all time scales education;

(2) build administrative and technical capacity with coastal, ocean, and watershed communities and stakeholder groups to enhance their effectiveness;

(3) encourage water-dependent, wildlife-dependent, and other outdoor recreation, experiential learning, and hands-on involvement with coastal and watershed resources as a method of promoting stewardship of those resources; and

(4) develop and implement new approaches to advance coastal, ocean, Great Lakes, and climate on all time scales education and environmental literacy at national, regional, and local levels.

(b) PRIORITIES.—In awarding grants under this section, the Administrator shall give priority consideration to innovative, strategic, high-leverage projects that demonstrate strong potential for being sustained in the future by a grant recipient beyond the time period in which activities are carried out with the grant.

(c) GUIDELINES.—No later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act and after consultation with appropriate stakeholders, the Administrator shall publish in the Federal Register guidelines regarding the implementation of this grant program, including publication of criteria for eligible entities, identification of national priorities, establishment of performance measures to evaluate program effectiveness, information regarding sources of non-Federal matching funds or in-kind contributions, and reporting requirements for grant award recipients.

(d) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS BY ADMINISTRATOR.—Of the amounts made available to implement this section—

(1) no less than 80 percent shall be used for competitive grants or cooperative agreements;

(2) no more than 10 percent may be used by the Administrator to implement the grant program; and

(3) no less than 10 percent of the annual funds appropriated for the program authorized under this section shall be used to fund contracts or cooperative agreements to conduct

strategic planning, promote communications among grant recipients and within communities, coordinate grant activities to foster an integrated program, and oversee national evaluation efforts.

SEC. 5. B-WET PROGRAM.

(a) EXISTING PROGRAM.—The Administrator shall conduct the B-WET Program, including each of the regional programs conducted or under active consideration for creation under such program immediately before the enactment of this Act.

(b) NEW REGIONAL PROGRAMS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator may create new regional programs under the B-WET Program in accordance with a strategy issued under this subsection.

(2) STRATEGY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall issue a strategy for establishing such new regional programs.

(B) CONTENTS.—The strategy shall include the following:

(i) Evaluation of the need for new regional program in areas that are not served under the B-WET Program on the date of enactment of this Act.

(ii) Identification of potential new regional programs, including a listing of potential principal non-Federal partners.

(iii) A comprehensive budget for future expansion of the B-WET Program over the period for which appropriations are authorized under this Act.

(iv) Such other information as the Administrator considers necessary.

(C) CONSULTATION AND PUBLIC COMMENT.—The Administrator shall consult with relevant stakeholders and provide opportunity for public comment in the development of the strategy.

(D) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—The Administrator shall submit the strategy to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate by not later than 270 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(3) PRIORITY CONSIDERATION.—In creating new regional programs under this subsection, the Administrator shall give priority consideration to the needs of—

(A) United States territories, including Guam, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and American Samoa;

(B) the Great Lakes States;

(C) Alaska; and

(D) the mid-Atlantic region.

(c) MODIFICATION OF B-WET PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator may modify or realign regional programs under the B-WET Program, based on—

(A) changes in regional needs;

(B) mutual interest between the Administrator and relevant stakeholders within a region or regions;

(C) changes in resources available to the Administrator to implement the B-WET Program; and

(D) other circumstances as determined necessary by the Administrator.

(2) CONSULTATION AND PUBLIC COMMENT.—The Administrator shall—

(A) consult with the persons conducting a regional program and provide opportunity for public comment prior to making a final decision to modify or realign such regional program; and

(B) publish public notice of such a decision no less than 30-days before the effective date of such a modification or realignment.

(d) REGIONAL PROGRAM MANAGERS.—

(1) APPOINTMENT OF REGIONAL PROGRAM MANAGER.—The Administrator shall be responsible for the selection, appointment, and when necessary replacement of a regional program manager for each regional program under the B-WET Program.

(2) QUALIFICATIONS.—To qualify for appointment as a regional program manager, an individual must—

(A) reside in the region for which appointed; and

(B) demonstrate competence and expertise in bay-watershed education and training.

(3) FUNCTIONS.—Each regional program manager shall—

(A) be responsible for managing and administering the B-WET Program in the region for which appointed, in accordance with this Act;

(B) determine the most appropriate communities within the region to be served by the B-WET Program;

(C) encourage water-dependent, wildlife-dependent, and other outdoor recreation, experiential learning experiences for students, and hands-on involvement with coastal and watershed resources as a method of promoting stewardship of those resources and complementing core classroom curriculum;

(D) support communication and collaboration among educators, natural resource planners and managers, and governmental and nongovernmental stakeholders;

(E) share and distribute information regarding educational plans, strategies, learning activities, and curricula to all stakeholders within its region;

(F) provide financial and technical assistance pursuant to the guidelines developed by the Administrator under this section; and

(G) perform any additional duties as necessary to carry out the functions of the program.

(e) PROGRAM GUIDELINES.—No later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act and after consultation with appropriate stakeholders, the Administrator shall publish in the Federal Register guidelines regarding the implementation of the B-WET Program, as follows:

(1) CONTRACTS.—The Administrator shall create guidelines through which each regional program manager may enter into contracts (subject to the availability of appropriations) to support projects to design, demonstrate, evaluate, or disseminate practices, methods, or techniques related to Bay-watershed education and training.

(2) GRANT MAKING AND COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall create guidelines through which each regional program manager may provide financial assistance in the form of a grant (subject to the availability of appropriations) or cooperative agreement to support projects that advance the purpose of this Act. The guidelines shall include criteria for eligible entities, identification of national priorities, establishment of performance measures to evaluate program effectiveness, and reporting requirements for grant award recipients.

(B) PRIORITY.—In making grants under this paragraph, each regional program manager shall give priority to those projects that will—

(i) promote bay-watershed education throughout the region concerned;

(ii) advance strategic initiatives to incorporate bay-watershed education into formal and informal education systems;

(iii) build capacity within bay-watershed education communities and stakeholder groups for expanding and strengthening their work;

(iv) build bay-watershed education into professional development or training activities for educators; and

(v) broadly replicate existing, proven bay-watershed education programs.

(f) NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In awarding grants under this section, the regional program managers shall give priority consideration to a project for which the Federal share does not exceed 75 percent of the aggregate cost of such project.

(2) IN-KIND CONTRIBUTION.—The non-Federal share of the costs of any project supported by an award of grant funding under this section may be cash or the fair market value of services,

equipment, donations, or any other form of in-kind contribution.

(3) *OTHER PRIORITY.*—The regional program managers shall give priority consideration to a project that will be conducted by or benefit any under-served community, any community that has an inability to draw on other sources of funding because of the small population or low income of the community, or any other person for any other reason the Administrator considers appropriate and consistent with the purpose of this Act.

(g) *REGIONAL PROGRAM COORDINATION.*—Within the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the Office of Education shall work with regional program managers on the following regional B-WET Program functions:

- (1) Strategic planning efforts.
- (2) Integration and coordination of programs.
- (3) Coordination of national evaluation efforts.
- (4) Promotion of network wide communications.
- (5) Selection of new Regional Program Managers.
- (6) Management, tracking, and oversight of the B-WET Program.

(h) *LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS BY ADMINISTRATOR.*—Of the amounts made available to implement this section—

- (1) no less than 80 percent shall be used for implementation of regional program activities, including the award of grants; and
- (2) no more than 20 percent may be used by the Administrator to implement the regional programs and regional program coordination.

SEC. 6. BIENNIAL REPORT.

Not later than December 31, 2011, and biennially thereafter, the Administrator shall submit to Congress a report on the grant programs authorized under this Act. Each such report shall include a description of the eligible activities carried out with grants awarded under the Act during the previous two fiscal years, an assessment of the success and impact of such activities, and a description of the type of programs carried out with such grant, disaggregated by State.

SEC. 7. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Administrator to carry out this Act such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 2011 through 2015.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. After 1 hour of debate on the bill, as amended, it shall be in order to consider the further amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in part A of House Report 111-445 if offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPs) or her designee, which shall be considered read, and shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

The amendment to the further amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in part B of House Report 111-445, if offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) or his designee, shall be considered read, and shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

The gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPs) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. CAPPs. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members that may have 5 legislative days in

which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 3644.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mrs. CAPPs. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of my legislation, H.R. 3644, which I introduced on September 24, 2009.

Madam Speaker, in California, we are often inundated with reports of the impacts of climate change, overfishing, wildfires and droughts. Such reports may frighten or dampen a child's innate curiosity and wonder of the natural environment. Fortunately, we have found that connecting children to their environment through hands-on experiences offers an effective way to overcome these challenges.

Over the past 7 years, two NOAA education programs, the Bay-Watershed Education and Training regional program, or as it's known, B-WET, and the Environmental Literacy Grants, or ELG, programs, have been critical tools in advancing a nationwide strategy of experiential education in building ocean, atmospheric and environmental awareness in the United States.

In my district, the MERITO program, which has been funded through the California B-WET program for the past 4 years, has allowed hundreds of children to enjoy the benefits of hands-on, bilingual ocean conservation experiences with trained scientists and professionals in Santa Barbara and Ventura Counties.

Many of these children have taken their first trips to the beach under this MERITO program, even though they may live only a few miles away. According to the testimonials of their parents and their teachers, it has given many of them a new awareness of their local environment and their community and opened the world of new opportunities that they now know they can pursue.

Madam Speaker, my bill, H.R. 3644, seeks to formally authorize these two innovative and important NOAA education programs that were established through the annual appropriations process so we can ensure that they are here for our children now and in the future. It also ensures that certain standards and criteria for positive implementation are met by the agency when they spend these funds. To me, this represents a responsible oversight effort on the part of our committee to exercise our proper duties.

Madam Speaker, these programs have been well received by the ocean and environmental literacy communities, and in fact, since the ELG program was initiated in 2005, the demand for ELG grants has been 10 times greater than the available funding.

Each program has gathered significant momentum and prominence since the Congress passed the America COMPETES Act in 2007, which elevated and enhanced NOAA's educational mission.

A recent report released by the National Academy of Sciences also commends both programs for their positive contributions to increase student interest in science and to improve awareness of the ocean and coastal environment.

H.R. 3644 is fully supported by the administration. The legislation is also strongly supported by the Campaign for Environmental Literacy. This is a coalition of nearly 60 national, regional and local private and non-profit organizations; and they represent science, education, conservation, outdoor recreation and zoological parks, including the National Wildlife Federation, American Fisheries Society, the American Fly Fishing Trade Association, and the Association of Zoos and Aquariums, to name just a few.

At the appropriate time, I will offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute which reflects a bipartisan compromise to address the concerns raised by my colleague and my friend, Congressman CASSIDY of Louisiana, during the markup of this bill by the Committee on Natural Resources.

Madam Speaker, in closing, the B-WET and ELG programs are both effective, wildly popular, and in great demand by educators around the country. These programs represent two critical investments in our efforts to connect children to their natural world and, hopefully as a result, inspire their interest in the sciences and in ensuring the future of their coastal communities. We should recognize their importance today by passing this legislation and codify them as formal programs within NOAA.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. CHAFFETZ asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Madam Speaker, H.R. 3644, the Ocean, Coastal and Watershed Act establishes and authorizes funding for two programs, one of which has been a total creature of appropriations earmarks.

There are two simple and compelling arguments for why I am opposed to this legislation: first, it spends too much money that our government just doesn't have, and it singles out two of the more than one dozen NOAA education programs for special treatment when the entire effort is subject to a top-to-bottom review.

The Capps substitute amendment provides authorized spending levels that provide a 10 percent increase each year for 5 years. The Federal Government and American taxpayers simply cannot afford to increase spending by 10 percent year after year. What American gets a 10 percent pay raise every year? What small business is guaranteed 10 percent more in sales or 10 percent growth? None. And this government program should not be promised such lavish increases.

Now, we are told that they have compromised on these spending levels, that the new amounts are lower than in the bill that was first introduced last year. And it can be acknowledged that they have floated this bloated spending balloon a little lower, but it is still sailing high up in the clouds of out-of-control spending. It needs to come all the way down out of the sky and face the harsh realities of the ground down here. Our Nation is running record Federal budget deficits and the national debt is at historic levels, some \$12-plus trillion.

We are paying over \$600 million a day just in interest on our debt. We need to put a stop to bills like this that just make the problem worse.

It is especially troubling that the Democratic-controlled Rules Committee didn't allow the ranking member of the Natural Resources Committee, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, to offer an amendment that would have frozen spending at the amount being spent this year. Apparently, giving a government program the same amount next year as they got this year is a concept the Democrats believe is so radical and dangerous that they don't even want Members of the House to vote on it, which isn't surprising these days. And this despite what the President has said, that he wants a spending freeze.

Now, it's not just Republicans that are objecting to these high levels of spending on these two programs. In President Obama's own budget proposal that he sent up to Congress in February, he proposed giving zero funding to one of these two programs included in this bill and giving less than half as much to the other one. President Obama has proven time and time again he doesn't have a problem with massive spending increases; and, yet, even he believes Congress is spending too much on these programs.

The second fundamental objection that I expressed with this bill is it is trying to write into law special funding and treatment for just two out of many of NOAA's education programs, when the entire effort is subject to top-to-bottom review.

NOAA itself is looking into how to best conduct its education program. The agency contracted with the National Academy of Sciences to review and critique NOAA's entire education effort. That study was just completed 2 weeks ago after more than 2 years of work. Just 2 weeks ago, this report came out. The American taxpayer spent over \$1 million producing this report, and despite this nearly 200-page document just being delivered into our hands, this House is apparently ready to ignore the work and recommendations by the National Academy of Sciences by moving this bill and voting on it today.

If Congress is going to ignore the National Academy of Sciences report and was going to tell NOAA which education programs it was going to pick and choose to authorize, we could have

saved the National Academy a lot of time, and we could have saved the taxpayers over \$1 million.

This bill needs to be sent back to the drawing board so that spending levels can be cut back and so the National Academy of Sciences report can be taken into consideration. Until the changes are made, I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill and the substitute amendment.

I would also like to note, Madam Speaker, that to suggest that the administration fully supports this bill, I think, is a mischaracterization of the facts. In fact, testimony was given that "we also note that NOAA supports education and outreach programs in the Office of Education and throughout NOAA's line offices. The authorization levels of H.R. 3644 could divert funding from these other programs." That should be noted as Members consider this bill.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAPPS. I'm pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I thank my good friend from California, and I rise in full support of H.R. 3644, the Ocean, Coastal and Watershed Training Act. I was proud to be an original cosponsor of this bill which creates the Bay Watershed Education and Training program.

Dozens of my constituents have written in support of the Bay Watershed Education and Training program which will strengthen local environmental education in Northern Virginia and in other parts of the Chesapeake Bay watershed.

When John Smith arrived in 1607, the bay estuary, the largest in the country, had an unbelievable profusion of fish, oysters and mussels. Smith's men fished from their boats just by dipping a frying pan in the water, and Smith wrote that the oysters "lay thick as stones" on the bay floor. Not true today.

A central part of restoring America's largest estuary is teaching the next generation about how to be good bay stewards. Northern Virginia educators do an outstanding job teaching students about the environment, including issues ranging from global warming to acid rain, to the health of the bay itself.

Every year, thousands of students will visit Occoquan Bay Wildlife Refuge, Mason Neck State Park and Pohick Bay Regional Park to learn about the Potomac River tidal ecosystems.

Unfortunately, constraints on local resources have prevented most northern Virginia students from participating lately in these programs. The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration will work with local school systems and nonprofits in the Bay Watershed Education and Training program and will provide competitive

grants to help more students participate.

In our area, the National Capital Region, this means more students will be able to participate in bird-banding programs, surveys of benthic macroinvertebrates and exploration of coastal wetlands.

I want to thank Congresswoman CAPPS for her leadership in introducing this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to vote in support of this bill.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Madam Speaker, I would like to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LUNGREN).

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, once again, we have a bill which has a wonderful name with a wonderful purpose; but it appears that we are forgetting the fact that we're broke. As I understand this bill, this will be a 10 percent increase per year for 5 years for this education program.

I don't know any school district in my district that is going to be able to increase their funding by 10 percent per year for the next 5 years. My State of California, we are broke. I don't know where we're going to get funding. At some point in time, the American people are going to ask us, do you ever connect your responsibilities with fiscal responsibility? And because this is a good idea that we want people to be educated on environmental matters, particularly dealing with the ocean, with the coastline and with watershed, do we just throw out the idea, throw off the table the idea that maybe we ought to be fiscally responsible, or do we ignore it? Similarly, we are probably going to deal with a bill this weekend that throws out the idea that we need to do something to fix some of the problems in our health care system, but apparently we just say, forget the costs.

We also appear to be saying, forget the rules. And we are also apparently saying with respect to that, forget the Constitution. Oh, by the way, the bill that I understand we are going to be presented with later this weekend is entitled this: An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the first-time home buyers credit in the case of Members of the Armed Forces and certain other Federal employees, and for other purposes.

□ 1115

Now, that doesn't sound like the health care bill, does it? And there is a reason for it. Once again, we have forgotten about transparency and, I would say, responsibility, because the Constitution of the United States says that all revenue-raising measures must start with the House of Representatives.

Now, why would the Founding Fathers say that? It is because they realized the tremendous power of reaching into the pocket of an individual citizen

and taking their money by way of taxes for, presumably, good programs. But because that power is so immense, the Founding Fathers believed that that power should reside initially in the House of Representatives because we are to be more responsive to our constituency, by way of going before them once every 2 years for election or reelection, as opposed to the Senate, which only does one-third of their membership and Members have 6 years before they have to go back to their constituency.

So what does that have to do with the bill that I just mentioned? Well, there was this bill dealing with the first-time homebuyers credit, in the case of the Armed Forces, that started in the Ways and Means Committee, passed out of the House, went over to the Senate. And what they did was they took the title of the bill, and—at least I can find nothing left of the bill that came from here over there—they gutted the bill and replaced it with this 2,000-plus-page health care bill.

Technically, they are complying with the Constitution, but they are violating the spirit of the Constitution, which said that revenue-raising bills—and this is a super-revenue-raising bill—should start here.

Now, to compound that, we used to talk about something in the criminal law called compounding a felony. I will call it compounding a political felony. We now are told that that bill that didn't originate in the House as the constitutional Founders thought it should will now come to the House. But we won't really vote on it. We will vote on some other animal called a rule and thereby deem it to be passed.

So think what we are doing to the spirit of the Constitution. We are not starting this humongous bill in the House of Representatives. We have allowed it to be captured in a shell bill that went over to the Senate, and then, the additional indignity to our constituents is they will not have the opportunity for those of us duly elected to vote on the precise question that the Senate voted on.

Now, I heard a lot of talk about transparency. I heard a lot of talk about regaining the trust of the American people and regaining the confidence of the American people in their institutions, a lot of talk about us re-establishing the confidence of the American people in their institutions of government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. I yield the gentleman from California 2 additional minutes.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. I would have to ask, if you were to make this a question for a fifth grade government class or a fifth grade U.S. history class as to whether or not that is the way in which you restore the confidence of the American people in their institutions of government. I suspect I know what the answer would be.

But of course we are not fifth graders. We are presumably adults around here. We have sworn an oath to uphold the Constitution. And while we might technically get around that requirement by following the letter of the Constitution, wouldn't it be better if we followed the spirit of the Constitution?

And so once again, Madam Speaker, we are presented in this case with a bill that sounds very good for a worthy cause but gives no consideration whatsoever to the ultimate cost to the American taxpayer because, in many cases, they are 2,000 and 3,000 miles away; they are not here. So out of sight, out of mind.

Oh, yes. And let's forget August. It didn't exist. And the people who were here have been described by some on this floor as un-American and not representative of the American people. I would suggest they are representative of the American people, and I would say that we, at some point in time, have to get away from our business as usual and get back to the people's business.

This would be a good place to start. I hope we will have a strong finish on that this weekend when we come to our senses and recognize that the bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the first-time homebuyers credit in the case of members of the Armed Forces and certain other Federal employees, otherwise known as the takeover of medical care in this country, that we should come to our senses and say enough is enough.

Mrs. CAPPAS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE).

Mr. INSLEE. This is a great bill because it will help American kids to understand what is going on in the oceans, which is they are becoming too acidic to support life as we know it. They are 30 percent more acidic because of carbon pollution. We have got to do something about that. It is nice to let our kids know what is going on.

But I want to respond to this criticism of the health care reform bill, because this Sunday people are going to stand up on this floor and be counted, and they are either going to be with the insurance industry in their ability to stop Americans from getting health insurance because they have diabetes or they will be with us who are going to stop insurance companies from denying coverage to Americans with diabetes and Parkinson's and heart problems.

Now, this criticism of the procedure that is going to be used reminds me of an old show I saw, "To Tell the Truth." And they showed a guy one time, he was a park ranger in Yosemite National Park. He got hit by lightning not once, not twice, but five times, and they asked him what advice he would give to people in a lightning storm. He thought about it for a minute and he said, My advice would be don't stand next to me.

Well, during this debate, don't stand next to the Republicans who are giving you this balderdash poppycock that there is something wrong with this procedure we are going to use, and I will tell you why.

The procedure we are going to use, we are going to vote. Everybody's votes are going to be right up there. It comports with the U.S. Constitution. I will tell you how I know. It is the same procedure the Republicans have used scores of times for the last two decades. Of the times this procedure has been used in the last two decades, 72 percent of the time it was initiated by the Republican Party.

Now, if you tell me there is something wrong with that, there might be a little hypocrisy involved. And when there is hypocrisy involved, maybe you could get struck by lightning.

So let me suggest that during this debate, for the Republicans who are going to say there is something wrong with the constitutional process we have of voting, don't stand next to a Republican. They might get struck by lightning.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Madam Speaker, I am a freshman here. I didn't create this mess, but I am here to help clean it up. And to suggest this is the direction we should go, I thought the campaign they said was about change. I thought we were going to try to raise the bar in this institution, but evidently not.

At this time, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE).

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Utah for yielding.

And it is very interesting that those of us who came here to clean up this process are watching as the liberals that are running this Congress try to ram through a 2,407-page government takeover of health care without even allowing a vote here on the House floor. And maybe they really think that the American people will be fooled, but the American people will not be fooled.

And isn't it interesting that we are here right now debating this bill, H.R. 3644. It is a 15-page bill. We have a debate here on the House floor, and in a little while we are going to have a vote here on the House floor on this 15-page bill; yet Speaker PELOSI and her liberal attendants want to hide a vote on this 2,407-page bill.

They are running around this building; they are running all around town saying how great this bill is. They are talking about all the wonderful things in this bill. Well, if it is so wonderful, why are they actually trying to hide a vote on the bill?

What they are trying to hide, maybe, is all the sweetheart deals that are in this bill and the other subsequent language that they just filed a little while ago that people are still combing through and finding more sweetheart deals.

Maybe another thing they are trying to hide in this bill are all the budget gimmicks, the fact that there is 10 years of taxes in this bill with only 6 years of spending, and yet they want to say that it is going to reduce the deficits.

Anybody who thinks that this bill, this \$1 trillion fiasco is going to reduce the deficit, obviously they didn't follow the Cash for Clunkers program that was supposed to last 6 months and ran out of money after about 2 weeks.

So here we are debating this 15-page bill and we are going to have a vote on this 15-page bill, and American people across the country are wondering right now what they are hiding in this 2,407-page bill that they are trying to avoid a vote on.

Again, maybe it is the \$500 billion in new taxes in this bill that they are trying to hide, most of which would fall of the backs of middle class families and the job creators in this country.

I will tell you one bill that the American people would like us to be debating; not this 2,407-page bill, not this 15-page bill. The American people would like us to be debating a bill to create jobs in this country to actually get our economy back on track. And those of us on the Republican side have put many ideas on the table that would actually create jobs in this country, and they have all been pushed to the side because they want to try to sneak this bill through without a vote on the House floor.

So what other things are in here that they are trying to hide? What about the \$500 billion in cuts to Medicare, including the virtual elimination of the Medicare Advantage program?

And I guess that leads us to something else they are trying to hide is all the broken promises that are in this bill, because the President said on multiple occasions, if you like what you have, you can keep it. The problem is, as the American people are finding out, there are multiple places in this bill that they take away the health care you like, including Medicare Advantage, which hundreds of thousands of seniors in Louisiana and all across the Nation like that plan, and yet it is taken away from them. And many small businesses will tell you the good health care that they provide to their employees, that their employees like, will be taken away.

And, even more importantly, doctors—and ask your family doctor. Many doctors across this country have said they are shutting down their practice if this 2,407-page monstrosity becomes law because they are not going to let a government bureaucrat interfere between the relationship of a doctor and patient.

So what else are they trying to hide? Let's talk about the broken promises again. You know, the President said multiple times all of this is going to be on C-SPAN. Now, if you are watching C-SPAN today, you are watching the debate on this 15-page bill. It is a good

debate we are having on the 15-page bill, but you are not allowed a debate on the 2,407-page bill because it is not on C-SPAN.

In fact, right now while we are here on this House floor, Speaker PELOSI and her liberal attendants have been dispatched all throughout town to continue cutting sweetheart deals. Yes, they are actually still meeting right now cutting sweetheart deals. And what about that C-SPAN promise? Not one of those meetings is on C-SPAN, and yet it is going on right now and we don't see any of that.

And so the American people are watching this, and the American people are sick of this process; yet all I hear on the other side is, Oh, George Bush and those Republicans.

They are running everything now. President Obama is in the White House. They have got a 59-vote majority in the Senate. They have got over 250 votes here on this House floor and they only need 216, and yet they still think that they can get away with saying, Oh, it is those Republicans that are doing all of this. And yet they are trying to sneak through this 2,407-page bill while saying, Okay, it is okay to have a vote on 15 pages and it is okay to have a debate on 15 pages, but they want to hide a debate and hide a vote on 2,407 pages.

The American people are not going to stand for this process, and they are watching.

Mrs. CAPPs. Madam Speaker, may I inquire how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California has 22 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Utah has 13½ minutes remaining.

Mrs. CAPPs. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES).

Mr. SARBANES. I want to thank my colleague for yielding and for introducing the Ocean, Coastal, and Watershed Education Act, H.R. 3644, and for working to maintain the Bay-Watershed Education and Training programs, watershed approach for environmental education.

In my own State of Maryland, the Chesapeake Bay B-WET was the first B-WET that was established for the country, and it serves as a national model of watershed-based environmental education.

Earlier this fall, I was pleased to join with Congressmen KRATOVIL and WITTMAN to introduce and then see passage in the full House of Representative's legislation that reauthorizes the Chesapeake Bay B-WET program.

The bill before us will codify other existing B-WET programs around the country and provide NOAA the authority to create new B-WETs in various watersheds throughout the country and the territories. So I want to again thank Congresswoman CAPPs for her leadership.

□ 1130

One of the things that this does, this education and training for the next

generation, is that it encourages our kids to become comfortable with science; to look at the world through an empirical lens; to make decisions based on data and facts, not just opinion. And that's a skill that we really need to encourage in the next generation.

It occurs to me as we talk about this health care bill, I wish more people would be bringing a lens of empiricism and fact-based review to the health care bill, because if you look at the health care bill through that lens, if you look at the facts of this health care bill, then it is clear why it responds to all of the grievances that so many Americans have had with the current health care system for decades.

Fact: Not only does it pay for itself, it reduces the deficit. So this suggestion that somehow it's not being paid for is misplaced. Not only does it pay for itself, but over the next 10 years, the independent Congressional Budget Office, the CBO, has projected that there will be savings and a reduction to the deficit of about \$132 billion. And then in the next 10 years they've projected that it will reduce the deficit by \$1.2 trillion. So all those people out there that want to reduce the deficit, this is your bill. The health care bill is a major vehicle for accomplishing that. That's fact number one.

Fact number two: It's going to make Medicare stronger—not weaker—because it's going to crack down on fraud and abuse. It's going to take those savings and—this is another piece of misinformation that's going on, that somehow the savings we're taking from Medicare are going to go off into the ether. We're taking the savings from Medicare, and we're actually putting them right back into the Medicare program by closing the doughnut hole, by making available to our seniors primary care opportunities and preventive care measures that currently they have to pay out of pocket for. But now, because it makes a lot of sense, those things will be covered. So we're taking the savings, we're putting it right back into the Medicare program.

Fact number three: Thirty-two million people who today do not have health insurance coverage, when this bill is passed, will be on their way to getting that coverage. Ninety-five percent of Americans will be covered ultimately when the provisions of this bill take full force. In fact, the last fact I'd just like to point out, which is this, is finally, after decades in which the health insurance industry has pretty much run the show—it's been a health insurance industry takeover of the health care system in America. That's who's taking over the health care system, the private health insurance industry. This bill finally fights back against the health insurance industry and says no longer will you discriminate against people based on pre-existing conditions, no longer will you terminate their coverage right at the moment when they need it most.

Finally, instead of us living in your world, by your rules, you're going to start living in our world by our rules. That's what this health care bill accomplishes. And that's why we're ready to support it.

Again, I want to thank my colleague for her work on the B-WET, and I strongly support that bill as well.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. I guess that's the fundamental challenge. I don't want to live in his world. And I don't want the people of the United States to have to live in his world. That's the fundamental difference in the approach that's dealing with this health care bill. We have an opportunity in this country to do the right thing. I think the more the people of the United States of America have gotten to know this health care bill, the less they like it. The more sunshine that's shown on this, the less they like it. Only in the United States of America can you spend a trillion dollars and it's not going to add to the deficit when we're already \$12 trillion into debt. This bill that we're considering here today will add to that debt. Even the President didn't even ask money for this program.

We can't even take care of our seniors in this country or our veterans. We have a Veterans Administration, and I have soldiers in the State of Utah that are trying get care and services, yet we got a notice recently from the Veterans Administration saying, Don't even bother applying because we have such a backlog of people. The American people understand this. They understand how deep our deficit and our debt is. They understand how irresponsible the health care bill is and what a detriment it's going to be to this Nation and this country. And I would challenge Members to try to articulate what this bill is even going to do. There's some 158 programs, and administrations, and departments, and boards. Somebody stand up and try to articulate what's going to happen—not what it's going to do, but how is it going to work? Because I don't think there's anybody in this body that can actually answer, How is it going to work?

Now going back specifically to this bill that we're considering here today. Again, I want to reiterate the point, Madam Speaker, that we spent a million dollars coming up with a study from the National Academy of Sciences and just totally ignored it. Two hundred pages, 2 years of work, and yet because we've got to fill some time here so we can get to health care—they don't even want Members to go home for the weekend—we're going to throw up this bill prematurely. Why are we ignoring this report?

I want to highlight a couple of things that are said in here. This is from that National Academy of Sciences report recommendation 1:2: "In order to adequately address the mismatch between its available resources and its ambitious education agenda, NOAA should

better align and deploy its resources. This may require the termination of certain activities and programs that, based on appropriate evaluation, do not directly and effectively contribute to its education and stewardship goals.

"NOAA's role in education is shaped by the distributed nature of its education efforts across five line offices and the Office of Education. Because of their diverse missions, the line offices . . . and the Office of Education can act independently and sometimes even in competition with each other."

Further, "The differences in management structures, missions, and education mandates are obstacles to creating a cohesive and coordinated education portfolio."

At a time when we are paying over \$600 million a day just in interest, we have a debt that exceeds \$12 trillion, close to a \$1 trillion new health care proposal that's moving forward, some how, some way, the Democrats want to offer a bill that gives an automatic increase year after year. Ten percent. Just keep adding 10 percent to it over the next 5 years. I think that is fundamentally wrong.

Now the ranking member of Natural Resources, DOC HASTINGS, offered an amendment that said, Let's just keep the funding level flat. That is a simple, reasonable proposal. But somehow the Rules Committee couldn't find it in their heart to allow Members to vote on it.

Please, don't come here and lecture to somebody and say, Oh, we're about openness and transparency. We're about change in America. I don't buy it. You're not living up to it. You have the opportunity to do the right thing—and you consistently don't. You consistently offend the American people and offend me. I'm a freshman here. I didn't create this mess. I don't want to hear about how the Republicans messed up, because you know what? They had the House and the Senate and the Presidency and they did blow it. I'll be the first one to stand here and point criticism to them. But if we're going to rise to the level that this body demands, then we need to raise the bar and start acting like adults. Vote on what we're supposed to vote for. Be open and transparent. Allow a rule that will come to this floor and make America proud. Let people without the disguise and the nuances. That is within your power, and yet it's not being done. And it's not being done consistently. There are a lot of people here that are fed up with it. I'm one of them. It's disgusting what you're doing. It is disgusting. And I think you know it.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. I'll reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAPPS. At this point I'm pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

Mr. HOLT. Madam Speaker, I rise today as cosponsor of H.R. 3644, the Bay-Watershed Education and Training Regional Programs and National Environmental Literacy Grant Program, and with great appreciation for my colleague from California, who combines her interest—our interest—in environmental protection with our interest in the education of youth. And I would like to talk about the bill at hand. She combines here book learning with field environmental education. Environmentalist David Polis once said, "Must we always teach our children with books? Let them look at the mountains and the stars up above. Let them look at the beauty of the waters and the trees and flowers on earth. They will then begin to think, and to think is the beginning of a real education."

If we want to teach our children to be responsible stewards of our environment, we must foster understanding and awareness of the environment as an integral part of our educational curricula. The B-WET and National Environmental Literacy Grant Program operated by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration is an excellent example of a successful environmental program.

Now the opponents of this legislation seem to think that because the National Research Council says there are other good educational programs in NOAA in addition to this, that we somehow should not do this. Through these grant programs, elementary students and high school students across the Nation have learned to appreciate the importance of healthy coastal and ocean resources to the quality of our life and to coastal-based economies.

The legislation before us today would fully authorize and expand access to the B-WET and the Environmental Literacy Program. I'd like to thank my colleague from California for including a provision in this legislation that would allow the Mid-Atlantic region to be a priority area for future B-WET programs. This will allow successful New Jersey educational programs like Rutgers University and the Jacques Cousteau National Estuarine Research Reserve to compete for funds that can enrich environmental education throughout the State and the region. New Jersey is already taking the lead on coastal and marine resources through the K-12 education program developed by the National Estuarine Research Reserve System. It's known as KEEP, the K-12 Estuarine Education Program. The availability of B-WET funds to the Mid-Atlantic region could help to advance KEEP, a field-based estuarine science education initiative that features real-time data and innovative technology. Research has shown that environmental education, particularly field-based education like this, fosters students' readiness to learn. It improves scores on standardized tests. Yes, it helps book learning, too. And it stimulates student interest in math and science.

I urge my colleagues to support this authorization, and I thank the gentlelady from California for her leadership on this.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Madam Speaker, we have no additional speakers, but I will continue to reserve the balance of my time, unless you're prepared to close.

Mrs. CAPPS. I'd like now to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH).

Mr. FATTAH. Let me thank the gentlelady from California. I want to congratulate my colleague for her extraordinary leadership on this issue of such importance. We know of the real environmental challenges facing the oceans throughout the world. Oceans represent the vast majority—more than two-thirds of the surface of our planet—and this effort to educate our future generations about our responsibilities to be good stewards is so very, very important.

Back home, we have the Lenfest Foundation, in which Gerry and Marguerite Lenfest have put forth tens of millions of dollars into these types of efforts. And here in Washington, my friend, Tom Lindenfeld, with the Blue Guardians. There's so many people, Americans, who have focused the Nation's attention on this challenge.

I want to rise as an appropriator that's on the subcommittee that handles the NOAA appropriations. First of all, these authorizations are important, but they will be held to the PAYGO rules. It's still vitally important that the Congress speak and indicate its preference. I'm a supporter of this bill. I want to thank my colleague for her introduction and hope that all of my colleagues will favorably support it.

□ 1145

Now, I want to say a little bit about the other subject matter that's been raised on the floor, about the health care debate that we're going to have on Sunday. Now, all we have to do as Americans when we really hear these very different points of view is look at the scorecard. When the Republicans had the Presidency, the Congress and the Senate for 6 years, tens of millions of Americans were uninsured, and they did zero. On the question of children's health care, there was just zero and vetoes of the children's health care program. In terms of reining in the insurance companies and their unfair practices, they did zero.

Now, the Democrats in less than 16 months have made sure that the children's health care program could insure over 10 million children. On Sunday—and what an appropriate day for it—we're going to take 32 million of our fellow citizens and make sure that they have health care coverage. Aren't we our brother's keeper? We have a responsibility to be stewards of the Earth, but we also have a responsibility to love our neighbor. And in this Easter season, we know that on Fridays a lot of things can happen. We can

hear a lot of things and witness a lot of things, but if we just hold on and wait until Sunday, good things happen on Sunday.

I believe that this Democratic majority, when we look at the scorecard, when we get held to account for how we were stewards—my colleague from California is showing good stewardship in terms of the oceans and educating future generations, and this Democratic majority is going to show that, indeed, we are our brother's keeper on Sunday. So notwithstanding the zero over their 6 years, we've taken less than 16 months to take the priorities of this country, right them again, and move us in the correct direction.

Now, we've heard this talk about deficits. The last time that we were paying down the deficits and balancing the budget, we had a Democrat in the White House. We're headed in that direction again. That's what PAYGO is about. That's what responsible leadership is about. And that's why the President's set up this fiscal commission. I have introduced a bill to get us to deal with the debts in our country. We hear a lot of nonsense from some of our Republican colleagues. We can stop talking about it and vote on it.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Sunday, Bloody Sunday. Can't wait.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Speaker, could I again inquire of the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California has 10 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Utah has 8 minutes remaining.

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased now to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maine (Ms. PINGREE).

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. I thank my colleague, the gentlewoman from California, for yielding her time to me and thank you for this great bill. We are veering from the conversation a little bit. But first I want to talk about the Capps bill and just say how important it is to a State like mine, with a tremendous amount of ocean coastline, with an enormous number of young people who grow up on the waterfront, who are fishermen, who work in waterfront communities. This is a great program. I wholeheartedly endorse this particular piece of legislation. I know it's going to be great for our coastal communities, and I commend you for doing it. So thank you very much for what you're doing on the floor today.

I just wanted to take a little bit of time to answer my freshman colleague from Utah, who is also my office neighbor, and just talk about how seriously we disagree on this topic of health care. I, for one, am thrilled that we are here this weekend to finally take up an issue that is of such great importance to my constituents. I mean, frankly, when I go back to my district, I find that the more people hear about this health care bill, the happier they are. They are thrilled to know that as a

small business they're going to start receiving subsidies to help support the cost of health insurance. My seniors are saying, Thank goodness we no longer will have to pay for preventive care under Medicare. Thank goodness we're going to get rid of the doughnut hole that was created by the other side, predominantly when they passed the Medicare prescription D plan.

We hear a lot about process, but I just want to talk a little bit about the process of insurance companies because that's what makes my constituents mad. When they hear about the fact that people are constantly denied coverage because of a preexisting condition—in many States, being a woman, a woman of child-bearing age is a preexisting condition. That will be gone with this bill. Immediately we'll say children are not a preexisting condition. None of them can be denied coverage. And by 2014, no one can be denied under this piece of legislation. We're going to get rid of lifetime caps, people who have a long-term illness who find that their insurance runs out in spite of the fact that they've been paying these high premiums.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Madam Speaker, I will continue to reserve the balance of my time as we have no further requests for time.

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Speaker, at this time I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

Mr. MCGOVERN. I want to thank my colleague from California, Congresswoman CAPPS, for yielding the time and for the excellent legislation which will help educate our children about the importance of our environment, our oceans and our watersheds. She has been a leader on environmental legislation, and I am proud to serve with her.

But, Madam Speaker, I want to just take a moment to comment on some of the other debate that's been going on here. I regret very much the tone that my Republican colleagues have taken in this debate. Never, never in all my time being here have I heard such rhetoric, personal attacks, harsh attacks. I regret it because the issue of health insurance reform is an important issue, and we should talk about it with respect for one another and with respect for each other's approaches to health insurance reform.

This is important. This debate we're going to have on Sunday, this vote we're going to have on Sunday is important. My colleagues express outrage over the process. Where's the outrage over the fact that tens of millions of our fellow citizens do not have health care? Where's the outrage over the fact that some of the biggest insurance companies in the United States of America regularly discriminate against individuals who have preexisting conditions, preexisting conditions like acne, believe it or not? And in some States in this country, domestic violence is used as a preexisting condition to deny women health insurance. So a woman who gets beaten by

her husband or her boyfriend has a pre-existing condition. Give me break. Give me a break.

I have heard that we're not going to vote on health care. This is some kind of crazy process. A process, by the way, which has been invoked by them many times when they were in charge. But to the question that always gets raised, is the House approving the Senate bill without actually voting on it? No.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mrs. CAPPS. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. MCGOVERN. The House is voting to approve the Senate bill when it votes on the rule. When Members take up the rule, they are considering whether to pass the Senate bill at the same time that they pass reconciliation, which will improve the Senate bill.

You want to be outraged, be outraged over the fact that we're the greatest country on this planet, the richest country on this planet, and tens of millions of our citizens do not have health care. We can do better, and we will do better on Sunday.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased now to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. Let me thank the gentlewoman for her excellent work in the area of the environment, our oceans and our watersheds. But it seems like every conversation here is going to be about health care, so let's take that on.

The fact is, Madam Speaker, this bill that we'll vote on on Sunday cuts the deficit by \$138 billion in the first 10 years. That level of deficit reduction is something the Democrats are known for and Republicans, unfortunately, have not been known for. We know that when the Democrats left office in 2000, we had a surplus, and then we quickly—based on tax cuts for the wealthy and unpaid-for wars and other things—we ran into a massive deficit. Quite frankly, if I was a Republican, I would be embarrassed to talk about deficits. But it seems like they're not.

So the fact is, we have to talk about the facts and straighten out the situation so that the American people will know that the fact is that that bill, this health care bill, cuts the deficit by \$138 billion in the first 10 years, and cuts it by \$1 trillion in the second 10 years. The fact is this bill is good for America. It is fiscally sound. It is paid for. It makes sense. And for any Republican to stand up here and talk about deficits and lecture on deficits, they really do need to review their history because they are the party of deficits. Democrats are the party of deficit reduction. Americans all over this country, some of whom have said that they're scared about the change that is

about to come, their fear should be overcome by the good things that are in this bill.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I do think we should go back and review history. The reality of this bill is the fact that it spends nearly \$1 trillion, and the reason you can try to say that it's deficit-neutral or reduces the deficit is because it raises taxes. Only in America do you try to get away with saying, Hey, we're going to spend nearly \$1 trillion, and by the way, it's not going to hurt the deficit. And let's also go back and review history and understand that during that time you like to tout when President Clinton was in office, the reality is that the debt continued to increase. There was a reduction in the annual deficit, and a Republican Congress was in charge. It is the Congress of the United States of America that originates spending. So let's also make sure that we're fair on that point as well.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, in closing the debate on this topic, I want to spend a couple of minutes responding to some claims from the other side. First with respect to the authorization levels, Congress is already investing in both of these programs under discussion today through the appropriations process. The authorized funding levels contained in my bipartisan compromise amendment were based upon existing appropriations and allow for the continuation and measured growth of both programs, which are in high demand by educators nationwide. They were negotiated with my colleague Mr. CASSIDY, and I do appreciate his efforts.

My bill would authorize the programs that Congress is already spending money on and makes sure that certain standards and criteria for implementation are met by the agency when they do spend these funds. To me, this represents a responsible effort on the part of our committee and our Congress to exercise our oversight function.

Second, with respect to the argument that we should not consider this legislation because we need time to study the recommendations from the NAS evaluation of NOAA's education program, it is true that the National Academy of Science report on NOAA's education program was released last week. Nothing in the report, however, was specifically critical of either the B-WET or ELG programs. And because of this, this report should have no bearing on my legislation to codify both programs.

Indeed, the NAS' National Research Council panel found that over the relatively short lives of both programs, they have made positive contributions to fulfill NOAA's educational mission and that they reflect well the agency's diverse capabilities in science, resource stewardship, and education.

In short, these are both very good programs with broad support from more than 60 science education, out-

door recreation, and conservation organizations. By authorizing them, we ensure money already being spent is spent well and responsibly. I urge all Members to support the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time. The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCGOVERN). All time for debate on the bill, as amended, has expired.

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MRS. CAPPS

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk made in order under the rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in part A of House Report 111-445 offered by Mrs. CAPPS:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Ocean, Coastal, and Watershed Education Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds the following:

(1) The United States faces major challenges, such as mitigating and adapting to the impacts of climate change, stewarding critical coastal and marine resources including fish and wildlife habitat while sustaining the commercial and recreational activities that depend on these resources, and improving resilience to natural disasters, that collectively threaten human health, sustainable economic development, environmental quality, and national security.

(2) Communities in coastal watersheds are particularly vulnerable to these increasingly urgent, interconnected, and complex challenges and need support for teacher professional development and experiential learning among students of all ages.

(3) These challenges can be met with the help of comprehensive programs specifically targeted to engage coastal watershed communities, schoolchildren, and the general public to develop engaged and environmentally literate citizens who are better able to understand complex environmental issues, assess risk, evaluate proposed plans, and understand how individual decisions affect the environment at local, regional, national, and global scales.

(4) The intrinsic social and conservation values of wildlife-dependent and other outdoor recreation can play an important role in outdoor educational programs that address the myriad of coastal and ocean concerns, as well as instill a sustainable conservation ethic that will enable them to face those challenges to the betterment of both the environment and coastal communities.

(5) The economic importance of coastal areas and resources to the overall economy of the United States is significant. According to the U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy, coastal and ocean-related activities support millions of American jobs and generate more than \$1 trillion, or one tenth of the Nation's annual gross domestic product. Sustainable use of the Nation's natural resources can provide additional economic opportunities to the United States economy.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this Act is to advance environmental literacy, develop public awareness and appreciation of the economic, social, recreational, and environmental benefits of coastal watersheds, and emphasize stewardship and sustainable economic development of critical coastal and marine resources, including an understanding of how climate change is impacting

those resources, through the establishment of—

- (1) an Environmental Literacy Grant Program; and
- (2) regional programs under the B-WET Program.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **ADMINISTRATOR.**—The term “Administrator” means the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

(2) **BAY-WATERSHED EDUCATION.**—The term “bay-watershed education” means environmental education focused on watersheds, with an emphasis on stewardship and sustainable economic development of critical coastal and marine resources, including an understanding of how climate change is impacting those resources.

(3) **B-WET PROGRAM.**—The term “B-WET Program” means the Bay-Watershed Education and Training Program of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, as in effect immediately before the enactment of this Act and modified under this Act or any subsequently enacted Act.

(4) **ELIGIBLE ENTITY.**—The term “eligible entity” means a State agency, local agency, school district, institution of higher education, or for-profit or non-profit nongovernmental organization, consortium, or other entity that the Administrator finds has demonstrated expertise and experience in the development of the institutional, intellectual, or policy resources to help environmental education become more effective and widely practiced.

(5) **ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION.**—The term “environmental education” means interdisciplinary formal and informal learning about the relevant interrelationships between dynamic environmental and human systems, including economic systems that depend on coastal, watershed and marine resources for job creation and economic growth, that results in increasing the learner’s capacity for decisionmaking, stewardship, and sustainable economic development of natural and community resources.

(6) **ENVIRONMENTAL LITERACY.**—The term “environmental literacy” means the capacity to perceive and interpret the relative health of environmental systems and the interrelationships between natural, economic, and social systems and technology, and to assess options and take appropriate action to maintain, restore, or improve the health of those systems and promote sustainable economic development.

(7) **HIGH-LEVERAGE PROJECTS.**—The term “high-leverage projects” means projects supported by grants authorized under this Act that use Federal, State and nongovernmental financial, technical, and other resources in such a manner that the potential beneficial outcomes are highly magnified or enhanced.

(8) **STATE.**—The term “State” means each of the several States of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, any other territory or possession of the United States, and any Indian tribe.

SEC. 4. ENVIRONMENTAL LITERACY GRANT PROGRAM.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Administrator shall establish a national competitive grant program, to be known as the “Environmental Literacy Grant Program”, under which the Administrator shall provide, subject to the availability of appropriations, financial assistance to—

- (1) expand the adoption of coastal, ocean, Great Lakes, and climate on all time scales education;

- (2) build administrative and technical capacity with coastal, ocean, and watershed communities and stakeholder groups to enhance their effectiveness;

- (3) encourage water-dependent, wildlife-dependent, and other outdoor recreation, experiential learning, and hands-on involvement with coastal and watershed resources as a method of promoting stewardship and sustainable economic development of those resources;

- (4) develop and implement new approaches to advance coastal, ocean, Great Lakes, and climate on all time scales education and environmental literacy at national, regional, and local levels; and

- (5) encourage formal and informal environmental education about the systemic interrelationships between healthy coastal, watershed, and marine resources and sustainable economic systems that depend on such resources for job creation and economic development.

(b) **PRIORITIES.**—In awarding grants under this section, the Administrator shall give priority consideration to innovative, strategic, high-leverage projects that demonstrate strong potential for being sustained in the future by a grant recipient beyond the time period in which activities are carried out with the grant.

(c) **GUIDELINES.**—No later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act and after consultation with appropriate stakeholders, the Administrator shall publish in the Federal Register guidelines regarding the implementation of this grant program, including publication of criteria for eligible entities, identification of national priorities, establishment of performance measures to evaluate program effectiveness, information regarding sources of non-Federal matching funds or in-kind contributions, and reporting requirements for grant award recipients.

(d) **LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS BY ADMINISTRATOR.**—Of the amounts made available to implement this section—

- (1) no less than 80 percent shall be used for competitive grants or cooperative agreements;

- (2) no more than 10 percent may be used by the Administrator to implement the grant program; and

- (3) no less than 10 percent of the annual funds appropriated for the program authorized under this section shall be used to fund contracts or cooperative agreements to conduct strategic planning, promote communications among grant recipients and within communities, coordinate grant activities to foster an integrated program, and oversee national evaluation efforts.

SEC. 5. B-WET PROGRAM.

(a) **EXISTING PROGRAM.**—The Administrator shall conduct the B-WET Program, including each of the regional programs conducted or under active consideration for creation under such program immediately before the enactment of this Act.

(b) **NEW REGIONAL PROGRAMS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Administrator may create new regional programs under the B-WET Program in accordance with a strategy issued under this subsection.

(2) **STRATEGY.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Administrator shall issue a strategy for establishing such new regional programs

(B) **CONTENTS.**—The strategy shall include the following:

- (i) Evaluation of the need for new regional program in areas that are not served under the B-WET Program on the date of enactment of this Act.

- (ii) Identification of potential new regional programs, including a listing of potential principal non-Federal partners.

- (iii) A comprehensive budget for future expansion of the B-WET Program over the period for which appropriations are authorized under this Act.

- (iv) Such other information as the Administrator considers necessary.

(C) **CONSULTATION AND PUBLIC COMMENT.**—The Administrator shall consult with relevant stakeholders and provide opportunity for public comment in the development of the strategy.

(D) **SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.**—The Administrator shall submit the strategy to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate by not later than 270 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(3) **PRIORITY CONSIDERATION.**—In creating new regional programs under this subsection, the Administrator shall give priority consideration to the needs of—

(A) United States territories, including Guam, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and American Samoa;

(B) the Great Lakes States;

(C) Alaska; and

(D) the mid-Atlantic region.

(c) **MODIFICATION OF B-WET PROGRAM.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Administrator may modify or realign regional programs under the B-WET Program, based on—

(A) changes in regional needs;

(B) mutual interest between the Administrator and relevant stakeholders within a region or regions;

(C) changes in resources available to the Administrator to implement the B-WET Program; and

(D) other circumstances as determined necessary by the Administrator.

(2) **CONSULTATION AND PUBLIC COMMENT.**—The Administrator shall—

(A) consult with the persons conducting a regional program and provide opportunity for public comment prior to making a final decision to modify or realign such regional program; and

(B) publish public notice of such a decision no less than 30-days before the effective date of such a modification or realignment.

(d) **REGIONAL PROGRAM MANAGERS.**—

(1) **APPOINTMENT OF REGIONAL PROGRAM MANAGER.**—The Administrator shall be responsible for the selection, appointment, and when necessary replacement of a regional program manager for each regional program under the B-WET Program.

(2) **QUALIFICATIONS.**—To qualify for appointment as a regional program manager, an individual must—

(A) reside in the region for which appointed; and

(B) demonstrate competence and expertise in bay-watershed education and training.

(3) **FUNCTIONS.**—Each regional program manager shall—

(A) be responsible for managing and administering the B-WET Program in the region for which appointed, in accordance with this Act;

(B) determine the most appropriate communities within the region to be served by the B-WET Program;

(C) encourage water-dependent, wildlife-dependent, and other outdoor recreation, experiential learning experiences for students, and hands-on involvement with coastal and watershed resources as a method of promoting stewardship and sustainable economic development of those resources and complementing core classroom curriculum;

(D) support communication and collaboration among educators, natural resource planners and managers, and governmental and nongovernmental stakeholders;

(E) share and distribute information regarding educational plans, strategies, learning activities, and curricula to all stakeholders within its region;

(F) provide financial and technical assistance pursuant to the guidelines developed by the Administrator under this section; and

(G) perform any additional duties as necessary to carry out the functions of the program.

(e) PROGRAM GUIDELINES.—No later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act and after consultation with appropriate stakeholders, the Administrator shall publish in the Federal Register guidelines regarding the implementation of the B-WET Program, as follows:

(1) CONTRACTS.—The Administrator shall create guidelines through which each regional program manager may enter into contracts (subject to the availability of appropriations) to support projects to design, demonstrate, evaluate, or disseminate practices, methods, or techniques related to Bay-watershed education and training.

(2) GRANT MAKING AND COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall create guidelines through which each regional program manager may provide financial assistance in the form of a grant (subject to the availability of appropriations) or cooperative agreement to support projects that advance the purpose of this Act. The guidelines shall include criteria for eligible entities, identification of national priorities, establishment of performance measures to evaluate program effectiveness, and reporting requirements for grant award recipients.

(B) PRIORITY.—In making grants under this paragraph, each regional program manager shall give priority to those projects that will—

(i) promote bay-watershed education throughout the region concerned;

(ii) advance strategic initiatives to incorporate bay-watershed education into formal and informal education systems;

(iii) build capacity within bay-watershed education communities and stakeholder groups for expanding and strengthening their work;

(iv) build bay-watershed education into professional development or training activities for educators; and

(v) broadly replicate existing, proven bay-watershed education programs.

(f) NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In awarding grants under this section, the regional program managers shall give priority consideration to a project for which the Federal share does not exceed 75 percent of the aggregate cost of such project.

(2) IN-KIND CONTRIBUTION.—The non-Federal share of the costs of any project supported by an award of grant funding under this section may be cash or the fair market value of services, equipment, donations, or any other form of in-kind contribution.

(3) OTHER PRIORITY.—The regional program managers shall give priority consideration to a project that will be conducted by or benefit any under-served community, any community that has an inability to draw on other sources of funding because of the small population or low income of the community, or any other person for any other reason the Administrator considers appropriate and consistent with the purpose of this Act.

(g) REGIONAL PROGRAM COORDINATION.—Within the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the Office of Education shall work with regional program managers on the following regional B-WET Program functions:

(1) Strategic planning efforts.

(2) Integration and coordination of programs.

(3) Coordination of national evaluation efforts.

(4) Promotion of network wide communications.

(5) Selection of new Regional Program Managers.

(6) Management, tracking, and oversight of the B-WET Program.

(h) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS BY ADMINISTRATOR.—Of the amounts made available to implement this section—

(1) no less than 80 percent shall be used for implementation of regional program activities, including the award of grants; and

(2) no more than 20 percent may be used by the Administrator to implement the regional programs and regional program coordination.

SEC. 6. BIENNIAL REPORT.

Not later than December 31, 2011, and biennially thereafter, the Administrator shall submit to Congress a report on the grant programs authorized under this Act. Each such report shall include a description of the eligible activities carried out with grants awarded under the Act during the previous two fiscal years, an assessment of the success and impact of such activities, and a description of the type of programs carried out with such grant, disaggregated by State.

SEC. 7. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Administrator—

(1) to carry out the Environmental Literacy Grant Program authorized by section 4 (including administrative expenses for preparing the report under section 6)—

(A) for fiscal year 2011, \$13,200,000;

(B) for fiscal year 2012, \$14,500,000;

(C) for fiscal year 2013, \$16,000,000;

(D) for fiscal year 2014, \$17,600,000; and

(E) for fiscal year 2015, \$19,300,000; and

(2) to carry out the B-WET Program authorized by section 5 (including administrative expenses for preparing the report under section 6)—

(A) for fiscal year 2011, \$10,700,000;

(B) for fiscal year 2012, \$11,700,000;

(C) for fiscal year 2013, \$12,900,000;

(D) for fiscal year 2014, \$14,200,000; and

(E) for fiscal year 2015, \$15,600,000.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1192, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPs) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Mrs. CAPPs. Mr. Speaker, my amendment in the nature of a substitute reflects changes to the bill, as ordered reported by the Committee on Natural Resources, that, as I mentioned, were negotiated between myself and Congressman CASSIDY of Louisiana. I wish to thank Mr. CASSIDY and his staff for their cooperation and thoughtful suggestions to improve this bill, and I think that the final bipartisan compromise does just that.

In particular, the amendment makes several changes to reflect the significant economic importance of coastal areas and resources to the overall economy of the United States.

As a Representative of a coastal district, I could not agree more that the economic health and viability of our coastal communities is intrinsically connected to the health of the natural resources of the watersheds in which

we live. You cannot have one without the other. In addition, my amendment will authorize a gradual increase in authorized appropriations for fiscal years 2011 through 2015. This modest annual increase of 10 percent will allow for the responsible expansion of both programs to incorporate new regions that are not currently served, particularly by the regional B-WET programs.

I applaud the gentleman from Louisiana for his leadership on this front. Both of our districts enjoy the benefits of the regional B-WET programs, and we would like to see those benefits extended to other watersheds around the country where, I can assure you, there is an overwhelming demand. Mr. Speaker, the changes reflected in this amendment serve to strengthen the overall purposes of this bill. I would like once more to thank Congressman CASSIDY and his staff for their work on these revisions, and I do encourage support of my colleague's amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1200

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Utah is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, there are several concerns with this. In fact, in the bill there are several good programs and things of quality that I would applaud, but there are some basic fundamental flaws that put me in a position, and others in a position, where we are unable to support this amendment and the overall bill.

First of all, it addresses simply two programs within a list of 16 that are found within NOAA's education programs and supporting offices. Further, you see, and actually JARED POLIS, a colleague of ours, had a Dear Colleague letter talking about Environmental Protection Agency educational programs. I don't think it has been addressed how cohesive or incohesive it might be between the overlap and what might be happening or not happening. I don't think that has been properly ferreted out.

Now through some foresight in previous Congresses here, the National Academy of Sciences was tasked with a 2-year study to go out and look at what is going on over at NOAA and what their recommendations are. We have spent, as American taxpayers, over a million dollars to get this report, and yet it seems to be totally ignored. Why does this Congress continue to spend money on worthless reports if the Members are going to simply ignore them and say, Oh, well, these are my two pet projects; and, by the way, let's go ahead and give them 10 percent increases year after year after year?

Is there no recognition that this country is over \$12 trillion in debt?

We are paying over \$600 million a day in interest on the debt, and yet we continue to fund these programs at record

levels, and giving them amazingly high increases without recognition of the fact that this body has got to make difficult decisions.

We can't be all things to all people. We are going to have to make some difficult decisions in this body. And to what is this body actually going to say "no"? Where do we actually turn around and say, No. You know what; we are this far in debt and, I'm sorry, we just can't increase the funding for another educational program?

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

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) who is the pioneer in the area of coastal education.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise on B-WET. I want to talk about B-WET rather than all wet.

I rise in support of this legislation, and I think it is interesting that people are talking about health care because, if you don't have a healthy planet and healthy ocean, all of this discussion about how you care for human beings on the planet is for naught. So let's, for a moment, just focus on a healthy Earth that we may understand, and this bill does that by this program called B-WET.

I am a strong advocate for California's B-WET program, and I come to the floor today to share a few of the stories that I have heard over the years from students and teachers who have benefited from the support.

I would like to tell you about a student who went through California State University of Monterey Bay's Recruitment in Science Education program, a program called RISE, which we all support, to try to get young people interested in the sciences. This young fellow started the RISE program when he was in the sixth grade. He was never very engaged in activities. He was very shy, and he got average grades. He probably would have quit if it hadn't been for his mom and the RISE staff pushing him to stay active. His experiences during a water testing program on the Salinas River while he was a sophomore in high school motivated him to get better grades and to get into college. RISE, the program that he went through grammar school and high school with, is happy to announce that he is now studying microbiology at the University of California, Davis. This program motivated him to go into higher education.

The other story I would like to share with you is about a teacher from Moss Landing Marine Laboratory. That teacher participated in the marine lab program for 3 years. Unfortunately, this year that teacher was given a pink slip and does not have a job, but he told me that his participation in the Moss Landing Marine Lab program was the only thing that kept him going.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. CAPPS. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. FARR. I thank the gentlewoman.

This interaction and relationship that he built with the teachers in the program have kept him motivated and excited about bringing meaningful watershed educational experiences to the classroom with something that he knew was making a big difference to his students.

These are stories about students and teachers that wouldn't exist without this program.

Mr. Speaker, we in Congress are constantly trying to think of new ways to get students engaged in science. I can attest that this program works and is money well spent. I urge its adoption.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would like to echo some of the comments that have already been made here. There seems to be no recognition at all that we have a \$12 trillion debt. We are paying \$600 million a day to service the debt that we have, and yet we are going to be adding, this bill authorizes \$23.9 million just in FY 2011. That is more than the President has recommended for all of the education programs at NOAA. He has recommended that we zero some out, but we have doubled down and said let's increase, by a factor of 100 percent, everything we are doing over there in terms of education.

The gentleman from Utah pointed out that we commission these reports, and then they come back to us and we simply don't follow their recommendations. It has been pointed out that they weren't criticizing the programs that we are actually plussing up funding for; but mark my words, when the President's recommendations come to Congress to zero out some of these programs, we will ignore them and say we can't zero out those programs just because a report says they are not working.

I remember one that we dealt with a while ago. I think it was the DARE program. We commissioned a report, and it came back and said this program is not working at all. It is not delivering the benefits that you say should be delivered. What did we do? I think we doubled funding for it that year instead of saying, all right, recognizing maybe we are not spending money wisely, let's not spend it. Let's pay down the deficit a little or pay down the debt. Let's not increase the deficit. And yet we get these reports, we throw them on a shelf, and we never see them again. That is not the proper oversight we should be doing.

Congress, as we have been going through this earmark debate, we hear Congress say that we are jealously guarding our congressional prerogative. We have the power of the purse; we have the power to earmark. We do have the power of the purse. We have the power to appropriate; and what bothers me more than anything is we

spend so much time on the 1 percent we earmark and ignore the other 99 percent that is spent by the Federal agencies. Instead of offering true oversight, and when we get reports saying programs don't work, then following those reports and say, We are not going to fund these programs any more, instead, we plus up year after year after year until our deficits are exploding and our debt is exploding. We cannot continue to do this. We cannot continue to go on this path.

I will be offering an amendment in a couple of minutes that will simply say that none of the programs that are authorized in this bill should be earmarked. That is a start, because often we will establish these competitive grant programs and, within a couple of years, they are all filled up with congressional earmarks and no one can even compete. I assume that amendment will be adopted. That is a good first start.

Still, we have to look at the overall impact of what we are doing here. We are spending \$23.9 million, and the total over 10 years is \$150 billion or so that we are authorizing in new spending, every dime of which we spend we are borrowing. We have a deficit of over a trillion dollars. We have deficits as far as the eye can see. We are scheduled to triple the debt just in a few years, and yet we are authorizing new programs, more spending, to add to this deficit that we already have. Mr. Speaker, we cannot continue to do this.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased now to yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS).

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentlelady from California for yielding me the time and for the underlying bill.

I come from the State of Maryland, and we have the largest estuary, the Chesapeake Bay, in and around the State of Maryland, and this notion of educating young people, investing them in science and also educating them about the deep impacts that we have through all of our communities onto this estuary is so important.

But I would like to take a moment and talk about an issue which has consumed us and over which we will hear a lot of discussion and misinformation over the ensuing days and hours. Let's talk about health care, Mr. Speaker.

I am so pleased that on Sunday we will have an opportunity in this country, finally, to bring health care to the American people. All of us as Members of Congress will have an opportunity to say that we either stand on the side of the American people or we stand on the side of insurance companies; insurance companies that continue to raise their rates for premiums; insurance companies that deny care and coverage; insurance companies that determine that it is maybe better to pay a CEO \$23 million a year than it is to deliver quality, affordable, and accessible health care to the American people.

So at long last, the Democrats in Congress and our Democratic President are going to bring health care to the American people. We are going to ensure that at a cost of \$940 billion over a decade, saving and cutting the deficit by \$138 billion in just the first 10 years and by \$1.2 trillion in the second 10 years. This is deficit reduction like we haven't seen since the last time we had a Democrat in the White House. And yet, that is exactly what this health care reform package will do.

And what do we get for \$940 billion? Well, I am going to tell you what the American people get. Our small businesses will receive tax credits so they can provide the kind of health care coverage that they want to their employees. Our seniors will see their Medicare coverage strengthened and those programs strengthened. Thirty-two million people across this country who don't have health care coverage now will finally be able to relieve themselves and their families of the worry of disease or illness that they can't take care of.

And, of course, all of us who have health care will see the stopping of the escalation of our premium costs because we will be taking a look at what insurance companies do. This and more is what we will get for \$940 billion, saving \$138 billion in the first 10 years, \$1.2 trillion over the next 10 years.

This is a real bargain for the American people. It is an opportunity for the American people. We have long waited for that.

It will eliminate exclusions for pre-existing conditions. Can you believe, Mr. Speaker, that, over on the other side of the aisle, we would let the practice continue where a preexisting condition is identified as domestic violence? Those of us in this Chamber and across the country know that domestic violence is a crime; it is not a pre-existing condition for excluding medical conditions.

We know that there are exclusions for preexisting conditions like acne or even for childbirth. This is unconscionable in this country that we have allowed insurance companies to determine health care, and we are going to put a stop to that. We are going to say, You know what; we need everybody out there covered. We want to make sure that people are covered and they get quality care and they get accessible care. And we are going to do it at a cost to the American people that is not going to continue to break the bank in the way it has over the decades.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, we are going to end rescissions. We are going to stop insurance companies from telling you, You know, you've reached your cap. You can't get covered any more, even though you have paid into this system. We have to end discrimination against our children because they have a preexisting condition. These practices are unacceptable.

Every American, whether you have insurance or you don't have insurance,

you know that it is unacceptable and unsustainable. And we are going to make sure that it is affordable for the American people. That is what they deserve. This is what will happen. You can listen to all of the mythology, Mr. Speaker. You can listen to the mythology and points that are put out there that don't describe this bill at all. But I want to say to you, Mr. Speaker, as one Member of Congress who, in fact, has read the House and Senate bill and stayed up late into the night looking at the reconciliation, I am confident about what we are going to do for the American people to bring quality, affordable, and accessible health care.

□ 1215

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

America gets it, what is happening with this health care bill. America gets it. They understand. The Peoria-based Caterpillar just announcing that in the first year alone they believe their costs will increase \$100 million in their first year. I would like to read a quote from Caterpillar, Mr. Gregory Folley, the vice president and chief human resources officer at Caterpillar. Quote, "We can ill afford cost increases that place us at a disadvantage versus our global competitors. We are disappointed that efforts at reform have not addressed the cost concerns that we have raised throughout the year."

Wasn't it the President of the United States that traveled to Peoria to go visit Caterpillar to tout all these great programs he was going to do? And yet Caterpillar, one of our most important manufacturers in this country, is saying they alone will have \$100 million in additional costs to their company. I fear for the small businessman and the small businesswoman, while it is touted on the other side, we're going to put root beer in every drinking fountain and it's just going to be glorious, and somehow this \$900-plus billion isn't going to add to the deficit. Come on. Come on. Who believes that?

This government can't get anything right when it comes to cost. That is why we are \$12 trillion in debt. That is why we are paying over \$660 million a day just in interest. At some point we have to become responsible. We can no longer take money out of the American people's pockets only to redistribute it to where the Congress thinks it should go. That is wrong. It is wrong. It is not the proper role of government to mandate this.

These solutions to health care will best come at the States. They will not come from this body, they will not come from Washington, D.C. And we have to have across this country for people to let their Members of Congress know they are not going to stand up for it anymore. Caterpillar is standing up and saying \$100 million. Who do you think that is going to affect? It is going to affect the rank and file, the members there in Illinois who may not have a job anymore.

The number one thing we can do to actually help people with their health care is get this economy, get jobs going again, because I guarantee if you have a job, you have much more of a propensity to be able to go out and get the health care that you want and you deserve.

Yet today we are looking at a bill and the other side is saying, we need to spend money on this education program and we're going to increase its spending, its costs, 10 percent year after year after year.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Speaker, as I close my discussion of this amendment, let me remark that over the past 7 years these two programs, the environmental and coastal programs have cumulatively introduced millions of students to unique hands-on learning experiences. The National Academy of Sciences report that was requested by NOAA, not by Congress, reaffirms that each program has increased student interest in science, increased teacher capabilities to instruct science, and increased awareness and appreciation of the environment.

So I urge Members to support the amendment and the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Madam Speaker, one of the things we are going to have to be careful with this health care debate is trading votes for jobs. Let's keep an eye on Mr. GORDON, where it was reported that he was promised the job of NASA administrator in exchange for his vote. Maybe we ought to pay attention to Mr. TANNER, who it was reported that he wants an appointment as U.S. Ambassador to NATO in exchange for his vote.

I hope we pay very close attention to these types of backroom deals that unfortunately might be happening in this very body.

With that, Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE TO THE AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MRS. CAPPS

Mr. FLAKE. Madam Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland). The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment printed in part B of House Report 111-445 offered by Mr. FLAKE:

At the beginning of section 7, insert "(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—" before "There are authorized".

At the end of section 7, insert the following:

(b) PROHIBITION ON EARMARKS.—None of the funds appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) may be used for a congressional earmark as defined in clause 9(e) of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1192, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the Chair. I just have to say something about the discussion that just went on. I guess only in this body can it be said that we are going to spend nearly a trillion dollars and pay down the deficit somehow, or pay down the debt over 10 years. When the CBO was figuring the savings or costs of this document, the health care bill, they have to assume what Congress says it will do, Congress will actually do. In this bill I think we are saying that we are going to be cutting \$500 billion out of Medicare. Now, who among us really believes that will happen? I can tell you nobody out there does. Nobody really believes that will happen. It wouldn't happen if we managed the bill on our side and said we were going to do it or on the other side of the aisle. But CBO has to score it as if we are going to follow through on our promises.

That is the problem you get into in believing some kind of CBO score that says we are going to pay down the debt over 10 years by spending a trillion dollars more. Now, you can say we are going to increase taxes, but you don't really want to say that. But there is a lot of that in here as well. So I would just encourage anybody who is watching this debate to actually look at the argument here. It is being said that we are going to pay down the debt by nearly a trillion dollars over the next 10 years, or over a trillion dollars, by spending another trillion dollars. That may make sense to us here, but it shouldn't make sense to anybody else.

On the substance of this amendment, this amendment should be non-controversial. This similar amendment has been adopted on a bipartisan basis on other programs that we have authorized. This bill before us, H.R. 3644, is to establish education and watershed programs that advance environmental literacy. This bill creates a competitive grant program titled the National Environmental Literacy Grant Program. This amendment would simply ensure that the new grant program is not earmarked by Members of Congress in the future.

Unfortunately, we talk a lot about getting control over earmarks. There are proposals before the Congress this year, gratefully, on the Republican side to have an overall moratorium, and on the Democratic side to at least restrict earmarks somewhat. I hope we follow through on these. But it is good to adopt these kind of amendments to these kind of bills to ensure that grant programs that are established, if we are going to fund them, they should go for their intended purpose.

The problem is too often in the past when grant programs like this have been established, then they are simply earmarked by Members of Congress, and those hoping to apply for those grants in the future simply have no money in the account to draw on.

Let me give a couple examples. FEMA's National Pre-Disaster Mitigation Program is a competitive grant

program that was designed to, quote, "save lives and reduce property damage by providing funds for hazard mitigation planning, acquisition, and relocation of structures out of the floodplain." The fiscal year 2010 Homeland Security appropriations bill appropriated \$100 million for the program. Almost \$25 million of that was earmarked for projects in Members' districts. That meant that only three-quarters of the money was available. Believe me, go a couple years in the future and all of that money will likely be gone because Members of Congress have earmarked it.

In some cases, these projects are earmarked when the applicant has applied for the grant and didn't get it. The grant wasn't deemed worthy, and so the Member of Congress steps in and simply earmarks it. There may have been a good reason why it wasn't deemed worthy.

But the thing is if we are going to establish these programs as competitive grant programs, then we better either trust the agencies that they are going to do it right or we provide the proper oversight to ensure that they do, instead of running a parallel track program where we Members of Congress say, they don't do it right over there in the agency so we're going to do that ourselves. That is not proper oversight. That is just handing out Federal largesse. And we shouldn't be doing that. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAPPs. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition to the amendment, although I am not opposed to it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mrs. CAPPs. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the gentleman from Arizona for offering his amendment to ensure that funds appropriated to support the implementation of the B-WET and the ELG programs are not earmarked. One of the primary purposes of this legislation is to finally codify these programs as permanent educational programs within NOAA's larger educational initiative so that they can be incorporated into NOAA's base budget. In addition, this legislation will establish the purposes and policies of both programs, which should improve the ability of Congress to conduct its oversight to ensure that they remain effective and accountable.

As it now stands, funds appropriated for these programs are not earmarked to benefit any one institution, but rather funds are distributed through regional programs or NOAA's education office through merit-based competitive processes. While this amendment will prohibit the earmarking of funds appropriated to implement both programs, it should have little direct effect on how B-WET or ELG grants are awarded in the future because, as the history of the programs dem-

onstrates, funds have always been awarded competitively.

Consequently, we can accept this amendment even though it is unnecessary, and thank the gentleman from Arizona for his interest in maintaining merit-based and competitive grant making for both programs.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FLAKE. Can I inquire as to the time remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the Chair, and I thank the gentlelady for agreeing to support the amendment. It is important that we ensure if we are going to establish these programs—I don't think we ought to establish them, frankly. I think we are overspent, we are overtaxed. We shouldn't put this additional burden. But if we are going to do it, certainly we ought to ensure that it goes to its intended purpose. That is what this amendment is for. I thank all for supporting the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAPPs. Madam Speaker, could I inquire what time there is remaining on this side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mrs. CAPPs. At this point I am very pleased to yield 1½ minutes to my colleague from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Let me thank the gentlelady from California. And I want to thank her for her thoughtfulness in being a leader on H.R. 3644, which focuses on the opportunity to promote ocean, atmospheric and environmental education awareness opportunities for young people. And to acknowledge that these are competitive grants again emphasizes that this caucus, that Democrats are concerned about the budget, but also concerned about important issues dealing with coastal growth and coastal learning.

I am from the coastal area, and it brings me to some of the comments that have been made on this health care bill. It is interesting that when we look at our friends on the other side of the aisle, who spent billions of wasteful dollars on giving tax cuts to the richest of Americans, that they can give a short shrift, if you will, to the fact that this health care bill will not only insure millions of Americans, almost 95 percent of Americans, including those who are employer-based insured, which we say to them, as in my own congressional district, where 41 percent are employer-based, yes, you can keep your insurance.

But at the same time, we are prepared to reduce the deficit \$130 billion over the next 10 years and \$1.2 trillion more over the following decade, reining in waste, fraud, and abuse, but at the same time providing millions of uninsured Americans, women, children, families with the opportunity for insurance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Tennessee, the chairman of the Science Committee, Mr. GORDON.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. I thank my friend from California.

I recognize that the health care discussion is personal and felt by a lot of folks that we're getting into an emotional point here and that there is a lot of passion. But we also need to stick with the facts.

I was a little shocked earlier to hear that there was an insinuation by a colleague of mine from Utah that I have worked together with on legislation to keep radioactive waste from other countries out of Utah. I just want to set the record straight. There was an insinuation that I had, he used the word, traded my vote for the directorship of NASA.

□ 1230

Let me make it very clear. We have an outstanding director of NASA right now in Charlie Bolden. If he were to leave, though, if it was offered to me, I would not accept. So please understand that. My wife has said 26 years of public service is enough.

I yield to my friend from Utah.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. I have nothing to say.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Then I would ask my friend from Utah, where would he get that type of misinformation?

I would yield back to my friend from Utah to explain why he said what he did and where he got that misinformation.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. I think it's important that we pay attention to those types of things. This is no doubt an emotional, deep debate.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Once again, I yield to my friend to explain where he got that misinformation.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. As I said, it's something that we should be aware of. It's something that we should pay attention to. I think that's fair. We'll pay attention to it.

I appreciate your comments and the direction that you're going. You've had a great and distinguished career. We applaud you for that. I appreciate your service in this Congress, the work that we've done together. But I think it's fair that we pay attention to what might or might not be happening.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Let me say this to my friend from Utah. If I say to you person to person right here on this floor that that offer was never made and that I would not accept it, would you accept that as true?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. I ask unanimous consent to allow the gentleman from Utah to have whatever time as he might to respond to that very fair question.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. I have no reason to doubt your word.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members will please suspend.

All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 376, nays 37, answered "present" 1, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 139]
YEAS—376

| | | |
|--------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Aderholt | Carson (IN) | Garamendi |
| Adler (NJ) | Carter | Garrett (NJ) |
| Akin | Cassidy | Gerlach |
| Alexander | Castle | Giffords |
| Altmire | Castor (FL) | Gingrey (GA) |
| Andrews | Chaffetz | Gohmert |
| Arcuri | Chandler | Gonzalez |
| Austria | Childers | Goodlatte |
| Baca | Chu | Gordon (TN) |
| Bachmann | Clay | Granger |
| Bachus | Cleaver | Graves |
| Baird | Coble | Grayson |
| Baldwin | Coffman (CO) | Green, Al |
| Barrett (SC) | Cohen | Green, Gene |
| Barrow | Cole | Griffith |
| Bartlett | Conaway | Guthrie |
| Barton (TX) | Cooper | Hall (NY) |
| Bean | Costello | Hall (TX) |
| Becerra | Courtney | Halvorson |
| Berkley | Crenshaw | Hare |
| Berman | Cuellar | Harman |
| Biggert | Culberson | Harper |
| Bilbray | Dahlkemper | Hastings (FL) |
| Bilirakis | Davis (AL) | Hastings (WA) |
| Bishop (NY) | Davis (CA) | Heinrich |
| Bishop (UT) | Davis (KY) | Heller |
| Blackburn | DeFazio | Hensarling |
| Blumenauer | DeGette | Herger |
| Boccieri | Delahunt | Herseth Sandlin |
| Boehner | DeLauro | Higgins |
| Bonner | Dent | Hill |
| Bono Mack | Diaz-Balart, L. | Himes |
| Boozman | Diaz-Balart, M. | Hinojosa |
| Boren | Dicks | Hirono |
| Boswell | Dingell | Hodes |
| Boucher | Doggett | Holden |
| Boustany | Donnelly (IN) | Holt |
| Boyd | Doyle | Hoyer |
| Brady (PA) | Dreier | Hunter |
| Brady (TX) | Driehaus | Inglis |
| Bralely (IA) | Duncan | Inslee |
| Bright | Edwards (TX) | Israel |
| Broun (GA) | Ehlers | Issa |
| Brown (SC) | Ellison | Jackson Lee |
| Brown-Waite, | Ellsworth | (TX) |
| Ginny | Emerson | Jenkins |
| Buchanan | Engel | Johnson (GA) |
| Burgess | Eshoo | Johnson (IL) |
| Burton (IN) | Etheridge | Johnson, Sam |
| Calvert | Fallin | Jones |
| Camp | Fattah | Jordan (OH) |
| Campbell | Flake | Kagen |
| Cantor | Fleming | Kanjorski |
| Cao | Forbes | Kaptur |
| Capito | Foster | Kilroy |
| Capps | Fox | Kind |
| Capuano | Frank (MA) | King (IA) |
| Cardoza | Franks (AZ) | King (NY) |
| Carnahan | Frelinghuysen | Kingston |
| Carney | Gallegly | Kirk |

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

NAYS—37

| | | |
|----------------|-----------------|---------------|
| Berry | Grijalva | Paul |
| Bishop (GA) | Hinchev | Payne |
| Brown, Corrine | Jackson (IL) | Rahall |
| Butterfield | Johnson, E. B. | Roybal-Allard |
| Clarke | Kennedy | Sherman |
| Clyburn | Kildee | Thompson (MS) |
| Conyers | Kilpatrick (MI) | Towns |
| Cummings | Kucinich | Waters |
| Davis (IL) | Lee (CA) | Watson |
| Edwards (MD) | McDermott | Watt |
| Farr | Moore (WI) | Woolsey |
| Filner | Nadler (NY) | |
| Fudge | Pascrell | |

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Thompson (PA)

NOT VOTING—16

| | | |
|---------------|-------------|--------------|
| Ackerman | Davis (TN) | Lofgren, Zoe |
| Blunt | Deal (GA) | Nunes |
| Buyer | Fortenberry | Ros-Lehtinen |
| Connolly (VA) | Gutierrez | Stark |
| Costa | Hoekstra | |
| Crowley | Honda | |

□ 1302

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. WOOLSEY, Messrs. FARR

of California, JACKSON of Illinois, CLYBURN, THOMPSON of Mississippi, PASCRELL, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. NADLER of New York, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Messrs. WATT, PAYNE, BUTTERFIELD, Ms. WATSON, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. CRENSHAW changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute by the gentleman from California (Mrs. CAPPS), as amended.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 233, noes 178, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 140]

AYES—233

| | | |
|----------------|-----------------|------------------|
| Adler (NJ) | DeLauro | Kilpatrick (MI) |
| Andrews | Dicks | Kilroy |
| Baca | Dingell | Kind |
| Baird | Doggett | Kirk |
| Baldwin | Donnelly (IN) | Kirkpatrick (AZ) |
| Barrow | Doyle | Kissell |
| Bean | Driehaus | Klein (FL) |
| Becerra | Edwards (MD) | Kosmas |
| Berkley | Edwards (TX) | Kratovil |
| Berman | Ehlers | Kucinich |
| Berry | Eshoo | Langevin |
| Bishop (GA) | Etheridge | Larsen (WA) |
| Bishop (NY) | Farr | Larson (CT) |
| Blumenauer | Fattah | Lee (CA) |
| Bocieri | Filner | Levin |
| Boren | Frank (MA) | Lewis (GA) |
| Boswell | Fudge | Lipinski |
| Boucher | Garamendi | Loeb |
| Boyd | Gonzalez | Lowe |
| Brady (PA) | Gordon (TN) | Lujan |
| Bralley (IA) | Grayson | Lynch |
| Brown, Corrine | Green, Al | Maffei |
| Butterfield | Green, Gene | Maloney |
| Cao | Grijalva | Markey (CO) |
| Capps | Hall (NY) | Markey (MA) |
| Capuano | Halvorson | Matheson |
| Cardoza | Hare | Matsui |
| Carnahan | Harman | McCarthy (NY) |
| Carson (IN) | Hastings (FL) | McCollum |
| Cassidy | Heinrich | McDermott |
| Castor (FL) | Herseth Sandlin | McGovern |
| Chandler | Higgins | McIntyre |
| Childers | Hill | McMahon |
| Chu | Himes | McNerney |
| Clarke | Hinchey | Meek (FL) |
| Clay | Hinojosa | Meeks (NY) |
| Cleaver | Hirono | Melancon |
| Clyburn | Hodes | Michaud |
| Cohen | Holden | Miller (NC) |
| Conyers | Holt | Miller, George |
| Cooper | Hoyer | Minnick |
| Costa | Inslee | Mollohan |
| Costello | Israel | Moore (KS) |
| Courtney | Jackson (IL) | Moore (WI) |
| Cuellar | Jackson Lee | Moran (VA) |
| Cummings | (TX) | Murphy (CT) |
| Dahlkemper | Johnson (GA) | Murphy, Patrick |
| Davis (AL) | Johnson, E. B. | Nadler (NY) |
| Davis (CA) | Kagen | Napolitano |
| Davis (IL) | Kanjorski | Neal (MA) |
| DeFazio | Kaptur | Nye |
| DeGette | Kennedy | Oberstar |
| Delahunt | Kildee | Oliver |

| | | |
|---------------|------------------|---------------|
| Ortiz | Sánchez, Linda | Tanner |
| Pallone | T. | Taylor |
| Pascarell | Sanchez, Loretta | Thompson (CA) |
| Pastor (AZ) | Sarbanes | Thompson (MS) |
| Payne | Schakowsky | Tierney |
| Perlmutter | Schauer | Titus |
| Perriello | Schiff | Tonko |
| Peters | Schrader | Towns |
| Peterson | Schwartz | Tsongas |
| Pingree (ME) | Scott (GA) | Van Hollen |
| Polis (CO) | Scott (VA) | Velázquez |
| Pomeroy | Serrano | Visclosky |
| Price (NC) | Sestak | Walz |
| Quigley | Shea-Porter | Wasserman |
| Rahall | Sherman | Schultz |
| Rangel | Shuler | Waters |
| Reyes | Sires | Watson |
| Richardson | Skelton | Watt |
| Rodriguez | Slaughter | Waxman |
| Ross | Smith (WA) | Weiner |
| Rothman (NJ) | Snyder | Welch |
| Roybal-Allard | Space | Wilson (OH) |
| Ruppersberger | Speier | Woolsey |
| Rush | Spratt | Wu |
| Ryan (OH) | Stupak | Yarmuth |
| Salazar | Sutton | |

NOES—178

| | | |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Aderholt | Gallegly | Murphy, Tim |
| Akin | Garrett (NJ) | Myrick |
| Alexander | Gerlach | Neugebauer |
| Altmire | Giffords | Nunes |
| Arcuri | Gingrey (GA) | Olson |
| Austria | Gohmert | Owens |
| Bachmann | Goodlatte | Paul |
| Bachus | Granger | Paulsen |
| Barrett (SC) | Graves | Pence |
| Bartlett | Griffith | Petri |
| Barton (TX) | Guthrie | Pitts |
| Biggart | Hall (TX) | Platts |
| Bilbray | Harper | Poe (TX) |
| Bilirakis | Hastings (WA) | Posey |
| Bishop (UT) | Heller | Price (GA) |
| Blackburn | Hensarling | Putnam |
| Boehner | Herger | Radanovich |
| Bonner | Hunter | Rehberg |
| Bono Mack | Inglis | Reichert |
| Boozman | Issa | Roe (TN) |
| Boustany | Jenkins | Rogers (AL) |
| Brady (TX) | Johnson (IL) | Rogers (KY) |
| Bright | Johnson, Sam | Rogers (MI) |
| Broun (GA) | Jones | Rohrabacher |
| Brown (SC) | Jordan (OH) | Rooney |
| Brown-Waite, | King (IA) | Roskam |
| Ginny | King (NY) | Royce |
| Buchanan | Kingston | Ryan (WI) |
| Burgess | Kline (MN) | Scalise |
| Burton (IN) | Lamborn | Schmidt |
| Larson (CT) | Lance | Schock |
| Calvert | Latham | Sensenbrenner |
| Camp | LaTourette | Latta |
| Campbell | Cantor | Lee (NY) |
| Capito | Capito | Lewis (CA) |
| Carney | Carter | Linder |
| Carter | Castle | LoBiondo |
| Chaffetz | Chaffetz | Lucas |
| Coble | Coble | Luetkemeyer |
| Coffman (CO) | Coffman (CO) | Lummis |
| Cole | Cole | Lungren, Daniel |
| Conaway | Conaway | E. |
| Crenshaw | Mack | Manzullo |
| Culberson | Manzullo | Marchant |
| Davis (KY) | Davis (KY) | McCarthy (CA) |
| Dent | Dent | McCaul |
| Diaz-Balart, L. | Diaz-Balart, L. | McCaul |
| Diaz-Balart, M. | Diaz-Balart, M. | McClintock |
| Dreier | Dreier | McCotter |
| Duncan | Duncan | McHenry |
| Ellsworth | Ellsworth | McKeon |
| Emerson | Emerson | McMorris |
| Fallin | Fallin | Rodgers |
| Flake | Flake | Mica |
| Fleming | Fleming | Miller (FL) |
| Forbes | Forbes | Miller (MI) |
| Foster | Foster | Miller, Gary |
| Foxx | Foxx | Mitchell |
| Franks (AZ) | Franks (AZ) | Moran (KS) |
| Frelinghuysen | Frelinghuysen | Murphy (NY) |

NOT VOTING—19

| | | |
|---------------|--------------|--------------|
| Ackerman | Ellison | Marshall |
| Blunt | Engel | Obey |
| Buyer | Fortenberry | Ros-Lehtinen |
| Connolly (VA) | Gutierrez | Stark |
| Crowley | Hoekstra | Wamp |
| Davis (TN) | Honda | |
| Deal (GA) | Lofgren, Zoe | |

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SERRANO) (during the vote). One minute is remaining on this vote.

□ 1310

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute, 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:

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 140, I inadvertently voted “no.” I wanted to be a “yea.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1192, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Yes, in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Chaffetz moves to recommit the bill H.R. 3644 to the Committee on Natural Resources with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendments:

In section 4(a)(4), strike “and” after the semicolon.

In section 4(a)(5), strike the period at the end and insert “; and”.

At the end of section 4(a), add the following new paragraph:

(6) examine the impacts of natural gas and oil seeps on oceans, beaches, air quality, and the coastal environment and the possibility of mitigation of those impacts through resource and energy development.

In section 7, in paragraph (1), strike “under section 6—” and all that follows through the end of the paragraph and insert “under section 6) \$12,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2011 through 2015; and”.

In section 7, in paragraph (2), strike “under section 6—” and all that follows through the end of the paragraph and insert “under section 6) \$9,700,000 for each of fiscal years 2011 through 2015.”.

Add at the end the following new section:

SEC. 8. LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.

An eligible entity that is a party to a pending lawsuit against the Administrator shall not be eligible to receive funds authorized or otherwise made available under this Act.

Mr. CHAFFETZ (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read.

Mrs. CAPPS. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk continued to read.

□ 1315

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, this Congress has to get control of spending. We're \$12 trillion in debt. We're spending more than \$600 million a day just in interest on our debt. At some point, some way, we're going to have to curb spending in this body. This bill authorizes a 10 percent increase every year for the 5 years covered in this bill. This is just too much. This motion to recommit does three very simple things.

First, it freezes funding in the bill to fiscal year 2010 appropriated amounts for the next 5 years—a very reasonable approach. This means that what these programs are getting this year is what they will get next year. No 10 percent increases. Just flat funding. In fact, I would remind this body that it was President Obama that asked for a spending freeze. I concur with the President on this issue in this matter. This Federal Government has to learn to live within its means.

Second, this motion to recommit would prohibit any entity from receiving a grant under this bill if it is currently suing the Federal Government. This bill allows both nonprofit and for-profit organizations to qualify for grants. The amendment simply disqualifies any of those that have a lawsuit against NOAA. Groups can't expect the American taxpayer to allow them to accept free money with one hand while taking the government to court on the other hand. The grant program in this bill shouldn't be allowed to become an avenue for subsidizing or enabling lawsuits that tie up the courts and waste the taxpayers' money.

Third, it expands the list of areas for which environmental literacy grants may be given. This legislation authorizes two educational programs aimed at teaching young people about the coastal and marine environment, and the amendment in the nature of a substitute adds language that will include lessons about jobs that are created by using the natural resources and the benefits of our coastal economies. However, the legislation does not include one more issue that affects some areas of our coastal environment—natural seepage.

In many areas of our Nation's coastline, natural seeps of oil and natural gas occur. This is common in the Gulf of Mexico, but probably nowhere more prevalent than in the areas off the coast of Santa Barbara, California. The educational programs authorized in this legislation are perfect vehicles to teach our young people about these naturally-occurring petroleum seeps—that they do exist, and they can have an effect on our beaches and our coastal air quality. The program proposed here will offer an opportunity to educate our communities and children about the cause of these seeps and the ability of resources and energy development to lessen the volume and impact of these natural seeps into our environment.

Again, this motion to recommit simply will freeze funding at the current year appropriated levels; block groups that have a lawsuit against NOAA from receiving grant money; and expand the range of grants to include the impacts of oil seeps on our beaches and marine environment. I would urge all my colleagues to vote in favor of this motion to recommit.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mrs. CAPPs. Mr. Speaker, I rise to claim time in opposition to this motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CAPPs. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, may I go back to the underlying legislation, which is H.R. 3644, the Ocean, Coastal, and Watershed Educational Act. This is an educational program for children. They are not qualified to do natural resource surveys or to assess the impacts of oil seep. NOAA, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, does not have jurisdiction over air quality and the mitigation of impacts. That would fall under jurisdiction of the Environmental Protection Agency.

The proposal to level fund the program was rejected in the Natural Resources Committee and by the Rules Committee. The modest increases in this bill were negotiated with my colleague, Mr. CASSIDY, in the Natural Resources Committee, in a very bipartisan discussion with negotiations that we made between the two sides, and I urge Members to oppose this motion and support the underlying bill.

I remind my colleagues that these programs have a track record of being grant-making programs under NOAA for several years, and in all the places where they are currently being enacted, they are very popular. At a time when our public schools are being inundated with funding decreases and cuts and at a time when we're so concerned about the availability of our young people to learn the basics in science and math, this is a hands-on experience that they can have. It is an educational program that helps them appreciate their environment and take good care of it. We have 10 more applicants for every grant that's been available. So we made this modest agreement in a bipartisan way to increase over time by a very small amount the amount of money that can be available under this program through NOAA. I would hope that we would all get back to the basics of the legislation, oppose the motion to recommit, and support this underlying bill.

I yield back the balance of my time. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of H.R. 3644, if ordered; and the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 4003.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 200, noes 215, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 141]

AYES—200

| | | |
|-----------------|------------------|---------------|
| Aderholt | Foxx | Miller, Gary |
| Adler (NJ) | Franks (AZ) | Minnick |
| Akin | Frelinghuysen | Mitchell |
| Alexander | Gallegly | Moran (KS) |
| Altmire | Garrett (NJ) | Murphy, Tim |
| Arcuri | Gerlach | Myrick |
| Austria | Giffords | Neugebauer |
| Bachmann | Gingrey (GA) | Nye |
| Bachus | Gohmert | Olson |
| Barrett (SC) | Goodlatte | Paul |
| Barrow | Granger | Paulsen |
| Bartlett | Graves | Perriello |
| Barton (TX) | Griffith | Peters |
| Biggert | Guthrie | Petri |
| Bilbray | Hall (TX) | Pitts |
| Billirakis | Harper | Platts |
| Bishop (UT) | Hastings (WA) | Poe (TX) |
| Blackburn | Heller | Posey |
| Bocchieri | Hensarling | Price (GA) |
| Boehner | Herger | Putnam |
| Bonner | Hill | Radanovich |
| Bono Mack | Himes | Rehberg |
| Boozman | Hodes | Reichert |
| Boustany | Hunter | Roe (TN) |
| Brady (TX) | Inglis | Rogers (AL) |
| Bright | Issa | Rogers (KY) |
| Broun (GA) | Jenkins | Rogers (MI) |
| Brown (SC) | Johnson (IL) | Rohrabacher |
| Brown-Waite, | Johnson, Sam | Rooney |
| Ginny | Jones | Roskam |
| Buchanan | Jordan (OH) | Royce |
| Burgess | King (IA) | Ryan (WI) |
| Burton (IN) | King (NY) | Scalise |
| Calvert | Kingston | Schauer |
| Camp | Kirk | Schmidt |
| Campbell | Kirkpatrick (AZ) | Schock |
| Cantor | Kline (MN) | Sensenbrenner |
| Cao | Lamborn | Sessions |
| Capito | Lance | Shadegg |
| Cardoza | Latham | Shimkus |
| Carney | LaTourette | Shuler |
| Carter | Latta | Shuster |
| Cassidy | Lee (NY) | Simpson |
| Castle | Lewis (CA) | Smith (NE) |
| Chaffetz | Linder | Smith (NJ) |
| Childers | LoBiondo | Smith (TX) |
| Coble | Lucas | Souder |
| Coffman (CO) | Luetkemeyer | Space |
| Cole | Lummis | Stearns |
| Conaway | Lungren, Daniel | Sullivan |
| Crenshaw | E. | Taylor |
| Culberson | Mack | Teague |
| Dahlkemper | Manzullo | Terry |
| Davis (KY) | Marchant | Thompson (PA) |
| Dent | Markey (CO) | Thornberry |
| Diaz-Balart, L. | McCarthy (CA) | Tiahrt |
| Diaz-Balart, M. | McCaul | Tiberi |
| Donnelly (IN) | McClintock | Turner |
| Dreier | McCotter | Upton |
| Duncan | McHenry | Walden |
| Ehlers | McKeon | Westmoreland |
| Ellsworth | McMahon | Whitfield |
| Emerson | McMorris | Wilson (SC) |
| Fallin | Rodgers | Wittman |
| Flake | Melancon | Wolf |
| Fleming | Mica | Young (AK) |
| Forbes | Miller (FL) | Young (FL) |
| Foster | Miller (MI) | |

NOES—215

| | | |
|---------|-------------|----------------|
| Andrews | Berry | Brady (PA) |
| Baca | Bishop (GA) | Brale (IA) |
| Baird | Bishop (NY) | Brown, Corrine |
| Baldwin | Blumenauer | Butterfield |
| Bean | Boren | Capps |
| Becerra | Boswell | Capuano |
| Berkley | Boucher | Carnahan |
| Berman | Boyd | Carson (IN) |

Castor (FL) Jackson Lee
 Chandler (TX) (TX)
 Chu Johnson (GA)
 Clarke Johnson, E. B.
 Clay Kagen
 Cleaver Kanjorski
 Clyburn Kaptur
 Cohen Kennedy
 Conyers Kildee
 Cooper Kilpatrick (MI)
 Costa Kilroy
 Costello Kind
 Courtney Kissell
 Crowley Klein (FL)
 Cuellar Kosmas
 Cummings Kratovil
 Davis (AL) Kucinich
 Davis (CA) Langevin
 Davis (IL) Larsen (WA)
 DeFazio Larson (CT)
 DeGette Lee (CA)
 Delahunt Levin
 DeLauro Lewis (GA)
 Dicks Lipinski
 Dingell Loeb sack
 Doggett Lowey
 Doyle Lujan
 Driehaus Lynch
 Edwards (MD) Maffei
 Edwards (TX) Maloney
 Ellison Markey (MA)
 Engel Marshall
 Eshoo Matheson
 Etheridge Matsui
 Farr McCarthy (NY)
 Fattah McCollum
 Filner McDermott
 Frank (MA) McGovern
 Fudge McIntyre
 Garamendi McNeerney
 Gonzalez Meek (FL)
 Gordon (TN) Meeks (NY)
 Grayson Michaud
 Green, Al Miller (NC)
 Green, Gene Mollohan
 Grijalva Moore (KS)
 Hall (NY) Moore (WI)
 Halvorson Moran (VA)
 Hare Murphy (CT)
 Harman Murphy (NY)
 Hastings (FL) Murphy, Patrick
 Heinrich Nadler (NY)
 Herseth Sandlin Napolitano
 Higgins Neal (MA)
 Hinchey Oberstar
 Hinojosa Obey
 Hirono Olver
 Holden Ortiz
 Holt Owens
 Honda Pallone
 Hoyer Pascrell
 Inslee Pastor (AZ)
 Israel Payne
 Jackson (IL) Perlmutter

NOT VOTING—15

Ackerman Deal (GA) Nunes
 Blunt Fortenberry Pence
 Buyer Gutierrez Ros-Lehtinen
 Connolly (VA) Hoekstra Stark
 Davis (TN) Lofgren, Zoe Wamp

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
 The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining on this vote.

□ 1339

Messrs. PAYNE and WEINER changed their vote from “aye” to “no.” Messrs. CARDOZA and SCHAUER changed their vote from “no” to “aye.” So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.
 The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.
 The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 244, noes 170, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 142]

AYES—244

Adler (NJ) Green, Al
 Altmire Green, Gene
 Andrews Grijalva
 Arcuri Hall (NY)
 Baca Halvorson
 Baird Hare
 Baldwin Harman
 Barrow Hastings (FL)
 Becerra Heinrich
 Berkeley Herseth Sandlin
 Berman Higgins
 Berry Hill
 Biggert Himes
 Bishop (GA) Hinchey
 Bishop (NY) Hinojosa
 Blumenauer Hirono
 Boccieri Hodes
 Boren Holden
 Boswell Holt
 Boucher Honda
 Boyd Hoyer
 Brady (PA) Inslee
 Brady (IA) Israel
 Brown, Corrine Jackson (IL)
 Butterfield Jackson Lee
 Capps Cao
 Capuano Johnson (GA)
 Cardoza Johnson, E. B.
 Carnahan Kagen
 Carney Kanjorski
 Carson (IN) Kaptur
 Cassidy Kennedy
 Castle Kildee
 Castor (FL) Kilpatrick (MI)
 Chandler Kind
 Childers Kirk
 Chu Kissell
 Clarke Klein (FL)
 Clay Kosmas
 Cleaver Kratovil
 Clyburn Kucinich
 Cohen Langevin
 Conyers Larsen (WA)
 Cooper Larson (CT)
 Costa LaTourette
 Costello Lee (CA)
 Courtney Levin
 Crowley Lewis (GA)
 Cuellar Lipinski
 Cummings Loebsack
 Dahlkemper Lowey
 Davis (AL) Lujan
 Davis (CA) Lynch
 Davis (IL) Maffei
 DeFazio Maloney
 DeGette Markey (CO)
 Delahunt Markey (MA)
 DeLauro Marshall
 Dicks Matheson
 Dingell Matsui
 Doggett McCarthy (NY)
 Donnelly (IN) McCollum
 Doyle McDermott
 Driehaus McGovern
 Edwards (MD) McIntyre
 Edwards (TX) McMahon
 Ehlers McNeerney
 Ellison Meek (FL)
 Ellsworth Meeks (NY)
 Engel Melancon
 Eshoo Michaud
 Etheridge Miller (NC)
 Farr Miller, George
 Fattah Minnick
 Filner Mollohan
 Foster Moore (KS)
 Frank (MA) Moore (WI)
 Fudge Moran (VA)
 Garamendi Murphy (CT)
 Gonzalez Nadler (NY)
 Gordon (TN) Napolitano
 Grayson Neal (MA)

NOES—170

Aderholt Austria
 Akin Bachmann
 Alexander Bachus
 Barrett (SC)
 Bartlett
 Barton (TX)

Bean Guthrie
 Bilbray Hall (TX)
 Billrakis Harper
 Bishop (UT) Hastings (WA)
 Blackburn Heller
 Boehner Hensarling
 Bonner Herger
 Bono Mack Hunter
 Boozman Inglis
 Boustany Issa
 Brady (TX) Jenkins
 Bright Johnson (IL)
 Brown (GA) Johnson, Sam
 Brown (SC) Jones
 Brown-Waite, Jordan (OH)
 Ginny King (IA)
 Burgess King (NY)
 Burton (IN) Kingston
 Calvert Kirkpatrick (AZ)
 Camp Kline (MN)
 Campbell Lamborn
 Cantor Lance
 Capito Latham
 Carter Royce
 Chaffetz Lee (NY)
 Coble Lewis (CA)
 Coffman (CO) Linder
 Cole LoBiondo
 Conaway Lucas
 Crenshaw Luetkemeyer
 Culberson Lummis
 Davis (KY) Lungren, Daniel
 Dent E.
 Diaz-Balart, L. Mack
 Diaz-Balart, M. Manzullo
 Dreier Marchant
 Duncan McCarthy (CA)
 Emerson McCaul
 Fallon McClintock
 Flake McCotter
 Fleming McHenry
 Forbes McKeon
 Foyx McMorris
 Franks (AZ) Rodgers
 Frelinghuysen Mica
 Gallegly Miller (FL)
 Garrett (NJ) Miller (MI)
 Gerlach Miller, Gary
 Giffords Mitchell
 Gingrey (GA) Moran (KS)
 Gohmert Murphy (NY)
 Goodlatte Murphy, Patrick
 Granger Murphy, Tim
 Graves Myrick
 Griffith Neugebauer

NOT VOTING—16

Ackerman Deal (GA) Ros-Lehtinen
 Blunt Fortenberry Schrader
 Buchanan Gutierrez Stark
 Buyer Hoekstra Wamp
 Connolly (VA) Lofgren, Zoe
 Davis (TN) Nunes

□ 1348

So the bill was passed.
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HUDSON RIVER VALLEY SPECIAL RESOURCE STUDY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4003, 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 gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4003, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 293, nays 115, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 143]

YEAS—293

Adler (NJ) Gonzalez
 Alexander Gordon (TN)
 Altmire Grayson
 Andrews Green, Al
 Arcuri Green, Gene
 Austria Grijalva
 Baca Guthrie
 Baird Hall (NY)
 Baldwin Hall (TX)
 Barrow Halvorson
 Bean Hare
 Becerra Harman
 Berkley Harper
 Berman Hastings (FL)
 Berry Hastings (WA)
 Biggert Heinrich
 Bishop (GA) Herseth Sandlin
 Bishop (NY) Higgins
 Bishop (UT) Hill
 Blumenaier Himes
 Bocchieri Hinchey
 Bonner Hinojosa
 Boren Hirono
 Boswell Hodes
 Boucher Holden
 Boustany Holt
 Boyd Honda
 Brady (PA) Hoyer
 Brady (TX) Inslee
 Braley (IA) Israel
 Brown (SC) Jackson (IL)
 Brown, Corrine Jackson Lee
 Buchanan (TX)
 Butterfield Jenkins
 Cao Johnson (GA)
 Capito Johnson (IL)
 Capps Johnson, E. B.
 Capuano Jones
 Carnahan Kagen
 Carney Kanjorski
 Carson (IN) Kaptur
 Cassidy Kennedy
 Castle Kildee
 Castor (FL) Kilpatrick (MI)
 Chandler Kilroy
 Childers Kind
 Chu King (NY)
 Clarke Kirkpatrick (AZ)
 Clay Kissell
 Cleaver Klein (FL)
 Clyburn Kline (MN)
 Cohen Kosmas
 Cole Kratovil
 Conyers Kucinich
 Cooper Lance
 Costa Langevin
 Costello Larsen (WA)
 Courtney Larson (CT)
 Crowley Lee (CA)
 Cuellar Lee (NY)
 Cummings Levin
 Dahlkemper Lewis (CA)
 Davis (AL) Lewis (GA)
 Davis (CA) Lipinski
 Davis (IL) LoBiondo
 DeFazio Loeb sack
 DeGette Lowey
 Delahunt Lucas
 DeLauro Luetkemeyer
 Dent Luján
 Diaz-Balart, L. Lynch
 Diaz-Balart, M. Maffei
 Dingell Maloney
 Doggett Markey (CO)
 Donnelly (IN) Markey (MA)
 Doyle Marshall
 Driehaus Matheson
 Edwards (MD) Matsui
 Edwards (TX) McCarthy (NY)
 Ehlers McCollum
 Ellison McCotter
 Ellsworth McDermott
 Engel McGovern
 Eshoo McIntyre
 Etheridge McMahan
 Farr McMorris
 Fattah Rodgers
 Filner McNerney
 Forbes Meek (FL)
 Foster Meeks (NY)
 Frank (MA) Melancon
 Frelinghuysen Michaud
 Fudge Miller (NC)
 Garamendi Miller, George
 Gerlach Minnick
 Giffords Mitchell

Weiner
 Welch
 Whitfield

Wilson (OH)
 Wittman
 Woolsey

Wu
 Yarmuth
 Young (FL)

NAYS—115

Aderholt
 Akin
 Bachmann
 Bachus
 Barrett (SC)
 Bartlett
 Barton (TX)
 Bilbray
 Bilirakis
 Blackburn
 Boehner
 Bono Mack
 Boozman
 Bright
 Brown (GA)
 Brown-Waite,
 Ginny
 Burgess
 Burton (IN)
 Calvert
 Camp
 Campbell
 Cantor
 Carter
 Coble
 Coffman (CO)
 Conaway
 Culberson
 Davis (KY)
 Dreier
 Duncan
 Emerson
 Fallin
 Flake
 Fleming
 Foxx
 Franks (AZ)
 Ross
 Gallegly
 Garrett (NJ)

NOT VOTING—22

Ackerman
 Blunt
 Buyer
 Cardoza
 Chaffetz
 Connolly (VA)
 Crenshaw
 Davis (TN)

Deal (GA)
 Dicks
 Fortenberry
 Gutierrez
 Hoekstra
 Kirk
 Lamborn
 LaTourette

Paul
 Pence
 Petri
 Pitts
 Platts
 Poe (TX)
 Posey
 Price (GA)
 Putnam
 Radanovich
 Roe (TN)
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rohrabacher
 Rooney
 Roskam
 Royce
 Scalise
 Schock
 Sensenbrenner
 Sessions
 Shadegg
 Shimkus
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Smith (TX)
 Souder
 Stearns
 Sullivan
 Terry
 Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Tiahrt
 Upton
 Walden
 Westmoreland
 Wilson (SC)
 Wolf
 Young (AK)

□ 1357

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
 The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Two minutes are remaining on this vote.

Mr. POE of Texas changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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.

QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. TANNER. I rise to a point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has been made aware of a valid basis for the gentleman’s point of personal privilege.

The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, I consider this a sad day for our institution here when a Member comes to the floor and, by name, calls other Members to task for an unsubstantiated, untrue, fabricated allegation made in a blog somewhere and stands behind the fact that it has been reported that such and such occurred.

Now, the primary reason my wife and I decided not to seek reelection is because we have four grandchildren in Tennessee that we don’t see enough of and are not a part of their lives as we want to be. And any suggestion that there is some sort of NATO job in Brussels, Belgium, is beyond the pale. I, and Mr. GORDON as well, I think, are rightly indignant about this reckless, scurrilous, I think, indiscretion.

Let me just say this. Emotions are high, but we can disagree on public policy matters agreeably. And to take an unsubstantiated, untrue, total fabrication and to repeat it on this floor, in my judgment, is an affront to this institution. It is too late to take the words down I’m told by the Parliamentarian, but let me just say this: When we get to the point as a society, when we—some of us—are unable to extend to one who may disagree with us on a matter of public policy the same purity of motive and the same intellectual honesty we claim for ourselves, we are going down the wrong road.

□ 1400

I didn’t pay any attention to this. It is a total fabrication. I have talked to nobody. I wouldn’t get on a plane and go to Brussels to live if they offered it to me. I say again, this is a complete fabrication by, and I think I know the political leanings of this blog. But to take that and then bring it down here to the floor is an affront to everything civil that we are supposed to stand for in the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to belabor the point, but I can tell you this. I have been in public office over half my life. That is another reason we decided we wanted to do something else. And I don’t remember a time when the people who know me best would countenance someone saying something like this about me. I don’t know what I am going to do. I can’t take the words down. But this is something that I think the institution ought to think carefully about and certainly I think the leadership of the Republican Conference ought to take seriously, as well as the Democratic leadership, because this institution is bigger and better than either political party that resides here right now.

I yield back the balance of my time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

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.

RECOGNIZING AFRICAN AMERICAN SCIENTISTS

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1133) recognizing the extraordinary number of African-Americans who have overcome significant obstacles to enhance innovation and competitiveness in the field of science in the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1133

Whereas from 1654 until 1865, slavery for life was legal within the boundaries of much of the present United States;

Whereas slaveholders limited or prohibited education of enslaved African-Americans because they believed it would empower them;

Whereas African slaves, because they were not considered citizens, could not register any invention with the U.S. Patent Office;

Whereas any free person wanting to patent a scientific invention could not acknowledge any contribution from a slave;

Whereas there is a strong likelihood that scientific innovation during the period of slavery may have been undocumented or stolen;

Whereas after slavery had been abolished, the majority of African-Americans lived in poverty and faced legal and social discrimination;

Whereas Historically Black Colleges and Universities were founded because few institutions of higher learning in the United States admitted students of African-American descent;

Whereas Historically Black Colleges and Universities have contributed and continue to contribute significantly to the overall percentage of African-Americans who receive undergraduate and graduate degrees in the fields of science, including agriculture (51.6 percent), biology (42.2 percent), computer science (35 percent), physical science (43 percent), and social science (23.2 percent);

Whereas many African-Americans have overcome extraordinary odds to advance scientific contributions to mankind;

Whereas the Nation's transportation system has been greatly enhanced due to the contributions of Richard Spikes, who invented the automatic gear shift technology, Joseph Gambol, who invented the super charge system for internal combustion engines, Garrett Morgan, who invented the automated traffic signal, and Elbert Robinson, who invented the electric railway trolley;

Whereas modern-day high-density cities and the United States unique architectural development of high rise buildings and modern-day skyscrapers were enhanced by Alexander Mills, who invented key elevator technology;

Whereas health and medicine in the United States have been advanced by Otis Boykin, who invented the pacemaker, Dr. Ben Carson, who led a medical team who became the first to separate conjoined twins success-

fully, Dr. Charles Drew, who found the method to preserve and store blood which led to the world's first blood bank, and Dr. Daniel Williams, who performed the first successful open heart surgery;

Whereas press and media have been strengthened by Will Purvis, who invented the improved fountain pen, Lee Burrige, who invented typewriting machine advancements, and W.A. Love, who contributed to the advanced printing press;

Whereas home appliances have been improved by Frederick Jones, who invented the portable air conditioner, Lewis Latimer, who helped pioneer the electric light bulb, George Sampson, who invented the clothes dryer, and John Standard, who enhanced the refrigerator;

Whereas historically, African-Americans have faced unprecedented inequities which have caused a disparity in the number of undergraduate and advanced degrees in the sciences, described as "the achievement gap";

Whereas many Members of Congress have proposed that this gap can and will be eliminated through progressive policies such as desegregation and Federal outreach and training programs;

Whereas many studies suggest that the achievement gap of African-Americans in the sciences has been lessening due in part to the effectiveness of these policies and programs;

Whereas the United States has vast untapped potential because African-Americans and other minorities remain underrepresented in science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM) disciplines; and

Whereas society in the United States today would not be the same without African-American innovations in the sciences: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes the extraordinary number of African-Americans who have overcome significant obstacles to enhance innovation and competitiveness in the field of science in the United States;

(2) honors and recognizes all African-American innovators who have contributed to scientific education and research, directly and indirectly, whose contributions have increased economic empowerment in the United States; and

(3) encourages the Administration to invest in programs that are proven effective to lessen the achievement gap of African-Americans as well as other minority and disadvantaged groups in the sciences and ultimately strengthen competitiveness in the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on H. Res. 1133, the resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

To honor the extraordinary number of African-Americans who have enhanced our country through scientific innovation, I offer this resolution to celebrate their accomplishments. This resolution also recognizes the significant barriers African-Americans have broken to enhance science and increase American competitiveness.

February is normally the month where the accomplishments of African-Americans are celebrated. It was our original intent to do just that and be on the floor last month. However, I am pleased to see this resolution on the floor today in March, knowing we all enjoy the contributions of African-American scientific contributions every day of the year.

As we go throughout our daily routines, Americans rely on technologies, procedures, and improvements fashioned by African-American innovators over the centuries. In any field, whether it is transportation, architecture, transportation, medicine, or home appliances, African-Americans have innovated, improved, and enhanced our technology.

In 2010 it is unthinkable that a person of any race, origin, or culture in this country would be denied an education because of the color of their skin. For centuries, African-Americans who developed procedures, inventions, and technologies we rely upon each day had to overcome significant obstacles to advance our Nation.

From 1654 until 1865, slavery for life was legal within the boundaries of much of the present United States. At that time, many slaves were prohibited from obtaining an education. In response, many historically black colleges and universities were founded. These universities contribute significantly to the overall percentage of African-Americans who receive undergraduate and graduate degrees in the fields of science today. We honor and celebrate the effectiveness of these vital institutions.

We acknowledge that slaves, because they were not considered citizens, could not register any invention with the U.S. Patent Office. Due to this, there is a strong likelihood that during the period of slavery many discoveries have been undocumented or stolen. After President Lincoln abolished slavery in 1865, many African-American scientists continued to face poverty, legal and social discrimination over 100 years later.

Our past is our prologue, and we must recognize and celebrate our history in order to achieve our full potential as a Nation. As Martin Luther King once said, "Many of the ugly pages of American history have been obscured and forgotten. A society is always eager to cover misdeeds with a cloak of forgetfulness, but no society can fully repress an ugly past when the ravages persist into the present."

Today our Nation has a vast untapped potential as African-Americans and other minorities remain disproportionately underrepresented in science,

technology, engineering, and math, the STEM disciplines. Many of these students suffer from inadequate schools, residential segregation, gender and racial bias from the classroom, and, perhaps even the most, nonprepared teachers. In order to become more energy independent, create new jobs and new exports, and develop the next great technology, we must invest robustly in scientific education and innovation.

Looking towards our future, the fraction of college age population ages represented by minorities is expected to grow to 55 percent in 2050. The proportion of STEM bachelor's degrees earned by minorities is much lower than the representation of minorities within the U.S. population. In order to keep the United States competitive in future years, we have a lot of work to do.

We honor African Americans who have overcome significant obstacles to enhance innovation and competitiveness in the field of science in the United States. We also encourage investment in programs which lessen the achievement gap of African Americans as well as other minorities and disadvantaged groups in the sciences and ultimately strengthen competitiveness in the United States.

The lights are on, the stage is set, the camera is rolling, and we are the actors. The actions we take today are ultimately what will determine our future.

I thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

H. Res. 1133 recognizes the African American contribution to U.S. innovation and competitiveness. There is no doubt that the American transportation system is better off thanks to the contributions of African Americans like Richard Spikes, Joseph Gambol, Garrett Morgan, and Elbert Robinson. Our cities' skyscrapers are accessible thanks to the work of Alexander Mills. Modern medicine, particularly cardiology, may not be as advanced if it were not for the work of Drs. Otis Boykin, Daniel Williams, Charles Drew, and Ben Carson. And our work lives would not be as simple had it not been for Will Purvis, Lee Burrigge, and W.A. Love, or our personal lives more comfortable had it not been for Frederick Jones, Lewis Latimer, George Sampson, and John Standard. And our children know that the sky is not the limit because of pioneering astronauts like Fred Gregory, Mae Jemison, Bernard Harris, and Charlie Bolden.

It is in part due to the contributions of these brilliant men and women that we as a Nation need to continue encouraging all Americans, male and female, from all socioeconomic, cultural and ethnic backgrounds, to become interested in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics disciplines so that our next generation of Americans will know there are no barriers to innovation, and United States competitiveness will continue to be unsurpassed.

I want to acknowledge and thank my good friend from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) for her tireless dedication and efforts on this issue. I encourage my colleagues to support it.

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

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Texas, Ms. SHEILA JACKSON LEE.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Let me rise and support the legislation that has been offered by my friend and colleague from Texas, and a senior member of the House Science Committee, to celebrate African Americans who have overcome significant obstacles to enhance innovation and competitiveness in the field of science in the United States.

Frankly, this debate is appropriate and timely, as we are discussing the status of NASA and the opportunity to inspire and to ensure that our scientists and physicians and those with inventiveness have the opportunity to show those talents and to produce on behalf of the American people.

As a 12-year member of the House Science Committee and the Subcommittee on Aeronautics, I know the value of research and the providing for a safe and secure place for the intelligence of America. I want to cite as part of this legacy of African Americans Dr. Lovell Jones, who heads the minority health center at M.D. Anderson, and has made great strides in the research dealing with cancer in minority populations.

Dr. Bernard Harris, an astronaut, who has led in establishing new businesses around research and knowledge that he was able to expand on as an astronaut in the NASA human space program.

The late Dr. Ron McNair, who was trained as a physicist, came from South Carolina, whose beginnings were enormously humble, and yet he was able to achieve greatness through his studies at MIT, and then ultimately he came to become an astronaut, and of course we lost him in the line of duty. But his research knowledge helped to expand horizons of the space exploration program.

Dr. Mae Jemison, trained as a physician, the first African American woman in space.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. I yield the gentlelady an additional 1 minute.

□ 1415

Dr. Mae Jemison trained as a physician now is in the business of producing and training new astronauts by her summer programs and year-long programs and camps emphasizing math and science, her work that she has offered to do with the North Forest Independent School District on science, technology, engineering, and math.

And Dr. Joshua Hill, my friend, the late Dr. Joshua Hill, of Texas Southern

University, was the first person to begin to talk about solar energy. And of course Prairie View A&M where a host of agricultural scientists have looked at new ways to produce food.

To the Speaker I will say that this legislation is timely. There are many scientists who are on the verge coming from the minority community and coming from the African American community. Look what they can do, and let us give them the further opportunity to be able to help America and to help the world.

Let us continue our support for NASA as many of these first develop their scientific prowess utilizing their skills as astronauts in America's human space program.

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

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. I urge passage of the bill, and I yield back my time.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1133.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. 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.

RECOGNIZING 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MARIANA TRENCH DIVE

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1027) recognizing the 50th anniversary of the historic dive to the Challenger Deep in the Mariana Trench, the deepest point in the world's oceans, on January 23, 1960, and its importance to marine research, ocean science, a better understanding of the planet, and the future of human exploration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1027

Whereas Captain Don Walsh, USN (ret.), Ph.D., and Jacques Piccard piloted the United States Navy's Trieste bathyscaphe to reach the deepest point in the world's oceans and remain the only two humans to ever achieve this historic feat;

Whereas Captain Walsh is the recipient of two Presidential Legion of Merit Awards and numerous honors and continues to explore the world;

Whereas Jacques Piccard is a hero in his home country of Switzerland;

Whereas Jacques Piccard passed away in November 2008, but the Piccard Family contribution and influence to marine science and exploration continues today;

Whereas the Mariana Trench has been designated as the Mariana Trench Marine National Monument and remains one of the world's most ecological and environmental treasures; and

Whereas only five percent of the ocean floor has been explored, but the need to continue to research the world's oceans and educate the next generation of explorers remains important to the United States in order to continue to unlock the secrets of the earth's oceans and ecosystems: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes the 50th anniversary of the dive to the Challenger Deep in the Mariana Trench and its valuable and historic scientific contributions;

(2) recognizes the lifetime achievements of Capt. Don Walsh and Jacques Piccard and their contributions to the furtherance of ocean science, ocean engineering, human exploration, and a better understanding of the planet;

(3) recognizes the Mariana Trench as one of the world's great ocean classrooms and the need to continue to explore its depths that can lead to great scientific discoveries; and

(4) recognizes the commitment of the United States to continue to educate the future leaders in ocean science and human exploration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on House Resolution 1027, the resolution now under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in strong support of H. Res. 1027 recognizing the 50th anniversary of the historic dive to the Challenger Deep in the Mariana Trench, the deepest point in the world's oceans, on January 23, 1960, and its importance to marine research, ocean science, a better understanding of the planet, and the future of human exploration.

Today we recognize the achievements of Captain Don Walsh and Jacques Piccard, who piloted the U.S. Navy's Trieste to reach the deepest point of the world's oceans. They remain the only two humans to ever achieve this historic feat.

Exploration of the ocean floor has led to and will continue to lead to important breakthroughs in marine science. However, shockingly, only 5 percent of the ocean floor has been explored. We must continue to encourage research and exploration of the world's oceans and must make education of the next generation of ocean explorers a priority.

The Mariana Trench is truly one of the world's great ocean classrooms, and I hope that as we remember this remarkable achievement, we also remain committed to returning to the ocean floor in the future.

I am once again pleased to recognize the achievements of Captain Don Walsh and Jacques Piccard, and I would like to thank Mr. SABLAN for his work on this resolution. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of House Resolution 1027, recognizing the 50th anniversary of the historic dive to the Challenger Deep in the Mariana Trench, the deepest point in the world's oceans, on January 23, 1960, and its importance to marine research, ocean science, and the future of human exploration.

Human curiosity about our world is one of the driving forces that compels exploration, and looking at the achievements of the last several hundred years, the accelerated pace of exploration has been propelled by our technological ingenuity and sheer courage. However, as we rush towards conquering the next challenge, such as further manned explorations into space under the Constellation Program, it is valuable to occasionally stop and remember the great achievements of our past.

Only 5 percent of the ocean floor has been explored to date. The Mariana Trench is the deepest known part of the world's oceans. It is the meeting point of two tectonic plates underneath the Pacific Ocean. This geologically active area reaches a maximum depth of over 36,000 feet below sea level. The lowest part of the trench, which itself is over 1,500 miles long—nearly twice as long as my home State of Texas—is called the Challenger Deep, so named after the vessel that explored its depth.

To put this in perspective, imagine that if you were to take Mount Everest, all 29,029 feet of her elevation, and place it at the bottom of the Challenger Deep, the top of Mount Everest would still be over 7,000 feet below sea level.

The Challenger Deep was first discovered in 1875 during the expedition of the HMS Challenger. Technology at that time prevented any substantial investigation of this region of the ocean, but such constraints have only encouraged humans to find new and innovative ways to break through these barriers.

Eighty-five years after discovery, two brave men had the courage and conviction to descend 5 hours in a converted submersible to reach the very bottom of the trench. U.S. Navy Lieutenant Don Walsh and Swiss oceanographer Jacques Piccard spent nearly 20 minutes at the bottom of the Earth before they had to begin their ascent.

This feat has been accomplished twice more since that day 50 years ago but with unmanned vehicles and far

more advanced technology. Today we stand in awe of their achievement and honor the courage they have demonstrated in pushing the limits of human exploration. This act encouraged further expeditions to explore the Earth's oceans just as Alan Shepard's ride as the first American in space on Freedom 7 inspired us to reach for the stars.

Mr. Speaker, we honor these men and the many who have come before and after by courageously taking the next step in exploration. This resolution is as much about remembering our past as it is looking toward the future, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands, Congressman SABLAN.

Mr. SABLAN. I thank the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today as the author of House Resolution 1027 to ask Members to join together to celebrate one of the most historic scientific achievements in our Nation's history, and certainly one of the most daringly courageous feats of exploration in all of human history.

Fifty years ago on January 23, 1960, the United States Navy submersible Trieste, piloted by U.S. Navy captain Don Walsh and by Swiss engineer Jacques Piccard, dove 36,000 feet to the bottom of the Challenger Deep in the Mariana Trench, the deepest known part of our world's oceans. The Trieste dive—a manned descent into the Challenger Deep—has never been repeated, and on only two occasions has an unmanned vehicle penetrated into this abyss during the last 50 years. Just think about that.

Over the last 50 years, responding to President Kennedy's challenge to put men on the Moon, 12 Americans made that incredible journey, reached that destination and put foot on the lunar surface. We have sent satellite messengers out beyond our solar system to send back word of what is there. We have established a permanent manned presence in the space station circling the Earth. We have placed remarkable robotic vehicles on our neighbor planet Mars, exceeding all expectation and for years exploring that far-off world.

Yet, throughout this period of outer space exploration, the 80 percent of our work covered by the oceans—our inner space—remains virtually unknown and unseen by human beings. Our Nation has stopped in its track to witness the brave exploits of its outer space explorers and lauded them as heroes.

Yet Captain Don Walsh and Jacques Piccard and the team of U.S. Naval personnel who made the dive possible are virtually forgotten. H.R. 1027 aims to correct that. This resolution commemorating the 50th anniversary of the Trieste dive is meant to shine a light on what these brave men and

their support team accomplished. This resolution is meant to inspire us with the example of Don Walsh and Jacques Piccard and reinvigorate the commitment of our Nation and this Congress to unlocking the secrets of the oceans of this Earth, of which we know so little.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Piccard passed away in 2008. But Don Walsh is still alive, and he remains in every way an adventurer. Next month in a series of events, we will honor Mr. Walsh and the memory of Mr. Piccard here in Washington. There will be a dinner at the National Geographic Society, a reception at the Smithsonian, and press tours of the Trieste herself, which is housed just down the street from the Capitol at the U.S. Navy Yards. These events were scheduled for April, not January, because Don Walsh has only just returned home from working and exploring in Antarctica.

I encourage my fellow Members of the House to add to the honors that will be accorded Captain Don Walsh next month by passage of House Resolution 1027.

I also want to thank my colleagues, Ms. BORDALLO and Mr. FARR, for their sponsorship of this resolution. Even more, I want to recognize their continuing leadership in the protection of our oceans and the advancement of the scientific understanding of our marine environment.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to the newly designated Mariana Trench National Monument. This monument not only contains the Mariana Trench where the Trieste descended, but also three islands of my district—Uracas, Asuncion, and Farallon de Pajaros—as well as a multitude of undersea volcanoes, upwellings of liquid carbon dioxide, and other features believed unique in all the world.

The people of the Northern Mariana Islands are proud of this environmental treasure and are committed to its protection so that it may be a source of wonder to those who visit and of knowledge to those who come there to explore and discover as Don Walsh and Jacques Piccard did 50 years ago.

□ 1430

Mr. OLSON. I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, let me express my appreciation to all of the staff as well as the Members who brought this forth.

I recommend that we support this resolution and pass it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1027.

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. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. 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.

NATIONAL DAY OF RECOGNITION FOR LONG-TERM CARE PHYSICIANS

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 244) expressing support for the designation of March 20 as a National Day of Recognition for Long-Term Care Physicians, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 244

Whereas a National Day of Recognition for Long-Term Care Physicians is designed to honor and recognize physicians who care for an ever-growing elderly population in different settings, including skilled nursing facilities, assisted living, hospice, continuing care retirement communities, post-acute care, home care, and private offices;

Whereas the average long-term care physician has nearly 20 years of practice experience and dedicates themselves to 1 or 2 facilities with nearly 100 residents and patients;

Whereas the American Medical Directors Association is the professional association of medical directors, attending physicians, and others practicing in the long-term continuum and is dedicated to excellence in patient care and provides education, advocacy, information, and professional development to promote the delivery of quality long-term care medicine; and

Whereas the American Medical Directors Association would like to honor founder and long-term care physician William A. Dodd, M.D., C.M.D., who was born on March 20, 1921: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress—

(1) supports the designation of a National Day of Recognition for Long-Term Care Physicians; and

(2) supports the goals and ideals of a National Day of Recognition for Long-Term Care Physicians.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Ms. SPEIER. I now yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 244, a bill recognizing the

work of our Nation's long-term care physicians. Millions of Americans with disabilities or chronic illnesses require long-term medical care. The medical professionals who provide this care commonly address multiple chronic conditions and develop strong, compassionate, and trusting relationships with their patients. Long-term care is often required by Americans in advanced age; and as this population increases, the demands for these services will obviously be increasing as well. However, all of us of any age are susceptible to illnesses, injuries, and conditions that require long-term care, so we all have a stake in this. All Americans should be grateful for the hard work of these dedicated professionals.

In particular, H. Con. Res. 244 recognizes the work of the American Medical Directors Association, the professional association for long-term care physicians officially chartered in 1978.

H. Con. Res. 244 was introduced by my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia, Representative PHIL GINGREY, on March 2, 2010. The measure was referred to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, which reported it favorably by unanimous consent on March 18, 2010. The bill enjoys the support of over 50 Members of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield myself just a few minutes here and then yield to our colleague from Georgia.

Long-term care physicians deserve to be commended for their expertise and devotion to their line of work. As such, it is my great pleasure to support the designation of a day to honor their committed and faithful service to the population of truly needy individuals in our Nation. And so I support H. Con. Res. 244.

I would like to yield to the gentleman from Georgia, Dr. GINGREY.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlelady from California (Ms. SPEIER) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN). I want to thank also my colleague in the Senate, Senator SAXBY CHAMBLISS, who is introducing the companion legislation.

Mr. Speaker, indeed, I do rise in proud support of authoring H. Con. Res. 244, expressing support for March 20 as a National Day of Recognition for Long-Term Care Physicians. And I want to give a loud shout-out to one of my best friends. In fact, he calls, he says we are pallbearer friends—now that's serious—Dr. Steve Jordan, who is a long-term care physician in Statesboro, Georgia, and one of my classmates in medical school.

Yet I support this resolution, Mr. Speaker, with a heavy heart because I fear that the Democrats' health reform bill will harm seniors and their long-term care. Seniors and patients all across this country have been telling our Congress that their health will suffer, their health will suffer if this bill,

ObamaCare, passes, \$500 billion in cuts to Medicare when the program is already going broke. Seniors in my district know their health care costs will go up if this bill, bought with backroom deals, is passed.

This Democratic majority, while promising the American people they will reform insurance, will bring in billions of new profits to private insurance companies and for liberal bureaucrats. Let me be very clear about this, Mr. Speaker. If the Democratic majority jams this bill down the throats of American patients, our health care, their health care will suffer. It will not get better; it will get worse. And to top it all off, the majority party wants to negate the votes of 300 million patients in this country by not even allowing an up-or-down vote by their Members on this backroom-deal bill. And that, Mr. Speaker, is the worst deal of all.

Yes, of course, I stand in proud support of this resolution, and I thank my colleague for making it possible to bring it to the floor.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

And I would like to just say to the gentleman from Georgia, as much as we are talking about the great work of long-term care physicians, it is important to note, as he expresses his disdain for the health care reform measure, that the American Medical Association, made up of thousands upon thousands of physicians across this country, stands in strong support of the health care reform measure.

I reserve my time.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I would yield 2 minutes to my distinguished colleague from the State of Illinois, Congressman SHIMKUS.

(Mr. SHIMKUS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues for bringing down this resolution. Long-term care is very, very important, as are the physicians involved in taking care of our seniors. The primary payer of long-term care is Medicaid. And regarding the Democratic health care bill, what happened to Illinois is that the mandated increase in Medicaid forces a \$2 billion additional cost in the State of Illinois, another unfunded mandate in a State that is already \$11 billion in debt. And I think my colleague from California would understand that because of the indebtedness in the State of California. We are both, our States are both, in serious problems.

The Medicare cost cuts in this bill, in the Democratic health care bill, is \$463 billion for Medicare, which means that doctors are going to stop providing and giving access. My colleague talked about the AMA. We have physicians here on the Republican side who are members of the AMA who are adamantly opposed to the health care bill.

The third thing is that in this economy we cannot afford a \$569 billion tax increase to pay for this. Caterpillar

today just announced that this health care bill will add another \$100 million of cost to their service. Now how are we going to increase jobs in the economy by increasing taxes that much? And I would like to end with this quote from the Catholic bishops: "Notwithstanding the denials and explanations of its supporters, and unlike the bill approved by the House of Representatives in November, the Senate bill deliberately excludes the language of the Hyde amendment. It expands Federal funding and the role of the Federal Government in the provision of abortion procedures. In so doing, it forces all of us to become involved in an act that profoundly violates the conscience of many, the deliberate destruction of unwanted members of the human family still waiting to be born."

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, as we again debate this health care reform measure, which is not the measure that is before us presently, but a resolution to promote long-term care physicians, I would just like to point out that while the bishops may not support the language in the Senate bill, the network which is comprised of tens of thousands of Catholic nuns across the country does support the language. So maybe it's the nuns versus the priests, and I would side with the nuns.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Would the gentleman yield?

Ms. SPEIER. I yield.

Mr. SHIMKUS. The true response to that is that 55 nuns signed that letter, 10,000 nuns have come out against this position by those 55.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I recognize my distinguished colleague, Dr. BROUN from Georgia, for 2 minutes.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 244 expressing support for the designation of March 20 as the National Day of Recognition for Long-Term Care Physicians and to honor an esteemed long-term care Georgian physician, Dr. William A. Dodd. As a primary care physician for almost four decades, I understand the important role long-term care physicians play for an ever-growing elderly population.

We as a body have spent the last year debating health care reforms. It appears that a weekend vote on government takeover of the entire health care system is the best Congress can come up with. It is a shame that we have lost an opportunity to debate real reforms that will help millions of Americans either continue with or obtain affordable, quality and accessible health care for their families, reforms that many in Congress can agree on, such as allowing the purchase of health care insurance across State lines, developing associations and State high-risk insurance pools to help lower insurance premiums, allowing medical providers to receive tax credits for providing free services for those who are unable to afford care and for full deductible of health care costs, tax fairness.

We in Congress can do much better than what the current discussion is yielding. For the sake of all long-term care physicians, as well as all Americans, the health care debate needs to move away from our current path and start over with commonsense reforms.

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I would like to recognize the distinguished colleague from Alabama, Dr. GRIFFITH, for 2 minutes.

□ 1445

Mr. GRIFFITH. Madam Speaker, the long-term care physicians of America are unsung heroes. Many of you have never seen them, many of you have never met one, but yet they work with some of the most difficult patients in the world.

Imagine, if you will, walking into a room of 20 or 30 Alzheimer's patients, walking into a room of 20 to 30 young men or women with closed-head injuries who will live in a vegetative state for 20 to 30 years. Imagine, if you will, a physician who has three to four nursing homes to take care of, patients on five and six medications. Very, very difficult medicine and very, very hard to find these individuals. Less than 2 percent of our medical school classes are going into primary care; 35 percent of our physicians are trained overseas.

The health care bill that is being proposed for America today is going to accentuate the physician shortage. We will have a very difficult time finding long-term care physicians. We have a hard time even today having people be seen who have Medicare coverage but still no access, Medicaid coverage but still no access. And our long-term physicians, long-term care physicians who are unsung and our heroes in medicine will become a fewer and fewer number under this present bill. We are very concerned about that. Because of that, we have voiced our opposition, but we are proud to sponsor this resolution.

Ms. SPEIER. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 2 minutes to Dr. GINGREY, our colleague from Georgia.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and of course I continue to support this great resolution recognizing March 20 as National Long-Term Care Physician Day.

As my colleague from Alabama, the gentleman from Huntsville, Dr. PARKER GRIFFITH, just spoke, Madam Speaker, as a medical oncologist he knows of what he speaks. And he talked about the long-term care physicians, many of us who have not yet needed their services but indeed we will. We will.

As I said earlier, Madam Speaker, I have great concerns. I have great concerns about their ability should this H.R. 3590, patient protection health care reform bill—I call it ObamaCare.

Should that pass, I have great concern about our long-term care physicians and what they can do, how they can help, how much in control they will be of the health and well-being of our senior citizens.

You know, the economic stimulus package of last year talked about shovel-ready projects. Well, that didn't have much effect, I don't think, on our senior citizens. But if this bill passes, if ObamaCare passes, Madam Speaker, then all of a sudden these senior citizens in our country will become shovel ready, and this bill will concern them. My great fear is they will be first in line to get thrown under the bus when we start rationing health care.

So as I support this resolution, as I said earlier, I have a very heavy heart and much concern. When you cut \$500 billion out of a Medicare program that has \$35 trillion, Madam Speaker, of unfunded liability over the next 50 years, and you are going to cut it 10 percent a year, Madam Speaker, for the next 10 years? How is that good for our senior citizens?

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, as we discuss this resolution on recognizing the long-term care physicians, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle keep wanting to debate the health care reform measure, so I feel it is incumbent on me to at least shed some light from our perspective on why this is so very important to the American people. And as we look at the health care professionals who are supporting the health care reform measure, I would like to just list a few of them.

The American Medical Association, the AARP, the Catholic Health Association, the Federation of American Hospitals, the National Association of Public Hospitals and Health Systems, the American College of Physicians, the National Hispanic Medical Association, and the list goes on and on. All of these health care professionals can't be wrong.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I would just respond to the comments from the gentlelady from California that one group she left out was the American people. Every single poll done over the last year shows the American people don't want the health care legislation. She can name every group she wants—I am sure she has got a longer list—but go talk to the American people. Time and time again, they have said they don't want this bill.

So while you have every special interest group that she wants to lay out there, that is fine. Think about it. They were going to pass this bill in September; the American people said "no." Oh, we are going to pass it in October; the American people said "no." We are going to pass it by Thanksgiving; the American people said "no." We are going to get it done by Christmas, we promise; the American people said "no." We are going to get it done by the State of the Union; the American people said "no." And now, they

are going to try to get it done by Easter.

What part of "no" don't they get?

So sure, there are all kinds of special interests who want this special deal, but the American people know what it is about, and that is why they are opposed to it.

And I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN).

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. JORDAN is exactly right; the American people are not being taken into consideration. They are being overlooked. But I want to remind the gentlelady from California, and the American people for that matter, the AMA only represents a very, very small fraction of physicians in this country, a very small group. All these groups that she named off have cut their own special little deals with the President and with the leadership here in the House and the Senate. They have cut out their special deals for their own parochial interests, but they haven't considered the American people.

I will tell the gentlelady from California, the vast majority of medical doctors who are practicing medicine, like I have for almost four decades, deplore this government takeover of the health care system, the vast majority, and what it is going to do if it is passed into law. It is going to mean that patients can't make health care decisions for themselves; doctors can't make health care decisions for their patients. Government bureaucrats here in Washington, DC, will be making those decisions.

And the people who are going to be hurt most are those people on Medicaid and Medicare, the poor people in this country and the senior citizens. The reason that they are going to be hurt the most, we already see it happening as doctors are having to not accept any more Medicaid patients, any more Medicare patients because of reduced reimbursement; and that is going to get much worse if this bill is ever passed into law.

So they may have an insurance card provided for them by the Federal Government in their pocket, but that insurance card is going to be worth the same amount that a confederate dollar was after the war between the States, worth nothing, because they can't get access. And that is exactly where the Democratic leadership is taking us. Access is going to be much worse than it is today. But we have some commonsense solutions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. WATSON). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. We have some solutions. I have challenged Democrats to introduce a bill that would do four things: across-State-line purchasing for businesses and individ-

uals, association pools to give people multiple options, develop State high-risk pools, and have tax fairness so everybody could deduct 100 percent of their health care costs and insurance off their income taxes. I've had many Democrats say they would love to support it but their leadership won't let them. We can have some commonsense solutions that would give people what my Democratic colleagues keep asking for—lower costs, more accessibility.

But the program we are seeing on the floor and that is going to be forced down the throats of the American people is actually going to be adverse to the people who can afford it the least, the poor people and the senior citizens in this country. It's going to put millions of people out of work. The cost is going to skyrocket. It is going to be disastrous.

We can find commonsense solutions. We can do some things that will be in the best interests of patients, doctors, businesses, and everybody, if we just do it.

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, I would like to yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) such time as she may consume.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, I was just doing a crossword puzzle waiting for my turn, because I am going to work with Congresswoman SPEIER on the next resolution, and there was a clue. I was doing a crossword puzzle, and the clue was "emotion evoked by pathos." The answer was "pity." And I thought, oh, my gosh, that is exactly what I am feeling about what I am hearing from other side of the aisle.

It is such a pity that for 8 years the Republicans did nothing to fix health care. It is such a pity that you must be so afraid of what is going to come out of the health care bill when we pass it this weekend, that it is going to be so popular when 32 million people will be covered, because 38 million people in this country have no coverage right now. And what did you do about it over the last 8 years? Nothing. What a pity.

What a pity that you have to say that we are rationing care when there is absolutely no question that American care is not going to be rationed. But care will be rationed today if we do nothing by the insurance companies, which are rationing care every day as I speak. They are making the coverage of care based on their profits. It is being rationed for those who have insurance but can't afford the care, and those who have lost insurance because it simply cost too much. Those who want to defeat reform are essentially defending rationing care.

Under the House and Senate bill and the President's proposal, there is not one provision that gives the government the ability to determine what treatments an individual can receive. More specifically, the comparative effectiveness research provisions in the House and Senate bills that are supported by the administration have been

funded by the Federal Government—already funded by the Federal Government for years.

This research has absolutely nothing to do with rationing. This research is to improve quality of care, it is to give doctors information they need and what they want so that they can treat patients better. That is what we are looking for. We are looking for treatment. We are looking for coverage. We are looking for access.

And what a pity that you folks couldn't work with us so we could get where we are getting this weekend, so we can bring care to the people of this country that is affordable, that they won't have to fear losing their coverage if they get sick. If they are sick, they get sick, they lose their jobs, they will still be able to be covered. That is what the people of America want.

You ask them point blank with these scare tactics—what a pity that you need them on the other side of the aisle. You ask anybody if they like those scare tactics. Of course they will say “no.” You ask them about the individual parts of this health care reform bill, they are absolutely glad to embrace it.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Madam Speaker, the gentlelady said the Federal Government won't be influencing the type of care Americans get. There is not a person outside this town who believes that statement. This is a 2,700-page bill, more boards, commissions, panels, bureaucrats between you and your doctor than you can imagine. No one outside of Washington believes that statement. Of course the Federal Government is going to be influencing the type of care you get. That is why it takes 2,700 pages of legislative language in this bill.

With that, Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, we have to respond to those comments that are being made.

Republicans did nothing? We did a lot. We opened up HSAs, health savings accounts, for Americans. We passed three bills in my first 2 years here that would allow for associated health plans. But what happened? They get over to the Senate and they can't get passed because the Democrats bottled them up.

The Democrats have over 250 Members in this body. Republicans never had more than 232. They are trying to blame us for this health care bill not passing?

If it is such a wonderful bill, how come you are having to break arms and bribe people to vote for it? That is the problem. The Democrats themselves can't agree on this bill.

We set up HSAs so that people aren't tied to their employers to keep their insurance. You all have ruined the

economy and you are destroying jobs. People are losing their jobs; they are losing their health care. That is what is happening. And Medicare rations more health care than the worst of the insurance companies does.

□ 1500

Look at the chart. Medicare turns down more people with preexisting conditions than the insurance companies do. And what's going to happen is you're spreading Medicare out. You're forcing people into Medicaid. They will have no choice as to whether to be in Medicaid or have private insurance. That's what the majority is doing here.

Don't talk to us about our doing nothing and about your giving access to people and coverage. You're raising the cost of health care. You're going to destroy at least 5 million jobs with this bill because of the taxes on businesses. This is not the way to go. This is not what Americans want. Americans deserve a better life. Americans deserve their freedom.

Ms. SPEIER. I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH).

Mr. YARMUTH. I thank the gentlewoman. Madam Speaker, this is getting to be like a broken record. And I know there are a lot of people out there younger than I am who don't know what a broken record is, but it used to be something we played music on, and when it got a scratch on it, it skipped, and you had the same notes time after time after time.

Well, we've been listening now for a year to the same talking points that Frank Luntz wrote a year ago and handed out and said, This is the recipe for defeating health care reform. And we need to defeat health care reform because if we don't defeat it, and the Democrats succeed and President Obama succeeds, then we will be in the minority for the foreseeable future. That's been the strategy from day one, and things like government takeover and job killing and rationing are the same words we have heard time and time again. The reason we keep hearing those is because our colleagues from across the aisle don't want to discuss the substance. They don't want to discuss the benefits. They don't want to discuss the protections and the security that we're providing for virtually every American.

Now I've heard a lot of this stuff about the burden on small businesspeople and job-killer. Well, I don't know how many of my colleagues from the other side have a lot of experience in the business world. I was a small businessman. I have two brothers who run considerable-sized businesses. I have a sister who runs a small business. And my father was an entrepreneur who developed a business. Not once, not once, did ever any of them, or I, my father included, ever say the tax rate, their personal tax rate, made a difference in how they operated. And you know why? Because entrepreneurs

aren't in it just to make money. They're in it because they want to be their own bosses and they're doing something they love. If the tax rate goes up, they just say, Hey, that's okay. I may have to work a little bit harder, but that's not why I'm in it. That's not going to change my business strategy, particularly when you're talking about a 2 or 3 percent tax increase on somebody who makes over a quarter of a million dollars a year.

Let me tell you what that means. Let's say you're making a million and a half dollars. Small business person, entrepreneur, making a million and a half dollars, and this bill is enacted. Now here's the way I look at it. Somebody comes to me and says, I'm going to make you a deal. You're a charitable guy. For \$30,000 I'm going to allow you to say that you insured 32 million people; that you saved 18,000 lives a year; that you prevented 700,000 bankruptcies in this country; that you allowed small businesses to provide insurance for your employees and employees of small businesses around the country, because they are 60 percent of all the uninsured in the country. And I'd say that's a pretty good deal. I make charitable contributions that were a lot less effective than that.

This is a good deal for small business people. And let me tell you why. A small businessperson right now is facing premium increases across the country, 20, 30, 40 percent. Those are the types of things that really impede a small business—not a small incremental tax increase on their personal income. When you're talking about premium increases of 30 and 40 percent, you're dramatically changing the way you do business. Plus, you're being put in the position of forcing your employees to pay more for their coverage or else dropping their coverage altogether, which means some of those employees aren't going to be able to continue to work for you. They're going to have to find a job with a big company that has a group plan. No. This is the greatest step forward for small businesses in the country's history.

I tell you, I was in a small business with about 25 employees. We had a very young, very healthy group of employees, except for one person. We had a woman who had cancer. What happened to our insurance premiums? Every year, 15, 20 percent, because of her misfortune. Everybody else in the company suffered. That's what we face now.

I talked to a businessman in my district not too long ago. He has 110 employees. I said, What's going on with your health insurance? He said, Well, funny you should ask. Last year, we had two people that had pretty serious illnesses. Our first quote for renewal was a 75 percent increase. We negotiated that down to 38 percent, but we had to increase everybody's copays and everybody's deductibles, and we had to ask everybody to come out of pocket a little more money.

So here's the situation. Two employees get sick and 108 others have their standard of living diminished. That shouldn't happen in America. That's not the law of supply and demand which we rely on in many other areas. This is the problem with our health care system. These are the problems that we're trying to solve in our health care reform. This is a great step forward for small business, it's a great step forward for America, and I urge all my colleagues to support it. I know it will be the best vote I've ever cast in Congress.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Madam Speaker, can I inquire of the amount of time on each side?

THE SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. PINGREE of Maine). The gentleman from Ohio has 2½ minutes. The gentleman from California has 7½ minutes.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. We'd like to reserve, if we could, Madam Speaker, the balance of our time.

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, I find this discussion somewhat hypocritical, to say the very least. We are here discussing the long-term care physicians and elevating them and talking about how necessary they are for the aging population in this country, and many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle took the opportunity to start talking about the health care reform measure. Well, guess what, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle? The long-term care physicians of America have endorsed health care reform. So don't use them as some means by which you can debate health care reform when they're the very physicians that support this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Madam Speaker, if the majority party has additional speakers, in the interest of keeping time relatively equal, we would continue to reserve the balance of our time.

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I thank the gentlelady, and I appreciate the opportunity to come here. My friend from Ohio, we have been through this routine before. We were in the State Senate many years ago together, except I was arguing against his proposals and he was passing them. This time, he's arguing against ours and we're going to pass ours.

The issue really, here—and I think the gentlelady from California brought it up. Our friends on the other side, Madam Speaker, like to say, Well, seniors are against it. But then AARP endorses it. Our friends on the other side say doctors are against it. But the American Medical Association endorses it. You say that this is pro-abortion, and you have 59,000 Catholic nuns

from across the country endorsing this bill, 600 Catholic hospitals, 1,400 Catholic nursing homes endorsing this bill. So you're not calling anybody over here pro-abortion. You're calling 59,000 Catholic nuns pro-abortion, which I think really brings this debate to a head.

We are doing something that we've not been able to do in this country for a hundred years. We all go back to our districts and with this bill alone we're going to make sure—I know in my congressional district—that over 9,000 people can go back on the rolls because they've been denied because of a pre-existing condition. We had 1,700 families in my congressional district last year go bankrupt.

I know this is difficult. And nobody on this side is saying that this hasn't been a difficult process. It has been. But nothing good happens without it being a little bit difficult and challenging. And that's the point we are at now in our country. We cannot get to the point where we are afraid to do bold things in our country. We have to do this.

Small businesses all over our State—to the gentleman from Ohio—all over our State can't get enough money to reinvest back into the capital, the technology, the wages that we need in order to get our businesses jump-started because it keeps going over to health care. If you're a small business, you're going to get a tax credit up to 50 percent of your health care costs. This is a tax cut for small businesses. And we're going to make sure that people are healthier and more productive.

I know our friends on the other side want to say, Well, let's start over. Let's get the blank piece of paper out and let's start all over. Let the insurance industry start all over. Let them go back to 1993 and 1994, revoke all of their increases that they gave to the American people over the last 15 or 20 years. Let them start over. Put all the people who have been denied because of a preexisting condition back on the insurance rolls; all the people who got sick when they had insurance and were kicked off insurance. Put them back on, and then maybe we'll consider starting all over. But we've got to make this bold move to make sure that everybody's in the tent. This is a moral issue on so many levels. We can't keep telling citizens in the wealthiest country that this globe has ever seen that we have the ability to care for you, but we can't afford it. It's time to pass this bill. We're going to do it this weekend. And we're going to look back, just like on Medicaid, Medicare, Social Security, and civil rights. We did the right thing, the moral thing.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. I would yield 90 seconds to a good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. FLEMING).

Mr. FLEMING. Madam Speaker, let me get to the point here. In this bill we have the other side says there's \$500 billion that's going to be taken out of

Medicare without one word of explanation how they're going to do it. They're going to take it to extend the life of Medicare. And they're going to count it to subsidize private insurance. Totally dishonest.

Now I have here a memo from the Democratic Caucus, and just to quote in talking about this giddy CBO score that's supposed to show savings: Do not allow yourself to get into a discussion of details of CBO scores and textual narrative. Instead, focus only on the deficit reduction and number of Americans covered. Do not give them ground by debating details. For example, the March 11 letter has some estimates of discretionary cost not accounted in the total. Again, instead focus only on the deficit reduction and number of Americans covered.

Finally, with regard to SGR, we know that that was carved out of this bill, \$250 billion, so let's add that to the trillion that's not being accounted for, and I quote: "Most health staff are already aware that our health proposal does not contain a 'doc fix' . . . The inclusion of a full SGR repeal would undermine reform's budget neutrality. So, again, do not allow yourself . . . to get into a discussion of the details of CBO scores and textual narrative. Instead, focus only on the deficit reduction and number of Americans covered."

" . . . Leadership and the White House are working with the AMA to rally physicians' support for a full SGR repeal."

So now we understand why the AMA is supporting this.

Ms. SPEIER. I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I would like to respond to that, Madam Speaker, because if we want to talk about memos, let's talk about the memo that the pollster and the consultant for the Republican Party put out last spring saying, No matter what you do, do not let President Obama pass health care. It will put you in the minority for another decade or two. It will make his Presidency. That was before we had any bill ready to go. It was socialism, it was this—the other side, Madam Speaker, was told by their consultants not to support this bill. And as for the Medicare costs, why are we going to save \$500 billion? Because there is waste in the Medicare program, and this is something that they've proposed on the other side for a long, long time. In addition to that, if those people 55 to 60, before they go onto Medicare, actually have health insurance, they're going to cost less when they get into the Medicare program because they're not going to be as sick.

□ 1515

When you come from an old industrial area like ours, there are sick people who have lost their jobs, don't have health insurance. They wait until they get into Medicare. They are chronically ill, and they cost more money. That's how we're going to save money.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to our distinguished colleague from Tennessee, Dr. ROE.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution to designate tomorrow as National Day of Recognition for Long-Term Care Physicians. And ironically the same weekend we're honoring these physicians, House Democrats are simultaneously destroying their ability to practice medicine by enacting a Washington takeover of the patient's decision-making power.

Let me just give you the short and sweet of it. We started health care reform in Tennessee 17 years, and I know what I am talking about here because we've experienced this. We wanted to control cost and increase access, and we began a plan called TennCare. What's happened during that plan is that it has decreased our access because of the payment to physicians and to providers. This year our plan has begun to ration the care. And how it's done that is, it's limited the number of patient visits and the amount of money that TennCare will pay for a hospitalization, no matter how much money the bill is. So those costs are shifted over to the private sector. I've seen this with my own eyes, as I have paid \$10,000 for a visit to the hospital, no matter what the bill is.

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, you know, there's something very ironic about the fact that when we are honoring long-term care physicians, that they have become the pawn by the Republicans to have a discussion on health care reform and—oh, by the way, the long-term physicians that they want to applaud are endorsing the health care reform legislation.

I have a story I want to share with my colleagues. It's about a constituent who has two children, a family of four. Their health insurance premium was \$560 a month 4 years ago. Their health insurance premium today is \$2,008 a month. The irony of this particular story is that the father is an emergency room doctor, and he gets his health insurance from Anthem Blue Cross. And, oh, by the way, Anthem Blue Cross negotiated a contract with him as an emergency room doctor where they require that he take a 60 percent discount in the fees that he was charging.

So what that should say to all of us is that the Anthem Blue Crosses of the world aren't spending the money on health care. They're spending the money on CEOs' salaries and bonuses and Wall Street; and that's why health care reform is so critical today. So I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing the work of our Nation's long-term care physicians who endorse health care reform by supporting this measure.

I yield back the balance of my time. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms.

SPEIER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 244, 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.

Ms. SPEIER. 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.

HONORING DONALD HARINGTON

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1040) honoring the life and accomplishments of Donald Harington for his contributions to literature in the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1040

Whereas Donald Douglas Harington was born on December 22, 1935, in Little Rock, Arkansas;

Whereas at age 6, he attempted to write his first novel, "The Adventures of Duke Doolittle";

Whereas at age 12, Harington contracted meningococcal meningitis and as a result lost most of his hearing;

Whereas Harington graduated from the University of Arkansas with a bachelor's degree in art in 1956, a master's degree in printmaking in 1959, and from Boston University with a master's degree in art history in 1959;

Whereas Harington taught art history at Bennett College in Millbrook, New York, from 1960 to 1962, and at Windham College in Putney, Vermont, from 1964 to 1978;

Whereas Harington had short-term teaching appointments at the University of Missouri Rolla, the University of Pittsburg, and South Dakota State, and taught art history at the University of Arkansas from 1986 until he retired in 2008;

Whereas Harington's first novel, "The Cherry Pit", was published in 1965 and over the course of his literary career he also published "Lightning Bug" (1970), "Some Other Place. The Right Place" (1972), "The Architecture of the Arkansas Ozarks" (1975), "Let Us Build Us a City: Eleven Lost Towns" (1986), "The Cockroaches of Stay More" (1989), "The Choiring of the Trees" (1991), "Ekaterina" (1993), "Butterfly Weed" (1996), "When Angels Rest" (1998), "Thirteen Albatrosses (or, Falling off the Mountain)" (2002), "With" (2003), "The Pitcher Shower" (2005), "Farther Along" (2008), and "Enduring" (2009);

Whereas in 1999, Harington was inducted into the Arkansas Writers' Hall of Fame;

Whereas in 2003, Harington won the Robert Penn Award for Fiction, and in 2006 received the first lifetime achievement award for Southern literature from Oxford American magazine;

Whereas writer Kevin Brockmeier expressed that "the signal feature of Donald Harington's novels is their tremendous liveliness. His books are not blind to suffering, featuring as they do murder, poverty, kidnapping, loss, and betrayal. Yet the mood of his stories is overwhelmingly one of celebra-

tion. He extends his sympathies so widely that even the trees and the hills, the insects and the animals, the criminals and the ghosts seem to sing with the joy of existence. He brings a tenderness and a brio to the page that prevents his characters from sinking beneath the weight of their troubles, and one finishes his books above all else with an impression of a robust, loving comic energy. You feel as if you have been immersed in life, both your own life and the particular lives of his characters, and that life, for all its misfortunes, is a pretty good place to be";

Whereas Entertainment Weekly called Harington "America's greatest unknown writer";

Whereas Harington was described in the Washington Post as "one of the most powerful, subtle, and inventive novelists in America";

Whereas Harington once said that his philosophy of writing was that literature, that all art, is an escape from the world that makes the world itself, when you return to it, more magical, bearable, or understandable; and

Whereas, on November 7, 2009, at age 73, Harington died in Springdale, Arkansas, from complications of pneumonia: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives honors the life and accomplishments of Donald Harington for his contributions to literature in the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Ms. SPEIER. I now yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 1040, recognizing the life and work of Donald Harington. This resolution was introduced by our colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas, Representative VIC SNYDER, on January 26, 2010. The measure was reported to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, which reported it out favorably by unanimous consent on March 18, 2010, and the measure enjoys support from over 50 Members of the House.

Mr. Harington was born December 22, 1935, in Little Rock, Arkansas, where he spent much of his childhood. It was there as well as in the town of Drakes Creek that he drew inspiration for his novel, set in the fictional town of Stay More. Though he lost most of his hearing at the age of 12, he had a strong memory of the local voices, accents and intonations he had heard as a boy and incorporated them to great effect in his works.

Mr. Harington's daring experiments with literary styles made him hard to pigeonhole in the world of literature.

But his stories attracted legions of fans and high praise from critics, particularly his 1975 novel "The Architecture of the Arkansas Ozarks," and the 1972 autobiography "Some Other Place. The Right Place."

Donald Harington's talents were not limited to the written word. He also taught art history at Bennett College in Millbrook, New York, from 1960 to 1962; at Windham College in Putney, Vermont, from 1964 to 1978; and at the University of Arkansas from 1986 until he retired in 2008. In addition, he shared his talent and wisdom with students at the University of Missouri Rolla, the University of Pittsburgh, and South Dakota State University.

Mr. Harington passed away in Springdale, Arkansas, on November 7, 2009, at the age of 73. He is survived by his wife, Kim, along with three daughters from his first marriage, a stepson, a sister, and four grandchildren. Madam Speaker, let us take time to remember and honor Donald Harington for his great contributions to American literature. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues in recognizing the life and accomplishments of novelist Donald Douglas Harington and stand in support of H. Res. 1040.

Described by Entertainment Weekly as "America's greatest unknown writer" and by The Washington Post as "one of the most powerful, subtle and inventive novelists in America," Mr. Harington's contributions to modern American literature deserve to be recognized and applauded by all Americans.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes at this time to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

Ms. FOXX. I thank the gentleman for the time. I want to just say that our colleagues across the aisle have been lambasting insurance companies about what terrible things they have done to the American people. But I want to say that there is one insurance company they like very much, and that's the AARP. And it's probably because the AARP has come out so strongly in favor of this terrible so-called health care bill.

Let me explain to the American people why the AARP is an insurance company. Because their royalty fees in 2008, according to their own financial statements, totaled \$414 million, pure profit. And a higher amount of net revenue than that generated by such large insurers as CIGNA, which had \$292 million profit, or Health Net, a \$95 million profit during the same time period.

Even as premiums continue to rise for seniors, AARP's profits have skyrocketed in recent years, jumping 31 percent just from 2007 to 2008. Now, our colleagues across the aisle don't even mention that when they talk about the horrible insurance companies and how their rates have risen. We all know

that a big part of the reason that other insurance companies are raising rates is because we're not paying adequate amounts from the Federal Government, and yet we're going to put everybody into a Medicare-type plan.

Madam Speaker, I have a sheet about the AARP and the problems that we see with AARP having endorsed this plan and it being a conflict of interest for them, and I would submit that for the RECORD.

DEMOCRATS FIND AN INSURANCE COMPANY
THEY LIKE . . .

This morning, deep in the bowels of the Capitol, Congressional Democrats are meeting with executives from one of the nation's largest insurers: AARP. According to its own Form 990 filings with the IRS, the AARP has a wholly owned "AARP Insurance Plan" that gives to AARP "a portion of the total premiums collected" from the sale of Medigap, Medicare Advantage, and Medicare Part D plans. In 2008, according to AARP's financial statements, those "royalty fees" totaled \$414 million—pure profit to AARP's bottom line, and a higher amount of net revenue than that generated by such large insurers as Cigna (\$292 million profit) or Health Net (\$95 million profit) during the same time period. Even as premiums continue to rise for seniors, AARP's profits have skyrocketed in recent years, jumping 31 percent just from 2007 to 2008.

It's also worth highlighting how the AARP Insurance Plan treats AARP members—and how, in drafting health care legislation, Democrats have bent over backwards to help the AARP Insurance Plan continue to rake in profits.

AARP currently denies access to individuals with pre-existing conditions by imposing waiting periods on its Medigap plans—and the Democrat legislation would allow them to continue this practice, even as it prohibits insurance companies who sell to the under-65 population from the same type of behavior.

AARP-sold Medigap plans are not subject to the same restrictions applied to all other forms of insurance in the Democrat bill, which require at least 80 cents of every premium dollar to be spent on medical expenses.

AARP's then Chief Executive Bill Novelli received more than \$1,000,000 in total compensation from the organization in 2008—more than 78 times the average annual Social Security benefit of \$12,738—yet the amendment supported by 56 Democratic senators to place a \$500,000 cap on insurance executive salaries somehow exempted AARP from its provisions.

A backroom deal cut in Sen. Harry Reid's office exempts AARP's lucrative Medigap plans from the new tax on health insurers (Section 10905(d), Page 2395 of H.R. 3590 as passed the Senate)—and the cuts to Medicare Advantage plans included in the Senate bill will doubtless encourage millions more seniors to buy Medigap supplemental coverage, where AARP plans consume the largest market share.

While insurance companies have responded positively, to Secretary Sebelius' request for additional transparency in their pricing policies, pricing AARP has publicly refused to disclose the exact amount of revenue it receives from the sale of its Medigap plans—even though the organization's board Chair made a public pledge to Congress to do so. Perhaps not surprisingly, Democrats have yet to comment on AARP's "stonewalling" tactics, as the ostensibly "non-profit" organization attempts to hide the exact amount by which its Medigap business will financially benefit if health "reform" is enacted.

Given these actions, it's worth asking whose side Democrats are on: The side of seniors, or the side of an advocacy organization that makes money from them?

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, I now yield for as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arkansas, and the author of this resolution, Mr. SNYDER.

Mr. SNYDER. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to be here this afternoon to consider this resolution and will not add much to the good summary that the gentlelady from California gave.

I have to say that I believe Mr. Harington—and I had met Mr. Harington before his death—I think he would be delighted that this resolution is turning into a debate on the big issue facing this country this day, this year, perhaps this decade. I think he would probably be more delighted by the cast of characters that we all are, and he would see us all as that way, with all of our intricate motivations and complexities and life histories and would probably find this to be quite a glorious day. And I hope he is enjoying it from wherever his perspective is.

The gentlewoman from California mentioned the fact that Mr. Harington lost his hearing when he was very young. He was 12 years old. As you know, as we have seen America modernize, we all start talking more and more like Walter Cronkite did on TV, those of us who were born in the forties and fifties. And as we grew up, we started seeing this homogenization. The fact that Mr. Harington had lost his hearing, he always had in his mind that vivid recollection of what people spoke like in north Arkansas, and that comes out so well in his novels.

I did have occasion to meet him. He was a delightful man. He had a critical following in the country. But as was pointed out, some people did not know him very well, and some people consider him just the greatest novelist that America had that nobody knew anything about. Today we are doing our small part to acknowledge him to bring his legacy to a few more people, and perhaps a few more people will read his great books.

Now we can let this debate continue in whatever form it may take, knowing that Mr. Harington will enjoy the exchanges.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my distinguished colleague from the State of Tennessee, Dr. ROE.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I would like to associate my remarks with Dr. SNYDER, the gentlelady from California, and the gentleman from Ohio. Madam Speaker, I, myself, have been in exactly the same position that the gentlelady from California spoke of when I ran for Congress and I left my medical practice with \$1,800 a month for my health insurance. I was fortunate I could pay that, as the ER physician was able to do that.

You can do a couple of things to make those rates go down immediately. One is letting an individual deduct their health insurance premiums just like huge corporations do. That would make it 30 to 35 percent cheaper tomorrow for every person out there trying to buy affordable health insurance. Number two, it speaks volumes for allowing you to buy insurance across the State line because that one single ER physician could group in an association health plan with numerous other physicians—perhaps hundreds or thousands of other physicians—and bring those costs down.

How do I know that? Because I started my medical practice with four physicians. We now have 70 physicians with 350 employees, and our costs came down. One of the ways we help keep our costs down was a health savings account which was about 30 percent cheaper than the regular insurance.

I am going to finish by reading a letter from Governor Bredesen, a Democrat from Tennessee, who wrote Senator CORKER and BART GORDON: "The problem that we're facing is simple: by 2013, we expect to have returned to our 2008 levels of revenue and will have already cut programs dramatically—over \$1 billion. At that point, we have to start digging out—we will have not given raises to State employees or teachers for 5 years, our pension plans will need shoring up, our cash reserves ('rainy day fund') will have been considerably depleted and in need of restoration, and we will not have made any substantial new investments in years. There will have been major cuts to areas such as children's services that we really need to restore. On top of these, there are all the unusual obligations to be met—Medicaid, for example, will continue to grow at rates in excess of the economy and our tax revenues. It's going to take at least a full decade to dig our way out and back to where we were prior to the recession."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. "In this environment, for the Congress to also send also along a mandatory bill for \$750 million for the health reform they've designed is very difficult. These are hard dollars—we can't borrow them—and make the management of our finances post-recession even more daunting." This is our Democratic Governor who's asking us not to pass this legislation.

□ 1530

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

(Mr. YOUNG of Alaska asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I have listened to this debate, and rarely do I

come to the floor if it doesn't affect Alaska, but this also affects Alaska. I am one who believes in health reform, but if anyone can tell me from that side of the aisle, with 2,700 pages, and they say the new one is not quite that long, it is 2,000 pages, what is in the bill. They forget to say there are 160 new grant programs that never existed before. There are 110 new agencies, Mr. and Mrs. America, that can issue regulations. There are 13 health czars; we are making them legal under this bill. The big thing, there is about 1,200 pages of gobbledygook. I read one on the floor the other day, but this is page 1,181:

"(A) IN GENERAL. Subject to the succeeding provisions of this subtitle, in the case of an affordable credit eligible individual enrolled in an Exchange-participating health benefits plan—

"(1) the individual shall be eligible for, in accordance with this subtitle, affordability credits consisting of—

"(A) an affordability premium credit under section 243 to be applied against the premium for the Exchange-participating health benefits plan in which the individual is enrolled; and

"(B) an affordability cost-sharing credit under section 244 to be applied as a reduction of the cost-sharing otherwise applicable to such plan; and

"(2) the Commissioner shall pay the QHBP offering entity that offers such plan from the Health Insurance Exchange Trust Fund the aggregate amount of affordability credits for all affordable credit eligible individuals enrolled in such plan."

Over a thousand pages of gobbledygook. I have an old saying: KISS; keep it simple, stupid. Keep it simple. I can tell you, go through this bill, Mr. and Mrs. America, and read it and tell me what you understand. I happen to have read this bill. I don't understand it. I suggest, respectfully, Mr. and Mrs. America, we should not pass this atrocity.

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO).

Mr. SERRANO. Madam Speaker, everybody on that side is throwing numbers around. The numbers I would like to think about for a second are more dates than numbers. It seems that everything that could be going wrong in this country, according to that side, started on January 20 of last year when we had a new administration. The prior 8 years were wonderful years. We were not in a war, we had surpluses, everything was going great. At least that is their presentation. But everything starting January 20 of last year, Oh, my God, that is pushing the country down the road to socialism. We are going into a big, deep hole, and it is the end of America as we know it.

Well, the fact of the matter is this bill is a good bill. It is a very good bill for our country. I would like to share with you some good numbers, numbers that affect my congressional district in New York, in the Bronx, New York.

But I must tell you that these numbers are reflected throughout the country.

Listen to this: 86,500 uninsured residents of my congressional district will now have coverage extended to them; Medicare will be improved for 65,000 beneficiaries, including closing gaps that existed in coverage before; 201,000 families will be given tax credits and other assistance, as will 7,300 small businesses to help them afford coverage.

We are talking about the United States of America, the greatest country on the face of the Earth; still, we are close to 40 million people without health insurance. What are we talking about here? Trying to fill that gap and take care of these folks.

Now, what was the biggest accusation that we heard for the last year, year and a half: You are moving too fast. Too fast? President Roosevelt, Teddy Roosevelt was the first President to bring this issue up. That is over 100 years ago. Too fast? They have had all these years to do something about it, but still they wasted time looking for weapons of mass destruction in Iraq.

I will tell you, I found a weapon of mass destruction, and it is close to 40 million people uninsured. That's the real threat to our country. The cost, the cost of health care in this country, that is a weapon of mass destruction. That can destroy us.

Who is unhappy? Not seniors, with this bill. Not children. Not the working class. Not AARP, which is not known to be a great liberal organization. They endorsed it today. Not so many people we have mentioned.

Who are unhappy? The insurance companies. Well, that's too bad.

As we say in the south Bronx, the gig is up and it is about time they began to behave properly. We are catching them, and we are catching them strongly. I support this bill, and I support the efforts of my side to be able to bring it through.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Madam Speaker, responding to the last speaker, I will tell you who is unhappy, and that is the American people. They don't want this bill, and they have spoken loud and clearly about that.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE) and request that he may control that time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM).

Mr. ROSKAM. Madam Speaker, I am not from the Bronx, but I am familiar with the phrase "the gig is up." I'm from Chicago, and in Chicago they call it a hustle, and I think that is exactly what this bill is. I want to highlight something that was brought to the attention of the Ways and Means Committee just a couple of days ago,

Madam Speaker, and that is this: With this bill that is being foisted upon the American public at this time, the Internal Revenue Service is going to grow. In other words, this bill, in the words of our friend KEVIN BRADY from Texas, he pointed out this bill doesn't create physicians or nurses or physical therapists or a whole host of health care providers, oh, no.

What this bill does is it creates positions for Internal Revenue Service agents; 16,500 IRS agents are estimated to be able to carry out this bill to pursue the individual mandate tax, the individual mandate tax which the IRS is going to begin tracking. Individuals are going to be getting the functional equivalent of a 1099, and the IRS is going to be tracking that, not annually, but they are going to be tracking that monthly. Think about that. They are going to be watching month by month by month. And whoa, if you are an American and you don't have what Speaker PELOSI says and you don't have what they say in the other Chamber that you need to have, then you know what; you are going to get taxed. In order to enforce that tax, do you know what is going to happen? They are going to have more IRS agents.

Madam Speaker, we can do better. We need to be creating more opportunities for Americans to get health care and not have a heavy hand of government with 16,000 more IRS employees. We know what we need to do with this bill this weekend. Let's vote "no." Let's start over and let's do it the right way.

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Speaker, wouldn't it be nice if we could continue honoring Donald Harington, a great novelist in America, but we can't because we have to counteract things that are not exactly accurate, which some of our friends are talking about on the subject of health care.

The fact is we are honoring a great American novelist, but we have to divert that important conversation to focus on the truth about health care. Now here is the truth about health care.

The truth is that the Republican caucus has been engaging in a campaign of fear to scare the American people from doing what is best for themselves. The fact is that this campaign, first they said there were death panels. Then they said there were community-based sex clinics. Now they are saying the IRS is going to come get you. America, this is not what is going on.

The truth is that 45,000 people a year die from the lack of health care, and that is what the Democratic caucus is going to address and that is what the American people will benefit from: being able to not go bankrupt because you have health care, being able to not have to lose a loved one because you have health care, being able to survive and thrive in America as a small busi-

ness person, provide a good benefit to your company because you can afford to offer a health care benefit. That is what is going on on Sunday.

I wish we could talk about the great novelist Donald Harington right now. He deserved it. He earned it and he is a great American and we honor him, but the fact is the Republican caucus wants to go toe to toe on health care. We can go toe to toe on health care because this is a good bill. It is going to improve this country. It is going to help small business. It is going to help people who are underinsured, and it is going to make this country stronger.

Why aren't our colleagues outraged about people being dropped for pre-existing conditions? Why don't they join us in our outrage in trying to fix it? Why don't our colleagues join us in saying, you know what; preventative medicine ought to be free? People shouldn't have to pay to be able to do preventative medicine. We are doing that right now. People ought to be able to get a good, decent health care policy for a good price, and they ought to be able to survive and do well in America. I wish we could get some support for that from the other side of the aisle; unfortunately, we won't.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PAULSEN).

Mr. PAULSEN. Madam Speaker, this body is nearing what will be a defining vote for the future of our Nation. While the majority leadership continues the arm-twisting to sway enough votes to push the health care bill through the House, the American people are left wondering: Who is listening? Who is listening to us in Washington?

The American people have said loud and clear they don't want this bill; they want health care reform, but they don't want this bill. My constituents, by a margin of 3:1, have been contacting me saying they don't want this approach, and with good reason. The bill will cost nearly \$1 trillion in the next decade alone. That is more Washington spending, that is more Federal borrowing, and it is more debt for our children and grandchildren, and it is surely going to go higher as entitlement spending soars as other provisions of the bill are phased in.

The bill is loaded with job-killing tax increases. An Associated Press analysis has even said that health care premiums will actually increase, will actually go up under this plan. The bill will also allow the IRS, for the first time, to charge up to 2 percent of income and confiscate tax refunds if Americans do not seek what is actually government approved, minimum insurance coverage. The bill will cut \$500 billion from Medicare and, in turn, use that money for new entitlement spending. History has certainly shown us that entitlement spending goes up, not down.

Finally, this bill hits my district in Minnesota especially hard with a \$20

billion tax increase on medical devices and medical technology. Shouldn't we be enhancing and giving opportunities for encouraging innovation in these technologies rather than taxing them and pushing these jobs offshore?

Given these provisions are out there, it is no wonder that we have seen a process that is riddled with special favors to gain votes. And it's no wonder that the ultimate passage of this bill may only come through procedural tactics rather than having an up-or-down vote on the bill.

Madam Speaker, simply put, if this bill was good policy, you wouldn't have to resort to those types of moves and tactics to actually pass it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. PAULSEN. If we want real health care reform in this country that the American people and many of us in Congress believe in on a bipartisan level, this bill should be set aside and replaced with commonsense approaches that lower the cost for everyone in America.

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE).

Mr. LANCE. Madam Speaker, I believe on a bipartisan basis Members of the House of Representatives favor health care reform, and I certainly want to be a voice of reason in that regard. Nobody in America is satisfied with the current situation. I am part of a group of House Republicans, the Tuesday Group, that has put forth an eminently sensible proposal, Madam Speaker: purchase of policies across State lines; making sure no one is denied coverage based upon preexisting conditions; coverage of young people on their parents' policies until age 26; and most important of all, medical malpractice insurance reform, not contained in the proposal we will be voting on this weekend or at the beginning of next week.

Number two, Madam Speaker, the proposal on which we will be voting, over the next 10 years is a proposal where there is only 6 years of benefits, but we begin paying for it in tax increases immediately. Regarding the scoring by the Congressional Budget Office, Madam Speaker, what is not in calculation is roughly a quarter of a trillion dollars, the so-called doctors' fix, that will clearly be a cost associated with this because we need to compensate physicians appropriately.

□ 1545

Let us review commonsense alternatives, and please let's not vote on this bill based upon procedure instead of an up-or-down vote that is, I believe, required constitutionally.

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE) just spoke rationally about the

bill. He spoke about wanting to make sure that insurance would be available across State lines. I think he referenced, or someone else on the other side referenced having high risk pools available, that we should address pre-existing conditions, and we should offer coverage to children of families up to the age of 26. What is so interesting is that all of those proposals, each and every one of those proposals, are included in the health care reform measure that we will all have the opportunity to vote on this weekend.

Mr. LANCE, if he has the courage to vote with the Democrats, would be improving coverage for over 500,000 residents in his district. He would be giving tax credits to 74,000 families and 18,000 small businesses. He would be improving Medicare for 96,000 people in his district. Those are the kinds of figures that speak to the American people.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I have spent the last 31 years before I came to Congress in the real world practicing medicine. So I know from where I speak. I have seen it, seen patients. I am probably one of the only people in this Chamber right now that has actually gone to an emergency room at 3 o'clock in the morning and seen someone without health insurance coverage and treated them, and treated numerous patients over the years without coverage. So I know that from a personal basis as a physician and just as a citizen.

Obviously what we are dealing with now is we are dealing with a very complex issue, health care. It is not easy. There is no question about that. I think the difference that we have, the gentlelady from California just pointed out some similarities, and that is where I think the American people would like us to start instead of this incredibly complex bill that the gentleman from Alaska read just a minute ago, only a portion of, that is incomprehensible.

There are two things you can do that would cover 20 million people, and we can do it on one sheet of paper and not have however many new bureaucracies and czars and agencies and IRS agents and all of that. And that is, which I wholeheartedly agree with, is allow young adults, I have had three in my only family do this, who graduated from college and didn't have insurance right after they got out, let those folks stay on, pick your number, 26, 27 years of age, on their family's health insurance policy. Simply sign up and adequately fund SCHIP, the State Children's Health Insurance Plan, and Medicaid. By doing those two things, you can cover 20 million people. This bill, as complex as it is, covers presumably 31 million people.

My concern with the cost is that one of the things that this bill does not do, it does not address costs. And let me just give you an example. When Medi-

care was established in 1965, the government estimates at that time was that in 25 years that bill would cost \$15 billion. The actual cost of that bill, \$90 billion. That was in 1990. The actual cost today, Madam Speaker, is over \$500 billion. And we know that this bill is going to remove \$500 billion, or approximately \$500 billion from this plan.

Let me just tell you what begins to happen, and I have watched it in my own practice, in 2011. The baby boomers hit. Seventy-eight million baby boomers in the next 20 years, 35 million or more in the next 10 years, and you're going to provide the care they need with 500 billion less dollars. I don't think you get that math. The way I read that is that three things happen: Number one, you decrease access. Number two, if you don't get the access, you get decreased quality. And number three, you are going to increase costs because people are going to pay, if they can afford to, for the care that they are receiving.

As my friend Mr. LANCE brought out, malpractice reform is desperately needed. I am an obstetrician. I know that all too well, about how many of my colleagues have left the practice of delivering babies, one of the most fulfilling things. I have delivered almost 5,000 babies. And when I left my practice to come to Washington, I never felt like I had a job. It was a privilege to take care of patients and bring those young people in and watch them grow up and flourish in the community I lived.

Young doctors are not able to do that now because of the cost. And it is not in here at all. In our own State, where we have a mutual company, an insurance company, State Volunteer Mutual Insurance Company, which insures the doctors of Tennessee, since the inception of that company, over half the malpractice premium dollars have gone to attorneys, not to the injured party. Less than 40 cents on the dollar. Many of my good attorney friends have said, we need to do something about this. I agree.

So we don't disagree about what needs to be done; it's the method to get there. We are going to have a large government bureaucracy that is expanding a plan that is not working, which is Medicaid. And I have some very good ideas about what we should do for that. We shouldn't treat our Medicaid patients different than we treat other patients. I absolutely agree with that. Therefore, I would argue also we have the insurance industry—I am not going to sit up here and be a shill for them. I have argued with them for 20 years, 30 years about care. But I will point out one thing.

You can take all the profits, that is what I have heard for the last 3 weeks up here is the evil insurance companies, you can take every nickel that they make and it will run our health plan in America, our health, for 2 days. So what are you going to do the next 363 days? Only 2 days. Take them all

and put them out, you only cover people for 2 days. So that is not the solution. It is just demonizing them. They need to shape up, there is no question about that. And competition will help that happen.

I know this is a great vote. I think it is one of the biggest votes that we have had in the last 45 years in America. The people in my district overwhelmingly oppose this bill by about 8-to-1. I am going to vote against this bill for the reasons that I have stated, and certainly would be willing to work with the other side, and asked to do that.

One of my great frustrations in coming to Washington, D.C., was to have spent over 30 years in the practice of medicine and not be included in the decision. The physicians caucus on our side, 10 doctors, 14—we have other folks other than M.D.s in that caucus—and the two Senators who are M.D.s, none were included in this discussion about health care. I think that was wrong. I think it was a mistake on the other side, and would have certainly liked to have brought over 300 years of experience to the table and discuss with them real solutions, positive solutions for health care.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, in closing, I wish that the gentleman from Tennessee would have returned to the resolution that is before us in concluding his comments. We are here, as you know, to recognize the life and work of Donald Harington. And while we were trying to recognize the great work of an American novelist, we find ourselves drifting into a discussion of health care. But in any case, we are going to conclude this particular discussion by urging our colleagues to recognize the life and work of Donald Harington by supporting this measure.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1040.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

Ms. SPEIER. 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.

CLARENCE D. LUMPKIN POST
OFFICE

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4840) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1979 Cleveland Avenue in Columbus, Ohio, as the "Clarence D. Lumpkin Post Office".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4840

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. CLARENCE D. LUMPKIN POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1979 Cleveland Avenue in Columbus, Ohio, shall be known and designated as the “Clarence D. Lumpkin Post Office”.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the “Clarence D. Lumpkin Post Office”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) and the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Ms. SPEIER. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4840, a bill designating the United States Postal facility located at 1979 Cleveland Avenue in Columbus, Ohio, as the Clarence D. Lumpkin Post Office. H.R. 4840 was introduced by my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TIBERI) on March 12, 2010. It was referred to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, which reported it by unanimous consent on March 18, 2010. It has bipartisan support from 17 Members of the Ohio delegation.

Mr. Clarence Lumpkin was born in 1925 and spent years as a community activist in Columbus, Ohio. He is often affectionately referred to as the mayor of Linden, a neighborhood in the northeastern part of the city. Among his many accomplishments, Mr. Lumpkin has helped the Community Development Block Grant task force, persuaded the city to separate storm and sanitation sewers to stop basement flooding, led anti-drug marches throughout Columbus, made Linden the first inner city community with lights on every residential street, and improved the Linden area by including the Point of Pride concept that was first shared with city leaders in a speech given in 1974. Before moving to Linden, Mr. Lumpkin served in the United States Army, and he is a veteran of World War II.

Madam Speaker, Clarence Lumpkin has spent his life serving his community and his country, doing everything he could to improve the lives of his fellow citizens. I urge my colleagues to join me in honoring this great American by supporting this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4840, introduced by my colleague from Ohio (Mr. TIBERI), designating the United States Postal Service located at 1979 Cleveland Avenue in Columbus, Ohio, as the Clarence D. Lumpkin Post Office.

Growing up in the poor rural south in a family of sharecroppers, Clarence D. Lumpkin has had his fair share of challenges, but that has never deterred him from moving ahead. Mr. Lumpkin picked cotton as a youngster from sunup to sundown, served lunch to turpentine workers, and at the age of 10 lost his mother, who had been bedridden for most of his life.

He entered the first grade at 12 years old. Hungry for knowledge, Mr. Lumpkin was a model student who studied constantly. After graduating from high school, Mr. Lumpkin joined the Army, where he served in New Guinea during World War II. After the war, he moved to Ohio, where over a period of 41 years he worked a number of jobs, finally retiring as chief of the enforcement division in the Department of Highway Safety's Bureau of Motor Vehicles.

Mr. Lumpkin is a remarkable man who came from a very difficult childhood and turned his experience of hard work into service to his country in the Army and lifelong service to his community, where he has truly made a difference every day in people's lives. In gratitude for his service, I ask all Members to join me in supporting H.R. 4840.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SPEIER. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, as my colleagues have said today, and I have mentioned, also, we are here this week, we are here on a Friday afternoon, we are not normally here, because our colleagues across the aisle, along with the President, have decided that it is time for the government to take over one-sixth of our economy and to institute a government-run health care plan in this country. We have talked about this before, but this is the wrong way to go.

The American people do not want this plan. And why are we being kept in town on a Friday afternoon and being told we will probably vote on Sunday? Because despite the fact that the Democrats control 253 seats and need only 216 votes, they cannot get their colleagues to agree with them to vote on this terrible bill.

□ 1600

They, again, try to blame Republicans for the situation that we're in, but they cannot do that. The American people are paying attention, they know about the Slaughter rule, they know the tricks and chicanery that are being used to get people to vote for this bill

that Americans do not want. But we've raised the awareness of process as well as substance here.

And I want today to talk about even a person in this great State of Massachusetts who has predicted that passing this bill will be a disaster. There was an article in *The Boston Globe* on March 17, 2010, that talks about State treasurer Timothy Cahill who was, until recently, a Democrat but who has become an Independent candidate for governor, who has said that the State's universal health care law is bankrupting Massachusetts and will do the same nationally if Congress passes a similar plan. “If President Obama and the Democrats repeat the mistake of the health insurance reform here in Massachusetts on a national level, they will threaten to wipe out the American economy within four years.” That is a statement that he made at a press conference.

He went on further to criticize the 2006 health care law and said—he started last summer when he began to think about running for Governor. His criticism has echoed that leveled by Senator SCOTT BROWN during his run for the U.S. Senate.

Another quote from Mr. Cahill. “It is time for the President and the Democratic leadership to go back to the drawing board and come up with a new plan that does not threaten to bankrupt this country.”

Many people are understanding exactly what Mr. Cahill is talking about. They know that this is not the direction to go.

Another quote from Mr. Cahill in this article says, “The real problem is the sucking sound of money that has been going in to pay for this health care reform. And I would argue that we're being propped up so that the Federal government and the Obama administration can drive it through.” He says in this article that the only reason they've been able to survive in Massachusetts is because the Obama administration is pumping money into Massachusetts, as he said, to keep it going in order that they can get their own health care plan through, which will be a disaster.

I want to point out further that our own chairman of the Rules Committee said herself last year that the Senate has ended up with a bill that isn't worthy of its support. And she said then in an op-ed, Supporters of the weak Senate bill say just passing any bill is better than no bill. I strongly disagree. It's time that we draw the line on this weak bill and ask the Senate to go back to the drawing board. The American people deserve at least that.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with that statement of the esteemed chair of the Rules Committee, Ms. SLAUGHTER. I believe that Americans know that they deserve a better life. They know that our freedom is at stake. They know they are not more secure than they were 3 years ago when the Democrats took control of this Congress. They

know that their taxes are higher and will go higher.

Mr. Speaker, it's time that we stop the charade of saying that this health care bill is going to help the American people and admit to the fact that it is going to destroy jobs, bring down our economy, and take away the freedom that Americans have to choose their health care.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) as much time as he may consume.

Mr. TONKO. I thank the gentlewoman from California for the opportunity.

You know, when I listen to the discussion on this floor, when I hear my friends from the other side of the aisle talk about the great plan that they have put forth, I think I need to share with the American public that their plan means 50 million Americans will go without health care coverage. I think that's an important distinction here.

And also when we talk about their plan, to me it translates to higher costs, it translates to reduced consumer protections, and it also speaks to no regulations on an industry that has had record profit columns over the last couple of years.

So I think our bill states very emphatically that we're about changing the course of direction. We're about putting individuals, families, doctors, in control of the health care outcome—not government, not insurance companies. So this effort to empower the insurance companies is not the solution America is looking for. It is not the solution.

They are looking for a thoughtful, academic approach. The Democrats in this House have put forward a sound plan. The Speaker, to her credit, has taken the input from the Members of this majority and advanced them to the United States Senate and to the White House, and we have been able to achieve, on behalf of the people of this great country, situations that allow us to control those skyrocketing costs to make certain that, again, our families, our individuals, our doctors, are making those decisions and not the greed of insurance companies.

We want to make certain that as we go through this effort that we provide assistance to those who are struggling in this economy. In fact, in my district, I can look at a family with an average annual income of \$50,000 and state to them that with this measure, they will realize a \$5,800 benefit, a tax credit, to help them afford their health care costs. That is monumentally important to that family.

It also speaks to the "whose side we're on." When a person comes to a situation, a catastrophic situation in their life, they need to know that they have access and affordability and quality care that is their option.

So when someone with acne is asking to be insured, our House, our majority, says yes, you should be insured. The other side says "no." When someone says that our health care costs are driving bankruptcy for American families, when we say there should be a cap on out-of-pocket expenditures, our side says "yes," their side says "no." When we speak to gender discrimination on the rating of premiums for women, especially in childbearing years, our side with a very sensitive concern says "yes" to giving them more fairness in the equation. The other side says "no."

So it continues to go on and on, and the American public needs to know that what this debate is about is providing control to the American families, the working families of this country, enabling them not to be put into bankruptcy because of catastrophic illness, enabling them to have access to health care coverage, enabling them to be strengthened by Medicare improvements where their pharmaceutical needs will be met if they're Medicare eligible, where the Medicare trust fund is stabilized. That's what this measure does.

And let me finally close with the impact on small business. We ask our small business to be that response team to drive us out of the economic woes.

This President, this Congress inherited devastating deficits from the previous administration. And so it's important for us to rebuild the economy. Many, myself included, profess that small business is the backbone of our economy, is the springboard to economic recovery. Well, we're dulling the competitive edge simply with health care costs that are crippling to our small business community.

So we need improvements with the exchanges that are developed with this proposal. They are then enabled, as individuals or small businesses, to enter into an exchange. Think of it. A small business of 5 or 10 employees can be crippled by catastrophic situations. Their premiums could rise exponentially simply because of 1 of 5 or 1 of 10 employees being impacted severely by a health situation. By entering into a pool, into an exchange, that is diluted a great deal. The ebbs and flows are neutralized. And so the impact is a favorable one for our small business community. They realize the benefits of a sounder, more modest premium because they're into an exchange. So there are many improvements.

But it's about greed. We say "no" to greed. Others say "yes." It's about fairness. We say "yes" to fairness. Others say "no." It's about strengthening that Medicare. We say "yes." Others say "no."

I am proud to stand here this afternoon on this House floor to say that by working with my colleagues, with the leadership, verbalizing the strength of our ideas and our passion to make a difference. We have a very sound bill before us.

Let's deal with fact, not fiction. Let's insert ourselves with a sense of compassion for all people in this country. This is a historic moment waiting to happen here on this Hill in Washington, and I am proud to serve in this House and to have had the response that we have had.

Thank you, Representative SPEIER, for the opportunity to join you this afternoon.

Ms. FOXX. Republicans are not saying that we don't need to do something to reform health care. We all agree with that. We need to do something to reform it. We have commonsense solutions. And compassion begins with preserving freedom. Don't tell me you're compassionate when you want to take away the people's freedom. That isn't compassion.

I would now like to yield 3 minutes to my colleague from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. I thank the gentlelady.

In my hand right here—and the chairman may know what I have here—is a document from your side of the aisle which basically is your talking points to your communication folks and the like saying that you want to talk about information. The memo actually says to your Members, We cannot emphasize enough, do not allow yourselves to get into a discussion of the details of CBO scores or any other such narratives. It continues to say, Do not give them—meaning Republicans or the media and such—grounds for debating the issue. Isn't that fascinating that, after all of this, the truth comes out?

The fact of the matter is that you do not want to discuss the details. You do not want to get into the facts of the matter. You want to talk in hyperbole and rhetoric.

Well, let me spend my next 2 minutes telling the American public what the actual details are and what the CBO says about your bill.

Number one: Delayed benefits, immediate taxes. This bill raises taxes before any other major benefits would go into effect. Ninety-eight percent of the major benefits don't start until 2014, but we immediately start taking taxes out of the American public's pocket.

Two: The CLASS Act has been described by Members of their House, Senator CONRAD, as a Ponzi scheme. Why is that? Something in there called the CLASS Act appears to make the bill cost less than it does because, as the CBO states, the program would pay out far less in benefits than it would receive in premiums under the 10-year budget window.

What does that simply mean? That means we will be collecting taxes for years and years and years before we actually pay out any benefits.

Thirdly, no doc fix. I've heard other people talk about that. That 10-year doc fix will cost \$371 billion. If you really want to talk about the facts—as obviously you do not want to—you

would have included the doc fix in here to give us a better picture of what this bill costs.

Raid on Social Security. A raid on Social Security in this bill, in the presentation that you're making. I also heard somebody talk about AARP. Where are they talking about the fact that in your presentation on the numbers, they rely on \$53 billion in new Social Security revenue to achieve the appearance, only the appearance, of deficit reduction.

□ 1615

The fact of the matter is these revenues are meant to stay and pay for Social Security benefits, not to fund a new entitlement.

Fourthly, double-counting of Medicare savings benefits, the other side of the aisle claims that \$520 billion in Medicare cuts and \$210 billion in Medicare taxes in the bill will improve solvency of the Medicare trust fund. But that's not the case. You're double-counting. Look, either Medicare savings improves solvency on the one hand, or they pay for this brand-new entitlement. You can't have it both ways. But I guess that's why you don't want to get into, as your very own talking point memo says, do not get into discussing the details.

One last one, if time permits, your legislation relies on unrealistic budget cuts. This is not my suggesting that. This is what your very own actuary at HAS says.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LUJÁN). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. FOXX. I yield the gentleman 10 additional seconds.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Your very own actuary said this, that the level of cuts was "unrealistic and finally jeopardized access to care for senior citizens." That's not me saying this; that's not this side of the aisle. That is your very own actuary saying what your bill will do is jeopardize care to senior citizens. When you begin to discuss the details, you will agree to vote "no" on this bill.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS).

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague from California.

The last time I looked, I thought we were talking about celebrating the distinguished career of an individual named Mr. Lumpkin and naming a post office. I understand the desperate need that our colleagues have to talk about what is about to take place in America that is particularly historic since they have had a negative drumbeat about it for the last 15 months.

Please know this, I hear all the time on the floor of the House what the American people want. If we put some

harsh reality into it and took out this poll or that poll, what we would learn is that a significant number of the American people want this health care measure that we are talking about and, indeed, more. When I hear someone say that the American people don't want this, and I heard one of our distinguished colleagues earlier on the minority side say that people in his district don't want it, well, people in my district do. And so I guess he and I cancel each other out. And if you went through the entire body, I think you would find that the same thing exists.

Now, I also have ranted right here on this floor and I meant it to be such that people will understand. I don't want to hear anybody else say that what we are proposing is socialism. And when they talk about a tremendous government takeover, I particularly know that all of us know that Medicare is a government program, and every one of us experienced at some point in our town hall meetings people saying to us, I don't want the government in my life. And I say, are you on Medicare? And they say, yes. And I say, well, that's a government program. Medicaid is a government program. There are poor people in nursing homes. There are people that are sick that if they did not have Medicare, they wouldn't have anything.

So I ask my colleagues, whose side are you on? Are you really on the side of people who would argue that 32 million people that are going to be covered under the Democratic plan would not be covered if we did not do something, as I believe we are historically going to do? And, therefore, it's troubling to me. I gather that the National Institutes of Health is not a government program, the Center for Disease Control must not be a government program, the Army, the Pentagon, they must not be government undertakings. And so all of this talk about government as a person is very disturbing to me as a person.

The same thing that people raise here in their fear-mongering is the same thing that took place with reference to Social Security.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. SPEIER. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. It is the same fear-mongering that took place about Social Security, oh, by the way, another government program. So it is not as if money is going to be evaporating. The same insurance companies that have made a ton of money are going to make two tons of money whether we pass this bill or not, and they have already in our faces shown us that they are willing to raise prices on the American people as desperate as we find them at this time.

I also want to put to rest this business about Slaughter House rules. I serve with Ms. SLAUGHTER, and I'm honored to do so. And what I think people must not have done is read

"Slaughterhouse-Five." In "Slaughterhouse-Five," there is a bird who says, poo-tee-weet, p-o-o-t-e-e-w-e-e-t. The jabbering bird symbolizes the lack of anything intelligent to say. Thank you very much. Poo-tee-weet.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Florida has made our case by bringing up the fact that Medicare is a government program. It's going broke. Medicare costs were 20 times more than what was estimated for part of the program, seven times more for part of the program, 2½ times more for part of the program. The gentleman from Florida has made our case on this issue.

I now would like to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman, the former attorney general of California, Mr. LUNGREN.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, hosanna and hallelujah. We have just heard the solution to all of our problems. It's spelled g-o-v-e-r-n-m-e-n-t, government. What I just heard from the gentleman from Florida is all of our problems will be solved by government. If you have a program, make it larger. If you have three, let's have six. If you have Medicare going broke, let's make it go broke faster. If you have Medicaid going broke, let's make it go broke faster. If you have Social Security, which just this last week now is having to cash in the IOUs because it's in a deficit position on an annual basis, then just make it larger.

The American people are smarter than that. The gentleman talks about the fact that he doesn't know where these American people are that are against this bill. I guess he has amnesia. I guess he wants to join the Speaker in pretending that August didn't exist. Those town halls were made up of cut-out figures. They weren't real people. The folks that are calling our offices are not real people. The 1,000 emails I got in 2 days this week in which 59 of them were in favor of the bill and everybody else against, I guess they don't count.

This is funny since we happen to be representing the people in the people's House, supposedly, although it's hard to tell if we're going to do the Slaughter rule which suggests that we won't even have an opportunity to truly vote on it.

And by the way, the Constitution says that we are supposed to initiate revenue-raising bills, not the Senate. So they took a bill in the House, kept the label on it, took everything out, every single word of content, and put a whole new bill in, and sent it back to us. That is called bait and switch if you're someone in the private sector.

The American people are asking for more. So it is interesting to hear much of the histrionics on the floor. But the fact of the matter is every single national poll shows the American people don't want this bill.

Now, the canard that we are hearing is therefore you don't want to cover 32

million people. Untrue. We have a better plan. We have a plan that doesn't go to Big Government. It goes to Big Competition. It goes to the individual rather than the government. I am not one who hates government; but I do believe this, when government gets inordinately larger, the individual gets smaller. That is not the essence of America established in our Constitution.

Now, some people want to just throw that out and say, government is the answer, government is always better, so we can combine the worst parts of our health care system with the worst parts of the post office, with the worst parts of the Internal Revenue Service, and we will get what? The bill that we are going to not have a chance to vote on except sort of vote on it. But we all know what it means.

I thank the gentlelady for the time.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire how much time both sides have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California has 8 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from North Carolina has 4¾ minutes remaining.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maine (Ms. PINGREE).

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, thank you to the gentlewoman from California for allowing me this opportunity to talk a little bit about the topic that has taken over our debate about a post office today. Normally, we would be discussing the naming of a post office; but because we are on the eve of this historic vote and very likely to proceed forward on the issue of reforming our health care system, we have been spending most of the day talking about that. And I just want to say in spite of the rhetoric and the anger that flares up across the different sides of the aisle, I personally, as a freshman Member of this legislature, can't imagine my good fortune to be here, to be here this weekend with the hopes that we may finally move forward on reforming our health care system.

I feel like the first entire year and a half I have been in office, more than anything else in my district, people say to me, when are you going to do something about that health care bill? When are you really going to fix the system? And much of this comes from people who are struggling in this economy. They are out of work. They are worried about being out of work. They are small business owners trying to figure out how to cover the cost of health care.

I have been working on this issue for a lot of years, and I can't believe how exciting it is that we might be here this weekend and finally move forward on reform.

I think back to 1992 when I, like my colleague from California, was a former member of a State legislature. And in 1992, I was running for office for the

first time as a State legislator, and it was the number one issue that year. President Clinton, the future President Clinton, was running for office talking about reforming the health care system. Every door I knocked on in the 19 towns in the legislative district where I ran, people said something to me about the cost of health care. And think of that, that was almost 20 years ago. If they thought costs were high then, if small business owners thought it was difficult to cover their employees, what does it look like today?

I got elected to that State legislature. And for 8 years, my State, the State of Maine, struggled to reform the health care system. We created our own plan, the Dirigo health care system, to expand the number of people we covered. We passed a bill to regulate the price of prescription drugs, to negotiate for a better price for prescription drugs. And what did we get from Congress? We got a failed health care plan in the nineties, and then we got 8 years of a majority party that decided not to do anything.

In fact, when they decided to do something about prescription drug pricing, they said you can't even negotiate with the drug companies. They didn't do anything to lower costs, and they decided in the dark of the night to do something about that.

But here we are today. We have the chance to begin to close the doughnut hole in the prescription drug plan. That will take effect when we pass this bill. That will begin to take effect and completely close by 2020.

We are going to be able to move forward on advances in Medicare, eliminate copays for preventative care under Medicare. We are going to see real savings for our senior citizens, and I can't be more excited than to go back and say to my State legislators, do you know what? We've finally done something at the Federal level. We are going to do something to help a struggling State like Maine.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. SPEIER. I yield the gentlewoman 1 additional minute.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. I can't tell you how happy I will be to go back and tell those State legislators who have tried to carry on in the face of this difficult era in a State where jobs are being lost, where businesses are struggling to cover people, they're saying to me, when I visit the State legislature, they are saying, when are you going help us at the Federal level? When are you going to realize that you are part of the responsibility as our State as struggled to cover those costs?

Do you know what is really exciting? I hear every day people say, nobody in America wants this. Well, the fact is when I go back and talk to small business owners, individuals who have coverage, individuals who struggle with their insurance company dropping their coverage, I hear people who say, do something about it. In fact, in my

State, people think we haven't gone far enough. When they polled the doctors in my State, these are physicians, and we have heard a lot of talk about doctors today and what they would do, the physicians in my State, over 50 percent of them say, why don't you do single-payer health care? They say this isn't going far enough.

So the fact is, I couldn't be more excited to be here this weekend. In fact, I think it's my responsibility, not to complain about being here on a Friday afternoon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has again expired.

Ms. SPEIER. I yield the gentlewoman 30 additional seconds.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. I'm not complaining about being here on a Friday afternoon. In fact, my constituents would say to me if I went back home, why don't you get down to Washington and finish the job? Why don't you get down there and handle this difficult issue, go through all the difficult procedural issues, do what you have to do to pass this bill? And by Sunday afternoon or Sunday evening, I want to see you casting a vote to reform the health care system to change the way our insurance companies do business, to help out struggling State budgets, and to make sure that people in this country once and for all have coverage for health care and we move forward in our system.

□ 1630

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I just want to point out to the gentlewoman from Maine that Republicans did a lot when they were in control, and what got stopped was because of Democrats in the Senate. We passed health savings accounts which give people individual control, Medicare part D which Democrats voted against because there was the private sector involvement.

And I guess we are going to get the same kind of results from the promises of this that we are getting from the stimulus bill. Her State is in such bad trouble because the President's stimulus plan, which was not going to allow unemployment to go above 8 percent, has failed so badly.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Ms. FOXX. I now yield 2 minutes to Dr. CASSIDY from Louisiana.

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. Speaker, I think my perspective might be a little bit different. In fact, when my colleague was speaking about physicians, I was sitting here thinking I am a physician. And not only am I a physician, but I have actually been working to treat the uninsured for the last 20 years. My practice has been for the uninsured, so it is a little bit different. And one reason that I ran for office is I was frustrated with the way that politicians always dealt with health care.

It is a truism: Politicians overpromise and underfund. We can see

that with Medicare going bankrupt in 7 years. We can see that with Medicaid bankrupting States. And I saw that in my practice, because everybody would be promised these benefits, and in my practice I could not get them for them. Inevitably, quality and access suffered.

But we are told now it's different. We are told, No, believe us this time we are going to adequately fund. We are going to adequately fund by taking \$500 billion from Medicare to create a new entitlement.

Wow, we are really doing a lot for Medicare there, aren't we?

We are going to expand Medicaid; Medicaid, which is bankrupting States. So now, instead of somebody having no insurance and being unable to see a physician, we are now going to give them Medicaid. But we are going to have to decrease payments so much that we are going to raise taxes, costing jobs, and they still won't be able to see a patient.

I say that because The New York Times had a heartrending article about a woman on Medicaid in Michigan, and payments are so low she can't get cancer treatment. When I hear we are taking care of the 31 million people without insurance, I think of that woman on Medicaid in Michigan with a government-funded—no, I am sorry—with a government-underfunded policy with which she cannot gain access.

If that is morality, we must have a different definition of morality. It is morality for show. It is not morality for reality.

Now, there are alternatives. And another frustrating thing about this debate is that actually we know what works. We can look at Massachusetts, where they attempted to expand access.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. FOXX. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. CASSIDY. In Massachusetts, they attempted to expand access and control costs. That is this plan. And what we just heard in Massachusetts is the Democratic treasurer saying this plan will bankrupt our Nation in 4 years.

Alternatively, what we can also say is that we know what works. The Kaiser Family Foundation did a study in which they found that health savings accounts lowered costs by 30 percent and that 27 percent of people with health savings accounts—27 percent of people with health savings accounts were previously uninsured. By lowering costs, we expanded access.

We know what works. The plan they proposed has already failed. The plan we proposed, there is data to show it works.

Now, we can talk about the Congressional Budget Office report that supposedly saves money, 10 years of tax revenue for 6 years of big government programs. That is a savings. Or, in 2018 it saves money by pushing the cost of Medicaid out onto the States. That saves money.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Ms. FOXX. I will give the gentleman 30 more seconds. That leaves me 30 seconds, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. CASSIDY. In my State, the first 3 years we are responsible for these additional costs is going to cost my State \$600 million. Well, that is a savings to the taxpayer. Now it is just the State taxes that are going up instead of the Federal taxes.

Now, there are bipartisan solutions. I challenge my colleagues, let's take a break. Let's go home Sunday and Monday and Tuesday and come back Wednesday. Let's have a town hall meeting, each of us in our districts, hear from our people back home what solutions they want to see and come back and vote on Thursday. Somehow, I think that these people who are on the bubble will learn that they should be representatives and not dictators.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER).

Mr. WEINER. I rise to pay tribute to Clarence Lumpkin. This is a great day for the State of Ohio. The mayor of Linden deserves to have a post office named for him for all his service.

I do hate to pollute this debate with facts. I am really almost hesitant to do so. The previous speaker pointed out an inequity that exists that, frankly, Medicaid doctors don't get reimbursed enough. We are fixing that in the reconciliation bill, so I trust my colleague will be voting for that, because it increases the reimbursement rates for people that we are expanding coverage to so that doctors get paid at the Medicare rate.

Do you know what you won't hear today in this conversation about the post office? Is that Mr. Lumpkin, who we are honoring today, I think is about 70 years old.

Mr. CASSIDY. Will the gentleman yield time?

Mr. WEINER. Certainly. We don't have a lot.

Mr. CASSIDY. I understand, and I appreciate it.

When you say that we are going to give a raise for primary care physicians, that is actually not included in this in terms of the Medicaid costs, so State Medicaid costs are now going to go up.

Mr. WEINER. Reclaiming my time to inform the gentleman that he is wrong.

Mr. CASSIDY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEINER. No. After yielding, it wasn't much of a payoff.

Mr. CASSIDY. We will get back to the facts later.

Mr. WEINER. It wasn't much of a payoff.

Mr. CASSIDY. Believe me, if you yield again, it will be.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Lumpkin, who we are honoring today, if it were up to the

members of the minority party, Mr. Lumpkin would not have Medicare, would he? He would have had Social Security privatized.

Now, I couldn't help noticing that not long ago the ranking minority member of the House Budget Committee, a Republican, floated a plan that for once, at least, was honest about the intentions of the Republicans. It said, Cut off Medicare. End it as a program we know. And I know that the previous speaker doesn't like it. A lot of my constituents believe it is a very worthy program. Ninety-six percent of all beneficiaries who were surveyed last year said they like it. But the Republicans say, No, we want to eliminate it.

And let's not forget how many of them signed on the dotted line to privatize Social Security. Boy, that seems smart, huh? Investing Social Security in the stock market. Now, that is a far-reaching idea.

Now, Mr. Lumpkin, who, God willing, will live another 20, 25 more years, he is going to be able to see Medicare for the rest of his life, thanks to the bill we are going to pass in short order, and no thanks to the votes of the people on the other side of the aisle who would deny him that.

Now, you may not like Medicare, but come out and say it. Don't say we are going to propose privatizing it. Let's see what you do. Can you get a majority over there to stand up, to come out from behind the artifice and to say—forgive me. Will the Speaker ask—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. SPEIER. I yield the gentleman 25 additional seconds.

Mr. WEINER. Look, the fact of the matter is there are differences of opinion here and they are philosophical and deep felt. We believe in Medicare; we created it. You opposed it at the time; you oppose it now. We support Social Security.

I would direct my remarks to the Speaker. Can you inform them that they opposed Social Security then; they oppose it now.

This is a philosophical divide. And every single member of the minority party has said that they are going to do anything they can to stand up in defense of the health insurance industry. That is a consistent position. We disagree with it, and Mr. Lumpkin is going to have Medicare for the rest of his life, which should be long.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 30 seconds.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, the good Lord gave us two ears and one mouth for a reason.

If our colleagues would listen, they would hear us say we don't want to do away with these programs. We want to save them.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support the passage of H.R. 4840.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for the remaining 1 minute.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I find that we are incapable of doing what we were here to do, which was to pass a number of suspension measures, this one for Clarence Lumpkin. God bless him for having to listen to this debate, but we are, in fact, very supportive of this resolution.

I just want to remind my colleagues that government-run programs are not bad, because Medicare is a government-run program, Medicaid is a government-run program. The veterans in this country embrace a health care program that is among the best in this country; again, a government-run program. Being government-run is a good thing.

I yield back the balance of my time. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4840.

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. SPEIER. 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.

NATIONAL WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1174) supporting the goals and ideals of National Women's History Month.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1174

Whereas the purpose of National Women's History Month is to increase awareness and knowledge of women's involvement in history;

Whereas as recently as the 1970s, women's history was rarely included in the kindergarten through grade 12 curriculum and was not part of public awareness;

Whereas the Education Task Force of the Sonoma County (California) Commission on the Status of Women initiated a "Women's History Week" celebration in 1978 centered around International Women's History Day, which is celebrated on March 8;

Whereas, in 1980, the National Women's History Project, which celebrates its 30th anniversary this year, was founded in Sonoma County, California, by Molly Murphy MacGregor, Mary Ruthsdotter, Maria Cuevas, Paula Hammett, and Bette Morgan to broadcast women's historical achievements;

Whereas National Women's History Project founder Mary Ruthsdotter, who passed away in January 2010, was a leader in the effort to ensure the inclusion of women's accomplishments in the Nation's history;

Whereas, in 1981, responding to the growing popularity of women's history celebrations, Congress passed a resolution making Women's History Week a national observance;

Whereas, during this time, using information provided by the National Women's History Project, founded in Sonoma County, California, thousands of schools and communities joined in the commemoration of National Women's History Week, with support and encouragement from governors, city councils, school boards, and Congress;

Whereas, in 1987, the National Women's History Project petitioned Congress to expand the national celebration to include the entire month of March;

Whereas educators, workplace program planners, parents, and community organizations in thousands of communities in the United States under the guidance of the National Women's History Project, have turned National Women's History Month into a major local learning experience and celebration;

Whereas the popularity of women's history celebrations has sparked a new interest in uncovering women's forgotten heritage;

Whereas the President's Commission on the Celebration of Women in American History was established to consider how best to acknowledge and celebrate the roles and accomplishments of women in United States history;

Whereas the National Women's History Museum was founded in 1996 as an institution dedicated to preserving, interpreting, and celebrating the diverse historic contributions of women, and integrating this rich heritage fully into the Nation's teachings and history books;

Whereas the House of Representatives recognizes March 2010 as National Women's History Month; and

Whereas the theme of National Women's History Month for 2010 is "Writing Women Back into History": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of National Women's History Month; and

(2) recognizes and honors the women and organizations in the United States that have fought for and continue to promote the teaching of women's history.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) and the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Ms. SPEIER. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 1174, a bill supporting the goals and ideals of National Women's History Month.

This resolution was introduced by my distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from California, Representative LYNN WOOLSEY, on March 11, 2010. It was referred to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, which ordered it reported by unanimous consent on March 18 of this year. It enjoys wide support from over 120 Members of the House, and I am pleased to be an original cosponsor of the measure.

Mr. Speaker, as recently as the 1970s, women's history was rarely covered in the kindergarten through grade 12 curriculum. Since the late 1970s, the concerted efforts of education commissions, historical societies, and others have increased recognition of the roles and accomplishments of women in history of the United States of America.

These efforts included the establishment of Women's History Week back in 1978, which this body formally acknowledged in 1981. In 1987, the national celebration was expanded to the entire month of March. These celebrations have initiated new interests in highlighting the history of women in America, and it is most appropriate that we recognize Women's History Month here today with this resolution of appreciation.

Mr. Speaker, women make history in this country every day, from our very own Speaker PELOSI and the Members of the House and Senate from both sides of the aisle, to the Supreme Court justices, to women scientists, CEOs, Nobel Prize winners, Olympians, teachers, writers, doctors, and leaders in every profession.

In November of 2008, voters in New Hampshire elected 13 women, a majority, to their State Senate, making it the country's first State-level legislative body with more women than men.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in taking a moment to recognize Women's History Month by supporting this measure.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 1174, supporting the goals and ideals of National Women's History Month. Designating a month each year to honor women's history gives us the opportunity to highlight the significant role that women have played in the history of this Nation through their many accomplishments.

From colonial times to the 21st century, the advancements of women have been inspiring. They are now being given their rightful place in our country's history for their tireless efforts in enriching all of our lives.

The President's Commission on the Celebration of Women in American History was established in 1987 to give national recognition to this effort and to highlight the accomplishments of women in American history throughout the month of March. Establishing March as National Women's History Month created an ideal teaching opportunity for educators, parents, community organizations, and workplace programs.

Embracing the history of women in the United States gives us the opportunity to recognize the many contributions women have made to the growth and success of the United States. I encourage all Members to support this important resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlelady from California (Ms.

WOOLSEY), the author of this resolution, such time as she may consume.

Ms. WOOLSEY. I thank the gentleman from California. I rise in support of honoring Women's History Month.

Women were once considered second-class citizens whose rights were restricted from voting to property ownership. But today, women serve in the Senate. They serve in the House of Representatives; as members of the President's Cabinet, including Secretary of State Hillary Clinton; and as Speaker of the House, NANCY PELOSI.

□ 1645

It's important that we honor the key role women have played in shaping our country. However, it wasn't until the late 1970s that women's history was taught in our schools, and it was almost completely absent in media coverage and cultural celebrations. That's why the Education Task Force of the Sonoma County Commission on the Status of Women, of which I was Chair, initiated a "Women's History Week." That was a celebration in 1978 centered around International Women's History Day.

The National Women's History Project, later located in my district, was founded in 1980 by many of the same dedicated women who started Women's History Day. These women poured their hearts and their ideas into promoting and expanding a weeklong celebration for women and of women. Because several dedicated women, including Molly Murphy MacGregor, the late Mary Ruthsdotter, Maria Cuevas, Paula Hammett, and Bette Morgan decided to write women back into history, thousands of schools and communities now commemorate Women's History Month by bringing lessons on women's achievements into the classroom, staging parades, and engaging neighborhoods in the celebration of the contributions of women. The hard work and dedication of these wonderful women and the support of the Sonoma County Commission on the Status of Women paid off. They started a national movement and, in 1981, Congress responded to the growing popularity of Women's History Week by making it a national observance, and eventually, in 1987, expanding the week to a month.

Mary Ruthsdotter, one of the founders of the National Women's History Project, passed away in January of this year. She should have been written into history a long time ago. She will be written into history from now on. Mary was a leader in the effort to ensure the inclusion of women's accomplishments in the Nation's history. She traveled around the country making presentations, training teachers, and lobbying for the inclusion of women's accomplishments in the Nation's history. Imagine what American history lessons would be today without teaching about Harriet Tubman's Underground Railroad; the work of Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Susan B. Anthony, and

the many women who fought for women's suffrage; or Dr. Sally K. Ride, who was the first woman in space and has worked to get more girls interested in science.

Today, I ask my colleagues to join me in reaffirming our commitment to the celebration of women's history by supporting H. Res. 1174, to ensure that our grandchildren and great grandchildren learn about women like Amelia Earhart, Speaker NANCY PELOSI, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, and, eventually the first woman President. This week, Mr. Speaker, Speaker NANCY PELOSI will make history by leading this Congress into passing a monumental health care bill that in itself will be making history. One of the parts of history that this bill will be ensuring is that women will no longer be considered a preexisting condition.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman TOWNS, Ranking Member ISSA, and Congresswoman JACKIE SPEIER for allowing me to speak today, for supporting this resolution, and letting us reflect on the contributions of women and their place in history, with the hope that the day will come when it's impossible to study American history without remembering the contributions of women.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I would now like to yield 4 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER).

Mr. SOUDER. I thank my friend from North Carolina, and I rise in support of Women's History Month. And I am proud to call Congresswoman WOOLSEY my friend. We don't agree on many issues, but we agree on many history issues. We worked together on Angel Island. I appreciate her leadership here. She's been a passionate advocate for women's rights in this House. But I want to talk more in depth about what most of America is looking at right now—and that's the foot in the door for the takeover of health care. There are several parts that directly relate to Medicare and retirement.

First off, I was not here when they passed Medicare, nor was I here when they passed Social Security. What other people did is other people's business. But what I see in this bill is 13 percent of Americans now say they're confident of their retirement. But without anything in committee, in some kind of magical formula in the last few years, they've raised the taxes to 3.8 percent on unearned income, which is a direct attack on those who've saved for annuities in America. We have spent years trying to encourage people to save. Now, at the last minute, we're going to dump an additional tax on them, already concerned about whether they're going to be able to survive as they hit their older age.

I'm happy to represent Lincoln Financial, which has 1,900 jobs in the annuity industry in my district. You just wonder: How many jobs is this bill going to kill? It is incredible what is

being done in this bill. Not only are they punishing people who've saved, who planned to save, and discouraged savings, but they're going to eliminate or at least restrict the growth and lead to a decline in industries like that.

Furthermore, I represent three of the four biggest orthopedic companies in the world. Here's an area where we bought the biggest companies in Germany and Switzerland and around the world. We've become the technology leaders. So what are we going to do? We're going to tax them. They have two choices. The tax is equivalent to half of their R&D. They can either move the jobs and all the parts jobs that go with it, tens of thousands of jobs overseas, or they can eliminate R&D, and our senior citizens in the future won't know what they're missing in hip replacement, they won't know whether we would have had new spinal equipment, they won't know what other types of things they'll miss because this administration proposes to put a tax on that will kill, most likely, future development. And then there's this whole thing about the very people who claim to be the founders and the protectors of Medicare are trying to come up and pay for this bill with reductions in Medicare.

Now they talk about the insurance companies and Medicare Advantage. But what does it mean when it says, "increased utilization of equipment"? Well, I found out from the cardiologist in my district. What it means is they have to get at least 80 percent utilization on the equipment. That means that the only hospitals in Indiana that will have heart equipment are in Indianapolis. Everything in Fort Wayne, South Bend, all over the State, is going to have to close. In oncology, because they're getting close to 40 percent utilization—the administration is claiming 80—they're going to consolidate in just the biggest cities for oncology.

In category after category, on the backs of senior citizens, saying just like they too often do for veterans, that you have to get in a car and go 200 miles if you want to have something treated on your heart. You have to go 200 miles if you want to do oncology. You have to go 200 miles if you're going to use equipment, because small-town, mid-size cities, and even the second-biggest city in the State of Indiana isn't good enough to have utilization of this type of equipment. We didn't have this debate. That's why you don't go fast on bills.

One of the things we do in the United States is we have driven our health care out to the second tier, the third tier, to small cities and towns, hospitals at 13,000 to 15,000, and things like outpatient clinics. What this does is re-consolidate—it provides jobs for government employees—but reconsolidates in the bigger cities, just like it does in Canada and in England. That's why they have waits. That's why small towns and people out in the countryside in those areas in the other countries have long waits, because if you

try and get high utilization on fewer pieces of equipment, it means your health care is less dispersed around the United States. So in one bill, somehow we're managing to kill the motive to save by taxing it more; to kill the one category that we are leading the world in, in orthopedics; and to destroy health care for seniors. We're not a big city like New York.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER).

Mr. WEINER. It is my pleasure to stand up in support of this resolution in support of Women's History Month. It is important to note that here, in 2010, that insurance companies very often charge women exponentially more money to get health insurance than they do for men. Now why do they do that? Because health insurance companies have been empowered by the present system—not because they're venal or bad—but because it's their job, their business model, to take in as much money as they can and to give as little service as they can. That's their business model. It's their business model to try not to provide any insurance at all for the toughest to ensure, so they drop people who have any pre-existing conditions or start to rack up needs, meaning people who get sick. They don't cover anyone who's over 65, because we, the Federal Government, decided 44 years ago, over the objections of many of my Republican friends, to create the Medicare system.

But let's talk for a moment about this notion of jobs for women, jobs for men, jobs for the next generation. The idea that we can continue this way, putting 20 percent of every single dollar we produce in this country into health care is why, my friends, our wages have been stagnant for the last 8 years. Because when an employer gets any additional money, it's got to go into keeping up with the high cost of health care. And you don't have to look in a book. You can go look in Michigan.

Take a look at the difference, with the exact same union contract, to build a Chevy Impala on the Michigan side of the Canadian border or on the Canadian side of the Michigan border. The same exact automobile. General Motors did what any sound-minded company might do. They said, Wait a minute. I'm paying an extra \$7.25 per hour per worker on the New York side of the border, on the Michigan side of the Canadian border. I'm going to stop doing that and move them overseas.

We simply are less competitive with the status quo in every instance except one: the health insurance industry. They're doing well. They're doing remarkably well. And you know what? I am at a place, as I think the previous speaker said, where I would have preferred to say, You know what? Let's take the Medicare system. People understand it. Let's extend it to people 55. Let's get younger people on. Let's try to do this right. Let's take an orga-

nization that has an overhead rate of 1.05 percent—1.05 percent—and let's take away the ones that have 30 percent, 25 percent. That's what I would have done.

Now my Republican friends have their own proposal. Let me tell you exactly what it is. It says that anyone over the age of 55, who's not 55 today, will not have Medicare the way it's structured today. They will essentially get some type of a voucher and say, Good luck. You will not have Social Security under the Republican plan because they would invest it in the stock market. Yeah. It's not a joke. This is their proposal—not from 10 years ago. This is the ranking minority member. They don't talk about it much, God bless them. But that's their proposal.

There's an expression down South—and I'm not very far south in Brooklyn—but it says that it takes a great man or a great woman to build a barn, but any jackass can kick it down. What that means is, yeah, writing bills is complicated. To say it was rushed, I've got to tell you, a year, plus 2 years talking about it in campaign, plus 30 years festering as a problem, and now I heard one of my colleagues say, Wait until Thursday. Have you got a Final Four you're watching or what? Honestly. Wait until Thursday. Twenty percent of the economy. I'm busy. Wait until Thursday. I want to see if Siena makes two rounds. Let's wait until Thursday. Sayonara.

Look, the minority party had an opportunity for 8 years and the trend went like this for health insurance. Costs went like this for incomes. That's what happened. We're not going to let it happen anymore. So there was a decision made that had to be made: Are you going to try to solve the problem, or are you going to stand up for the insurance industry? On this side, we chose to try to solve the problem. It ain't perfect, but it sure beats what we're hearing over there.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, some comments are so far from reality that they're not really worth responding to.

I'd like to now yield 3 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. I find it interesting. I admire my colleague from New York. He is a great speaker. And the reason he comes to the floor is to try to talk about everything else other than what is in the bill. He wants to say what Republicans are for so that they don't have to talk about what is in their bill. And that has been, really, the effort all along in this particular debate.

There is great bipartisan agreement on this bill, and it is overwhelmingly in opposition. Republicans and Democrats not only on this House floor worked together to say "no," but the American people worked together to say "no." And why? Why would they do that? And why wouldn't you talk about the things that you had to do to try to get people to vote in favor of the bill?

There are a slew of things which this body is about ready to approve. The Louisiana purchase. You made special adjustments. If this is so good and so wonderful, why do we have to put special provisions in this bill to exempt people from its provisions? Why? Because it's bad if everybody has to be a part of this bill, so individual Members said, If you give me just something I can go back and tell my people that I got them out of, it'll be a great day.

□ 1700

You know what, you're asking Americans to pit an American against an American, a trillion-dollar bill that's not paid for, a bill that raises premiums, a bill that raids the Social Security trust fund to pay for a bill that still puts us in deficit. That's what this bill is. It's amazing.

I think, you know, wow, we've fought for associated health plans where one small business could negotiate with another small business to lower their premiums, and the government, your government, said, no, you can't do that; that's illegal. We said, Hey, let's allow folks to cross State lines and force insurance companies to compete against each other so that we get lower premiums. And your government, your Democrat policies said, no, that's illegal. And then they said, you know what, this whole system isn't working because we can't associate together with small businesses and buy premiums because we don't like that idea. You can't go across State lines and force insurance companies to compete and be more transparent, we don't like that idea. So we made that illegal.

So guess what, the government created the problem, and now they're saying, you know what, this is so hard and so complicated, we're going to give up on democracy and freedom; and the government is going to solve this problem for you. The arrogance is unbelievable.

There are such simple things that we could do to lower premiums. There are such simple things that we could create in the free market that would allow people with preexisting conditions not to be discriminated against. You don't have to cut Medicare \$500 billion to do it. You don't have to raid the Social Security trust fund to do it. This isn't about health care anymore. It's about politics. And that's so unfortunate.

It's unbelievable what you are about to do to the American people. There's a new tax in here, a new tax on everything a doctor touches from the blood pressure cuff to the x ray machine to the smock that he wears. I have to tell you, you can't add cost to the health care system and have the premiums go down.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire how much time we have left, please.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California has 9 minutes left. The gentlewoman from North Carolina has 12.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS).

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I thank the gentlewoman, and I won't take 3 minutes. My good friend that just spoke—and he is my good friend—we serve together on the Select Committee on Intelligence—carried on in a manner, again, to say what the American people want. How do you continue to say what the American people want when, in fact, all of us are Americans, and anybody listening and looking would know that we have ideological differences, which we are permitted. But to come down here the last time that I spoke—and I want to spell it for the reporter again: P-O-O T-E-E W-E-E-T, poo-tee-weet—that's what the jabbering bird said when he didn't have anything intelligent to say, and that comes from "Slaughterhouse-Five." "Slaughterhouse-Five" also talks about free will on Earth. And, evidently, we don't understand that process.

Despite the unquestionable need for health care reform, some have sought to dominate the health care reform discussion with fear-mongering, misinterpretations and misinformation. They've stymied the progression of the reform process in the name of fiscal responsibility, bipartisanship, parliamentary procedure, and patriotism. These justifications are egregious. There's nothing bipartisan about continually opposing a bill that independent Federal agencies have repeatedly recognized as a substantive and reasonable approach to reform. There's nothing fiscally responsible about allowing premium State and Federal health expenditures to rise to unprecedented levels. There's nothing American about depriving men, women and children of the guaranteed right to health care in the richest country on Earth.

Today when Americans across the country are losing their homes, their jobs, their health insurance and their hope, we, as elected officials—American-elected officials have the opportunity and duty to deliver. We can't afford to back down. We've come too far and have too much to lose. Extreme times require extreme measures to ensure that we pass a health care reform bill that America needs and deserves.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana, Dr. CASSIDY.

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. Speaker, isn't it ironic that Women's History Month is at the same time, in the same week that this article in The New York Times comes out about how this poor woman in Michigan on Medicaid, there is such inadequate Medicaid reimbursement that she cannot get treated for her cancer.

Now, I have actually listened to these arguments. I have gone to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle and asked them—and I frankly feel a little bit disadvantaged—my colleague from New York, he has been in Con-

gress as a staffer or as a Member, I guess, for 20 or 30 years. I have just been a practicing physician. I still teach in a teaching hospital, a safety net hospital where I actually work with the uninsured. So I don't have the legislative experience, but I do actually have the experience of teaching and treating patients who otherwise would not have care.

I just wish that my colleagues could join me. I actually wish they could come with me and see the reality of what is happening. So when my friend says, Oh, my gosh, I think government programs are better than private insurance—ah, I wish he would join me on my telephone town hall where the guy with the Crohn's disease is calling in to say that he has got Medicare and Medicaid and would my office please help him navigate the system.

They should be with me when I am with my Medicaid patient who only gets—oh, can I get a referral to a specialist because they won't take Medicaid because it pays so far below their cost. And cost is actually the simple issue. I know it sounds hard-hearted, but the fact is, if you don't control cost, you can't provide access to quality care.

Now, there are so many examples of this. For example, Medi-Cal, the Medicaid program in California, did a huge expansion because of Medicaid's budget—one, California's gone bankrupt, and two, Medi-Cal is now decreasing eligibility. They tried to make everybody eligible. They did not control cost, and now they are decreasing eligibility. Massachusetts—expanded care, did not control cost, and now they are disenrolling people who formerly were enrolled.

If you don't control cost, you cannot provide access to quality care. I say that not as someone who has been here for 30 years. You know more about that than I do. I say it as someone who has been in the trenches, treating the uninsured for 20 years.

Now, by the way, Medicare, having such a wonderful low overhead, come join my world. Twenty percent of Medicare in south Florida is fraud. Only 1 percent of that goes to administration. Maybe a little bit more should, because 20 percent is going to fraud. Do we want another program based upon Medicare which expands fraud?

Now, we also said earlier in the debate that we're going to expand payment for primary care physicians, but it's not going to cost the States anything. Come to my world. Leave these Chambers. Walk with me in a hospital for the uninsured where you realize that the extra payments from the Federal Government are only for those newly eligible. And if we mandate here that the States raise those fees, that increases the burden for those who are already eligible.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Ms. FOXX. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. CASSIDY. If you don't control cost, you can't give access. Now Republicans have been proposing things. I was so pleased the President said we're the party of no and then he embraces our idea of HSAs, high-risk pools, and other things. So that's good. The party of no is suddenly the fountain of ideas for things which will be immediately beneficial.

I come back to one more thing that we have in common. We are all Representatives. We can agree on this: I actually don't think the American people would mind if we delay just two more days, fly home to our districts. We are Representatives. We are not dictators. We are here not for what we think is best, but to represent the people we represent. Join me in that bipartisan initiative.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS).

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. I'm here today of course to celebrate and to honor Women's History Month. Mr. Speaker, it's an important time to honor the political and social struggles of women across this world and certainly in this Nation who have made significant contributions in the advancement of women. And it is perhaps fitting that we are here today to discuss the subject of the hour, health care, and especially as that pertains to women—women who bear the brunt of a system that's failing; women who make the decisions for themselves, their children and their families on health care; women who sometimes work in positions, in jobs that don't allow them access to quality and affordable health care.

So I think that it is fitting that on this weekend, on this upcoming Sunday, we'll have an opportunity to discuss how we're going to bring health care, quality, affordable and accessible health care, not only to America's women but to all of our families and to our children. People who go every day, 32 million of them, who will now be covered, have health care coverage. Millions more will have more accessible coverage. Still millions more will have the access through their small businesses, through their independent employment, to quality, affordable health care.

And let me just say that in this Women's History Month, it should go with some noting that in this system that we have, women don't often receive access to preventive care, mammograms and other screenings and a full range of reproductive services. We're bringing those to America's women. Women are often excluded for preexisting conditions, like domestic violence. Domestic violence is a crime; it's not a preexisting condition.

So here we're talking today about what we're bringing to and for America's women in Women's History Month but also for all families, to make it

quality, to make sure that it's affordable, and to make sure that it's accessible.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. SPEIER. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. As a woman in this country, who would have known but for this debate that as a woman just starting out, same condition, same age, you pay more for your health care as a woman in this country than you do as a man. We're going to end that kind of gender discrimination and gender rating.

So I think that it is fitting in Women's History Month that we honor the contributions of all women in our history, and we honor the contribution of women and our families and our future by bringing quality, affordable and accessible health care to all.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 3 minutes to our distinguished colleague from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN).

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution establishing Women's History Month. I do this on behalf of my 92-year-old mother, my four sisters, my two daughters, my three granddaughters, and in memory of my grandmother, who graduated from a small Nebraska college in 1898. And I also do this in honor of some great women in my life, the Catholic nuns who taught me, who taught my brothers and sisters, who taught my children, and who this day are doing an unlimited number of acts of mercy around this country.

On their behalf, I would like to clarify the record because the Speaker has said today that the religious communities of nuns across the country support the health care bill as a life-affirming bill, and therefore, do not agree with the Catholic Bishops Conference that, in fact, it fails the test of protecting life in the consensus that has been established on this floor for the last 30-plus years.

A statement from Sister Mary Ann Walsh, director of media relations, the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops: "A recent letter from Network, a social justice lobby of sisters, grossly overstated whom they represent in a letter to Congress that was also released to media. Network's letter, about health care reform, was signed by a few dozen people, and despite what Network said, they do not come anywhere near representing 59,000 American sisters. This letter had 55 signatories, some individuals, some groups of three to five persons. One endorser signed twice. There are 793 religious communities in the United States. The math is clear. Network is far off the mark," says sister Mary Ann Walsh.

On behalf those great nuns that I've had the privilege of being influenced by

during my lifetime and those that have done considerable amounts of mercy in communities that I represent, the record ought to be straight. My wife and I had the privilege of knowing the Carmelite nuns in Georgetown, California, and we have had the privilege on an almost annual basis to visit with them. They are more than just a handful of individuals, and they and others like them stand for life unequivocally. They understand the protection of life. They understand that for the last 30-some years, we have had a consensus on this floor in the Senate and in legislation passed by a number of Presidents and, that is, Federal funding of abortion is to be limited. The language in the Senate bill changes the law. Let the record be correct.

□ 1715

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor, as my colleagues do, the medical doctors as well, saying we do all agree that we do need reform here; it is just that we are listening to the American public who says not the reform of the ObamaCare or the Pelosi legislation that we are looking at that is before us right now.

And I hear from the gentleman from New York that we need to talk about the facts, issues like Social Security and Medicare and the like. It seems to me I heard that in committee. The gentleman from New York actually submitted an amendment to repeal Medicare, if I am not mistaken. So I am not sure whether his constituents know that when he rails against us on the position of Medicare, he was the author of the amendment to repeal Medicare.

But let us not digress on those other issues; let us talk about the facts of the health care bill before us today. Interestingly enough on that, while we would like to talk about the facts on these issues, we know that your side, the Democrat side of the aisle, does not want to do so. Why do we know that? Because here is a memo that came out of talking points for the Democrat majority, Thursday, March 18, saying that to these very points on what they should be saying and what they shouldn't be saying: We cannot emphasize enough. Do not allow yourselves to get into a discussion of the details of the CBO scores.

Further on, it goes on to say: Do not give them—and who is "them"; I guess, the American public. Do not give them grounds by debating the details, for example, a March 1 letter. Again, focus on other issues, essentially, is what it says. So that is their talking points, to stay off message, don't talk about the facts.

Well, here are some of the facts. The bill is replete with budget gimmicks. Why health care reform will cost more than Democrats say it will, here are some of the facts:

Delayed benefits and immediate taxes. The bill will raise taxes around \$60 billion before almost all, 98 percent, of the benefits will go into effect. Do you hear that? We will be taking tax dollars out of our pockets before 98 percent of the benefits will ever go into effect.

Secondly, the CLASS Act. What does CBO, Congressional Budget Office, say about it? They say this program will pay out far less in benefits than it will receive in premiums over the 10-year budget window. What is that? Well, the gentleman from New York may be familiar with the Bernie Madoff situation. Well, that is what this is. According to Senator CONRAD, it is a Ponzi scheme.

Next, the doc fix that was talked about here. They do not include anything to deal with the doc fix. That will cost \$371 billion. And why don't they? Well, it says here in their talking points, or in your talking points, the inclusion of a full SGR doc fix repeal would undermine the reform budget's neutrality. So again, Do not allow yourself to get into a discussion of the details of the CBO scores in textual narratives.

Why don't they put the CBO score and the doc fix in it, because they know then the bill would be honest and fair as to the cost of it.

Fourthly, raid Social Security. Again, where is AARP on this one when they are going to raid Social Security to the tune of \$53 billion in new Social Security revenue to give us the appearance of a deficit cut? These revenues were meant to benefit Social Security, not to be a new entitlement and give them cover.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER).

Mr. WEINER. I would ask the American people to listen to the following exchange:

Will the gentleman from New Jersey kindly inform the House the source of the memo that he just read from?

That silence that you hear is the gentleman from New Jersey read from a fake memo, a fraudulent memo. He has been zoomed. It wouldn't be the first time, but that is the case. That memo that he just read from has no source. He will not return to the microphone and tell us what it was because he took something that was created by opponents of health care, and there are a lot of them, mostly paid for by the health insurance industry, and came to the rostrum with a fake document.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WEINER. I don't yield for that purpose.

Ms. FOXX. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York controls the time.

Mr. WEINER. The fact of the matter is there is an enormous amount of money being socked in by the health

insurance industry. They are doing everything. They are creating ads. They are making contributions. But what they are also doing is producing fake memos that say, "from the Democrats," with something crossed out on top.

But the fact remains here that there is no reluctance to talk about the real CBO score: \$1.2 trillion of savings for the American people. That is the fact. That is nothing we are hiding from.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEINER. I will yield if only for the purpose of telling the source of the document.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Will the gentleman not yield on the facts then?

Mr. WEINER. I asked the gentleman a direct question. Ladies and gentlemen—

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. I am responding with a direct answer.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. SPEIER. I yield the gentleman 30 additional seconds.

Mr. WEINER. Ladies and gentlemen, what you saw just now is a microcosm for this debate, a real piece of legislation that for a year we have been working on and a fake document that they won't even give the source for. We are going past that, and we are going to wait until Thursday, I say to my colleague, or Wednesday. We are going to do it when the bill is ready to be passed because we have debated this thing for a long time. We are here to solve the problems of the American people, not quote from fake memos.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN).

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote for this bill, but we are embarking upon a history for women that is going to be bleak. My mother died from metastatic breast cancer at age 63. A government panel just recently said women under 50 cannot get a mammogram and women over 50 can only get one every 2 years. This is the kind of rationing of care which is going to be exploded upon the American public.

When a woman walks into an abortion clinic, there are two people who walk in that are alive. When she walks out, there is one dead and one wounded. We are creating more abortions. We are going to support the abortion industry in the Senate bill. The American people need to understand very clearly, the Senate bill that we will be voting on in just a few days is going to promote abortions and it is going to kill unborn children.

We hear a lot of confusion, and we hear a lot of confusion about the CBO. I call the CBO parameters, what was given by them, zombie economics because a person would have to be dead without a soul walking around to believe the parameters that were given to the CBO, and it is just not factual. This

is going to create more debt and it is going to put people out of work. It is going to deny access to care to many people, particularly the poor people and the elderly, and it is going to be disastrous for women because, particularly the constraints on Medicare reimbursement, women expend more of those dollars than anybody else and they are going to be denied care because of it.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, to the gentleman who just spoke, I cannot understand how anyone seated in this Chamber today cannot appreciate the fact that the language from the Senate version of the bill already expands the Hyde language. Under the Senate version of the bill, a woman in the exchange paying for her insurance totally on her own is going to be required now to make out two checks: one for her insurance contribution and one for her abortion services should she ever need them.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Will the gentlelady yield?

Ms. SPEIER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. The facts are that the Federal Government will require all insurance policies to get that extra tax. It is not called a tax, but it is an extra tax that is going to be forced upon anybody who pays for insurance, and that tax is going to be what is paying for abortions. So abortions are going to be paid. They are going to be forced on the American people by the Senate bill. And that's just the facts. That's the simple facts of the bill.

Ms. SPEIER. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I think it is very important for the American people to appreciate that the Hyde amendment is alive and well in this bill. In fact, it is extended in this bill. Many of us who are concerned about making sure that women have access to the services they need recognize that many of them are not going to access these services now because they are not going to have insurance to cover it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I support the underlying bill that we have been talking about, H. Res. 1174, Women's History Month and urge people to vote for it. But I do want to say that Republicans have been maligned, I believe, on the floor today in many, many ways. A majority of Republicans in the House voted for Medicare. Republicans support Medicare and support Social Security. We have never, ever suggested doing away with those programs.

We know that the bill that is being proposed by the Democrats does not control cost, will not improve access, will not improve care for people in this country, and we know that is going to happen. We want to protect the American people. We want to protect their freedom. We do not want to turn our lives over to the government to run not just health care, but everything about our lives.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, again, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution recognizing Women's History Month. Let me also suggest that we are all going to go down in history this weekend for the kinds of votes we take. If there ever was an issue on health care that must be addressed and is addressed in this bill, it is gender discrimination. And the dirty little secret in health care is that women have been discriminated against for decades in health insurance.

In fact, a 22-year-old woman, a healthy 22-year-old woman is going to pay 150 percent more for her health insurance than a 22-year-old healthy man. A 40-year-old nonsmoking woman is going to pay more for her health insurance than a 40-year-old male smoker. Those are the kinds of discrimination that continue to exist in health care today that will not exist once we have health care reform.

One in five women over 50 is not getting mammograms today. That will not be the case anymore because every woman in America will have access to those kinds of screenings.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1174.

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. SPEIER. 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.

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. 4395, by the yeas and nays;

H. Res. 1133, by the yeas and nays;

H. Res. 1027, by the yeas and nays;

H. Con. Res. 244, by the yeas and nays.

Postponed votes on H. Res. 1040, H.R. 4840, and H. Res. 1174 will be taken at a later time.

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

REVISING BOUNDARIES OF GETTYSBURG NATIONAL MILITARY PARK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4395, 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 gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4395, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 372, nays 31, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 144]

YEAS—372

| | | |
|----------------|-----------------|------------------|
| Aderholt | Cohen | Hastings (WA) |
| Adler (NJ) | Cole | Heinrich |
| Akin | Connolly (VA) | Heller |
| Alexander | Conyers | Hensarling |
| Altmire | Cooper | Herger |
| Andrews | Costa | Herseth Sandlin |
| Arcuri | Costello | Higgins |
| Austria | Courtney | Hill |
| Baca | Crowley | Himes |
| Bachmann | Cuellar | Hinojosa |
| Bachus | Culberson | Hirono |
| Baird | Cummings | Hodes |
| Baldwin | Dahlkemper | Holt |
| Barrett (SC) | Davis (AL) | Honda |
| Barrow | Davis (CA) | Hoyer |
| Bartlett | Davis (IL) | Hunter |
| Barton (TX) | Davis (KY) | Inglis |
| Bean | DeFazio | Inslee |
| Becerra | DeGette | Jackson (IL) |
| Berkley | Delahunt | Jackson Lee |
| Berman | DeLauro | (TX) |
| Berry | Dent | Jenkins |
| Biggert | Diaz-Balart, L. | Johnson (GA) |
| Bilbray | Diaz-Balart, M. | Johnson (IL) |
| Bilirakis | Dingell | Johnson, E. B. |
| Bishop (GA) | Doggett | Johnson, Sam |
| Blackburn | Donnelly (IN) | Jones |
| Blumenauer | Doyle | Jordan (OH) |
| Bocieri | Dreier | Kagen |
| Boehner | Driehaus | Kanjorski |
| Bonner | Edwards (MD) | Kaptur |
| Bono Mack | Edwards (TX) | Kennedy |
| Boozman | Ehlers | Kildee |
| Boren | Ellison | Kilpatrick (MI) |
| Boswell | Emerson | Kilroy |
| Boucher | Engel | Kilroy |
| Boustany | Eshoo | Kind |
| Boyd | Etheridge | King (IA) |
| Brady (PA) | Fallin | King (NY) |
| Brady (TX) | Farr | Kirk |
| Braley (IA) | Fattah | Kirkpatrick (AZ) |
| Brown (SC) | Filner | Kissell |
| Brown, Corrine | Fleming | Klein (FL) |
| Brown-Waite, | Forbes | Kline (MN) |
| Ginny | Foster | Kosmas |
| Buchanan | Fox | Kratovil |
| Burgess | Frank (MA) | Kucinich |
| Butterfield | Frelinghuysen | Lance |
| Calvert | Fudge | Langevin |
| Camp | Gallely | Larsen (WA) |
| Campbell | Garamendi | Larson (CT) |
| Cantor | Garrett (NJ) | Latham |
| Cao | Gerlach | LaTourette |
| Capito | Giffords | Latta |
| Capps | Gohmert | Lee (CA) |
| Capuano | Gonzalez | Lee (NY) |
| Cardoza | Goodlatte | Levin |
| Carnahan | Gordon (TN) | Lewis (GA) |
| Carney | Granger | Linder |
| Carson (IN) | Graves | Lipinski |
| Carter | Grayson | LoBiondo |
| Cassidy | Green, Al | Loebsock |
| Castle | Griffith | Lowe |
| Castor (FL) | Grijalva | Lucas |
| Chaffetz | Guthrie | Luetkemeyer |
| Chandler | Hall (NY) | Lujan |
| Childers | Hall (TX) | Lummis |
| Chu | Halvorson | Lungren, Daniel |
| Clarke | Hare | E. |
| Cleaver | Harman | Lynch |
| Clyburn | Harper | Mack |
| Coffman (CO) | Hastings (FL) | Maffei |
| | | Maloney |

| | | |
|-----------------|------------------|---------------|
| Manzullo | Perriello | Simpson |
| Marchant | Peters | Sires |
| Markey (CO) | Peterson | Skelton |
| Markey (MA) | Pingree (ME) | Slaughter |
| Matheson | Pitts | Smith (NE) |
| Matsui | Platts | Smith (NJ) |
| McCarthy (CA) | Polis (CO) | Smith (TX) |
| McCarthy (NY) | Pomeroy | Smith (WA) |
| McCaul | Posey | Snyder |
| McClintock | Price (GA) | Souder |
| McCollum | Price (NC) | Space |
| McCotter | Putnam | Speier |
| McDermott | Quigley | Spratt |
| McGovern | Rahall | Stupak |
| McHenry | Rangel | Sullivan |
| McIntyre | Rehberg | Sutton |
| McKeon | Reichert | Tanner |
| McMahon | Reyes | Taylor |
| McMorris | Richardson | Teague |
| Rodgers | Rodriguez | Terry |
| McNerney | Roe (TN) | Thompson (CA) |
| Meek (FL) | Rogers (AL) | Thompson (MS) |
| Meeks (NY) | Rogers (KY) | Thompson (PA) |
| Melancon | Rogers (MI) | Thornberry |
| Mica | Rooney | Tiberi |
| Michaud | Roskam | Tierney |
| Miller (FL) | Ross | Titus |
| Miller (MI) | Rothman (NJ) | Tonko |
| Miller (NC) | Roybal-Allard | Towns |
| Miller, Gary | Ruppersberger | Tsongas |
| Miller, George | Rush | Turner |
| Minnick | Ryan (OH) | Upton |
| Mollohan | Ryan (WI) | Van Hollen |
| Moore (KS) | Salazar | Velazquez |
| Moran (KS) | Sánchez, Linda | Visclosky |
| Moran (VA) | T. | Walden |
| Murphy (CT) | Sanchez, Loretta | Walz |
| Murphy, Patrick | Sarbanes | Wasserman |
| Nadler (NY) | Schakowsky | Schultz |
| Napolitano | Schauer | Waters |
| Neal (MA) | Schiff | Watson |
| Nye | Schmidt | Watt |
| Oberstar | Schock | Waxman |
| Obey | Schrader | Weiner |
| Olson | Schwartz | Welch |
| Oliver | Scott (GA) | Whitfield |
| Ortiz | Scott (VA) | Wilson (OH) |
| Owens | Serrano | Wilson (SC) |
| Pallone | Sestak | Wittman |
| Pascarell | Shea-Porter | Wolf |
| Pastor (AZ) | Sherman | Woolsey |
| Paulsen | Shimkus | Wu |
| Payne | Shuler | Yarmuth |
| Perlmutter | Shuster | Young (FL) |

NAYS—31

| | | |
|--------------|------------|---------------|
| Bright | Kingston | Rohrabacher |
| Broun (GA) | Lamborn | Royce |
| Burton (IN) | Lewis (CA) | Sensenbrenner |
| Coble | Marshall | Sessions |
| Conaway | Mitchell | Shadegg |
| Duncan | Myrick | Stearns |
| Ellsworth | Neugebauer | Tiahrt |
| Flake | Nunes | Westmoreland |
| Franks (AZ) | Paul | Young (AK) |
| Gingrey (GA) | Petri | |
| Issa | Poe (TX) | |

NOT VOTING—27

| | | |
|-------------|--------------|--------------|
| Ackerman | Dicks | Moore (WI) |
| Bishop (NY) | Fortenberry | Murphy (NY) |
| Bishop (UT) | Green, Gene | Murphy, Tim |
| Blunt | Gutierrez | Pence |
| Buyer | Hinchee | Radanovich |
| Clay | Hoekstra | Ros-Lehtinen |
| Crenshaw | Holden | Scalise |
| Davis (TN) | Israel | Stark |
| Deal (GA) | Lofgren, Zoe | Wamp |

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Two minutes remain in the vote.

□ 1756

Mr. WESTMORELAND changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. CARTER, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. BARTON of Texas, and Mrs. BLACKBURN 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. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 144, had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

RECOGNIZING AFRICAN AMERICAN SCIENTISTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1133, 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 gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1133.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 399, nays 0, not voting 31, as follows:

[Roll No. 145]

YEAS—399

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

Kaptur Miller (NC) Schiff
 Kennedy Miller, Gary Schmidt
 Kildee Miller, George Schock
 Kilpatrick (MI) Mitchell Schrader
 Kilroy Mollohan Schwartz
 Kind Moore (KS) Scott (GA)
 King (IA) Moran (KS) Scott (VA)
 King (NY) Moran (VA) Sensenbrenner
 Kingston Murphy (CT) Serrano
 Kirk Murphy (NY) Sessions
 Kirkpatrick (AZ) Murphy, Patrick Sestak
 Kissell Myrick Shadegg
 Klein (FL) Nadler (NY) Shea-Porter
 Kline (MN) Napolitano Sherman
 Kosmas Neal (MA) Shimkus
 Kratovil Neugebauer Shuler
 Kucinich Nunes Shuster
 Lamborn Nye Simpson
 Lance Oberstar Sires
 Langevin Obey Skelton
 Larsen (WA) Olson Slaughter
 Larson (CT) Olver Smith (NE)
 Latham Ortiz Smith (NJ)
 LaTourette Owens Smith (TX)
 Latta Pallone Smith (WA)
 Lee (CA) Pascrell Snyder
 Lee (NY) Pastor (AZ) Souder
 Levin Paul Speier
 Lewis (CA) Paulsen Spratt
 Lewis (GA) Payne Stearns
 Linder Perlmutter Stupak
 Lipinski Perriello Sullivan
 LoBiondo Peters Sutton
 Loeb sack Peterson Tanner
 Lowey Petri Taylor
 Lucas Pingree (ME) Teague
 Luetkemeyer Pitts Terry
 Luján Platts Thompson (CA)
 Lummis Poe (TX) Thompson (MS)
 Lungren, Daniel Polis (CO) Thompson (PA)
 E. Pomeroy Thornberry
 Lynch Posey Tiahrt
 Mack Price (GA) Tiberi
 Maffei Price (NC) Tierney
 Maloney Putnam Titus
 Manzullo Rahall Tonko
 Marchant Rangel Towns
 Markey (CO) Rehberg Tsongas
 Markey (MA) Reichert Turner
 Marshall Reyes Upton
 Matheson Richardson Van Hollen
 Matsui Rodriguez Velázquez
 McCarthy (CA) Roe (TN) Vislosky
 McCarthy (NY) Rogers (AL) Walden
 McCaul Rogers (KY) Walz
 McClintock Rogers (MI) Wasserman
 McCollum Rohrabacher Schultz
 McCotter Rooney Waters
 McDermott Roskam Watson
 McGovern Ross Watt
 McHenry Rothman (NJ) Waxman
 McIntyre Roybal-Allard Weiner
 McKeon Royce Welch
 McMahon Ruppertsberger Westmoreland
 McMorris Rush Whitfield
 Rodgers Ryan (OH) Wilson (OH)
 McNerney Ryan (WI) Wilson (SC)
 Meek (FL) Salazar Wittman
 Meeke (NY) Sánchez, Linda Wolf
 Melancon T. Woolsey
 Mica Sanchez, Loretta Wu
 Michaud Sarbanes Yarmuth
 Miller (FL) Schakowsky Young (AK)
 Miller (MI) Schauer Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—31

Ackerman Fortenberry Murphy, Tim
 Baird Gohmert Pence
 Bishop (NY) Green, Gene Quigley
 Blunt Gutierrez Radanovich
 Buyer Hinchey Ros-Lehtinen
 Cao Hoekstra Scalise
 Clay Holden Space
 Crenshaw Israel Stark
 Davis (TN) Lofgren, Zoe Wamp
 Deal (GA) Minnick
 Dicks Moore (WI)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1803

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.

RECOGNIZING 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MARIANA TRENCH DIVE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1027, 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 gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1027.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 398, nays 2, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 146]
 YEAS—398

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

Kingston Moore (KS) Schrader
 Kirk Moran (VA) Schwartz
 Kirkpatrick (AZ) Moran (KS) Scott (GA)
 Kissell Murphy (CT) Scott (VA)
 Klein (FL) Murphy (NY) Sensenbrenner
 Kline (MN) Murphy, Patrick Serrano
 Kosmas Myrick Sessions
 Kratovil Nadler (NY) Sestak
 Kucinich Napolitano Shadegg
 Lamborn Neal (MA) Shea-Porter
 Lance Neugebauer Sherman
 Langevin Nunes Shinkus
 Larsen (WA) Nye Shuler
 Larson (CT) Obey Shuster
 Latham Olson Simpson
 LaTourette Olver Sires
 Latta Ortiz Skelton
 Lee (CA) Owens Slaughter
 Lee (NY) Pallone Pascrell
 Levin Pastor (AZ) Smith (NE)
 Lewis (CA) Paulsen Smith (NJ)
 Lewis (GA) Payne Smith (TX)
 Linder Lipinski Smith (WA)
 LoBiondo Perriello Snyder
 Loeb sack Peters Souder
 Lowey Peterson Speier
 Lucas Petri Stearns
 Luetkemeyer Luetkemeyer Stupak
 Luján Luján Sullivan
 Lummis Lummis Sutton
 Lungren, Daniel Poe (TX) Tanner
 E. Polis (CO) Taylor
 Lynch Pomeroy Teague
 Mack Posey Thompson (CA)
 Maffei Price (GA) Thompson (MS)
 Maloney Price (NC) Thompson (PA)
 Manzullo Putnam Thornberry
 Marchant Quigley Tiahrt
 Markey (CO) Rahall Tiberi
 Markey (MA) Rangel Tierney
 Marshall Rehberg Titus
 Matheson Matheson Reichert
 Matsui Matsui Reyes Tonko
 McCarthy (CA) McCarthy (NY) Richardson
 McCarthy (NY) McCaul Rodriguez
 McCaul McCollum Roe (TN)
 McClintock McCotter Rogers (AL)
 McCollum McDermott Rogers (KY)
 McCotter McDermott Rogers (MI)
 McDermott McGovern Rohrabacher
 McGovern McHenry Rooney
 McIntyre McIntyre Roskam
 McKeon McKeon Ross
 McMahon Rothman (NJ) Schultz
 McMorris McMorris Roybal-Allard
 Rodgers Rodgers Royce
 McNerney McNerney Ruppertsberger
 Meek (FL) Meek (FL) Rush
 Meeke (NY) Meeke (NY) Ryan (OH)
 Melancon Melancon Ryan (WI)
 Mica Salazar Salazar
 Michaud Michaud Sánchez, Linda
 Miller (FL) Miller (MI) T.
 Miller (MI) Miller (NC) Sanchez, Loretta
 Miller, Gary Miller, Gary Sarbanes
 Miller, George Miller, George Schakowsky
 Minnick Hill Schauer
 Mitchell Hill Schiff
 Mollohan Mollohan Schmidt
 Schock Schock

NAYS—2

Paul Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—30

Ackerman Dicks Moore (WI)
 Baird Fortenberry Murphy, Tim
 Bishop (NY) Green, Gene Oberstar
 Blunt Gutierrez Pence
 Buyer Hinchey Radanovich
 Clay Hoekstra Ros-Lehtinen
 Crenshaw Holden Scalise
 Davis (AL) Israel Space
 Davis (TN) Lofgren, Zoe Stark
 Deal (GA) McCarthy (CA) Wamp

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1810

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.

NATIONAL DAY OF RECOGNITION FOR LONG-TERM CARE PHYSICIANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 244, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 244, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 395, nays 0, not voting 35, as follows:

[Roll No. 147]

YEAS—395

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

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

NOT VOTING—35

| | | |
|-------------|---------------|--------------|
| Ackerman | Deal (GA) | McMahon |
| Baird | DeGette | Moore (WI) |
| Bishop (NY) | Dicks | Murphy, Tim |
| Blunt | Fortenberry | Pence |
| Boehner | Green, Gene | Radanovich |
| Butterfield | Gutierrez | Ros-Lehtinen |
| Buyer | Hinchee | Scalise |
| Cardoza | Hoekstra | Space |
| Carter | Holden | Stark |
| Clay | Israel | Wamp |
| Crenshaw | Lofgren, Zoe | Waters |
| Davis (TN) | McCarthy (CA) | |

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1818

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title was amended so as to read: “Concurrent resolution expressing support for designation of a National Day of Recognition for Long-Term Care Physicians.”

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent from the House Chamber today. I would like the RECORD to show that, had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall votes 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147 and “no” on 141.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, it is deja vu all over again.

On December 2, 1993, William Kristol wrote the Republican playbook. He said, “The Clinton health care proposal is a serious political threat to the Republican Party. Republicans must therefore clearly understand the political strategy implicit in the Clinton plan and adopt an aggressive and uncompromising counterstrategy designed to delegitimize the proposal and defeat its partisan purpose.”

He went on to say, “The long-term political effects of a successful Clinton health care bill will be even worse, much worse. It would re-legitimize middle class dependence for security on government spending and regulation that will revive the reputation of the party that spends and regulates, the Democrats, as the generous protector of the middle class interests, and it will at the same time strike a punishing blow against Republican claims to defend the middle class by restraining government.”

Nothing has changed. The Republicans refuse to deal with the problems of America and provide health security. They sat for 16 years since that date and did nothing. The time has come to pass the health care bill.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I get a big kick out of my Democrat colleagues as they join hands and run towards the edge of the political cliff to commit political suicide. It is very interesting.

You know, they just don’t get it. But the American people do. This sign, I want to make sure they understood. Americans get it. Listen to the people. But they aren’t getting it.

Today on television, just to make my point, the treasurer of the State of

Massachusetts, a Democrat, said that their State-run health care plan is bankrupting their State. And my colleagues over here, who are on the precipice of committing political suicide, want to do it nationally and spend trillions of dollars that we don't have.

So I would just like to say to those who haven't made up their mind, take a good look at Massachusetts. They are going bankrupt because of what you want to do.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(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, the Democratic health care plan that will be forced upon the American people this weekend is, in reality, a jobs bill, a really bad jobs bill. What is the evidence that this is true?

This bill will result in the firing of 30,000 individuals from jobs who currently work in the private student loan industry. This bill will bankrupt rural and underserved urban hospitals, eliminating both jobs and access to quality care.

So where are the jobs, Mr. Speaker? This bill will create jobs. This includes 16,000 jobs at the IRS to service the health care police to determine if your health care plan meets the health care czar's demands.

This bill has already created a job for Senator SCOTT BROWN, and I am confident, if this bill is forced on the American people, a surprising number of jobs will be created for new Republican Members of Congress in November.

DETROIT CATHOLIC CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL DIVISION I STATE CHAMPION HOCKEY TEAM

(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, today I rise to acknowledge the Division I State champion hockey team from my alma mater, Detroit Catholic Central High School.

On March 13, 2010, the Shamrocks bested Howell 6-1 to cap off a nearly perfect 27-1-1 season and to repeat as State champions. This victory marked the 14th State hockey title for Catholic Central and a record fifth Division I State title for the 2009-2010 athletic season. The hard work and dedication of Coach Todd Johnson's team epitomizes what it means to be a Shamrock.

Mr. Speaker, the Shamrock hockey team deserves recognition for their determination, achievement, and spirit, and I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating them for bringing home another title and honoring their devotion to Mary Alma Mater, our community, and our country. "Live and Die for CC High."

HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. The majority of Americans oppose the Senate's health care reform bill. Consider the stunning electoral upset in Massachusetts following the passage of this bill in the Senate, a bill that was pieced together through vote peddling and back-room deals. Yet, now Speaker PELOSI is trying to avoid a direct up-or-down vote on this bill in a plan to push it through this Congress. It is outrageous. If Democrats want to force this bill on the American people, they should show their support with a direct vote as our Constitution requires.

To prevent this affront, I am a sponsor of H.R. 1188 that would ensure that direct vote and prevent Speaker PELOSI from using this parliamentary trick to force the bill through the House.

For weeks, President Obama, when he was concerned with getting 60 votes in the Senate, demanded an up-or-down vote. House Democrats should honor this request now that the problem is getting House Democrats to vote for the bill. Americans need to see who supports this legislation, including the Cornhusker kickback, the Louisiana purchase, and other embarrassing deals included in the legislation.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Breaking news; all America needs to listen: Health insurers break profit records as 2.7 million Americans lose their coverage.

On Sunday, we will have an opportunity to correct this abominable announcement and, as well, to save the lives of 45,000 Americans who, in fact, die every year because they do not have insurance.

Breaking news: Insurance companies with large profits; my friends on the other side of the aisle, celebrating and voting against the American people.

The Congressional Budget Office shows that the health care bill we will vote on on Sunday will provide coverage for 32 million uninsured Americans, cut the deficit by \$130 million, cut the deficit by \$2 trillion in the second year—second decade, and eliminate the Medicare doughnut hole as well extends the sovereignty of Medicare for many years.

Breaking news: We are standing alongside of the American people, saving the lives of 45,000 who die every year. And the other side? Standing with the insurance companies.

LEADERSHIP IN THE FACE OF ADVERSITY

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

Mr. CAO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring attention to an important issue that, if left uncorrected, will affect the lives of many Louisianans. The issue is Louisiana's Federal Medical Assistance Percentage, or FMAP.

FMAP is the percentage by which the Federal Government reimburses a State for Medicaid expenses and is calculated using per capita income. In Louisiana, we face a massive drop in our FMAP because relief and recovery dollars that flowed into the State after Hurricanes Katrina and Rita artificially inflated our per capita income.

Senator MARY LANDRIEU was successful in including a provision in the Senate health care bill similar to H.R. 4047, which I introduced last year, to address the FMAP situation in Louisiana. Some have disparagingly referred to her provision as the Louisiana purchase. This is unfortunate, because Senator MARY LANDRIEU is doing what is right for Louisiana and other States similarly situated. I may have some serious concerns about provisions of the Senate health care bill, but this is not one of them.

I applaud the Senator and her persistence and President Obama for his support of this provision because it is necessary for the State, for the gulf region, and for other States that may face FMAP predicaments like Louisiana.

□ 1830

STANDING FOR AFFORDABLE HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, we have heard that by standing in the way of this fictitious health care, so-called reform bill, we're killing people. Here's a chart that tells you who dies. If you have prostate cancer, you want to be in the United States under our system right now. You've got a 91 percent chance of survival. If you're in England, 51 percent chance of survival. You want to talk about killing people? This will kill people—not because you're denied coverage, but because you're put on a list and you die waiting for protection.

I'm not standing with the insurance companies. We have insurance companies that are endorsing this bill. They're standing with the Democrats. Big pharmaceutical companies are standing with the Democrats. Who's standing with who? We're standing with the people that want health care that's affordable, that they control. We want the government and insurance companies both out from between patients and doctors.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRIGHT). 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.

HEALTH CARE DEBATE

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

Mr. BURGESS. Thank you, Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I want to take the opportunity—we've had a pretty full day with a lot of debate on the floor regarding the health care legislation that's going to be coming to the floor on Sunday—and I wanted to read into the RECORD some correspondence that my office has received. First, is a letter from the Governor of Texas, received March 19, 2010. The Governor, says: Texans deserve affordable, high-quality health care, but not higher taxes, increased health insurance premiums and unprecedented mandates. It goes on to say, We recognize the need for true health care reform that controls rising costs and ensures hardworking Texans can afford health care for themselves and for their families. But government programs should not be the first place we look to expand coverage.

It goes on to say, In addition to the enormous cost to Texas, we believe the backroom negotiations and special deals that some congressional leaders have cut may well be unconstitutional. Additionally, it appears that congressional leaders might resort to employing an obscure parliamentary procedure to avoid an actual vote on the bill. This is not how the public expects legislation of this magnitude to be debated or enacted. It's signed, Governor Rick Perry, Governor of Texas.

A letter from Tommy Williams, who's the chairman of the administration committee of the State senate. He's also on the senate finance committee. He says, Recently, the Texas Health and Human Services Commission provided me with an analysis of the impact of President Obama's proposal on our state budget. It would, in a word, be devastating. The analysis estimates that the President's proposal would cost the State of Texas over \$24 billion over the next 10 years. This includes a \$6 billion reduction in available disproportionate share of funding for hospitals. Our State simply cannot afford an additional average cost of \$4 billion to \$5 billion per biennium over the 10 years it would take to implement this plan. Signed, Tommy Williams, State senator from Texas.

Attorney General Greg Abbott wrote to Senators HUTCHISON and CORNYN earlier this year in a very detailed correspondence about the problems he saw with the Senate bill as it was passed on Christmas Eve—and do remember it will be the Senate bill that will be here on the floor on Sunday. There will be a reconciliation bill to fix some of the things in there, but it will be the Senate bill, make no mistake about that. It will be the Senate bill that passes.

All of those technical corrections could just as easily pass by the wayside if the administration is not interested in fixing the problems in the Senate bill.

Nebraska compromise. We've heard a lot about that. The attorney general was concerned about the equal sovereignty and due process contained within the Cornhusker kickback, the Nebraska compromise. The individual mandate was particularly instructive. The attorney general talked about the commerce clause. And he concludes by saying, The individual mandate is constitutionally suspect because it does not fall within any of the normal categories.

The mandate provision in H.R. 3590 attempts to regulate a nonactivity. The legislation actually imposes a financial penalty upon Americans who choose not to engage in interstate commerce because they choose not to enter into a contract for health insurance. In other words, the proposed mandate would compel every American to engage in commerce by forcing them to purchase insurance and then use that coerced transaction as a basis for claiming authority under the commerce clause. That is Attorney General Greg Abbott from the State of Texas.

Now I have a list of many physician specialty societies that are opposed to this legislation. This list was current as of today. This list represents nearly 500,000 physicians in the United States of America—parenthetically, more than the American Medical Association. The dermatologists; plastic surgeons; eye doctors; head and neck surgeons; trauma surgeons; neurological surgeons; American College of OB-GYNs; the College of Osteopathic Surgeons; the American College of Surgeons; the American Academy of Orthopedics; the Society of Breast Surgeons; the Society of Anesthesiologists; American Society of Cataract and Refractive Surgery; colon and rectal surgeons; metabolic and bariatric surgeons; the American Urological Association; the American Society of Plastic Surgeons.

State medical associations. That is not a complete list, but State medical associations: Alabama; Delaware; District of Columbia; Florida; Georgia; Kansas; Louisiana; Missouri; Medical Society of New Jersey; Ohio; South Carolina; Texas; and Tennessee. I will submit the entire list for the RECORD.

AMERICA'S PHYSICIANS DO NOT SUPPORT THE CURRENT HEALTH REFORM BILL VOTE NO

Physician Organizations Representing Nearly 500,000 Physicians (Many More than the AMA) Do Not Support the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act:

NATIONAL MEDICAL SOCIETIES

American Academy of Dermatology Association, American Academy of Facial Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery, American Academy of Ophthalmology, American Academy of Otolaryngology-Head and Neck Surgery, American Association for the Surgery of Trauma, American Association of Neurological Surgeons, American Association of Orthopaedic Surgeons, American Congress of

Obstetricians and Gynecologists, American College of Osteopathic Surgeons, American College of Surgeons, and American Osteopathic Academy of Orthopedics.

American Pediatric Surgical Association, American Society of Breast Surgeons, American Society of Anesthesiologists, American Society of Cataract and Refractive Surgery, American Society of Colon and Rectal Surgeons, American Society of General Surgeons, American Society for Metabolic & Bariatric Surgery, American Urological Association, American Society of Plastic Surgeons, and Coalition of State Rheumatology Organizations Congress of Neurological Surgeons.

Eastern Association for the Surgery of Trauma, Heart Rhythm Society, National Association of Spine Specialists, Society for Cardiovascular Angiography and Interventions, Society for Vascular Surgery, Society of Gynecologic Oncologists, and Society of Surgical Oncology.

STATE MEDICAL ASSOCIATIONS

Medical Association of the State of Alabama, Medical Society of Delaware, Medical Society of the District of Columbia, Florida Medical Association, Medical Association of Georgia, Kansas Medical Society, Louisiana State Medical Society, Missouri State Medical Association, Medical Society of New Jersey, Ohio State Medical Association, South Carolina Medical Association, Texas Medical Association.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, after hearing the hysterics of my Republican colleagues over the last several days, I was reminded of the adage I've heard about the legal profession. It said that if you have the facts, pound on the facts. If you have the law, pound on the law. But if you have neither the facts nor the law, pound on the table.

I give my Republican colleagues credit for doing a remarkable job of pounding on the table for the last few months. I've heard my colleagues saying outlandish things about how we're doing violence to the Constitution and sticking our fingernails in the eyes of the American public. But it's all an elaborate distraction from what the real debate is about. What we're talking about is what happens when you don't have health insurance.

I heard a story last week that I think gets to the heart of what we're doing and why we're doing it. It's about a family of five, including a newborn child, that's going through a rough patch. When the baby was born, the mother's employer didn't offer her maternity leave, so she was unable to earn an income. When the father's entire drywall crew was laid off because there was simply no work, the family lost their income, aside from the unemployment benefits her husband received. All five of them had to move into a relative's living room. And when stress and strain caused the mother to stop producing breast milk, she had to buy formula that she couldn't afford.

□ 1845

THE PRISON OF TYRANNY

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

So she applied to get some supplemental food benefits under the WIC program, which comes only once a month. When those benefits ran out, she went to the office for more help, and they said there was none. Without additional support, she was forced to dilute the formula with water, causing the baby to become malnourished. As a result of malnourishment, the baby developed something called starvation diarrhea, a very serious and very painful illness. When the baby's parents took her to the hospital, her diarrhea had become so severe that she was treated in the same way as people with severe burns. She stayed in the hospital for 10 days. Remember, this is a family with parents who worked, whose baby was born healthy, who had health insurance. They simply fell victim to this economy.

I read another article recently about an insurance company called Fortis, one of the largest in the country. Fortis designed a computer program that would automatically flag any policyholder with HIV-AIDS and trigger an automatic fraud investigation. Knowing the treatment was expensive, the executives were looking for anything they could use to revoke health insurance policies for people with HIV. Then, when nothing turned up, they would essentially invent a reason.

Now I know everyone in this room has at least 20 stories like this. And after hearing just one of them, I can't understand how anyone with a conscience can stand in the way of reform for one second. I've sat in this Chamber and listened to hours of foolishness and nonsense about what this bill will allegedly do. Despite being deafened by a year's worth of Republicans banging on the table, I'm thrilled we're going to get a chance to vote on a health care reform bill that will help millions of Americans. Eighty years from now, like the 80 years ago when Social Security passed, 80 years into the future people will look back at this as the bill that helped them take a sick child to the doctor. They'll look back and be shocked that there was a time when insurance companies were allowed to deny health coverage—even to children—just because they were sick, because they had a preexisting condition. And they'll be appalled that anyone would refuse to vote for this bill for no other reason than political grandstanding or trying to gain political advantage in the next election.

When we hit 216 votes on Sunday, I'm going to be proud that we will be helping millions of Americans right now and here in this day but also generations that are yet to come. A country is judged by how it handles the people who are least able to care for themselves. And when you're sick and you don't have health insurance and your country says, We don't care—go to the emergency room, that's your health care. Stand in an 8-hour line, that's your health care. We're going to change that on Sunday.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, "These are the times that try men's souls. The summer soldier and the sunshine patriot will, in this crisis, shrink from the service of their country. But he that stands by it now deserves the love and thanks of man and woman. Tyranny, like hell, is not easily conquered; yet we have this consolation with us, that the harder the conflict, the more glorious the triumph."

Thomas Paine spoke these words at another crossroads in this Nation's history, back when Americans were fighting the tyranny of King George and the British Empire. The question to be asked today is: Will we stand up to government tyranny as our Founding Fathers did over 200 years ago?

Government is taking over every aspect of our lives, and it's not just the big things, like the automobile industry, the banking industry, student loans, home mortgages. They're telling us what kind of cars we can drive, what kind of lightbulbs we can use, and they're even telling us how much water we can put in our toilets. We are living under the ever-growing oppression of government. The government has stolen our liberty one right at a time. They are building us into a prison of tyranny. Brick by brick, that wall of tyranny increases every day as the Federal Government intrudes into our personal liberty and takes over every single aspect of our lives.

Have we forgotten about the unaccountable czars who work in the shadows? At last count, we have 45 czars that rule over us. Most of them have not been confirmed by the Senate, as required by the Constitution. We've got a behavioral science czar that's studying human behavior. The government wants to know how they can influence human conduct. It sounds a bit like the book "1984" to me. We have a bailout czar. We have a border czar, but nobody knows whether the border czar is to secure the border or open it up.

We don't know what these czars do. We have a climate change czar and a communications diversity czar. We have a disinformation czar. It sounds like he should be called the "government propaganda czar" to me. We have two economic czars. We probably could use a few more of those. We have an energy czar, a food czar, a Great Lakes czar, and a Gitmo closure czar. We have a pay czar, and we have a religion or God czar. With our government, we don't know whether he's for or against God and religion.

We have a safe school czar, a science czar who wrote a controversial book from promoting population control. Now isn't that lovely. What are all of these people doing? Why are they working in the shadows, controlling our liberty?

Today as we debate health care, the government wants to take over America's health care system. We'll have a health care czar and a health choices czar because we're not smart enough, according to the government, to sit down with our own doctors and decide what's best for our own health care. So some bureaucrat here in D.C. has to decide for us. The health care takeover gives the Federal Government access to our bank accounts and our private medical records. The IRS will get 16,000 new agents to snoop around in these records. Whatever happened to the right of privacy?

This is not about health, and it's certainly not about care. This is about government control over every aspect of our lives without accountability and against the will of the people. In the long, lamentable catalog of human history, a person or a people yearning to be free have had to make tough choices. Will we stand at this hour for government tyranny or personal liberty?

As Patrick Henry once so famously said: "I know not what course others may take; but as for me, give me liberty or give me death." Now our choice today is the prison of tyranny or the frontier of freedom. Let us choose wisely or suffer the abominable chains of the oppression of tyranny.

And that's just the way it is.

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

HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk for a few minutes again on the health care bill that's pending that has millions of Americans upset, near panicked. Obviously, we have health care problems in America. I don't know how to answer some of the people who have preexisting conditions with their kids, who have lost their jobs or different challenges, but you don't need to have this type of bill to address those.

We've offered solutions from trying to limit defensive medicine to doing it across State lines. Clearly, we are going to have to spend some money to try to address the preexisting conditions and catastrophic, but you could do that and still keep the private sector by having some form of reinsurance that may or may not be subsidized to the individual or through the government in a pooling process. But there are ways to address this other than making the government the de facto center of the entire health care industry.

I want to talk about four particular things. One is that in this is one of the most weird economic terms: “unearned income.” There is a tax increase on unearned income. Unearned income is income you’ve already been taxed for once. If you put your money in an investment fund or you put it in buildings or in annuities, you’ve been taxed on that. It’s not unearned income. And for years, we’ve encouraged people to save so our Social Security system didn’t go broke, so our Medicare system didn’t go broke. Now we’re going to tax those who’ve saved, and we’re going to put a penalty on keeping people from saving. It seems counterintuitive that when we’re facing these huge challenges in a retirement system that we would raise taxes on the very thing that we’ve been encouraging people to do.

Then we have the question of industries like the orthopedics. In Warsaw, Indiana, a city of about 15,000 people, three of the four biggest orthopedic companies in the world are centered there: Zimmer, DePuy and Biomet. In addition, you have Medtronic with a large facility there and lots of other small ones. They bought the biggest companies in Switzerland, Germany, and France. It’s a category where we lead the world. So what’s our solution? If we’re the ones leading the world, we’re the ones inventing new things—well, we’re going to tax them, so maybe they’ll leave.

They only have two choices. Since the new tax is half of their R&D cost, they can either stop the R&D so we won’t know 20 years from now—I had one 13-year-old ask me on a teletown hall call the other night ask me, How will this bill affect me long term with my health coverage? I said, I don’t really know because the way we’re taxing orthopedic companies and these, we won’t know what would have been invented. The way we’re taxing the pharmaceutical companies, we won’t know what drugs would have been invented because we’re driving it out of the U.S. or out totally if they can’t make money on it anywhere in the world. So that’s another part of this bill.

Then I heard one Member on the floor tonight repeat one of the most often heard myths, that because Canada covers their health care, the health care for GM was cheaper. In fact, our Auto Caucus met with the head of GM when we were talking about what we were going to do related to GM. He said in direct response to some of the Members from the other party’s question, No, our costs are higher in Canada. It was so counterintuitive, every Member was asking why they were higher in Canada. They said, Well, unions aren’t going to take the base plan. They ask for the base plan with a supplement because the base plan in Canada and England isn’t satisfactory. So if you have enough power, you will negotiate it more, plus the taxes are higher in Canada. He said, that’s why—and that’s why GM has followed through with

this, as well as Chrysler—jobs have moved down to the U.S. because our health care was cheaper. How did this myth start? Why do we keep hearing that constantly repeated when they know the difference.

The other point I wanted to make is on the so-called savings in Medicare. How are they getting savings from Medicare? Partly from eliminating your choice of Medicare Advantage, the only program that’s ever come in under budget as part of Medicare because we had the big insurance companies negotiating with the big pharmaceutical companies. Rather than having somebody in a government office who didn’t know their head from a hole in the ground making the negotiations, quite frankly, we put people who are actually bottom line people who could figure out what the margins were and what they could survive with and move ahead with. That’s why Medicare Advantage works. But they’re going to do it by controlling the utilization of equipment.

We never had a discussion about utilization of equipment. They want to say 80 percent. In Indiana, the only city that can meet 80 percent on heart, on oncology and so on is Indianapolis. So Fort Wayne 270,000 people, the South Bend region with another 200,000 people, other parts of the State can’t reach that utilization. That’s the hub and spokes system, only they’re moving the hubs to the bigger cities in the United States.

We’re not talking about whether you can have this type of thing in rural areas. We’re talking about whether the type of diverse health care spread out with access all over America is going to be changed in the name of cost savings. It is a way to save money because people then have to do just like veterans do in the hospital system: they have to pay their gas. They have to decide if they’re going to stay overnight. If they get canceled, they have to drive back home or get a motel. All that has shifted to the individuals. No discussion. No discussion about that little clause in there that talks about utilization of equipment; yet it’s brutally already being implemented. So I hope that somehow in the next 48 hours, a miracle occurs, and we can defeat this bill.

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 gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

DOCTORS TELL CONGRESS TO VOTE “NO”

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. Well, here we are, folks, Friday night. People are going to the movies, having dinner with their kids and grandkids, and we’re here in the Capitol of the United States trying to screw up everybody’s life.

Let me just give you a little information we found today. Mr. Speaker, 46 percent of the primary care doctors in this country said if this bill passes, they’ll leave medicine. Now think about that. Let’s just say that that’s off by 75 percent. Let’s say only a fourth of that happens, and we only have, say, 10 or 15 percent of the doctors leave primary care because of this bill. What do you think that’s going to do to the patients? We’re going to have more patients, according to this bill, because they’re going to bring in more people, maybe some illegal aliens and people that aren’t completely covered right now. So we’re going to have fewer doctors and more patients.

What is that going to result in? It’s going to result in what we’ve all been talking about for a long time, and that is rationing of health care because you won’t be able to take care of all these people. You have to pick and choose. It’s going to cost more, and there’s going to be long waiting lines like they have in other countries that have socialized medicine. I just can’t hardly believe that we’re doing this.

You know, in Massachusetts, today I watched on television the Democrat treasurer of Massachusetts said on television just a couple of hours ago that their State is going to go bankrupt because of their public health program, which parallels what they want to do here in Washington. I mean, think about that. Massachusetts has a system like this. Their State treasurer—not a Republican, a Democrat—says that they’re going bankrupt because of it. And yet we’re doing the same thing only more in spades right here in the Congress of the United States, and we’re not hearing as much about it as we should.

Now, I want to real quickly read to you just to let you know what the doctors think. We have some doctors who are going to be talking here tonight, some very eminent doctors. The State medical associations that are opposed to this: the States of Alabama, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Kansas, Louisiana, Missouri, New Jersey, Ohio, South Carolina, Texas, the American Academy of Dermatology, American Academy of Facial Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery, American Academy of Ophthalmology. It just goes on and on and on. There’s probably 100 of them here. And they’re not listening to these people. They’re telling us in Congress that people are going to leave the practice of medicine.

Now, the other thing that they're not talking about is we don't have tort reform. You know, doctors have to spend an awful lot of money protecting themselves against lawsuits. So we've said in our bill that we really need tort reform. Well, they don't have that. It's not going to be in their bill. So doctors are going to be still unprotected as far as liability suits are concerned. That's another reason why 46 percent of the doctors say they're going to leave primary care. Why wouldn't you? You've got some money in the bank that you've worked your whole life to gain and achieve and you know that one lawsuit will wipe you out, and there's no protection at all in these health care plans they're going to ram through, why would you risk it? Why would you risk lose you are your home and your business and everything that you've worked your life to save? You wouldn't. And so it might be better to go out and do something else. Take the money that you've saved and go into maybe some kind of a private practice that doesn't require this kind of a risk.

So I would just like to say to my colleagues back in their offices who probably aren't listening to too much tonight—they're fighting to try to get that last vote or two to make sure they can get this thing passed—think about what you're doing to America. Think about what you're doing to the future generations that are going to be paying for this. We won't be paying for all of it. Trillions and trillions of dollars that we don't have are going to be spent. They're going to have to print that money. Our kids are going to be the ones who are going to have to pay it back through inflation and higher taxes. It's just a terrible, terrible legacy to leave to them.

So to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who may be in their offices, Mr. Speaker, listening to what we're talking about tonight, I hope they'll give this a lot of thought, especially if they haven't made up their minds. Don't leave this kind of legacy to the future generations, and listen to what's going on in Massachusetts that has a similar program. They're going bankrupt up there because of it. And we're going to put a program into place that's going to run doctors out of the business and possibly bankrupt America and run inflation through the roof because we're going to be spending money we don't have so they'll have to print it and raising taxes? It just doesn't make any sense.

The last thing I'll say is that the vast majority of the American people in addition to the doctors, Mr. Speaker, don't want this. So listen to your constituents before you go running off a cliff and killing yourselves politically.

□ 1900

WOMEN AND HEALTH CARE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentle-

woman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, the entire Nation is counting on us to pass comprehensive health care reform. The millions who have no coverage at all desperately need this legislation, but so too do those Americans who are insured and are being squeezed out by outrageous premiums. So do the businesses that are less profitable because they will be buckling under the weight of high health care costs. But above all, American women need us to do the right thing this week and overhaul the health care system.

Mr. Speaker, in ways both overt and beneath the radar, the current system discriminates against women. The health care reform bill with the corrections bill prohibits insurance companies from refusing coverage or charging higher premiums based on a pre-existing condition. And the fact is being a woman is a preexisting condition.

There are documented cases in which pregnancy was treated as a preexisting condition, with women denied the very basic prenatal care benefits that they needed. On other occasions, women have been socked with a huge hospital bill following a C-section because their insurance company would not cover the procedure which is used roughly one out of every three births in the United States.

And here is the most outrageous and unconscionable one of all. In several States, a woman who has endured domestic violence may also be out of luck when she goes to file a claim because domestic violence is defined by many of the large insurance companies as a preexisting condition. Talk about adding insult to injury. Literally, Sorry, ma'am, you're on your own. We can't pay to wire that broken jaw because it was given to you by your husband. Next time you get a facial injury, make sure it is from tripping or falling; then we might be able to help you. This is the health care equivalent of telling a rape victim she has no case because she was asking for it.

There's more. Systemic forces and biological realities conspire to make the health care crisis that much more severe for women. Because of their reproductive health needs, women, especially young women relative to their male peers, simply need to visit their doctor more often on average.

Women are less likely to have full-time jobs with large companies so they are less likely to qualify for employer-based coverage. That puts them at the mercy of the very expensive individual insurance market where women are at a disadvantage because they earn less. Thanks to the fact that women earn 78 cents for every dollar a man brings home, they are poorer. Many of the policies on the individual insurance market, 71 percent of them according to one study, don't offer comprehensive maternity services at all.

And thanks to a practice known as gender rating, many women are essen-

tially assessed an estrogen penalty when they sign up for health care coverage. Insurance companies are allowed to charge women more simply because they are women.

The legislation before us will close these disparities and correct these injustices. We should all be ashamed of a broken system that marginalizes more than half of our population. We have to stop putting health insurance company profits ahead of healthy American women. Let's answer history's call and pass health care reform.

STOP GOVERNMENT TAKEOVER OF HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, tonight it seems like the popular target is health care, and I rise tonight, Mr. Speaker, to talk about my opposition to government takeover of health care. And there are a lot of reasons why we should all be against this bill, a lot of reasons why I should be against this bill, but the main reason I want to talk about is jobs.

Right now in my home State of South Carolina, Mr. Speaker, about 270,000 South Carolinians are out of work. We have a record unemployment rate of 12.6 percent. Families and small businesses are trying to figure out how to put food on the table and keep the lights lit. And you know what? Here in Washington all we are doing is making the matter worse. If this bill passes, thousands of mothers and fathers and hardworking South Carolinians will be without a job. Businesses will be saddled with new taxes, resulting in additional layoffs, cutbacks, and businesses closing.

In South Carolina, taxpayers will pick up the tab for sweetheart deals Democrats made behind the scenes to muscle this bill through Congress. Despite the Democrats' best efforts to keep the American people in the dark, though, by resorting to shady tactics and backroom deals, nobody is fooled in this country about what is going on here. This is a trillion-dollar boondoggle that will kill job creation and take over one-sixth of the Nation's economy. It will mean nearly \$600 billion in tax increases, over \$500 billion in Medicare cuts, and a massive expansion of the Federal Government.

In South Carolina, we know government mandates only stand in the way of economic growth and jobs. With this bill, Democrats have found another way to help stifle this country.

Mr. Speaker, let me say this. If this bill does pass, South Carolina won't stand for it. And I will tell you today that I will do everything within my power to defend the States' rights that are set forth by the 10th Amendment of the Constitution of the United States. The truth is we can avoid the lawsuits and legal action that will result in further wasted taxpayer dollars.

There is a better way. Republicans have offered real solutions that lower the cost of health care and improve access while resulting in zero job loss, zero Medicare cuts, and zero tax increases. Let me say that one more time. Zero job loss, zero Medicare cuts, and zero tax increases.

Mr. Speaker, Americans deserve an honest debate and an up-or-down vote on this bill. That's why I have cosponsored legislation to do just that, but Democrats have continued to stand in the way of true and real reform. A government takeover of health care is wrong for South Carolina, it is wrong for this Nation, and, Mr. Speaker, it is wrong for freedom. I hope and I pray, Mr. Speaker, that come Sunday my colleagues and I will beat this bill, and I urge all of my colleagues to vote "no."

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.)

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. Mr. Speaker, I have had the opportunity to visit with Oklahomans all across our State and to talk about what really concerns them; and what I hear from my Oklahomans is they are concerned about their families, and they are concerned about their Nation, and they are concerned about their jobs and their children's future and how their children's future will even look, especially with the debates we are having here in Washington, D.C. They are concerned about their jobs and the economy and making rent payments, house payments, car payments, and paying for prescription drugs. They are concerned about their children going to college and about their education.

I have also had an opportunity to speak to our Oklahoma businesses and ask them, What do you think about what we are doing here in Washington? And they tell me time and time again that they are concerned about the big government intrusion into business, and they want government to stay out of their way and let them create jobs and let them invest and create opportunities and be entrepreneurs; yet what they hear from Washington is we are talking about more rules and regulations and more government takeover of industries and more taxes and higher taxes and the government expansion of programs like this health care bill. They are sitting on the sidelines and they are not creating those jobs and opportunities for my Oklahoma families so they can feel stable and secure in their lives.

Mr. Speaker, this health care bill that we are debating this weekend will change the course of our Nation. It is going to be a massive expansion of the Federal Government, a massive expansion, taking over our freedoms, our ability to make our own decisions about our health care. It is a massive expansion into one-sixth of our Nation's economy in the health care industry. I want my Oklahomans to know that I will stand firmly against voting for the Pelosi-Obama health care government takeover that we are going to be voting on this weekend, and I will not vote for it.

This vote will be one of the most far-reaching, significant pieces of major social policy legislation in our lifetime and will definitely affect the future of all of our children. It will change the course of future generations of our children. Already our Nation is facing huge deficits and large amounts of debt, out-of-control spending by Congress, and that is hurting our economy and killing jobs and even threatening the stability of our Nation and our businesses and our families.

As we now know, many States are facing also hard times from budget deficits, and they are having to cut services and making really tough, painful spending decisions about the delivery of services to their citizens. States are also having a hard time paying for growing Medicaid costs. And now this health care bill, if it passes, will pass on down more unfunded Medicaid costs upon our States and create even bigger, nanny state entitlement programs, all at a time when Medicaid reimbursements are so low that doctors are dropping both Medicaid and having a hard time—it is hard to even find doctors who will see Medicaid or Medicare patients, especially in our rural areas. In fact, I read an article this week that said some pharmacies are not accepting new Medicaid patients because of the low reimbursement rate.

So the question is: Will our children's future and the American citizen's future be better if we pass this health care bill? And the question will be: Will our citizens be able to choose their own doctor or will their doctor be deciding whether to chose them, or will there even be a doctor for them to see?

The U.S. already has a shortage of doctors. We just heard the previous speaker talk about how 46 percent of the primary care physicians say they may drop out of the medical profession if this bill passes. From my State of Oklahoma, it is estimated that this legislation will impose over \$500 million of unfunded Medicaid expansion mandates on our State.

Mr. Speaker, I ask our colleagues to reject this bill. Let's work on creating jobs and opportunities. Let's work on a lasting solution for health care reform.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I had the great privilege of practicing medicine for 20 years in Louisiana. I was a heart surgeon. I did open heart surgery, critical lung surgery, and I took care of many patients during very difficult times in their lives. And I got to see the wonderful innovation in technology that we were able to use to save so many lives during that time.

As we face a Sunday vote, here we are Friday night, and I have to say that I am deeply saddened because I really fear what is going to happen to health care in the United States if this bill passes. I have heard from many Americans across the country, given my status as a physician in Congress, many, many Americans from all over the country have contacted me and have basically rejected this bill. They are concerned. They are concerned because they will see their premiums rise. Let me explain.

The Senate Democrat bill will increase health insurance premiums for families by up to 13 percent by 2016. What does this mean? For an individual with the lowest cost basic plan, it would cost \$300 more in 2016 than if Congress did nothing at all. How about for a family? Families are struggling right now. Well, for a family who got the lowest cost basic plan, it would cost \$2,100 more in 2016 than if Congress did nothing at all. Premiums are going to rise.

We don't need an expensive bill to start bringing health care premiums down. All it would take is competition and choice, things that Republicans have promoted. We have written bills that would expand health savings accounts. We would allow folks to buy insurance across State lines, create transparency, and allow small businesses to pool together to get greater purchasing power, just like unions and large corporations do.

□ 1915

That wouldn't cost trillions of dollars to do. Let's just do this. It's easy.

What is going to happen with this plan? Well, it raids the Medicare program by a half a trillion dollars and uses that money to create a whole new entitlement, just like it basically raises taxes by over a half a trillion dollars to create this new entitlement program. What happens with these taxes? These are taxes on businesses and families. These are taxes on innovation in health care. And so the United States may end up losing its innovative edge if we allow this to go forward.

If you look at what's happened over the past 50 years in health care, folks, doctors, nurses have come from all over the world to train in the United States because of our advanced education in health care and in medicine and our advanced technology. Patients come from all over the world because of this great innovation, this great

ability to save lives. And if we tax this, well, we will lose that competitive edge. There is no question about it.

So what happens with this big massive entitlement that is going to be expanded? Well, \$434 billion will be used to expand Medicaid coverage. Now, as a physician I know that Medicaid is a deeply flawed program. There are serious problems with this. First of all, it is breaking States' budgets. Secondly, it is a strain on the Federal budget. But what does this really mean for families? Well, families who have Medicaid right now are having a very difficult time getting access to a doctor because the Medicaid reimbursements don't even come close in many instances to meeting the costs. So doctors are not seeing these patients until late in their conditions. They are having to go to the emergency room, when care is much more expensive, they are sicker. And it is just the wrong way to do this. It is not fair for these individuals, these families who are having to do this.

So what does this bill do? It expands Medicaid. Well, I have a problem with this. I think there is a better way to do it. We can expand coverage, meaningful coverage, by increasing competition, as I mentioned earlier, so that folks afford health care insurance. The last thing we want to do is drive up the cost of health insurance. And that is what this bill does.

The other thing this bill does is it increases taxes across the board. I mentioned new taxes on innovation, on pharmaceuticals, on devices that surgeons use in the hospital. You know, your knee replacement, your hip replacement. This is going to hurt innovation, as I mentioned. But there are also new taxes across the board on businesses. We are going to see new Medicare taxes, \$210 billion in new Medicare taxes, new taxes on health care benefits, new taxes on employers, and an individual mandate, an individual mandate that is going to have the IRS in everybody's business.

Mr. Speaker, we have a duty to do health care reform, but we have an obligation to get this right.

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

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

HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, America is at a pivotal point in its history. We hear a lot of claims on both sides that are contradicting. And I want to just talk for a few minutes

about some of those claims and just give you some simple truths. We heard all day long today that doctors support this government takeover of the health care plan. I brought one of several charts that we are putting together in my office. Nearly 500,000 doctors, represented by a number of organizations, including the Medical Association of Georgia, my own medical society, are against this bill.

In fact, this chart, small letters, this is just the beginning of the A's. The simple truth is that doctors don't support this bill, if they are practicing physicians, overwhelmingly.

Now, I am a family practice doctor. My own society, the American Academy of Family Physicians, has supported the bill. They have cut a sweetheart deal where the reimbursement rate for primary care docs, family doctors like me, will be upped a little bit. But what they haven't looked at is all the ramifications of this, which are going to be disastrous for their own practices.

The AMA cut a sweetheart deal. It is my understanding that they wanted tort reform, an SGR fix, and 100 percent coverage. They haven't done very well with that because none of those three are going to be accomplished in the Senate bill that we will be voting on this weekend.

We have heard claims about CBO says it is going to reduce the deficit. Well, the simple truth is they have used zombie economics to get these numbers. Because one would have to be walking around in a dead person to believe the economic parameters that were forced upon the CBO. A good example is the CBO was forced to score, or tell us how much it would cost when we pay out only 6 years' worth of benefits but we have 10 years' worth of increased taxes.

The Internal Revenue Service is going to be markedly increased in size and given more authority to snoop into our personal lives. In fact, they are going to hire 16,000 new agents to look at our bank accounts, look at our health records, look at whether we have acceptable health insurance as is deemed by a board here in Washington, D.C.

We hear our colleagues on the Democratic side, the far left, talk about people cannot get health insurance or health care. Well, they use health care and health insurance as being synonymous. I have treated many patients during my almost four decades of practicing medicine where I have treated them for free. Doctors all over this country are doing so. And some of the societies look at a government takeover of health care, maybe they will be paid for these patients that they are treating for free, and so maybe it is a better deal for them. But they are sadly mistaken.

Mr. Speaker, the simple truth is we are at a pivotal point in our history. We are going to go down a direction that is going to lead us towards total

government control of our lives. And that is exactly what this so-called health care bill that we are going to be voting on, the Senate bill, with all of its special sweetheart deals, the taxpayer-funded abortion, the Cornhusker kickback, the Florida gator aid, the Louisiana purchase, all those special sweetheart deals, we are going to vote on that by voting for a rule. And it is going to deem that bill to be passed.

Deem and Pass is what they say. That sounds like an old western, doesn't it. Deem and Pass. The only people who are going to be ambushed are the American people. Because the only people who are really going to be benefiting from that bill are the government bureaucrats and the politicians here in Washington that are supporting this bill.

We are at a pivotal point. The American people have to decide. Are we going to decide between freedom on one hand or socialism on the other? Are we going to look at entrepreneurial market solutions to lower the cost of health care, to cover people who are uninsurable? And we have those answers. The Republican Party is the Party of K-n-o-w. The American people can stop this by saying "no" and contacting their Democratic Congressman and tell them to vote "no" and we can stop this leap towards socialism and vote for freedom.

MARCH MADNESS—DC STYLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. LATOURETTE. I want to thank the minority leader for giving us the leadership hour on our side this evening. I will be joined by a number of Members. Already joining me on the floor, Mr. MCCOTTER from Michigan and Mr. TIBERI from the great State of Ohio.

Before we begin with our subject matter, when this group gathered a little while ago we, in an attempt to bring some levity, which there is not very much of here to the situation, we used probably in my mind one of the greatest games ever invented, the game of Operation. You go home and they say, Wow, boy, that was a good one. I was particularly proud of the "You got to be kidney" in talking about some of the provisions in the health care bill under consideration at the time.

But I got a letter after we did that special order from the lawyers at Hasbro, saying basically I was violating their copyright, and so on forth and so on. Apparently some of those lawyers were absent the day they taught constitutional law, because not only the speech and debate clause in the Constitution, but also the fair use doctrine sort of made that not accurate.

Having said that, I don't want to further inflame the lawyers at this New

York law firm, and so we are not going to talk about this, nor am I going to use this chart this evening.

Mr. Speaker, what we are going to talk about, however, is March Madness. It is now upon us. People all across the country saw the President of the United States, because he is a big basketball fan and he likes to play basketball, pick his brackets. I think that if I read the news reports right, he picked Kansas to win it all. And I think last year, if I remember right, President Obama nailed the winner. He picked it and off he went.

I think a lot of people who had brackets took a bath on Georgetown yesterday, but other than that, most other people's brackets are in shape.

But I thought we would use the theme of March Madness and what has gone on here on Capitol Hill, and sort of talk about some of the match-ups that have happened. We are a little further along than the NCAA tournament, so we start and we are down to the Sweet 16. I thought we would talk about the relationship of what is going on.

Let me turn first to the gentleman from Michigan. Pick a game and let's talk about it.

Mr. MCCOTTER. I would like to start with a match-up of two wily veterans, Speaker PELOSI and Minority Leader BOEHNER. These two teams have known each other quite some time on the floor of this House. They have had wins and losses, and there is no love lost. Yet despite a spirited effort by the tanned and resilient minority leader, he eventually did succumb to the tenaciousness and, yet some argue, some questionable tactics of Speaker PELOSI, who advances to the next round.

Mr. LATOURETTE. She is indeed a wily veteran.

Does my colleague from Ohio agree that the Speaker beat the minority leader?

Mr. TIBERI. I think there is no doubt at this point.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Okay. I would simply add not only did she beat the minority leader, she humiliated the minority leader in that there is not—well, there is one proposal by Republicans in this health care bill we are going to vote on on Sunday. But that is it. Out of 2,700 pages, the most they could do is squeeze in one Republican provision. And that was actually by Senator GRASSLEY of Iowa, who indicated that primary care physicians should get paid a little bit more for taking care of people.

Mr. MCCOTTER. If the gentleman will yield, I just want to add, and this is to watch in later rounds as Speaker PELOSI advances, is one thing that the opponent might want to watch for is she only dribbles on the left. So this could come in handy in later rounds for those of a more conservative bent.

Secondly, I think it is important that we point out to those people watching at home is that in many States wagering is illegal and is cer-

tainly frowned upon by most denominations.

Mr. LATOURETTE. I thank you so much.

So we declare the Speaker of the House the winner of round one. I just want to mention that these regionals are taking place in some interesting locations. They are interesting because of other things that are included in the bill that we will talk about.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia, when he was here, talked about the Louisiana purchase and Gator aid. We'll get into that in a minute.

But, TIBERI, pick a game, and let's talk about it.

Mr. TIBERI. I was going to pick a game, and I'm going to pick the People versus the Cornhusker Kickback, but I think it is important at the very top there for you to point out on the chart that you have got at Florida Gators, and you just mentioned at LSU. We could add Montana because there is a special provision for Montana as well. Unfortunately, they lost in the tournament yesterday. We could add the University of Connecticut. Connecticut has got a nice little special provision that is staying in the bill. New Jersey is getting another special little deal. And apparently North Dakota in the reconciliation. I don't know how you have got it just to the two, Florida and LSU. But since we are talking about special deals in special places, I think I will do the People versus the special deal in the Cornhusker Kickback.

Mr. LATOURETTE. I appreciate that. I would just say to the gentleman, the reason we don't have all of those venues is we can't make a chart big enough.

Mr. TIBERI. For all the special deals.

□ 1930

Mr. LATOURETTE. For all the sweetheart deals that are included in it. You know, the great thing is each one of them now has sort of a nickname that is becoming a household word in America. So I bet most people, Mr. Speaker, have heard of the Cornhusker kickback, most have heard of the Louisiana purchase. But we're going to attempt to coin some new ones for the new ones because they really are coming up fast and furious.

So a billion dollars is going to the drug companies in New Jersey. So I think we should call that the New Jersey needle exchange. And today there was news—and I think that the senator involved has since asked that it be withdrawn—but all banks in the country are going to be removed from student lending except one in North Dakota. So I think we call that the Bismarck bank job. But we were already done with this by the time the news broke.

I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TIBERI. This chart was put together before we found out that not just health care was going to be in the health care bill. That actually now we're going to be debating a student

loan bill which is how the Bismarck bombshell, Bismarck bank job—but now we have student loan, the takeover of the student loan business in the health care bill. I think America has to be aware of that as well.

Back to the issue at hand. The people versus the Cornhusker kickback. That special deal the people want. Is that correct?

Mr. LATOURETTE. That is correct.

Mr. MCCOTTER. Clearly the Cornhusker kickback had a tremendous inside game, and I think overwhelmingly just the sheer determination and tenacity of the American people did defeat the Cornhusker kickback. Although there was a case of a potentially flagrant foul involved, but that would have been the Cornhusker kickback itself.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Well, and we're going to give that game to the people.

And you know, Mr. Speaker, you may not remember what the Cornhusker kickback was. Well, basically, people who don't have insurance are going to have the ability throughout the many States to apply for insurance through the State Medicaid program. And sort of one of the dirty little secrets of this bill is, how do you reduce costs by including 30 million more people into a program? Of course you don't. It's going to cost more money.

In our State of Ohio, Mr. TIBERI's and mine, the estimate is \$656 million to take this uninsured population and cover them. And I would just say that the President indicates that we agree on 80 percent of it. I agree that the uninsured should have access to health coverage, but it comes with a price. And I think what doesn't get acknowledged is the price.

So the Cornhusker kickback involved a senator from Nebraska basically saying that it's going to cost his people in Nebraska more money to take the uninsured and put them in the Medicaid program—like every other State in the Union—but he didn't want his people to pay it. Well, and so at the end of the day, the reason that the people rose up and the reason that the people, I think, prevailed in it, it's not fair. How is that fair that people in Michigan and Ohio and every other State of the Union are going to participate in this plan. I mean, if you like the plan to cover more people but Nebraska isn't going to have to pay a dime? And that is why I think the people prevailed.

And today or Sunday when we vote on whatever we're going to vote on, the Cornhusker kickback has been defeated by the people.

Mr. TIBERI. The people won on the Cornhusker kickback, but I think it's important to note, as this chart partially does, that there is still Florida gator aid that is in this bill that the majority is going to have to defend, there is still the Louisiana purchase.

Now, there is a water deal for a couple of Members in California that Members are going to have to defend. There is a deal in Arizona. We mentioned

Montana. We mentioned Bismarck. We also mentioned Connecticut and New Jersey, just to name a few. Special sweetheart deals.

Mr. LATOURETTE. And apparently they're still being made. There was a newspaper article the other day where the Speaker is quoted as saying, The store is now closed. And that meant no more special deals, I think. But that came as a surprise to some of us. One, I didn't know that the store was open, and two, I didn't think I knew there was a store. But apparently there was a store, and it was open, but now the Speaker has closed it. I suppose unless they don't have the votes necessary to pass the bill on Sunday then perhaps they'll reopen for Sunday hours and violate the blue laws of the State and let people shop.

Mr. TIBERI. I do have a suggestion that may be a sequel to March madness, D.C. style. We could play the game of The Price is Right and talk about some of these sweetheart deals in our next hour that we have next week.

Mr. LATOURETTE. I'm going to take one over here from the Florida venue. I will start at the top.

You have MoveOn.org against the Blue Dogs. MoveOn.org is, of course, the liberal organization funded by George Soros and others that has really become sort of the main grassroots motivator for the liberal left. The Blue Dogs are conservative Democrats—if there is such a thing—primarily from border States with the southern States, and they have been giving the Speaker and her team fits all year long on cap-and-trade—cap-and-tax as we called it—and a variety of other things. So they're tough to bring along.

In this particular matchup, I think the MoveOn.org had like a 7-footer and came in and basically began threatening primary elections against any Blue Dog who wouldn't come to heel and support this bill even though it may not be what the people from their districts want them to do.

So unless either of you have an objection, I'm going to give this game to MoveOn.org.

Mr. TIBERI. I think in a rout.

Mr. MCCOTTER. I would have to agree that in this contest, the Blue Dogs came up lame.

Mr. LATOURETTE. All right. Mr. MCCOTTER, it's up to you. Pick a game. Mr. MCCOTTER. I say we go to the contest of Mr. Rahm Emanuel versus former Member Massa.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, you can't see this chart, but I just have "Rahm" here, I couldn't fit "Emanuel" in the box.

But this refers to the distinguished chief of staff for the President of the United States, Rahm Emanuel, who, of course, was an honorable Member of this House serving a district near Chicago, Illinois, until he was tapped by the President to serve as the chief of staff. And Eric Massa was a Representative—and I say "was" because he has

resigned—from the State of New York. And there was a pretty well-publicized dust-up between the two.

And why don't you tell us who won.

Mr. MCCOTTER. Well, I would have to say that in a pointed confrontation, Mr. Emanuel had a finger roll at the end of the game and sent Mr. Massa to the showers. I think this one has to go to Rahm.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Do you agree with that?

Mr. TIBERI. Hard to argue with that.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Give that to Mr. Emanuel. Mr. TIBERI, you're up. Pick a game.

Mr. TIBERI. Let's go with WAXMAN versus taxes.

Mr. LATOURETTE. All right.

Over in the Louisiana area because of the Louisiana purchase.

And again, just in case, Mr. Speaker, you've forgotten what the Louisiana purchase was, like Nebraska—even though it didn't get the same attention as Nebraska—like Nebraska, the Senator from Louisiana didn't want her people to have to pay increased costs that are going to be occasioned by this bill. So I think a number like \$300 million is slated to go to Louisiana.

But go ahead. Let us talk about Mr. WAXMAN, who is, of course, the distinguished chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee. And "taxes" is pretty self-explanatory.

Mr. TIBERI. Obviously the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee wrote most of the bill coming out of the House with the leadership on the Democratic side. And taxes are what more Americans are going to pay a heck of a lot more of.

In fact, I know the Speaker is aware that most of the benefits of this bill don't actually kick in until 2014, when my daughters are going—when my youngest daughters are going to kindergarten, in 2014.

Mr. LATOURETTE. How old are they now?

Mr. TIBERI. They're 1. So in 2014 they'll be entering kindergarten, and that is when the benefits will begin.

However, the tax increases will begin right away. And in fact, the Senate bill not only increases payroll taxes, but now we have a reconciliation bill that increases or begins taxing on the payrolls of American workers for the very first time unearned income. So when we are trying to convince Americans to save more, now suddenly their annuities and their interest income from a bank and their retirement accounts and all of these other things, rents, are going to now be taxed for the first time on payroll taxes.

Mr. LATOURETTE. What about what's built up in a pension? We all have thrift savings accounts as Federal employees. We take a portion of our pretax dollars, put them in there. And until the last couple of years they were doing okay, but they would build up X amount of interest during the course of the years.

Mr. TIBERI. We're cracking the door open for the first time on life insur-

ance. And it's a concern to many agents in the industry.

It's not only on that side of the aisle that we have a view of tax increases. We're taxing the medical devices, we're taxing wheelchairs, we're taxing insurance plans. We are having for the very first time something that you as a lawyer, I'm sure, would question the constitutionality of. We're going to tax for the very first time health insurance in terms of, if you don't pay it, if you don't have health insurance—which you're mandated to—you're going to have an IRS agent come knocking on your door.

The very first time we're going to get the IRS involved in your health care, and we're going to have to have the IRS—one estimate is \$1 billion dollars a year to hire agents over the next 10 years to monitor yours and mine and the people's health care. So the IRS is going to be involved in everybody's health care. Not to mention all of the other Federal Government employees who we're empowering.

But we are increasing taxes, we are cutting Medicare, and we are increasing the IRS by about 16,500 people to deal with our health care.

Mr. LATOURETTE. So I hear you're saying we're going to give the game to WAXMAN?

Mr. MCCOTTER. I would have to concur in this.

Clearly, around the office cooler, between Mr. WAXMAN and taxes there was no clear-cut crowd favorite, although most of the early money was on taxes because, as we all know, there is nothing more certain than death and taxes. Well, as so happens in the early rounds of the tournament, the underdog does prevail. And with this expert knowledge of the X's and O's of the insider Washington game and with the help of a deep bench of 16,500 new IRS agents, I think it's pretty clear that Mr. WAXMAN came out smoking in the field and buried taxes.

Mr. LATOURETTE. I think you're right.

I would just add the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. TIBERI, has talked about increased cost. And a lot of people are saying it's not going to cost anything; it's going to reduce the deficit. Just today a company that is pretty well known around the world—and certainly known in the President's home State of Illinois—Caterpillar Incorporated, said that the health care legislation being considered by the U.S. House and voted on Sunday will increase the company's health care costs by more than \$100 million in the first year alone.

In a letter Thursday to the Speaker and the Republican leader, Caterpillar urged lawmakers to vote against the plan because of the substantial cost burdens it would place on its shareholders, employees, and retirees. If they're right, and you're a retiree from Caterpillar, based upon what you were just saying, Mr. TIBERI, it's sort of a double whammy. One is that their health care benefits are going to be

taxed potentially; two, their health care benefits may cost them more in terms of premiums or copays that they receive as a retiree. And three, if they have retired and put their money in the bank and are drawing interest, that interest is now subject to taxation.

And I forgot to ask you. What's the rate of taxation on interest in a bank account that a senior citizen is earning under this proposal?

Mr. TIBERI. For the very first time, it taxes payroll for that unearned income at 3.8 percent. So 3.8 percent for the very first time on unearned income. And it actually raises by .9 percent, almost 1 percent, earned income on the payroll tax.

I'm going to add just one other mention to this. In Washington, D.C., we're spending \$1 trillion dollars. The Democratic bill spends \$1 trillion dollars to save money. Kind of an oxymoron. Only in Washington, D.C., can we spend a trillion dollars to save money.

Mr. LATOURETTE. It's kind of like being in a hole and trying to get out and digging the hole deeper. That is the analogy I would use.

I'm going to pick off an easy one where I don't think we're going to have any disagreements.

Just like over in the House we had the distinguished Speaker and the distinguished minority leader. Same situation over in the Senate. You've got Senate Majority Leader REID of Nevada and MITCH MCCONNELL, who is the Senate Republican leader from Kentucky. And there was this big health care pow-wow down at Blair House a few weeks ago.

□ 1945

It was on TV 6 hours. I watched most of it, and I thought it was great. I thought the President did a wonderful job. And the President said, This thing should be bipartisan. There are things we agree on. We should work it out.

Well, the AP, the Associated Press, moved a story, I apologize, I don't have it right here at my fingertips but—here it is. The Associated Press moved a story and basically the story talked about what the President said at that pow-wow and what the Congress, the Democrats in Congress, have given him. It's kind of illuminating. The President said he would give Federal authorities the power to block unreasonable rate increases. I don't know about you guys, but when I go back to my district, I hear from human resources people in every company that no longer are their health care costs going up 5, 6, 7 percent; it's double-digits. And if they're lucky, it's only in the tens and the teens. But in some instances it's more. So I think that some people were sort of excited about the idea that, in fact, there would be some oversight over these increases, but that's missing in the bill.

There were several Republican ideas, and this goes to Senator MCCONNELL, that the President said he wanted to include in the bill. There was also a—

one of them was a plan, I remember watching this from Senator COBURN of Oklahoma—to say one of the ways that you root out waste, fraud and abuse is to send patients, people pretending to be patients, and so people that are scamming either the system that is set up in the bill or the Medicaid or the Medicare system, they go to jail. And I think that is entirely appropriate. But none of those were adopted.

And the special deals, we have talked a little bit about Louisiana, Florida and the Cornhuskers, the President said he would eliminate all of the special deals that we have talked about and we are going to continue to talk about.

As we stand here tonight, the only deals that have been eliminated are the Cornhusker kickback, which actually, you know, it hasn't been eliminated in that it is still in the Senate bill. And so maybe the gentleman can talk to us about this strange procedure we are going through, because my understanding is there is going to be two votes, but never a vote on the Senate bill which contains the Cornhusker kickback and some of the other things.

So, Mr. MCCOTTER, you're sort of the parliamentarian around here in waiting. Why don't you talk to us a little bit about the process?

Mr. MCCOTTER. When we come to Congress, as the gentleman knows, we are empowered by our constituents' trust to engage in voting, to make decisions on their behalf and to engage in the great debates. And with that comes a constitutionally prescribed duty to the institution to respect its traditions, its customs and its rules because we are not allowed to leave this institution of the House or of the Senate or of the Congress as a whole in a worse condition than when we entered it.

And what we are seeing today with the process that is being used and abused to try to jam this bill on the American people is undermining the American people's faith not only in their Representatives, but in their representative institutions. So this is clearly a case where the process not only has institutional ramifications but, I would argue as well, has potentially constitutional ramifications. As we have heard described in the press, the "deem as passed" rule, which some refer to as the Slaughter House rule, could constitute a clear violation of article 1 section 7. And this is where I commence going back to the beginning.

Article 1 section 7 says we have to pass legislation. We are empowered to vote. We are supposed to be accountable. It is fundamental to our representative democracy that we come here and we vote upon the substantive issues that are before us before they are foisted upon the American people as law. To say something is "deem and passed," to use a procedural device to avoid your responsibility to discharge the duties entrusted to you, I believe, is a violation of the Constitution. It

will do damage to the institution just as these Cornhusker kickbacks, just as these Louisiana purchases, just as the Florida Gator deal, just as everything else we are seeing to get this bill passed, despite the American people, is doing damage to this institution.

Mr. LATOURETTE. I thank the gentleman. And basically, again, Mr. Speaker, I know you know, but we are being told there is going to be two votes, one on Sunday and then maybe one on Monday. The Sunday vote will be on a rule. It's not even going to be on a bill; it's going to be on a House resolution, which is a rule, that's going to authorize the vote that takes place, we think, on Monday; but included in there is something called the self-executing clause, and so it will self-execute passage of the Senate health care bill, which does, to my point, does include still the Cornhusker kickback and also the issue in Florida.

And we talked about Gator aid, but we never talked about what Gator aid was. And so the Medicare program which, of course, provides health care for millions and millions of seniors, has a program in it called Medicare Advantage. And it's optional. You don't have to sign up for it, but you can if you want to. I have about 14,000 people that live in my district that are in Medicare Advantage, and it has high satisfaction numbers. There are some people who don't like it, and there are some people who criticize it.

So the Senate bill, which was going to be deemed without a vote—and that really caught me by surprise. I got up, I think it was Wednesday, Tuesday or Wednesday morning, and one of the headlines above the fold in the Washington Post, Mrs. PELOSI, of course who is the distinguished Speaker of the House, may seek to pass health care bill without a vote. I said, holy mackerel, I thought I had missed something while I had been asleep, sort of the Rip Van Winkle thing. But, no, that is exactly where they are headed.

But the Florida deal was—again, Mr. Speaker, you know that there are a lot of retired people in Florida because the weather is warm and so forth and so on, and in order to ameliorate a problem that a Senator from Florida had, every State in the Union, all 49 States, plus the District of Columbia, that have people on Medicare Advantage can no longer be on Medicare Advantage. It's wiped out—except the 800,000 Floridians who happen to be on and enjoy Medicare Advantage.

Now, again, just like the Cornhusker kickback where Nebraska and Louisiana don't have to pay, why is it fair that—again even if you love this bill, the underlying policy—why is it fair that in one State if you like Medicare Advantage you get to stay on it and in 49 other States you don't? So currently the way they have designed this is that the House, the Senate bill will be deemed on Sunday under this self-executing rule, and then they have promised a bill with a series of fixes.

Now the big problem with the series of fixes is, when the Senate bill is deemed on Sunday, the President can sign it right away. It becomes the law of the land if he signs it with the Cornhusker kickback, with the Louisiana purchase and with the Gator aid. Now we have heard, and I think to be fair to our friends in the majority, the draft of their fixes bill would remove those two, two out of 12 of the deals that the President said would be gone. But it still has to go over to the other body. It still has to pass. And then through a process known as reconciliation, they have indicated that they don't think that their rules will permit them to pass it as it leaves here, that it's going to be modified again, which means it has to come back here.

At the time, the Democratic Party had a 60-vote majority over in the United States Senate. They couldn't get 60 people on their own team to row in the same direction without giving away these sweetheart deals. I would be nervous if I was voting on Sunday on the promise, like Wimpy from Pop-eye, I will gladly pay you Tuesday for a hamburger today. I would be nervous. And I don't think it is a done deal. We are going to give that game to HARRY REID.

Mr. TIBERI. I think that's pretty clear; but just to further demonstrate, I had a group of students ask me, with respect to the process in Washington, D.C. because they had learned in their government book that a bill passes the House, a bill passes the Senate, it goes to conference committee, and then they work out the differences, kind of come to an agreement, and it goes back to the House and back to the Senate, when did that change? I think we all have maybe a future business in publishing to change the process because we haven't had conference committees in the past year in this Congress. We have had backroom deals.

And here is another one. And after this Senate bill is deemed and passed through procedural trickery, maybe on Sunday, as the gentleman from Ohio said, that will go to the President's desk. That will have the Cornhusker kickback in it, and then the underlying bill of reconciliation will then come to the floor with all these changes in it, including something that will strike the Cornhusker kickback out, but not the other sweetheart deals, which will also include the student loan bill, among other health care items as well. That will pass with a majority vote here in the House.

But as the gentleman said, it has to pass unchanged in the Senate in order for it to become law and go to the President's desk. That is a huge promise, a huge promise that many Members of this House on the Democratic side are crossing their fingers in hope for because many of them who are voting for this bill now, voting for this deemed bill, this rule that has the deemed language in it, have been fairly critical of the Senate bill which they

are technically not voting on, they are deeming it passed.

And I think the American people have had it up to their eyeballs with this trickery and chicanery.

Mr. LATOURETTE. I agree wholeheartedly with the gentleman. It makes it a tricky business.

Because I had mentioned the President of the United States a couple of times, you will note that I don't have President Obama in the Sweet 16, because I will tell you as I went through this Associated Press story and I have watched his negotiations on this bill, when he says we agree on 80 percent of it and we should work this out in a bipartisan way, I believe him. I really believe that he would not have written this bill the way that it is currently being written. And I don't think he would say that the process has been okay.

As a matter of fact, the aforementioned AP story comes down to—it reports that it came down to President Obama making promises that Congress didn't keep. That I think is the appropriate distinction here. I don't think that when the President made the promises to include these four or five Republican ideas he was not telling the truth. I think he was serious. I think he wanted them in the bill. But when the bill got written, they are not in here.

Mr. MCCOTTER. I think like the health care system we all know, our time may be shorter than we think. I like to point out that if we were to change the "Schoolhouse Rock!" and "Schoolhouse Rock!" educational movie to update it to the shady backroom dealings and such as we have seen here, it would no longer be suitable content for children.

With that, let us move into the bracket our colleague Representative and my fellow Michigander, the great State of Michigan, Mr. BART STUPAK versus the National Abortion Rights Action League. It is my view that despite attacking offensively, NARAL could not withstand the tenacious zoned defense of innocent human life that was put forward by my colleague, Mr. STUPAK, and given his height advantage, morally he prevailed.

Mr. LATOURETTE. I would say it's a pretty well known axiom in sports, at least in football, the home team relies on the 12th man. And in this particular instance, the issue was whether or not taxpayer funds would be utilized in the purchasing of these sort of cooperative health care things that people could sign up for and that those plans could provide abortion services. And so Mr. STUPAK is a very devout, pro-life Representative, and obviously NARAL is not. They are on the side of pro-choice we call it. And so when it came—when the House bill—and the reason we are not doing the House bill is when the House bill came up a little while ago, Mr. STUPAK and 12, which would be the 12th man, Members of the Democratic Party said they are not going to vote for this unless you fix it.

And they gave an amendment vote, and we had a vote over here in the House, and that satisfied Mr. STUPAK for the moment, defeating NARAL. In my opinion, I agree with you, we will go to Mr. TIBERI in a minute, but now they find themselves in the same position, why there is so much angst here on Capitol Hill over the last few days is because they have to get to this magic number of 216, and at least at the moment some of these people who thought that there were not going to be taxpayer funds used to purchase insurance to provide abortion believe that it does.

And so, TIBERI, we are going to give this game to STUPAK if that's all right with you.

Mr. TIBERI. I would certainly give it to Mr. STUPAK and the brave Members who stood by him on the Democrat side.

Mr. LATOURETTE. We're almost down to the Great Eight.

Mr. MCCOTTER. As we recall, at the time of the Stupak amendment on the House bill, there were some voices from within the Republican Party that said to engage in mischief and to potentially defeat the bill, the pro-life Republicans should vote against the Stupak amendment. And my argument and the argument of so many of us at the time was no. Our commitment to the sanctity and dignity of the unborn will not be changed; it will not be utilized in a way that is diminished simply to engage in a parliamentary attempt to defeat a bill. We will stand for principle.

Mr. LATOURETTE. I appreciate the gentleman's observation.

Mr. MCCOTTER. What we are seeing now is a converse, but because the Senate bill has come back without the language to defend innocent human life that Representative STUPAK has not only put into the House bill but has defended in principle here against the Senate bill, you're going to see a lot of Democrats on the other side of the aisle who are going to have to face a crisis of conscience: Will you continue despite what may be your perceived political self-interest to continue to defend the unborn in this process and from the taxpayer funding of abortion? And sadly we have seen so many not.

□ 2000

I appreciate the gentleman's observation. We only have one game left, and that is Medicare, which, of course, Mr. Speaker, you know that both the House and the Senate bill call for a reduction of about one-half trillion dollars from the Medicare program.

Now, the people who have drafted the legislation indicate that that is going to be achieved by rooting out waste, fraud, and abuse. I have been here long enough to remember MediScare from 1996, when in our budget we proposed to slow the rate of growth of Medicare spending to twice the rate of inflation. I think it was projected to save about half of this one-half trillion dollars

that is now proposed to be cut out in this legislation.

When I ran for reelection in 1996, there were ads on television that said, I hated your grandmother and your grandmother and my own grandmother, and I didn't want them to have medical care. But now, without a whimper, all of a sudden taking twice that amount—and, again, just like I don't understand how you lower cost by putting 30 more million people into the program, how you make Medicare better by taking one-half trillion dollars out.

And then the matchup is the mighty team from PhRMA. And again, Mr. Speaker, you know that PhRMA basically is the trade association for the pharmaceutical industry here on Capitol Hill. There was a pretty well-documented deal made down at the White House that I will ask one of my colleagues to talk about.

But if I had to say that there were two groups that have been demonized during the discussion of this, it is health care insurance companies and pharmaceutical companies. They are continually talked about on this floor as being anti-American, villains, gougers, greedy. But we are going to talk about this matchup, and I would just say that when we are talking about one of the sweetheart deals that remains in the bill and will not be removed by fixers, as of this writing, is what I will call the New Jersey needle exchange.

Apparently, there was some difficulty in getting the vote of one of the Senators from New Jersey, and so under this bill there is \$1 billion that is going to go to the drug companies, the PhRMA representatives, who apparently are doing everything they can to mess around with people's health care and so forth and so on.

But maybe, Mr. TIBERI, let me turn to you and maybe you could talk a little bit about the discussion that took place between one of our former colleagues, the soon-to-be former head of PhRMA, and the administration relative to their participation in this program.

Mr. TIBERI. I certainly wasn't there, but I will rely on press reports of what happened.

But just today, one of our Democratic colleagues who voted for the House bill and announced that he was not voting for the special rule that will deem the Senate bill law, said—and I am paraphrasing—that he is voting against this bill because it actually benefits health insurance companies and benefits the pharmaceutical industry.

Now, the pharmaceutical industry actually has run ads all over the country urging a "yes" vote on this bill even though many in the White House have publicly attacked them and publicly attacked the health insurance reform industry. It is ironic, but there, apparently at the beginning of this process, was a special deal between the President and what was then the head

of this trade association to protect them from having any sort of provisions in the bill that might allow for reimportation of prescription drugs from Canada.

But in addition to that, on the Medicare side, I think my colleague from Ohio has already mentioned it, we are now seeing in this bill and more in the reconciliation bill that comes maybe Sunday, maybe Monday, a huge cut in Medicare. Not just Medicare Advantage, which a third of my seniors have the Medicare Advantage plan in my district, but actual cuts to Medicare, which Medicare's own actuary, his words not our words, said that he believes that the cut is so significant that it will leave providers, doctors, to stop treating Medicare beneficiaries because they won't be reimbursed enough for their services.

Now, in my district, and I am sure in the gentleman from Michigan's district and the gentleman from northeastern Ohio's district, I am already seeing doctors begin the process of not treating Medicare patients because they don't get reimbursed for every dollar that they treat a patient. They are getting reimbursed 80 cents or 85 cents.

Nothing in that bill changes this. In fact, the actuary states that this \$500 billion cut will make it much worse. And that doesn't even begin to talk about the impact it has on hospitals and other providers as well.

So this is a huge policy issue that we are going to see, once the benefits side and the cuts occur, that Americans have no idea what is coming with respect to this huge change in policy.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. MCCOTTER, before I go to you for your comments, we agreed that PhRMA takes out Medicare in this particular round one?

Mr. MCCOTTER. We would have to. Actually, PhRMA has run up the score in this game. You see one-half trillion dollars cut from senior citizens' Medicare. You see a backroom sweetheart deal for PhRMA. PhRMA, unfortunately, wins out with this administration and Democratic Congress over senior citizens who need their Medicare.

I would also like to point out here the malleable morality of the Democrat Party and the administration when, in 2007, we knew and were told repeatedly by their candidates, even one for the highest office in the land, of how intrinsically evil pharmaceutical companies were. And yet, come 2009, when they are putting together their health care bill, their government takeover of your wellness, all of a sudden PhRMA wasn't so bad when they got on board and took a sweetheart deal to support this.

Now, this, to me, and I am loathe to say it, tragically, how quickly the President's campaign mantra of "Hope and Change" has degenerated into hate and tax. When we now see it is the health insurance companies that are evil, well, PhRMA has been redeemed. The only difference is the health insurance companies have not taken a

sweetheart backroom deal; PhRMA did. I find that morality objectionable. At least be consistent.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Well, I want to just elaborate for a minute on the gentleman's point about the insurance companies, because in all of the remarks—and the President was recently in Strongsville, Ohio, which is a suburb of Cleveland, giving what was described as his closing argument to get it done. Again, the health care insurance companies are singled out for being particularly greedy and so forth and so on. So, like the pharmaceutical companies, you wouldn't think that there would be any special provisions for medical insurance companies in the bill. But if you said that, you would be wrong, because, again, Nebraska rears its ugly head, but also the State of Michigan.

In Michigan and Nebraska—and, Mr. Speaker, to those who may follow along at home or on the Internet, if you go to section 10905 of the Senate bill, which we will deem on Sunday, it levees an annual new health fee, the taxes we are talking about, on all health care insurers. And, again, that additional tax on everybody's health care coverage—which, again, something that mystifies some of us on this side is: If you recognize we have a problem with preexisting conditions, if you recognize we have a problem with people that we need to get coverage so that they get adequate care, why do we have to horse around with the other 85 percent of the people in the country who are satisfied with what they have?

But, in order to raise money for this program, a new tax is put on health insurance companies; however, the bill provides an exemption to a narrow group of companies. This section will specifically exempt Blue Cross/Blue Shield of Nebraska and Blue Cross/Blue Shield of Michigan.

Now, I know that the gentleman from Michigan, probably his constituents may see some benefits from that, but I doubt you are jumping for joy over that. Again, like all of these special deals, that is not fair. I mean, how can it be fair in a competitive marketplace if you are buying insurance from a health care insurance company and one company has to pay a tax and two companies—well, all companies have to pay a new tax except for two?

Mr. MCCOTTER. If the gentleman would yield, I would like to say that the residents of Michigan understand that in our constitutional free Republic the equality of treatment under the law cannot be vitiated. And while this provision may have some benefit to us in the short run, there is nothing more damaging to the people of Michigan or America than a Federal Government that treats people disparately and does so to put together a deal that, in the long run, will take over their health care.

Mr. LATOURETTE. I thank the gentleman.

And I want to go back to Mr. TIBERI's observation, because the published reports that I saw about PhRMA were

not only reimportation of drugs from Canada, that they would be protected from that—and that actually gets into our next matchup, Waxman versus PhRMA, because the reported deal in the newspapers was that the pharmaceutical companies would pony up \$8 billion over the next 10 years, and in return for that—because, again, money needs to be raised. People are arguing about the numbers and what it does to the budget, but I think almost every American understands it is counter-intuitive that you can insure more people and it is going to cost less.

Mr. TIBERI. And, actually, one of the Democratic leaders in the Senate took to the floor last week and in a speech actually came clean with respect to a statement that he said that actually insurance costs and health costs would continue to go up, and that is what we have said all along.

This doesn't deal with costs of health. This doesn't deal with costs of insurance. This deals with putting a whole lot more people on Medicaid, not fixing Medicaid. This deals with a whole lot of new taxes. This deals with restricting certain things like Medicare Advantage to give people less choices. This gives people less choices for health savings accounts. It reduces people who might have a flexible savings account, reduces that from \$5,000 to \$2,500 in taxable benefits.

The American people, once they find out what is in this bill, are going to be shocked at what is actually in this bill, aside from things like student loans that have nothing to do with health care, but actually on the health care side.

Mr. LATOURETTE. And I want to move to this Waxman-PhRMA matchup because, as we have indicated, the distinguished chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee is a crafty veteran, not tall in terms of height, but he has been around the game a long time and he knows the way the game is played.

PhRMA, with a lot of muscle, came into this thing, and they thought that the deal that they made was, if they ponied up \$8 billion, they would be held harmless, not only from reimporting drugs from Canada—which I really don't understand. Everything that I have read says that if you could reimport drugs from Canada, you could cut the cost about 28 percent. Even if it is only 20 percent, who cares. But the argument that has been made by both Republican and Democratic administrations is that it is not safe. We can't trust it if it is coming back from Canada.

Now, I would argue that if that were true—my district has one of the longest areas on Lake Erie up in Ohio. If that was true, I would go home to my district and find a lot of dead Canadians floating up on the beaches, and that is just not happening.

The second piece of that is that the deal as reported was that not only would they not get any reimportation

in the legislation, but they would not have to be subject—because the government is now under this program, or the proposed program, and become a big customer for drugs, that there would be no provision in the bill that the government could compete for best price.

And I can remember when we did Medicare part D—I think both gentlemen were here for that—and speech after speech from our friends over here, and I happen to agree with them, that it is nuts. Everybody can go in and negotiate for best price except us? But the deal was, between PhRMA and the White House, was: No. No negotiation for the price.

But a funny thing happened, I think, to PhRMA on the way to the deal. They ran into the wily veteran from California and he said, Oh, no, you don't. So I have to give this to Waxman, unless anybody has a problem with it.

All right. We are actually past it, now almost into the quarter finals. We have got Pelosi versus Stupak, MoveOn.org versus Rahm, and the People versus Senator REID.

Mr. TIBERI. We have one more to go to the final four here, don't we?

Mr. LATOURETTE. We have a few more, but we need to pick up this one, this one, and that one.

Mr. MCCOTTER. I would like to pick between the People and Senator REID. And I think, clearly, with the talk of reconciliation, we are going to have to go with Senator REID defeating the people; although, I understand that the people are demanding a rematch in November, where the score is expected to be settled.

Mr. TIBERI. Point of parliamentary inquiry.

Looking at the chart—maybe I am looking at it wrong. Before we do People/Reid, I think you have to do MoveOn.org/Rahm.

Mr. LATOURETTE. I think the gentleman is right, but I think the cat is out of the bag on this. And I would say that perhaps—well, sadly, they are both on the eastern time zone. But I think that, for the purposes of this discussion, we can say that this bracket is on the East Coast and these games will start later.

Mr. MCCOTTER. If the gentleman will yield, you might want to be careful. Someone may be taping the game.

Mr. LATOURETTE. It is like "The Sting" with Paul Newman and Robert Redford where they pretaped the race. We don't intend to do that.

□ 2015

Again, Mr. Speaker, we'd encourage people watching at home to not wager on the brackets or any sporting event.

So we're going to give this one to Senator REID. Mr. TIBERI, do you want to talk about MoveOn.org?

Mr. TIBERI. Can I inquire how much time we might have left?

Mr. LATOURETTE. I think we have about 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio has about 10 minutes left.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Go ahead.

Mr. TIBERI. So I'm going to go with Rahm versus MoveOn.org.

Mr. LATOURETTE. We're going to have to come back to that in just a second. There was a label around here someplace, and I can't find it.

Mr. TIBERI. Where would you like us to go?

Mr. LATOURETTE. Well, I was going to say about this matchup, there's really not a big difference between the two. You could declare this matchup a tie. But I think that, again, that perhaps it goes to the President's Chief of Staff. He's a pretty powerful guy. Are we all right with that?

Mr. MCCOTTER. If the gentleman will yield, they both know each other's games very well, in many ways. They are former teammates. Very well acquainted. But I think just for sheer athletic grace and the ability to pirouette, I would have to give it to the Chief of Staff for the President.

Mr. LATOURETTE. I think that's right. I thank the gentleman. So while I look for my Rahm sticker to put up here, why don't you fellows go back to the East Coast. We have two games up. The People versus Senator REID.

Mr. TIBERI. I think we probably should go People versus Senator REID.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Why don't we do that?

Mr. MCCOTTER. I believe that was settled in the instance of Senator REID.

Mr. TIBERI. I think the People lost. Mr. MCCOTTER. Not yet.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Not yet.

Mr. TIBERI. But to Senator REID in the Senate, they lost. Actually, on Christmas Eve.

Mr. MCCOTTER. Merry Christmas.

Mr. LATOURETTE. That really is one of my favorite things. We've had a lot of artificial deadlines. We had to have the stimulus bill by President's Day. I don't know whether George Washington or Abraham Lincoln were calling for it. We had to have cap-and-trade by the Fourth of July. I couldn't tell you why. And we were told we had to have the Senate bill by Christmas. So you had sort of this strange sight of these octogenarians sleeping on cots over on the other side of the Capitol. More show than play. But we're going to give this to Senator REID.

Mr. MCCOTTER. If the gentleman will yield, let's go to the bracket between Speaker PELOSI and our colleague, Representative BART STUPAK. While BART STUPAK does has a distinct reach advantage—

Mr. LATOURETTE. And a height advantage.

Mr. MCCOTTER. Let me rephrase, if I may. While BART may have a height advantage, the Speaker has the reach advantage on this one.

Mr. TIBERI. I think that's more appropriate.

Mr. MCCOTTER. I think that her offense of fast-breaking arms and legs, combined with our colleague BART STUPAK's shortage of Blue Dog manpower on the bench—I think we're

going to have to give this to the Speaker.

Mr. LATOURETTE. I think I agree with that. There are a couple of rumors out of the trainers' room that Mr. STUPAK will in fact need medical attention for some twisted arms and legs as a result of this. But while we were talking, I found the Rahm Emanuel sticker, so we're going to slap that up there.

Mr. TIBERI, any disagreement here about the Speaker versus Mr. STUPAK?

Mr. TIBERI. Hard to top the gentleman from Michigan's description.

Mr. LATOURETTE. We're down to two games to come to the semifinals. Let's go over to Senator REID and Chairman WAXMAN. What do you think?

Mr. TIBERI. Well, while the cagey veteran from California put up a pretty good game, I think it's hard to top the Christmas Eve dealings of Senator REID and the Senate bill, which ultimately, if it's deemed in the House, will be the one that actually becomes law over everything else. So I think you've got to give it to Senator REID over Waxman.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Sure. McCotter.

Mr. MCCOTTER. I would agree. I would say that while Mr. WAXMAN played a better game, he spent too much time on the left side of the court. Whereas, Senator REID was capable of smothering people with everything under the sun. You cannot argue with the final score. It is the Senate bill here.

Mr. LATOURETTE. That's a good point. I think that that's a clear victory for the Senator from Nevada. So that brings us over to this side. I'm still trying to peel the back off of the Pelosi sticker. But we do have the last quarter-final games between the President's Chief of Staff, Mr. Emanuel, and, again, the cagey veteran from California, the Speaker of the House, Mrs. PELOSI.

Guys?

Mr. TIBERI. I think it's hard to argue with the Speaker in a close one, but I'd have to give it to the Speaker.

Mr. LATOURETTE. McCotter.

Mr. MCCOTTER. I would have to agree with that, but I would just like to point out that the Speaker and Mr. Emanuel, former teammates, know each other's games very well. This was a very, very close contest, but in the end, I believe that Mr. Emanuel was given a technical foul for profane language and the Speaker hit the free throw.

Mr. LATOURETTE. I have heard he does in fact have a salty tongue. I think that's right. We'll give that to the Speaker. So we're down to the last quarter-final. It's Waxman versus Reid. Did we solve that?

Mr. TIBERI. We solved that already. You're a sticker behind.

Mr. LATOURETTE. So here we are as we come down to championship day. And the championship will be determined on Sunday here in the House of

Representatives. It appears that the contest is going to be not with any Republican leader, not with the People, not with the conservative Democrats, not with Mr. STUPAK and the people that believe in the pro-life movement. It's going to be between the two Democratic leaders in the House and the Senate, Senator REID and Speaker PELOSI.

Mr. Speaker, how much time have we got?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has about 4 minutes.

Mr. LATOURETTE. All right. Here we go. Then in this last 4 minutes I want to yield to each of my friends. And we can't yield specific blocks of time, but if you could each take about 2 minutes to give us your final thoughts and perhaps give us a prediction on the championship.

McCotter, you're first.

Mr. MCCOTTER. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TIBERI. What we know is if the House takes up this rule on reconciliation on Sunday or Monday, the Senate bill will be deemed passed and on to the President's desk. That means Senator REID will have won. The question is: Will they get the votes for the reconciliation the bill in the House and then in the Senate without changing it? If they do change it, does it come back to the House, and can they get the votes to uphold the changes, and what will happen then?

So this is going to play out. What's clear is, as you've pointed out, the American people end up losing. Health care reform is something that the three of us and the majority of Republicans support, but this isn't going to reform people's health care. This adds people to Medicaid. This adds people to insurance. This adds a slew of taxes, Medicare cuts, cuts to Medicare Advantage, and doesn't allow people to necessarily keep what they have. This is not reform that Americans bought into.

Mr. LATOURETTE. I thank the gentleman. I think I agree with it. This is going to be a barn-burner. This is one where you want to be on the edge of your seats because this thing, I expect, is going to go back and forth; first half, second half.

Mr. MCCOTTER. Looking at the chart, I'd like to first note that on the road to the championship game between Speaker PELOSI and Senate Majority Leader REID, I see no Republicans to obstruct their path. And I think that that points out the way this process has gone. What we are witnessing now is not an argument between Republicans and Democrats; we're watching an argument amongst Democrats. Because we will have a bipartisan vote on this health care bill—and it will be in opposition. This is heartening to know that as this process goes forward, the bipartisan support for true health care reform in this country between Republicans and Democratic centrists will continue be-

cause we are supported by the American people.

Fundamentally, in this debate I think the American people have reached a conclusion: that their government is not working for them. It is not listening to them. It is defying their expressed wishes. This is transcendent of the simple monetary considerations, which are great and which are dire for us. But this is really about your liberty and your relationship to your government. We do not work for government. Government works for the people. And under this health care bill, I would urge everyone to think of something. No matter how imperfect the health care system is right now, it cannot be fixed by the most broken entity in the world today, which is the United States Government. Mr. Speaker, no one in my district believes that the people who run Washington the way they do are going to do anything to improve your health care.

So, in conclusion, I would just like to point out one thing. Do not give this government this type of control over your life.

Mr. LATOURETTE. I thank both gentlemen for joining me this evening.

Mr. Speaker, where are we?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Two sentences. Tune in Sunday. Thanks.

HEALTH CARE REFORM IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to follow The Price is Right and my friends from Ohio, with whom we obviously disagree on this issue but consider ourselves friends and colleagues. And I appreciate their levity here tonight. We're going to talk a little bit about the substance of this health care bill that is now coming very, very close to being passed. But before we do, I just want to clarify the record a bit because throughout the course of the day today many people have been commenting on procedure and self-executing rules. And I just want to share with the House and put into the RECORD for the American people to be able to reference what the history of these self-executing rules has been.

In the 104th and 105th Congress under Speaker Newt Gingrich, Republicans used 90 self-executing rules. In the 106th, 107th, and 108th Congresses under Speaker Denny Hastert, Republicans used 112 self-executing rules. In the 109th Congress, under Speaker Hastert, Republicans used self-executing rules more than 35 times. This is a common procedure used here in the House. It has been proven under the Gingrich-Hastert regime before the Democrats took over. I also would like to show

and read and ask to submit this for the RECORD.

[Prepared by the Office of Majority Leader Steny Hoyer, March 17, 2010]

EXPERTS CALL OUT GOP ON HYPOCRISY, GOP OWNS UP TO LEGITIMACY OF RULE

REPUBLICANS CRY CROCODILE TEARS ON LEGISLATIVE PROCESS TO DISTRACT FROM UNFAIR INSURANCE PROCESS

With final passage of health insurance reform quickly approaching, Republicans are making another desperate attempt to distract from the substance of the health care debate. The GOP is hypocritically crying foul on a legislative process that they used more than 200 times under the last two Republican Speakers. Republicans clearly are trying to distract from the unfair insurance process that they support continuing:

Process that allows insurance companies to cancel coverage when a person gets sick;

Process that allows insurance companies to filibuster consumers' claims to fair coverage; and

Process that makes Americans fight for their health insurance even as they are fighting for their lives.

If Republicans are so sensitive to fair process, they should oppose those unfair insurance procedures and support passage of health insurance reform. And if they don't do that, then their record on using the same House rules to pass major legislation should be enough to end the legislative process debate.

REPUBLICANS USE SELF-EXECUTING RULES TO PASS MAJOR LEGISLATION

When Republicans complain about process—whether on reconciliation or self-executing rules—they conveniently ignore their own record on using the same procedures to pass major legislation. In fact, according to Don Wolfensberger, former staff director under a Republican House Rules Committee, Republicans have used self-executing rules hundreds of times in recent history:

104th & 105th Congresses: Under Speaker Newt Gingrich (R-GA), Republicans used 90 self-executing rules.

106th, 107th & 108th Congresses: Under Speaker Dennis Hastert (R-IL), Republicans used 112 self-executing rules.

109th Congress: Under Speaker Hastert and Rules Committee Chairman David Dreier (R-CA), Republicans used self-executing rules more than 35 times. [Norm Ornstein, 3/16/10]

REPUBLICANS, EXPERTS ACKNOWLEDGE LEGITIMACY OF RULE

“[D]espite Republican claims that such parliamentary gymnastics as reconciliation and self-executing rules are somehow in violation of House rules or rare, neither is the case, says congressional scholar Thomas Mann of the Brookings Institution. ‘On the self-executing rule, Republicans in their last Congress that they controlled, the 109th, used it 36 times; the Democrats, in the next Congress they controlled, used it 49 times,’ Mann said. And in many cases, Mann says, they were on some pretty major bills. ‘The reauthorization of the Patriot Act, the Tax Relief Reconciliation Act, the Deficit Control Conference Report; all kinds of major measures have been approved through self-executing rules, which means the House votes indirectly rather than separately on these measures.’” [NPR, 3/17/10]

[Prepared by Offices of Democratic Leadership, March 18, 2010]

HYPOCRISY ALERT

This practice has been in use since at least 1933—and has been commonly used under both Republicans and Democrats.

In 1948, the Republican-controlled House passed a resolution to consider as adopted

Senate amendments to a bill to change tax rates.

In 1993, the House adopted a resolution to consider as adopted the Senate amendment to the Family and Medical Leave Act.

In 1996, the Republican-controlled House adopted a resolution to consider as adopted the conference report on Line Item Veto.

Separately, beginning in 1980—and most years thereafter—the House has had in place a standing rule that approves automatically a joint resolution to increase the public debt limit upon adoption of a Budget Resolution that contemplates such an increase. Such a resolution has occurred 20 times in the last 30 years.

OPEN AND TRANSPARENT

The Senate bill has been publicly available for almost three months. The Reconciliation bill that improves it has been publicly discussed for weeks, and will be available online 72 hours before any House Member will be asked to vote on it.

AMICUS BRIEF

Some health care opponents are comparing this procedure to an amicus brief filed in a lawsuit challenging the constitutionality of the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005. Speaker Pelosi, Chairman Waxman, and Chairwoman Slaughter all signed onto that amicus brief. That court challenge arose due to the House and Senate passing two different final versions of a bill, President George W. Bush signing one of them (the Senate version) into law, and the significant constitutional questions it raised. It had nothing to do with this process.

Congressional scholar Norm Ornstein of the American Enterprise Institute, who's really the guru here for how Congress operates, wrote this in his March 16, 2010, column: “I can't recall a level of feigned indignation nearly as great as what we are seeing now from congressional Republicans and their acolytes at The Wall Street Journal, and on blogs, talk radio, and cable news. It reached a ridiculous level of misinformation and disinformation over the use of reconciliation, and now threatens to top that level over the projected use of a self-executing rule by House Speaker Nancy PELOSI. In the last Congress that Republicans controlled, from 2005 to 2006, Rules Committee Chairman DAVID DREIER used the self-executing rule more than 35 times, and was no stranger to the concept of ‘deem and pass.’ That strategy was defended by House Republicans in court, and upheld. Is there no shame anymore?”

So let's set this aside.

Obviously, as I'm going to be joined here by my friend here from Ohio, my other friend from California, if the substance of the bill is going to benefit the other side, I wouldn't talk about the substance of the bill either, Mr. Speaker. I would stay focused on smoke and mirrors, and bells and whistles, and distractions that would move the debate off of the centerpiece, off the meat and potatoes, which is this: our government has a moral mission. And that moral mission is, this Government, as designed by the Framers of the United States Constitution, has a moral mission to protect its citizens from terrorists, from foreign powers if they are aggressive. This government has a moral

mission to protect its citizens with issues of crime, workplace safety, should unruly corporations behave in a manner that would hurt individual citizens in the United States of America. The documents that founded this country, that created this country, give the United States Congress that moral mission—to act on behalf of individual citizens. So the health care reform proposal that we are talking about today is an attempt by the Congress of the United States. The elected representatives of the American people should step in, because they are being hurt by the current health care system. They are being hurt by the practices of the health care industry, of the insurance industry.

□ 2030

And what is going to happen this weekend as we pass health care reform, something that this country has been trying to do for 100 years, what will happen is the government will come in and not run health care. This isn't about the insurance company running health care or the government running health care. This is about the government stepping in and saying to the insurance industry, You are no longer allowed to kick people off of their policies just because they got sick. The insurance industry is no longer allowed to tell kids and their parents that they are denied insurance coverage because they have a preexisting condition. The insurance industry will no longer be able to tell adults that they can no longer get health insurance because they have a preexisting condition. That's what this bill does. It protects the American people.

To an American family who may be dealing with a catastrophic health care issue for their family, this bill is going to step in and say to the insurance company, Back off. You are no longer allowed to say to a family who's going through a health care crisis, Sorry, we're out of money. You hit your lifetime limit. You're on your own. This is going to come in and say on behalf of the American people, If you are 26 years old or younger, you will be able to stay on your parents' insurance so that young people will have an opportunity to do that. This is going to say to small business people—because the government also has a moral mission not only to protect from unsavory underhanded business practices but the government also has a moral mission to empower people in the United States of America. What this bill does through a series of tax incentives and in an exchange will provide the greatest tax cut for health care purposes in decades in the United States of America.

If you are a small business in the United States of America, you will receive up to a 50 percent tax credit in order to provide health care to your workers as well as go into the exchange and be able to negotiate with other small businesses and people around the country to drive down health care

costs. That is going to significantly reduce costs for small business people in the United States of America. And as we slowly begin to move out of the economic collapse that our friends on the other side and President Bush handed the American people, this reform will bring some stability to the market. This reform will allow small business people to take those savings and reinvest them back into their company, in the machinery, in the capital, in the technology, in the wages for their workers.

You can talk to any small business person—and I was just on the phone with one today who had an increase of 40 percent in their health care. And he said, You know what, I negotiated with the drug company. I negotiated it down to a 30 percent increase. This is a person who had 30 employees just a few years ago and now is down to just a handful, six or seven employees. But if you reduce the health care costs for this business, and thousands across the country, they will have more money to reinvest back into their company.

You talk to many union members when they go in and negotiate union contracts with businesses, they don't get a wage increase because the business person says to the union, You know, I've got \$5 an hour. Here it is. You can use it any way you want, but this is all I've got. And the unions, as they negotiate those contracts, have to put that money into health care. So wages have been stagnant now for decades. And this bill will allow those small businesses and big businesses to reinvest back into their companies and help us as we get out of the economic morass, as things start to open up, as we see they are now. We'll accelerate that and allow us to have some sustained long-term growth.

And before I yield to any of our friends here—Mr. BOCCIERI is here from Ohio—I want to make one final point. This bill will extend the life of the Medicare program. That's why AARP has endorsed this program. And our friends on the other side—I love it, they say, Well, the seniors are against it, but AARP endorsed it. The docs are against it, but the American Medical Association has endorsed the bill. This is a pro-abortion bill, but yet 60,000 Catholic nuns and 6,000 Catholic hospitals and 1,400 Catholic nursing homes have endorsed this bill. The National Catholic Reporter endorsed this bill. They wouldn't endorse a bill that is pro-abortion, giving Federal money for abortions.

But this is another distraction because our friends on the other side certainly don't want to compete with tax credits for small businesses, certainly don't want to say, you know, get rid of the preexisting conditions. We want to keep that in there. They don't want to have that campaign. They don't want to have that debate, and I don't blame them.

But the facts of the matter are this: this bill is good for the American peo-

ple. It probably should have happened 30 or 40 years ago. But for seniors, it extends the life of Medicare. It invests into the Medicare part D program so that if you have prescription drug coverage from Medicare part D, you'll get a \$250 stipend this year, a rebate this year. And next year, because of the negotiations, the average Medicare part D recipient will save \$700 on their prescription drugs that they're getting from Medicare Part D. We will eventually close the doughnut hole. No senior will ever have to pay for preventive coverage again. No citizen will ever have to pay for preventive coverage ever again.

So this, through the savings, extends the life of the Medicare program, reduces costs, makes insurance affordable for everyone in our country. The next day or so, Mr. BOCCIERI, we are moving in the direction of a historic vote. And I just want to say to you, my friend, that I appreciate what you have done, today came out and said that you are voting "yes" on this bill after a lot of consideration, a lot of thought because you feel it is the best thing for the American people. I want to say thank you for standing up for your constituents. We represent very similar districts, and I believe that history will vindicate you and your vote and what we're doing here. So with that, I yield to my friend from Ohio.

Mr. BOCCIERI. Well, I thank the gentleman from my adjoining district, the 17th Congressional District in Ohio. The 16th Congressional District of Ohio has had its share of people who are without health insurance. And in fact, nearly 39,000 people in my district right now are wondering how they're going to pay for coverage, how they're going to pay their doctors' bills should they have an emergency now. There are 9,800 residents in the 16th Congressional District who have preexisting conditions. As we speak right now, they will not be able to get health care coverage.

Let me speak to you about the face of this national debate because our friends on the other side like to make this national debate about Speaker PELOSI or Leader REID or even the President of the United States.

At the end of the day, the face of this issue is about Natoma Canfield. Natoma Canfield right now is sitting at the Cleveland Clinic, hanging on for dear life, getting blood transfusions every day for the next 30 days without health care insurance. Now her story moved me so because she brought me back to a place that I haven't been in a long, long time. I remember as a young boy standing at the bed of my mom—I was the oldest son—and she was telling me that she had breast cancer, and she didn't know what the future had in store for her. She was going to get treatment but wanted us to be prepared.

Now, she had health care insurance, and she survives today. But I wonder now as a father of four children what would have happened to my life if my

mom didn't have health care insurance. What would have happened to her? Would I have been able to go to college? Would I have had to work? How would we have paid for her treatments? My life could have been considerably different based upon this situation.

That story is played out hundreds of thousands of times not only across the 16th Congressional District but across this country. Too many of our citizens are one accident, one medical emergency, one diagnosis away from complete and utter bankruptcy, financial ruin. And in fact, in 2007, they said nearly 70 percent of all bankruptcies in the United States were because they had no insurance.

Now, I would remind my friend from Ohio, in 2004 our Secretary of Health and Human Services, Tommy Thompson, flew to Iraq with billion-dollar checks in hand to make sure that every man, woman and child in Iraq had universal access to the doctor that they wanted to see. Now, why is that good for Iraqis and not for Americans? Why do Americans have to pay for Iraqis to see their physician anytime they wanted to, but that's not good enough for our own people? Well, the time has come, the hour is at hand. Too many politicians are worried about their futures and not about the futures of the people that we represent. They're worried about the reelection. They're worried about their job security instead of the job security and the health security of the families that we represent.

I know a lot of people are angry. They watch the display of back and forth here in Washington. They become frustrated, frustrated because of all the blocking and stiff arms. You know, I would remind my colleagues on the other side, the bill that we have before us today and that we will vote on this weekend, the bill that is before the House of Representatives, when the components are added from the President's bipartisan summit and the four Republican ideas are added into this bill, this bill will be identical, if not completely identical, to the bill that was introduced by Lincoln Chafee and Bob Dole in 1993 as a Republican counterproposal to the Clinton administration's health care debate.

Leadership doesn't need to be worrying about who's going to control this House. They need to be making sure that Natoma Canfield can keep her house because without health care insurance—she told me on the phone the other day that she's worried about her home going into foreclosure.

Now, I know that a lot of people are uneasy about this process that we have here in Washington. I know a lot of people are suggesting that we ought to stop and start over, but the insurance companies aren't starting over. We see broad increases in insurance premiums, 40 percent, 50 percent sometimes. Where does this end? Where does it stop? Where do the most abusive practices stop? When you can block someone from seeing their doctor because

they had a preexisting condition, when you can deny someone coverage because they got sick, when you can tell somebody that they have reached their lifetime cap, and they can no longer be insured, that is what this debate is about, about the faces of our constituents.

Let me tell you, before I turn it over to my friend, about a young boy who made the journey to Washington, D.C. I couldn't be in Ohio today because we had votes, so I brought Ohio to Washington. I had a family here, a young boy by the name of Jay. Jay was here, and this young boy has autism. He is uninsurable. He has a preexisting condition because he has autism.

I was walking down the hall with his mother Esther, and she was in tears after our announcement. She said that, you know, I know this is a tough decision for you and the country, but it's one that is very necessary. And I told her, I said, If we don't succeed at this task in front of us, Jay will never be able to obtain health care insurance unless we vote on this bill, unless we say enough. Because on day one when this bill passes, Jay will be able to get health care insurance. We will no longer allow the insurance industry to deny people because they had a preexisting condition. I think this is a fight worth having. I do, Mr. RYAN, and that's why I'm here today.

□ 2045

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I tell you, what a cute kid he was. He was just the cutest little kid. You get caught up in this debate with numbers and statistics and whatnot, but he really was the poster child for why we need to do this.

With that, we are blessed with someone who has come from the great State of New Jersey and has been in the middle of all of the negotiations on behalf of our leadership and who chairs the subcommittee on the Education Committee which handles these issues. I yield to my friend, ROB ANDREWS.

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my friend for yielding and for being here night after night talking about what is really in this bill and doing a great job on it. I thank him for his friendship. I would like to thank and congratulate Mr. BOCCIARI's courageous decision to vote in favor of this bill on behalf of the families that he talked about.

And to my friend from Ohio, I would also like to thank someone who we wouldn't usually hear about being thanked, and that is the millions of Americans who have contacted us who oppose this bill. And I have heard from my constituents who oppose this bill, and they are worried. They are very worried, and they should be, because if the things that they have been told were in this bill were true, not only would I be worried about it, but I would not vote for it.

Our constituents are not simply entitled to know where their Representatives stand, they are entitled to know where their Representatives stand on the facts that are actually before us.

I want to take a few minutes tonight to talk about the things that I have heard from my neighbors and constituents that worry them and then lay out the facts.

I have heard from my senior citizen constituents that they don't want any cuts in their Medicare benefits. The fact is this bill does not cut anyone's Medicare benefits. The opposite is true. To those seniors who enrolled in the Medicare part D prescription drug program, the amount of their prescriptions that Medicare pays for goes up, the amount of drugs that they pay for goes down, and eventually, by the end of this process, 75 percent, at least, of all prescription costs will be paid by Medicare and 25 percent by the seniors. It is the closure of the so-called doughnut hole. It is one of the main reasons that the AARP is supporting this bill.

When a senior goes to the family doctor or the OB-GYN for an annual checkup, when this bill becomes law, that senior won't pay any copay. Medicare will pay the entire cost of that visit. Those are the only changes in Medicare that affect people's benefits. The benefits increase.

We have heard the outrageous statement that Americans who are elderly or disabled will be denied health care because there will be death panels in the bill. The answer can be found in section 1302 of the underlying text that we will be considering on Sunday. That text directs the Secretary of Health and Human Services, "to ensure that health benefits established as essential not be subject to denial to individuals against their wishes on the basis of the individual's age or expected length of life or the individual's present or predicted disability." That's the fact that is in the bill.

We have heard people say that they do not want to be forced to join a government health plan or any other health plan. They don't want to wait in a health clinic like the British do, like they say they do. They don't want to be in the Canadian system, and they are not. The fact is that section 1312 of the text that we will consider on Sunday says the following: "Nothing in this title shall be construed to restrict the choice of a qualified individual," that is anyone, "to enroll or not to enroll in a qualified health plan or to participate in the exchange." It goes on to say "nothing in this title shall be construed to compel an individual to enroll in a qualified health plan." Nothing. That's what the bill says.

We have heard many Americans of good conscience say they do not wish to see their tax dollars pay for abortion services. My friend, Mr. RYAN, who is staunchly pro-life and has stood to that position irrespective of the political consequences, has eloquently described what the bill says. For those who wish to read it for themselves, go to section 10104 and read it. It says that no public funds may be used to pay for an abortion for anyone.

I hear constituents say, quite understandably, they do not want undocu-

mented people to receive health care benefits or subsidies under this bill, what are sometimes referred to as illegal aliens. Neither do the authors of the bill. So if you go to section 1312f, a qualified individual is defined, and a qualified individual is someone who is a U.S. citizen or is here legally on a green card or other legal document. That's what the bill says.

We hear that the bill will destroy small businesses across the country. Small businesses do create three out of every four private sector jobs in this country. The bill does have a substantial effect on small business. Here is what it isn't and here is what it is. What it isn't is a crushing mandate on small businesses, because section 1304 of the bill says, if a business has 50 or fewer full-time employees, the business is required to do nothing. No mandate, no requirement, no tax, nothing. The person who is running a gas station, a deli, a barber shop, a small firm, nothing.

What the bill does say about small business is this: That the same deal that General Electric or Lockheed Martin or a huge company can get, so can the small business by joining a purchasing exchange set up in each State. And it says that the smallest of businesses will get a tax cut effective immediately this year for insuring their employees voluntarily. If you have 50 or fewer employees, you are not required to do anything and you probably qualify for a tax cut as a result of hiring more people.

Finally, we hear that this bill will dramatically increase the country's deficit and debt. And as a father of two daughters who are 15 and 17, I worry about a lot of things unrelated to politics and the debt, but I also worry about the debt because they are going to have to pay it off. I think the American people need to know a fact about the debt before they consider this bill. The debt is everyone's fault. I have had the privilege of serving here quite a long time. Both parties share a blame. I own my share of the responsibility. But we need to know this: 70 percent of the national debt was run up during the administrations of President Reagan, the first President Bush, and the second President Bush. Seven out of every \$10 of debt came from them.

Now, what does this bill do to the national debt and deficit? You should not believe the Democratic Party or the Republican Party or any political person on this issue. Mr. Speaker, our constituents, for those who wonder what this does to the national deficit and debt, look at the accounting by the neutral, nonpartisan scorekeeper, the Congressional Budget Office, which for a long time around here has been recognized as the gold standard and authority. Here is what they say. They say that if this bill becomes law, the deficit will be reduced by \$138 billion over the next 10 years, and, in the second 10 years, it will be reduced by \$1.2 trillion.

Everyone in this Congress is entitled to his or her own opinion, but the American people are entitled to the facts. Everyone is entitled to his or her own opinion, but not everyone is entitled to their own facts. The facts are that this is what is in the bill. The things that people have been told about this bill are not true, and, Mr. Speaker, I would invite those who wonder to go to the Internet, to read the bill and draw their own conclusions and then frankly evaluate the criticisms of people who will continue to mislead about this bill.

We are fortunate that people of good faith have made legitimate criticisms about this bill. We tried to listen and improve the bill, and on Sunday we look forward to a clear, on-the-record vote to adopt this legislation.

I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey. I always learn something when he is around.

This bill, we ask: How does it affect the country? And it only makes good sense that if we are reducing health care costs over time, that will reduce the deficit; because the government is so intertwined with Medicare and Medicaid and veterans' benefits and everything else, taking the health care system and putting in these fixes and including everybody in the system so that they don't run up health care costs, and fixing the waste in Medicare and those kinds of things, at the end of the day will be very, very beneficial for the deficit.

I have got a district in northeast Ohio. Very specifically, Mr. Speaker, I just want to state what this bill is going to do for those people in Ohio who have been for 30 years in a recession, for the most part. They lost the steel industry, lost the rubber industry, and lost a lot of the manufacturing in the United States and have been hurt very, very badly. I wish this was in place 30 or 40 years ago and it would have saved a lot of people from a lot of suffering over time.

This bill alone will improve coverage for 355,000 citizens in the 17th Congressional District. This particular bill will give tax credits and other assistance for up to 180,000 people. There a lot of people in my district who have a family of four, make about \$50,000 a year. That family, under this bill, will get a \$5,800 tax cut for them to be able to afford health insurance.

Last year alone in the 17th Congressional District, we had 1,700 families, neighbors of mine—this is all throughout the country—who went bankrupt because of the health care system. Because of health care issues, they went bankrupt, and many of those people had health insurance. They actually had health insurance and still went bankrupt. How many kids, how many families, how many parents had to file for bankruptcy in this country last year because of the current health care system that we have here?

So 53,000 young adults in the 17th Congressional District will be able to

stay on their parents' health insurance because we extend it up to 26 years old. This bill will guarantee 9,300 people in the 17th Congressional District will no longer be able to be denied health insurance because of a preexisting condition. This is where the rubber meets the road.

I mentioned about the \$250 that the Medicare part D recipients will get this year, a \$700 savings in Medicare part D next year. They will save \$3,000 by 2020. So this is a bill that has great significance.

We will have enough money in this bill, just in my congressional district, for four new community health clinics. We already have a few sprinkled around, but four new community health clinics so people can go and get the kind of preventive care that we are focused on in this bill. Hospitals will save \$11 million.

This bill is a good bill. Is it a perfect bill; not even close. Nothing is perfect. We are all imperfect here, so why would we create something that is perfect? But we have extended it. We implement things over time so we have an opportunity to tweak things.

As the gentleman from New Jersey said, this reduces the deficit by \$1.2 trillion over the next couple of decades. That's what this is all about for our kids and our grandkids, to have the kind of future that we want. So I think it is an important piece of legislation. I am excited about it.

If I can say lastly—because the Ohio State Buckeye's basketball game is coming on and we have to do our part, Mr. BOCCERI and I, to make sure that we root them in as much as we are rooting in the health care bill this weekend—I want to say this, and I don't mean to be glib or arrogant, but I want to be honest.

I look forward to the campaign in November. I looked forward to going out and talking to the constituents in my district and around the State of Ohio about what is in this bill. And I very much look forward to the Republican Party running on a platform of repealing this bill, repealing the ban on preexisting conditions for children, repealing the ban for preexisting conditions on adults, repealing the tax credits for small businesses, repealing the tax credits for someone in Niles, Ohio, who makes \$50,000 a year and will get \$5,800. I want to have that debate.

I want to have the debate where the Republicans come up and they say we need to repeal that and we need to make sure that our seniors, we continue to keep the doughnut hole wide open. We don't want to close it. I look forward to that debate and look forward to the debate saying that we should keep the lifetime caps in and keep the status quo.

□ 2100

So it is going to be an exciting time in our country. And as I heard one of my colleagues say, we are debating real issues here. And we have an oppor-

tunity to talk about what is in this bill and how it is going to benefit the American people.

I will then yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to enter into a colloquy with my colleague from New Jersey who earlier spoke of the truth, what is actually in the bill. One of the things that is not in the bill but is actually a fact is that in America about 45,000 people a year die because they lack health insurance. They don't have the opportunity to see a doctor on a regular basis, and they wind up in the emergency room very, very sick.

The truth is that under this legislation, 32 million Americans will be able to get health insurance, and poor people will see an expansion of the Medicaid program so that they get in under that program. That is in the legislation, is it not?

Mr. ANDREWS. It is. I would like to thank the gentleman for being here, for being the former insurance commissioner of California, really knowing these issues and doing a great job. I want to talk about one of the people who would be helped by this.

A few years ago, I was in my best friend's wedding, and I was in the bridal party, and there was a beautiful young lady who was also in the bridal party as a bridesmaid. The wedding was in June. We all had a great time; all of our families there. My wife and I had a wonderful time. A few months later, around Thanksgiving, she started to feel sick. Now, she was a part-time cafeteria aide in a public school. Her husband was a truck driver who lost his job. So they had no health insurance.

She started to feel some stomach discomfort. She went to the emergency room. They decided to admit her to the hospital. They said they were going to run a series of tests over the next couple of days. And she was terrified that if she stayed in the hospital for that time that she would run up a huge bill that she couldn't afford. So she checked herself out. She continued to have some stomach problems, and again afraid to go see a doctor because she couldn't pay the bill. This is around Thanksgiving. She died the day after Christmas, leaving her kids behind.

A lot of politics on this floor, I say to the gentleman from California. She is not here today to hear those politics. Her kids don't have a mother because someone who worked hard for a living, who was in a rough time in their life, could not afford health care. She is the issue and her children are the issue on Sunday.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. ANDREWS, I believe that every one of the 433 Members, or 432 who are still here in the House, know the exact same experience. All of us, and virtually every family in America has that experience where they have found one of their friends or one of their family without health insurance and facing the reality of bankruptcy, the reality of losing their life because they were unable to get the care that they need.

I will never forget a visit that I made to a carpenter who had worked his entire life and had come down with lung cancer. He was about 63 at the time. I visited him in his home, a trailer home out in the back part of the district. His wife was there. She had emphysema. And she was about 62. He told me, "I have to hang on. I have to hang on. I cannot die because she will be left without insurance. And then she too will die." That doesn't have to happen in America.

What we are doing today, as we prepare for this historic vote on Sunday, is to lay out before the American people why this is so important. It is important to the individual, it is important to that family, that person lying in their sick bed trying to hang on for another year-and-a-half so that the wife would qualify for Medicare.

Now, that's the reality of life. But the reality of this bill is it deals with that problem. Because if that gentleman lived next week, after the President signs this bill, he would have the confidence of knowing that there is a special program created specifically for he and his wife. The gentlemen and the women between the age of 55 and 65 who have lost their job, who are unemployed without insurance, there is a special high risk program specifically for them so that if he is to die, he can die with the confidence of knowing that his wife will have health insurance.

Now, that is really important because so many Americans and so many in my district have lost their job, they fall into that age group. That is a tough place to get a job because of the discrimination that the insurance industry now puts upon people in that age group.

Mr. ANDREWS. If the gentleman will yield, I know the person you are talking about. Shortly before the holidays this year, on a very snowy Saturday, my wife and I went to a large department store to pick up some last-minute items. A lady in Audubon, New Jersey, was working at the store and talked about what a long day for her it was. She was in the eighth or ninth hour of her shift. And she had no health insurance because she conveniently fit underneath the full-time worker category, working for a huge corporation. She was not yet 65, so she didn't have Medicare. And she was really worried that she was going to get sick, because if she got sick she also had a pre-existing condition which would make it all the worse. Couldn't buy insurance.

Here is what this bill says, as the gentleman knows, to that lady. First of all, because she works for a large firm, her employer is going to have to either insure her or contribute toward the cost of insuring her. And she is going to be able to get insured for 3 or 4 percent of her income, maybe \$15 or \$20 a week, which is affordable for her. A lot of people say, well, this is an unfair mandate on business. They don't understand. When a huge corporation like that one doesn't pay its fair share, the rest of us all do. She will get insurance, it will be paid for fairly, and I think she is the lady the gentleman is talking about.

Mr. GARAMENDI. As you said at the outset, I was the insurance commissioner in California for 8 years, '91 to '95 and 2003 to 2007. I saw this problem over and over again, where corporations push aside, literally discriminate against people because they may be more expensive. A particular problem in the smaller companies, where the risk cannot be spread out. This piece of legislation provides an opportunity for those risks to be adjusted, to be smoothed out among all of the people that are insured, all of the companies, thereby reducing the incentive for companies to discriminate in their hiring, discriminate against people that have a sickness or who may become sick because they happen to be 50, 55 years of age.

There is another thing in this legislation that is extremely important to every single qualified, to use your term earlier, qualified American, or qualified person in this country.

Mr. ANDREWS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARAMENDI. Let's talk about that.

Mr. ANDREWS. Define what "qualified" means so people understand. Qualified means you are a citizen or you are here legally. That is what it means.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Let me get that straight. Qualified means that you are a citizen or you are legally in the country with the appropriate immigration papers.

Mr. ANDREWS. Right.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Green card or H-1B visa, et cetera. So if you are illegal, you don't qualify.

Mr. ANDREWS. Right.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Now, back to the point I was making is that insurance companies discriminate against individuals. We all, if we think about it, know the examples here. I am going to give one. Twenty-three-year-old girl had been insured by the same insurance company for 23 years, from her conception, birth, all the way through teenage years, all the way to 23. She becomes 23. She is no longer on her parents' insurance. She goes back to the very same company and says, I'd like to carry on insurance.

No. Not available to you.

Why?

Well, you had acne when you were 16.

The fact of the matter is she also happens to be a woman and in those child-bearing years. So the company says, well, you know, you might get pregnant, might get married; might get pregnant and not be married. In any case, you're going to cost us a lot of money, and, therefore, no insurance.

That kind of discrimination is over when the President signs this bill, be it discrimination against people who have a preexisting condition—and who doesn't? Who didn't have acne when they were a kid? Who didn't have asthma? Who didn't have a broken arm? Who in our society does not have a preexisting condition? Very few of us. Under the current situation, the insurance companies are able to pick and choose. Only the healthy or likely to be healthy do they want. Those who might be expensive they push aside.

The message to the insurance industry is this: The President signs this bill, your discrimination is over. No longer will you discriminate against women, young or old, whether they are in their fifties or sixties. You will not discriminate against a person who has a preexisting condition. And you will not be able any longer to cancel a policy when somebody becomes sick.

Now, I have got to tell you, I went after Blue Cross of California and a couple other companies out there with a vengeance because what they did, people had been buying insurance from them for years and years, they get an illness, maybe they have a cancer, and suddenly the company goes back and says, oh, you didn't tell us when you were 3 years old that you had a tonsillectomy and had to take antibiotics. Therefore, we're going to cancel your policy because you didn't tell us. That is finished the day the President signs this bill. So in the insurance field, the era of discrimination on all of these methods is over and the insurance companies will take all comers.

Mr. ANDREWS. I think the gentleman's point, Mr. Speaker, is so well taken, because a lot of times people hear about this legislation and say, Well, okay, what does this really have to do with me? I have insurance, I'm employed, I don't run a small business, so I'm concerned about this because I think I'm going to pay higher taxes and get nothing for this.

Let me deal with that. First of all, if you live in a family that has an income of less than a quarter of a million dollars a year, there is no tax on your family. If you are an individual that earns less than \$200,000 a year, there is no new tax on your family. So let's get that straight.

Secondly, who is the next person who is going to find out that they are diabetic, or they are asthmatic, or God forbid they are diagnosed with a malignancy, or there is some other condition, as you said, that is relatively trivial as acne or eczema or something like this. The record is filled with people who are denied coverage or who face huge premium increases.

Because I am sure, Mr. Speaker and my friend from California, there are people watching this tonight who thought today was their lucky day, that they got a job offer. This happened to someone I know very well in my family. She got a job offer. She had been looking for a long time for a job, and this is the job she wanted. The employer called back the next day and said, We're sorry, but we have to rescind our offer because you cost too much to insure because she's diabetic and has a family history of breast cancer. So her punishment for conditions that are beyond her control is that she is now unemployable if she wants health insurance.

Now, people say that in this country everybody should work their way up the ladder. I completely agree with that. How can you work your way up the ladder if you can't get an employer to offer you a job because you are not insurable? That is over when this bill becomes law.

Mr. GARAMENDI. The gentleman could not be more correct. And those are very, very common. Along the same lines, we often consider America to be the country of entrepreneurs. We know the statistics are clear, the evidence is there, the polling has indicated that tens of thousands, perhaps even hundreds of thousands of Americans do not begin their own small businesses because they fear that they will be unable to get insurance. They don't want to leave the big corporate family. I know a specific fact of a fellow that worked at the university and wanted to start his own business. He and his wife wanted to start their own business for 10 years, and yet with small children and she with a preexisting condition, they did not do so. And so that entrepreneurial spirit was stifled by the insurance system we have in America.

Under this legislation they will be able to get insurance, either directly with an insurance company or as soon as in this case the State of California develops its exchange, which is a pooling. You talked about this when you spoke earlier. And we really ought to have a better discussion and a more thorough discussion about the exchanges, which is a method of setting up a mechanism in which standard benefit insurance policies will be available from different companies, the information will be readily available, and the insurance companies will be forced to compete with each other on quality and price and availability. Those exchanges are an extremely important way to create competition and availability of insurance.

Mr. ANDREWS. If the gentleman will yield, it is not a terribly exotic concept. My family has two kittens, so we buy a lot of food for them and the other things that they need.

□ 2115

We buy them at one of these discount centers. I won't name the brand name. But we buy them at one of the centers

because you can buy these products a lot cheaper than you can at retail because there is a purchasing group that gets a better deal on these products. This is a concept Americans understand very well. The larger the volume of the group of buyers, the better the discount.

The problem for those small entrepreneurs that the gentleman talks about is they're out there on their own. They're out there with 5, or 6, or 7, or 20 people, and they get whatever they can get. But when they join an exchange—if they want to—it is voluntary. When they join an exchange, they join a buy-in club, that just like our family is able to buy our pet supplies at a cheaper price. They're going to buy health insurance at a price at a Lockheed Martin, or a General Electric, or the United States of America.

And listen, their employees are going to get the same choices of health plans that we do as Members of Congress. It's long overdue.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I'm relatively new here, and I don't know everything about the health systems here. But when I signed up, I was given an array of options. I could go to Blue Cross-Blue Shield, or I can get Aetna, or Kaiser. It turns out that Federal Government employees, including every Member of Congress, have access to an exchange. And if you happen to be in California and you're a public employee at the State or county, many of the counties and cities, you are already in an exchange called CalPers, California Public Employees Retirement System. Those are exchanges. This is nothing new. What we're doing is making that exchange available to everybody.

Mr. ANDREWS, you have been here some time, and I know you're very familiar and indeed an expert on the American economy. Let us talk a little bit about the American economy and why this legislation is extremely important to the American economy.

Right now we rank 19th in our health, in how healthy we are. And we're actually ranking below Colombia. The fact of the matter is we also spend nearly 17 percent of our total wealth, our GDP, on health care. Our competitors in Europe, Japan, Korea, spend no more than 11 percent—most of them are 10 percent and below. So you know in your economy, we have an enormous disadvantage.

I remember actually it was President Clinton talking about this, and it's as though we took a check every year for about \$800 billion and gave it to our competitors. We're giving that advantage to our competitors because our health care system is so expensive and consumes so much of our economy and leaves us not at the top of the heap, but at the bottom.

Mr. ANDREWS. Thank you for calling me an expert on the U.S. economy. That is hardly the case. That is the one inaccurate thing the gentleman said.

I do know this from listening to my neighbors: The economy is in deplor-

able, horrible shape. It's the worst economy, I think, in my life.

And the number one issue today is not health care; it is the economy, but it's important to understand how this issue plays into jobs and the economy.

Businesses can't create jobs as their premiums skyrocket. As an employer pays more and more and more in health care, what he or she has to do is either hire fewer people or offer narrower health benefits. The auto manufacturers tell us that the price of health care for their employees in making a car costs more than the price of steel that goes into the car.

A young entrepreneur starting a software company is likely to not even make it at all or crash and burn from the beginning because of these costs.

One of the ways to help businesses create more jobs—and by the way, an independent estimate shows that over time, the savings that this health care bill will generate will create 4 million jobs in the United States—is to fix health care.

So I do say one thing. Our opponents do have a track record, because I hear their rhetoric. They say that well, the taxes that are required on families making more than a quarter million of dollars to help pay for this—by the way; it's about 55 percent spending cuts, 45 percent new revenues to pay for this—but that those taxes will have a catastrophic effect on job creation. We will hear that ceaselessly this weekend. And they're consistent, if nothing else.

I want to read you a statement that was made, as an echo, not about this plan, but another plan 17 years ago. Here's the quote. "It is a recipe for disaster. It is not a recipe for more jobs. Taxes will go up. The economy will sputter along. Dreams will be put off, and all this for the hollow promise of deficit reduction, of lower interest rates"

The plan was not this health care plan. It was the Clinton economic plan in 1993. The Speaker was former majority leader Dick Armey, one of the leading critics of this plan. He was wrong then, and he is wrong now.

Mr. GARAMENDI. What happened, if I recall in the 1990s after he said that, the Balanced Budget Act did pass. You were here. I think you were here at the time.

Mr. ANDREWS. I was, and I will confess I didn't vote for that plan, and I regret that vote. I think it was a mistake because I frankly didn't understand it as well as I should. It was a mistake on my part.

Mr. GARAMENDI. That is one of the wonderful things about life. You can come back and do it a second time.

In this case we're looking at a situation where in the Clinton balanced budget plan, it led to the longest sustained economic growth in America's history. And we created—I forget the number of jobs—

Mr. ANDREWS. Twenty-three million new jobs.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Twenty-three million jobs were created during that period of time.

Excuse me. Do you remember the statistics for the Bush, George W. Bush years?

Mr. ANDREWS. I do. For every private-sector job created during the George W. Bush years, during the Clinton years we created 140. Let me say that again. For every one private-sector job that the Bush administration with its policies created, 140 were created during the Clinton administration.

Now, the reason I make this point is that the same rhetoric that we're hearing this weekend, that these taxes which affect the top 3 or 4 percent of people in America, are going to have a catastrophic effect on jobs, this is an echo chamber.

One other quote I want to read you again about the 1993 plan: "This plan puts the economy in the gutter. If it was to work, then I would have to become a Democrat." The person who said that was former Representative John Kasich, a very dear friend of mine, budget chairman, who unfortunately—depending on how you look at it—is not a Democrat; he's still a Republican, even though it did not put the economy in the gutter; it created 23 million new jobs.

So we will hear this tired old refrain this weekend, but the facts dictate differently.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I want to take up another subject that you broached earlier in the conversation, and that is of seniors.

The senior population spent the good part of the summer being totally scared, frightened, purposely so, with a pack of incorrect, or shall I just call them lies. Death panels, Medicare is going to be cut, other things were put out there to scare seniors into opposing this. When in fact—and you went through some of this; I want you to drive this home—when in fact, this piece of legislation that we will vote on Sunday strengthens the Medicare program and provides significant benefits and increases.

So, please.

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank the gentleman again.

What does that plan mean for seniors? It means no cuts in benefits for any senior. It means an expansion of benefits to cover more prescription drugs as well as preventative care visits. It means that the life of the Medicare trust fund will be extended for 7 or 8 more years, and it emphatically does not mean that any senior, any disabled person, will ever be denied coverage because of their age or disability. It's not the truth.

Mr. GARAMENDI. And you cited the specific code sections, and you also cited the fact that this will reduce the deficit of America over the next 10 years by some \$300 billion.

Mr. ANDREWS. The parties do have a record on entitlement health care

spending. The erstwhile majority increased health care entitlements by \$800 billion in deficit spending. We're going to decrease it by \$1.2 trillion. That's a \$2 trillion difference between the rhetoric of the other side and the facts of this bill.

Mr. GARAMENDI. And that was the Medicare Part D.

Thank you very much, Mr. ANDREWS.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

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. It's my privilege to be recognized here on the floor and address you as we watch this Nation lurch forever forward toward their version of socialized medicine.

It's astonishing to me to think that the people on the other side of the aisle who have spoken in the previous hour could even stand and make the statement that we are going to put 30 million more people onto the insured rolls and somehow we're going to cut spending and reduce the deficit. How in the world could that be? We're going to ensure 30 million more people for less money than we ensure the people we have today? Are we going to go back to President Obama's mathematical logic that seemed to have gotten him elected into office when he and Hillary Clinton vied with each other on who had the best government-run health care plan? When President Obama said—and he said consistently and continually—We spend too much money on health care. We have to fix that.

He said as the President of the United States that we're in an economic downturn, an economic crisis, and we can't fix the crisis of our downward spiraling economy unless we first fix health care.

Mr. Speaker, do you remember that? The astonishing statement that the solution to our economic downward spiral is socialized medicine? That is what came out of our President's mouth.

So we have to first fix this health care. And what's wrong with health care? According to the President, we spend too much money. Now, I don't necessarily quibble with that particular statement. We spend too much money on health care. I just disagree on where that too much money goes.

But he argued that we spend too much on health care. We have to fix it in order to fix the economy. And what's his fix? All of the way through his political history up until the reality of being President of the United States was a single-payer plan. The Federal Government writes the check for everybody's health care in America. That's been the President's solution all along. It's clear. It's as clear as his statement eight times on national TV that there were going to be C-SPAN negotiations over health care.

But the President's logic was, and apparently remains, the economy is in a

crisis, the problem with the economy is health care, the only fix for health care is to turn it into socialized medicine because we spend too much money. And we've heard these gentlemen say, We're going to save money. We're going to save \$300 billion, and it's going to be trillions of dollars by giving 30 million more people a health insurance policy that is paid for by the taxpayers in America. Now, how can they do that?

First I need to dispatch this thing of President Obama's statement that we can fix the economy by fixing health care. I never agreed with that. I always believed that our economic problems were too much spending, too much irresponsibility, too many Federal guarantees. We had the implicit guarantee that the Federal Government would prop up these businesses that are, quote, "too big to be allowed to fail." Now "too big to fail." And so, that was implicit.

And those big businesses took great risks to grow against their other competition that was taking great risk, and the economy was on the verge of collapsing, and that is when we became deemed "too big to fail," and the Federal Government dropped in and bailed them out with our tax dollars. Treasury dollars that are just simply advanced, appropriations that were approved by this Congress in the form of \$700 billion dollars in TARP funding, \$787 billion in an economic stimulus plan—none of which the American people in anywhere near a majority believed actually worked.

□ 2130

So the free enterprise system was sacrificed off for the nationalization of the huge entities in our Federal Government. And the President continued to insist, even though he had the brilliant Tim Geithner there as the U.S. Secretary of the Treasury, too smart to be allowed not to be confirmed, to help bail out these businesses that are too big to be allowed to fail, and the only way we can fix all these economic problems is to first fix health care because we spend too much money on it. And so the President of the United States argues, well, here is a solution for everything: we will just spend a lot more money on health care in America.

In terms of numbers that we have seen from Senator JUDD GREGG, say that when you look at the 10 years after, the first full 10 years, \$2.5 trillion, the President has repeatedly made the breathtaking statement that we want to spend all of this extra money in the trillions of dollars on health care in order to fix the economy that we can't fix without, and the problem with spending too much money is solved with spending a lot more money.

That's the President's position. And any third grader can figure that out, Mr. Speaker. That position could not be sustained in a third grade logic class. I don't think they actually have logic classes in third grade, but it couldn't be sustained.

And so we went from this breath-taking position of spending a lot more money on health care to solve all the Nation's woes on down to, well, the problem really is that we don't have enough competition among insurance companies. So the President said, let's create a Federal health insurance company to compete against the privates, and that way we will have competition that it will drive done the costs. I don't think the President ever counted the private health insurance companies, 1,300 of them, 100,000 public health insurance varieties; and still the President wanted 1,301 health insurance companies and 100,000 and about a dozen health insurance policies. And that was going to solve all the problems, Mr. Speaker.

So we see that the massive, multi-trillion dollar Federal takeover of the management and of the approval of everybody's health insurance in America is based upon two flawed premises. I wonder what would happen if President Obama were sitting in the square in Athens and he had to sit between Socrates and Plato, and he would make the pitch we're going to solve the problem of spending too much money by spending a lot more, and we're going to solve the problem of not enough competition in 1,300 companies by adding one more company with 1,301. Those two fellows would have just eviscerated him with clearest logic of chopping his axiom down and tossing it off into the Aegean Sea.

But, instead, we are so polite in this country. We aren't willing to say that these premises don't even make the third grade level. And now here we are, a Nation that has seen its President use all the leverage possible to force the situation where we are, even though, even though it was all Speaker PELOSI could do to squeeze the votes to pass the first version of this bill. Even though she has 41 votes to burn when this happened, Speaker PELOSI didn't have any to burn when it was over.

It barely, barely passed the House. The Senate, they had no votes to spare, and on Christmas Eve that bitter pill was dropped into our stocking by HARRY REID and company over in the Senate. And most folks thought that this thing would become law, until SCOTT BROWN was elected to the United States Senate. And when that happened, it changed the whole dynamics, Mr. Speaker.

But here we are today, the President of the United States doesn't hear "no." He doesn't hear that the American people have stood up and screamed, no, don't spend any more money. You poured trillions in this economic stimulus plan and in the TARP funding, and what do we have to show for it? A declining economy and a growing unemployment and 15.4 million people on unemployment, a mismanaged economy with a government that has taken over three large investment banks, AIG, Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac, General Motors and Chrysler and given us a couple

of trillion dollars' worth of wild spending programs.

And the President had told us in a meeting a year ago February that Franklin Delano Roosevelt lost his nerve. He should have spent a lot more money. If FDR had spent a lot more money in the late thirties, then this Keynesian economy would have turned around, and it would have recovered before World War II came along.

That was an experiment that is called the Great Depression. And the New Deal failed throughout the thirties. And the stock market that crashed in October of 1929, even though we had World War II, even though we had the Korean war, did not recover to the place where it was in October of 1929 until Franklin Delano Roosevelt had been passed away for 9 years. 1954 is when the Dow Jones Industrial Average caught up to where it was in 1929.

And this President doesn't learn this lesson from history. If you borrow money, if you raise taxes, if you spend that money with government, you're competing against the private sector. And, necessarily, if government spends money, they can't spend money unless they first take it from somebody else; and when they take it from somebody else, they are borrowing the investment capital away. They are taking it away. They are taxing investment capital. There would be a whole row of entrepreneurs out here, Mr. Speaker, that maybe have a little capital, and they have a way to borrow some money, and they have an idea about expanding an existing business or creating a new one, businesses hire people and they create careers and jobs.

The Federal Government raises taxes and dips into the capital base and raises the cost of that capital because of the higher taxes, and that diminishes the jobs in the private sector. It might create new government jobs in the public sector, but it diminishes them in the private sector.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I cannot be convinced that our President of the United States, he may understand, but I can't be convinced that he believes that there is a difference in this economy between government employment and private sector employment.

The private sector is the sector that creates the wealth. The government is the burden on the wealth creators. If you have a career, if you're an entrepreneur, if you have a business, and if you employ people, and the Federal Government raises taxes and raises the cost of the capital, it takes away your ability to generate more revenue for expanding more careers and jobs or for paying taxes. And eventually if the Federal Government swallows up all sectors of the economy just to macro this and fast forward it to where I think even the people on this side of the aisle could understand, if the government runs everything, there is nothing left to tax except government. That's where this country is going.

I have looked on the Progressives' Web site. They are linked in with the

Democratic Socialists of America. Their Web site used to be managed by the same people. It says on there they want to nationalize the Fortune 500 companies. They want to take them over. They want to nationalize the oil refineries business. That was offered by MAURICE HINCHEY of New York. They want to nationalize the energy industry in America. That was offered by MAXINE WATERS of California. They are both members of the Progressive Caucus. The Progressive Caucus is the progressive arm of the socialists. They want to nationalize our economy and take it over. If the Government takes over the Fortune 500 companies, where they have already taken over one-third of the private sector profits, if they do that, they will have killed the goose that lays the golden egg, and there won't be any tax revenue then that comes into the Federal Government because the Government will be the entity that has to tax itself. And I know how that works. I have been to Cuba. I know how that functions down there, Mr. Speaker.

So we have a couple of flawed premises here. We spend too much on health care, the solution is to spend a lot more, and we don't have enough competition in health insurance companies, so one more, the Federal Government, competing against them solves the problem. I could not have advanced either one of those ideas and gotten them past first base. But that's where we are, Mr. Speaker.

And so it comes before us this weekend, this nationalization of our health care, the Federal management of our health care that has been debated since last July or so, that has filled the town hall meetings in the United States with hundreds of thousands of people and their cumulative total and every State in the Union that I'm aware of. They certainly filled them up in Iowa, they filled them up in Texas, and they filled them up in Minnesota and everywhere else. And the American people came to reject the idea that the Federal Government can take over our health care.

Now, some will argue that this isn't a nationalization of our health care. And I will submit in response to that, how far do you need to go before you concede that it's nationalized? If you set up a health choices administration commissioner who has the power and the authority vested in him by the legislation to approve every health insurance company in America, every health insurance policy in America, that is a nationalization.

It doesn't matter if the Federal Government is just managing the private companies. They will tell the private companies how they have to operate. Hugo Chavez tells companies how they have to operate in Venezuela. It doesn't mean they aren't nationalized. He will come in and say, you're going to give me so much of a cut out of your gross receipts, and you will meet all these standards. This is what you will

do to manage help; this is how it will look as far as the facade in front of your building. They dictate right down to the minutiae of what you have to do if you want to do business in Venezuela. Hugo Chavez dictates that. We call it "nationalize." If the Federal Government dictates these things, we say, what, no, that is just private? No.

I would make the argument that our military takes care of our national security, and sometimes they will hire private contractors. The left was critical of Blackwater; and they would like to, and some suggest did, reduce Blackwater's involvement overseas in places like Iraq. But if the Federal Government writes the check to Blackwater and says take care of the security for, let's just say, for the airport in the Baghdad, is there a difference between whether they are nationalized, whether it's people in uniform wearing military uniforms or people wearing paramilitary uniforms, if all the shots are called by the Federal Government? I don't think so, Mr. Speaker.

So what we're seeing here is the nationalization of our health care, the Federal Government dictating everything about our health insurance policies. The Federal Government would decide, in fact, they would cancel every health insurance policy in America over a period of time, 2 to 4 years, by the time they rotated through the Federal Government, would cancel every health insurance policy in America. And then if those policies didn't meet the new guidelines yet to be written into the rules and approved by the health choice administration commissioner, then what we have would be a Federal Government that would say, all right, your company hasn't met the guidelines and your policies haven't met our guidelines, therefore you're not doing business in the United States. That's just a fact, Mr. Speaker.

And so that is the nationalization of our health care. They want to tax you if you don't buy diet pop. They want to tax your medical devices, your hearing aids, your wheelchairs, your oxygen. And that's in order to fund this. So the people on this side of the aisle that spoke in the previous hour that have argued that they are actually going to save \$300 billion over a period of 10 years because they—do you know how long they have been massaging these numbers and they send something back to CBO, the Congressional Budget Office and go back and forth, in secret, by the way, until they get some numbers that they think they can defend as the clock ticks down?

Well, now they are at maybe \$300 billion in savings. But what they're not telling you it is a massive increase in taxes to raise revenue. The first 4 years of this bill produces revenue before the costs actually kick in. It is a half a trillion dollar cut out of Medicare reimbursements so that we are starving the health care services of our seniors in America.

That's just two of the ways that they manipulate these numbers. And that is where JUDD GREGG comes in and makes the argument that if you calculate the first full 10 years of this bill, it's \$2.5 trillion; and of course that's not considering the things that they would offer for reconciliation.

I would also make the point, Mr. Speaker, that this House doesn't have the will to pass the Senate bill. The Senate version of the bill can't pass the Senate today. They all know that. That's a given. They're not taking the bill back over there. It passed this Congress. The Senate version of the bill passed on Christmas Eve, Christmas Eve morning, to be charitable. HARRY REID's lump of coal in the stocking for America was this Senate socialized medicine bill that barely had enough votes to pass. It had none to spare.

And SCOTT BROWN was subsequently elected as the United States Senator from the improbable place of Massachusetts. And today, the Senate version of the bill can't pass the Senate. They couldn't bring that bill back there to pass it because maybe the Senators over there don't have buyer's remorse, but the people in Massachusetts had buyer's remorse. And they've reversed their position, and millions of Americans have reversed their position. They have done so because they've seen this spending that is out of control, and they don't want someone to take over their health care, so they reversed their position.

There are a lot that have buyer's remorse from the Presidential election in November of 2008. A lot of them would like to have a do-over, and they are not going to get one. But they have buyer's remorse. And so when you add the coalitions of people that are opposed to this national health care act, this socialized medicine, it becomes Americans with buyer's remorse that regret that they put the votes up that they did for "hope and change," and I put that nicely in quotes, votes for hope and change, they put it up, they had more hope, and we got a different kind of change than they thought they were going to get. But now they regret putting that vote up. That's the buyer's remorse crowd.

And then you have the newly energized Americans that are across the vast middle of America. They started out with 9/12 project, people that came out here by the hundreds of thousands on the 12th of September, and patriots of a number of different categories including TEA party patriots that lit up this country. And on April 15, they had rallies across this country. I joined in some of them. Then they filled up the town hall meetings across this country and began to also come to this Capitol to petition for redress of grievances, as the Constitution says, in a constitutional fashion.

□ 2145

They did so November 5, November 7. They did so again in December on the

Senate side. They came back again a few days ago, and they are going to be here tomorrow starting in the morning with the central event at noon on the west of the Capitol, and it will have thousands of Americans here that say: Keep your fingers off of my health care. I want to preserve my liberty. I want to preserve my freedom, and I want to preserve fiscal sanity in the United States of America.

I see that my friend and colleague, my neighbor to the north, has joined us here on the floor this evening, and I would be so happy to yield such time as she may consume to MICHELE BACHMANN.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I thank you to the gentleman from Iowa. He has done a wonderful job explaining the context of the health care debate that we are in today. We also have a neighbor to the south joining us as well, LOUIE GOHMERT from Texas, and he has a lot that he wants to add to this debate.

I just wanted to focus for context purposes, to begin with, on what the President has demonstrated thus far that his understanding of economics has been when he had been in the United States Senate. He was an advocate for the \$700 billion bailout of the banks and the financial meltdown. All through the 1990s and then in the early 2000s, there were continual bailouts that occurred. This was nothing new. This is yet one more bailout. They didn't work before.

What they did is they laid the groundwork, the moral hazard, if you will, for the same players, the same investment banking houses on Wall Street to make very bad bets because they knew the chump would be Uncle Sam. Uncle Sam would come along and pick up the pieces if they made mistakes.

What did they care. They rolled the dice. They took the risk. They risked their investors' money. And, when the deals went south, they came crawling back to Uncle Sam here in D.C., and Uncle Sam said, Sure, I will bail you out. That history was available for everyone to see.

Then-Senator Barack Obama should have known about those deals. After all, he served as a lawyer for Project Vote, Project Vote being an affiliate for ACORN, and ACORN was the organization pushing for all the relaxed lending standards that led to all of the toxic mortgages with the subprime loans that led to the mortgage-backed securities that were bad, that were starting to fail. And he was also a part of that effort suing, suing and threatening to sue so that banks and financial companies would relax their standards and make loans to people with no income, no assets, no jobs. The President had that in his background.

After that, he decided when he became President to deal with the financial crisis. Rather than tightening up those lending standards, he wanted to spend \$1 trillion. And he came here and he told all of us in the United States

Congress we had to spend \$1 trillion, because if we wouldn't, unemployment could go as high as 9 percent or 8 percent. I think he said it could go as high as 8 percent.

Mr. KING of Iowa. 8.5 is the number I remember.

Mrs. BACHMANN. 8.5 percent, it could go that high. So that is what the \$1 trillion was supposed to do.

The \$1 trillion was allocated. We saw unemployment soar above 8 percent, soar above 8.5, and now Americans are sitting at about a permanent level of near 10 percent. The White House came out and said, Get used to it. This is our new normal. We are looking at these elevated levels of high unemployment.

Well, America isn't used to this, Mr. Speaker. American people don't want to be used to these elevated levels of unemployment. They actually like to work, and they actually like high prosperity.

Also, when President Obama was a Senator, he wanted to devote our entire U.S. budget—he wanted to devote 1 percent or 1.5 percent of our U.S. budget to redistribute wealth to the rest of the world. Knowing that our country was already trillions of dollars in debt, his goal was to have us, every year, devote at least 1 percent of the U.S. budget to redistribute the wealth. We should have known where President Obama was going with this. We can't say that we weren't warned.

Next, the President offered cap-and-tax or cap-and-trade. That is the government takeover of the energy industry. In other words, the government would take control of 8 percent of the private economy.

After that, he was proposing amnesty for illegal aliens, saying that that was something he wanted to do, but the people were pushing back.

So what did we see happen? We saw 30 percent of the private economy taken over by the Federal Government. In fact, Senator Obama wasn't even sworn in yet as President of the United States, and he was already pushing President Bush, You have to give me \$17 billion, \$19 billion for the automobile task force, because, guess what, GM and Chrysler, they might go bankrupt if we don't get \$17 billion to \$19 billion. We have got to prop these businesses up, or they are going to go bankrupt.

President Bush, he was going out the door, President Obama was going in, so he gave that money to President Obama to create the automobile task force.

What did we get out of that deal? We got Chrysler bankrupt. We saw the bondholders shafted, losing their equity interest. We saw the UAW come in and scoop up a big share of that company so that they got their retirement plans and their health insurance plans, not fully, but funded at the expense of the bondholders, and the United States Government now is a shareholder. The same with GM. It is Government Motors. We all know that story.

And we also know the other thing the automobile task force did. They put 150,000 people out of work, with what? Pink slips to 3,400 mostly viable dealerships across the Nation.

This is the level of economics that we were treated to just in the very first months of the Obama administration.

After all of that groundwork was laid, after banks were taken over, AIG, the largest insurance company, Freddie and Fannie, the secondary mortgage market, which today the Federal Government owns over 50 percent of all of America's mortgages. That, the student loan industry, Chrysler, GM, 30 percent.

What did President Obama propose? Not to lower costs in health care, as my colleague STEVE KING has suggested, by allowing people to buy across State lines. No. His suggestion was let's have the Federal Government take over 18 percent more of the private economy and put it under government's control. That is the solution.

And so here we are, on a Friday night. America has spoken. Three out of four Americans have weighed in and said, We don't want any part of the Federal Government taking over our private health care system. We don't want it.

The doctors have said that. Investors Business Daily, 45 percent of all doctors surveyed said they would leave the profession if the government takes over health care. New England Journal of Medicine this week, 35 percent of all doctors surveyed, We will leave the medical profession.

But no, no, no. What does Speaker PELOSI want to do? What does President Obama want to do? Ram this bill through. Pass it, without even the courtesy of the Members of this body voting for the bill.

My name, MICHELE BACHMANN, will not be listed in the journal with a "yes" or a "no." Why? Because Speaker PELOSI, Mr. Speaker, wants to presume my vote. When she presumes my vote, Mr. Speaker, she has stripped the people of my district from their voice, because the people of my district made a choice, sent me here to vote on their behalf. And, Mr. Speaker, I will tell you with complete confidence, the overwhelming number of people in Minnesota's Sixth Congressional District want nothing to do with this government takeover of health care. They want nothing to do with it, because the more they have heard, the more fearful they become.

So let's call it for what it is, Mr. Speaker. This is pretty clear. This administration and this Congress wants to have the Federal Government take over private industry, because if they win on Sunday, the American people lose. If they win, they will have taken over, effectively, one half of the American economy from September of 2008 until March 20, 2010. We are talking less than 2 years, something like 18 months time. This is stunning. This is a coup, if you will, an economic coup of

our free market system, half of it being taken over.

Mr. Speaker, someone came in, it almost feels like, in the middle of the night and has stolen away America's future and America's promise. That is why we are here tonight. There is no exit strategy out of this.

And then we learned that the IRS will be the enforcement agency for this new health care system. It will be up to the IRS to verify, on a monthly basis, that 300 million Americans have purchased insurance that is acceptable, not to the Americans, acceptable to government. Because every American, Mr. Speaker, all 300 million Americans are forced to purchase a product or a service that they may not want. But government wants them to have it, so they are forced to buy it.

So who is the enforcer? Well, it is the IRS. Doesn't that make everyone feel great? About 16,500 new IRS employees are about to be employed at a cost of \$10 billion, because they have got to breathe down the neck of every American every month to make sure that they have applied with government-approved health insurance. And, in order to do that, they have got to pry into private business. They have got to go into the books of every private business every month, find out how many employees that private business has, what the wages are that business is paying. All that information with the IRS, that is confidential taxpayer information, and now they will be sharing that with the Department of Health and Human Services.

And if the IRS, Mr. Speaker, discovers that an American has failed to purchase government-approved insurance, well, then that American is subject to a fine of \$2,250 or 2 percent of their income. The same with the businesses. The businesses also will be subject to fines, penalties, interest.

I don't remember, Mr. Speaker, on the President's team and the Cabinet, all of the people that had tax problems who weren't paying taxes who repaid their taxes, I don't recall too many of them paying taxes, penalties, and interest. They just paid their tax liability.

But that is not good for the American people. They don't get that sweetheart deal. No, no, no, Mr. Speaker. The American people and American private industry, they are paying the interest and the penalties and the taxes.

The IRS, Mr. Speaker, in this scenario, has now become the collection agency for the insurance companies. President Obama has been saying the Republicans are sold out to the insurance companies. Well, Mr. Speaker, now we know the truth. Behind those closed doors, President Obama struck a deal with these insurance companies so that every American is mandated to buy their product, and now the IRS is the collection agency and will be the enforcer and will send about one-half trillion dollars to the insurance companies.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Will the gentlelady read from the poster?

Mrs. BACHMANN. And the poster says, as my colleague STEVE KING is pointing, "Why does the Democrat bill subsidize health insurance companies?"

Here is the strong arm of the IRS shaking money out of the average American taxpayer and sending that money straight in to the insurance companies, which, by the way, we know will be collapsing, because ultimately that was the purpose. One of our colleagues in this body even said as much himself. He said this is a temporary step, because what they want is government to own it all.

Let's realize, Mr. Speaker, who are the hogs in this situation? Who are the pigs here? Who wants to soak up the people's money? It is the same culprit, Mr. Speaker. It is those who embrace Big Government. The big winner in the stimulus, the big winner in the TARP, the big winner in every bailout we have ever had, and the big winner in this health care bill is Big Government.

And, as my colleague shows, the loser in all of this is the forgotten man of the American taxpayer, the American worker, the American boy and girl who may not grow up to realize their American Dream of a better life than their parents. The biggest loser again, Mr. Speaker, is the forgotten man of the senior citizen who will have to potentially go without with their Medicare funding.

Well, not if we have anything to say about it, Mr. Speaker. Not if we have another breath in our body will this happen.

And so we are here. We are here, because this is all we can do, to fight until our last breath to make sure that this monstrosity does not make it over the finish line.

□ 2200

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, I thank the gentlelady from Minnesota for this presentation tonight and for many more that have gone in the past and more that are in front of us before such time as we can put this monstrosity deep into a hole where it belongs for at least another generation. That's what happened when HillaryCare was brought forward, almost a generation ago, and that's what needs to happen here this weekend, Mr. Speaker.

I recognize that my friend from Texas is here—from east Texas. An Aggie from Texas. He will make it clear to us if we don't make it clear, anyhow. Judge GOHMERT from Texas, who has more to say about this health care monstrosity and this government takeover, I'd be happy to yield so much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. I thank you and I appreciate the insightful words from the gentleman from Iowa, the gentlelady from Minnesota. One of our friends commented earlier tonight that America is a Nation of entrepreneurs. Thank

God, it used to be. Thank God, it could be again. But with the oppressiveness that the Federal Government has put on entrepreneurs and people who would do well and start businesses, they are making it next to impossible, because an entrepreneur needs capital. Normally, they have to borrow capital. This Federal Government is sucking the capital out of the country and not leaving anything for entrepreneurs to borrow capital. So I hear people every day I'm back in the district saying, I can't get loans like I need to keep my business going. I sure can't add anybody on—not that I could right now. I'm hearing over and over they're just trying to hang on, hoping the health care gets defeated, the cap-and-trade bill gets defeated.

You look at what is being done, just the atrociousness of the things that are in these bills. You look at what this bill effectively does. This monstrosity here, this is the Senate bill. It's not the House bill. And when you base a bill starting with a lie, that's not a good place to start. But on the front page of this Senate bill it starts with a lie. The Constitution, heaven forbid that anybody should refer back to it, the Constitution indicates that all revenue-generating bills must begin in the House. Well, the Senate didn't like the House bill. So they knew there was too much they wanted to do different in their bill.

So what they did, they took—and it's on the front of the Senate bill. As it says: In the Senate of the United States, December 24, 2009, as they did it on Christmas Eve. What a sad thing to do on Christmas Eve. Resolved, that the bill from the House of Representatives, H.R. 3590, entitled: An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the first-time homebuyers credit in the case of members of the Armed Forces and certain other Federal employees and for such other purposes, do pass with the following amendments. That's how this starts. That's how this atrocious health care bill that usurps, sucks the capital out of the country, it sucks the authority out of the States, it mandates oppressiveness upon people who would be entrepreneurs. And it starts with a lie. And now we're told we're going to have a rule.

Normally, a rule, anyone can ask—well, if no one objects, then we do not read the bill. But if there's any objection, then they have to read the entire bill. The rule, as I understand it, deems that there can be no reading of the bill; that it's already been read. It is deeming that the bill has been read. Not only that, once the procedural rule of how many minutes for debate and those kind of things is passed, then the bill—they will be deeming the bill passed. It's atrocious.

But I looked at this quote that I carry with me most of the time. I have a number of quotes that I carry in my suit pocket. And this one is from George Washington, when he said, Gov-

ernment is not reason. It is not eloquence. It is force. Like fire, it is a dangerous servant and a fearful master.

And so as we have looked at this, and I know my friends from Iowa and Minnesota remember President Obama going to the Caterpillar headquarters. Caterpillar is the world's largest construction machinery manufacturer—the world's largest construction machinery manufacturer. And it's in the news today that Caterpillar has sent a letter to the President, Speaker PELOSI, and other leaders, urging lawmakers to vote against the plan "because of the substantial cost burdens it would place on our shareholders, employees, and retirees."

The article here, this is from Chicago Breaking Business. Boy, is that true, Chicago Breaking Business, and business is about to be broke here. This is a quote from the letter, We can ill afford cost increases that places us at a disadvantage versus our global competitors. It says, We are disappointed that efforts at reform have not addressed the cost concerns we have raised throughout the year. The Peoria-based company said these provisions would increase its insurance costs by at least 20 percent or more than a \$100 million dollars just in the first year.

This is just incredible the Federal Government would do this to our largest manufacturer of construction equipment. I mean they have done so much to drive our businesses overseas. "Bye-bye jobs." This is another reason economists have told us that if this bill passes, signed into law on Sunday, 5 million jobs will be gone.

The article notes that the company supports efforts to increase the quality and value of health care, but unfortunately, neither the current legislation in the House or Senate nor the President's proposal meets these goals. It's going to bankrupt this company. They're going to have to go overseas. All these wonderful American workers that are doing such a great job will see their jobs go overseas.

And it brought me back to what my friends know, and I know my friend from Iowa and I have spent a great deal of time going back through the original Declaration of Independence. And if I could, just briefly, I would like to touch on a few things in that and see if instead of King George III, if this doesn't fit what the Federal Government is doing to the States and the people. And keep in mind the Ninth Amendment says, The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people. They did not intend for the Federal Government to have all this power. They knew that most power would be retained by the people. And the 10th Amendment says, The powers not delegated, specifically delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor

prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

With that in mind, remember the Declaration of Independence says governments are instituted among men deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. They point out that the history of the present King of Great Britain—in our case, the Federal Government—is a history of repeated injuries and usurpations. We see them every day in this body, usurpations of the States and the people's rights. But the Declaration says, All having in direct object the establishment of absolute tyranny over the States. To prove this, let facts be submitted to a candid world. And one of the things it said is about the King—think about our Federal Government: He has forbidden his governors to pass laws of immediate and pressing importance unless suspended in their operation until his assent should be obtained. And when so suspended, he has utterly neglected to attend to them.

We have heard from nearly 40 States who say, You can't do this to us. You're usurping the powers reserved under the Constitution to the States and the people. You're taking those away. We're ready to file a lawsuit as soon as you pass this unholy bill come Sunday. Sunday, the Lord's day, we're going to pass an unholy bill like this, when the vast majority of the States, over two-thirds of the States, are saying this is wrong. You're usurping our power. You can't do this. It's what they said in the Declaration. Goodness. And the Declaration goes on, He has erected a multitude of new offices and sent hither swarms of officers to harass our people and eat out their substance. Well, how about that? A new article today that happened to be in the paper talking about just that very thing. Isn't it interesting?

This is in the news today—yesterday, I'm sorry—from the Hill. It says, Assuming this bill becomes law, the Congressional Budget Office expects the IRS will need around \$10 billion over the next 10 years and nearly 17,000 new employees to meet its new responsibilities under health reform or, as the Declaration of Independence called it, to harass our people and eat out of their substance. They're going to take tax dollars in order to create 17,000 new IRS agents to go out and harass the people and eat out of their substance.

The Declaration goes on: He has combined with others to subject us to jurisdiction foreign to our Constitution and unacknowledged by our laws, given his assent to their acts of portended legislation. We see that in things that this White House is proposing; that we're going to give Interpol, a foreign intelligence group, the same rights our own intelligence people have in this country. And another point. We're suspending our own legislatures and declaring themselves invested with power to legislate for us in all cases whatsoever.

It goes on: In every stage of these oppressions we have petitioned for redress in the most humble terms. Our repeated petitions have been answered by repeated injury. A prince whose character is thus marked by every act which may define a tyrant is unfit to be the ruler of free people. We have appealed to their native justice and magnanimity, and we have conjured them by the ties of our common kindred to disavow these usurpations which would inevitably interrupt our connections and correspondence. They, too, have been deaf to the voice of justice and consanguinity. For support of this Declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of divine providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor.

Man, the power in there. The power in that. And out from that, John Adams wrote this letter to Abigail. On July 4th he wrote her, and he said at the end, You will think me transported with enthusiasm, but I'm not. I'm well aware of the toil and blood and treasure that it will cost us to maintain this Declaration and to support and defend these States, yet through all the gloom I can see the rays of ravishing light and glory. I can see that the end is more than worth all the means, and that posterity will triumph in that day's transaction, which I trust in God.

□ 2215

Anyway, these are powerful things, and these are on our shoulders to protect the States and the people's rights and not to continue to usurp what was so graciously entrusted to us and to make sure the States had us protected. I thank my friend, and I yield back.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time from the gentleman from Texas, I appreciate the work that he puts into this and the research that gets done and the memory that it taps into. We reviewed this Declaration of Independence not that long ago, and we established—the three of us, actually, very intensively working on it along with a few others—the declaration of health care independence and produced a document that reflects many of the same values that are in the Declaration of Independence. And it lays out the rules of the road for going forward, a very reasonable thing to do. It anchored that philosophy of the declaration of health care independence, which I imagine is on all of our Web sites, Mr. Speaker, into these values into the declaration itself.

I listened to this discussion, and what I get out of this is one thing: this national health care bill doesn't play in Peoria. I mean, Peoria where the national headquarters of Caterpillar are. The world's largest heavy equipment manufacturer has written a letter that says that their shareholders, their employees, and their retirees will be disadvantaged by this, that there will be a 20 percent increase in their premium costs, and the first year would cost them \$100 million.

And over the course of this bill where this Congress sets up the cost estimates and the budget in a 10-year period of time, that's \$1 billion. It's a \$1 billion tax on a great American corporation, Caterpillar, based out of Peoria, Illinois, which has been viewed to be the center of America. If it doesn't play in Peoria, it doesn't play for America. Well, this bill doesn't play in Peoria, Mr. Speaker.

Then one of the other components of this is the unconstitutionality of the legislation. We're virtually guaranteed that if a bill passes here Sunday or any other day, that there immediately will be lawsuits that will be filed as soon as it becomes law, if it should become law. And I believe that the President is sitting at the White House now, looking for a chance to sign something. But there would immediately be lawsuits because of the unconstitutionality of the bill. Congressman GOHMERT's talked at length about the violation of the Ninth Amendment of the Constitution. And remember, the powers that are not vested in the Federal Government are reserved for the States or the people, respectively.

There is no one that can point to the authority in the Constitution that would grant this Congress the authority to compel an American citizen to buy a product that's produced or approved by the Federal Government, every American for the very privilege of being an American, being compelled to buy a product that the Federal Government has designed and approved. That would be the first in the history of America. The Congressional Budget Office wrote about this back in 1994 when HillaryCare was preparing to do the same thing.

Here's the conundrum, Mr. Speaker. First they want to establish socialized medicine, so there is a long hard leftward push on this. But in order to solve the problem of preexisting conditions—people that can't buy insurance that can sick, and we have solutions for that that I'll not go into tonight because of the interest of time—they would argue that they will compel every insurance company to sell insurance policies to applicants without regard for their preexisting conditions. So someone could have a very expensive and serious cancer, have not ever had any health insurance, and walk into the health insurance company and say, Sell me insurance now. I have got a diagnosis that says it is going to cost me a few hundred thousand dollars. People won't buy insurance until they're sick if you prohibit insurance companies from considering preexisting conditions. That's just a fact.

So the way they solve that problem of people refusing to buy insurance if you're going to compel insurance companies to issue is they compel every American to own a health insurance policy, and that's where we get into trouble. That's where the unconstitutionality of this comes up. That's

why there's no precedent for the Federal Government producing or approving a product that requires every American to buy it. And as Mrs. BACHMANN said so clearly, put the IRS in charge of doing the enforcement, and the IRS in charge of doing the collection, the IRS in charge of collecting the insurance premiums for the insurance companies and transferring that into the insurance companies—that's what will be going on with the Federal Government.

So it's unconstitutional on two other grounds I can think of. And one of them would be a violation of the equal protection clause. The equal protection clause means that because we have people in different States that would be affected differently by it, if you live in Nebraska, you've got a different benefit than if you live in Iowa or Minnesota or Texas. And because of the Cornhusker kickback—and yes, they say they're going to fix that. It's in the bill. If anybody votes for a rule that deems the bill passed, they voted for Cornhusker kickbacks, they voted for the Louisiana purchase, they voted for the Florida Gator aid bill that exempts the senior citizens in Florida from the cuts in Medicare Advantage that will be brought against the senior citizens in Iowa and in the other States.

And it sends money by backroom deals into clinics across this country at the insistence of BERNIE SANDERS, a self-evolved socialist from Vermont. Self-evolved. I didn't lay that label on him. He lays it on himself. So that's another place where it's unconstitutional, Mr. Speaker.

And another way is a violation of the commerce clause. There are people that don't do business with health insurance companies. The Federal Government does not have the authority under the commerce clause to impose a health insurance policy on somebody that's not engaged in interstate commerce. And that could be a person that's born, doesn't do health care, and dies within a State, that doesn't cross State lines. There's no way you can argue they were involved in interstate commerce. So this massive stretch, it is unconstitutional.

It does fund abortions, and it funds abortions in a number of ways. Congressman GOHMERT has laid that out pretty clearly. Even though the Speaker has publicly said it doesn't fund abortion, it does. And when you look at Congressman GOHMERT's argument and you track the legal language, you have to understand it starts out about \$700 million a year for that subject and grows to about \$1.5 billion a year. It's in the categories of the authorizations within the bill itself. And then it also funds abortions through the Federal health insurance exchange that just says that there has to be a policy offered that doesn't cover them that someone could buy.

A policy doesn't have to be something that meets their other needs. It would just be something to assuage the

conscience of a single taxpayer. The other part of this could be a whole series of health insurance policies that do fund abortions under the Senate language.

So when the President says he won't sign a bill that does fund abortion, that's just simply not true. And the liberals have been making the argument ever since 1973—ever since *Roe v. Wade* was decided by the Supreme Court and *Doe v. Bolton*, both on abortion issues—they have argued that the Federal Government has no business telling a woman what she can or can't do with her body, two generations of arguments saying that over and over again. The Federal Government has no business telling a woman what she can or can't do with her body. They argue about whose body it is, but that's been their argument, their statement since 1973.

And now the same people, this side of the aisle, the liberals, the progressives, the Democrats in Congress are now arguing that the Federal Government has every business to tell everybody in America what they can or can't do with their bodies. That undermines their argument that they call pro-choice or else their pro-choice argument undermines their argument that we ought to have nationalized socialized medicine. They can't have that one both ways, Mr. Speaker. They have got to settle on one side or the other. I think they're both untenable arguments myself.

Then the bill also funds illegals, and the President has said that he won't sign a bill that funds illegals. And the Speaker has said it doesn't fund illegals. I will tell you that I have been through this policy for 7-plus years. I know this policy. Two and a half years ago under the rewrite of SCHIP, the children's health insurance legislation, they changed the language for proof of citizenship to qualify for Medicaid. Prior to that, it required that an applicant would produce a birth certificate and a couple of supporting documents to show that they were an American citizen or their naturalization papers and supporting documents.

They lowered the standard to only require that an individual simply attest to a nine-digit Social Security number. Just attesting to a nine-digit Social Security number means that you don't have to speak English, you don't have to have anything except be able to write down nine numbers. Nobody checks it; they just qualify for the benefit. That's the case with Medicaid, and the Congressional Budget Office put out those numbers on those additional costs there. And here the Congressional Budget Office has now, through their calculations, shown that under the Senate version of the bill—the reason is because they lower the standard of proof. Even though it says, We're not going to fund illegals in the bill, they lower the standards of proof. CBO's numbers then—their calculations produce this number—6.1 illegals

could qualify for taxpayer-funded health insurance benefits under the Senate version of the bill.

So we have a bill that's designed to expand the dependency class in America in order to expand the political class on the left side of the aisle that funds abortions against the will of the American people and violates any principle we have here that American people of principles should not be compelled to fund abortions. And it also funds illegals.

While expanding the dependency class, we have 38 States that have initiated legislation that has already been signed into law in Idaho by Governor Butch Otter, compelling his State attorney general to file a lawsuit in Federal court because of the unconstitutionality of this bill. They're already set up. The idea of facing almost 17,000 IRS agents to eat out our substance, to sit in our kitchens and go into our offices and look through our books and look through our health insurance policies to determine and verify if it's the proper policy, that's approved by Uncle Sam.

Mr. Speaker, we need to kill this bill this weekend and have this rally at noon tomorrow. We'll have it on the west side of the Capitol.

I yield back.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

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, I thank my three colleagues who were here for the last hour doing yeoman's work on explaining why this so-called health care reform bill is bad, why it's unconstitutional, why it does not deserve to be passed. I want to especially thank my colleague from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for reminding us of the words in the Declaration of Independence and John Adams' letter to Abigail Adams.

What we're doing here is really pitiful compared to what the Founders did and all those who have sacrificed to keep this country free. This country is really a miracle. Never before in the history of the world were there people who believed that they had the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. We were a totally revolutionary people. It was a totally radical idea, and it is our job now to keep that miracle going. The founding of this country was truly a miracle and I think ordained by God.

From the beginning of this country, it has been average people who have kept us free: those who fought in the Revolutionary War, those who have fought in every war since, those who gave their lives and who gave their time, who were wounded, who came back wounded and maimed from those wars in other countries because they know that the price of freedom is dear. The price of freedom for us is not threatening our lives currently, but it

could in the future. It could threaten the lives of other people, and that's why we have to continue to resist the passage of this horrible bill.

As Leader BOEHNER has said, Republicans can't defeat this bill alone, but the American people can. So we need you tonight to continue to call your Member of Congress and to say, We do not want you to vote for this bill. We want you to live up to your oath to the Constitution and be reminded that the 10th Amendment says, The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution nor prohibited by it to the States are reserved to the States respectively or to the people.

We also want you to ask Congresswoman SLAUGHTER, Why did you say in an op-ed on CNN on December 23 that the Senate bill was not worthy of our support, and yet you find the sleight of hand to do everything you can to get the bill passed?

And, Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert into the RECORD the op-ed written by my colleague Ms. SLAUGHTER.

[From CNN, Dec. 23, 2009]

A DEMOCRAT'S VIEW FROM THE HOUSE:
SENATE BILL ISN'T HEALTH REFORM
(By Louise M. Slaughter)

Story Highlights: Senate bill isn't worthy of being called health reform, says Rep. Louise Slaughter (D-New York); Slaughter, who heads Rules Committee, says lack of public option is a fatal flaw; She says Senate bill would not stir competition among big insurance firms; Slaughter: Senate needs to go back and start over on health care.

Editor's note: Rep. Louise M. Slaughter, a Democrat, represents the 28th Congressional District of New York. Slaughter is the first woman to chair the House Rules Committee and the only microbiologist in Congress.

WASHINGTON (CNN).—The Senate health care bill is not worthy of the historic vote that the House took a month ago.

Even though the House version is far from perfect, it at least represents a step toward our goal of giving 36 million Americans decent health coverage.

But under the Senate plan, millions of Americans will be forced into private insurance company plans, which will be subsidized by taxpayers. That alternative will do almost nothing to reform health care but will be a windfall for insurance companies. Is it any surprise that stock prices for some of those insurers are up recently?

I do not want to subsidize the private insurance market; the whole point of creating a government option is to bring prices down. Insisting on a government mandate to have insurance without a better alternative to the status quo is not true reform.

By eliminating the public option, the government program that could spark competition within the health insurance industry, the Senate has ended up with a bill that isn't worthy of its support.

The public option is the part of our reform effort that will lower costs, improve the delivery of health care services and force insurance companies to offer rates and services that are reasonable.

Although the art of legislating involves compromise, I believe the Senate went off the rails when it agreed with the Obama Administration to water down the reform bill and no longer include the public option.

But that's not the only thing wrong with the Senate's version of the health care bill.

Under that plan, insurance companies can punish older people, charging them much higher rates than the House bill would allow.

In the House, we fought hard to repeal McCarran-Ferguson, the antitrust exemption that insurance companies have enjoyed for years. We did that because we believed firmly that those Fortune 500 corporations should not enjoy special treatment.

Yet the Senate bill does not include that provision—despite assurances from some members that they will seek to add it. By ending that protection, we will be able to go after insurance companies with federal penalties for misleading advertising or dishonest business practices.

The House bill would cover 96 percent of legal residents, while the Senate covers 94 percent. Compared with the House bill, the Senate's bill makes it much easier for employers to avoid the responsibility of providing insurance for their workers.

And of course, the Senate bill did not remove the onerous choice language intended to appeal to anti-abortion forces.

Now don't get me wrong; the current House and Senate bills are a significant improvement over the status quo. Given the hard path to reform and the political realities of next year, there is a sizable group within Congress that wants to simply cut any deal that works and call it a success. Many previous efforts have failed, and the path to reform is littered with unsuccessful efforts championed by Franklin Delano Roosevelt, Harry Truman and Bill Clinton.

Supporters of the weak Senate bill say "just pass it—any bill is better than no bill."

I strongly disagree—a conference report is unlikely to sufficiently bridge the gap between these two very different bills.

It's time that we draw the line on this weak bill and ask the Senate to go back to the drawing board, The American people deserve at least that.

We've had so many things said about this bill that have been misrepresented. We're told that we're the ones who misrepresented. But I want to say that President Obama has said over and over again, If you like your plan, you won't have to give it up. You can still keep it. But at our Republican retreat, President Obama was quoted as saying, "For example, we said from the start that it was going to be important for us to be consistent in saying to people if you have your—if you want to keep the health insurance you got, you can keep it, that you're not going to have to have anybody getting in between you and your doctor in your decision-making. And I think that some of the provisions that got snuck in might have violated that pledge."

The President admitted that what he had said and what he continues to say is not accurate because the bill that they proposed that we vote on is the very bill that has those things in it. It's the very bill that Ms. SLAUGHTER has said is not worthy of the American people.

Well, we need you to continue to tell the President, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and all the Democrats who have said they're going to vote for this bill that they are right, this bill is not worthy of the American people. It's not worthy of the sacrifices that have been made to keep us free because this is a government takeover of our lives. We will be giving up our freedom if this bill is passed. The government will take over not only our health care but ultimately

our lives. That is unworthy of the people who started this country.

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. MCDERMOTT) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, March 26.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, March 26.

Mr. POSEY, for 5 minutes, March 20.

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

Mr. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, today and March 22.

Ms. FALLIN, for 5 minutes, today and March 20.

Mr. BOUSTANY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BURGESS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, March 22, 23, 24, 25, and 26.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, for 5 minutes, today and March 20.

Mr. BONNER, for 5 minutes, March 20.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. Con Res. 54. Concurrent resolution recognizing the life of Orlando Zapata Tamayo, who died on February 23, 2010, in the custody of the Government of Cuba, and calling for a continued focus on the promotion of internationally recognized human rights, listed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, in Cuba; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced her signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1147. An act to prevent tobacco smuggling, to ensure the collection of all tobacco taxes, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Saturday, March 20, 2010, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from

the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

6674. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Processed Raspberry Promotion, Research, and Information Order; Referendum Procedures [Docket No.: AMS-FV-07-0077; FV-07-705-FR] (RIN: 0581-AC79) received February 28, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6675. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Choline chloride; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0671; FRL-8802-4] received March 4, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6676. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Dibenzylidene Sorbitol; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2009-0610; FRL-8802-5] received March 4, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6677. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Extension of Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions (Multiple Chemicals) [EPA-HQ-OPP-2009-0824; FRL-8801-9] received March 4, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6678. A letter from the Deputy to the Chairman for External Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Interest on Deposits (RIN: 3064-AD46) received March 4, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6679. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Reserve System, transmitting the System's semiannual Monetary Policy Report, pursuant to Public Law 106-569; to the Committee on Financial Services.

6680. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Ventura County Air Pollution Control District [EPA-R09-OAR-2008-0341; FRL-9094-1] received March 4, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6681. A letter from the Deputy Chief, CGB, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Closed Captioning of Video Programming [CG Docket No.: 05-231] received February 25, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6682. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's FY 2009 Competitive Sourcing Activity Report, pursuant to Public Law 108-199, section 647(b) of Division F; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6683. A letter from the Chairman, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting a copy of the annual report for Calendar Year 2009, in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6684. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Permits and Regulations, Division of Migratory Bird Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — General Provisions; Revised List of Migratory Birds [FWS-R9-MB-2007-0109; 91200-1231-9BPP] (RIN: 1018-AB72) received

March 4, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6685. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Surfclam and Ocean Quahog Fisheries; Suspension of Minimum Atlantic Surfclam Size Limit for Fishing Year 2010 [Docket No.: 070717342-7713-02] (RIN: 0648-SX18) received March 4, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6686. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's second biennial report on the "Implementation of the Deep Sea Coral Research and Technology Program", pursuant to the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Reauthorization Act of 2006; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6687. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Reef Fish Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; Closure of the 2009 Gulf of Mexico Recreational Fishery of Greater Amberjack [Docket No.: 070718369-8731-02] (RIN: 0648-XS50) received March 4, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6688. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources of the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic; Closure [Docket No.: 001005281-0369-02] (RIN: 0648-XS51) received March 4, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6689. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting a legislative proposal to implement international agreements concerning nuclear terrorism and nuclear materials; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6690. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Revised Jurisdictional Thresholds for Section 7A of the Clayton Act received February 17, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6691. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Community Disaster Loans Program [Docket ID: FEMA-2005-0051] (RIN: 1660-AA44) received February 19, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6692. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Qualified Transportation Fringes [Notice 2009-95] received March 4, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6693. A letter from the Deputy Associate Commissioner, Office of Regulations, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Exclusion of Certain Military Pay From Deemed Income and Resources [Docket No.: SSA-2008-0051] (RIN: 0960-AF97) received March 5, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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. OBERSTAR: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. House Resolution 1062. Resolution recognizing the Coast Guard Group Astoria's more than 60 years of service to the Pacific Northwest, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 111-446). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LEVIN: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 4849. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives for small business job creation, extend the Build America Bonds program, provide other infrastructure job creation tax incentives, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 111-447). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

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. SKELTON (for himself, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. NYE, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. GIFFORDS, Mr. REYES, Mr. BOREN, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. TAYLOR, and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California):

H.R. 4887. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that health coverage provided by the Department of Defense is treated as minimal essential coverage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Washington (for himself, Mr. COSTA, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. NUNES, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. REHBERG, and Mr. HERGER):

H.R. 4888. A bill to revise the Forest Service Recreation Residence Program as it applies to units of the National Forest System derived from the public domain by implementing a simple, equitable, and predictable procedure for determining cabin user fees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HENSARLING (for himself, Mr. PENCE, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. AKIN, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. LATTI, Mr. PITTS, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. OLSON, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. PLATTS, and Mr. SMITH of Texas):

H.R. 4889. A bill to establish a term certain for the conservatorships of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, to provide conditions for continued operation of such enterprises, and to provide for the wind down of such operations and the dissolution of such enterprises; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. EHLERS (for himself and Mr. SARBANES):

H.R. 4890. A bill to direct the Administrator of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration to carry out a collaborative research effort to prevent drunk driving injuries and fatalities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. EHLERS:

H.R. 4891. A bill to amend chapter 1 of title 23, United States Code, to condition the receipt of certain highway funding by States on the enactment and enforcement by States of certain laws to prevent repeat intoxicated driving; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MCKEON:

H.R. 4892. A bill to provide for the interrogation and detention of enemy belligerents who commit hostile acts against the United States, to establish certain limitations on the prosecution of such belligerents for such acts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, and the Judiciary, 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. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 4893. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to establish a United States Citizenship and Immigration Services field office in Kodiak, Alaska; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. STUPAK (for himself, Mr. BERRY, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CAO, Mrs. DAHLKEMPER, Mr. DRIEHAUS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. RAHALL, and Mr. ELLSWORTH):

H. Con. Res. 254. Concurrent resolution correcting the enrollment of H.R. 3590; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. OBEY (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. KIND, Mr. PETRI, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. NADLER of New York, Ms. NORTON, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. FARR, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HOLT, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. HONDA, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. POLIS, Mr. FILNER, Ms. HARMAN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. BEAN, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. RICHARDSON, and Ms. MCCOLLUM):

H. Con. Res. 255. Concurrent resolution commemorating the 40th anniversary of Earth Day and honoring the founder of Earth Day, the late Senator Gaylord Nelson of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CAMP (for himself, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. UPTON, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, and Mr. MCCOTTER):

H. Res. 1199. A resolution expressing support for designation of March 20, 2010, as Na-

tional American Meat and Poultry Appreciation Day; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MCCOTTER:

H. Res. 1200. A resolution expressing support for designation of March as Malignant Hyperthermia Awareness and Training Month; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana (for himself and Mr. ELLSWORTH):

H. Res. 1201. A resolution recognizing the 175th anniversary of Old National Bank based in Evansville, Indiana; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. EMERSON (for herself and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H. Res. 1202. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of Global Child Nutrition Month; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on 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.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 85: Mr. GERLACH.
 H.R. 99: Mr. GERLACH.
 H.R. 211: Mr. MELANCON, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, and Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN.
 H.R. 301: Mr. GERLACH.
 H.R. 442: Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. HERGER and Mr. DEAL of Georgia.
 H.R. 446: Mr. GERLACH.
 H.R. 484: Mr. GRIFFITH.
 H.R. 678: Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. POLIS, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. SOUDER, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. BARTLETT, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
 H.R. 690: Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. COBLE, Mr. WEINER, and Mr. PETERS.
 H.R. 775: Ms. JENKINS.
 H.R. 1017: Mr. ISRAEL and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
 H.R. 1083: Mr. COBLE.
 H.R. 1169: Mr. GERLACH.
 H.R. 1205: Mr. COLE.
 H.R. 1210: Mr. JONES, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. WAMP, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
 H.R. 1220: Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 1346: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
 H.R. 1362: Mr. BOREN and Mr. TOWNS.
 H.R. 1587: Mr. HOEKSTRA.
 H.R. 1710: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. GERLACH.
 H.R. 1990: Mr. COBLE.
 H.R. 2057: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania and Mr. TONKO.
 H.R. 2112: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
 H.R. 2156: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 2254: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
 H.R. 2296: Mr. BACA.
 H.R. 2724: Mr. KAGEN.
 H.R. 2733: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. SHADEGG, and Mr. MCCOTTER.
 H.R. 3147: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.
 H.R. 3286: Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. BOSWELL, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
 H.R. 3715: Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California.
 H.R. 3790: Mr. HIGGINS and Mr. BILIRAKIS.
 H.R. 3839: Ms. BORDALLO.
 H.R. 4021: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
 H.R. 4037: Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN.
 H.R. 4107: Mr. NEUGEBAUER.
 H.R. 4115: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
 H.R. 4196: Mr. GARAMENDI and Mr. CUELLAR.

H.R. 4243: Mr. SESTAK.

H.R. 4270: Mr. GERLACH.

H.R. 4278: Mr. CLAY, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. BOUSTANY.

H.R. 4302: Mr. CARNEY, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. KAGEN, and Ms. SHEA-POR-TER.

H.R. 4303: Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas and Mr. TANNER.

H.R. 4333: Mr. CONYERS and Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 4352: Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California.

H.R. 4393: Mr. SPRATT.

H.R. 4415: Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 4502: Ms. FUDGE.

H.R. 4539: Mrs. MALONEY.

H.R. 4568: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 4592: Mr. HARE.

H.R. 4647: Ms. HARMAN.

H.R. 4653: Mr. PLATTS.

H.R. 4682: Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 4684: Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. HARE, and Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 4687: Mr. HONDA, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 4689: Mr. CALVERT, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. BOSWELL, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 4700: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Ms. BEAN.

H.R. 4722: Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 4733: Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 4746: Ms. JENKINS, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. OLSON, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. AKIN, Mr. PITTS, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. PENCE, Mr. ISSA, Mr. JORDAN of Ohio, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. POSEY, and Mr. McCLINTOCK.

H.R. 4764: Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. LATTA.

H.R. 4785: Mr. INGLIS and Mr. STUPAK.

H.R. 4812: Mr. WATT, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 4850: Mr. HIMES, Mr. BLUNT, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. BOUSTANY.

H.R. 4862: Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BACA, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BERRY, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. COSTA, Mr. CROWLEY, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GUTIERREZ,

Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HONDA, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. MAFFEI, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. MORAN of Virginia,

Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. OLVER, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REYES, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUSH,

Mr. SABLAN, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. SRES, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. WEINER, Mr. WU, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BONNER, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska,

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Ms. ROSLEHTINEN, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. KINGSTON, Ms. CLARKE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BERKLEY, Mrs. BONO MACK, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HOLT, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. KIRK, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MACK, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. TONKO, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. WATT, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. CONYERS, Mr.

PAUL, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. JONES, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. PETERSON, Ms. WATERS, Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts, Mr. CAO, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. CLAY, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. CRENSHAW, and Mr. GINGREY of Georgia.

H.R. 4869: Mr. FILNER, Mr. MANZULLO, and Ms. WATERS.

H.J. Res. 76: Mr. ETHERIDGE and Mr. BOREN.
H.J. Res. 79: Mr. MILLER of Florida and Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado.

H.Con. Res. 71: Mr. FORBES.
H. Con. Res. 244: Mr. GRIFFITH.

H. Con. Res. 253: Mr. NADLER of New York.
H.Res. 213: Mr. TEAGUE.

H.Res. 855: Ms. GIFFORDS, Mr. CONAWAY, and Ms. GRANGER.

H.Res. 888: Mr. COBLE.
H.Res. 987: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.

H.Res. 1052: Mr. LAMBORN and Mr. HEINRICH.

H.Res. 1075: Mr. WAMP.
H.Res. 1099: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
H.Res. 1171: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona, Mr. DUNCAN, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
H.Res. 1188: Mr. KIRK, Mr. McCLINTOCK, and Mr. PUTNAM.
H.Res. 1191: Mr. McCLINTOCK and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

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:

The amendment to be offered by Representative BISHOP of Utah, or a designee, to

H.R. 1612, the Public Lands Service Corps Act of 2009, 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.

The amendment to be offered by Representative FLAKE, or a designee, to H.R. 3644, the Ocean, Coastal, and Watershed Education Act, 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.

OFFERED BY MR. SPRATT

H.R. 4872, the Reconciliation Act of 2010, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.