



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 156

WASHINGTON, SATURDAY, MARCH 20, 2010

No. 42

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, March 22, 2010, at 2 p.m.

House of Representatives

SATURDAY, MARCH 20, 2010

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

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 20, 2010.

I hereby appoint the Honorable YVETTE D. CLARKE 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:

Let us approach the Lord with praise and thanksgiving. Strong is His love for us. Left to ourselves, we are easily overwhelmed. We cannot be attentive to His Word or accomplish His holy will.

So shield us with Your Holy Spirit, Lord, and make this Congress bold and strong. As Your instrument of mercy and compassion, drive away all that is evil and reveal the path that will strengthen Your people in hope and salvation, and give You the glory both now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House her approval thereof.

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

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. Madam Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. WILSON of Ohio 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 now entertain up to five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Today we are close to achieving a long-sought goal ensuring that all Americans have access to meaningful, affordable health coverage. Passing health care reform benefits all of us: families, seniors, businesses, taxpayers, and our Nation.

This plan includes many vital prescriptions that strengthen health care for all Americans, provisions that I have fought hard for: prohibiting insurance companies from excluding pre-existing condition coverage for children and adults. Six months after reform is passed, all children will be protected from these denials, strengthening primary care for seniors with a new focus on those with chronic diseases. Seniors will no longer have to pay copayments for preventative care and will have greater access to primary care doctors and nurses. And reform ensures that all insurance policies use plain, easy-to-understand language so that consumers know what they're buying and can honestly compare their choices.

The status quo is unacceptable and unsustainable. I urge a "yes" vote on health care reform.

GOVERNMENT FAIRY TALE

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

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.

H1747

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, Ronald Reagan once said the most terrifying words in the English language are, "I'm from the government and I'm here to help." This is exactly what Washington liberals are trying to tell the American people.

The scheme that the government can give everyone free health care is a fairy tale which defies history and reality. The reality is there are real and affordable ways to improve the health care financing system, and Republicans presented 70 such proposals. Proposals like H.R. 3400 will make health care accessible and affordable, covering pre-existing conditions, promoting employer-sponsored insurance, and offers insurance across State lines.

The Pelosi bill will kill 1.6 million jobs according to the National Federation of Independent Business.

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

Citizens can make a difference, like Chuck Stauck of Hilton Head Island, with Ann Bull, Brenda Maxwell, and Lynn Dempsey of Lexington, South Carolina.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I rise today to share my strong support for the health reform bill that we will be voting on this weekend.

This bill is not perfect, but it's a significant step forward. This bill will ensure that a wonderful little girl named Bridget from Marietta, Ohio, whom I met with last week, will never be denied health insurance due to a pre-existing condition even though she was stricken with cancer at the age of 3. It will guarantee that 9,300 other residents in Ohio's sixth district with pre-existing conditions can obtain coverage. This legislation will improve coverage for 365,000 residents in my district with health insurance and extend coverage to 40,000 people who are uninsured.

The bottom line is that we need this reform. Families like Bridget's need this reform. Our economy needs this reform. This is a historic vote, and I'm proud to cast my vote in favor of commonsense health care reform that finally benefits the people, not the insurance companies.

THE FIRST WORD WAS "HOUSTON"

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, the United States is positioned to raise the white flag of surrender in space exploration. America is the leader in space technology, but yet there are plans afoot to turn our lead over to the Russians and the Chinese.

By foolishly canceling the Constellation Program and when the last NASA

shuttle flight occurs, we will have no means to transport our astronauts into space. We will have to hitch a ride with the Russians if we want that transportation. And if one of our security satellites needs repair, who's to say the Russians will even let us buy a coach ticket on their space aircraft.

Now even the Iranians have entered the space race. Last month they sent a rat, two turtles, and a worm into space.

Keeping our edge in spaceflight is a national security issue. We can not give that away to anybody. After all, when Neil Armstrong landed on the Moon, the first word was "Houston," not "Moscow" or "Beijing."

And that's just the way it is.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. Madam Speaker, from the beginning of the debate of health care reform, my top priority has been clear: strengthen and protect Medicare for our seniors, like Bunny Steinman in my district.

I believe that the doctor-patient relationship is absolutely essential, especially for our seniors. No one, not the government or private insurance, should stand between a patient and the doctor of their choice.

When I talk to seniors in my district, many of them tell me that struggling to cover the costs of prescription drugs—especially if they have fallen into the part D drug doughnut hole—is a real problem for them, and that is why I took the lead in working with AARP to make sure health care reform, this bill, closes the doughnut hole for good. Seniors will see immediate relief on prescription drug prices—a \$250 rebate next year and thousands more in savings in the years ahead.

We have won this fight. This reform will close the doughnut hole and save seniors money. There will be other benefits for seniors such as preventative care, like cancer screenings will now be free—no copays, no deductible. We owe it to our seniors. They paid into the Medicare trust fund. Taking care of our seniors is one of our top priorities. Benefits like these are critical to our senior population in south Florida, my district, and around the country.

I urge support of the bill.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I know that I am just a country doctor from Tennessee, but the fact that we can't have a true up-or-down vote on one of the most important pieces of legislation this body will ever consider just flat out confounds me.

I decided to do a little research on the issue, and just since the time I've been here, the House has recorded votes on whether to congratulate two college football teams, a college basketball team. There was a vote on a college quarterback. We've even held votes on honoring 10 colleges and universities and named 30 post offices. The House held a recorded vote on whether to pay tribute to Homeland Security Department employees, and just this week, we actually voted on whether or not to congratulate Vancouver on hosting the Winter Olympics. Heck, we've even asked Members of Congress to go on record about the 2,560th birthday of Confucius.

We can vote on all of these matters, but we can't have a vote on health care. Madam Speaker, if anyone can explain this to me, my phone line is open.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Madam Speaker, this morning on my way in to the Capitol I experienced a moment of karma. The first song that came on the radio, when I turned it on, was a song from the show "Les Mis" called "One Day More." In that Broadway show, "One Day More" is sung on the eve of an insurrection by French students, many of whom know they are going to die.

One day more today we will be passing an historic piece of legislation that will not take lives. It will save lives; the 18,000 lives that are lost every year because of a lack of health insurance. We will save lives, we will save money, we will save Medicare, and we will save jobs. One day more until we accomplish all of that for our economy, for our citizens, and for our country.

Tomorrow, indeed, will be a wonderful day.

AP FINDS PREMIUMS WILL GO UP UNDER HEALTH CARE

(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, here is what the Associated Press has to say about the administration's health care plan: "Buyers, beware. President Barack Obama says his health care overhaul will lower premiums by double digits, but check the fine print."

"Premiums are likely to keep going up even if the health care bill passes, experts say."

"Listening to Obama pitch his plan, you might not realize that's how it works."

"The (Congressional) Budget Office concluded that premiums for people buying their own coverage would go up by an average of 10 to 13 percent."

The rest of the national media should report the facts about health care, not cover them up.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Mr. HIMES. Madam Speaker, for a long time I have started discussions about health care with the phrase, "Setting aside the moral dimension, let's talk about the costs and the need to bring down costs."

I want to come back to that moral dimension. I want to come back to the fact that at the core of that moral dimension is the belief that we look after our own; that if you were attacked by your enemies, we send the best military in the world for hundreds of billions of dollars. If your house catches fire, we will send men and equipment to put out that fire. If an assailant enters your home, we will send men and equipment to look after our own.

But if you're one of the tens of thousands of people diagnosed with breast cancer, coronary disease, leukemia, well, then we're not sure. We might look after you if you have a job, if you can keep that job, if you don't have preexisting conditions, if you haven't committed the sin of getting older.

Madam Speaker, if we are to be true to what is the value of this country, that we look after our own, we will finally join the company of civilized nations and say, Every American, we will look after you; you will not die needlessly, by passing health care reform.

□ 0915

HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Mr. CAO. Madam Speaker, I understand that we need health care reform. I have a younger brother who has a kidney disease that put him on dialysis at the young age of 30 and forced him to have a kidney transplant. I have a father who is also on dialysis and struggling to survive. I have a younger sister who has been fighting lupus for over a decade. I also saw how my sister struggled and fought the insurance companies for coverage.

I understand the crushing costs of health care. I understand that we have to fight the insurance companies. But I also understand that abortion is wrong. Last week, I called my brother and apologized to him and told him that I cannot support the Senate health care bill. He told me that he understands, and I thank him for it.

Tomorrow will be a sad day for me as I cast a "no" vote against something I believe we need to prevent: The expansion of abortion, an absolute moral evil.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 15 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1030

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas) at 10 o'clock and 30 minutes a.m.

PUBLIC LANDS SERVICE CORPS ACT OF 2009

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1192, I call up 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, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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. 1612

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 "Public Lands Service Corps Act of 2009".

SEC. 2. REFERENCE.

Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or a repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Public Lands Corps Act of 1993 (16 U.S.C. 1721 et seq.; title II of Public Law 91-378).

SEC. 3. AMENDMENTS TO THE PUBLIC LANDS CORPS ACT OF 1993.

(a) **NAME AND PROJECT DESCRIPTION CHANGES.**—*The Act is amended—*

(1) *by striking "Public Lands Corps" each place it appears and inserting "Public Lands Service Corps";*

(2) *in the title heading, by striking "PUBLIC LANDS CORPS" and inserting "PUBLIC LANDS SERVICE CORPS";*

(3) *in the section 204—*

(A) *in the section heading, by striking "PUBLIC LANDS CORPS" and inserting "PUBLIC LANDS SERVICE CORPS"; and*

(B) *in the heading of subsection (a), by striking "PUBLIC LANDS CORPS" and inserting "PUBLIC LANDS SERVICE CORPS";*

(4) *in the heading of paragraph (2) of section 210(a), by striking "PUBLIC LANDS CORPS" and inserting "PUBLIC LANDS SERVICE CORPS";*

(5) *by striking "conservation center" each place it appears and inserting "residential conservation center"; and*

(6) *by striking "appropriate conservation projects" each place it appears (except in paragraph (1) of section 204(e) as so redesignated)*

and inserting "appropriate natural and cultural resources conservation projects".

(b) **FINDINGS.**—*Section 202(a) of the Act is amended as follows:*

(1) *In paragraph (1), by striking "the natural and cultural" and inserting "natural and cultural".*

(2) *By redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (4) and (5), respectively, and by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:*

"(2) Participants in conservation corps receive meaningful training and their experience with such corps provides preparation for careers in public service.

"(3) Young men and women who participate in the rehabilitation and restoration of our Nation's natural, cultural, historic, archaeological, recreational, and scenic treasures will gain an increased appreciation and understanding of our public lands and heritage, and of the value of public service, and are likely to become lifelong advocates for those values."

(3) *In paragraph (4) (as so redesignated), by inserting ", cultural, historic, archaeological, recreational, and scenic" after "Many facilities and natural".*

(4) *By adding at the end the following:*

"(6) The work of conservation corps can benefit communities adjacent to public lands and facilities through renewed civic engagement and participation by corps participants and those they serve; improved student achievement; and restoration and rehabilitation of public assets."

(c) **PURPOSE.**—*Section 202(b) of the Act is amended to read as follows:*

"(b) **PURPOSES.**—*The purposes of this Act are to—*

"(1) introduce young men and women to public service while furthering their understanding and appreciation of the Nation's natural, cultural, historic, archaeological, recreational, and scenic resources;

"(2) facilitate training and recruitment opportunities in which service is credited as qualifying experience for careers in public land management;

"(3) instill in a new generation of young men and women from across the Nation, including those from diverse backgrounds, the desire to seek careers in natural and cultural resource stewardship and public service by allowing them to work directly with professionals in agencies responsible for the management of the Nation's natural, cultural, historic, archaeological, recreational, and scenic resources;

"(4) perform, in a cost-effective manner, appropriate natural and cultural resources conservation projects where such projects are not being performed by existing employees;

"(5) assist governments and Indian tribes in performing research and public education tasks associated with natural and cultural resources;

"(6) expand educational opportunities by rewarding individuals who participate in national service with an increased ability to pursue higher education or job training; and

"(7) promote public understanding and appreciation of the individual missions and natural and cultural resources conservation work of the Federal agencies through training opportunities, community service and outreach, and other appropriate means."

(d) **DEFINITIONS.**—*Section 203 of the Act is amended as follows:*

(1) *By amending paragraphs (1) and (2) to read as follows:*

"(1) **APPROPRIATE NATURAL AND CULTURAL RESOURCES CONSERVATION PROJECT.**—*The term 'appropriate natural and cultural resources conservation project' means any project for the conservation, restoration, construction, or rehabilitation of natural, cultural, historic, archaeological, recreational, or scenic resources.*

"(2) **CORPS AND PUBLIC LANDS SERVICE CORPS.**—*The terms 'Corps' and 'Public Lands Service Corps' mean the Public Lands Service Corps established under section 204 of this title."*

(2) By striking paragraphs (3) and (8).

(3) By redesignating paragraphs (4), (5), (6), (7), (9), (10), (11), (12), and (13) as paragraphs (3) through (11), respectively.

(4) By amending paragraph (7) (as so redesignated) to read as follows:

“(7) PUBLIC LANDS.—The term ‘public lands’ means any lands or waters (or interest therein) owned or administered by the United States, including those areas of coastal and ocean waters, the Great Lakes and their connecting waters, and submerged lands over which the United States exercises jurisdiction, except that such term does not include any Indian lands.”

(5) In paragraph (8) (as so redesignated)—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (C), by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(D) makes available for audit for each fiscal year for which the qualified youth or conservation corps receives Federal funds under this Act, information pertaining to the expenditure of the funds, any matching funds, and participant demographics.”

(6) In paragraph (10) (as so redesignated)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) with respect to the National Marine Sanctuary System, coral reefs, and other coastal, estuarine, and marine habitats, and other lands and facilities administered by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the Secretary of Commerce.”

(7) By adding at the end the following:

“(12) RESIDENTIAL CONSERVATION CENTERS.—The term ‘residential conservation centers’ means the facilities authorized under section 205.

“(13) CONSULTING INTERN.—The term ‘consulting intern’ means a consulting intern selected under section 206.

“(14) PUBLIC LANDS SERVICE CORPS PARTICIPANT.—The term ‘Public Lands Service Corps participant’, ‘Corps participant’ or ‘participant of the Corps’ means an individual who is enrolled in the Public Lands Service Corps pursuant to section 204(b).”

(e) PUBLIC LANDS SERVICE CORPS PROGRAM.—Section 204 of the Act is amended as follows:

(1) In subsection (a)—

(A) in the heading, by adding at the end “PROGRAM”;

(B) by striking “and the Department of Agriculture a” and inserting “, the Department of Agriculture, and the Department of Commerce a service and training program titled the”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following: “The Secretary of the Interior shall establish a department-level office to coordinate Public Lands Service Corps activities within the Department of the Interior. The Secretary of Agriculture shall establish within the U.S. Forest Service an office to coordinate Public Lands Service Corps activities within that agency. The Secretary of Commerce shall establish within the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration an office to coordinate Public Lands Service Corps activities within that agency. The Secretary of each department shall designate a Public Lands Service Corps coordinator for each agency within that department that administers Public Lands Service Corps activities.”

(2) By amending subsection (b) to read as follows:

“(b) PARTICIPANTS.—The Secretary may enroll in the Public Lands Service Corps individuals between the ages of 16 and 25, inclusive, who are either hired by an agency under the Secretary’s jurisdiction to perform work authorized under this Act or who are members of a qualified youth or conservation corps with which the Secretary has entered into a cooperative agreement to perform work authorized under this Act.

The Secretary may also enroll resource assistants and consulting interns. All enrollees shall be considered Public Lands Service Corps participants, and may be enrolled for a term of up to 24 months of service, which may be served over more than two calendar years. The individuals may be enrolled without regard to the civil service and classification laws, rules, or regulations of the United States. The Secretary may establish a preference for the enrollment in the Corps of individuals who are economically, physically, or educationally disadvantaged.”

(3) In subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “contracts and”; and

(ii) by inserting “natural and cultural resources” after “appropriate”; and

(iii) by striking “subsection (d)” and inserting “subsection (e)”; and

(B) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (3);

(C) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

“(2) RECRUITMENT.—The Secretary shall undertake, or enter into cooperative agreements to provide, a program to attract eligible youth to the Corps by publicizing Corps opportunities through high schools, colleges, employment centers, electronic media, and other appropriate institutions or means.”; and

(D) by amending paragraph (3) (as so redesignated) to read as follows:

“(3) PREFERENCE.—For purposes of entering into cooperative agreements under paragraph (1), the Secretary may give preference to qualified youth or conservation corps located in a specific area that have a substantial portion of members who are economically, physically, or educationally disadvantaged to carry out projects within the area.”

(4) By redesignating subsections (d) through (f) as subsections (e) through (g), respectively.

(5) By inserting after subsection (c) the following:

“(d) TRAINING.—The Secretary shall establish a training program based at appropriate residential conservation centers or at other suitable regional Federal or other appropriate facilities or sites to provide training for Corps participants. The Secretary shall—

“(1) ensure that the duration and comprehensiveness of the training program shall be commensurate with the projects Corps participants are expected to undertake;

“(2) develop department-wide standards for the program that include training in—

“(A) resource stewardship;

“(B) ethics for those in public service;

“(C) principles of national service;

“(D) health and safety;

“(E) teamwork and leadership; and

“(F) interpersonal communications; and

“(3) direct each participating agency to develop agency-specific training guidelines to ensure that Corps participants enrolled to undertake projects for that agency are appropriately informed about matters specific to that agency, including—

“(A) the history and organization of the agency;

“(B) the agency’s core values; and

“(C) any agency-specific standards for the management of natural, cultural, historic, archaeological, recreational, and scenic resources; and

“(4) take into account training already received by Corps participants enrolled from qualified youth or conservation corps, including in the matters outlined in paragraph (2).”

(6) In subsection (e) (as so redesignated)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “The Secretary may utilize the Corps or any qualified youth or conservation corps to carry out appropriate” and inserting “The Secretary may use Corps participants to carry out, under appropriate supervision and training, appropriate natural and cultural resource”; and

(ii) by striking “law on public lands.” and inserting the following: “law. Such projects may include, but are not limited to—

“(A) protection, restoration, or enhancement of ecosystem components to promote species recovery, improve biological diversity, enhance productivity and carbon sequestration, and enhance adaptability and resilience of public lands and resources in the face of climate change and other natural and human disturbances;

“(B) promoting the health of forests and public lands, refuges, and coastal and marine areas, including—

“(i) protection and restoration of watersheds and forest, riparian, estuarine, grassland, coral reef, intertidal, or other habitat;

“(ii) reduction of wildfire risk and mitigation of damage from insects, disease, and disasters;

“(iii) erosion control;

“(iv) control or removal of invasive, noxious, or non-native species; and

“(v) restoration of native species;

“(C) collection of biological, archaeological, and other scientific data, including monitoring of climatological information, species populations and movement, habitat status, and other factors;

“(D) assisting in historical and cultural research, archival and curatorial work, oral history projects, documentary photography, and activities that support the creation of public works of art related to public lands; and

“(E) construction, repair, rehabilitation, green building retrofitting, and maintenance of roads, trails, campgrounds, and other facilities, employee housing, cultural and historic sites and structures, and facilities that further the purposes of the Public Lands Service Corps.”

(B) By redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (4) and (5), respectively.

(C) By inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

“(2) VISITOR SERVICES.—The Secretary may—

“(A) enter into or amend an existing cooperative agreement with a cooperating association, educational institute, friends group, or similar nonprofit partner organization for the purpose of providing training and work experience to Corps participants in areas including, but not limited to, sales, office work, accounting, and management provided that the work experience directly relates to the protection and management of the public lands; and

“(B) allow Corps participants to help promote visitor safety and enjoyment of public lands, and assist in the gathering of visitor use data.

“(3) INTERPRETATION.—The Secretary may assign Corps participants to provide interpretation or education services for the public under the appropriate direction and supervision of agency personnel, including—

“(A) providing orientation and information services to visitors, including services for non-English speaking visitors and visitors who use American Sign Language;

“(B) assisting agency personnel in the delivery of interpretive or educational programs, including outdoor learning and classroom learning;

“(C) presenting programs on Federal lands or at schools, after-school programs, and youth-serving community programs that relate the personal experience of the Corps participant for the purpose of promoting public awareness of the Corps, its role in public land management agencies, and its availability to potential participants; and

“(D) creating nonpersonal interpretive products, such as Web site content, Junior Ranger program books, printed handouts, and audiovisual programs.”

(D) In paragraph (4) (as so redesignated), by striking “Appropriate conservation projects” and inserting “Appropriate natural and cultural resources conservation projects”.

(7) In subsection (g) (as so redesignated), by striking “appropriate conservation project” inserting “appropriate natural and cultural resources conservation project”.

(8) By amending the text of subsection (f)(2) (as so redesignated) to read as follows: “will instill in Corps participants a work ethic and a sense of public service;”.

(9) In subsection (g) (as so redesignated), by striking “on eligible service lands”.

(10) By adding at the end the following:
 “(h) OTHER PARTICIPANTS.—The Secretary may allow volunteers from other programs administered or designated by the Secretary to participate as volunteers in projects carried out under this section on such terms as the Secretary considers appropriate.”.

(f) RESIDENTIAL CONSERVATION CENTERS AND PROGRAM SUPPORT.—Section 205 of the Act is amended as follows:

(1) In the section heading, by striking “CONSERVATION” and inserting “RESIDENTIAL CONSERVATION”.

(2) In subsection (a)—
 (A) by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may establish residential conservation centers for—

“(A) such housing, food service, medical care, transportation, and other services as the Secretary deems necessary for the Public Lands Service Corps; and

“(B) the conduct of appropriate residential conservation projects under this Act.”;

(B) by striking paragraph (2) and redesignating paragraphs (3) and (4) as paragraphs (2) and (3), respectively;

(C) in paragraph (2) (as so redesignated)—

(i) in the text, by inserting “residential” before “conservation centers”; and

(ii) in the heading, by inserting “RESIDENTIAL” before “CONSERVATION CENTERS”; and

(D) in paragraph (3) (as so redesignated), by striking “with a State or” and inserting “a cooperative agreement with another Federal, State, or”.

(3) In subsection (b)—
 (A) by striking “The Secretary” and inserting the following:

“(1) The Secretary”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:
 “(2) The Secretary may make arrangements with other Federal agencies, States, local governments, or private organizations to provide temporary housing as needed and available.

“(3) In project areas where Corps participants can reasonably be expected to reside at their own homes, the Secretary may fund or provide transportation to and from project sites.”.

(4) By redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (g).

(5) By inserting after subsection (c) the following:

“(d) FACILITIES.—The Secretary may, as an appropriate natural and cultural resources conservation project, direct Corps participants to aid in the rehabilitation or construction of residential conservation center facilities, including housing.

“(e) GREEN BUILDINGS.—The Secretary may seek the assistance of the Secretary of Energy in identifying and using solar and other green building technologies and modular housing designs that may be adapted for residential conservation center facilities, including—

“(1) designs from the Department of Energy’s Solar Decathlon competition; and

“(2) logistical support, assistance, and training from Solar Decathlon participants.

“(f) MENTORS.—The Secretary may recruit from programs, such as agency volunteer programs, and from agency retirees, veterans groups, military retirees, active duty personnel, and from appropriate youth-serving organizations, such adults as may be suitable and qualified to provide training, mentoring, and crew-leading services to Corps participants.”.

(6) In subsection (g) (as so redesignated), by striking “are appropriate to carry out this title” and inserting “the Secretary determines to be necessary for the residential conservation center”.

(g) RESOURCE ASSISTANTS AND CONSULTING INTERNS.—Section 206 of the Act is amended as follows:

(1) In the section heading, by inserting “AND CONSULTING INTERNS” before the period.

(2) In subsection (a), by striking “The Secretary is authorized to provide individual placements of resource” and inserting the following: “The Secretary is authorized, to provide individual placements of the following:

“(1) Resource”.

(3) By inserting after subsection (a)(1) (as so designated), the following:

“(2) Consulting interns with any Federal land, coastal, or ocean management agency under the jurisdiction of the Secretary to carry out management analysis activities on behalf of the agency. To be eligible for selection as a consulting intern, an individual must be a current enrollee and have completed at least one full year at a graduate or professional school that has been accredited by an accrediting body that has been recognized by the Secretary of Education. The Secretary may select consulting interns without regard to the civil service and classification laws, rules, or regulations of the United States.”.

(4) In subsection (b)—
 (A) by inserting “or consulting interns” before “through private sources”;

(B) in the second sentence, before the period, by inserting “; up to 15 percent may be in-kind”; and

(C) by striking “Resource Assistants” and inserting “resource assistants or consulting interns”.

(5) By adding at the end the following:

“(c) COST SHARING REQUIREMENTS.—At the Secretary’s discretion, the requirements for cost sharing applicable to participating nonprofit organizations for the expenses of resource assistants and consulting interns under subsection (b) may be reduced to not less than 10 percent.”.

(h) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—The Act is amended by redesignating sections 207, 208, 209, 210, and 211 as sections 208, 209, 210, 211, and 212, respectively.

(i) GUIDANCE.—The Act is amended by inserting after section 206 the following:

“SEC. 207. GUIDANCE.

“Not later than 18 months after funds are made available for this purpose, the Secretaries shall issue guidelines for the management of the Public Lands Service Corps programs for use by regional and State directors, and the supervisors of individual parks, forests, districts, sanctuaries, reserves, hatcheries, and refuges.”.

(j) LIVING ALLOWANCES AND TERMS OF SERVICE.—Section 208 of the Act (as so redesignated) is amended—

(1) by amending subsection (a) to read as follows:

“(a) LIVING ALLOWANCES.—The Secretary shall provide each Corps participant with a living allowance in an amount established by the Secretary. The Secretary may—

“(1) apply a cost-of-living differential to such allowances; and

“(2) reimburse Corps participants for travel costs at the beginning and end of their term of service if the Secretary deems appropriate.”;

(2) by amending the text of subsection (b) to read as follows: “Each Corp participant shall agree to participate in the Corps for such term of service as may be established by the Secretary enrolling or selecting the individual.”;

(3) in the heading of subsection (c), by adding at the end “PREFERENCE AND FUTURE EMPLOYMENT”; and

(4) in subsection (c)—

(A) by amending paragraphs (1) and (2) to read as follows:

“(1) grant to a participant of the Public Lands Service Corps credit for service time in the Corps to be used as qualifying experience toward future Federal hiring;

“(2) provide to a former participant of the Public Lands Service Corps noncompetitive hir-

ing status for a period of not more than two years after the date on which the participant’s service with the Public Lands Service Corps is complete (not counting any time spent enrolled in an academic institution or trade school), if the candidate—

“(A) has served a minimum of 960 hours on an appropriate natural or cultural resource conservation project that included at least 120 hours through the Public Lands Service Corps; and

“(B) meets Office of Personnel Management qualification standards for the position to which the candidate is applying;”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) develop a system to provide consideration for participants who cannot meet the requirements of paragraph (2);

“(4) provide to an individual who has successfully fulfilled the resource assistant program noncompetitive hiring status for a period of not more than two years after the date on which the individual has completed an undergraduate degree from an accredited institution;

“(5) provide to an individual who has successfully fulfilled the consulting internship program noncompetitive hiring status for a period of not more than two years after the date on which the individual has completed a graduate degree from an accredited institution; and

“(6) provide, or enter into cooperative agreements with qualified employment agencies to provide, alumni services such as job and education counseling, referrals, verification of service, communications, and other appropriate services to participants who have completed their Corps service.”.

(k) NATIONAL SERVICE EDUCATIONAL AWARDS.—Section 209 of the Act (as so redesignated) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “If a” and all that follows through “shall be eligible” and inserting “If a Corps participant also serves in an approved national service position designated under subtitle C of title I of the National and Community Service Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12571 et seq.), the Corps participant shall be eligible”; and

(2) in subsection (b), by striking—

(A) “either participants in the Corps or resource assistants” and inserting “participants in the Corps”; and

(B) “or a resource assistant”.

(l) NONDISPLACEMENT.—Section 210 of the Act (as so redesignated) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 210. NONDISPLACEMENT.

“The nondisplacement requirements of the National and Community Service Act of 1990 shall be applicable to all activities carried out by the Public Lands Service Corps participants.”.

(m) FUNDING.—Section 211 of the Act (as so redesignated) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1)—

(A) by striking “appropriate conservation project” each place it appears and inserting “appropriate natural and cultural resources conservation project”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following: “The Secretary may reduce to no less than 10 percent the non-Federal costs of a project when the Secretary determines that it is necessary to enable participation in the Public Lands Service Corps from a greater range of organizations.”; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by inserting “program” after “Corps”; and

(B) by inserting “, consulting interns” before “and qualified youth”.

(n) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 212 of the Act (as so redesignated) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting “to the Secretary” after “authorized to be appropriated”; and

(2) in subsection (a), by striking “to carry out” the first place it appears and all that follows through the period and inserting “such

sums as may be necessary to carry out this title.”;

(3) by striking subsection (b); and

(4) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (b).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. After 1 hour of debate on the bill, as amended, it shall be in order to consider the further amendments printed in part C of House Report 111-445, each of which may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, and shall be separately debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 1612.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1612, a bill I introduced last year to help repair and restore our Nation's public lands while employing and training thousands of young Americans and promoting the culture of public service.

In 1993, when the Public Lands Corps was established through the good work of our late colleague Bruce Vento of Minnesota, there were huge backlogs of labor-intensive work on national park lands, forests, wildlife refuges, historic sites, and Indian lands. Unfortunately, we still face those challenges and more. Years of inadequate funding have put our Federal land management agencies further behind on vital maintenance work, while infrastructure continues to crumble.

Despite the best efforts of these underfunded agencies, natural and cultural resources are being neglected, and in many places the effects of climate change are magnifying earlier problems such as fire risk, damage by insects and invasive species, coastal erosion, and fragmented habitat. The stimulus bill we passed in the first session has begun to attack the problem, but is only a start. Much remains to be done on the public lands.

My bill, H.R. 1612, will expand and reinvigorate an existing program, the Public Lands Corps, by streamlining its management, modernizing its scope, and providing new tools to help the program accomplish its mission, putting young people to work repairing our most treasured resources. Young people participating in the Public Lands Service Corps will work side by side with professional land managers to collect biological data, preserve his-

toric documents, rebuild roads and trails, attack invasive weeds, reduce fire risk and improve watershed health, paint visitor facilities, restore damaged wetlands, help build green buildings, and welcome visitors to our parks and public lands. These and a wide variety of other jobs will be available to Corps members for a period up to 2 years. Their term of service will include the training they need do these jobs.

My bill also allows the agencies to provide housing for Corps participants, and even allows the Corps members to build housing that can be used by future Corps members. The training and experience Corps members receive while working to improve the condition of our natural and cultural resources will give them a huge advantage when they enter the working world in such professions as science, land management, the building trades, academic disciplines such as history and education.

The legislation not only takes a decisive step forward in finishing desperately needed work on our national park lands, forests, wildlife refuges, historic sites and Indian lands, but also recognizes the importance of our coastal and marine systems and our national marine sanctuaries. This expanded public service initiative will introduce people from a greater diversity of social, ethnic, and cultural backgrounds to our Nation's parks, forests, and public lands not only as possible future employees, but also as lifelong advocates and enthusiasts.

The legislation takes advantage of an opportunity to provide meaningful employment and training to young people who need it, while also improving the condition of our priceless natural and cultural resources. President Obama and Interior Secretary Salazar have made national service a priority and have graciously supported this legislation. I am also proud to have the support of preeminent conversation corps groups, as well as leading national parks advocacy groups.

I ask my colleagues to support the passage of this measure. At a time when unemployment among our youth and particularly the urban areas is at an all time high, H.R. 1612 begins to address that crisis and also to address the unmet needs of our public lands.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I, as well as many who are here on the floor, am just pleased to be here on a Saturday morning to discuss the bill that is the significance and the reason why we are here, and also the side-view of being able to count the number of arm splints that we see today so we can be part of an historical occasion.

This bill I do think happens to be one of the metaphors perhaps for this entire session as we begin this weekend reality play that definitely does fit

into the theater of the absurd. This is a good program, but there is much common good for which we could have found a great deal of common support had this bill been allowed to have some bipartisanship with it.

Both the ranking member of the full committee and the ranking member of the subcommittee had amendments that had been proposed in the committee that were withdrawn under the assumption that they would be worked upon and added to the final bill when it came here to the floor. That was not simply the case. So what could have been an easy bill to pass with common assumptions to it that would have been one of the things that could have been done in a bipartisan way has now been turned into something that has a partisan flavor to it, as the only rule bill that we have for this weekend so far simply because of the standards that we have had in this proposal. This is indeed a metaphor for what we are doing and what we have been doing for much of this session.

I do have some concerns, Madam Speaker, for this bill in three basic areas. First of all, the concept of funding and fiscal responsibility. Secondly, the concept of curriculum that will be involved in this program. And third, what I would probably call is the generalology of this particular program.

One of the amendments and one of the requests that we had is that this bill should be sunsetted in some particular way. In fact, there will be an amendment that will be brought to the floor to add a sunset provision to this particular bill. This bill as currently administered spends \$12 million a year. For some people, that is considered a lot of money. Around here, I realize that is simply a rounding error. But what it does, if you pass this particular bill, it takes off the cap that caps this program at \$12 million a year and allows it to be funded at any level one assumes. The CBO made the assumption that would be \$120 million over 5 years. How they reached that assumption no one really knows.

One of the things we should do if we were fiscally responsible would be to make sure that there was a specific cap on this program and that there was a sunset provision so it could be reviewed. One of the things we all realize around this country, especially as we talk about the increasing deficit of this country, is that there are some things that the Federal Government must do. Defense of this country is one of the things we must do. There are some things we should never do. And there are some things that fall into those limited categories of it would be nice to do if it meets with our priorities and we have the means to provide them. Providing for the Park Service, healthy forests is one of those things we should do. But it must be set in the environment of how much money we have and where our priorities lie.

Having kids being groomed to be future managers is a nice thing to do on

these public lands if it fits into our priorities. And that is why this program should be reviewed at a regular basis by Congress. Once these types of programs are passed on indefinitely and become embodied within the budget itself, it is never reviewed by this body again, which is our function and our responsibility.

If anything was done in a self-executing rule, the amendment we will talk about later to actually put a cap on this program and make sure that we review it on a regular basis, that should have been self-executing because it is our responsibility as Congress, and we should not abrogate that particular responsibility.

The second concern I have is what I call the curriculum of this particular program. It has been portrayed by groups to us that this is like a new version of the CCC coming along trying to make changes and improvements in public lands. If that were the case, we would probably have very little concern about it. But that is not necessarily what will be allowed if this bill actually goes into effect. See, when this program was originally started the goal was to have kids working on projects that would benefit specially our Forest Service and public lands. But unfortunately as this is now altered, there is no guarantee of where the funds will go and what the priorities may be, which is one of the things we simply wanted. Keep the program doing what the program was intended to do.

This time the government will send money, much of which will be handled by the Student Conservation Association. They will be the ones who will facilitate programs and give grants. How it's structured no one knows. Because once again, instead of ensuring that this is done to the betterment of public lands, this allows for money to go to political issues under the guise of some kind of conservationship. For indeed, this group has had an agenda in the past which has been anti-affordable energy, anti-coal fired plants, pro-higher taxes and energy costs.

Our staff had the opportunity of looking on the Web site of this particular group. They sponsored a conference here in Washington several years ago sponsored by the National Park Service, some funding from the National Park Service in which the curriculum for that conference was not just about how we improve our public lands, but also how one stages protests, how one can do a sit-in to prevent a timber harvest from taking place. In fact, as you look at their Web site their organizing chart lists to start small and then grow and make it fun in the process.

Now, once again, that is not what this program was intended to do, nor should it be the program. And there are no prohibitions to say that this program will not evolve into that form. Had they simply added amendments we wanted to say what the purposes and

the directions of this program were, once again it would be a very good bipartisan bill. But that was not allowed. It was not allowed by leadership here or in the Rules Committee to take that place and form.

This Student Conservation Association once again has taken a great deal of stimulus funds that were added in the stimulus bill. In each of those, once again, there was much that was involved that was advocacy outside building our public lands. One of the funds got 18 grand into my community to assist in building a public library so that they could associate at the refuge center with conservation efforts. One hundred twenty thousand dollars was given to this group so they could go to New England and show legal techniques and practices of how they could use the legal system to reach goals that they had. That is political activism, which is not what this program was about, not to which this program should evolve into itself.

One of the things, Madam Speaker, that was funded as part of this program is the Mo Udall Legacy bus tour. Actually, it was a 54-day bus tour promoted by the National Park Service. You can see their logos all the way around here, as well as Department of Interior, to promote sustainability in biodiesel buses. According to the kids, it was a wonderful 54-day trip. However, most of them actually said how great it was as they visited microbreweries in every one of those areas, especially biodiversified microbreweries.

Actually, I don't know how successful this tour was. I don't drink anything harder than Dr. Pepper, so I am going to ask some of the rest of you around here to see if their touring, their visiting to all of the bars they had in the cities in which they went on this particular trip really was worthwhile in making that particular kind of evaluation.

□ 1045

Nice trip. There is nothing wrong with these guys doing this as long as they do it on their own dime; not on the government's dime under the guise of creating some kind of better lands for our public services.

National Park Services, which will be in charge of the oversight of this, does not have a great record in that. In 2007, the IG in the Department of the Interior came up with this in one park service-managed job corps center—\$3 million of misreported expenditures and \$200,000 of improper charges. And that is the oversight that we're going to have. Those types of things should have been added to the bill.

We asked those to be added to the bill. It would have solved the problem of this particular bill, but they weren't done; therefore, we're here complaining about something which should have been and could have been a great program of bipartisan support, and it isn't.

Let me talk about the genealogy, for, indeed, this Student Conservation As-

sociation that will be managing this new program was an offspring created by the National Park Conservation Association, the godfather of this program, a special interest group with a history of what I consider to be extreme agendas—a history of filing lawsuits against this government, filing lawsuits against the Second Amendment rights, efforts to restrict hunting and recreation that are currently permitted on public lands, and presently involved in a national courtroom crusade to destroy the benefits of coal-fired plants with letters, with testimony. Once again, their motives may be pure, fine. It's okay to do that, but not on the government dime. And this bill is written so loosely that it is not clear if any money goes indirectly or directly back to this point to do it.

This bill, when originally established, this program, when originally established, was there to inspire use and needs and build needed programs on public lands. When this program was originally established, by law, it's highest priority was to generate a new generation of land managers trained specifically to improve public lands and specifically to implement the bipartisan Healthy Forest Restoration Act.

That was, under the current system, the highest priority: to help our lands, stop catastrophic fires, to improve our forests. It was managed for that. Seventy-five percent of the money went to that particular issue. That is what should be done.

But once again, in committee, when we said let's restate that at least as one of the important criteria—because, you see, when this bill was written, they removed anything that related to healthy forests from the language. Reinstatement that. We actually said, Why don't you reinstate it so at least 50 percent of this goes to improving the forests of this country? And that wasn't allowed either.

So there is no criteria. There is no reference once again to the purpose of this bill originally, which was to make sure that we had a healthy forest. Instead, we have an open-ended bill that could do anything, that could go anywhere, that may make any kind of function.

And see, Madam Speaker, all of this could have been avoided. These are not tough issues. This is not one of the bills that is going to make or break the Republic. It could be avoided if simply the Democrat majority had decided to try and do something in a bipartisan way. If they said, These are your objections. Let's draft something to make sure that your restrictions are what we do as well. We didn't need to be here.

As I said, the committee promised that they would work on this before it came to the floor. I was not privy to those negotiations. I don't know where it went down, but something happened that did not need to happen.

And the Rules Committee, we once again took these amendments to the

Rules Committee and, in their typical fashion, the Rules Committee dropped all of them except for two. That didn't need to take place. Typical of what we're doing around here is simply trying to push things through when we don't need to do it. If we had really had a spirit of bipartisanship, this is something that could easily be accomplished.

So you can sit back, if this happens to pass today, and simply tell yourself it could have been great. It could have been a united bill. It could have been something which we all could say of which we are now proud. But because of the process that we are using, that does not take place. In fact, Madam Speaker, what we are doing here is duplicative.

AmeriCorps, if you look on their enacting legislation on page 22 and page 24, everything this program—which was designed to help public lands, especially healthy forests—everything this is now opened up to do is done by AmeriCorps. It's part of their program. Why not funnel all of the money there and avoid the duplication?

What we are doing now is building a program that has no latitudes, no restrictions on what their options are, no restrictions on their funding. This is a hole so wide you could drive a Toyota Prius through it because there is nothing involved that could stop it. That is not the way you do good legislation. This is not the way you do good legislation. But it could be, and it should have been.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, part of the process that we also see today, that we're going to experience today and have been experiencing for a while, is an effort on the part of my colleagues across the aisle to erase history and to assume that everything that we're doing today is somehow misconstrued to increase the deficit and that it is a government takeover, that it's not bipartisanship; and we're at this place to take corrective steps legislatively, including this legislation, because we are working on a history, a history of deficit spending, a history of no priorities, and a history that, although people want to erase it from memory, is there, and this is the reason that we're in the situation that we are right now.

As in terms of conspiracies in terms of this legislation, the American Camp Association endorsed it. The National Trust for Historic Preservation endorsed it. The Boys and Girls Club endorsed it. Girl Scouts of Northern California endorsed it. The Wellness Coalition endorsed it. The Student Conservation Association endorsed it. The Hispanic Federation endorsed it. The Coalition of National Park Retirees endorsed it, and the National Trust for Public Lands endorsed it, and the Muddy Sneakers: The Joy of Learning Outside endorsed it. So I'm assuming that they must be also part of this vast and nefarious conspiracy that is going

on. Somebody should advise them of that.

With that, let me now yield to the gentlelady from the Virgin Islands, a member of our Committee on National Resources, Dr. CHRISTENSEN, for 3 minutes.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Thank you, Chairman GRIJALVA.

And although I could be at home this weekend since I don't get to vote, as a physician, a family doctor, and a person who has worked all my life, all of my adult life to ensure that people had access to health care—especially minorities, people of color, those in our rural areas and territories who have often been left behind—I am pleased to be here this weekend for this historic vote.

And Chairman GRIJALVA, I want to thank you for introducing this legislation and thank you for your leadership as chairman of the Subcommittee on Parks, Recreation and Public Lands and your leadership in preserving some of our Nation's most important treasures.

Madam Speaker, I'm pleased to join my colleagues on the floor this morning in strong support of H.R. 1612, the Public Lands Service Corps Act. I am sure that my Park Superintendents Tutein and Hargrove are very much in support of this bill. In fact, Superintendent Hargrove and I have been trying to set up exactly what this bill would do in St. Thomas and St. John for several years.

H.R. 1612, in expanding and reinvigorating an existing program, addresses at least two important needs. First, it creates jobs—jobs that are so badly needed in our Nation today; jobs in an age group that has the highest and most chronic unemployment. In the absence of decent job opportunities, they're lured into drugs and criminal activity that is threatening to destroy the fabric of many communities, communities such as mine.

And then it helps to clear up a long-standing maintenance backlog in our Nation's parks and public lands, but it also begins to reestablish a relationship between the people in the involved communities and the public lands in their area.

If I can just speak about St. John for a moment. Two-thirds of that island is national park, and while it is the anchor of tourism there, for the most part, the native population are not the major stakeholders in that important mainstay of our economy. And though it's a small community, too many of our young people in St. John are in need of jobs and job training, especially those that don't require that they travel by boat to St. Thomas every day.

But more than that, with the Virgin Islands National Park occupying so much of the island, it is critical that we make more St. Johnians an integral part of what happens there and that they begin to regain a sense of belonging and ownership with our Nation that has been lost over the years.

The same is true for the Salt River and the other parklands in St. Croix and historic Hassel Island in St. Thomas, where those same young men and women are also in need of job training and jobs.

Although these public land service corps jobs would be just entry level jobs in the beginning, I am sure that once our young people are provided with the jobs and the training in preserving our national treasures that this bill would provide, they will want to go further.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield the gentlelady an additional 1 minute.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. We will be building a cadre of new local park rangers, interpreters, and other positions, as well as management all the way up to superintendents in the future.

So Chairman GRIJALVA, thank you for this bill. I am glad to support it.

Mr. BISHOP. Madam Speaker, I reserve.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield 3 minutes to the gentlelady from California, Ms. BARBARA LEE.

Ms. LEE of California. Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

Let me thank Chairman GRIJALVA for his leadership in bringing this bill, the Public Lands Service Corps Act, to the floor. And especially I want to thank you for bringing it to the floor and our leadership for allowing it to be brought to the floor today on such a historic day, a historic weekend. And Congressman GRIJALVA, I just want to salute you and Congresswoman WOOLSEY and all of you who fought so hard for this health care reform bill this weekend, especially for the public option.

And let me just say, when we cast this vote this weekend, we will be casting a vote on behalf of all of those uninsured and underinsured, on behalf of all of those who have died prematurely because they did not have preventative health care. And we will be casting this vote this weekend on behalf of our children and our grandchildren so that they may live longer and healthier lives.

So I'm very delighted that this bill is up this weekend so we would have a chance to talk about the importance of what we're doing within the context of this great bill.

This bill will train and connect young adults to service opportunities on public lands, putting a new generation of Americans back to work, finally, while instilling in them a great respect for America's legacy of conservation and stewardship.

The work done by the Public Lands Service Corps will do more than restore our public lands. It will also protect and preserve our environment, improve infrastructure, and help ensure the American public will always have access to the world's greatest recreational and scenic resources.

The bill would also engage with NOAA to allow young adults to serve

near coastal and marine waters along our treasured coastlines, such as those near my home in California in the Bay Area.

And we have many, many young people, especially those with the Martin Luther King Freedom Center, who work on many conservation projects. Also, they're learning about protecting our environment, ecology studies, nature studies. So this bill is going to be of tremendous help to the young people in my district.

But perhaps more importantly, this bill will provide service opportunities for our youth to work in restoring and preserving our public lands at a time when our young adults have been particularly hit hardest by the economic downturn. We have to remember that the youth unemployment rate now stands at more than 20 percent. Although low-income and minority youth populations face even greater challenges, African American youth, Latino youth, unemployment rates are now estimated to be as high as 42 percent.

□ 1100

In light of these harsh economic realities, I am so pleased that H.R. 1612 would encourage Federal agencies to prioritize outreach to underrepresented communities and populations and take steps to prepare participants—

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield the gentlelady 30 additional seconds.

Ms. LEE of California. Let me just say that this bill would prioritize, actually, outreach to underrepresented communities and populations and would take steps to prepare participants for careers with those agencies or within related conservation fields.

Simply put, this bill could not come at a better time. So I encourage my colleagues to support this bill and to provide the necessary funding to start this valuable program as soon as possible.

And let me just thank you, Chairman GRIJALVA, once again, for your leadership.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Let me yield 3 minutes to the gentlelady from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1612, the Public Lands Service Corps Act. And as I do so, I note the rather unusual markup of this bill or vote on this bill this afternoon here, or this morning here in our Nation's Capital on a Saturday. We are not usually gathered here, but that's because we have an historic opportunity tomorrow to cast a vote for major health care and health insurance reform legislation in the House of Representatives.

It's interesting the way the various topics are interconnected. When I think of health, we often think of people's health. But we can also think of

the health and survival, really, of our environment. And then I also believe that this is a jobs bill because this is a bill designed to put our young people to work. And that has a great deal to do with the subject very much on our minds these days with our slow economy and our great unemployment rate, and as the colleague who preceded me mentioned, the even higher unemployment rate among our young people.

This legislation will allow more of them to go to work and go to work in very healthy settings, out in the fresh air, engaged in exercise, learning to appreciate their natural surroundings. And I believe it really is a win-win all the way around.

So let me address the legislation. This important bill would help prepare, repair, and restore our Nation's public lands while also creating jobs for thousands of young Americans. Years of inadequate funding have left our public land management agencies with huge backlogs of labor-intensive work in our national parks, our forests, our wildlife refuges and our historic sites. Physical infrastructure is crumbling, and the natural resources have been neglected.

In many places, such as my home State of California, the effects of climate change are only magnifying the existing problems such as fire risk, damage from invasive species, coastal erosion, and fragmented habitat.

H.R. 1612 will help address all of these problems by expanding and strengthening the Public Lands Corps. It will streamline the corps' management, modernize its scope and provide new tools to help the program accomplish its mission. It will also expand the program to other agencies within the Department of the Interior and to the Commerce Department agencies, those which manage our coastal and marine systems, and our national marine sanctuaries.

This expanded public service initiative will introduce people from a greater diversity of social, ethnic, and cultural backgrounds to our Nation's parks, our forests, and our public lands, not only as possible future employees, but also as lifelong enthusiasts. And this bill will create jobs. H.R. 1612 will provide meaningful training and employment to young people who especially need it now while also improving the condition of our priceless natural and cultural resources.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield the gentlewoman 1 additional minute.

Mrs. CAPPS. As one who represents a national forest and a national marine sanctuary as well as a national park, the Channel Islands, I can attest to the great work of the Public Lands Corps and the importance of this legislation. So I thank you, Mr. GRIJALVA, for introducing this very important bill and for your great leadership on this issue. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this important legislation.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, may I inquire of the gentleman

from Arizona, my good friend, wrong on all the issues, but still a great guy, if he has any other speakers?

Mr. GRIJALVA. I have one additional speaker.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I will reserve.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) 3 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, and to Congressman GRIJALVA, let me thank you for your leadership on this very important issue, and to Congressman BISHOP as well for managing this legislation and acknowledging the concerns that may have been expressed. And I offer maybe this rebuttal to some of the points that have been made, and celebrate legislation that really recognizes that we are not here on the floor to only provide jobs and support the student conservation association, if that is what it is being interpreted as, but frankly to be part of fixing America's crumbling infrastructure, and certainly our public lands need fixing.

Years of inadequate funding have left our public land management agencies with huge backlogs of labor-intensive work on national parklands, wildlife refuges, historic sites, and Indian lands. As we watch America take advantage of visiting their Capitol, for example, to see the many monuments and sites that are here, they don't want to come and see monuments that have chipped surfaces or that are dangerous to visit.

And this opportunity to employ our young people and to teach them character and integrity is a very important part of this legislation. I for one have spoken to my State parks management entity asking them to look more carefully at the parks in inner cities, the opportunities for them to be designated national parks and to be able to put more parks in the inner cities that are under the jurisdiction of our Federal Government.

Of course, that analysis takes long. But I want to applaud my own city of Houston that continuously looks to put public and open space for the many people that live in our community. Houston expects to be the third-largest city in the Nation. Green space, public opportunities to utilize parks is very important. So when I see a bill that is going to help fix the crumbling infrastructure, the physical crumbling infrastructure, the natural and cultural resources that have been neglected—and in many places the effects of climate change are magnifying earlier problems such as fire risks, damage from insects and invasive species, coastal erosion, and fragmented habitat—I am in support of this legislation.

I also come from the Gulf Coast region and have seen what happens to the deterioration and erosion of the Gulf Coast. In particular after Hurricane Ike, we are now trying to restore Galveston and those coastal lands to be able to provide for an economic engine. So this is a good bill. With a high rate

of unemployment among African American youth and youth around the country, the opportunity for them to work with their hands and minds is a positive step.

This legislation will be part of the road map to help expand park service and ensure that our sites are maintained and kept at the level that they should. And I hope to be able to work with the chairman of this committee as I assess the needs of Houston to be able to provide more green space in our community. Along with this bill—tomorrow we will provide real health care for America by the vote I make tomorrow.

I urge support for the legislation.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The first gentlelady from California who spoke talked about how important it was to start this program. May I reiterate, once again, we are not starting anything new. We have a program. All we are doing is changing things in that program. The current program has specific dollar amounts going which will be reviewed and specific programmatic responsibility, all of which were stripped out in this particular version.

The gentlelady from Texas, actually, I appreciate everything she said, she was right on. Everything for which she argued that is necessary is what the original program was intended to do. The problem we have is—and we could have easily, easily gone along with the expansion of this program if they had actually allowed us to come up with some kind of limitations, because unfortunately, as I mentioned before, what we have now done with this program, 75 percent of which was to go to make sure that we have healthy forests, where the actual priority was to go to help public lands, is you have taken out all that language and we have simply replicated AmeriCorps.

Once again, go on to the language of the legislation that created that document. On page 22 they list what they can do. It's exactly the same thing that has now opened up this possibility. Page 24, where can they go? Exactly the same thing. All we are doing is making a duplicate of a program that's already there when we have a good program with a specific goal, a specific recommendation, and we have taken out those specifics.

Now I suggested that there is plenty of opportunity for abuse in this particular program if you don't try and limit it to what we want it to accomplish, because we all agree on what we want it to accomplish. The unfortunate thing is the language in this bill doesn't say that. It doesn't specify that. And so indeed we can have instead people going in there to provide not jobs, but to provide internships for people to go in and have them assist professional staff in identifying problems, formulating legal strategies to address those problems, providing legal education and direct response represen-

tation, engaging in policy development.

There is nothing wrong with doing that, but not on the government dime. I don't have a problem with having a tour of this country talking about sustainability of processes and having drinking parties and all. That's fine, but not on the government dime. I don't mind actually having an agency that has a program here in Washington sponsored by the National Park Service, but not if it's going to teach people how to lead protests and sit-ins, not on the government dime. You can do all of these, but not subsidized by government funding. And that's what should be specified, that those type of activities should be beyond the opportunity and beyond the appropriation and beyond the concept of this program. That is what should have been in the bill. And had we done that, we would also all be singing Kumbaya or anything else that you want to with that.

But this bill, as I said before, is somewhat of a metaphor for everything that we have been doing for a large part of this session. It's simply, once again, a bill that there were assurances made in the committee that amendments would be applied to this bill. For whatever reason, they are not. Instead, we are standing up here protesting a bill which should have been and could have been a great piece of legislation to move us forward towards a common goal, but for whatever reason it was not allowed to be written in that form.

We are standing here on a bill that actually presents itself with a visual of why we need systemic change in this body. If the vast majority of Members were here on the floor to hear what these arguments are, I think they would say, yes, this is a logical limitation, it should be there. But as you look around, the vast majority of Members are not on this floor right now. So far too often we do things in a vacuum of understanding, which is why this body needs systemic change in the process that we use to reach conclusions.

Nothing, nothing more than the changes, nothing more than the process we are going through this weekend, reeks of the need for some kind of systemic change. Because if we did that systemic change and the expectation were the people were here to listen to the debate, they were there in the committees to hear the testimony, there were there in the committees to be part of the markup process, I am still convinced that we could have a better product and a bipartisan product.

But the process does not encourage that. The process encourages the exact opposite. We have a process that has evolved in the wrong direction, and if anything else, this weekend should show that we need systemic change in the process.

This bill, this program, is still a decent program. And with some limitations on the amount of spending, some review on a regular period, and some

limitations on what the product will be, what the kids will be working on as they go through these internships, we could have a very, very good positive program. And I hope before this bill actually goes all the way through the system, those kinds of limitations are put back in the bill so we can have something of which we can actually be proud.

I urge defeat of this bill until those changes are made.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I rise to encourage support for H.R. 1612. Part of the discussion today was to say, from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, that it's a bad time to spend money on this program because unemployment is high and the deficit is high. I would respond that it is the perfect time for such investment.

This program is an investment in reducing unemployment among young people and in the long run will save money by preventing these maintenance problems in our public lands from getting worse. I want to talk about what is in the bill. Much of the limitations that were talked about by my good friend are not part of—some of the points that he made are not even part of the legislation. But let's talk for a second what this bill does do.

□ 1115

H.R. 1612 will broaden the scope of the program to include more agencies within the Department of the Interior, NOAA, within the Commerce Department; to expand the purposes of this program to make clear that a central aim is to attract participants from diverse backgrounds who are underrepresented among visitors and managers of our public lands; require establishment of coordinators with each agency eligible to participate in the program so that implementation of the program will be more uniform and efficient; authorize these Federal agencies to enter into cooperative agreements with non-profit youth or Conservation Corps to improve these partnerships; establish criteria and methodology for training programs for all participants; modernize the scope of eligible projects to include new challenges such as climate change and insect infestation; authorize participating agencies to provide housing for participants.

That is what the program does do. It is an appropriate time, it is a necessary time, and it is an investment that will pay huge dividends for our public lands and our young people, and I urge its adoption.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland). All time for debate on the bill, as amended, has expired.

—

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourns to meet at 1:00 p.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

PUBLIC LANDS SERVICE CORPS ACT

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. COLE

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

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

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 2 printed in part C of House Report 111-445 offered by Mr. COLE:

Page 20, line 14, after "local" insert ", and tribal".

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise today to offer what I believe is a noncontroversial amendment that would amend the Public Lands Service Corps Act to allow the Secretaries to enter into arrangements with tribal governments in order to provide temporary housing for Corps workers. This would be in addition to other Federal agencies, States, local governments, or private organizations. Because tribal governments are not included under the umbrella of any of the bill's other categories, it is necessary to modify the bill's language to include them.

Tribal governments enjoy a unique government-to-government sovereign relationship with the United States. Tribal governments regularly enter into similar agreements with a variety of Federal agencies and have done so for over 200 years, so this change would not disturb precedent.

Throughout this bill, tribal lands are designated as a place for young adults employed in this program to expend their efforts. It makes sense, then, that these tribes would be able to house some of the participants, thereby enhancing the experience of these workers. Not only would this program connect participants to the land, but housing in the tribal areas could enhance their cultural understanding and awareness.

Indian Country is as diverse as America itself, so obviously housing these individuals would not be ideal on some reservations. It is important, though, to include willing tribal governments in this program, as Native Americans are historically some of the best stewards of the environment and because the potential for cultural interchange in this program would certainly have great benefit for both the national lands conservation workers and the tribes.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition to the amendment, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, this amendment would ensure that the tribes would be among the governments and groups with whom the Secretaries would contract to provide temporary housing for Corps participants.

We support this amendment and appreciate the gentleman's efforts and appreciate the correction of an oversight.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. I thank the gentleman very much, and I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, I urge all Members to vote "yes" on this amendment. Again, this is a simple modification that will allow Native American tribes to enter into agreements to house the employees of the Public Lands Service Corps just like Federal agencies, States, localities, and private organizations.

This designation will give the Departments of Agriculture and the Interior more housing options for these workers and will allow the tribes to be more fully engaged in the program.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, I would also urge support for the amendment and would also note that the Health Care Reform Act we are expecting to take up tomorrow includes the most sweeping changes to Indian health care in decades, long overdue.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE).

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 1192, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. BISHOP OF
UTAH

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, I have an amendment 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 No. 2 printed in part C of House Report 111-445 offered by Mr. BISHOP of Utah:

Page 28, strike lines 8 through 13 and insert the following (and redesignate the subsequent paragraphs accordingly):

"(1) in subsection (a), by striking 'for each fiscal year' and inserting 'for each of fiscal years 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, and 2015';"

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This is a very simple amendment, an easily understandable one. It simply has two parts to it.

Number one is you continue the funding authorization that is in the current law; and, number two, you add a 5-year sunset period in there.

As I said earlier when we were talking about the base bill, there is nothing wrong with the things that we should be doing, but there is something wrong when we refuse to periodically exercise our legislative responsibility to review those things that we are currently doing.

We do it all the time. The Endangered Species Act has a sunset, FLPMA has a sunset, The Elementary and Secondary Education Act has a sunset, all of which are designed to have us come back here and reevaluate what we are doing to make sure that our priorities have stayed the same. There is nothing wrong with a sunset. In fact, it should be standard fare in most of our pieces of legislation.

If we are now creating this bill, which replicates AmeriCorps one more time, there is nothing wrong with saying let's review it every 5 years to make sure we are still going on the path we originally determined.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, under existing law, funding for Public Land Corps is capped at \$12 billion annually. The bill before us, H.R. 1612, would remove this cap. The amendment offered by my colleague, Mr. BISHOP, would not only leave the cap in place, but also force the program to sunset in 5 years.

Madam Speaker, as we all know, when the Republicans controlled this Congress and the White House, they presided over the largest increase in Federal spending in the history of this Nation. Amendments like this one provide important clues as to why that happened. Are we honestly worried about runaway spending on youth job, training, and education programs? Is it imperative that we clamp down on efforts to put young people to work repairing trails and visitor centers used by American families when they visit in parks and public lands? Of course not. This is the definition of being penny wise and pound foolish.

Republicans want to cap and sunset a popular, effective, bipartisan jobs program; but when they controlled the entire Federal budget, they spent like

sailors on leave. Big spending, runaway spending, all those analogies fit. This is a poor attempt to appear fiscally responsible after years and years of irresponsible free spending. This amendment is not necessary. The fact that this program is already incredibly popular, an enactment of H.R. 1612 would make it an even bigger success.

Many Members will continue pushing to put young people to work and give them the job training they so desperately seek.

Some in the minority can continue coming to the floor and nipping at the heels of these bills as we pass them. The American people will see which Members are serious about addressing unemployment and the condition of our parks and public lands, and which Members are just trying to mask that legacy of irresponsible spending.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, once again, the process here is that it is not about whether a program is popular or not. The Endangered Species Act has popularity within certain groups. Obviously, higher ed has popularity and elementary education has popularity. The issue here is, do we adequately review these particular programs to see where we are and what our priorities ought to be? And if we don't, we have a tendency of losing those in the morass of the rest of the body, the plethora of legislation, the plethora of organizations that we simply have.

This does not technically sunset the program. It sunsets the authorization for the appropriations for the program; the program goes on until further action is taken by this particular body, but it is the sequence that we use to try and see should we redo, should we continue, should we at least reevaluate what we are supposed to be.

When we don't do those kinds of re-evaluations, we abrogate legislative responsibility, and we pass it on to an executive branch which sometimes, well, always, has somewhat of a checkered response in its oversight responsibilities in these particular areas.

Madam Speaker, this is the right thing to do. It is one of the things that could easily turn a bill that is right now partisan into a bipartisan bill so we don't have to look back and say what we did we could have done so much better. I urge approval of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I urge defeat of the amendment and remind that a review of this legislation is conducted every year by appropriators, and that committees of jurisdiction are not prevented in this legislation from conducting oversight of the programs. With that, let me urge defeat of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP).

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 1192, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1192, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part C of House Report 111-445 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. BISHOP of Utah,

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. COLE of Oklahoma.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. BISHOP OF UTAH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on adoption of the amendment printed in part C of House Report 111-445 by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 227, nays 180, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 148]

YEAS—227

Aderholt	Capito	Gohmert
Adler (NJ)	Cardoza	Goodlatte
Akin	Carnahan	Gordon (TN)
Alexander	Carney	Granger
Altmire	Carter	Graves
Andrews	Cassidy	Griffith
Arcuri	Castle	Guthrie
Austria	Chaffetz	Hall (TX)
Bachmann	Childers	Halvorson
Bachus	Coble	Harper
Barrett (SC)	Coffman (CO)	Hastings (WA)
Bartlett	Cole	Heller
Barton (TX)	Conaway	Hensarling
Biggart	Costa	Hergert
Billray	Courtney	Herseth Sandlin
Bilirakis	Crenshaw	Hill
Bishop (UT)	Culberson	Himes
Blackburn	Davis (AL)	Hodes
Bocieri	Davis (KY)	Hunter
Boehner	Dent	Inglis
Bonner	Diaz-Balart, L.	Issa
Bono Mack	Diaz-Balart, M.	Jenkins
Boozman	Donnelly (IN)	Johnson (GA)
Boren	Dreier	Johnson (IL)
Boucher	Driehaus	Johnson, Sam
Boustany	Duncan	Jones
Brady (TX)	Ellsworth	Jordan (OH)
Bright	Emerson	Kilroy
Broun (GA)	Fallin	King (IA)
Brown (SC)	Flake	King (NY)
Brown-Waite,	Fleming	Kingston
Ginny	Forbes	Kirk
Buchanan	Poster	Kline (MN)
Burgess	Fox	Lamborn
Burton (IN)	Franks (AZ)	Lance
Calvert	Frelinghuysen	Latham
Camp	Gallely	Latta
Campbell	Garrett (NJ)	Lee (NY)
Cantor	Gerlach	Lewis (CA)
Cao	Gingrey (GA)	Linder

LoBiondo
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maffei
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Marshall
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris
Rogers
McNerney
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Minnick
Moran (KS)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye

Olson
Owens
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Perriello
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (GA)
Putnam
Quigley
Radanovich
Rehberg
Reichert
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schauer
Schmidt
Schock
Schwartz

Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Skelton
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Souder
Space
Stearns
Sullivan
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Titus
Turner
Upton
Walden
Walz
Wamp
Weiner
Welch
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—180

Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Bralley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Giffords

Gonzalez
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Hinojosa
Hirono
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Johnson, E. B.
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lowey
Lujan
Maloney
Markey (MA)
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Meek (FL)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)

Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy, Patrick
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Perlmutter
Pingree (ME)
Polis (CO)
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sanchez, Linda T.
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schradler
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Snyder
Speier
Spratt
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Teague
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Vislosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Watson

Watt Wilson (OH) Wu
 Waxman Woolsey Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—23

Ackerman Hinchey Payne
 Blunt Hoekstra Richardson
 Buyer Holden Sanchez, Loretta
 Deal (GA) Holt Sarbanes
 Ellison LaTourette Stark
 Engel Lofgren, Zoe Towns
 Fortenberry Meeks (NY) Waters
 Green, Gene Nadler (NY)

Castle Hinojosa Moore (KS)
 Castor (FL) Hirono Moore (WI)
 Chaffetz Hodes Moran (KS)
 Chandler Honda Moran (VA)
 Childers Hoyer Murphy (CT)
 Chu Hunter Murphy (NY)
 Clarke Inglis Murphy, Patrick
 Clay Inslie Murphy, Tim
 Cleaver Israel Myrick
 Clyburn Issa Napolitano
 Coble Jackson (IL) Neal (MA)
 Coffman (CO) Jackson Lee Neugebauer
 Cohen (TX) Nunes
 Cole Jenkins Nye
 Conaway Johnson (GA) Oberstar
 Connolly (VA) Johnson (IL) Obey
 Conyers Johnson, E. B. Olson
 Cooper Johnson, Sam Olver
 Costa Jones Ortiz
 Costello Jordan (OH) Owens
 Courtney Kagen Pallone
 Crenshaw Kanjorski Pascrell
 Crowley Kennedy Paul
 Cuellar Kildee Paulsen
 Culberson Kilpatrick (MI) Pence
 Cummings Kilroy Perlmutter
 Dahlkemper Kind Perriello
 Davis (AL) King (IA) Peters
 Davis (CA) King (NY) Peterson
 Davis (IL) Kingston Petri
 Davis (KY) Kirk Pingree (ME)
 Davis (TN) Kirkpatrick (AZ) Pitts
 DeFazio Kissell Platts
 DeGette Klein (FL) Poe (TX)
 Delahunt Kline (MN) Polis (CO)
 DeLauro Kosmas Pomeroy
 Dent Kratovil Posey
 Diaz-Balart, L. Kucinich Price (GA)
 Diaz-Balart, M. Lamborn Price (NC)
 Dicks Lance Putnam
 Dingell Langevin Quigley
 Doggett Larsen (WA) Radanovich
 Donnelly (IN) Larson (CT) Rahall
 Doyle Latham Rangel
 Dreier Latta Rehberg
 Driehaus Lee (CA) Reichert
 Duncan Lee (NY) Reyes
 Edwards (MD) Levin Rodriguez
 Edwards (TX) Lewis (CA) Roe (TN)
 Ehlers Lewis (GA) Rogers (AL)
 Ellsworth Linder Rogers (KY)
 Emerson Lipinski Rogers (MI)
 Engel LoBiondo Rohrabacher
 Eshoo Loeb sack Rooney
 Etheridge Lowey Ros-Lehtinen
 Fallin Lucas Roskam
 Farr Luetkemeyer Ross
 Fattah Luján Rothman (NJ)
 Filner Lummis Roybal-Allard
 Flake Lungren, Daniel Royce
 Fleming E. Ruppertsberger
 Forbes Lynch Rush
 Foster Mack Ryan (OH)
 Foxx Maffei Ryan (WI)
 Frank (MA) Maloney Salazar
 Franks (AZ) Manzullo Sanchez, Linda
 Frelinghuysen Marchant T.
 Fudge Markey (CO) Scalise
 Gallegly Markey (MA) Schakowsky
 Garrett (NJ) Marshall Schauer
 Gerlach Matheson Schiff
 Giffords Matsui Schmidt
 Gonzalez McCarthy (CA) Schock
 Goodlatte McCarthy (NY) Schrader
 Gordon (TN) McCaul Schwartz
 Granger McClintock Scott (GA)
 Graves McCollum Scott (VA)
 Grayson McCotter Sensenbrenner
 Green, Al McDermott Serrano
 Griffith McGovern Sessions
 Grijalva McHenry Sestak
 Guthrie McIntyre Shadegg
 Gutierrez McKeon Shea-Porter
 Hall (NY) McMahan Sherman
 Hall (TX) McMorris Shimkus
 Halvorson Rodgers Shuler
 Hare McNeerney Shuster
 Harman Meek (FL) Simpson
 Harper Melancon Sires
 Hastings (FL) Mica Skelton
 Hastings (WA) Michaud Slaughter
 Heinrich Miller (FL) Smith (NE)
 Heller Miller (MD) Smith (NJ)
 Hensarling Miller (NC) Smith (TX)
 Herger Miller, Gary Smith (WA)
 Herseth Sandlin Miller, George Snyder
 Higgins Minnick Souder
 Hill Mitchell Space
 Himes Mollohan Speier

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

□ 1201

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Mr. EDWARDS of Texas, Ms. McCOLLUM, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mrs. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. ISRAEL, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Messrs. BARROW, SCHRADER, HOYER, PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, SESTAK, SNYDER, THOMPSON of Mississippi, SIRES, AL GREEN of Texas, GUTIERREZ, Mrs. CAPPS, Messrs. SCOTT of Virginia, DOGGETT, CUELLAR, Ms. LEE of California, Messrs. KRATOVIL, MATHESON, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. KOSMAS, Messrs. GEORGE MILLER of California, CONYERS, and Mrs. LOWEY changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. NEUGEBAUER, SHIMKUS, PITTS, SOUDER, HERGER, WALZ, FLAKE, BILIRAKIS, OWENS, DRIEHAUS, CHILDERS, Ms. FALLIN, Mrs. HALVORSON, and Ms. FOXX changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the amendment was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. COLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on adoption of the amendment printed in part C of House Report 111-445 by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE) on which the yeas and nays prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

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

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 402, nays 0, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 149]

YEAS—402

Aderholt Bilbray Brown (SC)
 Adler (NJ) Bilirakis Brown, Corrine
 Akin Bishop (GA) Brown-Waite,
 Alexander Bishop (NY) Ginny
 Altmire Bishop (UT) Buchanan
 Arcuri Blackburn Burgess
 Austria Blumenauer Burton (IN)
 Baca Boccheri Butterfield
 Bachmann Boehner Buyer
 Bachus Bonner Calvert
 Baird Bono Mack Camp
 Baldwin Boozman Campbell
 Barrett (SC) Boren Cao
 Barrow Boswell Capito
 Bartlett Boucher Capps
 Barton (TX) Boustany Capuano
 Bean Boyd Cardoza
 Becerra Brady (PA) Carnahan
 Berkley Brady (TX) Carney
 Berman Braley (IA) Carson (IN)
 Berry Bright Carter
 Biggert Broun (GA) Cassidy

Castor (FL) Hirono Moore (WI)
 Chaffetz Hodes Moran (KS)
 Chandler Honda Moran (VA)
 Childers Hoyer Murphy (CT)
 Chu Hunter Murphy (NY)
 Clarke Inglis Murphy, Patrick
 Clay Inslie Murphy, Tim
 Cleaver Israel Myrick
 Clyburn Issa Napolitano
 Coble Jackson (IL) Neal (MA)
 Coffman (CO) Jackson Lee Neugebauer
 Cohen (TX) Nunes
 Cole Jenkins Nye
 Conaway Johnson (GA) Oberstar
 Connolly (VA) Johnson (IL) Obey
 Conyers Johnson, E. B. Olson
 Cooper Johnson, Sam Olver
 Costa Jones Ortiz
 Costello Jordan (OH) Owens
 Courtney Kagen Pallone
 Crenshaw Kanjorski Pascrell
 Crowley Kennedy Paul
 Cuellar Kildee Paulsen
 Culberson Kilpatrick (MI) Pence
 Cummings Kilroy Perlmutter
 Dahlkemper Kind Perriello
 Davis (AL) King (IA) Peters
 Davis (CA) King (NY) Peterson
 Davis (IL) Kingston Petri
 Davis (KY) Kirk Pingree (ME)
 Davis (TN) Kirkpatrick (AZ) Pitts
 DeFazio Kissell Platts
 DeGette Klein (FL) Poe (TX)
 Delahunt Kline (MN) Polis (CO)
 DeLauro Kosmas Pomeroy
 Dent Kratovil Posey
 Diaz-Balart, L. Kucinich Price (GA)
 Diaz-Balart, M. Lamborn Price (NC)
 Dicks Lance Putnam
 Dingell Langevin Quigley
 Doggett Larsen (WA) Radanovich
 Donnelly (IN) Larson (CT) Rahall
 Doyle Latham Rangel
 Dreier Latta Rehberg
 Driehaus Lee (CA) Reichert
 Duncan Lee (NY) Reyes
 Edwards (MD) Levin Rodriguez
 Edwards (TX) Lewis (CA) Roe (TN)
 Ehlers Lewis (GA) Rogers (AL)
 Ellsworth Linder Rogers (KY)
 Emerson Lipinski Rogers (MI)
 Engel LoBiondo Rohrabacher
 Eshoo Loeb sack Rooney
 Etheridge Lowey Ros-Lehtinen
 Fallin Lucas Roskam
 Farr Luetkemeyer Ross
 Fattah Luján Rothman (NJ)
 Filner Lummis Roybal-Allard
 Flake Lungren, Daniel Royce
 Fleming E. Ruppertsberger
 Forbes Lynch Rush
 Foster Mack Ryan (OH)
 Foxx Maffei Ryan (WI)
 Frank (MA) Maloney Salazar
 Franks (AZ) Manzullo Sanchez, Linda
 Frelinghuysen Marchant T.
 Fudge Markey (CO) Scalise
 Gallegly Markey (MA) Schakowsky
 Garrett (NJ) Marshall Schauer
 Gerlach Matheson Schiff
 Giffords Matsui Schmidt
 Gonzalez McCarthy (CA) Schock
 Goodlatte McCarthy (NY) Schrader
 Gordon (TN) McCaul Schwartz
 Granger McClintock Scott (GA)
 Graves McCollum Scott (VA)
 Grayson McCotter Sensenbrenner
 Green, Al McDermott Serrano
 Griffith McGovern Sessions
 Grijalva McHenry Sestak
 Guthrie McIntyre Shadegg
 Gutierrez McKeon Shea-Porter
 Hall (NY) McMahan Sherman
 Hall (TX) McMorris Shimkus
 Halvorson Rodgers Shuler
 Hare McNeerney Shuster
 Harman Meek (FL) Simpson
 Harper Melancon Sires
 Hastings (FL) Mica Skelton
 Hastings (WA) Michaud Slaughter
 Heinrich Miller (FL) Smith (NE)
 Heller Miller (MD) Smith (NJ)
 Hensarling Miller (NC) Smith (TX)
 Herger Miller, Gary Smith (WA)
 Herseth Sandlin Miller, George Snyder
 Higgins Minnick Souder
 Hill Mitchell Space
 Himes Mollohan Speier

NOT VOTING—28

Ackerman Green, Gene Pastor (AZ)
 Andrews Hinchey Payne
 Blunt Hoekstra Richardson
 Cantor Holden Sanchez, Loretta
 Deal (GA) Holt Sarbanes
 Ellison Kaptur Stark
 Fortenberry LaTourette Towns
 Garamendi Lofgren, Zoe Waters
 Gingrey (GA) Meeks (NY)
 Gohmert Nadler (NY)

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

□ 1208

So the amendment 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. PASTOR of Arizona. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 149, had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

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

Mrs. LUMMIS. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

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

Mrs. LUMMIS. Yes, in its current form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. Lummis moves to recommit the bill H.R. 1612 to the Committee on Natural Resources with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendments:

Page 7, line 18, insert “on public lands” after “resources”.

Page 15, line 17, strike “and”.

Page 15, line 18, insert “and” after the semicolon.

Page 15, after line 18, insert the following: “(iv) projects under the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (Public Law 108-148); “Projects under this subparagraph shall be considered priority projects;”.

Page 18, after line 12, insert the following (and redesignate the subsequent paragraphs accordingly):

“(8) By amending the text of subsection (f) (as so redesignated), by inserting ‘involve improvements to Federal property and’ after ‘preference to those projects which’.”

Page 28, line 13, after “title” insert “, of which no less than three quarters of the

sums shall be made available for healthy forests restoration priority projects under section 204(e)(1)(B)(iv)''.

Page 28, after line 16, insert the following: "(o) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—No person or entity who is a party to a pending lawsuit against the dispensing Secretary is eligible to receive funds authorized or made available under this Act or amendments made by this Act.

"(p) FURTHER LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS TO PROTECT CHILDREN.—No adult shall be eligible to receive funds or participate in the Public Lands Service Corps program under this Act or amendments made by this Act, if that person—

"(1) refuses to consent to a criminal history check;

"(2) makes a false statement in connection with such a criminal history check;

"(3) is registered, or is required to be registered, on a State sex offender registry or the National Sex Offender Registry established under the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 (42 U.S.C. 16901 et seq.) or

"(4) has been convicted of murder, as described in section 1111 of title 18, United States Code."

Mrs. LUMMIS (during the reading). Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS) is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Madam Speaker, this motion to recommit will strengthen and improve the Public Lands Service Corps program by ensuring it is focused on defined, priority activities and by adding safeguards against misuse of program funds.

There are four clear and simple parts to this motion:

First is an important provision that will protect the young men and women in the program from being subjected to registered sex offenders. People as young as 16 years of age are eligible to participate; and for many, a summer job with a Public Lands Corps project will be their first time away from home for an extended period of time.

That is why this motion to recommit would require criminal background checks for the adults in the program who come in contact with the minors and would bar registered sex offenders from supervising these young people. The protections included in this motion are taken directly from those in the AmeriCorps program that we just passed in this Congress a year ago.

Sex offenders should not be placed in positions of authority over, or be allowed access to, young people in the Public Lands Corps, just as they are prohibited in AmeriCorps. By voting for this motion to recommit, you will prohibit sex offenders from participating in this program and will be voting to provide basic protections for young people.

Second, this motion restores the current act's emphasis on combating the

threats of beetle infestation and wildfires that are devastating vast tracts of our public forest lands. Without this motion, urgently needed efforts to combat this ongoing tragedy will receive no priority whatsoever for funding.

The Healthy Forests Act passed the House with strong bipartisan support, and yet this bill would erase the emphasis provided for Healthy Forests Act activities in the existing law. This is the wrong approach and a step backwards. Wildfire prevention and battling beetle and other infestations should be a priority to protect local communities and our national forests. These activities must be continued, not eliminated, as the bill would do. Voting for the motion to recommit will ensure this occurs.

Third, this motion would prevent misdirection of grant funds by requiring that the projects funded actually make improvements to public lands rather than being used for public advocacy or junkets like the organic, micro-brewed beer bus tour we heard about from Mr. BISHOP. This program is billed as a means of connecting young people to our public lands. So this motion very simply requires that funded projects occur on public lands and improve these lands.

□ 1215

Fourth and lastly, this motion would make any group that is engaged in a lawsuit against the government ineligible to receive grant funds. If you are going to sue the government, then you shouldn't collect grant money from taxpayers. This will ensure that political advocacy groups that sue the government are not supported by taxpayer dollars.

This motion to recommit includes four commonsense improvements to the bill. I urge my colleagues to vote to prevent sex offenders from getting access to young people through this program, to vote to restore the bill to the priority status of wildfire prevention activities under the bipartisan Healthy Forests Act, to vote to ensure grant funds are spent and work actually on our public lands and not bus tours, and to vote to prevent grant money from going to groups that file lawsuits against the government.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the motion to recommit.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRIJALVA. The current bill would expand the public lands program to a dozen agencies. By restricting the use of the money that would be appropriated for the legislation, you effectively put three-quarters of it into forest activities, thereby eliminating the opportunity to be able to engage young people in a variety and a comprehensive look at opportunities in our public lands and in our public lands agency.

The vast majority of the adults who participate in the program are Federal employees. The oversight is their responsibility in the agency. NPS rangers, forest rangers already get full background checks and full clearance. They already get full FBI checks. The minority failed to raise this issue during committees or at the Committee on Rules.

The other issue is the issue of due process. To prohibit an individual or organization from being able to seek redress in a court of law I think is not only undemocratic, but sincerely wrong.

The motion to recommit basically hamstring the legislation, prevents it from being effective. It is a hodgepodge of items thrown in that were not before the Rules Committee and were not before the discussion on the full committee. I would urge a "no" vote.

Let me point out thus far that only \$7.5 million has ever been appropriated for Public Land Corps, and all of that money was earmarked for forest health. Under this legislation before us today, it is our expectation that more funds will be available for all eligible projects, forest health as well as other programs.

Finally, we never hear the end of it from the other side, the need to take care of lands we own before we do anything else. This program does precisely that. The motion to recommit hamstring the program, reduces its effectiveness, narrows the opportunity for young people in terms of where they work and what training and what education they will receive, duplicates the process by which people are checked that are going to be working with young people in this program, and prevents and neglects full redress under our laws for individuals and organizations. I think those three items have nothing to do with the legislation. They are there to hamper the legislation.

I would urge my colleagues to oppose the motion to recommit, to pass this legislation, and give full, meaningful employment opportunity for the young people that are right now suffering the most from a lack of jobs and for the young people that most need a second chance. This legislation is about opportunity. This legislation is about saving our public lands and educating our young people. The motion to recommit is about preventing that.

I would urge all my Members not to be duped into that presumption, to go forward with the bill and pass the legislation as is, and oppose the motion to recommit.

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 yeas appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 387, noes 21, not voting 22, as follows:)

[Roll No. 150]

AYES—387

Aderholt	Cooper	Hinojosa
Adler (NJ)	Hirono	
Akin	Costello	Hodes
Alexander	Courtney	Hoyer
Altmire	Crenshaw	Hunter
Andrews	Crowley	Inglis
Arcuri	Cuellar	Inslee
Austria	Culberson	Israel
Baca	Cummings	Issa
Bachmann	Dahlkemper	Jackson (IL)
Bachus	Davis (AL)	Jackson Lee
Baird	Davis (CA)	(TX)
Baldwin	Davis (IL)	Jenkins
Barrett (SC)	Davis (KY)	Johnson (GA)
Barrow	Davis (TN)	Johnson (IL)
Bartlett	DeFazio	Johnson, Sam
Barton (TX)	DeGette	Jones
Bean	Delahunt	Jordan (OH)
Becerra	DeLauro	Kagen
Berkley	Dent	Kanjorski
Berman	Diaz-Balart, L.	Kaptur
Berry	Diaz-Balart, M.	Kennedy
Biggert	Dicks	Kildee
Bilbray	Doggett	Kilroy
Bilirakis	Donnelly (IN)	Kind
Bishop (GA)	Doyle	King (IA)
Bishop (NY)	Dreier	King (NY)
Bishop (UT)	Driehaus	Kingston
Blackburn	Duncan	Kirk
Bocchieri	Edwards (MD)	Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Boehner	Edwards (TX)	Kissell
Bonner	Ehlers	Klein (FL)
Bono Mack	Ellsworth	Kline (MN)
Boozman	Emerson	Kosmas
Boren	Engel	Kratovich
Boswell	Eshoo	Kucinich
Boucher	Etheridge	Lamborn
Boustany	Fallin	Lance
Boyd	Farr	Langevin
Brady (PA)	Fattah	Larsen (WA)
Brady (TX)	Filner	Larson (CT)
Bralley (IA)	Flake	Latham
Bright	Fleming	Latta
Broun (GA)	Forbes	Lee (NY)
Brown (SC)	Foster	Levin
Brown, Corrine	Fox	Lewis (CA)
Brown-Waite,	Frank (MA)	Lewis (GA)
Ginny	Franks (AZ)	Linder
Buchanan	Frelinghuysen	Lipinski
Burgess	Fudge	LoBiondo
Burton (IN)	Gallegly	Loebsack
Butterfield	Garamendi	Lowe
Buyer	Garrett (NJ)	Lucas
Calvert	Gerlach	Luetkemeyer
Camp	Giffords	Lujan
Campbell	Gingrey (GA)	Lummis
Cantor	Gonzalez	Lungren, Daniel
Cao	Goodlatte	E.
Capito	Gordon (TN)	Lynch
Capuano	Granger	Mack
Cardoza	Graves	Maffei
Carnahan	Grayson	Maloney
Carney	Green, Al	Manzullo
Carson (IN)	Griffith	Marchant
Carter	Guthrie	Markey (CO)
Cassidy	Gutierrez	Markey (MA)
Castle	Hall (NY)	Marshall
Castor (FL)	Hall (TX)	Matheson
Chaffetz	Halvorson	Matsui
Chandler	Hare	McCarthy (CA)
Childers	Harper	McCarthy (NY)
Clarke	Hastings (FL)	McCaul
Clay	Hastings (WA)	McClintock
Cleaver	Heinrich	McCollum
Clyburn	Heller	McCotter
Coble	Hensarling	McDermott
Coffman (CO)	Herger	McGovern
Cohen	Herseht Sandlin	McHenry
Cole	Higgins	McIntyre
Conaway	Hill	McKeon
Connolly (VA)	Himes	McMahon

McMorris	Price (GA)	Smith (NE)
Rodgers	Price (NC)	Smith (NJ)
McNerney	Putnam	Smith (TX)
Meek (FL)	Quigley	Smith (WA)
Melancon	Radanovich	Snyder
Mica	Rahall	Souder
Michaud	Rangel	Space
Miller (FL)	Rehberg	Speier
Miller (MI)	Reichert	Spratt
Miller (NC)	Rodriguez	Stearns
Miller, Gary	Roe (TN)	Stupak
Miller, George	Rogers (AL)	Sullivan
Minnick	Rogers (KY)	Sutton
Mitchell	Rogers (MI)	Tanner
Mollohan	Rohrabacher	Taylor
Moore (KS)	Rooney	Teague
Moran (KS)	Ros-Lehtinen	Terry
Moran (VA)	Roskam	Thompson (CA)
Murphy (CT)	Ross	Thompson (MS)
Murphy (NY)	Rothman (NJ)	Thompson (PA)
Costa	Roybal-Allard	Thornberry
Murphy, Patrick	Royce	Tiahrt
Murphy, Tim	Ruppersberger	Tiberi
Myrick	Rush	Tierney
Hunter	Ryan (OH)	Titus
Neal (MA)	Ryan (WI)	Tonko
Neugebauer	Salazar	Tsongas
Nunes	Scalise	Turner
Issa	Schakowsky	Upton
Obama	Schauer	Van Hollen
Oberstar	Schiff	Velázquez
Obey	Schmidt	Visclosky
Olson	Schock	Walden
Oliver	Schrader	Walz
Ortiz	Schwartz	Wamp
Owens	Scott (GA)	Wasserman
Pallone	Sensenbrenner	Schultz
Pallone	Serrano	Weiner
Pastor (AZ)	Sessions	Welch
Paul	Sestak	Westmoreland
Paulsen	Shadegg	Whitfield
Pence	Shea-Porter	Wilson (OH)
Perlmutter	Sherman	Wilson (SC)
Perriello	Shimkus	Wittman
Peters	Shuler	Wolf
Peterson	Shuster	Wu
Petri	Simpson	Yarmuth
Pingree (ME)	Sires	Young (AK)
Pitts	Skelton	Young (FL)
Platts	Slaughter	
Poe (TX)		
Polis (CO)		
Pomeroy		
Posey		

NOES—21

Blumenauer	Johnson, E. B.
Capps	Kilpatrick (MI)
Chu	Lee (CA)
Conyers	Moore (WI)
Dingell	Napolitano
Grijalva	Pascarel
Harman	Reyes
Honda	

Sánchez, Linda
T.
Scott (VA)
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Woolsey

NOT VOTING—22

Ackerman	Hoekstra	Richardson
Blunt	Holden	Sanchez, Loretta
Deal (GA)	Holt	Sarbanes
Ellison	LaTourette	Stark
Fortenberry	Lofgren, Zoe	Towns
Gohmert	Meeks (NY)	Waters
Green, Gene	Nadler (NY)	
Hinche	Payne	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Two minutes remaining in the vote.

□ 1259

Mr. CONYERS changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Messrs. LEVIN, EDWARDS of Texas, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Messrs. MOORE of Kansas, ISRAEL, POLIS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Messrs. BISHOP of New York, LIPINSKI, KENNEDY, HARE, KIND, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. SUTTON, Messrs. MOLLOHAN, RAHALL, COURTNEY, WEINER, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona, Messrs. SPRATT, PERLMUTTER, DELAHUNT, GORDON of Tennessee, SMITH of New Jersey, CAPUANO, NEAL of Massachusetts, LUJÁN, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Messrs.

CONNOLLY of Virginia, KANJORSKI, KISSELL, FARR, PRICE of North Carolina, CLAY, BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Messrs. SALAZAR, BRALEY of Iowa, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Messrs. MCGOVERN, PASTOR of Arizona, FRANK of Massachusetts, THOMPSON of California, CARNAHAN, MCDERMOTT, LARSEN of Washington, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. DELAURO, Messrs. VAN HOLLEN, MICHAUD, HOYER, GRAYSON, TIERNEY, GEORGE MILLER of California, GARAMENDI, RANGEL, HEINRICH, OBEY, BUTTERFIELD, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. SPEIER, Messrs. DAVIS of Illinois, SIRES, MILLER of North Carolina, RUSH, BISHOP of Georgia, CLYBURN, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Messrs. WELCH, JOHNSON of Georgia, BERRY, KAGEN, PALLONE, KUCINICH, MURPHY of Connecticut, DOYLE, MORAN of Virginia, RYAN of Ohio, SERRANO, CROWLEY, BERMAN, CLEAVER, LEWIS of Georgia, TONKO, CARSON of Indiana, HINOJOSA, GONZALEZ, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. HALL of New York, Ms. FUDGE, Messrs. JACKSON of Illinois, SHERMAN, CUMMINGS, DOGGETT, Ms. TSONGAS, Messrs. VISCLOSKY, ENGEL, BECERRA, SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. HIRONO, Messrs. OLVER, HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. BALDWIN, Messrs. FATTAH, INSLEE, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Messrs. OBERSTAR, ROTHMAN, GUTIERREZ, ANDREWS, HIGGINS, DICKS, THOMPSON of Mississippi, COHEN, Ms. KAPTUR, Messrs. FILNER, MARKEY of Massachusetts, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Messrs. BACA, QUIGLEY, Ms. CASTOR of Florida and Ms. CLARKE changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the motion to recommit was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, pursuant to the instructions of the House in the motion to recommit, I report the bill, H.R. 1612, back to the House with an amendment.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GRIJALVA: Page 7, line 18, insert “on public lands” after “resources”.

Page 15, line 17, strike “and”.

Page 15, line 18, insert “and” after the semicolon.

Page 15, after line 18, insert the following: “(iv) projects under the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (Public Law 108-148); “Projects under this subparagraph shall be considered priority projects;”.

Page 18, after line 12, insert the following (and redesignate the subsequent paragraphs accordingly):

“(8) By amending the text of subsection (f) (as so redesignated), by inserting ‘involve improvements to Federal property and’ after ‘preference to those projects which’”.

Page 28, line 13, after “title” insert “, of which no less than three quarters of the sums shall be made available for healthy forests restoration priority projects under section 204(e)(1)(B)(iv)”.

Page 28, after line 16, insert the following: “(o) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—No person or entity who is a party to a pending lawsuit against the dispensing Secretary is eligible to receive funds authorized or made available under this Act or amendments made by this Act.

“(p) FURTHER LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS TO PROTECT CHILDREN.—No adult shall be eligible to receive funds or participate in the Public Lands Service Corps program under this Act or amendments made by this Act, if that person—

“(1) refuses to consent to a criminal history check;

“(2) makes a false statement in connection with such a criminal history check;

“(3) is registered, or is required to be registered, on a State sex offender registry or the National Sex Offender Registry established under the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 (42 U.S.C. 16901 et seq.) or

“(4) has been convicted of murder, as described in section 1111 of title 18, United States Code.”.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.

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.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 288, nays 116, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 151]

YEAS—288

Adler (NJ)	Camp	Davis (AL)
Altmire	Cantor	Davis (CA)
Andrews	Cao	Davis (IL)
Arcuri	Capito	Davis (TN)
Baca	Capps	DeFazio
Baird	Capuano	Delahunt
Baldwin	Cardoza	DeLauro
Barrow	Carnahan	Dent
Bean	Carney	Diaz-Balart, L.
Becerra	Carson (IN)	Diaz-Balart, M.
Berkley	Castle	Dicks
Berman	Castor (FL)	Dingell
Berry	Chaffetz	Doggett
Biggert	Chandler	Donnelly (IN)
Bilirakis	Childers	Doyle
Bishop (NY)	Chu	Dreier
Bishop (UT)	Clay	Driehaus
Blumenauer	Cleaver	Edwards (MD)
Bocieri	Clyburn	Edwards (TX)
Bono Mack	Coffman (CO)	Ehlers
Boren	Cohen	Ellsworth
Boswell	Cole	Engel
Boucher	Connolly (VA)	Eshoo
Boyd	Conyers	Etheridge
Brady (PA)	Cooper	Farr
Brady (TX)	Costa	Fattah
Braley (IA)	Costello	Filner
Brown, Corrine	Courtney	Foster
Buchanan	Crowley	Frank (MA)
Burgess	Cuellar	Frelinghuysen
Butterfield	Cummings	Fudge
Calvert	Dahlkemper	Garamendi

Gerlach	Maffei	Ruppersberger
Giffords	Maloney	Rush
Gonzalez	Markey (CO)	Ryan (OH)
Gordon (TN)	Markey (MA)	Sánchez, Linda
Grayson	Marshall	T.
Green, Al	Matheson	Schakowsky
Grijalva	Matsui	Schauer
Gutierrez	McCarthy (CA)	Schiff
Hall (NY)	McCarthy (NY)	Schrader
Halvorson	McCollum	Schwartz
Hare	McCotter	Scott (GA)
Harman	McDermott	Scott (VA)
Hastings (FL)	McGovern	Serrano
Hastings (WA)	McIntyre	Sestak
Heinrich	McKeon	Shea-Porter
Heller	McMahon	Sherman
Hereth Sandlin	McNerney	Shimkus
Higgins	Meek (FL)	Shuler
Hill	Melancon	Simpson
Himes	Michaud	Sires
Hinojosa	Miller (NC)	Skelton
Hirono	Miller, George	Slaughter
Hodes	Minnick	Smith (NJ)
Honda	Mitchell	Smith (WA)
Hoyer	Mollohan	Snyder
Inslee	Moore (KS)	Space
Israel	Moore (WI)	Speier
Jackson (IL)	Moran (VA)	Spratt
Jackson Lee	Murphy (CT)	Stupak
(TX)	Murphy (NY)	Sutton
Johnson (GA)	Murphy, Patrick	Tanner
Johnson (IL)	Napolitano	Taylor
Johnson, E. B.	Neal (MA)	Teague
Jones	Nunes	Terry
Kagen	Nye	Oberstar
Kanjorski	Oberstar	Thompson (CA)
Kaptur	Obey	Thompson (MS)
Kennedy	Oliver	Thompson (PA)
Kildee	Ortiz	Tiberi
Kilpatrick (MI)	Owens	Tierney
Kind	Pallone	Titus
King (NY)	Pascrell	Tonko
Kirk	Pastor (AZ)	Tsongas
Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Paulsen	Turner
Kissell	Perlmutter	Upton
Klein (FL)	Perriello	Van Hollen
Kosmas	Peterson	Velazquez
Kratovil	Pingree (ME)	Visclosky
Kucinich	Platts	Walden
Lance	Polis (CO)	Walz
Langevin	Pomeroy	Wasserman
Larsen (WA)	Price (NC)	Schultz
Larson (CT)	Putnam	Waters
Latham	Quigley	Watson
Lee (CA)	Rahall	Watt
Levin	Rangel	Waxman
Lewis (GA)	Rehberg	Weiner
Lipinski	Reichert	Welch
LoBiondo	Reyes	Wilson (OH)
Loeb sack	Rodriguez	Wittman
Lowe y	Rogers (MI)	Wolf
Lujan	Rooney	Woolsey
Lummis	Ros-Lehtinen	Wu
Lungren, Daniel	Ross	Yarmuth
E.	Rothman (NJ)	Young (FL)
Lynch	Roybal-Allard	

NAYS—116

Aderholt	Emerson	Lewis (CA)
Akin	Fallin	Linder
Alexander	Flake	Lucas
Austria	Fleming	Luetkemeyer
Bachmann	Forbes	Mack
Bachus	Fox	Manzullo
Barrett (SC)	Franks (AZ)	Marchant
Bartlett	Gallagher	McCauley
Barton (TX)	Garrett (NJ)	McClintock
Bilbray	Gingrey (GA)	McHenry
Blackburn	Goodlatte	McMorris
Boehner	Granger	Rodgers
Bonner	Graves	Mica
Boozman	Griffith	Miller (FL)
Boustany	Guthrie	Miller (MI)
Bright	Hall (TX)	Miller, Gary
Broun (GA)	Harper	Moran (KS)
Brown (SC)	Hensarling	Murphy, Tim
Brown-Waite,	Herger	Myrick
Ginny	Hunter	Neugebauer
Burton (IN)	Inglis	Olson
Buyer	Issa	Paul
Campbell	Jenkins	Pence
Carter	Johnson, Sam	Peters
Cassidy	Jordan (OH)	Petri
Coble	King (IA)	Pitts
Conaway	Kingston	Poe (TX)
Crenshaw	Kline (MN)	Posey
Culberson	Lamborn	Price (GA)
Davis (KY)	Latta	Radanovich
Duncan	Lee (NY)	Roe (TN)

Rogers (AL)	Sensenbrenner	Thornberry
Rogers (KY)	Sessions	Tiahrt
Rohrabacher	Shadegg	Wamp
Roskam	Shuster	Westmoreland
Royce	Smith (NE)	Whitfield
Ryan (WI)	Smith (TX)	Wilson (SC)
Scalise	Souder	Young (AK)
Schmidt	Stearns	
Schock	Sullivan	

NOT VOTING—26

Ackerman	Green, Gene	Nadler (NY)
Bishop (GA)	Hinche y	Payne
Blunt	Hoekstra	Richardson
Clarke	Holden	Salazar
Deal (GA)	Holt	Sanchez, Loretta
DeGette	Kilroy	Sarbanes
Ellison	LaTourette	Stark
Fortenberry	Lofgren, Zoe	Towns
Gohmert	Meeks (NY)	

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

□ 1313

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

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

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title was amended so as to read: “A bill 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 opportunities for young Americans; 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.”.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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.

TRICARE AFFIRMATION ACT

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4887) 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, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4887

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 “TRICARE Affirmation Act”.

SEC. 2. TREATMENT OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE HEALTH COVERAGE AS MINIMAL ESSENTIAL COVERAGE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 5000A(f)(1)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as added

by section 1501(b) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, is amended—

(1) by striking clause (iv) and inserting the following new clause:

“(iv) medical coverage under chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, including coverage under the TRICARE program;”;

(2) by striking “or” at the end of clause (v);

(3) by striking the period at the end of clause (vi) and inserting “; or”; and

(4) by inserting after clause (vi) the following new clause:

“(vii) the Nonappropriated Fund Health Benefits Program of the Department of Defense, established under section 349 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 (Public Law 103-337; 10 U.S.C. 1587 note).”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect as if included in section 1501(b) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and shall be executed immediately after the amendments made by such section 1501(b).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LEVIN. I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 4887.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1315

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, under H.R. 3590, as passed by the Senate, individuals are responsible for obtaining minimum essential health care or pay a small penalty. The Senate bill states that anyone with eligible employer coverage meets this requirement. The coverage that is provided today for the members of our armed services and their families and for military retirees and their families satisfies this requirement. In an abundance of caution, H.R. 4887 was introduced by our distinguished chairman, Mr. SKELTON, to reaffirm this result.

I now reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, today the House is considering H.R. 4887, the TRICARE Affirmation Act. While I support the bill we have before us, I'm disappointed in another display of rushing the process. Speaker PELOSI said that we need to pass the health care bill so we can find out what's in it. This is, fortunately, one that was found before it was passed. Think of how many other hundreds and hundreds of possible errors there may be in that bill because of being forced through quickly and being ill considered.

Moreover, as a former member of the 82nd Airborne Division, I'm deeply disappointed that we had to leave out veterans. Those who have served our country would actually become victims of a policy that the Congress is enacting—

inadvertently and not by any malice aforethought. And I certainly thank and share my greatest appreciation with the distinguished chairman, Mr. SKELTON, of the Armed Services Committee, who I served with for several years, for catching this and correcting this wrong.

The bill wasn't added to the schedule until close to midnight last night. Beyond the immediate process issues, the addition of this bill to the calendar points to a troubled future if the Senate health care bill passes the House tomorrow. We're many votes away from health care reform becoming law, but already, as I mentioned, we're seeing fundamental flaws in this Senate bill that require amendment.

As we all know, the health care bill that we'll consider tomorrow contains a new requirement that every single American in this country enroll in a health care plan that the government approves. President Obama said that if you like your doctor, you can keep him—if he approves. Now we have the IRS and we have Federal agencies that are going to get into our private affairs, and now it's affecting our veterans. If an individual does not have this coverage, they will be subject to a penalty and even the possibility of prosecution through the IRS.

H.R. 4887 essentially amends the not-yet-passed Senate health care bill to clarify that all TRICARE plans are considered as minimal acceptable coverage under the bill. It is the least that we can do for our veterans. Defining TRICARE as such is important because it exempts its enrollees from the individual mandate in the Senate bill.

As most know, TRICARE is a complete medical care benefit program for active duty members and retirees of all seven uniformed services and their dependents. TRICARE is currently open to about 9.3 million potential beneficiaries. Active duty military, their spouses, and dependents are automatically enrolled in TRICARE Prime. Retirees can choose between TRICARE Prime or two other options. Then there is a fourth subset called TRICARE for Life. These beneficiaries are enrolled in Medicare, but TRICARE serves as a secondary payer.

Unfortunately, in the Senate health care bill, Democrats do not deem TRICARE programs for servicemembers and military retirees under age 65 to provide minimum acceptable coverage. H.R. 4887 would clarify these programs and make sure that they're included in this definition.

It's surprising to me that these programs were left out originally. This is an important change to make, but I think this is only a foreshadowing of what is to come for hardworking Americans.

The Senate health care reform bill has not even been signed into law and we already have to fix it. If Democrats were originally willing to adversely impact the health care coverage of these Americans who have honorably

served our country, you have to wonder whose health care is safe.

These oversights occurred because this process is too big, too fast, and being done against the will of the American people. I support this amendment. It's critical that we protect our military families.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. It's now my privilege to yield 2 minutes to someone who has worked so hard for so many years on behalf of the veterans of this country, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON).

Mr. SKELTON. I certainly thank the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. Speaker, it's a commonly known fact that I oppose the health care reform bill as it exists currently and will vote against it tomorrow, but my duty as the chairman of the Armed Services Committee compels me to ensure that the health care of our brave service men and women, our military retirees, and all of their family members are protected if the bill does indeed pass.

In the health care bill currently under consideration in Congress, which originated in the Senate, TRICARE and the Non-Appropriated Fund health plans, the programs that provide health care for these individuals, will meet the minimum requirements for individual health insurance coverage, and no TRICARE or NAF health plan beneficiary will be required to purchase additional coverage beyond what they already have. However, to reassure our military servicemembers and their families and make it perfectly clear that they will not be negatively affected by this legislation, my bill, H.R. 4887, explicitly states in law that these health plans meet the minimum requirements for individual health insurance.

Our brave men and women in uniform provide us with first-class protection. It's our obligation to provide them and their families with first-class health care in return. Every day, our troops risk their lives to stand up for us on the battlefield, and now I ask my colleagues, no matter what the position you may have on health care reform itself, to join me in standing up for our servicemembers and their families.

Nobody knows what the fate of health care will be tomorrow, but by supporting this bill that's before us right now, H.R. 4887, we will at least know that we have protected those men and women who sacrifice their lives to protect us. We must affirm for our military servicemembers and their families that even if the health reform bill passes, the coverage provided by TRICARE and the Non-Appropriated Fund health plans will be properly defined in law as meeting the minimum requirements for individual health insurance.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. I now yield 4 minutes to the distinguished ranking member of the Armed Services Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON).

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise in support of H.R. 4887, which would try to fix a significant flaw in the Democratic health care reform bill by including the Department of Defense TRICARE program in what is considered minimum essential coverage for the purposes of the individual mandate in the health care bill.

Mr. Speaker, while I applaud Chairman SKELTON for taking this step, I'm deeply concerned and aware that it does not go far enough to protect TRICARE from the ravages of ObamaCare. The simple truth is that the Senate health care bill still leaves TRICARE, the world-class health care program that takes care of 9.2 million of our men and women in uniform and their families and retirees and their families open to the whim of bureaucrats outside of the Department of Defense who may change the program as they see fit. Is this what we want for the men and women who lay their lives on the line every day to protect this great Nation?

Last summer, the White House made two promises to America's Armed Forces and their families:

One, that the health reform legislation that's being considered would enable those who are covered by TRICARE to meet the shared responsibility requirement for individuals to have insurance, thereby exempting such members of the armed services and their families from being assessed penalties. This is the explicit promise that the Senate health care bill fails to meet. The chairman's resolution is an attempt to meet that commitment, but what it definitely does is point out the flaws in the Senate health care bill.

The second promise the President made is that the Secretary of Defense would continue to maintain sole authority over TRICARE. Chairman SKELTON's language today does not address this promise. That is why Mr. BUYER, the ranking member on the Veterans' Affairs Committee, and I filed and will offer later today language at the Rules Committee that would meet both of these promises.

We've been hearing since last summer many promises that this problem would be fixed. Mr. BUYER and I even offered similar amendments to the House version of the bill passed last fall. Our attempts were rebuffed and the military service organizations were given assurances by the Democratic leadership that TRICARE would be protected in a conference report that never came.

Now we see this legislation that appeared in the dark of night. We've been told that there's no cost associated with this legislation. We cannot confirm that. History is rife with examples of House legislation that does not survive in the Senate. In other words, there's no guarantee that what the President finally signs will protect Medicare.

Mr. Speaker, I was told by a veteran that one of the problems we had in the

Vietnam War was pilots became so fixated on the target that they ultimately crashed into the target. That's what I see happening with this health care bill that the Democratic leadership and the President are pushing. They're so fixated on getting something passed that they're making so many mistakes that we're not going to be able to fix them all. I will support my chairman's efforts today, but I will continue to work toward a comprehensive fix.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. SHEA-PORTER).

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. I thank the chairman for his legislation. As a member of the Armed Services Committee, I'm proud to be an original cosponsor.

Mr. Speaker, we have a solemn responsibility to provide our servicemembers with the care and the services that they are due. They risk their lives in service to our Nation, and it's imperative that we keep our promises to them.

This is not a Democratic or Republican responsibility, and as an advocate for the members of our military and their families—and I might add, as a former military spouse myself—it's troubling for me that throughout the debate on health care reform that TRICARE would be included as one of the topics of the various misinformation campaigns. This bill will ensure that those members of our armed services can keep their TRICARE coverage.

I'm proud to have stood in support of our servicemembers in the Armed Services Committee, preventing increases in TRICARE copays, for example. I'm pleased that the chairman, through this legislation, has given us all the opportunity to reaffirm not only the importance of TRICARE, but that, under our health reform legislation, these benefits will remain as they are.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Now, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished ranking member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, a veteran of Desert Storm and a retired United States Army Colonel, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER).

Mr. BUYER. Let me ask how much time the minority has.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There are 13 minutes remaining.

Mr. BUYER. First of all, I'd like to applaud BUCK McKEON and IKE SKELTON for their efforts, along with Mr. LEVIN, to permit this bill to be considered, but we haven't gone far enough. Now, it's kind of what happens when we rush or go too fast around here. We get sloppy in our drafting.

Now, in the bill that was passed here in the House, there were general authority provisions under the Secretaries of DOD and VA to ensure that those health systems would be protected—the authorities, their general provision authorities to the Secretaries would be protected. That language was not in the Senate bill.

The Senate bill, which is now coming over here, interestingly enough, to—which is about to be deemed. Pretty interesting. I don't know if you know about the word "deem." It comes from the old English origin to "dom," and to "dom" was from judges. It means to make judgment. In the 17th century, judges actually then began to make rapid judgments, and they called them "deemers." The origin of to dom—there are two words: to deem and to doom. Pretty fascinating.

So, right now, the language that was going to be deemed, the bill under consideration, will, in fact, cover the TRICARE, because right now it covers just TRICARE for Life.

□ 1330

There's about \$30 billion a year for TRICARE for those who are active duty, or guardsmen, or reservists who are brought to active duty to include their dependents. And with this \$30 billion price tag, that's a lot of money. Over 10 years, that's around \$300 billion. I don't know how we can exclude them, but we're going to bring them in.

What I'm about to ask of Mr. LEVIN is, we also have this commitment, this commitment from the leadership, from the Speaker, from the leaders of the dominant committees of Ed and Labor, and Ways and Means, the Appropriations, and Energy and Commerce to protect the veterans programs. Now in that language that's coming from the Senate to here for which we're not going to get to vote on nor amend, it says that we will take care of the chapter 17 veterans programs. Veterans programs.

But this chapter 17, there are other programs to survivors and dependents which would not be covered. So their programs which presently exist would not be under the minimum essential. Who are they? That would be the widows, the survivors, and the orphaned children, to include, for example, an agent orange Vietnam veteran whose child or adult dependent has spina bifida would not be covered.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. BUYER. I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana will state his inquiry.

Mr. BUYER. My parliamentary inquiry would be this: The bill that is under suspension was dropped last night. We had to immediately respond to all of this, and I have dropped a bill just in the last hour. I apologize to my Democrat friends. I know you're just getting a chance to look at this.

My parliamentary inquiry is, how would I be able to ask for an immediate consideration of this bill under a suspension?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman speaking to a separate measure other than the one that is before the House?

Mr. BUYER. That's correct. Yes, as a separate measure. How can I call this bill to an immediate consideration?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Speaker's policy for recognition requires clearance with leadership on both sides before entertaining such a request.

Mr. BUYER. At the conclusion of this bill, could I ask for unanimous consent for immediate consideration of this bill to protect the survivors and orphans of our veterans?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is constrained to recognize for such a request only if both leaderships have cleared it.

Mr. BUYER. Further parliamentary inquiry. Does that mean that at the conclusion of this vote that the Chair would not recognize me for a unanimous consent request?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BUYER. So the U.C. would not be in order.

Mr. LEVIN. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUYER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LEVIN. Let me suggest this: The provision that is in question here or is before us doesn't take effect—the overall provision—until 2014. What our purpose is here today is not to correct a flaw but to reaffirm so there could be zero questions. I would suggest this: That we proceed—and I want to assure you, I think I can on behalf of everyone concerned—that we will look at your bill, and we will work with you, and if there's agreement, we will proceed expeditiously. So I would hope that would work for you. I just wanted to assure you of our good will on this. And if there is an issue that has to be considered, we'll do that.

The problem right now is, it's impossible—we just received this—to understand whether or not it might have an impact in terms of the overall bill. The overall bill has to be scored. As you know, Mr. BUYER, it's very technical. So again, let me suggest that we proceed and give you the assurance that we will look at this and proceed expeditiously.

Mr. BUYER. Reclaiming my time on the parliamentary inquiry, would it be made in order under a unanimous consent request on a suspension that the gentleman could amend? In other words, could I offer a unanimous consent request to amend to include the general authority language that is very similar to which the House had already passed previously under the health bill?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The proponent would be allowed to withdraw, amend, and re-offer.

Mr. BUYER. So the gentleman—I accept your good faith. You could withdraw this bill. We are moving quickly, and you're correct that it is highly technical. We only got to see this bill a few days ago. So Mr. SKELTON and Mr. McKEON, all of their staffs didn't get to fully cover it. It's immediately dropped at midnight. We immediately bring it to the floor. We then have to react.

Further parliamentary inquiry. As gentlemen, why don't we pause under the rules? We can withdraw the suspension. We can work, and then the gentleman can bring it back, in good faith. I would ask of the gentleman under the comity of the House—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will look to the majority manager for any change in plans.

Mr. BUYER. All right. I would ask of the gentleman, would the gentleman consider to withdraw the suspension to allow us to include the general authority provisions and correct the errors in the bill?

Mr. LEVIN. Let me suggest the reason why I think we need to proceed with this bill. We can accomplish what you want to accomplish by taking up your bill separately. The purpose of this bill is not to correct a flaw. The purpose of it simply is to reaffirm what should already be clear. I don't think in this period of time that we could look at your bill and be sure that it would have no impact in terms of the overall legislation.

I know that this bill will have no such effect. I'm not sure of yours because we've just received it. So let me just offer again in the best of good faith that we will take a note that the—

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will note that the colloquy is on the time of the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BUYER. All right. I'm going to reclaim my time. The gentleman's position is that you have chosen not to withdraw the bill to correct the errors, but you want to proceed.

Mr. LEVIN. I don't think it's a question of correcting an error.

Mr. BUYER. Let me reclaim my time, because we have a really large distinction here. Because the bill that is about to be deemed—we don't even have the right to vote on it. See, this is what's blowing my mind, Mr. LEVIN. Those of us who have actually worn the uniform, we don't fight for any bounty of our own. We fight for liberty, we fight for freedom, the right to speak, the right to vote. And then we're going to be denied the right to vote on a Senate bill, and nor do we have the opportunity to amend? And to say that there are not errors when we move this fast, we don't even allow the deliberative process to be used. I'm pleading with you, Mr. LEVIN. I'm pleading with you. The bill that's before us only covers TRICARE for life. I know this.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will be reminded to address the Chair.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I apologize. Mr. LEVIN, I apologize. I drafted TRICARE for Life. I understand this program. This bill only covers TRICARE for Life. So individuals who are enrolled in TRICARE—it's not considered a minimum essential health program.

Now I know you didn't mean to do that. So let's get that corrected. That's why you're going to do this bill. So then why don't we absolutely make sure we correct chapter 17 to then protect survivors and dependents? It's an error. I'm not going to stand here and say you intentionally meant to leave out widows and orphans. I don't believe that. But if you're going to correct it on TRICARE, let's take care of the veterans too. I would just plead for the gentleman to stop and pause while we're in consideration here. Let's amend this, and let's do it right. That's my plea.

I will also let you know that we do things substantively. We also do things politically. Ha. There's a response. Letters are coming in, and emails are coming in right now from all the VSOs, and the Veterans Service Organizations are pretty upset. Pretty upset. Whenever we move fast, we're sloppy, and people get hurt in the process. This is not one of our finest hours.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address the Chair and not other Members in the second person.

The Chair will also 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.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS).

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I support the health reform bill that this body will consider tomorrow, yet section 1501 of the Senate bill needs to be modified to ensure that the insurance our brave men and women in uniform have qualifies as "minimum essential coverage" under the new law. I already believe that TRICARE and the nonappropriated fund health plans will meet the minimum requirements for individual health insurance coverage in the health care bill. Yet like Mr. SKELTON, I believe this legislation should explicitly state that these health plans meet the minimum threshold.

As chairwoman of the Military Personnel Subcommittee, I am a strong proponent of the TRICARE system and do not want that great benefit threatened in any way by health care reform in the United States. Fixing section 1501 of the Senate bill will help achieve this goal and will remove any ambiguity for men and women in uniform and for my colleagues who do not believe that the current bill goes far enough to protect those who serve.

Mr. Speaker, this language to protect TRICARE originally passed the House Education and Labor Committee on a bipartisan basis. I remember it. I was there. I would ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to put aside politics for this one vote and help pass

a measure that will allow our men and women in uniform to focus on their mission, not their health insurance. I urge a "yes" vote on this measure.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining on our side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky has 8 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Michigan has 14½ minutes remaining.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Now I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS), an Air Force veteran and another distinguished member of the Veterans Committee.

Mr. STEARNS. I thank the distinguished chairman. The bottom line—this is the bottom line—the Senate language in the health care bill does not protect VA and Department of Defense health care systems from interference by other Federal agencies, such as Health and Human Services. We need to have the Buyer-McKeon bill part of this package, or you're going to leave out a whole segment of veterans who are under TRICARE, not to mention survivors and dependents who are covered under the CHAMPVA.

This is extremely important to American veterans, so I urge you, Democrats who are in the majority, to reconsider Mr. BUYER's simple request to make part of your bill today, immediately, as much as possible, to amend it so that we include the Buyer language which is H.R. 4894. It's not a major thing to do here. We can do that.

Mr. SKELTON here earlier said that he's against the health care bill. He emphatically said he's going to vote "no." I understand that. He feels that the Democrat health care bill is not something he can support. He's chairman of the Armed Services Committee. He understands that passage of this rule that we're going to talk about later will deem passage of the entire health care bill in America. But then here we are, trying in desperation because this is a farce, this health care bill, because it strips TRICARE from the military veterans. It hurts survivors and dependents.

Now in a charade here of a farce, they're trying to amend a bill that has never passed. Think of that. This bill that we're going to vote on, the Skelton bill, is amending a bill that has not even passed. So I even question the constitutionality and the procedures here. The health care bill is not going to protect Department of Defense military people under TRICARE and veterans.

Now why is this occurring? I think we realize it is because the Democrats moved too quickly, and they're penalizing our veterans. So the chairman of the Armed Services Committee is against it. More importantly, he's here with this bill, and I think all of us should understand that without passage of the Buyer-McKeon bill, which is H.R. 4894—the bill has been dropped—to amend the patient protection and af-

fordable care to ensure appropriate treatment of Department of Veterans Affairs and Department of Defense health programs—this is a simple statement, but it has huge implications.

So Mr. LEVIN, I urge you to reconsider and to make sure that part of this McKeon bill has the language of the Buyer-McKeon. Again, I will just close by saying that the reason why we're here today is because the bill was put together improperly, and it's just an affront to our veterans, to our military retirees that they are going to be affected by this health care bill.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are once again reminded to address the Chair and not others in the second person.

□ 1345

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

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER).

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, in consultation with the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, a gentleman that I respect, I think the best approach is we will vote on your bill and ask the minority leader, and approach the majority leader and the Speaker, and you can do your due diligence on the policy aspects to make sure that things can get corrected and then maybe we can call for immediate consideration of the Buyer-McKeon bill. I think that is a good approach.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LEVIN. I agree.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will once again remind Members to speak through the Chair and not in the second person.

Mr. LEVIN. I reserve the balance of my time. Do I have the right to close?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Yes.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. As we revisit this event, we are correcting an egregious wrong that was done by oversight to not fully cover our veterans and those on active duty and their families. The fact that TRICARE would not fall into the so-called minimally accepted coverage leads me back to the false standard that was set in the beginning on this bill in the first place.

I was, among other things in the military, an assault helicopter pilot. One of the things that we learned as young aviators is that accidents normally didn't happen because of one big thing. Normally an accident would happen, and several of my close friends paid the ultimate price in this, was because several little things would begin to pile up, small events, things unseen. The faster the environment began to process, the more they would pile up, and eventually they became uncontrollable. Not noticing power, not noticing air speed, not noticing their rate of descent, their altitude, their visual ref-

erences, lots of things can come into play.

The bottom line is we are doing the same thing now, except we are doing it with one of the largest and most sweeping bills in the history of this country. We are rushing headlong without even a week; 72 hours for a bill this big, give me a break. Let's think about the reality of what we are doing, rushing headlong to do the largest transfer of power to the executive branch in the history of the United States.

This is about turning us into a different Nation. This is about stepping beyond article I of the Constitution to deem. To deem what? We are fixing a small mistake. I guarantee you, there are hundreds of others. Deeming actually is pronouncing something that isn't as if it were done, for all practical purposes, and it was designed from a legislative perspective for simple corrections. Let us deem everybody good health; that has about the same effect in the eyes of the American people. If we are dealing with veterans, let us deem world peace so there won't be any more risks internationally.

You see the absurdity of this argument presented over and over and over. And for the thousands of Americans outside this building, while we stand in here trying to work together to fix a small piece, there are hundreds and hundreds of other things piling up.

Remember what the Speaker said: the Speaker said we have to pass this bill so we can find out what's in it. In the name of heaven, shouldn't we know what is in it before it even comes to this floor for a vote? I demand to know the justice in that, in ramming a piece of legislation through here that is going to change the lives of our children and our grandchildren.

You ask the people dying in hospitals in England, you ask the people who wait 18 months for bypass surgery, you ask the veterans who are yet to come forward who will not have health care because of this on some technical fix. We are hiring over 100,000 new government bureaucrats and not making the changes the rest of the country uses. And every time in the Ways and Means Committee we tried to offer those changes, they were rejected. Think about this for a moment.

I don't want the most important thing that we are handling in this administration to become a train wreck waiting to happen when we see all of the events beginning to pile up. We need to slow the overall bill down. The fact that we would have to do this, the fact that there are thousands of people demonstrating tells us that there is more to this than simply giving people health care.

I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS).

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, there is something else that is going on here, too. Okay, so the Skelton bill passes without the Buyer-McKeon. Okay, then the health care bill comes tomorrow. We vote on it tomorrow night, and it

passes. But still, the veterans will still be without care because this bill that is passing here has to go to the Senate. The Senate could make some changes and then it comes back to the House. So you will have a health care bill out there standing by itself that has passed, gone to the President, signed into law that does not protect veterans on TRICARE. You should be very concerned about that, and I think the American people should be concerned that our veterans, who are in two wars today, are not going to be protected because you are delaying the enforcement of the rigorous understanding of what this bill is about.

So just simply passing this today under suspension will not mean that the veterans are protected. It still has to go to the Senate and comes back to the House before it is signed by the President.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I will go ahead and close with these final remarks.

Next year will be the 30th anniversary of my graduation from the United States Military Academy. When I am back there seeing these men and women who have served this country in so many distinguished ways, through times of peace and war and turbulence, the one thing that I want to be able to look in their eyes and say that we did as a Congress, not simply me, is that we served their needs, their family needs, the needs of their soldiers, the needs of veterans in general.

And it is clear from the overall legislation that we are seeking to amend before it even becomes law, although I think that is constitutionally in question if we are not actually going to vote on the Senate bill, we need to slow this process down and stop the Senate bill from being forced through this House, this reconciliation process, and go back to square one and do this step by step and get it right the first time rather than having to make corrections.

I thank the chairman of the Armed Services Committee and the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee for bringing this critical fix forward. There are many more. Let us get to those.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I want to make two points clearly and very forcefully: veterans and veterans' health are protected and will be protected. We are glad to bring our record before the world where this party that I belong to has been in terms of protecting veterans and veterans' health. I just want to say a word about that because I have been here now for some years; and a few years ago the party that I belong to, when we had the power, took the steps to make sure that the health of veterans was protected, indeed, enhanced. What we did was to pass billions of dollars' worth in programs to make sure that veterans in this country were protected as to their health care needs. That is

absolutely clear. No veterans need to be worried about their health care. No one covered by TRICARE needs to be worried about whether that will be in effect. No one.

This is done simply to reassure in terms of the language. It is not to fix a flaw. It is to reassure. Indeed, it is being brought for the very reason that we feared that some people might decide to misstate what the reality was. The reality is that we are simply reassuring. There is no flaw to fix, period.

So no one in any place, any veteran or anybody and their family needs to worry about our dedication or the impact of this legislation. That is point one.

Number two, I think what is being done here, what is being said here is pretty clear. The argument isn't really over veterans' health. We are all dedicated to sustaining that. It isn't over TRICARE. We are dedicated to improving TRICARE wherever possible. What we hear on the other side instead are speeches and words about the reconciliation bill. You don't like it.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVIN. I am not sure that I want to carry on much longer a debate over the health care bill, but sure.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. I would point out that TRICARE for life was excised from the Senate bill.

Mr. LEVIN. Look, the Senate bill, we wanted to be 100 percent sure that nobody would misstate its impact. So don't misstate it. That's the purpose of this.

Instead, after you talk about veterans' health, you begin to talk about the reconciliation bill. Now we will debate that tomorrow, but we should not use any question about coverage for veterans as a reason to attack the reconciliation bill. I support it. I think it will have a major positive impact. You used all kinds of words about a different Nation, about rushing headlong. That has nothing to do with this bill. I think you are completely wrong about this being a different Nation. You raised it, so I will say a few words.

What this is going to do is continue the path of this Nation, to make sure that health care can be afforded, to make sure that health care is spread to everybody. It is not a different Nation; it is continuing the best in our Nation. And so we are not rushing headlong. We have been talking about health care for a century in this country. I said at the Rules Committee, my first political experience as I remember it was as a kid passing out leaflets for the dad of JOHN DINGELL. His father had introduced a health care bill how many decades ago, and before him, others. Going back to Teddy Roosevelt, no huge radical.

So now decades later we come to a moment when we can step up to the plate, and you call it a different Nation. No, I say it is in the best traditions of the United States of America. And so this is simply a bill to reassure;

don't use it as an opportunity to talk about something else. We want to say clearly to the veterans of this country and to the families of those veterans, to everybody who is part of that family, that their health care is going to be protected. That is the purpose of this legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4887, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

Mr. LEVIN. 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.

COMMENDING AGRI-BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT TEAMS OF THE NATIONAL GUARD FOR THEIR EFFORTS IN WAR-TORN COUNTRIES

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1075) commending the members of the Agri-business Development Teams of the National Guard for their efforts, together with personnel of the Department of Agriculture and the United States Agency for International Development, to modernize agriculture practices and increase food production in war-torn countries, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1075

Whereas the Agri-business Development Teams of the National Guard began as a pilot program started in Missouri, and the Missouri National Guard worked with the Missouri Farm Bureau and the University of Missouri to draw a blueprint that could be followed by other Army National Guard units;

Whereas the Agri-business Development Teams consist of National Guard members who have a civilian background in farming or a related agricultural business;

Whereas the Agri-business Development Teams now consist of units from 11 States;

Whereas before deploying overseas, members of an Agri-business Development Team collaborate with land-grant universities, which spend weeks teaching and preparing strategies for the farms to which the Agri-business Development Team will deploy;

Whereas in Afghanistan, the goals of the Agri-business Development Teams include improving irrigation systems and providing sustainable methods for fertilizing, planting, harvesting, marketing, and storing agricultural crops, modernizing slaughter facilities, setting up markets to trade crops and livestock, developing a juicing and canning facility, and improving livestock health through mobile vet clinics, all of which can help divert cropland from poppy production;

Whereas the Agri-business Development Teams also are partnering with the Department of Agriculture to have a directory of 50-60 experts in a variety of agricultural areas in Afghanistan; and

Whereas the Agri-business Development Teams have been quick to use alternative energy sources, such as wind, solar, and small water dams, which in the absence of a national energy grid in Afghanistan are more reliable and easier to protect from enemy attack: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives commends the members of the Agri-business Development Teams of the National Guard and the National Guard Bureau for their efforts, together with personnel of the Department of Agriculture and the United States Agency for International Development, to modernize agriculture practices and increase food production in war-torn countries.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) and the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in strong support of H. Res. 1075, a resolution commending the Agri-business Development Teams of the National Guard; and I thank the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER) for introducing this resolution.

The Agri-business Development Teams, often called ADTs, are one of the unsung successes of the mission in Afghanistan. Agriculture makes up about 45 percent of Afghanistan's gross domestic product and employs over 70 percent of its population. Although Afghanistan once supplied food for the region, 30 years of war has degraded the agriculture economy of Afghanistan so much that substantial assistance is required to rebuild it and ensure that Afghanistan has food security.

□ 1400

The first Agri-business Development Team was from the great State of Missouri, and I have particular pride in the great work that they do. These teams are made up of National Guard members who have expertise in agriculture from their civilian lives. These volunteers spend 1 month training for deployment in Indiana and then they are sent to Afghanistan for 11 months. Each team has about 58 personnel, with 12 agriculture experts, although all members of the team have some level of agriculture expertise. Right now there are teams from nine States deployed, including one from Missouri.

Mr. Speaker, I might mention that the Thanksgiving before last I spent with the Missouri Agriculture National Guard team in Afghanistan. And I must tell you that they did a fantastic job. I am very proud of them. I was proud to have visited with them, break bread with them on Thanksgiving Day, and tell them that we in Missouri are downright proud of them.

From the start, the Missouri National Guard has been a leader in the program, and the fourth Missouri team is now preparing to go. I have a list of the Missouri Guard members who have gone to Afghanistan and returned, and I would ask that their names be included in the RECORD.

MISSOURI AGRIBUSINESS TEAM ONE

Allen, Jon Matthew, E3.
 Allen, William Noel, Jr., E4.
 Allison, James Gregory, O5.
 Brandt, Curtis Herbert, E6.
 Briscoe, Aaron David, E4.
 Bruce, William Eugene, E5.
 Bunch, Billy Wayne, E4.
 Choate, Richard Austin, E4.
 Dignan, Kyle Patrick, E5.
 Douglass, Earl Brian, E4.
 Dunlap, Douglas Kevin, O3.
 Elkin, William Anthony, O2.
 Garner, Nathan Lee, E4.
 Gideon, Chad Ryan, E4.
 Godsey, Larry David, E8.
 Gustin, Brian Eugene, E7.
 Hall, Shannon DeWayne, E5.
 Harper, Stephen Timothy, O1.
 Hoaglin, Robert Lee, Jr., E5.
 Holderieath, Jason Jacob, E4.
 Huitt, Mark Douglas, E6.
 Kellison, Aaron Curtis, E3.
 Kidd, Jimmy Wade, E4.
 Lyons, Jeffry Joseph, E7.
 Murray, Rickie Dean, E5.
 Neher, Jeremy Lee, E4.
 Norman, Michael Timothy, E4.
 Oyer, Chad Edward, E4.
 Pennington, Nicholas Ryan, E3.
 Peterson, Erik Sven, E4.
 Pettibon, Matthew Travis, E4.
 Pierce, Russell Wayne, E7.
 Richards, Clayton Shawn, E6.
 Roth, Robert Edward, O3.
 Rufener, Damon Carl, E6.
 Salmon, Joshua Nathan, E6.
 Saunders, Berry James Allen, E5.
 Seek, Michael Lee, O3.
 Simmons, Randall Scott, E8.
 Stegmann, Matthew Herman, E7.
 Sutton, Darrell Craig, E4.
 Thornborrow, William Jose II, E5.
 Vesco, David James, E4.
 Vogel, William Joseph, Jr., E9.
 Wagner, Ted Curtis, E4.
 Williams, David Roy, E6.
 Winston, Bryan Joseph, E4.
 Wymore, John Darren, E6.

MISSOURI AGRIBUSINESS TEAM TWO

Ashton, Daniel James, O2.
 Banuelos, Scott Alexander, E5.
 Bennett, Alan Lee, O3.
 Boyle, David Lee, O5.
 Brainard, Jonathan Gregory, E5.
 Branson, Timothy, E3.
 Brody, John Anthony, E4.
 Brown, James Edward, E4.
 Coplin, Richard Keith, W1.
 Cunningham, Heather May, E4.
 Dam, Russell Jens, E6.
 Davenport, Zachary Dale, E4.
 Davidson, Sean Michael, E4.
 Diple, Jennifer Lindsay, E5.
 Flaxbeard, Zachary Thomas, E3.
 Frink, Richard Allen, E8.

Funken, Jennifer Ann, E6.
 Green, John Allen, E5.
 Green, Ronald, E7.
 Hafner, Gerald Wesley, E5.
 Hartman, Timothy Ray, O5.
 Hill, Scott Douglas, E6.
 Hill, Timothy Michael, E4.
 Jones, Anton Claxton, E6.
 Keilholz, Nicholas Allen, E1.
 Lane, Andrew Christian, E4.
 Larsen, John Kenneth, E4.
 Latour, Andrew Dennis, E4.
 Ledbetter, Jason Robert, E5.
 Lee, Daniel, E1.
 Litherland, Sean Nicholas, W2.
 Love, Richard Anthony, E4.
 Matlock, Kyle, E4.
 Mullins, Matthew Dean, E9.
 Olson, Julie Ann, E4.
 Patty, Ryan Heith, E4.
 Percy, Jacob, E4.
 Powell, Nathaniel Elliot, E3.
 Reppert, Michael Leslie, E3.
 Sears, James Grant III, E1.
 Smith, Stephen Ryan, E4.
 Steinbrook, Michael Lee, E6.
 Stewart, David Liekweg, O2.
 Thomas, Michael, E3.
 Trigg, Timothy William, E6.
 Udovich, Anthony Steven, E5.
 Walters, James Wilson, Jr., E9.
 Wilkinson, Denise, O4.
 Wilmoth, Scott Allen, E4.
 Wilson, Tony Lynn, Jr., E4.
 Withrich, Jason Allen, E7.
 Wunderlich, Janet, O3.
 Beaver, Jonathan A., SSG.
 Brandau, Scott W. SRA.
 Herring, Adam S., SRA.
 Jacobs, Matthew E., SRA.
 Mackey, Seth E., SSG.
 Moe, Eric J., SRA.
 Pearce, Douglas D., SRA.
 Polley, Terry P., TSG.
 Robison, Richard C., SSG.
 Salcedo, Daniel A., SSG.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to include an exchange of letters in regard to House Resolution 1075.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,

Washington, DC, March 16, 2010.

Hon. IKE SKELTON,
 Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
 Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to you concerning House Resolution 1075, "Commending the members of the Agribusiness Development Teams of the National Guard for their efforts, together with personnel of the Department of Agriculture and the United States Agency for International Development, to modernize agriculture practices and increase food production in war-torn countries." As you know, this measure was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

This resolution contains provisions within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. In the interest of permitting your Committee to proceed expeditiously to floor consideration of this important resolution, I am willing to waive this Committee's right to mark up this resolution. I do so with the understanding that by waiving consideration of the resolution, the Committee on Foreign Affairs does not waive any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the resolution which fall within its Rule X jurisdiction.

Please include a copy of this letter and your response in the Congressional Record

during consideration of the measure on the House floor.

Sincerely,

HOWARD L. BERMAN,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, March 16, 2010.

Hon. HOWARD L. BERMAN,
*Chairman, House Committee on Foreign Affairs,
Rayburn House Office Building, Wash-
ington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding House Resolution 1075, "Commending the members of the Agri-business Development Teams of the National Guard for their efforts, together with personnel of the Department of Agriculture and the United States Agency for International Development, to modernize agriculture practices and increase food production in war-torn countries." This measure was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

I agree that the Committee on Foreign Affairs has certain valid jurisdictional claims to this resolution, and I appreciate your decision to waive further consideration of H. Res. 1075 in the interest of expediting consideration of this important measure. I agree that by agreeing to waive further consideration, the Committee on Foreign Affairs is not waiving its jurisdictional claims over similar measures in the future.

During consideration of this measure on the House floor, I will ask that this exchange of letters be included in the Congressional Record.

Very truly yours,

IKE SKELTON,
Chairman.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of House Resolution 1075. I am pleased to join my colleagues, Representative BLAINE LUETKEMEYER and the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, Representative IKE SKELTON, both from Missouri, as well as the many cosponsors of this resolution, in expressing the gratitude and pride of the United States House of Representatives for the work of the U.S. National Guard's Agri-business Development Teams. The efforts of these brave men and women, along with their colleagues from the Department of Agriculture and the United States Agency for International Development, are critical to creating economic opportunities for nations such as Afghanistan.

We know all too well that Afghanistan has been devastated by nearly three decades of war. And such efforts, in addition to what our combat forces are doing, are instrumental in bringing security and stability to the country.

I would like to take a moment to recognize all those who serve, our military and civilians. I am proud to stand here today and say "thank you." Thank you for making the choice to serve. Thank you for sharing your skills and expertise with the Afghan people. Thank you for protecting America's interests and representing

the best she has to offer. And I thank your families as well for their sacrifices.

I want to thank the gentleman from Missouri for introducing this bill. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my friend and my colleague from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

Mr. KIND. I thank my friend from Missouri for yielding the time. And I also want to commend my colleague who introduced the resolution. I was a proud cosponsor of this resolution.

On a previous trip to Afghanistan, I too had a chance to spend some time with the National Guard Agri-business Development Teams. And we can't thank our troops for the mission that they are carrying out in Afghanistan enough. And it is especially true for the citizen-soldiers that we send over there, our Guard and Reserve units. But the Agri-business Development Teams are performing a very vital and important function in the development and assistance that is taking place in Afghanistan, a country which, after all, is an agrarian nation.

I am especially proud that one of the leaders in the National Guard is a gentleman by the name of Colonel Marty Leppert, who as a kid grew up on a dairy farm outside of Reedsburg, Wisconsin, in the heart of my congressional district. And I commend USDA and USAID, but especially our military leadership for recognizing the value of identifying our soldiers with agriculture backgrounds, and utilizing that expertise in the development of these ag development teams working with Afghan farmers. That is going to be the key to a successful resolution and the economic development that has to occur in that country.

I commend my colleague for offering the resolution.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER).

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise in support of House Resolution 1075, commending the Agri-business Development Teams, or ADTs, on their work. I want to thank Chairman SKELTON along with Ranking Member McKEON, as well as the rest of the Missouri delegation for their support and efforts in helping the Missouri ADTs. In addition, I would like to thank the senior Senator from Missouri, KIT BOND, for his support of the ADT program from the very beginning.

There are many people who made the efforts of the ADT a great success. First, I want to commend Colonel Marty Leppert, Chief Tony Romano, and the entire team of men and women dedicated to using their skills and knowledge to improve the situation in Afghanistan. They have met a massive challenge with determination to see their goals achieved.

The National Guard's Agri-business Development Teams started as a pilot

program in Missouri. The Missouri team partnered with the Missouri Farm Bureau, the University of Missouri, and Lincoln University to draw a blueprint that is being followed by other Army National Guard units from around the United States. In addition, ADTs get resources and guidance from the National Guard Bureau, the United States Department of Agriculture, and the United States Agency for International Development.

The National Guard ADTs have a big mission. They help to modernize agricultural practices and increase food production in a war-torn country. ADTs are made up of Guard members who have a civilian background in farming or a related agricultural business, and they are using those skills to teach Afghan farmers sustainable farming practices. This task is not easy, but the units from 11 different States have been working long hours with farmers and community officials.

The farming practices used today by the Afghans are very primitive, almost medieval-level farming. The teams that have been deployed work with Afghan farmers to provide basic agricultural requirements. Their goals include: improving irrigation systems, providing effective methods for fertilizing, planting, harvesting, marketing, and storage of agricultural crops. In addition, they have established modern slaughter facilities to help contain spreading diseases, set up markets to trade crops and livestock, developed a juicing and canning facility, and improved livestock health through mobile vet clinics.

They have been quick to use alternative energy resources such as wind, solar, and small water dams as well. Maintaining a reliable water source still remains one of the biggest problems. The Guard units are using sustainable methods for pumping water and working on watershed management to capture snow melt and rainwater runoff for irrigation. Since a national energy grid and 24/7 energy is not available, these alternative energy sources actually provide a better solution.

There is no easy fix for the situation in Afghanistan. There are problems with local customs, tribal leadership, and issues of property rights that must be solved on a routine basis. If a team wants to construct a building or dig a well, it has to find out which village elder has authority to grant permission to use the land. In many villages, property usage and ownership is decided in meetings with family elders. However, our young men and women labor vigorously and diligently in search of solutions to these many challenges.

The work in Afghanistan is important, where agriculture makes up 45 percent of the gross domestic product and employs more than 70 percent of the population, but where farming practices are inefficient and outdated. Many Afghan fields are used to grow opium poppy plants, which provide the

raw material used to make heroin. It is my hope that establishing a viable agricultural industry will provide farmers throughout Afghanistan with alternatives. And quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, in my judgment this is the way that we are going to be successful in Afghanistan, by turning the Afghan people and their economy around and earning their trust to be able to work with us in running the Taliban out of the country.

The bill we consider today recognizes the good work that these men and women are carrying out every day. I encourage other States to look at ways they can contribute to the mission of the National Guard ADTs.

I urge my colleague to join me in passing this legislation.

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

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

Once again, I commend the National Guard for their service to this country and to the cause of freedom. The freedom they work and fight for is embodied in the constitutional system that we enjoy in this country. Few votes we have taken in this body will affect our constitutional system of freedom more than the vote we take tomorrow on health care.

Now, the American people have spoken loud and clear on this issue of health care. They do not want a government takeover of health care. And the latest health care plan that we will be voting on as early as tomorrow afternoon is still a government takeover of health care despite what others have said, because, number one, it includes billions of dollars in new taxes and over a trillion dollars of new government spending. It will cause millions of employers to cancel the health care they offer their employees and force these individuals into a government-run health care plan.

It creates a health care czar to impose health care price controls that will lead to a shortage of care and even more individuals falling into government-run insurance. It will mandate private citizens that they purchase health care whether they need it or want it.

Democrats are planning to abuse the legislative process to pass purely partisan legislation with no bipartisan support that will change one-sixth of the American economy. Democrat leaders are even considering a process that will allow their health care bill to become law without an up or down vote. That would be the so-called "Slaughter solution," named for the chairman of the Rules Committee, Representative LOUISE SLAUGHTER of New York.

This would declare that the House deems the Senate version of ObamaCare to have been passed by the House. House Members would still have to vote on whether to accept the rule, but then they would be able to say they only voted for the rule and not for the

underlying Senate bill. But remember, a vote on the rule is a vote on the bill. Legislative tricks and unconstitutional procedures should not be used to jam through Congress a partisan bill that will impact the life of every American and affect one-sixth of our Nation's economy.

The American people have been trying to get the message across that they want Congress to start over on health care through an open and honest dialogue and process. It is time to work step by step on health care reform that will lower costs for families without increasing the size of the Federal Government.

I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that when you add the 4,872 pages of legislative text to the 1,347 pages of committee reports, you have a total of 6,219 pages of bill text. Now, we got the final version of this 72 hours from the potential vote tomorrow afternoon. And if a Member was to take all 72 hours, allowing for 8 hours of sleep each day, because otherwise they may just get burned out, that leaves 48 hours of solid reading of this 6,200 pages. That works out to 129 pages an hour, or 2 pages a minute.

I haven't seen a lot of Members, frankly, spending their time reading 2 pages a minute for this 6,000 pages, and yet that is what we are being asked to vote on as early as tomorrow afternoon. I don't think that's really what the American people deserve for how this body should do its business.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1415

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CARNAHAN).

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, it's an honor to be here and to speak on behalf of this resolution that honors the members of the Agri-business Development Teams that have been operating. These are joint missions that combine some of the best of our military capabilities, the best of our civilian capabilities, and they are operating in some of the most important areas we need to succeed.

We've seen the success of these teams on the ground in Afghanistan. We have heard from our military leaders how essential they are to our success. We are very pleased that our Missouri National Guard has been one of the leading groups that has done this. They have worked with our universities, with our rural electric co-ops, and many of our civilian capabilities have been brought to bear from our farming communities in Missouri to help bring more advanced agricultural methods to Afghanistan and to be sure that we succeed in the fight against terrorism.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, at this point, I would like to yield 2 minutes to my colleague from the State of Texas (Mr. POE).

Mr. POE of Texas. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

I totally support H. Res. 1075 and the support of the National Guard and the Agri-business Development Teams.

The National Guard is doing a phenomenal job in Iraq and Afghanistan. The chairman could give me the exact number, but I don't know the percentage of the National Guard troops that are in Afghanistan, but it's extremely high. We count on the citizen soldiers to help us in times of war, and they are there not just from the State of Missouri but from the State of Texas as well.

And I had a chance to be with some National Guard troops in Afghanistan during the Christmas season. They're doing a phenomenal business in helping those Afghans change from growing poppies that is turned into cocaine and heroin that is sold primarily in Europe and teaching them to farm wheat and soybeans. In fact, Texas A&M University has developed some type of soybean that yields ninefold what a typical soybean yields, and they are being planted in Afghanistan so that farmers can sell legitimate crops on the open market.

This bill is an important bill because it recognizes our National Guard, but also this bill is a bipartisan bill. It is supported by both sides. And legislation in this House, to be successful, should be supported by both sides, unlike the health care bill that we're going to vote on tomorrow afternoon. It's only supported by a portion of one side with no input from the others. And I think that we should have a bipartisan vote in support of the health care bill as well, which, unfortunately, we are not.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the gentleman from Texas, my understanding is that right now as we speak—though the number is increasing—there are some 80,000 American troops in Afghanistan today.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. LAMBORN. I would like to inquire how much time our side has remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. LAMBORN. Thank you.

I will yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me just continue where I left off a few moments ago talking about this huge bill tomorrow that affects our Nation's freedom so much on health care, and let me just point out that our side of the aisle, the Republicans, have introduced 70 bills that offer free market solutions to health care reform that do not take over America's system of health care.

For instance, one solution, H.R. 3400, is the Empowering Patients First Act. This particular bill would do three things, Mr. Speaker:

Number one, it gives access to coverage for all Americans. It makes the purchase of health care financially feasible for all by extending the income tax deduction on health care premiums to those who purchase coverage in the

nongroup or individual market. Right now, you only have this tax break if you're an employee of a corporation. That is not fair to all Americans. Everyone should have that same tax break.

The beauty of that is that you would have a tax advantaged purchase price on your health care premiums and you would own that premium. It wouldn't have to come to you through your job, and then it would be portable. If you go to another job, if you transfer, if you lose your job, you don't lose your coverage. It goes with you when you buy it yourself. That is why that point is so important.

Number two, coverage is truly owned by the patients. Like I said, this gives greater choice and portability and it expands the individual market. We can also, to accomplish this goal, create pooling mechanisms such as association health plans. I have friends who are Realtors in the real estate industry. They would love to form a national association of real estate agents and brokers and employees all over this country. That association would have tremendous buying power and economies of scale, but right now, that is prohibited by law. That is a commonsense solution that Republicans have offered and, I dare say, would have bipartisan support by this body.

And thirdly, we need to rein in out-of-control costs, and 3400 does that as well. It reforms the medical liability system. It establishes administrative health care tribunals—you could call them health courts—in each State and adds affirmative defense through provider-established best practice measures. That would be a defense if you're charged with some kind of malpractice as a provider. This would encourage, also, the speedy resolution of claims and would cap noneconomic damages.

So, Mr. Speaker, let me just conclude by saying that there are reforms that the Republicans have offered that would be not a massive overhaul of one-sixth of our Nation's economy and that would incorporate free market mechanisms and procedures that the American people would be much more comfortable in. If you look at the polling, Americans do not want a massive takeover of health care.

At this point, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1075, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. SKELTON. 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 questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

suspending the rules and passing H.R. 4887, by the yeas and nays;

agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, by the yeas and nays;

suspending the rules and agreeing to H. Res. 1040, by the yeas and nays.

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

TRICARE AFFIRMATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4887, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4887, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 403, nays 0, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 152]

YEAS—403

Ackerman	Buchanan	Davis (TN)
Aderholt	Burgess	DeFazio
Adler (NJ)	Burton (IN)	DeGette
Akin	Butterfield	DeLahunt
Alexander	Buyer	DeLauro
Altmire	Calvert	Dent
Andrews	Camp	Diaz-Balart, L.
Arcuri	Campbell	Diaz-Balart, M.
Austria	Cantor	Dicks
Baca	Cao	Dingell
Bachmann	Capito	Doggett
Bachus	Capps	Donnelly (IN)
Baird	Capuano	Doyle
Baldwin	Cardoza	Dreier
Barrett (SC)	Carnahan	Driehaus
Barrow	Carney	Duncan
Bartlett	Carson (IN)	Edwards (MD)
Barton (TX)	Carter	Edwards (TX)
Bean	Cassidy	Ehlers
Becerra	Castle	Ellsworth
Berkley	Castro (FL)	Emerson
Berman	Chaffetz	Engel
Berry	Chandler	Eshoo
Biggett	Childers	Etheridge
Bilbray	Chu	Fallin
Bilirakis	Clarke	Farr
Bishop (GA)	Cleaver	Fattah
Bishop (NY)	Clyburn	Filner
Bishop (UT)	Coble	Flake
Blackburn	Coffman (CO)	Fleming
Bocchieri	Cohen	Forbes
Boehner	Cole	Foster
Bonner	Conaway	Fox
Bono Mack	Connolly (VA)	Frank (MA)
Boozman	Conyers	Franks (AZ)
Boren	Cooper	Frelinghuysen
Boswell	Costa	Fudge
Boucher	Costello	Galleghy
Boustany	Courtney	Garamendi
Boyd	Crenshaw	Garrett (NJ)
Brady (PA)	Crowley	Gerlach
Brady (TX)	Cuellar	Giffords
Braleigh (IA)	Culberson	Gingrey (GA)
Bright	Cummings	Gohmert
Broun (GA)	Dahlkemper	Gonzalez
Brown (SC)	Davis (AL)	Goodlatte
Brown, Corrine	Davis (CA)	Gordon (TN)
Brown-Waite,	Davis (IL)	Granger
Ginny	Davis (KY)	Graves

Grayson	Markey (CO)	Roybal-Allard
Green, Al	Marshall	Royce
Griffith	Matsui	Ruppersberger
Guthrie	McCarthy (CA)	Rush
Gutierrez	McCarthy (NY)	Ryan (OH)
Hall (NY)	McCaul	Ryan (WI)
Halvorson	McClintock	Salazar
Hare	McCollum	Sánchez, Linda T.
Harman	McCotter	Scalise
Harper	McDermott	Schakowsky
Hastings (FL)	McGovern	Schauer
Hastings (WA)	McHenry	Schiff
Heinrich	McIntyre	Schmidt
Heller	McKeon	Schock
Hensarling	McMahon	Schrader
Herger	McMorris	Schwartz
Herseth Sandlin	Rodgers	Scott (GA)
Higgins	McNerney	Scott (VA)
Hill	Meek (FL)	Sensenbrenner
Himes	Melancon	Serrano
Hinojosa	Mica	Sessions
Hirono	Michaud	Sestak
Hodes	Miller (FL)	Shadegg
Honda	Miller (MI)	Shea-Porter
Hoyer	Miller (NC)	Sherman
Hunter	Miller, Gary	Shimkus
Inglis	Miller, George	Shuler
Inslee	Minnick	Shuster
Israel	Mitchell	Sires
Issa	Moore (KS)	Skelton
Jackson (IL)	Moore (WI)	Slaughter
Jackson Lee	Moran (KS)	Smith (NE)
(TX)	Moran (VA)	Smith (NJ)
Jenkins	Murphy (CT)	Smith (TX)
Johnson (GA)	Murphy (NY)	Smith (WA)
Johnson (IL)	Murphy, Patrick	Snyder
Johnson, E. B.	Murphy, Tim	Souder
Johnson, Sam	Myrick	Space
Jones	Napolitano	Speier
Jordan (OH)	Neal (MA)	Spratt
Kagen	Neugebauer	Stearns
Kanjorski	Nunes	Stupak
Kaptur	Nye	Sullivan
Kennedy	Oberstar	Sutton
Kildee	Obey	Tanner
Kirkpatrick (MI)	Olson	Taylor
Kilroy	Olver	Teague
Kind	Ortiz	Terry
King (IA)	Owens	Thompson (CA)
King (NY)	Pallone	Thompson (MS)
Kingston	Pascarell	Thompson (PA)
Kirk	Pastor (AZ)	Thornberry
Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Paul	Tiahrt
Kissell	Paulsen	Tiberi
Klein (FL)	Pence	Tierney
Kline (MN)	Perlmutter	Titus
Kosmas	Petriello	Tonko
Kratovil	Peters	Tsongas
Kucinich	Peterson	Turner
Lamborn	Petri	Upton
Lance	Pingree (ME)	Van Hollen
Langevin	Pitts	Velázquez
Larsen (WA)	Platts	Visclosky
Larson (CT)	Poe (TX)	Walden
Latham	Polis (CO)	Walz
Latta	Pomeroy	Wamp
Lee (CA)	Posey	Wasserman
Lee (NY)	Price (GA)	Schultz
Levin	Price (NC)	Waters
Lewis (CA)	Putnam	Watson
Lewis (GA)	Quigley	Watt
Linder	Radanovich	Waxman
Lipinski	Rahall	Weiner
LoBiondo	Rangel	Welch
Loeb sack	Rehberg	Westmoreland
Lowe y	Reichert	Whitfield
Lucas	Reyes	Wilson (OH)
Luetkemeyer	Rodriguez	Wilson (SC)
Luján	Roe (TN)	Wittman
Lumms	Rogers (AL)	Wolf
Lungren, Daniel	Rogers (KY)	Woolsey
E.	Rogers (MI)	Wu
Lynch	Rohrabacher	Yarmuth
Mack	Rooney	Young (AK)
Maffei	Ros-Lehtinen	Young (FL)
Maloney	Roskam	
Manzullo	Ross	
Marchant	Rothman (NJ)	

NOT VOTING—27

Blumenaue r	Hinchey	Mollohan
Blunt	Hoekstra	Nader (NY)
Clay	Holden	Payne
Deal (GA)	Holt	Richardson
Ellison	LaTourette	Sanchez, Loretta
Fortenberry	Lofgren, Zoe	Sarbanes
Green, Gene	Markey (MA)	Simpson
Grijalva	Matheson	Stark
Hall (TX)	Meeks (NY)	Towns

□ 1452

Mr. BUCHANAN changed his 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.

HONORING FORMER INTERIOR SECRETARY STEWART UDALL

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

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Madam Speaker, it is with great sadness that I inform the House that former Interior Secretary Stewart Udall, father of our former House colleague, Senator TOM UDALL, and uncle of our other former Member, Senator MARK UDALL, passed away this morning at his home in Santa Fe, New Mexico, surrounded by his family. He was 90 years old.

Stewart Udall was born in St. Johns, Arizona, on January 31, 1920, to the former Supreme Court Justice Levi S. Udall and Louise Lee Udall. He attended the University of Arizona where he earned undergraduate and law degrees.

During World War II, Stewart served 4 years in the United States Air Force as a gunner. He flew 50 missions over Western Europe for which he received the Air Medal with Three Oak Leaf Clusters.

In 1954, Stewart was elected to serve from Arizona's Second Congressional District to the U.S. House of Representatives. He was elected to serve four terms in Congress, which he did with great distinction.

In 1960, he proved instrumental in helping persuade Arizona Democrats to support then-Senator John F. Kennedy during the Democratic National Convention. Upon election in 1960, President Kennedy appointed Stewart Udall Secretary of the Interior, where his accomplishments under Presidents Kennedy and Johnson made him an icon in environmental and conservation communities.

Legislative achievements from Secretary Udall's Cabinet career include the Wilderness Act of 1964, the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, the expansion of the National Park System, and the creation of the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

Until his passing, Stewart Udall continued his dedication to public service as an author, historian, scholar, lecturer, and environmental activist, lawyer and citizen of the outdoors. He was the last surviving member of the President Kennedy's original Cabinet.

Stewart Udall was preceded in death by his wife of 55 years, Erma Lee Udall. He is survived by his six children, TOM, Scott, Lynn, Lori, Denise, and Jay, and other family members including eight grandchildren.

The country is greater for Stewart Udall's service, and on behalf of the House I wish to extend my deepest condolences to the Udall family. I ask that we join for 1 minute of remembrance.

I thank the House.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. FLAKE. Madam Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. BALDWIN). The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. FLAKE. Many of us are confused about the last vote we took. We just need to see if we have it right.

We had the vote to include TRICARE for life because it is not included in the Senate bill that we will vote on tomorrow. Is that correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members may consult the respective legislative texts.

Mr. FLAKE. Madam Speaker, I have a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. FLAKE. Madam Speaker, it is our understanding that the Senate bill did not include coverage for TRICARE for life in the vote that we will take tomorrow. And so we are amending a bill that hasn't been passed yet. Is that correct?

I apologize. I meant to say TRICARE, not TRICARE for life.

It is our understanding here that the Senate bill that we will vote on tomorrow does not include coverage for TRICARE. Is that correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members may consult the relevant legislative text and come to their own conclusions.

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the Chair.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will resume. There was no objection.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 211, nays 186, not voting 33, as follows:

[Roll No. 153]

YEAS—211

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Bachmann
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Beane

Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell

Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano

Carahan
Carson (IN)
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chandler
Chu
Clarke
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Driehaus
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Foster
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Graves
Grayson
Green, Al
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Harman
Harper
Heinrich
Heller
Higgins
Hill
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Honda
Hoyer
Inslie
Israel

Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kosmas
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lowey
Luetkemeyer
Lujan
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McMahon
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Owens

Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Perriello
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Sutton
Tanner
Taylor
Teague
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Vislosky
Walz
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NAYS—186

Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Arcuri
Austria
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp

Campbell
Cao
Capito
Carney
Carter
Cassidy
Childers
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Costa
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Dahlkemper
Davis (KY)
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Ellsworth
Emerson
Etheridge
Fallin
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly

Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Granger
Griffith
Guthrie
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Himes
Hunter
Inglis
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson, Sam
Jordan (OH)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kline (MN)
Kratovil
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
Latta
Lee (NY)
Lewis (CA)

Linder	Nunes	Sessions	Carney	Higgins	Miller, George	Speier	Tiberi	Watson
LoBiondo	Olson	Shadegg	Carson (IN)	Hill	Minnick	Spratt	Tierney	Watt
Lucas	Paul	Shimkus	Carter	Himes	Mitchell	Stearns	Titus	Waxman
Lummis	Pence	Shuster	Cassidy	Hinojosa	Mollohan	Stupak	Tonko	Weiner
Lungren, Daniel	Peters	Smith (NE)	Castle	Hirono	Moore (KS)	Sullivan	Tsongas	Welch
E.	Peterson	Smith (NJ)	Castor (FL)	Hodes	Moore (WI)	Sutton	Turner	Westmoreland
Mack	Petri	Smith (TX)	Chaffetz	Honda	Moran (KS)	Tanner	Upton	Whitfield
Manzullo	Pitts	Souder	Chandler	Hoyer	Moran (VA)	Taylor	Van Hollen	Wilson (OH)
Marchant	Platts	Stearns	Childers	Hunter	Murphy (CT)	Teague	Velázquez	Wilson (SC)
Markey (CO)	Poe (TX)	Stupak	Chu	Inglis	Murphy (NY)	Terry	Visclosky	Wittman
McCarthy (CA)	Posey	Sullivan	Clarke	Inslee	Murphy, Patrick	Thompson (CA)	Walden	Wolf
McCaul	Price (GA)	Terry	Cleaver	Israel	Murphy, Tim	Thompson (MS)	Walz	Woolsey
McCotter	Putnam	Thompson (CA)	Clyburn	Issa	Myrick	Thompson (PA)	Wamp	Wu
McHenry	Radanovich	Thompson (PA)	Coble	Jackson (IL)	Neal (MA)	Thornberry	Wasserman	Yarmuth
McKeon	Rehberg	Thornberry	Coffman (CO)	Jackson Lee	Neugebauer	Tiahrt	Schultz	Young (AK)
McMorris	Reichert	Tiahrt	Cohen	(TX)	Nunes	NOT VOTING—31		
Rodgers	Roe (TN)	Tiberi	Cole	Jenkins	Nye	Bachus	Hinchey	Roskam
Melancon	Rogers (AL)	Turner	Conaway	Johnson (GA)	Oberstar	Blunt	Hoekstra	Ruppersberger
Mica	Rogers (KY)	Upton	Connolly (VA)	Johnson (IL)	Obey	Buyer	Holden	Sanchez, Loretta
Miller (FL)	Rogers (MI)	Walden	Conyers	Johnson, E. B.	Olson	Clay	Holt	Sarbanes
Miller (MI)	Rohrabacher	Wamp	Cooper	Johnson, Sam	Olver	Davis (AL)	LaTourette	Simpson
Miller, Gary	Rooney	Waters	Costa	Jones	Ortiz	Deal (GA)	Lofgren, Zoe	Stark
Minnick	Ros-Lehtinen	Westmoreland	Costello	Jordan (OH)	Owens	Ellison	Meeks (NY)	Towns
Mitchell	Royce	Whitfield	Courtney	Kagen	Pallone	Fortenberry	Nadler (NY)	Waters
Moran (KS)	Ryan (WI)	Wilson (SC)	Crenshaw	Kanjorski	Pascrell	Gohmert	Napolitano	Young (FL)
Murphy (NY)	Scalise	Wittman	Crowley	Kaptur	Pastor (AZ)	Green, Gene	Payne	
Murphy, Tim	Schmidt	Wolf	Cuellar	Kennedy	Paul	Grijalva	Richardson	
Myrick	Schock	Young (AK)	Culberson	Kildee	Paulsen			
Neugebauer	Sensenbrenner	Young (FL)	Cummings	Kilpatrick (MI)	Pence			
NOT VOTING—33			Dahlkemper	Kilroy	Perlmutter			
Blunt	Hare	Richardson	Davis (CA)	Kind	Perriello			
Boccieri	Hinchey	Roskam	Davis (IL)	King (IA)	Peters			
Cantor	Hoekstra	Sanchez, Loretta	Davis (KY)	King (NY)	Peterson			
Cardoza	Holden	Sarbanes	Davis (TN)	Kingston	Petri			
Clay	Holt	Shuler	DeFazio	Kirk	Pingree (ME)			
Davis (AL)	LaTourette	Simpson	DeGette	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Pitts			
Deal (GA)	Lofgren, Zoe	Stark	Delahunt	Kissell	Platts			
Ellison	Meeks (NY)	Towns	DeLauro	Klein (FL)	Poe (TX)			
Fortenberry	Nadler (NY)	Wasserman	Dent	Kline (MN)	Polis (CO)			
Gohmert	Payne	Schultz	Diaz-Balart, L.	Kosmas	Pomeroy			
Green, Gene	Perlmutter		Diaz-Balart, M.	Kratovil	Posey			
Grijalva	Pingree (ME)		Dicks	Kucinich	Price (GA)			
			Dingell	Lamborn	Price (NC)			
			Doggett	Lance	Putnam			
			Donnelly (IN)	Langevin	Quigley			
			Doyle	Larsen (WA)	Radanovich			
			Dreier	Larson (CT)	Rahall			
			Driehaus	Latham	Rangel			
			Duncan	Latta	Rehberg			
			Edwards (MD)	Lee (CA)	Reichert			
			Edwards (TX)	Lee (NY)	Reyes			
			Ehlers	Levin	Rodriguez			
			Ellsworth	Lewis (CA)	Roe (TN)			
			Emerson	Lewis (GA)	Rogers (AL)			
			Engel	Linder	Rogers (KY)			
			Eshoo	Lipinski	Rogers (MI)			
			Etheridge	LoBiondo	Rohrabacher			
			Fallin	Loebsack	Rooney			
			Farr	Lowe	Ros-Lehtinen			
			Fattah	Lucas	Ross			
			Filner	Luetkemeyer	Rothman (NJ)			
			Flake	Luján	Roybal-Allard			
			Fleming	Lummis	Royce			
			Forbes	Lungren, Daniel	Rush			
			Foster	E.	Ryan (OH)			
			Fox	Lynch	Ryan (WI)			
			Frank (MA)	Mack	Salazar			
			Franks (AZ)	Maffei	Sánchez, Linda			
			Frelinghuysen	Maloney	T.			
			Fudge	Manzullo	Scalise			
			Gallegly	Marchant	Schakowsky			
			Garamendi	Markey (CO)	Schauer			
			Garrett (NJ)	Markey (MA)	Schiff			
			Gerlach	Marshall	Schmidt			
			Giffords	Matheson	Schock			
			Gingrey (GA)	Matsui	Schrader			
			Gonzalez	McCarthy (CA)	Schwartz			
			Goodlatte	McCarthy (NY)	Scott (GA)			
			Gordon (TN)	McCaul	Scott (VA)			
			Granger	McClintock	Sensenbrenner			
			Graves	McCollum	Serrano			
			Grayson	McCotter	Sessions			
			Green, Al	McDermott	Sestak			
			Griffith	McGovern	Shadegg			
			Guthrie	McHenry	Shea-Porter			
			Gutierrez	McIntyre	Sherman			
			Hall (NY)	McKeon	Shimkus			
			Hall (TX)	McMahon	Shuler			
			Halvorson	McMorris	Shuster			
			Hare	Rodgers	Sires			
			Harman	McNerney	Skelton			
			Harper	Meek (FL)	Slaughter			
			Hastings (FL)	Melancon	Smith (NE)			
			Hastings (WA)	Mica	Smith (NJ)			
			Heinrich	Michaud	Smith (TX)			
			Heller	Miller (FL)	Smith (WA)			
			Hensarling	Miller (MI)	Snyder			
			Hergert	Miller (NC)	Souder			
			Herseth Sandlin	Miller, Gary	Space			

NOT VOTING—31

□ 1512

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.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1652

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas) at 4 o'clock and 52 minutes p.m.

RECOGNIZING THE 65TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BATTLE OF IWO JIMA

Mr. OWENS. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1099) recognizing the 65th anniversary of the Battle of Iwo Jima, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1099

Whereas 2010 marks the 65th anniversary of the Battle of Iwo Jima, in which the United States Marine Corps, directly supported by the United States Navy and elements of the United States Army, captured the island of Iwo Jima during World War II;

Whereas the Battle of Iwo Jima, lasted from February 19 to March 26, 1945, and was among the most bitter battles in the history of the Marine Corps;

Whereas more than 70,000 Marines participated in the Battle of Iwo Jima;

Whereas 22 Marines, 4 Navy corpsmen, and 1 Navy landing craft commander received

NOT VOTING—33

Blunt	Hare	Richardson
Boccieri	Hinchey	Roskam
Cantor	Hoekstra	Sanchez, Loretta
Cardoza	Holden	Sarbanes
Clay	Holt	Shuler
Davis (AL)	LaTourette	Simpson
Deal (GA)	Lofgren, Zoe	Stark
Ellison	Meeks (NY)	Towns
Fortenberry	Nadler (NY)	Wasserman
Gohmert	Payne	Schultz
Green, Gene	Perlmutter	
Grijalva	Pingree (ME)	

□ 1505

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

HONORING DONALD HARINGTON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1040, 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 California (Ms. SPEIER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1040.

This will be 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. 154]

YEAS—399

Ackerman	Berry	Brale (IA)
Aderholt	Biggert	Bright
Adler (NJ)	Bilbray	Broun (GA)
Akin	Bilirakis	Brown (SC)
Alexander	Bishop (GA)	Brown, Corrine
Altmire	Bishop (NY)	Brown-Waite,
Andrews	Bishop (UT)	Ginny
Arcuri	Blackburn	Buchanan
Austria	Blumenauer	Burgess
Baca	Boccieri	Burton (IN)
Bachmann	Boehner	Butterfield
Baird	Bonner	Calvert
Baldwin	Bono Mack	Camp
Barrett (SC)	Boozman	Campbell
Barrow	Boren	Cantor
Bartlett	Boswell	Cao
Barton (TX)	Boucher	Capito
Bean	Boustany	Capps
Becerra	Boyd	Capuano
Berkley	Brady (PA)	Cardoza
Berman	Brady (TX)	Carnahan

the Medal of Honor, the highest award for valor in action against an enemy force which can be bestowed upon an individual serving in the United States Armed Forces, for their service during the Battle of Iwo Jima;

Whereas half of the awards issued to Marines and Navy corpsmen of the 5th Amphibious Corps were posthumous awards;

Whereas awards for service during the Battle of Iwo Jima represented more than one-fourth of the 80 Medals of Honor awarded Marines during World War II;

Whereas, in recognition of the particularly treacherous conditions experienced by Marines, sailors, and soldiers during the Battle of Iwo Jima, Commander in Chief of the Pacific Fleet, Fleet Admiral Chester W. Nimitz stated, "Among the Americans who fought on Iwo island, uncommon valor was a common virtue";

Whereas the raising of the American flag over Mount Suribachi on February 23, 1945, was witnessed by many Marines all over Iwo Jima and the ships at sea and, upon witnessing the sight, Navy Secretary James Vincent Forrestal said, "The raising of that flag means a Marine Corps for another five hundred years";

Whereas Joe Rosenthal's Pulitzer Prize-winning photograph of the 5 Marines and 1 Navy corpsman raising the American flag over Mount Suribachi during the Battle of Iwo Jima produced an iconic and lasting symbol of the courage and determination that helped achieve victory for the United States Armed Forces during World War II;

Whereas the Battle of Iwo Jima was a military victory critical to the assault on Japan, providing a base for American fighter escorts and a way station for bombers raiding Japan;

Whereas the United States success in capturing Iwo Jima was a crucial victory that led to the eventual triumph in the Pacific Theatre during World War II; and

Whereas over 17,000 Marines were wounded and almost 6,000 Marines made the ultimate sacrifice by giving their lives for their country in the Battle of Iwo Jima: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes the 65th anniversary of the Battle of Iwo Jima; and

(2) recognizes and commends all members of the United States Armed Forces who participated in the Battle of Iwo Jima for their service and sacrifice, with particular honor and gratitude given to those gallant Americans who gave their lives in defense of the United States and of freedom during the Battle of Iwo Jima.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS) and the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. OWENS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise today in support of House Resolution 1099, recognizing the 65th anniversary of the Battle of Iwo Jima. I would like to thank my colleague from

Iowa (Mr. BRALEY) for putting this resolution together.

Madam Speaker, I don't know if you have ever been to the Marine Corps Memorial that sits nearby off Arlington Boulevard and George Washington Parkway atop a knoll overlooking all of the memorials on The Mall, the Washington Monument, and this Capitol building. If you haven't, I highly recommend going for a thoughtful visit. The memorial is a larger-than-life statue depicting one of the most famous images generated during World War II—Joe Rosenthal's Pulitzer Prize-winning photograph of the five marines and one Navy corpsman raising the American flag over Mount Suribachi during the Battle of Iwo Jima. At daybreak, the sun rises over the Capitol, illuminating monuments to America's history of perseverance for freedom. I can think of no better backdrop to this monument than that for which these brave men and women fought—the capital of the free world.

The battle of Iwo Jima lasted from February 19 to March 26, 1945, and was among the most bitter battles in the history of the Marine Corps. Over 70,000 participated, nearly a quarter of those were wounded, and almost 6,000 marines made the ultimate sacrifice by giving their last measure for America in this famous battle. And while the Marines suffered the most casualties in this confrontation, by far, this effort was directly supported by the Navy, which suffered roughly 2,800 casualties, and elements of the Army, which suffered 37 casualties.

Madam Speaker, 22 marines, 4 Navy corpsmen, and 1 Navy landing craft commander received the Medal of Honor, the highest award for valor in action against an enemy force which can be bestowed on an individual suffering in the United States Armed Forces, for their service during the Battle of Iwo Jima. It was Admiral Nimitz who stated, "Among Americans who fought on Iwo Island, uncommon valor was a common virtue." It is hard to imagine or even truly understand what that experience must have been like.

The Battle of Iwo Jima was a military victory critical to the assault on Japan, which led to the eventual triumph in the Pacific Theatre during World War II. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to recognize and commend all members of the United States Armed Forces participating in the Battle of Iwo Jima for their service and sacrifice, with particular honor and gratitude given to those gallant Americans who gave their lives in defense of the United States and freedom, by voting in favor of House Resolution 1099.

If any of my colleagues haven't had the opportunity yet, I recommend that they stand at dawn, or during one of the Marine Corps Tuesday Sunset Parades, and reflect upon the Battle of Iwo Jima and the sacrifices our servicemembers have made during all of America's wars to protect the freedoms we enjoy this very moment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 1099, as amended. This resolution recognizes the 65th anniversary of the Battle of Iwo Jima. I want to commend the sponsor of this resolution, Representative BRUCE BRALEY of Iowa, for introducing it.

The Battle of Iwo Jima in February and March of 1945 has become a symbol of the devotion to duty and valor of all the men who fought there. For marines especially, the action then of five marines and one Navy corpsman raising the U.S. flag on Mount Suribachi, as captured in the iconic photo, is now the standard by which all marines measure themselves. Every marine and many others as well, when viewing that image, are almost compelled to ask: Could I do the same thing? Would I measure up?

By any standard of measure, the Battle of Iwo Jima ranks as one of the most violent and savage in the history of the Marine Corps. The Marines, the Navy, and the Army personnel who fought the battle prevailed because, as Admiral Nimitz, Commander in Chief of the Pacific Fleet at the time, said, "uncommon valor was a common virtue."

Today, many of those men who won that victory are now gone. Our memory of and tribute to their valor and devotion to duty, however, remain. It is for that reason that we recognize the 65th anniversary of the Battle of Iwo Jima and commend all who served in it.

I urge all Members to support this most worthy bill.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OWENS. I yield such time as he may consume to my friend and colleague and the sponsor of this resolution, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BRALEY).

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank my colleague from Colorado for his kind remarks.

Madam Speaker, the photograph to my immediate right is what most people think of when they think of the Battle of Iwo Jima. It is the most famous photograph in the world. It was taken by Joe Rosenthal. It was not a staged photograph. It was taken while the second flag was raised on Mount Suribachi. What most people don't know is the rest of the story behind that flag raising.

This is a photograph that was taken on the summit of Mount Suribachi that's commonly referred to as the "gung-ho" photograph. It depicts the unit, the platoon, that was the first to reach the summit of Mount Suribachi and raise the first flag.

One thing that's important about this photograph is you can actually see the faces of the marines who made that heroic sacrifice. You cannot see the faces of anybody in the Joe Rosenthal photograph, and that was something

that bothered Joe Rosenthal when he saw his photograph weeks after he took it, because in the heat of the battle, that film was sent to be processed away from Iwo Jima and was published and released in newspapers across the United States. It instantly became the most popular symbol of the struggle in the Pacific.

Now, this photograph is especially important to me because shown right here in this photograph is a young man named Harold Keller, who was a corporal in the Marine Corps from my hometown of Brooklyn, Iowa. Harold Keller was one of those uncommon heroes that nobody knew anything about after he came home, but he was the second marine to reach the summit of Mount Suribachi. He slept that night under the flag that was erected on top. And while he and his buddy Chick Robeson slept under the flag, buzz bombs and mortars came in toward that flag, because it was the subject of great debate and competition between the Americans and the Japanese.

□ 1700

Harold Keller was remarkable for many other things that happened in this very brief period on an island that was so small, it was less than 10 square miles, and yet 30,000 Japanese soldiers and 70,000 marines and Navy corpsmen occupied that tiny island during this incredibly intense struggle. When Harold Keller first landed on the beach on D-day, February 19, 1945, the first thing he did was save his commanding officer, Lieutenant Keith Wells, who stuck his head up above the berm of that sandy beach and would have had his head blown off had it not been for Harold Keller, who pulled him down as a large piece of shrapnel soared right over where he had been.

He was also friends with Ernest "Boots" Thomas, who was the marine who carried the first flag to the summit and was called down to go on national radio and talk about the historic moment when that flag was unfurled over Mount Suribachi. When Harold Keller was walking up Mount Suribachi with his unit, he saw two stretchers being carried up to the summit, and his comment tells a lot about what they were facing. He told a friend of his, "We'll probably need a hell of a lot more than that." He saved the life of one of his colleagues, Robert Leader, who was later, after the flag was raised, wounded by mortar fire. Harold Keller came upon him, did a field dressing as he found him with his bowels laying outside his body, saved his life, and sent him home, where he became an art professor and gifted artist at the University of Notre Dame.

These are things that are stories behind the flag raising and why this is so important. Another reason this photograph is important to me is, as you look over the shoulders of these marines, you can see the beach down below, and you can see some of the landing craft. One of those landing craft was LST-808 which dropped my father off on Green Beach in Iwo Jima

the same day these flags were raised, and you can see LST-808 down below.

My father was 17 years old, Byard Braley, when he enlisted in the Marine Corps after getting his mother's permission, and he was 18 when he landed on Iwo Jima. He served in the Corps Artillery in the headquarters and service battery of the Fourth 155th Howitzer Battalion, which was commanded by Colonel John Letcher. One of the things John Letcher did was he wrote a book about his experience in the Marine Corps called "One Marine's Story," and this is how he described his first night on Iwo Jima at the Corps Artillery headquarters:

"I had been asleep for perhaps an hour when a shell burst which seemed to be right outside the tent. It was followed in rapid succession by others. The shells were bursting in the air a few feet above the ground and were spraying fragments in every direction. The command post area seemed to be their target, and they were making a hit with every shell. Most of our personnel must have been poorly dug in, just as I was, because mingled with the noise of the shell bursts, I heard screams and cries of wounded men. I was trembling uncontrollably and found myself reciting the Apostles' Creed."

Thirty-five men in my father's unit were killed and wounded during that barrage, and it was something that he carried with him every day of his life until he died 29 years ago. One of the things that we know about the people who served on Iwo Jima is that the ones who were fortunate enough to come home, like my father and Harold Keller, never considered themselves heroes. They considered the heroes their fallen comrades who were buried on that island in the Third, Fourth and Fifth Marine Division cemeteries. And this photo, Madam Speaker, shows the lines of crosses and Stars of David in the Fifth Marine Division Cemetery, with Mount Suribachi in the background.

Probably one of the most compelling cemetery dedications given since the Gettysburg Address was delivered by Rabbi Roland Gittelsohn at the dedication of the Fifth Marine Division Cemetery, and I want you to listen to his powerful words, which we should hear today just as powerfully as when he delivered them. Here is what he said about these fallen comrades:

"Our poor power of speech can add nothing to what these men have already done. All that we even hope to do is follow their example. To show the same selfless courage in peace that they did in war . . . These men have done their jobs well. They have paid the ghastly price of freedom . . . We dedicate ourselves, first, to live together in peace the way they fought and are buried in this war . . . Here lie officers and men, Negroes and Whites, rich men and poor—together. Here no man prefers another because of his faith or despises him because of his color. Here there are no quotas of how many from each group are admitted or

allowed. Among these men there is no discrimination, no prejudices, no hatred. Theirs is the highest and purest democracy."

Madam Speaker, these are the reasons why we gather here today to honor this historic battle, to remember the sacrifice of the most severe battle in Marine Corps history, where one-quarter of the Medals of Honor were awarded in World War II during this one battle. That's why I urge my colleagues to support this resolution and remember, we must never forget.

Mr. LAMBORN. Madam Speaker, I just want to thank my colleague and friend from Iowa again for bringing this resolution. I had the great privilege of standing on Iwo Jima a year ago when some of us on the Armed Services Committee were going to Okinawa to review the Marine transfer that may take place to Guam. The whole island is sacred territory. We were able to bring back samples of the black volcanic sand from the beach right below Mount Suribachi. I have that in my office. We stood on the top of Mount Suribachi. There is a wonderful memorial there right now. It's very touching and very moving for all the reasons that Representative BRALEY has highlighted. Thank you again for bringing this resolution, and I urge all of my colleagues to support it.

Madam Speaker, at this point I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California, Representative HERGER.

Mr. HERGER. Madam Speaker, the American people could not be more clear. They want to fix the problems with our health care system, but they do not want the Democrats' government takeover of health care. It's time to stop the backroom deals and bring transparency to this debate. On a bill that rewrites one-sixth of our economy, adds \$1 trillion to the Federal budget, and affects every American's health care, Members of Congress should stand up and be counted. I call on Speaker PELOSI to grant Republicans' requests for a call of the House so Americans can watch at home and can see and hear how their Representative is voting.

Mr. OWENS. I will continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Madam Speaker, at this point I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER).

Mr. BUYER. I would like to thank both parties for recognizing the uncommon virtue and valor. It didn't occur just at Iwo Jima. It occurred in many battlefields and lonely places all over the world. These are military values and virtues which are passed from one generation to the next. They are memorialized, and we've done that here in the Nation's Capital in Arlington by that extraordinary photo that was then transformed into that statue.

The art of man is able to construct monuments and awards that are far

more significant than the narrow span of our own existence. It's the silent lapse of time that displays how frail and how fallible we are as a people. So it truly is what we do with the time that we have that matters most. So those of us with whom we've had the privilege to wear the uniform and fight our Nation's wars and to serve on foreign soil, I can tell you having done that, that it is an extraordinary feeling.

Now for the men and women, the nurses and the men who were in the dark sands of Iwo Jima, what an extraordinary campaign, and we have done everything we can to fulfill their ideal. At times, we fall short. We fall short as a people when we don't fulfill the ideal of their sacrifice; that is, the preservation of freedom and the preservation of individual liberty. And we have to be careful here in the institution of Congress if we don't respect each other with regard to our opinions, with regard to the process, because liberty also in the democratic process is pretty important.

So we have this debate on the health bill. We shouldn't try to scheme. We should be open. This should be the most open and deliberative body in the world so that Lady Liberty that sits on top of the dome can truly shine as that beacon of liberty so that the sacrifices of those marines and the sailors and others at Iwo Jima can live forever. The men and women who wear the uniform, they fight for no bounty of their own, and they leave freedom in their footsteps. They are truly extraordinary people. They also go to a land where they've never been, and they fight for a people that they've never met because they fight for extraordinary ideals. So those sacrifices that occurred on Iwo Jima have been passed on to other generations, those of whom fought in Korea or in Vietnam, in the sands of the first gulf war or even the second gulf war and Afghanistan.

So those of us who inherit the freedoms and those ideals, we are merely trustees for life, and our duty is to concentrate our lives to the greater good, beset by recurrent hopes for a more peaceful and prosperous Union. To do otherwise would be selfish as a people, and it would be wrong to turn to the next generation and say that we did not improve upon it, and we would then not be able to uphold the men, like at Iwo Jima, who did so much for so many.

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

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

Once again, I commend our fighting forces for their service to this country and to the cause of freedom. The freedom they worked and fought for is embodied in the constitutional system we enjoy in this country. Few votes that we have taken in this body will affect our constitutional system of freedom

more than the vote that we take tomorrow on health care. And I would like to show, Madam Speaker, the bills that we have in front of us and the—I think—short time that we've unfortunately had to review them.

Sitting here are the various bills from the House and Senate, the reconciled version, and the committee reports. These total more than 6,200 pages. We've had a brief 72 hours to review these materials by the time our vote rolls around, projected for tomorrow afternoon. That is simply not the way we should do business in the people's House.

If we take 72 hours and subtract 8 hours a day for sleeping so you don't get burnt out completely, in that remaining 48 hours, you could read about two pages a minute if you read from morning until night, and then you would get through these 6,000 pages. You probably couldn't look up very many of the citations, though. That slows you down a bit further. But this is what we are faced with when we have our vote tomorrow.

□ 1715

I think we really should have a different and better process, and the American people deserve better.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND).

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Madam Speaker, I want to thank my friend for the time, and I want to also thank Mr. BRALEY for bringing this resolution and what it means to the men and women who served in our military and especially those who fought so bravely at Iwo Jima.

As I was walking across today to the Longworth Office Building, Madam Speaker, I ran into several veterans out in the crowd. They were asking me about the health care vote that we are going to have tomorrow and about other situations that are going on in our government, and a lot of them asked me, said, You know, I served my country and I didn't expect to have this type of treatment or to have this forced on me or my children or my grandchildren.

One of the interesting facts is that the Senate bill, the Senate bill that is going to be passed in this House tomorrow, that passed in the Senate, evidently had some things in it that maybe people didn't understand.

Chairman SKELTON brought a bill to the floor today to make sure that TRICARE is looked at as an acceptable insurance program. TRICARE, the thing that we give our veterans that serve so faithfully in our military, TRICARE was not even going to be looked at as one of the acceptable insurance programs. We were fixing to strip them of that. And those veterans on the street just could not understand that concept, how that could have gotten by 60 people in the Senate, that evidently didn't know it was in there or didn't care about those veterans that had served our country so bravely.

And, you know, earlier today we had a bill on the floor, a motion to recommit that bill, and I believe there were 178 people that voted "no" originally, and then the votes started changing. And I think it ended up with 39 "no" votes, Madam Speaker, after all of the changes from 170-something down to 39, and it was only a 3-page bill. Now our side certainly—and I am sure the gentlewoman from Wyoming wasn't trying to trick anybody—it was a 3-page bill, very plainly written; but, evidently, nobody had read it and so everybody voted against it. And all of a sudden it started getting around what was in it, about sexual predators being allowed to be in this volunteer group to look after our forest land. So the next thing you know, 140 people are down here changing their vote on a 3-page bill.

Can you imagine what is in a 2,700-page bill that Members of this House have not read? We are going to suffer some unintended consequences. And probably those that are going to feel the greatest loss of those unintended consequences are the brave men and women who have served so faithfully and defended this country and fought for our rights and for our freedoms. And we are fixing to pass legislation that I would venture to say that nobody in this House has read and completely understands.

Mr. OWENS. Madam Speaker, I would like to respond to the comments about the bill and the inability to comprehend it in a short period of time.

I am relatively new to Congress. The Senate bill has been available, I think, for better than 80 days. This sounds more like a college or high school student saying I had to stay up all night and cram because I didn't study during the semester.

There was adequate time for everyone in the House to read the Senate bill. I certainly did. I read the reconciliation bill in one night. So the claim this is being foisted upon us in a manner which does not allow for its comprehension is simply incomprehensible.

I yield 2 minutes to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. Madam Speaker, let's return to the subject at hand for a minute. The Republicans are attempting to pretzel into a debate honoring the heroes of World War II, the Greatest Generation, those who liberated the Pacific Rim, those who gave their lives, those who climbed Mount Suribachi against all odds and raised the American flag so bravely, and they are trying to pretzel into the debate some pretty strange things. Let me address a couple.

First, we had the gentleman talking about threats to veterans' health care. There will be nothing in the legislation, the health care legislation, that in any way impinges upon the health

care that our veterans have earned. The gentleman is fully aware that in the House bill, which was thoughtfully written, that that was mentioned and fully protected.

I am not going to apologize for the bipartisan, and it is bipartisan, total incompetence of the United States Senate. I am not going to apologize for that. But we passed a resolution here today to make clear what our intent was, and what will be in the law: veterans' health care benefits fully protected.

While I am on the subject of veterans' health care benefits, I saw the former Chair of the Veterans' Committee here on the floor, and I would remind people, we need a sense of history. There was a year in the Bush administration, after repeated cuts to the veterans' budget, when they were running out of money in June when the Republicans controlled the House, the Senate, and the White House. And it was the Democrats who came to the floor and said we need \$2 billion more immediately to deliver on our obligations to our veterans. And there was a brave guy, he is a Republican, CHRIS SMITH from New Jersey, he was the chairman of the Veterans' Committee, and he voted with the Democrats. And you know what the Republican leadership did? They stripped him of his chairmanship for his advocacy for veterans, and they put that other gentleman who just spoke previously in the chair in his stead.

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

Mr. OWENS. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. DEFAZIO. We are still repairing the damage the Bush administration did to the Veterans Health Administration. They need better funding. We are on a path now to give them 2 years of certainty whereas before they were hanging on the cliff, and 1 year in the Bush Republican era they ran out of money in June when the fiscal year ends in October, and they were going to close their hospitals. So don't tell me that you guys here are the great defenders of our veterans.

And then this other gentleman raises this thing about this 3-page Republican motion to recommit where people changed their vote. I didn't have to change my vote; I read it. But he might also reveal that that 3-page amendment was only available 1 minute before it was discussed for 10 minutes on the floor. It was not published online. It was not made available to Members, and Members did not know the content of that.

This health care legislation that will be voted on has been online for 72 hours. The manager's amendment is now up online. That Republican amendment was available for a grand total of about 11 minutes before the vote began.

So let's be honest and consistent around here in our arguments, and let's spend a little more time honoring the Greatest Generation.

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

Madam Speaker, I would like to point out that this pile of paper here representing 2,310 pages was released to the body 3 days ago, March 17. This is the text of H.R. 4872 reported from the House Budget Committee. I would be curious if my colleague from New York has read this 2,300-page document, as well as the several hundred pages of additional committee reports since that time, and possibly we will have a manager's amendment tomorrow. We will find out about that.

But even more substantively, Madam Speaker, is that we are talking tomorrow about a health care plan that the American people do not want. We should not be doing this bill tomorrow or at any time. We should start over with incremental, bipartisan reform that everyone here, or most of us anyway, could agree with, not a partisan bill that only one party will be voting for. The bipartisanship here in the House tomorrow, I suspect, will be the opposition to the bill. There are mandates in the President's proposed plan for health care as the House and Senate are taking it up. There are new taxes. There are cuts in Medicare. There is failure to have tort reform. There is increased government intervention.

Let me mention the increased government intervention. There will be new bureaucratic boards that will come up with a definition of quality and will give more power to the Federal Government through bureaucracy. Provisions such as the Comparative Effectiveness Research Board, the Independent Medicare Advisory Board and others will be set up through this plan. A form of government-run plan will maintain the OPM, overseeing multistate plans and co-ops. There are still, unfortunately, sweetheart deals in this plan. The Cornhusker kickback has some provisions still existing in the current version. The Louisiana purchase is still there. There are carveouts for unions and other sweetheart deals.

And, sadly to say, there are broken promises. The President set several parameters, including that the bill will cost under \$900 billion; that has been broken. That there will be no taxes on those making under 250,000; that promise has been broken. That family's health insurance premiums would go down by \$2,500 a year, and that promise has been broken. And if individuals liked what they had, they could keep it, and that will not be kept either.

The bottom line is that some might compare the last-minute inclusion of a few bread crumbs from the Republican side without true Republican input or knowledge on fraud, waste and abuse, and subsequent comments that we are somehow being partisan for standing up for our constituents and not supporting something that we in principle do not agree with is just plain wrong.

Now let me say this about reconciliation. House Democratic leaders have

been searching for a way to ensure that any move that they make to approve the Senate-passed \$871 billion health care reform bill as it came over from the Senate is followed by Senate action on a reconciliation package of adjustments to the original bill. However, this is a nonstarter. The Senate Parliamentarian has ruled that President Barack Obama must sign Congress's original health care reform bill.

Mr. ISRAEL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBORN. I yield briefly to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ISRAEL. I thank the gentleman. Would the gentleman explain to me what reconciliation has to do with honoring veterans at Iwo Jima?

Mr. LAMBORN. Reclaiming my time, let me also conclude by saying that there is another problem with the health care bill that we will be looking at in a few hours tomorrow afternoon on abortion. Abortion funding will be required of the taxpayers in our country.

□ 1730

Current legislation would permit Federal funds to subsidize plans covering abortion, would permit a multi-State health plan to offer abortion coverage, and would require citizens in States that have opted out of elective abortion coverage in their own exchange to still fund Federal subsidies for plans that cover elective abortion in other States.

In addition, the bill includes \$7 billion in new mandatory spending on community health centers, funding that is not subject to any restrictions prohibiting Federal dollars from funding elective abortions. If the current legislation passes the House without abortion funding restrictions, such as was I believe properly introduced in the Representative BART STUPAK amendment, it will be virtually impossible to alter the language through reconciliation as the two versions are reconciled over in the Senate since Senate Republicans have said they will block amendments which require 60 votes to overcome a point of order under reconciliation.

So for those reasons, I would say that we should not be passing the bill tomorrow. It will severely degrade the freedom in our country for those who want to live their lives and not be subject to government control and intervention in all the intimate decisions that they make with their doctors for their own health care.

I would yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OWENS. I yield 1 minute to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL).

Mr. ISRAEL. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Speaker, I must say that with all due respect I am profoundly disappointed. I always thought that the one thing that we could all agree on in this body without delay, without distraction, without partisanship and

without politics, is honoring our veterans. We are discussing a resolution honoring the veterans of Iwo Jima, and even that has been politicized, even that has been delayed, even that has been distracted.

Is there anything that you can agree to do with us? Can they not even agree, Madam Speaker, to pass without delay a resolution honoring our veterans without politicizing it and injecting partisanship into it and delay? We are here to honor our veterans. We are here to honor the memory of people who were at Iwo Jima. And instead we turn it into a political debate on an unrelated issue. And for that I am profoundly disappointed.

Mr. OWENS. I yield 2 minutes to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER).

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I have had a chance to listen to my colleague from Colorado take what should be really a glorious opportunity to honor our vets, to honor vets who served in one of the bloodiest battles World War II or this world has ever seen generally, and to start talking about abortion and about the health care bill. I can't believe that they are taking this approach, Madam Speaker.

I had the opportunity just within the last 2 weeks to work with 11 veterans who served in Iwo Jima who were flying there for the 65th anniversary, which we are honoring today. And to stand with those men, who they and so many others just gave everything they had to protect this Nation, was such a privilege, such an honor. The fact that I and our office could play any role in helping them get back there for the ceremony in which the flag was raised was a tremendous privilege for all of us.

To take the time to veer off into health care when we should be honoring these gentlemen for their service I think is a travesty, and I would say that to my friend from Colorado. This is something that is important. These people served us valiantly. Their service is just honored and is so celebrated in Colorado that I just wanted to get up here today, while I am in the midst of the health care debate, to honor them and to thank them for their service.

Mr. LAMBORN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I yield to my colleague from Colorado.

Mr. LAMBORN. My good friend has raised a point. I don't know if he was able to be here at the beginning of this resolution, but we had a wonderful discussion about the tremendous valor shown in Iwo Jima. But this is a discussion also—

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Reclaiming my time from my friend, this hour should be dedicated to the veterans. That is what I say.

Mr. OWENS. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by

the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1099, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

Mr. OWENS. 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.

RECOGNIZING MILITARY AVIATORS WHO ESCAPED CAPTURE

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 925) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the meritorious service performed by aviators in the United States Armed Forces who were shot down over, or otherwise forced to land in, hostile territory yet evaded enemy capture or were captured but subsequently escaped, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 925

Whereas aviators in the Armed Forces, including pilots, navigators, bombardiers, weapons control officers, and other aircraft crew members, have served the United States with great courage and distinction in every major conflict during the 20th and 21st centuries;

Whereas thousands of aviators in the Armed Forces have been forced down while performing their missions, as a result of hostile action, mechanical failures, or other problems;

Whereas many of these aviators overcame long odds and great hardships to return to their units and resume their service to the United States;

Whereas some of these aviators tried to evade enemy forces, but were captured, and some of these aviators were compelled to endure arduous confinement, retaliation, and even death as a result of their efforts to evade capture or escape;

Whereas these aviators faced the added responsibility of maintaining the secrecy of their escape and evasion methods in order to protect the lives of people who assisted them and other aviators; and

Whereas the need to maintain secrecy initially may have prevented these aviators from being publically recognized for their meritorious service in avoiding capture, in escaping from captivity, or for their efforts to escape: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that—

(1) aviators in the United States Armed Forces who, as a result of hostile action, mechanical failures, or other problems, were forced to evade or escape enemy capture, were captured but subsequently escaped to return to their units and resume their service to the United States, or were compelled to endure arduous confinement, retaliation, and even death as a result of their efforts to evade capture or escape should be publically recognized for their extraordinary service; and

(2) the Secretaries of the military departments should consider these aviators for appropriate recognition within their branch of the Armed Forces.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) and the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Guam.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of House Resolution 925, which recognizes aviators in the United States Armed Forces who were forced to evade or escape enemy capture, were captured but subsequently escaped, or were compelled to endure arduous confinement, retaliation, and even death as a result of their efforts to evade capture or escape. I want to thank my colleague from Oregon (Mr. DEFazio) for introducing this measure.

As a member of the House Committee on Armed Services, I am honored to recognize the aviators of the Armed Forces who have valiantly served the United States in every major conflict during the 20th and 21st century. Aviators, including pilots, navigators, bombardiers, weapons control officers, and other aircraft crew members, with fierce courage and distinction face the threat of being forced down each time they take to the skies.

Madam Speaker, House Resolution 925 recognizes those downed aviators that have not only miraculously survived unexpected flight termination, but also have confronted additional dangers escaping or attempting to escape enemy capture on the ground. It also expresses the sense of the House that those downed aviators that were tortured or killed as a result of their efforts to evade capture or escape should be publicly recognized for their extraordinary service. So in honor of these men and women who have selflessly served our Nation, many without the encouragement of public recognition, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" to this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Madam Speaker, I too rise in support of House Resolution 925, which seeks recognition for aviators who, as a result of hostile action or other causes, were forced to escape and evade their potential captors. Every military aviator who begins a combat mission recognizes and prepares for the possibility that hostile actions or other events will compel the aviator to escape and evade capture.

Thousands of American aviators have faced that daunting task. Some overcame long odds and great hardships to return to their units to resume their service. Others tried to evade enemy forces but were captured, suffering arduous confinement, torture, and even death. Except for a few, the specific identities of those thousands have mostly faded from American memory, and many were not recognized for their determined efforts to escape and evade. That is why this resolution is important. These aviators deserve recognition. That is why I call on all Members to support this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to my friend and colleague, and the sponsor of this resolution, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank the gentleman.

The previous resolution had to do with the anniversary of Iwo Jima. This is something that would actually go to a number of wars and conflicts that the U.S. Armed Forces have been involved in, but I will focus a bit on a veteran of World War II in terms of the need for this recognition and resolution.

Oddly enough somehow, the Defense Department has overlooked the valiant service of many who were previously in the Army Air Corps, now in the United States Air Force, or in the flying arms of the United States Army or the Marines and Navy and their sacrifice when they have been shot down behind enemy lines and not captured and imprisoned, but actually managed to evade escape, sometimes allying themselves with resistance movements, other times just depriving the enemy of the victory of capturing a downed U.S. pilot, bombardier, airman of any sort.

This first came to my attention when I was approached by a gentleman I have known a number of years in Eugene, Oregon, Don Fisher. And he came to me with a request I hear from a lot of vets, which is, "Hey, could you help me get my service records?" We had the infamous fire in St. Louis which burned up so many veterans' records. And we are often asked to help reconstitute their records, generally for benefit purposes, but sometimes for other purposes. And I said, "Sure, Don." I mean that's really pretty routine. "We can help you with that." He said, "This one isn't quite so routine." And I said, "Well, how is that?" And he said, "Well, I was shot down over occupied France in a B-17. I came down behind enemy lines, and I was harbored by French families who were friendly to the allies. I cooperated and worked with the resistance and evaded escape until D-day." And on D-day he revealed himself to British forces and was first allowed to send a message home. But then when turned over to the U.S. forces, they had questions about whether he really was a U.S. aviator, and he was rather extensively interrogated.

So what he wanted was to get his interrogation files. He said, "I really don't remember everything that happened to me when I was behind enemy lines." He said, "I'm sure when I was a young man I had a better memory. And I would like to have that for my family and myself." I said, "Well, sure. We'll help." It's either still in the depths of some classification system somewhere or it was declassified, so we could never find that file.

But that brought me an interest in him and his organization. There is an organization of what they call evaders. In this case they are World War II. Many of them are becoming quite elderly. They are going to have a reunion in the not too distant future out at the Air Force Academy in Colorado.

I took on the task to try to get them some recognition. So this is actually two parts. One is expressing the sense of Congress for admiration for their extraordinary service. And again, this does not just extend to World War II. It would be Korea, Vietnam, and Iraq, Afghanistan, other conflicts and other involvements by U.S. forces. Anybody who has been in this situation.

Secondly, I am recommending strongly to the Secretary of Defense that a special ribbon, award, or medal be developed to recognize these activities and encourage these activities, because there will be future U.S. aviators who will be in the same position. And we want them to know that we honored their forebears, those who came before them who for years hid and operated behind enemy lines and then came back to freedom with our victories.

It is almost exactly 47 years since he was shot down. It's a story that is not totally extraordinary. I know other World War II veterans. But I just recount it briefly. His plane was shot down. They bailed out. He doesn't remember much because they were at a pretty high altitude. He blacked out. The next thing he knew he was hanging from a tree, and the German fighter pilot circled him. And he thought for sure he was going to be strafed. Instead, the German fighter pilot saluted him and flew off.

He then managed to get extricated from his harness, and after that was sheltered by the French, and ultimately became associated with French resistance, and as I say, met the liberators in Paris when we liberated Paris. So this is one of thousands of extraordinary stories and acts of valor by our soldiers.

I just hope strongly that we can get unanimous agreement on this resolution and restrict the debate to the subject of this resolution to honor these people for their extraordinary service, and move on.

Mr. LAMBORN. Madam Speaker, the service performed by aviators in the U.S. Armed Forces is indeed meritorious. They have fought bravely and risked much to take care of our country. Indeed, they deserve the recognition and care for their sacrifice that

this resolution embodies. As members of the military, their health care falls under the TRICARE system, which as Representative SKELTON mentioned earlier in this day, must be addressed in any health care bill before Congress.

□ 1745

We must make sure that any bill we pass in this area gives them the benefits that they deserve.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. POSEY).

Mr. POSEY. I thank the gentleman from Colorado for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I applaud the sponsors, cosponsors, and everyone in the body who is taking the time to support the heroes that we're discussing today. I would also like to take this opportunity to remind the body, as my colleague just has, that we must keep the TRICARE promised them for life as well. And while we're on the TRICARE/health care subject, I'd like to stress my strong objections to the health care legislation, the unprecedented abuses, and perhaps unconstitutional process through which it's being considered.

The American people are telling us, either in letters or calls, in every poll that they don't want it. Besides the fact of Social Security is unsustainable, Medicare is unsustainable, and only a few doctors even accept Medicaid as it is now. There are other top 10 reasons to reject it.

It raises taxes by over \$550 billion. It adds over a trillion more dollars to the national debt, kills over 2 million more jobs, and drives up the cost of medical insurance; gives the IRS unprecedented power over the lives of the American people; replaces your doctor with Federal bureaucrats to make critical decisions about your medical care; cuts Medicare by more than a half a trillion dollars, and of course Congress is exempt; provides for the largest expansion of abortion coverage since Roe v. Wade, including taxpayer-funded abortions. It will bankrupt States through billions in unfunded mandates; force American citizens to foot the bill for health care for illegal aliens, inasmuch as it fails to include strict enforcement; is the result of a flawed process, having been written in secret out of the view of C-SPAN cameras and filled with backroom deals and vote buying.

We're a Nation of laws. Laws are not supposed to be ignored when they are inconvenient or simply pose a hurdle to achieving certain agendas. We teach our children to play by the rules, but this Congress is teaching them something very different.

How can we expect the American people to obey the laws Congress passes when Congress won't obey its own rules? It is respect for the rule of law that has distinguished the United

States from the banana republics and authoritarian regimes.

Indeed, millions of Americans, including those we're honoring today, have fought and even have died for this country; yet this bill, this process grossly compromises that principle. Clearly, Congress isn't listening to the American people and is once again ignoring their voices.

There is an old political axiom that says any time you promise to take from Peter to pay Paul, one thing usually happens—Paul votes for you. And that is where we are right here, right now today in Congress. This is exactly what ultimately leads democracies to fail, and this bill, if enacted into law, will greatly undermine the future of our Republic, the greatest Nation in the history of the world that these men and women fought and died for.

It has been said democracy cannot exist as a permanent form of government; it can only exist until the voters discover they can vote themselves largesse from the public treasury. From that moment on, the majority usually votes for the candidates promising them the most benefits. Therefore, the average age of the world's greatest civilizations has been about 200 years.

These nations have progressed through this sequence: from bondage to spiritual faith, from spiritual faith to great courage, from courage to liberty, from liberty to abundance, from abundance to selfishness, from selfishness to apathy, from apathy to dependence, and from dependency back into bondage.

It is not difficult to see where we are right now on that scale, but what is true is it's frightening. It's frightening that some people think our government is some kind of cosmic Santa Claus who cannot fail. It isn't—and it can fail if we are not good stewards of the gift our Forefathers gave to us. We must not allow the American experiment at representative self-government to fail on our watch.

If our Founders wanted to live like Europeans, they would not have come here in the first place or they would have turned the ships around and headed home. But they didn't. They wanted a land of opportunity, not a land of government-administered, cradle-to-the-grave entitlements.

Americans don't want to go down this path toward future socialism, increasingly losing power to government. Vice President BIDEN said it best yesterday when he said, if this bill is passed, government will "control" health care in America. His words not mine.

No one believes the status quo in our Nation's health care system is acceptable. There are many areas where we can find agreement, and we must move forward to fix those problems. The American people deserve better. Let them know that we know we don't work for Congress. Congress works for them by defeating this bill.

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, I would like to inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Guam has 12½ minutes. The gentleman from Colorado has 14 minutes.

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

Mr. GARAMENDI. I grew up in the forties and fifties, and I remember the men and women that came back from the war, some gravely wounded, carrying those wounds the rest of their lives, and some having survived but survived behind enemy lines. This resolution honors those that fought in so many different ways, and particularly those behind enemy lines and were unable to really be recognized for the extraordinary contributions they made to the war effort. And it's perfectly appropriate.

What is not appropriate is what our colleagues on the Republican side have done with this debate and with the previous debate. We're honoring our soldiers. We're honoring our men and women that have fought. We will soon be debating the health care issue, and in the appropriate time, we should be taking that up. But to somehow demean, to somehow demean the courage, the resolution, and the extraordinary sacrifice made by these people is just plain wrong.

I would ask our colleagues to set it aside. In a few moments we will pick up the health care debate, and then I would be delighted to join you in that debate. But now let's focus on those who have served this country in time of war.

Mr. LAMBORN. I would say that it's always the proper time to talk about issues that impact our freedom, and we have momentous issues here in Congress at times that deal directly upon our freedom.

With that in mind, I would like to yield 3½ minutes to my colleague and friend who is an Army veteran from the State of Michigan (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. I commend MADELEINE BORDALLO on the work on this bill, and it does sadden many of us that we have to come here today and talk about an issue that is so pressing, an issue that affects 310 million Americans. And it's hard to find that time to get out and talk about that issue that will take away health care from millions, that will tax health care for millions, that will raid the Social Security trust fund, that will actually cut a half a trillion dollars out of the Medicare budget. But there are things in this bill that I think the other side does not want to talk about that is in here, and that is exactly why we feel compelled to come here to offer amendments at the Rules Committee to get this thing at least where the American people can have some faith that you're going to have an honest debate.

The number of sweetheart and sleazy deals in this bill, the bill that this

Chamber will vote on tomorrow, is sickening. It pits one American against another American. It pits one neighbor against another neighbor, and it happens time and time and time again in your legislation.

If you're a retired UAW worker living next door to a retired tool and die machinist, guess what? There is a special provision where you get offsets for the increase in your premiums for a UAW worker but the tool and die machinists get nothing except a higher tax bill. It's wrong. It was a special provision tucked in this bill.

If you're a senior citizen in Florida, there is a special provision that says your Medicare Advantage stays intact, but if you're a senior citizen living in Ohio or New York or Michigan, guess what? Not for you. You get treated differently. You lose your Medicare Advantage. It's wrong. It's sleazy. It's un-American.

If you're a UAW worker in Michigan, you're going to get a higher tax on your insurance plan. If you're a longshoreman in New York City, you don't pay the higher tax on your insurance plan. It's unseemly, sleazy, and it's wrong.

These are provisions tucked into this bill we can only assume to get to the magic number to pass on this floor.

You know, if you're a banker in Michigan, you no longer, after this bill is passed, will be able to make a private student loan. That is right. But if you're a banker from North Dakota, guess what? You will get to make a private student loan. It's un-American. And each and every one of these sleazy deals ought to be brought to this floor and eliminated from this bill.

We will have that opportunity in Rules Committee. We will see the commitment of this Chamber to be honest and transparent, not to mention the fact that we will stop the Social Security raid to pay for a bill that adds a trillion dollars to the deficit.

And do you realize, Madam Speaker, why the impact of this is so important? Because this administration has had more deficit spending than every other President of the United States combined. It is shocking and it's breathtaking, and the arrogance of this Chamber to bring such an un-American bill with special sweetheart, sleazy deals tucked in and arm-twisting to make it happen is wrong.

I know that the soldiers I served with fought for a unified country, a country that believed in liberty and personal responsibility and limited government. I know that today we ought to stand for that, too, and we ought to ask all of this to come to light and put those amendments as a part of the bill and clean up our act in Congress.

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. Again, I wish that the Republican side had been able to wait until later this evening during their 2

hours to raise their concerns about health care, but there are some things that merit response in the interest of truth and the American way.

The gentleman before me is extraordinary. This President has deficits totaled larger than every other President combined? No. Actually, yes, we do have a record deficit this last year. Most of it is inherited from George Bush. But it's true, now, that that's a very high year.

But George Bush is the one who doubled the national debt and did accumulate more debt than every other President before him, before the collapse of Wall Street because of the deregulatory agenda of the Bush administration and the Republican Party—every ounce of which I fought on the floor of this House—which brought America to its knees, which dissolved people's savings and 401(k)s and everything else for greedy bankers and investors and others. And the Republicans put that agenda in place when they controlled the House, the Senate, and the White House with their deregulatory approach.

So it's not even factually true. Yes, I'm very concerned about the astounding deficits, and we've got to deal with that, but George Bush doubled the debt. There is a record 1-year increase. It does not exceed even the amount of debt George Bush accumulated. He may be looking into the future, but it's not factually true.

To the gentleman before him who talked about bankrupting people because we're going to give them access to quality, affordable health care, I wish he would tell that to the woman from my district who I talked to who got cancer, had an individual policy, and guess what? She paid her premiums, and when it became time for renewal, the company said, Sorry. We don't renew policies of people who have cancer. Thank you very much for your premiums.

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

□ 1800

Ms. BORDALLO. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Or the gentleman I met in the unemployment office. Yeah, he had rights to purchase his health care under COBRA. But the cost of his health care was three-quarters of his unemployment benefit. His wife was deathly ill. This is a tough guy. He cried in public in that office. That won't happen again if we pass this legislation tomorrow. That gentleman will not be forced to choose between keeping his home, feeding his family, and getting his wife needed health care. Under your plan, that continues, status quo. You guys are the pets of the insurance industry, and you know it.

And then the woman that needed a double mastectomy and they had a special team from her insurance company. That was great. But their job was to

find a way to get her off the plan. They reviewed her history. They found she had been to a dermatologist for acne. They said she hadn't reported it. They rescinded her policy. And a gentleman from your side of the aisle had to threaten that insurance company publicly to get her reinstated. This law will prohibit that in the future.

We need to take on the health insurance industry in America and prevent these abuses, and you guys did nothing about that under your charge, and your proposals for the future will do nothing about that.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is reminded to address his remarks to the Chair.

Mr. LAMBORN. Madam Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Finally, some spirited debate on an issue that will impact 310 million Americans. The problem with your anecdotal stories is, you are going to say that 85 percent of the system that is working right and having insurance are going to be punished and rationed in health care to fix the 15 percent. That's the travesty. You won't have one tough guy crying; you will have millions and millions of Americans crying for losing their health care.

And on the deficit, to set it straight, the year prior to the Democrats taking over control of this Congress it was a \$270 billion deficit. The year leading up to their takeover of this Chamber, \$160 billion. And guess what? The very next year, \$1.4 trillion. That's your problem. That's your plan. You need to deal with the facts.

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE).

Mr. INSLEE. The purpose of this resolution is to honor the aviators who have done such courageous duty for this country. And they have. And I think one of the things they have done because of their sacrifices is that they have always given America a chance to become a more perfect union. And I think the language in our founding documents of working towards a more perfect union suggests that we're a country that's always looking for an opportunity to get just a little bit better. And we now have a bill we will be voting on tomorrow that does give America a chance, not to solve all our problems, but to get a little bit better when it comes to health care.

And I just want to, in the context of an aviator, suggest what that may mean. Let's take an aviator that goes to France, serves in a B-17 like so many courageous aviators did, is shot down, rescued, prisoner-of-war, returns, starts a little business, raises a family back home, survives World War II, raises let's say his daughter, she grows up to maturity, maybe has a kid. He is a proud grandfather like many of these aviators are.

What could happen to his daughter right now in the current situation of the law? What could happen is she could have insurance, she could have a good job, she could be taking care of her family, and then she can develop cancer. And do you know what this side of the aisle wants to allow to continue to be the law of the United States of America? They want to let the aviator's daughter to be able to be canceled in her insurance policy because she develops cancer.

Let's assume the grandchild of the aviator develops diabetes and gets to maturity and wants to go out and buy an insurance policy. Guess what this side of the aisle wants to allow to be continued practiced in America? They, who are going to be voting en masse, en masse, against health care reform, against this step forward tomorrow, they will be voting tomorrow to allow the aviator's grandchild to be denied insurance because she developed diabetes.

Now I question whether American aviators who fight wars proudly think it's really up to American standards to allow the children and grandchildren of aviators to be denied coverage because they developed illness. We don't think that is good enough for America. We think we deserve better. And what we will be doing tomorrow is voting for a provision that will give the families of aviators the right, in fact, to be treated fairly in America.

Now I know many people, they have argued this is somehow a government takeover of health care. I've thought about that, and I can understand people don't want a government takeover of health care. But it is fundamental. What this does is it changes the relationship between Americans and the insurance industry. And that's a relationship, and the rules of that relationship do need to change because we need to give Americans more choice. We need to give them more freedom. We need to give them more protection against some of the practices of the insurance companies. And that's what we will be voting to do tomorrow.

So I say let's honor some aviators. Let's honor their families by giving their families the right to have health care even though they have asthma, even though they have diabetes, even though they have Parkinson's. Whether they are Republicans or Democrats, or red and blue States, all Americans deserve to be able to have insurance in this country. That's what we're going to do tomorrow.

Mr. LAMBORN. Madam Speaker, there are some important, vital, and principled reasons why those of us on this side of the aisle will be opposing the health care plan should it come to a vote tomorrow. And just briefly let me recap these. It raises taxes by \$570 billion over 10 years. It will cost the taxpayers \$1.2 trillion, not to mention the so-called doc fix of about \$371 billion, a massive increase of government spending. It's also a takeover by the

government, a dramatic step away from personal, private coverage and choice to a government-run system that will end up rationing care. It's unconstitutional. There is nowhere in the Constitution that says the government has the power to require every single person to go out and buy insurance whether they want to or not. It fails to adequately address illegal immigrants through no enforceable means of citizen verification. It funds abortion. There's lack of tort reform. It forces Americans out of their current plans. It increases premiums. It will increase personal health expenditures whether people can afford it or not. It bends the curve of government spending in the future in the wrong direction. It constitutes a massive permanent government takeover of the private student loan industry. That's 30,000 jobs right there. It is chock-full of special deals, from the Bismarck bank job to the Louisiana purchase and others. It does not factor in market risks regarding defaults on student loans.

So for all those reasons, Madam Speaker, we should be opposing that bill when it comes, if it comes, to a vote tomorrow.

At this point, I would like to yield 3 minutes to my friend and colleague from the State of Ohio who is also a member of the Armed Services Committee that I serve on with him, Representative TURNER.

Mr. TURNER. Madam Speaker, while we are debating this bill, Americans are concerned about the pending health care legislation. Americans know that advances in medical research are a strength of the American health care system and should be encouraged instead of restricted by additional layers of redtape.

Unfortunately, this misguided health care legislation would reduce Medicare payments to CAT scan and MRI providers. It also creates a 2.9 percent excise tax on medical device manufacturers. The lowered payments and increased taxes can reduce the availability of new and advancing medical imaging technology. This will inhibit future innovation in medical research and will delay or deny patient access to new and valuable technologies.

Continued innovation that improves patient-centered medicine is vital to the long-term availability of health care services in America. This is just one example of the number of provisions buried in this pending health care bill.

The unintended consequences of lowering payments and increasing taxes will constrain future research and development and hinder our doctors' ability to deliver the best quality care to our patients. This pending health care legislation will end up restricting the innovation and invention which is at the heart of the American economy. And for that reason, I strongly oppose the bill, and we should be debating that bill today.

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, could I inquire about how much time we have left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Guam has 5 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Colorado has 6½ minutes remaining.

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, I would like to yield 2 minutes to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

Mr. GARAMENDI. A moment ago, I asked, Madam Speaker, if we could focus on the issue before us, which is certainly a meritorious issue. But apparently our colleagues from the Republican Party want to debate health care so, okay, guys, let's debate health care. A moment ago, the speaker from wherever you were from spoke about somehow limiting the MRIs. You are absolutely right. The legislation does limit MRIs that are ordered by a doctor that owns the MRI machine. There is blatant fraud going on, and there's blatant overuse and payments by the taxpayers to the Medicare and Medicaid program as a result of physician-owned practices, pharmaceuticals, pharmacies, as well as the MRIs and hospitals, and this legislation does limit it. You're quite right. We must limit that kind of overuse.

I've been at this a long time. I was the chairman of the health committee in California in the 1980s when we limited it. I was the insurance commissioner. I've seen these pernicious practices over and over.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind Members to address their remarks to the Chair and not to others in the second person.

Mr. LAMBORN. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my friend and colleague from Alabama, Representative ADERHOLT.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, I want to rise today to voice my strong opposition to the massive health care bill that is scheduled to come before the U.S. House of Representatives in the next 24 hours.

Backdoor deals to coerce Members to support the government takeover of health care is something the American people completely disagree with, and they're making their voice known loud and clear. However, the President and the Democrat leadership of this body are forcing us to vote on this bill.

In many countries, people have no free speech. But in America we do. So on behalf of all the families in north Alabama that I represent, I say to my colleagues in Congress, reject this massive takeover of health care that we are to vote on in the next 24 hours.

To make this legislation even worse, no amendment is being allowed to stop abortions from being federally funded. Members of the majority are not even being allowed to bring up a vote on abortion, one of the issues that means most to Americans. Businesses will be crippled with new taxes, and they won't be able to hire out-of-work Americans.

America has never gone down this road, Madam Speaker, the road for government-controlled health care. And never in our history have we forced individuals to actually purchase insurance. As I was walking into the Chamber this afternoon to cast my votes, there were literally thousands of people outside the Capitol. They were shouting their opposition to this bill, and it was loud and clear.

Madam Speaker, these people are still out there, and the message is still the same. And it is loud and clear: No government-controlled health care. Kill this bill.

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL).

Mr. ISRAEL. I thank my very good friend.

I want every veteran in America who is watching this debate who has at one time or another tried to figure out why it takes so long to get an overdue medal, why they have to wait so long to get a retroactive payment for a disability or PTSD, I want them to remember that tonight, when we try to pass a resolution on Iwo Jima, the Republicans delayed it. When we tried to pass a resolution honoring aviators, the Republicans delayed it. When we are going to try to pass a resolution honoring Cold War veterans, the Republicans delayed it.

How can you expect as veterans to have your medical care taken care of promptly when the other side won't even allow us to pass resolutions honoring veterans expeditiously?

Mr. LAMBORN. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my friend and colleague from Texas, Representative BRADY.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. I thank and commend the gentlelady from Guam for her resolution. We have so many heroes, aviators who have been shot down in foreign countries, defending our freedom and enduring tremendous hardship, even death.

One of those who was shot down over Vietnam, the longest-serving POW in America, Congressman SAM JOHNSON of Plano, Texas, is a friend and a true hero to many of us. He opposes this health care bill because he is worried about the impact it will have on veterans. He believes by taking on a huge new entitlement we can never hope to pay for, at the end of the day we will end up robbing Peter to pay Paul, and we will rob from veterans' health care, which we don't even fully fund today as a Nation. It's embarrassing. And yet we are going to launch a brand new health care bill we can never afford to pay for. He is worried about rationing.

He has seen what happens when Congress has the greatest intentions. They passed this wonderful new GI Bill and updated one, yet never even bothered to put in place a mechanism today. Most of the veterans waiting in our offices are just trying to get the fair benefits this Congress promised them, but

this administration, this government can't deliver. He is worried about the fact that we can't fund health care under this bill.

And I think what frustrates people is we already have a Medicare program that is going bankrupt. We have Social Security not far behind. We don't fully fund veterans for military care, yet we are going to add this new entitlement. Americans, I don't think, are very easily fooled. They know the Democrats in Washington aren't really blameless when it comes to who is responsible for driving health care through the roof. Fueled by labor and lawyer contributions, millions and millions of dollars from them in their pockets, Democrats have for decades successfully killed lawsuit reform and efforts to allow small businesses to join together to buy health care at the same discount the big companies get. As champions of government mandates have driven up health care premiums and union contracts have demanded unsustainable health benefits, Democrats have fought voraciously against reasonable efforts to keep health care costs down. Yet today Democrats in Washington wield this sword of a massive government takeover in order to slay the health care beast that they have been feeding for decades and decades.

So tomorrow, even if the powerful combination of threats, union paybacks, and backroom deals ultimately produce 216 votes, the fight isn't over, and nor are the consequences. The images of Democrats in Washington running from town halls, hiding from C-SPAN cameras, slipping in sweetheart deals and arrogantly ignoring the voices of constituents is also indelibly etched in the public's mind. It is a disturbing picture the American people won't easily forget.

I object to that bill. I will fight it with all my might. It is not the right solution for America.

□ 1815

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Madam Speaker, I would inquire as to the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Guam has 3 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Colorado has 1½ minutes.

Mr. LAMBORN. Madam Speaker, let me point out that there is a big flaw in the process that we have been following here recently. We have these massive groups of bills that we are supposed to absorb in a 72-hour period which finishes tomorrow, and then we culminate potentially with a vote on a massive piece of legislation reforming one-sixth of our Nation's economy.

And if you look at this bill right here, this is the reconciliation bill, H.R. 4872, the bill reported from the House Budget Committee, 2,310 pages; the two plain-language reports from the Budget Committee totaling about 1,300 pages; and, the amendment in the

nature of a substitute of 150 pages. You add all that together, that is 3,800 pages that we have been given in the last 3 days. I dare say there is not a single Member of this House that has read these 3,800 pages, and that is on top of the original bill of a couple thousand pages.

So we have a process here where we are not really given enough time to absorb and go through these bills, and the American people really deserve better than that. This system has not been followed like we should be doing, and I just regret that. I think that is a flaw in this process.

I yield back the balance of my time.
Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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 agree to the resolution, H. Res. 925, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Ms. BORDALLO. 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.

COLD WAR VETERANS RECOGNITION DAY

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 900) supporting the goals and ideals of a Cold War Veterans Recognition Day to honor the sacrifices and contributions made by members of the Armed Forces during the Cold War and encouraging the people of the United States to participate in local and national activities honoring the sacrifices and contributions of those individuals, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 900

Whereas the Cold War involved hundreds of military exercises and operations that occurred between September 2, 1945, and December 26, 1991;

Whereas millions of Americans valiantly stood watch as members of the Armed Forces during the Cold War; and

Whereas many Americans sacrificed their lives during the Cold War in the cause of defeating communism and promoting world peace and stability; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) honors the sacrifices and contributions made by members of the Armed Forces during the Cold War; and

(2) encourages the people of the United States to participate in local and national activities honoring the sacrifices and contributions of those individuals.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from

Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) and the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Guam.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of House Resolution 900, honoring the sacrifices and contributions made by members of the Armed Forces during the Cold War. I would like to thank my friend from New York, Mr. STEVE ISRAEL, for bringing this resolution to the House floor.

In an age where fear dictated the world's stage, the Armed Forces of the United States of America bravely stood guard to ensure that communism, one of democracy's greatest adversaries, would not prevail. The Cold War Certificate Program recognizes the service of veterans during the period of the Cold War from September 2, 1945 to December 26, 1991 in promoting peace and stability for America.

For nearly five decades the United States stood the test of time and proved its powerful convictions in defending itself and the ideals of freedom from the threat of communism.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to help the achievements and sacrifice of the Armed Forces during the Cold War be recognized by passing a resolution that encourages the people of our Nation to participate in local and national activities honoring our veterans. I am proud to stand here today to honor the men and the women who stood on the brink of devastating global war in order to bring peace and stability to the world, and I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of House Resolution 900.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Madam Speaker, I rise also in support of House Resolution 900, as amended, supporting the goals and ideals of a Cold War Veterans Recognition Day, and encouraging the people of the United States to participate in activities honoring the sacrifices and contributions of Cold War veterans.

The Cold War was a war between the freedoms of democracy and the totalitarian ideology of communism. It was fought around the world, often in places that were on the brink of slipping into the harsh realities of communism. It was fought by millions of Americans who, as members of the Armed Forces, were at the point of the spear defending democracy whenever it was in peril. Many Americans sacrificed their lives in the long struggle against communism.

For that reason, Madam Speaker, it is right to recognize the veterans of the Cold War and thank them for their dedication and efforts toward defeating communism.

I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL) for introducing this bill. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to my friend and colleague, the sponsor of this resolution, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL).

Mr. ISRAEL. I thank the gentlewoman and the gentleman, as well, for the bipartisan cooperation that has been demonstrated with respect to this bill.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution, supporting a day of recognition for Cold War Veterans. I am very proud to have authored it and sponsored it. It recognizes American heroes who protected our Nation during one of the most perilous times in our history.

Madam Speaker, the Cold War began on September 2, 1945, and ended on December 26, 1991, and the years in between were fraught with peril. I, along with many of my colleagues, grew up in the Cold War. I remember going to elementary school and hearing the air raid drill, going out into a hall, bracing myself against a wall covering my head with my arms. There were millions of American children who went through those exercises.

Tens of thousands of nuclear warheads were aimed between the United States and the Soviet Union. The world was on hair trigger. And while wars were fought and combat raged in places like Korea and Vietnam, those nuclear missiles never fired. The nuclear conflagration between the United States and the Soviet Union never occurred. It never occurred because of those heroes of the Cold War.

They answered President Kennedy's call as we embarked on a path full of hazards. They maintained and defended missile silos and checkpoints. They served on remote B-52 bomber bases and storm-tossed Navy ships. And when they returned, there were no parades; there were no public thanks. They went quietly to their jobs.

Until today. Today, they receive that thanks. Today we acknowledge their courage, their valor, and their patriotism. Today we say thank you to those who kept the world safe, who kept the peace, who saved the world from that unimaginable nuclear catastrophe.

My bill honors their service, Madam Speaker, and asks that Americans fly their flags high in thanks, that we dedicate 1 day each year to thank them for 50 years of security.

Those young children in those elementary schools had to feel great fear during those air raid drills. They may have felt unsafe at the time, but those in dangerous places kept them safe for a generation and more. We thank them for that service.

I thank both sides of the aisle for their bipartisan demonstration of support for this bill, and I urge its passage.

Mr. LAMBORN. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia, Representative GOODLATTE.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Colorado and the gentlewoman from Guam for bringing forward this bipartisan resolution honoring Cold War veterans.

I too also commend the importance of understanding the history of the Cold War and of what President Kennedy did with the airlift into Berlin to protect the people of that city; what happened during the 1980s when President Reagan called the Soviet Union exactly what it was, the Evil Empire, and later went to the Berlin Wall and called upon Mr. Gorbachev to "tear down that wall." It was the brave men and women who served in our Armed Forces who made that possible in our history to see the ability of our President to stand up to the Soviet Union, and, indeed, to see that wall torn down not that many years ago.

I will tell you also, however, Madam Speaker, that we have before us in this Congress today and tomorrow health care legislation, a massive bill. When you take all of the pages of all the bills that are being considered here, the House bill, the Senate bill, the reconciliation bill, you are talking about thousands and thousands of pages. And tomorrow—tomorrow, we will have a couple of hours for 435 Members to talk about what is in those bills.

So I have no doubt that the millions of American veterans who served their country, and many of whom are baby boomers and will be facing \$520 billion in cuts in the Medicare program to pay for a new government program at a time when our Nation is broke, that they are going to be as concerned as all of us are here today about this health care legislation, this monstrosity that is going to include \$569 billion in tax increases that will cost millions of American jobs.

They will be concerned to hear from the 130 economists from across the country who sent President Obama a letter explaining how this legislation is a job-killer. They will be concerned about their children and grandchildren who will inherit the enormous debt that is a product of this legislation. Because, unlike the specious claim that this will indeed result in deficit reductions, they know that when you have a side deal of over \$200 billion to take care of physicians under the Medicare bill, when you have a bill that provides 6 years of coverage with 10 years of tax increases and Medicare cuts, that does not balance out.

In fact, this legislation is hundreds and hundreds of billions, some say more than \$1 trillion, greater in costs than will be taken in in revenue and Medicare cuts. The result of this is going to be devastating for our country, and I urge my colleagues to reject this monstrosity.

□ 1830

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. I rise in very strong support of this bill. I commend Members on both sides for supporting it. I regret that the Member who just spoke has chosen to use this debate about honoring veterans of the Cold War era by mischaracterizing the bill before us tomorrow. I'd like to take a few minutes and specify those mischaracterizations.

The gentleman said there will be Medicare cuts. There will be no cuts to benefits for any Medicare recipient. Yes, there'll be cuts from fraud, waste, and abuse under Medicare. Senator COBURN of the other body says a third of Medicare spending is fraud, waste, and abuse. The Heritage Foundation says at least 10 percent. This bill takes between 5 and 6 percent of that fraud, waste, and abuse.

For the record, the gentleman made reference to veterans and TRICARE. Veterans Administration care, which this Congress under this majority has increased to the highest level of the history of the country, will not be affected in any way. I will challenge anyone on the minority side to show me one word in these bills that justifies a different conclusion, one. TRICARE will not be affected in any way, and I would offer a similar challenge.

The gentleman said there will be massive tax increases. What he did not say is that tax increases to help pay for this bill are on families with an income of more than a quarter of a million dollars a year, the top 3 or 4 percent in the country.

He said it will cost American jobs and be a job killer. This is echoes of the words we heard in this Chamber in 1993, when Members of the other side said the Clinton economic plan would be a job killer. The former chairman of the House Budget Committee, our friend from Ohio, Mr. Kasich, said at that time that if the plan worked, he would become a Democrat. Well, he didn't become a Democrat, but the plan worked. It created 23 million new jobs after it was passed.

He said there was a specious claim of deficit reduction. I'll say this to you. The gentleman said that some say the deficit will go up as a result of this. Well, around here, we don't rely upon hearsay from unsubstantiated sources. We rely upon the Congressional Budget Office, and here's what they say. They said the deficit will go down by \$138 billion in the first 10 years, and over \$1.2 trillion in the next 10.

With all due respect, the men and women who served this country in the Cold War served honestly and always gave a fair accounting of what they do. When we hear these remarks on the

floor, they are not an accurate representation of facts and they, frankly, do dishonor to this bill and this debate.

Mr. LAMBORN. Madam Speaker, at this time I would like to yield 4 minutes to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER).

Mr. SOUDER. I thank my colleague from Colorado.

Apparently, our ground rules here are: We praise the vets on Saturday and punish them on Sunday. To my friend from New Jersey, this afternoon we did a supposed fix for TRICARE, because the Senate bill, basically, unless you're 65 and over, triples TRICARE. We did this Band-Aid thing—

Mr. ANDREWS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOUDER. I have 4 minutes, so let me do mine.

We did a Band-Aid this afternoon. Now, the challenge is that as we debate tomorrow, apparently we're going to have separate votes on the Senate bill. And the Senate bill is the problem here because it could become law. So it doesn't really matter what we're doing in the House right now. The question is: Are our veterans covered in the Senate bill, and is TRICARE going to be gutted in the Senate bill? And the veterans who took this risk during the Cold War would rather—as much as they appreciate a flag being raised, they'd rather have their TRICARE. So the fundamental question, if any Member votes for the Senate bill tomorrow in the rule, if we're not going to do this deeming bill and instead do a separate vote on the Senate bill, this is really going to be the vote for veterans.

A second category. When it says there's no harm for veterans, or no job killing, I happen to represent the orthopedic capital of the world in Warsaw, Indiana. It has DePuy, Biomet, and Zimmer. They are getting a tax clobbering in this bill, particularly in the Senate bill, and that tax clobbering equals half of their R&D.

Now, who uses hip replacements and elbows and shoulders more than anybody? Our vets. Because, particularly as we've developed body armor, they're getting hit in those places where they used to die, they're now alive, and a big percentage of them are doing hip replacements.

Now, R&D is critical, particularly as they're 18- to 22-year-olds, those who are retired vets from the Cold War era are looking at trying to get quality hip and joint replacements. One of the questions is is that if you reduce half the R&D, only one of two things can happen: either future vets are not going to have as good quality and advances like we've been having or the jobs will go offshore to reduce the costs so they can do the R&D. There's really not a way that this isn't going to affect vets. It's indirect.

Then, as we all know, veterans health care in general, just like Medicare and Medicaid, pays for variable costs and a little bit of mixed costs. The way the government runs through

buildings is that, if we run through those in one year, we don't do amortization and depreciation; therefore, in health care costs, private pay funds most R&D and innovations. So if you're going to keep the quality of care that you're going to have in veterans, you may have your veterans hospital, but the new drugs that are being invented, the new hips that are being invented, the new things that were there that were funded by private pay are going to be squeezed out of the market and, therefore, veterans will be indirectly hurt by that.

A third category this bill hurts in veterans and these Cold War people that we're paying tribute to is, as it goes through and addresses—even in second home sales, by the way. I have a hundred lakes in Steuben County, a hundred lakes in Kosciusko County. These aren't big, fancy kind of western lakes. These are often where retired vets have a mobile home—it's their second residence—that we've now airdropped in a tax on the second residences. It's going to punish many of them who are banking on this either to cash it out for the retirement or to maybe retire there. They're going to get taxed. They didn't have the margin for their homes. We have whole lakes that are around different veterans groups and age groups and people were police and firemen. They aren't all million-dollar homes. Many of them are \$20,000 and \$30,000 homes that now are suddenly valued at \$100,000, \$200,000, and they're going to get hammered.

The fourth category where they're going to get hit, and they're very used to in the veterans systems, and it may not directly affect them, but they're going to watch with everybody.

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

Mr. LAMBORN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to Representative SOUDER from Indiana.

Mr. SOUDER. Veterans get ping-ponged back and forth. Right now in Indiana, we're online in this budget to get a new hospital in Fort Wayne. We haven't had investment since before World War II. But they get ping-ponged down to Indianapolis because of utilization. You know what this bill says? In the Medicare reduction it says: Higher utilization of equipment. Higher utilization of equipment is being interpreted and they're now going to cardiologists, oncologists, and others in my district, saying, 80 percent utilization.

That does great for the Federal savings in Medicare, but what it means is everybody's going to get ping-ponged like the veterans are getting ping-ponged, because only Indianapolis in the State of Indiana can reach 80 percent utilization.

So they're telling Fort Wayne, South Bend, other parts of the State that they aren't going to have oncology equipment, heart equipment. And just like the veterans who see their records are often lost; when their appointments are canceled, they have to get a

motel. They have to pay for their own gas. This is a nightmare for the rest of the citizens.

So, once again, I would say, We praise them on Saturday. We're punishing them on Sunday.

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my friend and colleague, who is also a member of the Armed Services Committee, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

My friend from Indiana, the previous speaker, is a very thoughtful and substantive Member and I appreciate the good work he does, so I want to ask him a couple of questions about the assertions he just made. One is that the Senate bill, the base text, hurts TRICARE. I wonder if he could explain to us exactly how that is, and I would be happy to yield to him if he could explain to us.

Can anyone explain how the Senate bill hurts TRICARE? I'm just simply asking for an explanation of the statement.

Mr. SOUDER. I'm sorry. I don't have the details in front of me. I have it down. You know the details of the bill far better than I do.

Mr. ANDREWS. Let's talk about one of the details that is more obvious. I thank you.

The gentleman talked about a couple that would buy a home for \$30,000 and sell it for \$200,000, having a \$170,000 gain. Under the proposal that the House will consider tomorrow, does the gentleman know what tax that couple would pay on that gain if they had a \$170,000 gain?

Mr. SOUDER. It's based off the capital gains. Right now—I had one person with a \$40,000 house, and the capital gains on that made the difference of his retirement on an annual basis. The question is they have planned nothing—

Mr. ANDREWS. Reclaiming my time, the example the gentleman used was a couple that bought a \$30,000 house, sold it for \$200,000, which means it's a \$170,000 gain. The tax would be zero because the tax doesn't kick in until \$250,000.

Every Member is entitled to his own opinion but not his own set of facts. These assertions are false.

Mr. LAMBORN. Let me say in response to the gentleman from New Jersey that it was a good step we took with the IKE SKELTON bill today. It solved half the problem. We still have a remaining problem, and that is that it's not clear, like it should be, who has jurisdiction over defining beyond whether it's a minimum standard that TRICARE will satisfy, whether there will be additional impositions and regulations put on by the health czar. I think a health czar should have no impact, no say whatsoever on TRICARE.

Mr. ANDREWS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBORN. In just a moment.

And we should have gone farther. We did not do that. We only went halfway. So it's still undefined who has final control over imposing all the regulations. And I have veterans in my district, a hundred thousand of them, who feel that they have earned a right to have health care, and they don't want to have to be told that they need a second policy, that somehow that's not good enough. That's what the danger is, because it hasn't been defined like it should be.

Mr. ANDREWS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBORN. You'll have a chance shortly, I'm sure.

I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding, Madam Speaker, and I rise in support of this resolution to honor our veterans who did so much to preserve our freedom during the Cold War. It is unfortunate that we may be about to pass a massive health care bill that will take away an important part of that freedom that those veterans worked so hard to preserve.

Madam Speaker, Robert Samuelson, a very middle-of-the-road economics columnist for the Washington Post, wrote a column this week entitled, *A Cost-Control Mirage*. Mr. Samuelson wrote that the health care plan we will vote on tomorrow "evades health care's major problems and would worsen the budget outlook." He added that "It's a big new spending program when government hasn't paid for the spending programs it already has."

Every government health care program has far exceeded all cost expectations and has cost many times more than what is predicted. Medicare cost just \$3 billion a year after it was created and \$453 billion last year. Its unfunded future liabilities are estimated at a whopping \$38 trillion.

Medicaid is also out of control at both Federal and State levels. Last week, the Governor of Arizona estimated that this new health care bill would cost her State alone \$4 billion that they do not have, when Arizonans are facing their biggest deficit ever—over \$3 billion.

Most States are in their worst shape ever, financially, and yet according to the Census Bureau, 10 States would have to expand Medicaid coverage by more than 50 percent, and 33 States would have to expand by more than 30 percent. The States simply cannot afford all the megabillions this bill would order them to spend.

Our senior Senator from Tennessee, Senator ALEXANDER, said Congress "set out to reduce health care costs," but that this bill "will do the exact opposite." He said this bill "will increase health insurance premiums, raise taxes, cut Medicare, and dump millions into Medicaid."

Of course, the bill is so long, so complicated, so confusing, that the Speaker of the House was quoted as saying we would have to pass it to find out

what is in it, and one of the Senate Democrat leaders said on the floor of the Senate even he did not know all that was in it.

□ 1845

Now the Congressional Budget Office has apparently cooked the books and filed a very misleading report, attempting to show a cost of less than \$1 trillion. To do this among other budget gimmicks and manipulations, the CBO was told to count phony savings, such as over \$400 billion from cutting doctors' payments by over 20 percent and never raising them back up again. This will never happen.

Another huge phony savings comes from cutting Medicare. Dr. David Gratzner wrote in a column in the New York Daily News last December, "It's that time of year again: Washington is talking about cuts to Medicare. President Obama's health care reforms depend on them—up to \$400 billion over 10 years. As a psychiatrist, I'll break the news gently: Medicare cuts are like Santa Claus and his flying reindeer—often talked about, never actually seen."

The Weekly Standard magazine published an analysis of this bill 2 days ago, estimating the bill's real cost during its first decade at \$2.5 trillion to \$3 trillion, more than double or triple the CBO estimate. Then there are the tax increases on everything from medical equipment producers to tanning bed operators to \$210 billion in new Medicare taxes. Then there are the fines of \$695 for individuals or up to 2.5 percent of household income against people who do not buy insurance and the employer mandate of \$2,000 per employee if they do not provide insurance. The bill starts the tax increases immediately, but 98 percent of the benefits do not take effect until 2014. Two lawyers from one of the Nation's most prominent law firms wrote a column for the Washington Post entitled, "Illegal Health Reform." David Rivkin and Lee Casey wrote that this bill is, without question, unconstitutional.

In the early 1990s, Madam Speaker, I went to a reception, and the doctor who delivered me came and brought my records. I asked him how much he charged back then, and he said \$60 for 9 months of care and the delivery, if they could afford it. Medical care was cheap and affordable for almost everyone until the mid sixties. Then we took what was a very minor problem for a very few people and turned it into a massive, major problem for everyone.

Anything the Federal Government subsidizes, the costs just explode. There are many things we can do to bring down the cost of health care, but this bill would cause costs to go up even more, and getting the Federal Government into health care in an even bigger way will eventually lead to shortages, waiting periods, and declining quality of care, all at greater cost. This bill in the long run will end up hurting most poor, lower-income, and

even middle-income people. It should be defeated.

The problem is, as Jeffrey Toobin, the CNN legal analyst who is liberal himself, said in a speech at the Free Library of Philadelphia last September 27: "The risk of a liberal Supreme Court is that the Constitution becomes a meaningless document that means anything you want it to." Apparently, a majority in Congress feel the Constitution is meaningless, too.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Guam has 11 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Colorado has 5 minutes remaining.

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my friend and colleague, Mr. ANDREWS from New Jersey.

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. We've just heard another series of misrepresentations. We just heard the CBO, the Congressional Budget Office "cooked the books." I, frankly, think that does a great disservice to the men and women on a nonpartisan basis who work for that budget office and give us their honest judgment. Apparently the minority doesn't like their honest judgment—that the bill reduces the deficit. So rather than argue the facts, they attack the men and women, nonpartisan people, who wrote the report. I think that's just not fair.

Cuts to Medicare: No Medicare beneficiary gets any cut. There's an increase in prescription drug coverage. There's an increase in preventive care where there's no copay. Having said that, I think there is fraud, waste, and abuse in Medicare. Senator COBURN thinks that. The Heritage Foundation thinks that. The gentleman on the other side must think that because last spring when the Republicans put their alternative budget on the floor, it cut Medicare outlays by \$100 billion more than this bill does. It was in excess of \$600 billion. And I, frankly, think that that targeted some fraud, waste, and abuse, so to argue somehow that these are cuts is disingenuous and inaccurate.

Then we come back to TRICARE. There are two issues with respect to TRICARE. The first is, which office or department regulates. It's very clear it is the Department of Defense, and it should be the Department of Defense, not any other department. Mr. SKELTON's bill very wisely affirmed that. But I'm still waiting for someone on the other side to tell me what the other problem was of trying to fix TRICARE. I just don't know what it was. There's an assertion made that the bill hurts people on TRICARE, and I'm still waiting to hear what that was.

Mr. TIAHRT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. TIAHRT. The concern was for veterans that were under the age of 65 and have 20 years of service or more, that the health care bill statutes that were determining what was acceptable as the stand-alone insurance committee—

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

Ms. BORDALLO. I yield the gentleman an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TIAHRT. I thank the gentleman.

It was that the folks who were on TRICARE under the age of 65 and retired would get moved out of TRICARE into the government-determined plan.

Mr. ANDREWS. Reclaiming my time, show me in the bill where it says there's any possibility of that happening. The bill says exactly the opposite. It says that under the terms of the individual mandate, someone who's covered by TRICARE satisfies the individual mandate. The bill also says expressly, No one can be forced to join the exchange, no one can be forced to buy a particular insurance policy from anyone. So not only does the bill lack the accusation that the minority makes, it expressly disclaims it.

I think the public has a right to see where we stand on this, and tomorrow it will. But I think that right would be in the expectation of people who have actually read the bill and have an understanding of what's in it. I don't think the minority has.

Mr. LAMBORN. Madam Speaker, at this time I yield 3 minutes to my friend and colleague from Kansas, Representative TIAHRT.

Mr. TIAHRT. I thank the gentleman from Colorado.

Madam Speaker, I was just on the steps of the Capitol speaking to a Cold War veteran who served this country admirably and then went to serve the Fire Department in the State of Mississippi. He has driven all the way from Mississippi to Washington, D.C., because he is concerned that the health care bill that's going to be passed is going to increase the debt for his grandchildren and his children. He had other lists of concerns that he had, but primarily he was concerned about the debt.

We know for a fact that since October 1, the beginning of this fiscal year, we have overspent by \$655 billion. This is money we do not have that we've gone ahead and spent. We've borrowed this money and applied it to programs that I don't believe we needed. So he's concerned that, looking at this health care bill and the current projections, the total cost outlays over the next 10 years is \$1.2 trillion, money, again, that we don't have, and so we're going to have to borrow from somewhere. And that takes into consideration that there's only 6 years of health care benefits that are going to be applied in the first 10 years and 10 years of higher taxes. So he's very concerned about the direction. If you go on to the next 10 years, it's going to be over \$1.5 trillion that we will have to borrow for the health care bill that we are about to vote on tomorrow. He's concerned about that as well. Where's the money going to come from?

The gentleman from New Jersey was very concerned about us overlooking something that may have been or may not have been in the bill. The concern that the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee had is that under the way the bill is currently written, that people who are on TRICARE would be forced into the government exchange, and so he corrected that earlier today. Now it wasn't me that came up with that solution. I was aware of the problem, but even the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, the Democrat Chairman IKE SKELTON from Missouri, was concerned, so we had the legislative change. What else is hidden in this bill?

Now we have the bill, and yet we're not going to know the entire contents as far as what the American public is concerned about or what they will know. So if you look at the Senate bill that's going to be passed, fortunately, it's not going to be deemed to be passed with a rule. And I think that's a tremendous victory for the American people.

Yesterday the American people were very upset that we were going to deem the Senate bill passed. Today 50,000 people showed up to protest it. Calls came in. You couldn't even call into our switchboard, 202-224-3121 was blocked because of all the calls coming in, and their voices were heard. So tomorrow we're going to get a separate vote on the Senate bill. The people of America spoke out. They didn't want it to be deemed to be law. They wanted a separate vote. Now they want us to vote against it.

There is a whole bunch of people standing out here on the east side of the Capitol near the steps. They are protesting the health care bill. What they're saying is, Kill the bill. They're chanting it over and over and over again. Are we going to listen to their voices? Are we going to listen to what they're saying? What they know of what's in the Senate bill and the reconciliation bill they don't like. So tomorrow we hope that we can explain to them what's in the bill. Then they'll make an informed decision, and hopefully they will encourage their Members of Congress to vote against the bill.

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, I would inquire of the minority if they have any additional speakers.

Mr. LAMBORN. There will be one more speaker.

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, I will continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. I yield the balance of my time to Representative CASSIDY from Louisiana.

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

Mr. CASSIDY. My colleague from New Jersey made a point earlier that he wasn't sure that many people on this side have read the bill. I have read the bill, and some things are quite apparent to me. One, there is a loss of

freedom. Thou shalt buy insurance or else thou shalt pay a penalty. You shall provide insurance to your employees or thou shalt pay a penalty. But I think the point that Mr. TIAHRT made is the, if you will, the ultimate sacrifice of freedom.

As one said, The power to tax is the power to destroy. Well, clearly as we expand Medicaid, we are going to ultimately shift taxes both to the Federal taxpayer and to the State taxpayer. Now this plan will increase Medicaid to 133 percent of the Federal poverty level. That has tremendous implications. One implication, for example, is that the physicians will be paid extremely poorly, so poorly that they won't be able to see the patients. I looked up in New Jersey, for example, Medicaid only pays 37 percent of Medicare rates to physicians to see the patient. They only pay 37 percent. Now as it turns out, that's below a physician's cost. Physicians would like to see the patients. It's too low of a reimbursement.

There was just an article in the New York Times, and the New York Times held up an example of a woman from Michigan on Medicaid who could not get treatment for her cancer because the Medicaid reimbursement was so low that she was unable to find a physician who could afford to treat her. I've read the bill. If we think this bill is a way to provide insurance for the uninsured, I would like to invite you to come to the public hospital where I've worked for 20 years, where many of the patients that I see are on Medicaid, and they come to the public hospital because, despite Medicaid, they still cannot go to a private facility.

In fact, I'm struck. For 20 years, I have been seeing politicians in Washington saying that we've now fixed health care. Consistently they have overpromised and underfunded. Now I think what's coming down is, this bill is a question of whether this time, this time indeed is different. Whether or not we were not overpromising, even though we're promising greatly, and we're adequately funding. The reality, I am afraid, is going to be the same as it has been in the past.

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, I wish to ask my colleagues to support House Resolution 900, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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 agree to the resolution, H. Res. 900, 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. BORDALLO. 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.

URGING A MOMENT OF SILENCE
FOR MILITARY PERSONNEL

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1119) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that all people in the United States should participate in a moment of silence to reflect upon the service and sacrifice of members of the United States Armed Forces both at home and abroad, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1119

Whereas it was through the brave and noble efforts of the Nation's forefathers that the United States first gained freedom and became a sovereign nation;

Whereas there are more than 1,471,000 active component and more than 1,111,200 reserve component members of the Armed Forces serving the Nation in support and defense of the freedom that all Americans cherish;

Whereas the members of the Armed Forces deserve the utmost respect and admiration of their fellow Americans for putting their lives in danger for the sake of the freedoms enjoyed by all Americans;

Whereas the families of members of the Armed Forces make sacrifices commensurate with the men and women of the Armed Forces;

Whereas members of the Armed Forces are defending freedom and democracy around the globe and are playing a vital role in protecting the safety and security of all Americans;

Whereas the Nation officially celebrates and honors the accomplishments and sacrifices of veterans, patriots, and leaders who fought for freedom, this resolution pays tribute to those who currently serve in the Armed Forces;

Whereas all Americans should participate in a moment of silence to support our troops and their families; and

Whereas March 26, 2010, is designated as "National Support Our Troops Day": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that all Americans should participate in a moment of silence to reflect upon the service and sacrifice of members of the United States Armed Forces both at home and abroad, and their families.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) and the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Guam.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. BORDALLO. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 1119, which honors the service and the sacrifice of

the members of the United States Armed Forces both at home and abroad. I would like to thank my colleague from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) for authoring this thoughtful measure.

The men and women of the United States Army, Navy, Air Force, Marines, and Coast Guard are true patriots, not only because they have heard but because they answered the call of duty, the duty to defend our great Nation from threats both foreign and domestic, the duty to protect our immutable freedoms, and the duty to uphold the values that make the United States both a guardian and a herald of peace and justice.

□ 1900

They come from all around us: from big cities and small towns; from the heartland to the coasts; from jobs in farming, industry and technology; from high schools and colleges and universities; and from Wall Street and Main Street. They come from all different backgrounds, from all classes, races, and denominations. They are diverse, yet they share the same sense of duty and purpose. They possess the same courage and fortitude to go and do what others cannot.

They courageously grasp the mantle passed on by those before them, those who gave their lives so others may live free. They understand the consequences and the risks, yet they keep their heads held high in honor and in pride, knowing that the rewards are great, but so are the costs.

They are often asked to sacrifice that which many of us take for granted: a home-cooked meal; a comfortable bed; the embrace of a friend or a relative; and most importantly, safety. They leave behind spouses, children, and other family members, the people that they love the most, so that other Americans, complete strangers, can enjoy the same freedom.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1119 also acknowledges the critical sacrifice families of servicemembers make: the uncertainties and the inconveniences incurred from permanent changes of station, the anxiety and the stress induced by a deployed servicemember, the grief experienced by families and loved members of those servicemembers wounded or killed in action. These families and loved ones also deserve our most sincere thanks.

The moment of silence that will take place on March 26, 2010, on National Support Our Troops Day to honor the men and women in uniform is an undemanding effort, but their service and sacrifice demand our contemplation and our gratitude. So I implore that everyone use the time to recall the sacrifice that they make each and every day.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 1119.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 1119, as amended, which asks that all people in

the United States participate in a moment of silence to reflect upon the service and sacrifice of members of the Armed Forces who are currently serving both at home and abroad.

Service in the Armed Forces during peacetime is a difficult enough proposition; but during an extended period of war, like we have had since 9/11, the courage and sacrifices required of our all-volunteer military are especially challenging. These men and women are working for us all over the globe: on land; on and under the sea; and in the skies above. They are on duty around the clock, every day, 7 days a week, in every month of every year, in all seasons and climates.

This Nation owes the members of the Armed Forces and their families the respect and thanks for their willingness to serve and sacrifice. This resolution asks us to do that by taking a moment out of our own busy lives to pause and in a moment of silence honor our soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines who are currently serving. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. PETERS), my friend and colleague and the sponsor of this resolution.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

I rise today in support of House Resolution 1119 calling for a moment of silence in support of our troops and designation of March 26, 2010, as the National Support Our Troops Day.

As a Nation, we celebrate and honor our veterans and patriots, yet we don't have an official day celebrating our servicemen and -women who are currently protecting our country at home and overseas.

As the son of a World War II veteran and as a former officer in the U.S. Navy Reserve, I have the utmost respect for the sacrifices made by our active duty soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines.

Recently, I had the honor of visiting our troops in Afghanistan where I was able to observe first hand the dedication with which they are serving our Nation. I was truly humbled by the sacrifices they are making each and every day.

This resolution honors those troops, and I am proud to have introduced it, continuing a bipartisan tradition in the 9th Congressional District in Michigan. One of my constituents, Alexandra McGregor, contacted my predecessor, Congressman Joe Knollenberg, with her idea of a day to honor our heroes currently fighting on the front lines. Alexandra was a student at Waterford Kettering High School in Waterford, Michigan. She, along with her fellow students, as well as the faculty of Waterford Kettering High School, have observed a moment of silence for the last several years on March 26 in support of our troops.

Alexandra brought this idea to her Congressman and asked him to pass a resolution calling for March 26 to be recognized as a day for all Americans to observe a moment of silence in recognition of our troops. And during the 110th Congress, the body passed such a resolution.

Today, I am honored to keep this tradition alive by bringing this resolution before the House for consideration. I would like to thank the leaders of the Interact Club at Kettering High School, Melina Lopez and Connor Newton, for coordinating the event and for bringing this tradition to my attention. I would also like to thank Chairman SKELTON for his support of the resolution, as well as Zach Steacy and Joe Hicken of the House Armed Services Committee staff for their work in bringing House Resolution 1119 to the floor today.

Finally, I would like to thank my colleagues for supporting this resolution.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, the service performed by Cold War veterans is indeed honorable and meritorious. We should encourage the people of the United States to participate in activities to honor these brave men and women in uniform. We must give them the recognition and benefits they rightly deserve. As members of the military, their health care falls under the TRICARE system which Representative SKELTON worked on earlier today and which must be protected in any health care bill before Congress. We must make sure that any bill gives them the health care benefits they deserve. However, what happens to them and their families tomorrow? We are going to be voting on a massive health care bill that will affect the health care of our veterans and their families and, indeed, of all Americans.

Something I would like to briefly address is that we have many doctors and physicians in the United States who are opposed to this health care plan. Yes, there is one large organization of about 245,000 members which supports the plan, the American Medical Association; but we have a number of medical plans, including the State associations of Alabama, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Kansas, Louisiana, Missouri, New Jersey, Ohio, South Carolina, and Texas, which are opposing the health care plan. And we have many medical national societies which are opposing this plan such as the American Academy of Dermatology, American Academy of Facial Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery, the American Academy of Ophthalmology, American Academy of Otolaryngology, the American Association for the Surgery of Trauma, the American Association of Neurological Surgeons, the American Association of Orthopedic Surgeons, the American Congress of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, the American College of Surgeons, American Osteopathic Academy of Orthopedics, American Pediatric

Surgical Association, American Society of Breast Surgeons, American Society of Anesthesiologists, and it goes on and on and on. General surgeons, colon and rectal surgeons, plastic surgeons, neurological surgeons, on and on and on. Twice as many doctors in this country are formally opposed to this health care plan as have supported it through the American Medical Association. Twice as many are in opposition, and I think that speaks importantly for what we should consider the medical community's response really to be to this legislation.

At this time I would like to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, every Member of the United States House of Representatives is privileged to serve the people of their districts. I am honored to work for the people of Kansas, the place that has been my home my entire life. Tomorrow it is expected that we will be called to vote on health care reform legislation. While most of the focus here in Washington has been on the politics surrounding this vote, back home they care about what this legislation will mean to them, their families, the businesses they work in or own and, importantly, what it will mean to their children and grandchildren.

For a long time, well before the Obama administration began talking about health care, I have been arguing that we need to make improvements to our health care delivery system. Many folks can't afford the escalating medical costs associated with illness and old age. Folks with preexisting conditions can't change jobs without losing their health insurance, and small business owners struggle to provide health coverage to their employees. I would have welcomed the chance to work to see that these problems were addressed.

I co-chair the Rural Health Care Coalition, a group of more than 100 Members of the House, Republicans and Democrats, who work continually to see that patients in States like Kansas have access to affordable, quality health care. I am extremely disappointed that President Obama and Speaker PELOSI have chosen to go their own way on this issue with no input from those of us who disagree with them on what is best for America.

Many times in this Chamber, I have outlined commonsense things that we could and should do: medical liability reform to eliminate lawsuit abuse that forces the practice of expensive defensive medicine; allowing the purchase of insurance policies across State lines; creating State high-risk pools to address preexisting conditions and provide uninsured Americans access to insurance; encouraging better fitness, diet, nutrition; implementing health information technology that upgrades our outdated health records system and streamlines costs, reduces medical errors and eliminates redundant med-

ical tests; allowing small businesses to pool together to negotiate and purchase health insurance. These and many more could and should be done.

While I know there is much to do, almost none of these ideas are contained in the bill that my colleagues and I will be voting on tomorrow.

I now strongly object to the plan Speaker PELOSI is forcing upon the House. This bill is too big and tries to change too much at once. Instead of working to improve our current system, which the majority of Americans like, this plan will create a massive expansion of government. History demonstrates that government programs are significantly more expensive than estimated. This plan would raise taxes and increase the deficit. It is propped up with budget gimmicks that will greatly expand our deficit.

The bill requires 10 years of tax increases and 10 years of Medicare cuts to pay for only 6 years of so-called benefits.

This plan is the Senate-passed health care bill. It is the same bill that America cried out against in December because it was pieced together through vote peddling and backroom deals. Members who think this plan is good, they should vote "yes." Members who don't think this plan is good, they should vote "no." But this is much too important an issue for the usual deal of politics and cutting deals with backroom promises.

This plan reduces the chance that all Americans will have access to quality care. In rural America, our health care delivery system is fragile as medical professions are caring for an aging population across a wide geographic area. Medicare reimbursement rates determine whether doors stay open and whether doctors and nurses remain in communities. With Medicare cuts, it is likely that more hospital doors will close and fewer doctors will remain in Kansas. The government method of control is through price fixing, which leads to scarcity of doctors, nurses and medical innovation and the advancement of medical research.

Tomorrow's vote will be one of the most important cast during my time in Congress. If the bill should pass, I will work hard in an open and public way to repeal what Speaker PELOSI has done in darkness. Some have said we need to pass a bill because we have to do something, but what I think they really mean is that we have to pass a bill to do something right.

□ 1915

We can overcome the "Washington knows best" attitude. Americans rightly are opposing the Washington, D.C. approach to changing health care, an approach that tramples upon our Constitution, diminishes personal responsibility, and reduces freedom of our children and the prosperity of our Nation.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. HIMES).

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, I rise with a certain amount of outrage tonight because we are debating a resolution that, just to remind this House, expresses the sense of the House of Representatives that all people of the United States should participate in a moment of silence to reflect upon the service and sacrifice of members of the United States Armed Forces both at home and abroad. A noble thing, a good thing that we would honor our veterans who day in and day out put their lives on the line for the freedom and safety of every single American. And the minority stands here tonight and brings their politics into this resolution.

Mr. KINGSTON. Will my friend yield?

Mr. HIMES. I will not yield.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SCHAUER). The gentleman from Connecticut controls the time.

Mr. HIMES. I will yield to the gentleman when I have completed my statement. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am appalled that at this moment when we are here to honor our veterans the minority would bring their politics and their misinformation. And though I am appalled, while we are talking about veterans I will not stand here while that misinformation is peddled.

A bill made in darkness, if I might quote my friend on the other side of the aisle. This bill has been discussed for months, for years. For decades this debate has raged. One hundred twenty Republican amendments included in this. This thing posted in the House and in the Senate and now for the requisite 72 hours, and they call that darkness.

Increasing the deficit. The non-partisan Congressional Budget Office, respected by both sides, has indicated clearly down to many significant figures that this will be the largest reduction in the deficit ever engineered by this House: in excess of \$100 billion in the first years, in excess of \$1 trillion in the second 10 years.

We are hearing the same misinformation about 6 years of benefits for 10 years of taxation. How is this? Shortly after this bill's enactment children will no longer be denied coverage because of preexisting conditions. Shortly after this bill's passage how is this for 6 years of benefits? Our seniors will experience immediately a reduction in the doughnut hole that has forced them in instances to choose between food and drugs. Shortly after passage of this bill, shortly after the passage of this bill young people up to the age of 26 will be able to go on their parents' insurance. Six years of benefits with 10 years of taxation. This is outrageous misinformation made all the worse by the fact that the minority chooses to bring this up at this moment when we are here to honor the sacrifice of our proud veterans.

I yield to my friend on the other side.

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Although we haven't worked together on any committees, I know you

by reputation, and I know that your reputation is good and that you are known to be a fair Representative. So one of my concerns I just have to tell you, as somebody who has served in the minority and the majority and oftentimes in the majority felt that we ran roughshod over the minority and that it was the wrong thing to do, but I have also known that when you are in the minority and you don't get to offer, for example, a single amendment on the largest piece of legislation that we've faced maybe since the income tax debate, I would appeal to your sense of understanding why you and I have this discussion going on. Because I support this bill, and I certainly think a moment of silence is the fit and proper thing to do.

I look forward to traveling with the gentleman not just to Iraq and Afghanistan, but actually some of the places where we have World War II soldiers buried in foreign lands. I can tell you they absolutely love Americans as they look at the graves of Americans that are all over the world protecting not just our freedom but their freedom.

So I certainly understand why you are appalled that we are using this as a vehicle to discuss health care. I agree with you. There is a good sense of indignation. Yet I find myself in a few minutes one of these people who will be talking about health care because it is my only opportunity. Because as I understand it, we are going to have 1 hour of debate on two different pieces of legislation, 30 minutes per side. And if you are not directly on the health care committee, you won't have an opportunity to speak tomorrow. That is why, while I support this legislation—

Mr. HIMES. Reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for bringing the discussion back to its proper topic of the honoring that this House and that the people of America can do for our veterans. I thank the gentleman for that, and would like to note to this gentleman that I spent this morning fighting to make sure that we would vote on the bill in an up and down fashion. And in fact that is what we will do.

I will note to the gentleman that he has had ample opportunity to discuss this over many, many months. But again I thank him for bringing this discussion back to where it should be, which is debating whether and how we honor our veterans.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I take exception to the suggestion that this process has been conducted in an open way. We have 3,800 pages of materials right here that we have been given in the last 3 days. Who on earth is able to go through 3,800 pages? That consists of the bill itself, H.R. 4872, 2,300 pages; House Report volumes 1 and 2 from the Budget Committee report explaining the bill, that adds up to 1,300 pages; and the amendment in the nature of a substitute to the Reconciliation Act, 150 pages. That is a total of 3,800 pages that we have been given in the last 72 hours. What kind of process is this?

I now yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER).

Mr. SOUDER. In an earlier bill where I was talking about the veterans health care parts of this bill as we paid tribute to Cold War veterans, Chairman ANDREWS and I had a follow-up discussion about two of the details which shows the difficulty of this bill. He believes that the partial fix that was done this afternoon on TRICARE was not needed and that it was duplicative. We believed it was absolutely needed. Members who read the same bill can come to different conclusions. Now, my friend from New Jersey actually wrote much of the bill, he is a very detailed guy, and I appreciate his knowledge. But we feel that we needed the TRICARE fix.

On the question of the second home, I said \$30,000 and used an example of \$200,000. By not going to \$230,000, I have missed the tax portion. And he also agrees that it depends on what your income is. If it is \$80,000 or above, the example I gave of somebody who had a mobile home whose lot is now worth \$230,000 and if they have a job as a teacher and work at a gas station they will have \$80,000 in income, which means they will now have taxes on a home that they never thought were taxes. So there were disagreements. You can look at the same question, but clearly it is a tax increase on veterans.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the Chair how much time we have?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Guam has 8½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Colorado has 9 minutes remaining.

Ms. BORDALLO. I now yield, Mr. Speaker, 2 minutes to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

Mr. GARAMENDI. I have the great privilege and honor of representing Travis Air Force Base and the more than 20,000 active service men and women on that base. Their mission is one of supplying the necessary equipment and armaments and food and other materials to men and women that are in the front zone of fighting. They also provide extraordinary support for humanitarian efforts, most recently those in Guam. And they may very well be heading to Chile on missions there. So I honor them and call our attention to their work.

Again, I remain really saddened that my colleagues on the Republican side have used this time, and instead of honoring the work of our active duty men and women in the Armed Forces, they are using it to debate a bill of which there is plenty of time.

Most recently the discussion about the availability. The Senate bill has been available to all of us since Christmas Eve. Three months to read the Senate bill. And that is a large portion of those documents that you have there on your table. The House bill has been available since November 6. So those two bills have been available to

be read all that time. There are about 156 or 160 pages of corrections to the Senate bill that are before us. There are explanations, to be sure. And I suppose all of us would like to see the explanations from the committee. That has been available to us also.

This was not done in the dark of night. This has been done over a long period of time. And that big stack of material before you has been available. And perhaps you have not had or taken the time to read it, but if you had, much of the misinformation that has been presented this evening you surely would not have put before this House because it simply is not reflected in the bill. Specifically, the issue of the veterans. The veterans are fully protected in the legislation. TRICARE is fully protected.

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

Ms. BORDALLO. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. GARAMENDI. By the way, there are about a million and a half veterans out there that will be able to get medical insurance through the various programs that are created by this legislation. They presently are not in the Veterans Administration process for many, many reasons. They will have access to it.

So on the whole, A, we have had time to read these bills; B, the corrections that are in the reconciliation process, which will be voted on along with the Senate bill, have been around for some time, for 72 hours minimum, and in many cases over 3 and 4 months. So read the bill.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, let me highlight several sweetheart deals in the health care legislation that I think are a real problem to me, many of my colleagues, and many Americans. We have the Rocky Top Vote Swap. Tennessee is quite familiar with the runaway costs associated with government-run health care as seen with TennCare. Payoffs from Washington, though, have a way of smoothing thing things over. So the bill includes tens of millions of extra Medicaid dollars for the State of Tennessee.

The Big Sky Buy-Off. A special provision was inserted in the Senate bill recently that provided taxpayer-funded health care to only certain Montana residents.

U Conn. As part of the original health care bill, a mysterious provision was inserted providing a whopping \$100 million in a cryptically worded provision for a new medical facility. After some investigation, it was discovered that Connecticut was the lucky recipient of this taxpayer dollar giveaway.

The Bismarck Bank Job. A helpful provision was inserted in the reconciliation package. While most American banks will be cut off from subsidies for private student loans when the government takes over the student loan industry, which is part of the bill we will vote on tomorrow, banks in North Da-

kota will still see the cash rolling into their banks.

PhRMA'ing for Favors. As has been reported, Democratic staffers were huddled behind closed doors over the last few weeks with PhRMA lobbyists as they crafted the final bill. Coincidentally, PhRMA has now decided it will run expensive TV ads in the districts of 38 wavering Democrats.

Cowboy Cash. North Dakota and Montana, along with Wyoming and South Dakota stand to get extra Federal cash for their States' Medicare rolls.

And the Louisiana Purchase that we have all heard about. Three hundred million dollars extra for Medicaid payments to one State is still in the bill. That is just yet one more reason we should reject the health care bill tomorrow.

At this time I will yield 3 minutes to my colleague and friend from the State of Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As a member of the defense committee who represents four military installations, someone who has gone to Afghanistan and Iraq five times, and never without going to Ramstein to visit our logistics crew over there, at Landstuhl Hospital to visit people in the hospital, as well as to go to Walter Reed Hospital here in Washington, I feel very strongly that this resolution is a good resolution and should be debated and voted on.

I have to tell you that at only 20 minutes per side, that sort of gives a signal to veterans also what the majority thinks about veterans. This is a good bill and I'm going to support it, but it saddens me that this is the vehicle in which we're going to be allowed to talk about health care.

But as I talk to the veterans of my four military installations back home and the ones who are retired in those areas, they're saying this is a horrible health care bill. I did not go to Iraq, I did not go to Vietnam, I did not fight in World War II for you to take away my freedom in one piece of legislation.

I've got to remind my friends of what the Speaker said just a week or two ago. I quote directly Speaker NANCY PELOSI: "We need to pass this bill so you can find out what's in it."

□ 1930

Does anyone deny that is a direct quote from the Speaker? That is exactly what Speaker PELOSI said.

So when my veterans back home are concerned, along with the middle class taxpayers, of what's in this bill, I think they have that right to have some apprehension. We do need full debate. Keep in mind that health care is one-sixth of the economy, \$2.4 trillion.

This is a major government intrusion into it, not that the government should not be in it at all. But we are totally changing the balance of it, and yet we're not having a full debate. Why not have just several hours but weeks? Can

you say to me with a straight face that would be unreasonable? We need to have hours and hours of debates.

The Republican Party has offered 99 amendments, and how many will be accepted? Zero. No ideas from the Republican Party. And shutting out the Republican Party might be great Democrat politics, but you're shutting out the people that we represent.

And I will point out, as you know, you don't need one single Republican vote. If this bill is so good, why did you not pass it in August? You didn't pass it because you didn't have the Democrat votes. The reason we're here on a weekend is because you don't have the Democrat votes. Now, I don't know what the President was here today doing. I don't know what he gave away. We know about the Louisiana purchase. We know about the hospital in Connecticut. We know about the Gator aid for Florida. We know about the Cornhusker kickback in Nebraska. And we found out now that student loans are being put in the health care bill. How did that get in there? The federalization of student loans is now in the health care bill. That doesn't make sense at all, and it doesn't make sense that in North Dakota they're exempted from the law.

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

Mr. LAMBORN. I will yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. KINGSTON. I've got to say this on behalf of veterans; they're not comfortable with this TRICARE wording. In the dark of the night or in the light of the day, unintentionally or intentionally, the health care bill does put TRICARE on the chopping block. Now, it might be okay with the fig leaf amendment that we passed today in lots of words, but that's what happens when you ram something through.

The \$523 billion in Medicare cuts, how does that affect seniors? I don't know the good and the bad and the ugly of it. I think it's worth more than 72 hours to debate. If this is such a great bill and it's going to last such a long time, why not give it more time to debate?

The impact of hiring 16,000 new IRS agents. I don't think Democrats like the IRS any more than the Republicans. I agree that the IRS is necessary. They do a vital job. But 16,000 new IRS agents with all kinds of new powers to look into the businesses and households of America? That scares me. That's why we plead to you. Let us have time to look at the bill carefully. We don't need to do it on a Sunday afternoon.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my friend and colleague, the gentlelady from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I want to thank the gentlelady from Guam for doing such an excellent job in honoring our veterans and honoring our soldiers by managing legislation that truly deserves our honor and respect to the

Cold War veterans, many of whom are unsung heroes. I offer my greatest tribute as we honor the aviators and those marines who sacrificed their lives as well.

It is interesting, when there is nothing good to say about something that is good, then my friends on the other side of the aisle begin to engage in misrepresentations and fairy tales and exaggeration. So I'm reminded of the words of Thomas Edison that many of life's failures are people who did not realize how close they were to success when they gave up. And that's what they want us to do—to give up.

I appreciate the breadth and depth of the representation and the interest that is appearing on the east steps of the Capitol. This is what a democracy is about. But when I see words like "socialized medicine" and "ObamaCare, a lethal injection," it is important to realize that people have been so provoked because of misrepresentation and untruth.

They don't understand that there will be \$1.3 trillion in cutting the budget; that, in fact, small businesses will get tax incentives and subsidies to help insure those hardworking Americans who work for small businesses, the engine of our economy; that our young people who, in fact, have gone on without insurance, our college students, our graduate students, the best of America's future suffer without health insurance, like a young woman that I know that is in between jobs and cannot get health insurance because she happens to be over the age of college and cannot be on her parents' insurance.

What are we doing if we're not investing in our children? All of the chatter and confusion says nothing about the value of this bill. All of the misrepresentations about special interests, when many of that is not done, but much of that is helping Americans. It's helping the States who've been donor States. It's helping those States who are poor. It's helping those States who have suffered from a devastating disaster like Hurricane Katrina. What is wrong with America standing up for those who cannot speak for themselves.

And so it is important to note they want us to give up, and as was recounted by one of our major leaders in the Congress comparing this to a basketball game when the clock has run out and people are continuously trying to foul the winning team, putting obstruction in the winning team's place. But you know what we're going to do in this March month? We're going to keep on dunking that ball, as this great leader has said. We're going to put that ball in the basketball hoop and we're going to win that game, because we've got to stand up for those who are not out there on those front steps. We've got to stand up for the veterans who understand that TRICARE will be preserved. And what a miserable collapse the veterans health care system was just about 2

years ago when we had to come to this floor and fight—

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

Ms. BORDALLO. I yield 1 extra minute to the gentlelady.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. When we had to come to this floor and provide extra money for those veterans to shore up this health care system, or the many veterans that I work for in my office that come and ask about helping them get their benefits because it's a logjammed system that we're continuing to try to work on.

So don't use this argument about the TRICARE. We're protecting the TRICARE system, as well as the veterans hospitalization system. But those veteran families and their extended family members who are uninsured or the 45,000 who die every year because they have no insurance, this is the toughest health insurance reform that we've ever been able to do.

And I can tell you, my friend, health insurance companies, you need to be tough with them, because all they can see is the dollar and the up and up and up of the premiums. And I want to say enough is enough.

So this is not a lethal injection. This is a lifeline. This is a rope being thrown into the water to drag those out who are drowning because they can't get any health insurance. And this is not socialized medicine, nor was it with Medicaid or Medicare or the veterans system. It is helping Americans using their tax dollars in a wise way.

We need to move forward on health care reform and dunk the ball and win the game.

Mr. LAMBORN. Republicans believe that we can have health reform, and we should, without a government takeover of one-sixth of our Nation's economy.

Republicans introduced over 70 bills that offer free market solutions to health care reform, and one of those is H.R. 3400. H.R. 3400, a bill I have co-sponsored, is the Empowering Patients First Act. It does three things.

It gives access to coverage for all Americans. It does this in large part by extending the tax deduction, which right now unfairly only goes to corporate employees, and says every American can have this tax deduction. That lets you have your insurance and not be dependent on your job to provide it for you. That way you can take it with you. It becomes portable. You have less to fear from preexisting conditions.

Coverage will be truly owned by the patient under H.R. 3400. The individual market is expanded. Things like pooling mechanisms, where national associations can form together, use national economies of scale to form membership plans and accounts to pool across State lines. Right now that is not allowed under law. And reining in out-of-control costs. We can do this for instance, through reforming the medical liability system.

The bills in front of us that we may vote on tomorrow do nothing about medical tort reform. That's a huge driver of defensive medicine and needless costs in our health care system. But if we, for instance, establish administrative health care tribunals, known as health courts, in each State, added affirmative defense through provider-established best practice measures, or encourage the speedy resolution of claims, we would do things to cut down on the cost of defensive medicine.

So Republicans have solutions that, unfortunately, have not been allowed to come to this floor for a vote. We also have about a hundred amendments being heard, as we speak, over in the Rules Committee, and I doubt that a single one of those rules will be labeled in order for voting on the floor tomorrow.

Let me conclude by reading some lines out of today's Wall Street Journal. They have summed it up better than anyone can. This is the lead editorial in today's Wall Street Journal:

"A self-governing democracy," it concludes, "can of course decide that it wants to become this kind of superwelfare State. But if the yearlong debate over ObamaCare has proven anything, it is that Americans want no such thing. There is no polling majority or any bipartisan support, much less a rough national consensus for this expansion of government power. The election of SCOTT BROWN in Massachusetts for Ted Kennedy's seat, of all things, was as direct a referendum as you could have."

"So if the health bill passes in the House, it will only do so the way it did in the Senate, with a narrow partisan majority, abetted by political bribery and intimidation, budget gimmicks and procedural deceptions."

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

Ms. BORDALLO. Would the Chair give me the time that we have left.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Guam has 2 minutes remaining.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to state for the record, House Resolution 1119 states that we should honor our armed services with a moment of silence, and I hope that my colleagues will seem fit to support this very fine resolution.

I would also like to go on record to thank Mr. LAMBORN of Colorado for managing the bills and resolutions this afternoon with me.

I yield back the balance of my time. 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 agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1119, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Ms. BORDALLO. 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.

□ 1945

ARE MEN THE PROPERTY OF THE STATE?

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

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, in his introduction to the epic "The Ten Commandments," Cecil B. DeMille asked the question, "Are men the property of the state, or are they free souls under God?" Congress will authoritatively address this question tomorrow. Will the Federal Government order Americans to purchase products that the government thinks that they should buy and fine or imprison them if they refuse? Will it empower a new health czar to make decisions over the most minute details of every American's health care? Will it set loose 16,000 new IRS agents to enforce its edicts?

This vote transcends any questions of health care. It introduces a proposition that will fundamentally alter the relationship between the Government and the people for all time. I pray that my democratic colleagues, drunk as they may be with power, will consider carefully the implications of the action they are about to take.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, here we are a day away from a very big vote. The bill has been read, the details have been debated, the amendments have been offered, the fights have been fought, the misinformation has been peddled. But now we are left with the facts. We are left with the facts that the bill we are voting on tomorrow will, according to the Congressional Budget Office, reduce the deficit of this Nation by over \$100 billion in the first 10 years of its existence and by over \$1 trillion in the second 10 years of its existence. This bill contains every reasonable and good idea that has been offered by credible health care economists for how to bring down the costs of our health care.

Is there risk? Of course there is risk. This body may choose not to do some of the things it has said it will do.

Some ideas will work. Some will fail. There is risk. But to try to do nothing is the biggest risk of all.

We have spent so much time on the economics and the cost, and now I think, as we reflect on the last day, that we return to the moral question associated with health care reform. At the core of the moral question, to my way of thinking, is the fact that this Nation protects its own, that we look after each other, that we won't let you die.

I need to tell you about my friend, Dave Roberson. He was a good, close friend, and a fellow parishioner at the First Presbyterian Church at Greenwich. A volunteer, an activist, a former NASA engineer, a kind, thoughtful smart man who lost his job at NASA 6 years ago. And with that loss of his job, he lost his health insurance.

Dave had a heart condition. He didn't see a doctor for 6 years. He got no advice. He got no help. And 2 weeks ago, driving home, he lost consciousness for reasons that they believe had to do with his heart condition and drove his car into a wall and was killed. We buried Dave Roberson today, a good, fine man whom we did not stand for, whom the health care system failed. Dave worked his career so that his Nation could explore space. But his Nation, our country, couldn't do what was needed to keep Dave on Earth.

And by the way, Dave is no lone individual. One hundred twenty-three people will die every single day because they don't have adequate health care coverage, 123 Americans every day like Dave Roberson. We don't do this. If our enemies attack, we spend billions to send men, women, and equipment to defend the lives and the values of this Nation. If your house is on fire, we send men, women, and equipment to put out that fire. If you're assaulted, if an intruder enters your home, we don't ask, we send police, equipment, the resources to save your life. But if you get breast cancer, if you have diabetes, if you get leukemia, we don't make that same promise. We might help you if you have a job and can keep that job, if you're not too old, if you're not maybe a woman with a history of domestic violence, we might help you. But we didn't help Dave Roberson. And we don't help the 123 Americans who die every day because we do not live true to the promise that we look out after each other. On this we can do better.

And it's not just the Democrats who think so. It is 250 organizations, including the AARP, the American Medical Association, the American College of Physicians, the Catholic Health Association, the Consumers Union, the League of Women Voters, the list goes on and on of organizations who say, we can do better, we can live more true to the values of this Nation.

I hope that each and every one of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle when the vote comes tomorrow will say, we'll send the military. We'll send

the fire. We'll send the police to save your life. And now being true to the values of this Nation, we will save your life if you get sick.

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

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

THE GOVERNMENT TAKEOVER OF HEALTH CARE IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Constitution of the United States of America was written by our Founding Fathers to limit the size of government. The Constitution sets limits on what the government can do for us and what the government can do to us.

The people decide what is best for themselves and our country, not the all-seeing eye of the Federal Government. James Monroe said in 1788 at the Virginia convention to ratify the United States Constitution, How prone all human institutions have been to decay, how difficult it has been for mankind in the ages and countries to preserve their dearest rights and best privileges, imperiled as they were by an irresistible fate of tyranny.

Now the tyrannical all-seeing eye of the Federal Government is trying to take care of us. The government doesn't think we know how to take care of ourselves, so it must come in and take care of us. We are to be made subjects incapable of taking care of our own health. Nowhere in the Constitution is the Federal Government given any authority to control the people's health, not one place.

George Washington didn't fight the redcoats so people could be the subjects of the new, oppressive, and untrustworthy Federal bureaucracy. The colonists didn't die in the War of Independence so a health care czar could rule over us.

The government takeover of health care is unconstitutional. And if this bill passes, the Texas attorney general and 30 other State attorneys general are prepared to sue the Federal Government for an exercise of unconstitutional action because this bill is unconstitutional. It forces Americans to buy health insurance against their will. And if people don't buy the insurance, they will face fines or go to jail. And on top of that, it forces people to buy government-approved health insurance. That means the Feds tell people they have to buy the Federal-approved insurance, and it tells them what insurance they must buy. That's not allowed under any stretch of the law or imagination. That is unconstitutional.

And of course, in this bill they are hiring 16,000 new IRS health care police to enforce that dictate. The IRS health care police will verify that American citizens have acceptable health care insurance every month. I say American citizens because illegals are exempt from paying health care fines and taxes, although illegals can receive coverage in this bill. The health care bill also violates the people's right to privacy. People's most secret, private, intimate medical records will become the property of the U.S. Government.

Health care busybody bureaucrats will burrow through private medical records and decide what medical care people are allowed to have. Health care bureaucrats will stick their nose into private banking accounts and their records to decide how much people have to pay for that health insurance. They will be able to seize tax refunds, bank accounts, garnished wages all in the name of forcing people to buy insurance for their own good. And of course, this is in the bill.

This power grab is not about health, and it's certainly not about care. It's about liberty. It's about Federal Government control over people's lives against their will. The Federal Government has no right to dictate to the people their health care needs. And in my opinion, it's unconstitutional. Most of the American people oppose the government plan to take over this health care. There were thousands of people here today making their voices known that they are opposed to this bill. It costs too much, it borrows too much, it taxes too much, it's inefficient, and it gives government bureaucrats the control of our medical decisions.

Even Thomas Jefferson talked about government-run health care. He said, "If people let government decide what foods they eat and what medicines they take, their bodies will soon be in as sorry a state as are the souls of those who live under tyranny."

Mr. Speaker, government-run health care is unconstitutional, and it's unhealthy for everyone. We must remember the Constitution says and begins with "We the People," not "We the Subjects."

And that's just the way it is.

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

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

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, I rise today to tell the story of an 11-year-old boy from Washington State

who visited Congress last week to lobby for health care reform. His name is Marcellas Owens, and he had lost his uninsured mother to pulmonary hypertension which could have been treated.

He shared his story with Senator PATTY MURRAY and then presented to an audience of 100 people at a hearing, telling them that he thought "health care should be for everyone." He was an articulate and bright young man, and his story exemplifies why we desperately need health reform.

So in one of the clearest signs of Republican desperation, Glenn Beck, Rush Limbaugh, and Michelle Malkin took to the airwaves to tear Marcellas apart. Mr. Limbaugh came up with the most unconscionable line, telling his listeners, I would say this to Marcellas Owens, "Well, your mother would have died anyway because ObamaCare doesn't kick in until 2014."

FOXNews' Michelle Malkin came in a close second with a column entitled "Desperate Dems Cling to Human Kiddie Shield." Perhaps the only accurate word in Ms. Malkin's piece was "desperation," but she used it to describe the wrong party.

In all my years of public service, I can't remember the last time I saw such a cheap and disgraceful campaign. Republican determination to derail reform at any cost is reprehensible, and I cannot find words to describe how shameful I think it is to direct vitriol at an 11-year-old boy who lost his mother.

On my way to work this morning, I saw a group of tea baggers, and I'm really happy that they will be in Washington to witness Congress pass this historic health care bill tomorrow. When I got to the office, I did a little research on my own and found the Web site of a tea bagger group called the 9/12 project, which includes a page which they call "the nine principles."

Number 7 reads, "I work hard for what I have, and I will share it with who I want to. Government cannot force me to be charitable." That reminds me of another gem Glenn Beck said on his show last week, when he had started criticizing a new poverty measure that would help us understand what it really means to be poor in this country. He said that if it were implemented, he would be considered poor. Glenn Beck reportedly made \$23 million last year, which means that in one workday, he earns the equivalent of what four families earn in poverty over a whole year.

"Government cannot force me to be charitable." I have always been a little confused about what would motivate someone to get up in the morning to attack an 11-year-old boy who lost his mom or compel someone to drive 500 miles to protest reforms that would help millions of Americans.

But I'm finally beginning to understand the mentality behind the tea party crowd and its spokespeople Glenn Beck, Rush Limbaugh, and Michelle Malkin. They are simply selfish,

greedy, and indifferent, and they don't seem to care about helping anyone in need.

I should note that when Marcellas heard what these three said about him, he graciously responded by saying, "My mother always taught me they can have their own opinion, but that doesn't mean they are right." When an 11-year-old outshines and outclasses your party's three top mouthpieces, it might be time to look for some replacements.

When I vote for health care reform tomorrow, I will dedicate it to Marcellas Owens and the memory of his mom. And if I had to write my seventh principle, I think I would use one of the my favorites quotes from the book of James in the Bible, "Suppose a brother or a sister is in rags with not enough food for the day, and one of you says, 'Good luck to you, keep yourselves warm and have plenty to eat,' but does nothing to supply their bodily needs. What is the good of that? So with faith; if it does not lead to action, it is in itself a lifeless thing."

That is what we are doing here. We are making the first step to return to the concept of the common good that we will take care of each other.

□ 2000

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 Alabama (Mr. BONNER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, here we are on the verge of one of the most significant votes that Congress has ever taken. The only time that I can think of which perhaps rivals the importance of this vote has been when we have had to decide to send our Nation's finest young men and women off into the perils of war. And yet it is mind-boggling, literally unconscionable to think that we are about to slap the American people in the face and have the audacity to say, "We know better than you."

In town meetings, at TEA Party rallies, from emails, faxes, letters, and literally millions of phone calls that have jammed the Capitol switchboard, the voices of America have spoken out, begging, pleading with their elected Representatives, Please, slow down, start over, and do this the right way.

Sadly, instead of listening to the American people, the Democrat majority, at least most of them, have chosen to tune the people out, to ignore the angst, the fear, the frustration, and the anger and hope that somehow this will all go away. Let me assure you it will not.

This whole process has been an insult. It is an outrage. It is an all-out

attack on freedom and liberty, on fiscal responsibility, and on the sanctity of human life.

On Thursday afternoon, right after work a man from my district left his wife and children, drove all night some 998 miles all the way from Fairhope, Alabama, to Washington, D.C., just to go door-to-door to those Members who were still on the fence to encourage them to do the right thing. When I thanked him for making the trip, he said, Congressman BONNER, I just couldn't sit back and look my children in the face and tell them one day years from now I didn't do everything I could do to keep this from happening.

Earlier this morning, another man from Mobile walked into my office. He had stopped in Knoxville, Tennessee, to pick up his mom, and together they came for the same reason: to thank those of us who are saying "no," and to reach out to every last undecided Member of Congress and beg them to listen to the American people.

All day long we have watched people come into our offices from towns in Monroe and Escambia Counties in my district to folks from New Jersey, all the way to the coast of California. All of them, literally thousands, who descended on the Hill today came for the same reason, to leave no stone unturned before the vote tomorrow afternoon.

Common sense tells us that with a bill this big and with so many last-minute deals that have been made, there are going to be a lot of angry people, a lot more throughout the entire country when all the details of this legislation are known in the coming weeks and months.

Isn't it ironic that just the other day the Speaker of the House told a group, "We have to pass this bill to find out what is in it." Well, earlier today we found out how true that promise was with the disclosure that Democrats have now added a new 3.8 percent Medicare surtax that will hit average middle-class taxpayers who have invested in real estate. Just what an already depressed real estate market needs.

Or the fact that just a couple hours ago on this very floor the House attempted to fix another little problem that we discovered in this bill, a provision that, if left unchanged, could have taken more than 9.5 million veterans out of TRICARE. Once again, just another example of the dangers of passing legislation on the fly.

While the outrage of the American people did help succeed in taking "deem and pass" off the table earlier this afternoon, we are still left with reconciliation, a process that leaves many Americans dizzy in terms of the ever-changing rules that are being rewritten to try to pass this bill.

The American people remember reconciliation. Back in October of 2007, then-Senator Obama said of reconciliation, and I quote, "We are not going to pass universal health care with a 50-plus-1 strategy." And a couple years

earlier then-Senator BIDEN said, and I quote, "I say to my friends on the Republican side, you may own the field right now, but you won't own it forever. And I pray to God, when Democrats take back control, we won't make the same kind of power grab that you were doing."

Back home this might sound like doublespeak. Sadly, in Washington it is just another day at the office.

Mr. Speaker, while many people understandably are focusing on the vote that will take place tomorrow on the third Sunday in March, trust me, the vote that will be taken on the first Tuesday in November is the vote that will allow the American people to have the last word.

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.)

HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I was on this floor just a moment ago, and I guess I am struck by this quote by Thomas Edison, because as I have listened to more of my colleagues, it seems as if they are driving themselves into failure and they just want to see this determined and committed number of Members who represent constituencies across America driven into failure as well. But it says: Many of life's failures are people who did not realize how close they were to success when they gave up.

And so the stories that we have heard about a young 11-year-old who has the common sense to know that maybe his mother would have lived had she had the right kind of coverage, to my good friend who was just on the floor of the House and mentioned his constituents from his great State of Alabama, I don't know if that constituent that drove 900-plus miles realized that Alabama has one insurance company, only one, no competition.

And so when we think about where we are today on the eve of that magnificent vote, this is not arrogance, it is not an attempt to have the majority abuse the minority. It is to reflect on those Americans who did not come, who in silence suffer and die because they have no insurance.

I support this legislation, but there are fixes that I would like to have, and I am committed to working beyond the vote tomorrow. I don't like to see the comments that I have seen on signs. I respect it, because I am someone who appreciates the Constitution.

There is no instruction or demand on people to get insurance that is uncon-

stitutional. In States, we require people to buy auto insurance, get seat buckles, to wear helmets when they are riding on motorcycles. This is to save lives. And we provide incentives to small businesses and subsidies.

And so today in the Rules Committee I submitted amendments, because I want to help a body of hospitals that are in rural and minority areas. My amendments had to do with what we call physician-owned hospitals. My first amendment was to preserve physician-owned facilities. They have a greater percentage of Medicaid inpatient admissions than the State average in operation and allows them to expand, a fix that is not illegal but one that we want to work on as we move forward.

My second amendment is extremely critical for minority communities in high-poverty areas. This amendment would prevent physician safety-net hospitals from closing and preserves critical care access for impoverished communities and the disabled.

My third amendment, that is supported by the Physician Hospital Association of America, would effectively prevent the closure of 230 existing hospitals, save \$2.9 billion in total payroll, \$608 million in Federal taxes, \$3.5 billion in trade payables, and preserves 62,000 full- and part-time jobs, the Senate amendment, by striking all language that prohibits the grandfathered facilities from expanding.

I am grateful for what we have done so far. We have extended the time in which these hospitals can receive their Medicare certificate, which means that more hospitals can come online. That is a good thing.

That is why I understand that I am so close, that we are so close, to success, that I am not going to allow failure to destroy that success for millions of Americans.

But I do want to tell you about St. Joseph's Hospital in Houston that was going to close until many of us intervened. In fact, I said something like, Over my dead body would this hospital close and not serve our constituents. Well, a group of doctors were able to invest, and lo and behold this hospital now serves one of the most income-challenged and a hospital that serves in the African American community. Physician ownership provides an avenue for it to stay open.

Or in south Texas an out-of-state corporation forced over 700,000 Texans to travel more than 250 miles to receive life-saving medical procedures. Decisions not to offer needed services by out-of-state health care conglomerates and the lack of public or county hospitals left patients with two options: go without or transfer to another facility 350 miles away.

So there is value to physician-owned hospitals, and one opened in south Texas and therefore stopped this drain of sick people having to drive 350 miles just to get medical care or hospitalization.

Or in the Chinatown section of Los Angeles, the Pacific Alliance Medical Center is a 142-bed full-service hospital and has been the community's main hospital for 140 years. This facility was purchased by a group of physicians 20 years ago after the existing hospital board planned to close and demolish this facility. Throwing a lifeline, this is what these hospitals do.

Or in Wisconsin, the Aurora Bay Care Medical Center, a 167-bed full-service hospital, holds seven centers of excellence, and it was the first hospital in the country to become a designated emergency center.

Or the Wenatchee Valley Medical Center established in 1940 in the State of Washington is a large rural health care center that helps serve patients in a largely rural area.

There is a lot of good work that has already been done. This bill has been reviewed over and over again. So what my opponents say on the other side or the opponents of this bill, this bill has been on the table for a long time. We know that we can work going forward to make things better.

So no amount of attack, being spat on by those who have come here to this place to show their opposition, or being called names is going to stop us from seeing success just down the road. But we want to work for these hospitals who are in rural and minority areas and poor areas to be able to stay open as well.

I know that in working with my colleagues and moving to the other body we will have that opportunity. Why don't my friends on the other side sit down and work as well so that we can have what all America is crying out for, those who are listening and understanding the issue, that is, health care for all Americans. Not socialized medicine, not a government takeover, but the opportunity to see the good and the value of good health care for this great country of ours. I want to see success. I am not going to allow failure to get in the way of success.

Mr. Speaker, I have three amendments at the desk and I rise to speak in support of my amendments No. 1, No. 2 and No. 3 to H.R. 4872, the Reconciliation Act of 2010. My first amendment would preserve physician-owned facilities that have a greater percentage of Medicaid Inpatient Admissions than the state average in operation and allows them to expand.

My second amendment is extremely critical for minority communities and high poverty areas.

This amendment would prevent physician safety-net hospitals from closing and preserves critical care access for impoverished communities and the disabled.

My third amendment, supported by Physician Hospital Association of America, would effectively prevent the closure of 230 existing hospitals, save \$2.9 billion in total payroll, \$608 million in federal taxes, \$3.5 billion in trade payables, and preserves 62,000 full- and part-time jobs by striking all language that prohibits grandfathered facilities from expanding.

As you know during the ongoing healthcare debate, discussions about physician owner-

ship of hospitals have ignored the positive impact these facilities have had on minority communities and minority physicians. Physician-owned general acute care hospitals, who have unprecedented amounts of minority owners, have allowed Hispanic, Black, and Asian Americans to enter into the field of hospital ownership. The largest physician-owned hospital, Doctors Hospital at Renaissance, is over 50 percent minority owned.

Physician-owned hospitals have created a positive change in the quality and delivery of care to minority populations.

The insight gained by the diversification of hospital ownership has led to many new advances in care delivery and opened up untapped avenues and knowledge in the race to cure and/or prevent diabetes, AIDS, cancer, and other illnesses we all face.

While we are pleased that language to grandfather existing physician hospitals has been included in the Senate Amendment package, this bill still contains language that prohibits these needed institutions from expanding. This prohibition will lead to their eventual closure and endanger hospital access for minority and low-income communities.

Physician ownership has enabled high poverty and minority areas to open hospitals where corporate-owned facilities wanted to abandon a current site or refused to bring in needed services. By way of competition, physician hospitals have raised the bar of service in communities often ignored by large healthcare corporations, offer exceptional overall care, and forced all hospitals in an area to do better for their community.

To help you understand what is stake, I would like to highlight some of these success stories:

In Houston, St. Joseph's Hospital, a full service general acute care center, is the only hospital that serves one of the most income-challenged and minority sections of the city. Within the last few years, a for-profit corporation abandoned this hospital and the surrounding community. Physician ownership provided an avenue for it stay open and prevent a critical loss for the neighborhood.

In South Texas, out-of-state corporations forced over 700,000 Texans to travel more than 250 miles to receive life-saving medical procedures. Decisions not to offer needed services by out-of-state healthcare conglomerates and the lack of public or county hospitals, left patients with two options: go without or to transfer to another facility up to 350 miles away. Income challenged families who could not afford the travel were placed in great peril. Physician ownership enabled a group of local doctors to open a new hospital with advanced medical capabilities that reduced the need for travel to seek care. Doctors Hospital at Renaissance, a 506-bed premiere general acute care center, now provides some of the best care in the nation and consistently has been recognized by Thompson Reuters as a Top 100 Hospital in the nation.

In the Chinatown section of Los Angeles, California, the Pacific Alliance Medical Center (PAMC), a 142-bed full service hospital, has been the community's main hospital for 140 years. This facility was purchased by a group of physicians 20 years ago after the existing hospital board planned to close and demolish the facility. Physician ownership once again provided an avenue for the hospital to stay open and serve an at risk community.

In Wisconsin, Aurora Baycare Medical Center, a 167-bed, full-service hospital hosts seven Centers of Excellence and was the first hospital in the country to become a designated Emergency Center of Excellence. The Women's Center at Aurora Baycare was also the first in Wisconsin to be accredited for breast care by the American College of Surgeons.

Established in 1940, Wenatchee Valley Medical Center in the state of Washington, is a large rural healthcare delivery system that helps serve patient needs in a largely rural area. It has brought countless life-saving procedures to a community in need.

Without physician ownership, the number of minority hospital owners will decrease substantially, low-income and minority communities will see a reduction in the amount of available services in their community, and some will be left with no access to hospitals. While this may sound extreme, unfortunately, it has happened and will happen if this measure is left unchanged. This is also extremely distressing since the effect of this section will be to reduce access while simultaneously adding 30 million new Americans to the healthcare system, mostly in these very communities that will see their safety net hospitals close.

While I support all physician-owned facilities and comprehensive efforts to incorporate everyone into our national hospital network, today I start that process by helping preserve physician-owned facilities that serve poor, disabled, indigent, or uninsured patients. These amendments were crafted with strict adherence to the reconciliation process and fully comply with the Byrd Rule.

As a Member of Congress whose constituents are greatly assisted by physician-owned facilities, I urge my colleagues to—help my community, help my constituents, and help America build a better and inclusive health care system.

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 gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, this government health care takeover has been debated on so many fronts. The President says it is to save money; and, yet, Mr. Speaker, in every corner of the planet, in every corridor of history, socialized medicine has always cost more, not less. Every government health care program the United States has ever implemented has cost many times the amount that was first predicted. So if this bill saves money, Mr. Speaker, it will be the first in human history.

Democrat leaders say that the government takeover will increase the quality of health care; and yet once

again, Mr. Speaker, every example in history speaks to the contrary. Those living under socialized medicine across this planet can only dream of living in a free market economy like America, because they know that if they have a cold in their country, they can call a doctor. But if they have something serious like cancer or diabetes or heart disease, they had better call a travel agent and come to America if they possibly can.

Democrat leaders say that this will make health care more accessible to the people, and yet we have testimony from doctors themselves that say that anywhere from 20 to 50 percent of them say that they will quit the practice of medicine if this health care monstrosity passes.

□ 2015

And it will be the poorest of the poor, Mr. Speaker, who will fall off the table when the scarcity of health care resources comes. So much for accessibility.

But the big one, Mr. Speaker. Liberals say that this bill is about compassion to those who can't afford health care. But it is such a false argument, Mr. Speaker, because there are so many ways that we can help those who don't have health insurance without destroying the best health care system in the entire world. One of those would be to wipe out frivolous lawsuits, the savings of which would pay for a Cadillac insurance policy for every last one of the 11 million Americans who say they want health insurance but can't afford it.

And to say this is about compassion, Mr. Speaker, when Democrat liberals are doggedly determined to prevent any amendment that would be included to stop the taxpayer-funded murder of little unborn children is the most insidious distortion of all. Mr. Speaker, nothing so completely destroys the notion that this bill is about compassion than the arrogant and cruel disenfranchisement of helpless unborn children who have no voice in this twisted and corrupt process.

No, Mr. Speaker, this is not about compassion. This bill is about power. It's about robbing the American citizens of power and putting it in the hands of left-wing liberal bureaucrats and elitists who think they know more about running people's lives than the people themselves do. It's about robbing America of one of its greatest distinctives: the freedom of the individual.

I just have to tell you, Mr. Speaker, if left-wing Democrats in this Chamber arrogantly disregard the voice of the American people and shove this socialist obscenity down the people's throat, the people themselves are going to shove it somewhere else in the next election.

But there are still Members, Mr. Speaker, of this body who are going to support this bill anyway because they're willing to sacrifice freedom in

the interest of gaining either a political advantage or somehow some free lunch to them in some capacity. And to those, I would just repeat the words of Samuel Adams during the time when there was another great struggle in America over whether the power of the government or the rights of the people would prevail.

During the early days of the Revolution, when America was about to be born, Samuel Adams admonished those who would give up freedom and accept tyranny and government control over their lives in its place. And I repeat this admonition to those who would still intend to vote for this bill. He said, "If you love wealth more than liberty, the tranquility of servitude more than the animating contest of freedom, go home from us in peace. We seek not your counsel nor your arms. Crouch down and lick the hands that feed you. May your chains sit lightly upon you, and may posterity forget that you were our countrymen."

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

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

IRRESPONSIBLE BEHAVIOR

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

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to take my entire 5 minutes here, but I wanted to come to the floor after hearing about, experiencing, and reading some reports of what happened here today in the Nation's Capitol to some of the finest servants that this institution has ever seen by some of these tea bagger protestors who have been out today.

It's one thing to have disagreements on policy and it's one thing to have disagreements on political philosophy and how that is implemented and the role, either more or less of government, and what the government role and responsibility may be, but today, we had several Members of Congress, as they were walking from this Chamber back to their office, get spit upon; get called derogatory, racial remarks; derogatory remarks about a Member of Congress' sexual orientation. That is unacceptable. And I am calling upon, Mr. Speaker, the Republicans who spoke at this tea party today and who have supported this movement to come out and condemn this tea party.

This behavior is irresponsible. It does not belong in a civilized society. It shows that many people in this country want to divide this country, want to seek out our differences and not what unites us. It's a shame. One of those Members was JOHN LEWIS, one of the greatest civil rights leaders this country has ever seen.

And let me say this in closing. Baseball bats and dogs and firehoses didn't stop JOHN LEWIS from the last cause that he had, and spitting on Members and calling them names is not going to stop the progress of this bill. Have your disagreements about our philosophies, but let's conduct ourselves in a responsible way—not spitting on Members of Congress. Disagree with them. Give them your ideas. Calling them names? One of the greatest civil rights leaders in the United States of America has to walk, as a Member of Congress, from the House Chamber to his office and get worried about getting spit upon, getting called the N word?

The Republican Party needs to distance themselves from this kind of behavior. It is irresponsible. It diminishes this office. It diminishes this country. And we call upon the Republicans to say: shame on the tea party for that type of behavior.

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

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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the 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.)

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

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

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

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

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

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

HEALTH CARE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GARAMENDI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I request that we enter into a colloquy with our colleagues from the Democratic side.

Earlier today, I had the opportunity to exit the Chamber and go out to the veranda overlooking the east lawn of the Capitol, and there were a couple thousand folks out there protesting this legislation. And in their chanting they were saying: Kill Obama bill. I suspect they're referring to the health care bill, not to the President. And I was thinking about what does it mean to kill the bill. What is the effect of killing this legislation and letting time go on with the current situation in the United States?

Next to me here is what is happening in the United States today. Forty-five thousand Americans die each year because they are uninsured. They lack health insurance. Forty-five thousand. That's about twice the number that are found in any of the arenas today as March Madness continues. Forty-five thousand. But that's not the end of it.

So we start with 45,000 Americans. What about the rest of the Americans? We rank 19th among the industrialized nations of the world in the health of our citizenry. Our children die earlier. All Americans die earlier than the other 18 industrialized countries. The rate of increase in the health care market for the individual market in California and in many other States was nearly a hundred percent within a 1-year period. Some 50 percent last year and a similar amount this year, an unaffordable rate increase.

In California, the average number of claims denied by the insurance companies was 21 percent, and the range was from 39 to 17 percent. You talk about a death panel. Here's where the real death panel is. It is in the insurance companies themselves, denying benefits, denying claims, denying treatment for illnesses and for afflictions that cause death. This has to end. On Sunday, we will bring this kind of unacceptable situation to an end, because on Sunday we will pass affordable, available health care for America.

I'd like now to call upon my colleague from New York (Mr. TONKO).

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Representative GARAMENDI.

It is important, I believe, for us to recognize, as you're suggesting, the benefits that we're bringing because of this reform for Americans across this great country. Now, the chants that we heard today were concerned about taking away freedoms. I would suggest that as we look at the dynamics of this legislation, we're going to see great improvements—great improvements to access, to affordability, and to the quality of care, all of which are, in-

deed, important to our families, our individuals, and certainly to our businesses, as they continue to struggle with the cost of health care insurance.

As we think of these dynamics, it's important to know—and I look at the benefits personalized to my congressional district in upstate New York, in the capital region, and amongst those benefits is an improvement where 1,100 to 1,200 families will be spared the pain of bankruptcy. When you think of the growing dynamic that health care costs have as they relate to bankruptcy, it's staggering. It's staggering. Eleven hundred to 1,200 families will be saved from the ravages of bankruptcy driven by medical costs, health care costs.

I'm reminded with recent data that 62 percent of bankruptcies in this country are caused by exorbitant medical fees, health care that is not covered even though in some cases people are insured. In fact, I'm reminded that of that 62 percent, 78 percent had insurance when they were impacted by this illness, by the catastrophic situation. That tells us something.

So we want to talk about freedoms. Yes, I want to provide for the freedom from bankruptcy, the freedom from claims being denied by insurance companies when you are insured. And as you indicated, Representative, in your home State of California, the number is staggering. I want to promote freedom—freedom from the greed of insurance executives who say the sky is the limit for compensation and the profit column rules the day.

These are the freedoms that we believe are important to the American public: freedom from bankruptcy; freedom from denied claims; freedom from ever-rising costs, premiums that are escalating beyond belief; freedom from grief. That's what we're talking about here.

And tomorrow will be an historic day as we look to change that situation and to strengthen the fabric of our American families and our business community as we continue with this employer-based health care delivery system that will allow us to go forward with a sense of access, affordability, and quality of care.

Thank you for bringing us together this evening, Representative GARAMENDI.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. TONKO, thank you very much. You raised the issue of the insurance companies and how they act in the marketplace. I was insurance commissioner in California 1991 to 1995 and again 2003 to 2007, and I can tell you horror stories about what the insurance companies do, and I will tell this to the insurance companies.

When the President signs the bills tomorrow, the era of the insurance companies discriminating against Americans because they have a preexisting condition, it's over, folks. It's over. No longer will the insurance companies be able to say to you, No, I will not give you insurance because you had acne

when you were a child or because you may have taken some asthma medicine early in your life or you have any of the four pages of preexisting conditions. The insurance companies will end their discrimination because the law will make it illegal for them to do so.

And the issue of bankruptcy. The policies that will be available through the networks will provide, by law, that there is no longer lifetime maximum payments so that the bankruptcies that you specifically spoke to will no longer be existing.

□ 2030

The maximum lifetime limitations that the insurance companies have used for years will be over, and shortly the annual limitations will also be over, and the benefit packages will be full because there will be national standards for benefits. The kind of cheap, useless policies that plague Americans when they can't afford a standard policy, they seek something that ultimately will not provide them with the care they need. So that is one of the major reforms in this. This is an insurance reform of extraordinary importance.

Let me now yield to our colleague, the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Let me thank both the distinguished gentleman from California for the background that he brings to the United States Congress as an insurance commissioner of a State and the distinguished gentleman from New York who made some very valid points.

As a member of the House Judiciary Committee, in fact, we have lived with this for now almost 10 years. I remember trying to reform the bankruptcy code to protect people from things like alimony payments or women being denied the ability to receive alimony payments because credit card companies wanted to stand in front of the alimony payments and take first in line. So we have seen people being destroyed in a number of ways, and we do know that by catastrophic illnesses they are destroyed.

I just want to focus on two or three points. One, the big sign, about 45,000 Americans dying every year. I don't know why that doesn't send out a clarification call. We should not be so insensitive to life that 45,000 people dying does not impact our colleagues on the other side of the aisle. We've been saying this over and over again, 45,000 people. That means somebody is dying as we speak because they did not have health insurance or that they were denied.

I want to remind our colleagues of some horrible stories. I remember one of a young girl who had leukemia, and it was on national television. I think the company was CIGNA where the family actually went to the insurance company and begged for this young girl to be able to have this very special blood procedure. They were turned away, and they were turned away, and

they were turned away until finally public embarrassment—the news media. And the family went again. The tragedy is that when the company finally approved the right of this young girl, 11 years old, it was too late. The doctors could not perform the procedure. And so we have seen any number of incidences where because of lack of insurance, we have not been able to save a life.

What about the recommendation of Goldman Sachs that said just a couple of weeks ago, If you want to make a buck, the best place to put your money is the Nation's health insurers, the Nation's insurers. You'll never have to worry about them going out of business. You will never have to worry about them trying to save you any dollars, and you'll always know and count on them raising the premiums over and over again. What did you say, 94 percent of the premiums are raised. A family of four will see their premiums go up \$2,000 to \$3,000 a year.

Mr. GARAMENDI. It's interesting to observe the effect of that. This is Blue Cross of California. Two years ago, their profit was almost \$300 million. The effect of those rate increases—the first rate increase, not the second one, but the first one which was around 50 percent—was to increase their profits to \$2.3 billion, and now they want to add another about 30 percent average on top of that. So what will their profits be after all of that? It's shameful.

What the legislation does is to reign in the excessive increases in the insurance companies' premiums. It does that by requiring that a higher percentage of their total premiums go to medical services. Now if you want, go check Wall Street, go on Charles Schwab, check the Wall Street thing. If you want to make an investment, they will say, Invest in the companies whose medical loss ratio is low and trending downward. That simply means that they're paying less for medical care and more for profit. We're going to turn that on its head. We're going to force the insurance companies to pay for medical services and less for profits.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Let me just make one final point so I can close. The final point is, and what this bill will do as well, is provide competition. I mentioned that a good friend came on the floor and talked about a State where there is only one company. My State—a big State and is soon to gain in population through the Census, Texas—has three. So this bill, once it passes, will open up the doors of choice for those who have insurance or those with employer-based insurance, because we're not taking away employer-based insurance. I think that we're moving in the right direction, and I hope that this story will be told tomorrow in the right way.

Mr. GARAMENDI. And we should also remember in that competition model, we will be creating exchanges in which insurance companies will be

there, they'll have to compete, and they'll compete on a standard policy.

Let me now call on our colleague from Ohio (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I appreciate it, and I appreciate the gentleman from California and our other colleagues here.

I have got a nephew at home who is like 3 years old I think. You know how these kids have different little cute things that they say. His new thing is that if you ask him, you know, Why are you going in this room, and he'll say, Well, I'm going in here because of X, Y or Z, that's why. So he finishes all of his sentences with "That's why." You ask him why, he says, "That's why."

So I was thinking about this debate, and people say, Well, why are you supporting this legislation? Well, so kids can stay on their parents' insurance until they're 26 years old. That's why. You know, we have got kids that are getting denied because they have a pre-existing condition. The insurance company says, We won't cover you. I'm supporting this bill because that's going to change. The other provisions that you're highlighting here, tax credits for small businesses, up to 35 percent, and it's actually in some instances 50 percent of a tax credit for our small businesses for people who are providing tax relief to small business men and women who are providing health insurance. That's why I'm supporting this bill. If you get sick, and you try to get coverage, and all of a sudden the insurance industry, the insurance company says, Well, we can't cover you anymore, that's going to be done with.

Think about these significant investments, these significant protections that we are making as a country. I love the idea of all the tea baggers that were down here today talking about these concepts of liberty. I would ask them today, Tell me, what do you mean? What liberty are we taking from you? And let me compare it to the person in my district, the 1,700 families last year in my district that went bankrupt. Are they free? They are not free. They are trapped in an economic system that buries them because someone in their family got sick.

My goodness gracious, what did our Founding Fathers mean when they gave us these ideas of life and liberty and the pursuit of happiness? Who can pursue happiness when they're bankrupt? Because of nothing that they did—it wasn't bad financing; it was bad luck. And if we don't start to recognize in America that some people in our country just have bad luck, and if the government doesn't step in and push back the insurance industry to say, We're going to carve out—we're going to box out the insurance industry so this family will have some freedom, have some protections, that's what this is about.

I've got no interest in stymieing business growth. I come from Youngs-

town, Ohio, for God's sake. We've been in a recession for 30 years. You think I have an interest in stymieing business development? I want to help it. You've tried yours. They've tried their side, I would say to my friends. I was here. I'm not that old, but I've been here 8 years now. I sat here, and I watched while Bush jammed through his tax policy, cut taxes for the rich. They said, This is going to trickle down and help the poor. It didn't help anybody but the rich.

I sat here and watched while he passed a prescription drug bill, didn't negotiate prices, didn't do anything, didn't pay for it, borrowed the money, started wars, didn't have money for the wars that he started. I sat here and watched while the Republican rubberstamp Congress rubberstamped all of those policies. The economy didn't improve. Wages didn't go up. They had control of every single thing. They had a chance to implement their health care strategy. It didn't work because they didn't do anything. They had a chance to implement their energy strategy. And when gas goes to \$4 a gallon again this summer, we're going to feel it again. This is significant stuff we're talking about, and Democrats are stepping up to bat for the American people. We are taking on the insurance industry.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you. We've discussed here the issue of bankruptcy, and I got a call from my daughter this afternoon. She said, Dad, thank God I'm a nurse and I have insurance. Matteo's arm, which was badly broken and required surgery, will probably be a \$70,000 event. She said, If I didn't have insurance, we would have lost our house. That's the situation that's faced by every family. Thankfully this was not the situation that my daughter and grandson faced, but it is faced by tens of thousands, if not hundreds of thousands of Americans. And it's right here. The insurance companies dominate these markets. Lifetime benefits. She probably has already run through her lifetime benefit. That child is probably going to be uninsurable because he has a preexisting condition, a badly broken arm. Those days are over.

I would like now to yield to my colleague from California, a magnificent Representative with whom I have worked with for more than 34 years. She was a California State senator and took over my position when I left the chairmanship at the California State Senate Health and Welfare Committee, Representative WATSON.

Ms. WATSON. I just want to say to my colleague and those here on the floor this evening, I am so proud to share the space in this Chamber with the likes of you. And particularly you, Congressman GARAMENDI. And he was correct in saying that, yes, when I got into the Senate, he relinquished his committee, and I held it for 17 years. I think he probably is aware of my feelings at this moment.

I have viewed the ugliness of today, Congressman GARAMENDI, that is so

reminiscent of what I went through when I was on the school board in the 1970s, and we had to integrate our schools. I was the only person there who was an African American, and I had to endure the slurs that were heard today. It was absolutely ugly. The use of the "N" word, spitting, the ranting, the distortions, the slurs, and the deceitful references to our health care reform. I felt it was despicable. I didn't think it could happen again here in America, but I'm reminded that hate continues.

Why should there be ranting and raving when we're trying to cover the 38 million Americans without health care insurance? And 8 million are in our State, California, and 6 million of them are children. I want to say that the legislation that we are addressing will make health care affordable for the middle class. I don't know how many people out there ranting were middle class, but this definitely will help them. It will provide security for our seniors and guarantee access to health insurance for the uninsured.

I just want to very quickly mention what it will do for the 33rd Congressional District. That is my district in Los Angeles, Culver City, California. It will improve health insurance coverage for 304,000 residents, it will give tax credits and other assistance to up to 173,000 families and 15,100 small businesses to help them afford coverage.

□ 2045

It will improve Medicare for 75,000 beneficiaries, including closing that doughnut hole. It will extend coverage to 132,000 uninsured residents. It will guarantee that 22,200 residents with preexisting conditions can obtain coverage, and certainly the children, starting when the bills are signed into law. It will protect 1,100 families from bankruptcy due to unaffordable health care costs. It will allow 66,000 young adults to obtain coverage on their parents' policies until they are 26 years old. Isn't that exciting. It will provide millions of dollars in new funding for five community health clinics in my district alone. And it will reduce the cost of uncompensated care for hospitals and other health care providers by \$16 million annually.

And I want to set the record straight: this will add and protect and supplement, not take anything away.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Representative WATSON, thank you so very much. I am appalled and personally offended and I think all owe an apology to those Representatives who were demeaned, who were spat upon, who were cursed, and who were called the ugliest of names. It is totally unacceptable.

I yield to Mr. TONKO.

Mr. TONKO. Representative GARAMENDI, I couldn't agree more. I think Representative WATSON says it well. There is all the call for civil discussion, exchange of information to do things analytically and substantively when it comes to a huge industry that represents \$1 of \$6 in this country, and we need to do it in a way that brings together the facts, not to deal with fic-

tion. Emotion, obviously, is a part of this discussion. We heard it from our friend, Representative RYAN. We are emotionalized by this, but let's have the sort of dialogue that builds soundness into the reforms that we desperately need as a Nation.

When we get back onto this message of freedom, the freedom to shop, many of us understand there is a capitalist model out there. People understand that it is good to have business be successful. And where we can control cost and contain cost, and allow for growth of that business so more jobs are part of that picture, all the better. So we have the opportunity with these exchanges, developed by this reform legislation, to allow for the freedom to shop, to find a better bargain for health care, and as previous speakers have said, add more people into the mix, more providers into the mix that want to fight for the right to serve you. That is a strengthener.

And then we establish these exchanges where we require those exchanges to have certain rules to be met, to have regulatory aspects. We saw what happened when no regulation was part of the financial world and the banking community; it brought us to our knees in a recession. We need that sort of regulatory aspect, and it is part of the picture.

The medical-loss ratio, the amount of money going back directly to consumers, to those insured, rather than into the profit column, will be a litmus test in order to offer your services in that exchange. And to live with the standards' minimum benefits package. These are the improvements that we bring.

So again to Mr. RYAN's emotion, and I attach myself to that sentiment, we are promoting freedom to shop and we are promoting freedom from bankruptcy. These are essentials of this bill; and the exchanges will allow for much more competition that sharpens the pencil and drives the bottom line benefits for consumers. And the freedom to escape restriction and bias if you have acne or are overweight, or for women who are of child-bearing years, or those who have been violated through domestic violence, to use that as a standard, to deny you insurance coverage, that is the freedom you need, to escape those biases and that prejudice and that tool that allows the industry to grow more prosperous because it won't insure you—these are the freedoms we are encouraging. These were the freedoms we are guaranteeing.

So I am proud to be here tonight to work with you, Representative GARAMENDI, to make certain that we share with the American public what is really happening with this measure, and we are going to make history by approving this package.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Representative TONKO and Representative RYAN, both of you have spoken to the American economy in Youngstown and the effect that 30 years of recession has had on that town. One of the fundamental problems in the American economy is

the extraordinary growth in the health care sector.

This little chart here really explains why many parts of the American economy are not competitive. This little red line here is the growth in the percentage of the wealth of this Nation, the GDP, that is now in health care. We heard earlier one-sixth. Well, it is 16, almost 17, percent of the total wealth of the Nation that is tied up in health care. We are growing faster in this sector than any other sector of the American economy.

Our competitors around the world are down in the 10–11 percent range. President Clinton, explaining this in a speech in California that I had the pleasure of attending, indicated that this gap here between the 16–17 percent of the American economy that goes into health care versus the 10–11 percent that our competitors are spending is like giving a \$80 billion a year gift to our competitors around the world.

And so when the industries in the manufacturing of America go out, the car industry, other heavy industries go out to compete, they are saddled with this extraordinary additional cost because of the growth in the health care sector.

The fact is the more inflation in the health care sector, the fewer people are insured. This is why we are seeing small businesses shedding health care, and why we see the extraordinary run up of the uninsured as the economy goes down. It is not just losing your job; it is the small businesses being unable to continue to purchase health care.

One of the most important things that is going to happen in this legislation for small businesses is a specific tax reduction, a credit, of up to 35 percent in year one and then rising to 50 percent for every employee that they provide health care for. So it is an enormous benefit and incentive to provide the insurance, to maintain the insurance, and that is what is going to go on in the years ahead. So all of the talk about this bill being bad for business, it is simply not true. This is what is bad for business. There is serious cost containment in this legislation through a variety of ways.

I yield to Mr. RYAN.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. It is interesting, I was listening to my colleagues from New York and California, I can't get over what all of the fuss is about against this bill. This is something that Bob Dole and Senator Chafee had worked out in the eighties. This is middle-of-the-road stuff. Many of us wanted other things in here. I am not afraid to admit that. There is no public option in here. This is not single-payer. This is right down the middle. This is bread and butter, all American, apple pie and Chevrolet. This is baseball.

Look at it, tax cuts for small businesses. Many people in our districts make \$50,000 a year. Under this proposal, a family of four making \$50,000 a

year in Niles, Ohio, will get \$5,800 worth of a tax credit. That is a middle class tax cut. This is what is in the bill. We are regulating and putting in new rules for the insurance companies. We are not taking over, but this is pretty simple. And the gentleman from New York mentioned it: this is about prevention. There is no one who can argue with the fact, Mr. Speaker, that we have 30 million-plus people in the United States of America who have no preventive care at all, dumped into our emergency rooms, much sicker than they need to be. And it doesn't take a Philadelphia lawyer to figure out that that costs a lot of money, as opposed to giving each one of those, and they pay nothing, they go there and they pay nothing. They don't pay anything. So it is all free, shifted off to the next person who comes in with an insurance card.

What we are saying is, it is cheaper for us as a country, since we are all already paying for them anyway through higher insurance premiums, it is cheaper for everybody if we give them an insurance card and make them pay something. No more free riders. Everyone is going to have to pay something, and get them to a primary care physician who will give them a \$20 prescription drug instead of going to the emergency room a week or two later and costing us \$10,000 or \$15,000 or \$20,000. That is what this whole thing is about.

And when the industry is set up, as it is currently, to knock people off the rolls and deny coverage, especially the stories we have heard coming out about people with HIV and AIDS, you are not covered. That gets pushed off and dumped on everybody else. We are saying this is a pro-business bill.

I am glad, as the one gentleman said earlier, I am glad that the tea baggers are in Washington, D.C. to watch this pass because this is going to be the most significant tax cut for middle class people in the history of our country, especially geared towards health care.

When I can go home and tell my folks that a family of four making \$50,000 a year, they are going to get a \$5,800 tax credit for their health insurance, they probably don't know that right now, but I am going to spend the next 6 months making sure that every single family in my district knows that they are going to get that tax cut, and they are going to like what we have done here.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you, Mr. RYAN.

One of the things that we have heard all day is about Medicare cuts, somehow the Medicare system is going to be cut. I would like to get into that a little bit because this bill specifically helps Medicare. We have talked about the doughnut hole. This is the prescription drug benefit which, by the way, my Republican colleagues, which I guess are not here at the moment, when the prescription drug benefit part D was put in place, the Republicans

controlled this House with the President and they never bothered to pay, never bothered to pay for that benefit. And so you want to know where the deficit came from? It came from there and it came from the two wars that the Bush administration started and didn't bother to pay for either, so we ran up the deficit.

But here is the thing for seniors, to go back on my point here, is that the program provides very specific benefits to seniors. It provides \$250 this year, a \$250 additional benefit for seniors to pay for drugs. Those that fall into the doughnut hole, that doughnut hole begins to close this year, and in 5 years it is totally gone.

In addition to that, it is explicit in this legislation that the Medicare benefits will not be reduced.

I yield to Mr. TONKO.

Mr. TONKO. I think what is important to note is the nomenclature on this one is rather offensive. We talk about the doughnut hole as being Medicare part D, but who is paying that? Is Medicare paying that? No, our senior community. Our senior citizens are asked to contribute. It is not Medicare paying for that portion.

So this one was cleverly devised. Cleverly devised. You can almost see the game of footsie going on because somewhere people sat down and thought, We can come up with this great, clever name, sounds attractive, sounds tempting, a doughnut hole. I can tell you many seniors come to me and tell me within a matter of months in any calendar year, I am at that threshold.

For those who are not familiar with it, think of the simple doughnut with the hole in the middle. You get covered for a while, then you don't, and then you do. It is that threshold. Actuarial measures could have told them right when you have to peak there to get people into their own pocket paying for this device that is hurting our senior community.

So when we talk again about freedom, this is freedom from the doughnut of the worst kind. This is freedom from digging into your pocket and paying for your pharmaceutical needs to stay well or to stay alive. So this measure is great about freeing us from that doughnut hole; but this is not Medicare funded, this is out of the individual's pocket, and it is hurting our senior community. And by the year 2018, we will close that doughnut hole completely. It is an expensive proposition; but, again, as you pointed out, no one worried about paying for it when they came up with the plan.

□ 2100

Mr. GARAMENDI. I might add that between now and 2018, some of us are going to be around here, and we are going to give the Federal Government the power to negotiate drug prices. We are not there today. It is one of the things that is missing in this legislation that I wish was in it. But it will

happen. No longer will they be free from competition.

I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. WATSON. I want to set the record straight, because there have been so many distortions. In church last Sunday, and I am Catholic, and it is Lent, and I was going down to take communion. I was four people before getting to the priest to get communion when someone I know leaned over and said, "Don't take my Medicare away." The distortions that are out there have to be set straight.

I really appreciate my colleagues and you, Representative GARAMENDI, for talking about closing the part D doughnut hole. I think it was about \$2,300 that you had to expend for your own prescriptions and then you went into a period of time when you got no help and no discounts. Now that is going to be eliminated. And I just want to say for my friend who stopped me in church last Sunday, the legislation will allow 6,100 Medicare beneficiaries in my district who entered the part D doughnut hole and are forced to pay the full cost of their prescriptions, that under this bill these beneficiaries will receive a \$250 rebate in this year, 2010; 50 percent discounts on brand name drugs beginning in 2011; and complete closure, complete closure of the doughnut hole within a decade. A typical beneficiary who enters the doughnut hole will see savings of over \$700 in 2011 and over \$3,000 by 2020. And you will be here to see that because you are from California too.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you, Representative WATSON, for making it so personal to your district. The same savings are to be found in every one of our districts. We have different percentages of seniors in our districts, but the fact is that there are very, very significant savings in this.

I want to take up one other issue that has been raised over and over again by the Republicans in the most disingenuous and I think rather dishonest way. And that is the reduction of some \$500 billion over the 10 years in Medicare expenses. Now, where do those reductions come from? They would let us believe that those savings are from the reduction of benefits. That is not true. There is explicit language here that benefits will not be reduced. I will tell you where the money is going to come from. It is going to come out of the pockets of the insurance companies that have ripped the Federal Government off to a fare-thee-well for the last 6 years, ever since the George W. Bush administration created the Medicare Advantage program, which they did, incidentally, in reconciliation.

It is abominable that this government has had to pay a bonus to the insurance companies to provide Medicare Advantage programs when in fact they said they could do it cheaper than the fee-for-service Medicare program. Sixteen percent bonus over and above the

average cost of Medicare for seniors is given to the insurance company for no good reason. Those days, that bonus, that unintended and unnecessary profit is going to be over.

Secondly, there is fraud and abuse in the Medicare system not from the seniors who are striving to get their benefits, but rather from purveyors, doctors, medical device people, and out and out fraudsters. We are going to be hiring. Some of those people that were talked about earlier from the IRS and the CMS, the Medicare office, those folks are going to be out there chasing after criminals that are ripping the Medicare system off to a fare-thee-well. That is where the reductions are coming from, from those two places.

I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TONKO. Representative GARAMENDI, again thank you for bringing us together. I think in addition to that, and you are very right, to have over-subsidized the Medicare Advantage programs some 12 to 14 percent, people say where are the costs coming? Not from you, from the profit column. And actually, we want that to be transformed to something that is Medicare-related in terms of balancing the scales there and allowing our seniors to still have an advantage by having that program continue, but making certain that the oversubsidization is denied. And you are very right about the fraud and the abuse that may be part of that programming.

But it is also important to note, I believe, that situations like medical home models and accountable care organizations will provide for the collaboratives that we need to coordinate the resources, to improve access, and to bring together the confluence of services in a way that streamlines without really hurting—actually helping the outcome for our seniors.

Then of course free annual wellness visits. Making certain that those copayments, those deductibles are not going to saddle individuals, again having to be forced to dig into your own pocket. We will now have those free annual opportunities, screenings of essential types, the annual checkups. These are items that will not require—actually, copayments and deductibles will be denied and they will be disallowed. So you go forward and you encourage the preventative and wellness approaches to health care delivery, which is an important aspect, I think, to the benefits of this program.

We have to remember that the \$1.2 trillion that is saved in the second 10 years out and the \$138 billion that is saved in the first 10 years are just those budget-related scorings that were done by the Congressional Budget Office. But there are those who are suggesting that well beyond any kind of budget impact are the ripple effects of a good kind that will come simply by instituting wellness and prevention and access and putting clinics into the system, relieving our health care deliv-

ery system of uncompensated care burdens. A number of these things can't be scored by the Congressional Budget Office. So it goes well beyond the \$1.34 trillion that has been projected by a very conservative, nonpolitical CBO group.

So I think there is reason for great hope here. And if we could instill hope, if we could insert hope into the lives of people, into the fabric of our health care opportunities we are achieving a great deal. And again, because this is so critical in the lives of people and in the profit columns of businesses that provide jobs, this is an important discussion.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I really want to home in on what you are saying, but let me wrap up the senior part here if I might. Let's be very, very clear about the Medicare program. First of all, the AARP, American Association of Retired Persons, say that this legislation is going to lower costs and improve care for seniors.

Secondly, it is in the bill, no benefit cuts. It is in the bill. Two hundred fifty dollars in the pocket of seniors who have got their medical prescriptions in the doughnut hole to help pay for that. And that is this year. Not 10 years from now, this year. Medicare part D doughnut hole is beginning to close. It is going to take time because it is expensive and it does take a lot of money, but it is going to close by 2018. And there will be significant drug discounts for seniors who use generic drugs this year, saving seniors, just as you said, millions of dollars out of their pocket. And that is not in the CBO score.

I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TONKO. I would have to add to your list of benefits in this measure is the stabilization of the Medicare trust fund, providing that trust fund as we go forward being a stronger element out there, enabling us to again provide the Medicare benefits and services that are required. It is an important aspect. It is important to 113,000 beneficiaries in my district. So we want to make certain it's there.

Mr. GARAMENDI. It's not on my list. Do you want to add to my list another benefit?

Mr. TONKO. I will add to your list. And I am glad, Representative, that you made mention that no benefit cuts are included in the language of the bill. So these are another bit of freedoms that we are talking about in this measure.

Mr. GARAMENDI. So we add to the bill that the Medicare trust fund is made solvent for something either 7 to 9 years.

Mr. TONKO. Nine years.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Nine years. Okay. We added that one here. Medicare Advantage, we talked about that. The bonus to the insurance companies is gone. And that money is not sent off to some other program, that savings stays in the Medicare program. Reduce senior premiums, improve access, ex-

panded benefits, extend Medicare's fiscal—I did have it here. I just didn't read it. Here is the Medicare fiscal health. And finally, the issues you were talking about, prevention, organizing the care so we have continuity of care.

I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Just listening, I want to speak directly to Members of the House because we've got a few minutes left tonight and some debate tomorrow. How does this play out over the course of the next few months? By listening to what you gentlemen have just got done saying about Medicare, the significant improvements of strengthening Medicare, we're going to have to run an election. And there is probably going to be an election on this bill. What has happened over the last few months is our friends on the other side have consistently tried to throw arguments again the wall, and they would just fall; they wouldn't stick because they weren't true.

We started with death panels, and illegal immigrants, and abortion, and we went right down the line. None of them ended up working out. "It's going to bankrupt the country." And then we get CBO—I mean you just go right down the line. They said it's going to support abortion, and then we have 60,000 Catholic nuns, 600 Catholic hospitals, 1,400 Catholic nursing homes, a bunch of Catholic theologians saying this is not a pro-abortion bill, this is a pro-life bill. Same thing with illegal immigrants.

Then they say it's going to spend a ton of money, and then the Congressional Budget Office, a neutral third party, says it's going to save \$1.2 trillion, reduce the deficit by \$1.2 trillion in the second 10 years, \$130 billion in the first decade. That is a reduction in the budget deficits on the backs of what President Clinton did by reducing the budget deficit. So we have a history of doing that.

So quickly, the debate in the fall about health care is going to go something like this. We pushed an initiative that is going to close the doughnut hole and give our seniors 250 bucks just this year to help close that doughnut hole. Our friends on the other side running against us will be saying we want to repeal that. We don't want that closing of the doughnut hole.

We're going to be campaigning on little kids who have a sickness are now being denied insurance coverage because they have a preexisting condition, we're going to say, we stopped that from happening in the United States of America. Our friends on the other side are going to be running a campaign saying we want to repeal that.

We're going to have in there we want to have a ban on preexisting conditions for all citizens across the board. Our friends on the other side are going to be running a campaign saying we want to repeal that. And on and on and on.

People who are now getting kicked off the rolls, their insurance rolls, because they got sick, we're saying that

could never happen again in the United States of America. And next fall our friends on the other side of the aisle are going to say, no, no, we want to repeal that ban. We want to continue that practice of the insurance industry being able to kick people off of their insurance because they got sick.

We're going to be saying, hey, your kid that just went on the insurance rolls because they were 24 years old and we allowed that to happen because of the health care reform bill. Our friends on the other side are going to be saying they want to repeal that provision that allows young people to stay on their parents' insurance until they're 26 years old.

Very clear. The family in my district, your district in New York, your district in California, your district in California, all across the country, those families of four making \$50,000 a year who are going to get a \$5,800 tax cut that we put in because of this reform, our friends on the other side are going to say we want to run this election about repealing that tax cut.

Same with the 35 percent and then up to 50 percent tax cut for small businesses. Our friends on the other side are going to say, we want to repeal that. This is a referendum on health care reform. I say I want to have that debate day and night for the next 6 or 7 months because that is a debate, Mr. Speaker, we can win and we shall win. The only issue now is a lot of people do not know all of these benefits that have been itemized here tonight. They will know in the next 6 months.

I yield back to my friend.

□ 2115

Mr. GARAMENDI. We've got about 6 minutes left, so let's each take about 2 minutes.

Mr. TONKO.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you very much for bringing us together.

There is so much to talk about with this bill, but you know, as what has been mentioned with Representative RYAN, a family living on an annual income of \$50,000 gets the \$5,800 tax credit. Well, you know, it doesn't end there. It goes all the way up to the threshold of \$88,000 for annual household incomes whereby families are going to receive some sort of benefit.

This is an extraordinary opportunity to provide for middle-income America, to provide income for them so that they can promote wellness within their individual families. Absolutely tremendously strong idea. It empowers the middle class, the working families of this country.

It empowers our small businesses. Representative WATSON talked about the benefits in her district to small businesses. In my district, between 14,000 and 15,000 businesses will be given the opportunity for tax credits to help purchase the employer-based plans for their given employees. And don't they prosper from a sound and well workforce? I think that is impor-

tant. They also will have the benefits of shopping within an exchange if they so choose.

So there is all of this effort made to make certain that we advantage people in a way that will promote wellness, provide health care in an affordable and accessible fashion.

We also do know that the benefits to our senior community, with all of the strengthening of Medicare without reducing those benefits, promoting their pharmaceutical needs being addressed fully in the near future so that they are not avoiding those pharmaceuticals simply because they cannot afford them; that is bad policy.

So what we have here is freedom galore, freedom galore to be able to stay well, to stay strong, to grow and prosper, to be hopeful. This is a golden moment. This is a wonderful moment that we will share tomorrow as we come out to this floor and address this health care reform measure.

And thank you Representative GARAMENDI for bringing us together. Thank you for the opportunity.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I appreciate your passion on this no less than Mr. RYAN's.

Ms. WATSON. And very quickly I, too, want to add my thanks to my colleagues for providing this time.

I want to remind our country that in this legislation, we have community health centers. And I remember in the beginning some people were very disturbed because their districts—and they feel that they have areas that are so remote, how will this health insurance plan cover them.

They need to know that nationwide the legislation will provide \$11 billion in new funding for these health clinics. And they'll be in rural areas; they will be in suburban areas. Those people who are not in the urban core will be provided with health care. And if the community health centers in the district, your district, receive the average level of support, these centers will receive millions of dollars in new assistance so that we can cover as many of the uncovered as possible.

And I want to remind the viewers that if you have insurance and you like your insurance, you can keep your insurance. If you love your doctor or your health care provider, government does not come in between that relationship. And I want the viewing public to know that.

And then I want to end by saying there is no deficit spending. I sat in my office and heard the opposition say, It's going to rob my children, you know, and, it's going to wreck their children, and it will rob them because they'll have to pay off the deficit.

The cost of health care reform under the legislation proposed is fully paid for in large part by eliminating, and you mentioned it, waste, fraud, and abuse and excessive profits for private insurers.

The legislation will reduce the deficit by over a hundred billion dollars over

the next 10 years and by about \$1 trillion over the second decade.

So thank you, Representative GARAMENDI for allowing us this time to set the record straight.

Onward to victory.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you very much, Representative WATSON. It has been a joy to work with you these 35 years and work with you this evening.

This is a historic moment. This is something you and I and many others have worked to try to provide health insurance for all Americans. Some 32 million Americans will receive health insurance as a result of this. There will be the incredible tax cuts for working men and women. For small businesses, they, too, will receive significant tax credits so that they can provide insurance for their employees. And there will be programs to promote wellness. There will be programs to create better information technology so that we don't have to waste money every time you present yourself with a different doctor. And you have the freedom to choose your own health insurance company, and your health insurance company no longer has their freedom to deny you benefits and coverage. There are serious insurance reforms in this.

Finally, I just want to add, I have seen this sign so many times around the Capitol, so many times, and it says, "We the people." Those are the first three words of the preamble of the United States Constitution. And it goes on to say, "We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union." That is what we're doing here. A more perfect union within our families so that we don't have to fear bankruptcy and the loss of health because we have no health insurance; a more perfect union in our communities so that everyone in our communities has health care and access to health insurance.

It establishes justice.

Thank you so very much.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAFFEI). Members are reminded that it is not in order to address remarks to those outside the Chamber.

TEXAS SAYS "NO" TO HEALTH REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. BURGESS. I came to the floor of the House tonight because I want to share with the House a letter I received from the Texas Medical Association.

The letter says, "On behalf of the nearly 45,000 physician and medical student members of the Texas Medical Association—and on behalf of our 25 million patients—we are writing to express our opposition to the health reform bill (H.R. 3590) that will be before

the U.S. House of Representatives this weekend. Please vote 'NO.'

"Unlike the American Medical Association, we do not believe that passage of H.R. 3590 and the accompanying reconciliation bill are steps in the right direction. Our position on health reform remains steadfast: Keep what's good in the health care system and fix only what's broken.

"To repeat what we said in December when the U.S. Senate passed this bill, the bill is bad medicine for our patients, and TMA cannot support it. The legislation:

"Does nothing to correct the flawed Medicare payment formula that Congress created in 1997."

The legislation "would increase the cost of health insurance for our patients and deliver even less in return."

It "would dramatically enhance Federal Government interference."

It "would create incentives for patients to pay a fine for not having insurance rather than to pay an unrealistic amount for insurance coverage."

It "would not protect Texas' liability reforms and does even less to expand those protections to patients and physicians in other States."

It "would impose untested and arbitrary treatment standards that do not improve the quality of patient care.

"In addition, this bill could be a budget buster for Texas. According to the Texas Health and Human Services Commission, the current proposal would cost the State of Texas up to an additional \$24 billion in increased Medicaid spending over the first 10 years of its implementation.

"Please note that our position is not based solely on the personal opinions of the TMA leadership. In a recent survey of nearly 3,300 TMA members, almost 70 percent said if a new health care bill becomes law, it will make the U.S. health care system worse than it is now in the long run. Six out of 10 said the quality of patient care will get worse, patients' cost for care will go up, and patients' health care coverage will go down if a new bill becomes law.

"Please work with your Texas colleagues on both sides of the aisle to develop and pass a rational Medicare physician payment system that automatically keeps up with the cost of running a practice and is backed by a fair, stable funding formula. No more Band-Aids. It's time for a permanent Medicare fix.

"Thank you for your consideration of our requests."

And I will insert the letter from the Texas Medical Association into the RECORD.

TEXAS MEDICAL ASSOCIATION,

March 19, 2010.

DEAR MEMBER OF TEXAS' CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION: On behalf of the nearly 45,000 physician and medical student members of the Texas Medical Association—and on behalf of our 25 million patients—we are writing to express our opposition to the health reform bill (HR 3590) that will be before the U.S. House of Representatives this weekend. Please vote "NO."

Unlike the American Medical Association, we do not believe that passage of HR 3590 and the accompanying reconciliation bill are steps in the right direction. Our position on health reform remains steadfast: Keep what's good in the health care system and fix only what's broken.

To repeat what we said in December when the U.S. Senate passed HR 3590, this bill is bad medicine for our patients, and TMA cannot support it. The legislation:

Does nothing to correct the flawed Medicare payment formula that Congress created in 1997. That formula is directly responsible for the slow erosion of access to care for seniors and the poor.

Would increase the cost of health insurance for our patients and deliver even less in return.

Would dramatically enhance federal government interference, bureaucracy, and red tape for patients and physicians.

Would create incentives for patients to pay a fine for not having insurance rather than pay an unrealistic amount for insurance coverage.

Would not protect Texas' liability reforms and does even less to expand those protections to patients and physicians in other states.

Would impose untested and arbitrary treatment standards that do not improve the quality of patient care.

In addition, this bill could be a budget buster for Texas. According to the Texas Health and Human Services Commission, the current proposal could cost the State of Texas up to an additional \$24 billion in increased Medicaid spending over the first 10 years of its implementation.

Please note that our position is not based solely on the personal opinions of the TMA leadership. In a recent survey of nearly 3,300 TMA members, almost 70 percent said if a new health care bill becomes law, it will make the U.S. health care system worse than it is now in the long run. Six out of 10 said quality of patient care will get worse, patients' cost for care will go up, and patients' health care coverage will go down if a new health care bill becomes law.

Finally, regardless of whether HR 3590 becomes law, we strongly urge you to take swift action to stop the implosion of our Medicare system. Since its inception, the Sustainable Growth Rate Formula (SGR) has not worked. Annually, it has forced physicians to limit access for our patients, pushing patients into higher-cost areas like emergency rooms. Every year for a decade, we have faced steep cuts that jeopardize our ability to care for patients. You and your colleagues have recognized this glaring problem—this gaping wound in our health care system—but have been willing to address it only with Band-Aids. We need more than Band-Aids. We need more than sutures. We need a complete transplant. Congress created this disease, and only you, as a current member of Congress, can cure it.

We note that HR 3590 creates a physician payment board—independent of and not answerable to Congress—with the authority to unilaterally determine physicians' Medicare payments. Even if Congress were to fix the flawed SGR formula, your action could be, and likely would be, ignored by this board.

Please work with your Texas colleagues on both sides of the aisle to develop and pass a rational Medicare physician payment system that automatically keeps up with the cost of running a practice and is backed by a fair, stable funding formula. No more Band-Aids. It's time for a permanent Medicare fix.

Thank you for your consideration of our requests. Please feel free to contact us at any time if we can be of any assistance in this process.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM H. FLEMING III,
MD,
President, Texas Medical Association.

SUSAN RUDD BAILEY, MD,
President-Elect, Texas Medical Association,
Chair, Texas Delegation to the AMA.

I also want to share a letter I received from the American College of Surgeons. Again, this is similar language.

"On behalf of the more than 75,000 members of the American College of Surgeons, I write to restate that the College shares your commitment to make quality health care more accessible to all Americans. Over the past year and a half, the College has consistently sought to serve as a constructive voice of reform, guided by the College's principles of providing quality and safety, improving patient access to surgical care, while enacting meaningful liability reform, and reducing health care costs."

"The College's principles underscore our commitment to health care reform that will extend coverage and improve access to quality health care for more Americans. Without addressing these fundamental concerns, the College believes that H.R. 3590 will undermine quality and threaten patient access to surgical care. Therefore, the College opposes the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act of 2009." But we do "remain steadfast in our role as champions for meaningful health care reform that is in the best interest of patients."

I also have a letter from the Texas Association of Home Care & Hospice. They conclude by saying, "The Texas Association for Home Care & Hospice again respectfully requests that Congress reject the notion that reductions in Medicare home health and hospice reimbursement rates equates to health care reform and long-term cost containment and ask that you vote no on the current health care proposal."

I also wanted to share some insights from the Texas Attorney General regarding the constitutionality of the individual mandate.

According to Greg Abbott, "The individual mandate is constitutionally suspect because it does not fall within any" of the normal categories. "The mandate provision of 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 nearly every American to engage in commerce by forcing them to purchase insurance, and then use that coerced transaction as the basis for claiming authority under the commerce clause."

Seems a little tortuous to get to that point.

Finally, a letter from the Governor of the State of Texas, Rick Perry, who also delineates concerns about the cost of the program. He ends up, "While Washington argues, Texans wait for real reform that results in everyone to have the opportunity to live a healthier life without adding trillions of dollars of debt that we and our children will" end up having to pay.

Thank you for the consideration.

□ 2130

HEALTH CARE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased to have been on the floor and heard from my colleague, my physician colleague from Texas, in fact, my OB-GYN colleague from Texas, who talked about the opinion and read the letters from the Texas Medical Society and also the Governor of Texas in regard to their opposition to this bill that we are going to be voting on tomorrow, H.R. 3590. In fact, I don't have any letters tonight from the State of Georgia, Mr. Speaker, but indeed, it was the Georgia Medical Association and the Texas Medical Association that came together months and months ago, an organized effort in many, many other State medical societies and special societies across this country, I think, representing some 500,000 physicians who are in opposition to this legislation, in contrast, Mr. Speaker, to the support, I'm still quite astounded by that, the support of the American Medical Association.

But it is important to know, while I respect the American Medical Association and their leadership, they represent probably less than 20 percent of the physicians in this country. And so I think we need to always put that in perspective. And again, I'm glad to hear from Congressman Dr. MICHAEL BURGESS from the State of Texas regarding that.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, the Democratic majority had the previous hour. I had an opportunity both while at home a few minutes ago and here on the floor in the more recent moments to hear some of the discussion. And it's real interesting to hear some of the comments. And I jotted down quickly some of those, and I would like to go over it a little bit so my colleagues can understand and get maybe a different, more possibly, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, more accurate perspective on some of that.

The gentlelady from California indicated in her remarks that in this bill, in this health care reform, that there is absolutely no deficit spending. In fact, she talks about something like \$100 billion savings in the first 10 years, I guess it's calculated by the CBO. Of course, Mr. Speaker, we all know the

CBO can only work on the numbers given to them. And they do a great job. And we are not here to denigrate the hardworking men and women of the CBO. They've been working hard for over a year and a half now. Every time there's a change, they have to re-crunch numbers.

It's kind of interesting from the historical perspective of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle. Remember when Medicare, the program, was passed in 1965? The CBO and the number crunchers at that time said by the year 2010, based on all of the information that we have, demographics and how long people live and that sort of thing, by the year 2010, this program, although not nearly as costly in 1965, will cost about \$60 billion in 2010. Well, Mr. Speaker, you and, I think, everybody in this Chamber and everybody listening knows that we are in the process now on an annual basis in the Medicare program of spending about \$480 billion, \$480 billion a year. We are spending more on Medicare than we are spending on our national defense, \$480 billion.

Well, the number crunchers didn't miss it too much, did they? They only missed it by \$420 billion, just a little small accounting error, I guess, you round it off maybe in government speak. So, for the gentlelady from California, and I respect my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, but no deficit spending indeed, and to suggest that there will be \$1 trillion worth of savings in the second 10 years, don't hold your breath, colleagues. Don't hold your breath.

Well, it has been interesting today. It has been real interesting. I told the men and women on the west steps and the Mall earlier today, I don't know how many were there, Mr. Speaker, but thousands, maybe 25,000, people from all across the country, who came, I had an opportunity to ask some of them how they got here. Some drove, some came on buses, some flew, indeed, yes, there were even some from California. But God bless them, Mr. Speaker. The Member of the majority party in the previous hour referred to them as "tea baggers." He called them "tea baggers." I found that highly insulting, Mr. Speaker, to these men and women who made that effort to be here. "We, the People," another gentleman in the majority party talked about "We, the People," and referred to "We, the People" and talked about the Declaration of Independence in order to form a more perfect union and that this is a result, this bill, was going to give us a more perfect union.

And, Mr. Speaker, I know you have many on your side of the aisle who say we have been trying to pass comprehensive health care health care reform for 40 years, 50 years, 60 years. President Theodore Roosevelt tried to do it. President Woodrow Wilson tried to do it. President Franklin Roosevelt tried to do it. President Kennedy and President Johnson tried to do it. More recently, of course, President Clinton

back in 1993 tried to do it. We almost did it, they said, Mr. Speaker. We almost got there, and now here we are right on the cusp of victory, as they describe, and tomorrow we are going to get over the finish line, we are going to do it for We, the People.

Well, Mr. Speaker, let me suggest to you and my colleagues why we have never done it over the past 40, 50 or 60 years, because We, the People don't want it. We, the People hate it. They did then, and they do now. We, the People have rejected this in every poll that has been taken for the last year and a half. And the Democratic majority and the Democratic leadership and the President of the United States, they know that. They know that. We, the People don't want it. We, the People don't want what Otto Von Bismarck had to offer 150 years ago. We don't want Western European socialism for this country. We, the People like what is written in the Constitution, and that is what we want. And we want to make sure that We, the People know that there are some sensible men and women in this Congress, in both the House and the Senate, that will continue to stand up, right to the 11th hour, with our last breath, to stand up for We, the People and to fight off this socialism that this administration and this majority is insisting on.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I want to recognize some of my colleagues who are on the floor with me tonight that I think feel just as strongly as I do. And We, the People would like to hear from them as well. At this point, I would like to yield some time to my colleague from Georgia, my good friend from the Third Congressional District of west Georgia, the Honorable LYNN WESTMORELAND.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. I want to thank my fellow Georgian for taking this hour so we can come straighten out some of the things that have been said in the previous hour. And I listened to them with great interest. And I believe that they believe in Santa Claus, the Easter Bunny and the Tooth Fairy. I was going along with them pretty well until they got down to the "free" part, free wellness screening, free preventative and free test.

I want to ask the people, Mr. Speaker, of America, have you ever gotten anything free from the government? The American people pay for everything that this government does with their taxes or with penalties or interest. What every American pays is what pays for everything this government does. There are no free lunches here. And for our colleagues on the other side of the aisle to get up and say that these things were free, they've got to believe in the Tooth Fairy. They've got to believe in Santa Claus or the Easter Bunny to believe that.

The gentleman, our colleague from Ohio, is talking about the things that he will campaign for in November, and what we will be campaigning for and

what he will be campaigning for. I welcome, I welcome those campaigns because even though they haven't heard the people on this third Saturday in March, they will hear from the people on the first Tuesday of November.

There are some facts that I would like to just get straight while we are talking about "free" things, free what the government is going to do. This bill is not free. And as the gentleman, my colleague from Georgia, explained, the costs that come with it.

Let me tell you some things that are going to be on the campaign and is going to be ahead of this Congress for the next 7 months. Let's talk about the \$1.2 trillion, the total cost of the bill between 2010 and 2020. Though the real cost, as the gentleman stated, doesn't go until 2014. This includes \$940 billion in coverage subsidies. Those aren't going to be free. That's what your tax dollars are going to be paying for in coverage subsidies. Those are not free, \$144.2 billion in additional mandatory spending. That's going to come out of your tax dollars, \$70 billion in discretionary spending in the Senate bill and \$41.6 billion in unrelated education spending. Yeah, they included education in this health care reform because they could not, under any other way, get it passed through the Senate, \$208 billion, and both my colleagues here tonight are doctors.

This is the cost of a 10-year patch for the SGR, the sustainable growth rate, to prevent reduction in Medicare physicians payments, which is 21 percent right now. This cost is hidden because it was included in the earlier Democratic bill, but was dropped to better provide a cost estimate. This is your tax dollars. This is not free, \$569.2 billion tax increases in the legislation, including \$48.9 billion in new taxes in the reconciliation bill alone. That's not free. That's coming from your tax dollars, \$52 billion, the amount of new taxes on employers, \$52 billion of new taxes on employers who can't afford to give their employees health care. And that's going to be imposed when unemployment right now is at 9.7 percent.

Twelve is the number of new taxes in the bill that violate President Obama's pledge that under my plan no family making less than \$250,000 a year will see any form of tax increase; 46 percent is the percentage of families making less than \$66,150 who will be forced to pay the individual mandate tax, which, by the way, I believe is unconstitutional; 16,500 is the estimated number of IRS auditors, agents, and other employees that will be needed to collect the hundreds of billions of dollars in new taxes levied on the American people.

There is nothing free in this bill. There's nothing free. You've got to believe in the Tooth Fairy, and the Easter Bunny, and Santa Claus all rolled into one to think that you're going to get something free out of this.

Twenty billion dollars is the estimated amount of money that the IRS

and the HHS will need for the cost of additional regulations, bureaucracy, and redtape over the next 10 years. This spending is not included in the CBO's cost estimate. Fifty-three billion dollars is the amount of revenue this bill raids from Social Security to make it appear as if it actually reduces the deficit; \$202.3 billion the amount of money cut from Medicare Advantage program for seniors to help offset the cost of a new entitlement.

Now we have heard over and over that if you have the insurance you like, you can keep it. Have we not heard that? You can keep the insurance that you have. These seniors on Medicare Advantage are not going to be able to keep the insurance that they have. Where does that come from? \$436 billion dollars is the amount of Federal subsidies in the bill that will go directly to insurance companies to provide health care in the exchange, \$436 billion to pay to these evil insurance companies. No wonder they don't mind getting cut out of a little bit of money on Medicare Advantage by providing additional coverage these seniors pay for when they're going to get another \$436 billion. One out of 22, the number of times the Senate has not somehow amended a reconciliation bill passed by the House and thus required further action.

Like I said, these people have been convinced that there is a Santa Claus, a Tooth Fairy, and an Easter Bunny to believe that the Senate is going to take this reconciliation bill that they are sending over. Sixty-three percent is the percentage of physicians surveyed who feel that health reform is needed but are opposed to this sweeping overhaul legislation.

Nine billion dollars is the amount that the Ways and Means Committee estimated Medicare would spend annually after 25 years when it was passed in 1965. To my two colleagues here, in reality, Medicare spent \$67 billion, or seven times the initial cost estimate.

If you believe that this is a deficit reduction bill, then you certainly believe in these people I have mentioned prior. \$1.55 trillion the projected fiscal year 2010 deficit—11 times the 10-year savings that the Democrats claim that this bill will provide by spending more than \$1 trillion for this government health care takeover.

□ 2145

If you think the government is going to be giving things for free, you are kidding yourself. If you think this thing is going to cost what they say it is going to cost, you are kidding yourself. If you think this is going to reduce our deficit, you are kidding yourself.

The American people are smarter than this, and I think our colleagues on the other side of the aisle need to realize this. If they don't realize it now, they will realize it in a very short time to come. This is not going to be behind them. It is going to be in front

of them. I welcome the opportunity to campaign on this issue, alone, which will provide that they have failed to promise and keep the promises that we have made to the American people in this last election.

So I want to thank my colleague from Georgia for doing this. I thank you for giving me the opportunity to come and share this. And, hopefully, tomorrow we will be able to make our case to the American people and to change some hearts and minds of some of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

With that, I yield back.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, my colleague from Georgia, for being with us this hour and hopefully he will be with us for the entire hour, as long as he can stay.

We also have the gentleman from Texas, as I referred to previously, who did the special 5-minute talking about the Texas Medical Society and the way the Governor in Texas and the medical society have written letters to him to share with all of us, Mr. Speaker, in opposition, in strong opposition to the passage of this bill tomorrow. And I would like to refer to Dr. BURGESS at this time.

Mr. BURGESS. Well, I thank the gentleman for yielding and thank him for the recognition.

The gentleman and I spent some time this afternoon up in the Rules Committee, a little hideaway up on the third floor of the Capitol. I don't think the air condition was working today. It is always an interesting time when you get to spend a little time in the Rules Committee. And we heard several people sort of lead off their soliloquies as they were talking and extolling the virtues of this bill and that it is going to try to come through the House tomorrow and they say we are going to go down in history. And I think the gentleman from Georgia said, and it certainly ran through my mind, I don't know if you are going to go down in history, but you are very likely to go down in November.

With that, let me just refer—the gentleman talked about the people who have been here all day around the Capitol. And it has been impressive. And I think back to a year ago, my town halls, people were so frustrated with what they saw happening. They didn't know how bad it was going to get, but they were very frustrated with the direction they saw from this Congress and from this administration. And they kept saying, Well, we want to do something. What can we do? We want to stop this. We want you to stop this. And if you can't stop it, we want to stop it.

And a year ago it seemed like we were so far away from a fall election; but that unease, that energy kept building and building through the spring and through the summer and through the fall. And we saw it here on July 4, when the people came and

camped out on the Washington Mall. We saw it again on September 12 when people flooded to the Capitol to make their voices heard. And we certainly heard it today.

And you might ask, does this do any good, this sort of outpouring of angst and emotion and energy to surround the Capitol with living, breathing Americans who want to press the point of, hey, look. It is supposed to be governed with the consent of the governed—government with the consent of the governed—and we didn't give you our consent for this. We don't want it. We want you to take it back.

So you do wonder if it does any good to have people around the Capitol all day, all of that energy, all of that enthusiasm, all of that pushback against what they see as a very bad health care bill, and I will tell you that it does. Because as we started the day today—we just refer to my little friend from School House Rock. I brought him out earlier in the week.

This is a bill who is on Capitol Hill and one day he wants to become a law. This bill looks mad, and I wonder why this bill is mad. Well, you look at what he is thinking and he says, I don't want to be deemed or Slaughtered. He is referring of course to the Slaughter rule. The chairwoman of the Rules Committee, Ms. LOUISE SLAUGHTER, had put forward the Slaughter rule that said we wouldn't even have to vote on this Senate bill that no one wants to vote on. We will just deem its passage and then send it on to the President for signature.

Well, that is kind of a big deal in this body. It kind of might not really be in accordance with all of the rules laid down by the Founders in the Constitution.

So the bill was mad. He didn't want to be "Deemed or Slaughtered." Well, guess what happened. About the middle of the afternoon up in the Rules Committee—and I don't know if it was because of all the people who were here or not. I don't know if it was because their voices were heard and folks on that Rules Committee felt the heat that was being generated around the Capitol outside; but somewhere or another in the middle of the afternoon, they said, You know what? This guy is right. We will just have an up-or-down vote. So tomorrow, although the outcome may not be what I want, we are going to at least have an up-or-down vote on H.R. 3590, the Senate bill.

I do want to tell people what is at stake here. This bill, H.R. 3590, is a bill that actually originated in the House of Representatives. It was not a health care bill; it was a housing bill, through the Ways and Means Committee, voted on on the House of Representatives floor, went over to the Senate as a housing bill. It languished over there. When the Senate needed a vehicle for a health reform bill, they took up that bill that had already been passed by the House, stripped all the language out of it, just like coring out the inside

of an apple or something, pushed their health care language into this bill, passed that bill in the Senate with 60 votes.

And now that they no longer have 60 votes in the Senate and do not want to go—they had the opportunity to go to a conference committee right after Christmas. They still had 60 votes. To heck with the notion that Republicans were blocking a conference committee. That is a fairy tale. They had 60 votes on December 26. They could have named conferees. They could have gone to a conference committee and done it the right way and tried to put those two bills together and bring that product back to the House, but they didn't want to do that. They wanted to do something smoother or something easier.

SCOTT BROWN won an election in Massachusetts; they don't have 60 votes anymore. Now they really can't go to a conference committee. Their only way forward is to pass the Senate bill or take the Senate bill that has passed the Senate and bring it back to the House. And then the question will be for the House of Representatives: Will the House now concur with the Senate amendment to H.R. 3590?

If the answer to that is "yes," the bill is passed. It does not go to the Senate. There is no further finagling or adjustments on it. It is what the Senate bill is with no changes. That goes down to the White House or the President comes here, it is signed, and within a matter of 20 minutes that bill has become law.

Now, all the people in this House who say, yeah, but I want to tweak things a little bit, I want to change some language here, I want to adjust this some over here, maybe there is something we can do for the doctors over here, maybe there is something we can do for seniors over here—and we will do this in a reconciliation bill that only takes 51 votes.

Yeah, have fun with that. Because you are going to make all of those adjustments, we are going to pass that bill in the House, however it looks it will go over to the Senate. And there is no guarantee that the majority leader of the Senate will ever pick that bill up and even look at it because they don't have to. This Congress was charged with passing a health care bill, and, hey, that happened March 22 on the floor of this House when we passed H.R. 3490.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. If the gentleman will yield back to me for just a second.

I agree with him completely in regard to that so-called "fix it bill," the reconciliation bill. It very likely could ping-pong back and forth forever, and nothing in that so-called fix it bill that maybe many of the Members, Mr. Speaker, on the majority side of the aisle are counting on as they make that difficult decision possibly to vote "yes" tomorrow. That ping-ponging back and forth could result in no

changes to this bill that they vote on tomorrow, H.R. 3590, the gentleman from Texas just described, and that is it. The President will sign that, that will be the law for better or for worse, and they indeed will be stuck with that bill with having voted to support it, Mr. Speaker, and that is what they will have to go back into their districts in this fall campaign right up until November 2nd, and that is what is going to be hung around their neck. And I hope, Mr. Speaker, that every Member in this body understands what the gentleman from Texas is talking about in regard to that.

And I yield back to him at this time.

Mr. BURGESS. An important point is that is a Senate bill. It never went through any House committee. There was never any House input or imprint upon that bill. All of that language was derived over in the Senate. And the House of Representatives, although will go down in history as having passed sweeping health care reform if that bill passes tomorrow, the reality is that is all a product of the Senate. The House will have no fingerprints on that bill but will—but will—have that bill hung around their neck.

Nobody knows what is in that stupid bill, I beg your pardon. Nobody knows the degree and the depth of the intricacies of the legislative language contained therein within that bill. And we will be learning. The press will then suddenly become very interested in this bill, and we will learn in great detail over the next several months how many bad things were hidden within the dark recesses of that 2,700-page bill.

I am going to finish up in just a minute. If I could, I want to just reiterate the letter from Greg Abbott, the attorney general in the State of Texas, in dealing with the issue of constitutionality of this bill. Because if this bill passes tomorrow, then all eyes go to the States, and what are they going to do? Are they simply going to accept this new unfunded mandate from the Federal Government, or will there be some pushback from the States? Greg Abbott has indicated that they have serious concerns with the bill and told me today on a conference call that Texas will be ready to lead when the time comes if this bill is passed.

But just his thoughts on the individual mandate. And quoting from Greg Abbott here: "The individual mandate is constitutionally suspect because it does not fall within any of the normal categories. The mandate provision of 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"—continuing to quote—"In other words, the proposed mandate would compel nearly every American to engage in commerce by forcing them to purchase insurance and then use that

coerced transaction as the basis for claiming authority under the commerce clause.

"If there are ever to be any limitations on the Federal Government, then commerce cannot be construed to cover every possible human activity under the sun, including mere human existence. The act of doing absolutely nothing does not constitute an act of commerce that Congress is authorized to regulate."

And I thank the gentleman for his indulgence, and I will yield back to the gentleman.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas. He is absolutely right. I have the pocket Constitution; I keep it with me all the time. I think my colleagues here on the floor do as well. And he was making reference, of course, to the Democratic majority and the chairwoman of the powerful Rules Committee, the gentlewoman from New York, LOUISE SLAUGHTER, saying that, okay, we have finally decided that we are not going to do the Slaughter solution, that we are not going to do the "scheme and deem," we are not going to try to sneak this by the American people by not having our fingerprints on it. We are going to actually vote on the real bill tomorrow. We will vote on the rule, and we will vote on the bill.

Well, I don't know what caused that change of heart, Mr. Speaker, but I think the gentleman from Texas is very likely right on that. We, the people, all of these folks from all across the country that the gentleman from Ohio on your side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, referred to as "tea baggers," they are the ones that were up here today. And I am sure that every Member of this body and the other body, Republicans and Democrats alike, you couldn't miss them. No matter how hard some Members may have wanted to not walk that gauntlet, they couldn't get away from them. So I think we, the people, had a lot to do with it.

It may be because former Attorneys General Edwin Meese III and Bill Barr said very recently in an article that they fully believe—I believe that article was in the Wall Street Journal—that it is totally unconstitutional according to article 1, section 7. I have it right here in front of me, Mr. Speaker. But for whatever the reason, I think it probably is a combination of both. I thank "we, the people."

With that, I refer back to my colleague from Georgia, the Honorable LYNN WESTMORELAND.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. And I want to thank my fellow Georgian for yielding. And we, the people, are the ones that are going to be paying for these free preventive care wellness screenings. It is the "we, the people." It is those tea baggers, as they were called by the gentleman from Ohio, that are going to be paying for these free government things, much like some of the stuff that we pay for now,

some of the entitlements that are robbing our children and our grandchildren because of their escalation.

But the gentleman from Texas mentioned something about not knowing what was in the 2,700-page bill. And we had the gentleman today talk about that we had this bill for 72 hours now to look at, and that we should know what is in it. I believe it was the gentleman from New York.

Well, you know, we had a three-page motion to recommit today on the floor that the gentlelady from Wyoming offered on a forest or maintaining the forest lands and kind of allows the AmeriCorps, the volunteers to be able to do this, a three-page motion to recommit that the Reading Clerk read. And it talked about that if you were a sexual predator that you would not be able to do this volunteer work; that you would be screened and that you couldn't do it. And I believe the count on the board was 178 Members voted against that. And then, all of a sudden there was 175, and then 170. And then it went on for about 30 minutes, and it got down to where there were only 39 people who voted against that.

Now, that was a three-page bill that was read by the Reading Clerk, and many people had not heard it or not understood it but just knew to vote the party line.

If that is true with a three-page motion to recommit that was read by the Reading Clerk, think what the unintended consequences are in that 2,700-page bill, plus I believe it is a 700-page reconciliation bill, and we haven't even seen the manager's amendment yet.

□ 2200

So that's something that we don't even have. I'm telling you that there's a story about a gentleman—and my colleague from Georgia knows this, that we do a lot of hunting at night down there, and we use dogs. We hunt raccoons. It's a very good sport. A very big sport down there.

There was a gentleman that served in World War II that had lost the bottom part of his leg. He had a peg leg, a wooden peg leg put in. And so he was there with some of the guys and they were laying around the campfire. It was kind of cool. And his leg was a little too close, and it burned about 8 inches off of that wooden peg leg. But all of a sudden the dogs started howling, so everybody got up to run to go follow the dogs. The old Navy veteran got up first and he ran. And he ran about 20 yards and he turned around and said, Watch out, boys. There's a hole every other step.

Well, I'm telling my colleague from Georgia, there's some holes in this bill, and I believe they're about every other step. And so we need to be very cautious of that and understand that I'm telling you there are more unintended consequences than we can ever believe in this bill.

So I want to warn my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, Watch out,

boys, because there's a hole about every other step.

With that, I yield back my time.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, indeed, indeed, there's a hole every other step. I had not heard that story, but I'm very glad the gentleman from Georgia related it to us, because the analogy is perfect.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I referred to the Democratic majority party who did their hour Special Order I guess 30 minutes or so ago and some of the comments that were made. One of the gentlemen made the comment that when they pass—the Democratic majority passes this bill tomorrow, H.R. 3590, if indeed they do, but he felt confident that they would, that he welcomed, Mr. Speaker, the debate as we go into the fall and as we all stand, as we do in every even year, every 2 years, for reelection to the House of Representatives, this great body, that he welcomed that opportunity to have that debate. In fact, he suggested that the Republican Party, our side of the aisle, none of whom will be voting for this bill tomorrow, would be campaigning on how we can win back the majority and do away with everything in the bill, all 2,700 pages of H.R. 3590, and the changes and the manager's amendment and whatever else we don't get to see but get to vote on.

Mr. Speaker, the minority party has had lots of ideas on how to reform the health care system so that we bring down the costs and give I don't know how many million—maybe it's 15 to 20 million people that don't get health insurance because they cannot afford it and they're not eligible. Their income is not low enough that they qualify for a safety net program like Medicaid or the CHIP program, Children's Health Insurance Program, for their families.

And when the President, Mr. Speaker, as you know, and my colleagues know, when he invited both Republicans and Democrats 2 weeks ago to come over to the Blair House and meet with him, I don't know that they realized that it would be 6½ hours, much of it filibustering. A lot of hot air in that room. A lot of oxygen sucked out of the room. But the President controlled it, and he recognized speakers when he wanted to and he made them yield back when he wanted to. But we had so many good ideas presented. And as we go forward and when we do regain the majority, we're not going to strike down every single provision of H.R. 3590. There are things in that bill that I, as a physician member, and many of my colleagues on this side of the aisle agree with and we think that they are good.

The gentlelady from California mentioned the expansion of community health centers. That's a good thing. That's a good thing. Someone else in the majority party mentioned allowing our children to stay on a family policy until they're 26 years old. Many of them, of course, are still in college or graduate school, and, heretofore, insurance companies have required at age

21, maybe in some instances even at age 18, unless they were in school, that these children no longer could be covered under the family policy, and that was wrong. And we're changing that. I'm glad that we're changing that.

So the gentleman from Ohio and others on your side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, I think they misspoke in regard to that. We can, should have worked together and come up with a solution that doesn't cost a trillion dollars, doesn't allow the Federal Government to take over our health care system—one-sixth of our economy, \$2.5 trillion. Goodness knows, the Federal Government already controls about 60 percent of that when you think about Medicare and Medicaid and TRICARE, veterans' health care. For some reason, the Democratic majority and this President are not going to be satisfied until the Federal Government controls it all, lock, stock, and barrel, just like they said they have been trying to do for the last 40, 50, or 60 years. And I said in my earlier remarks, it's no surprise to me that it's had difficulty passing. I don't care how close it came, we the people didn't want it.

And as the gentleman from Ohio talks about, let's tee it up. We're ready. We're ready for those fall elections and we're ready to run on H.R. 3590, and we're going to beat these mean old stingy Republicans.

I want to, Mr. Speaker, give him a little history lesson. Thirty-four Democrat incumbents were defeated in 1994. Thirty-four incumbents were defeated. When was 1994? Well, it was one year after the latest and last great attempt for the Federal Government to take over our health care system. And that was known, my colleagues, as HillaryCare.

Let me just mention to my colleagues a few names, and I think it will be quite instructive because, I think, men and women, you will recognize some of these names who were among the 34 that went into that election cycle, I'm sure, very confident, having voted for HillaryCare and the takeover by the government of our health care system.

Speaker Tom Foley. Speaker of the House Tom Foley from the State of Washington, first elected in 1964. Tom Foley represented the Spokane area for 30 years. Thirty years. This was the first time since 1862 that a sitting Speaker was defeated in a reelection bid. Speaker Foley in 1992, Mr. Speaker, won by 11 points. In 1994, Speaker Tom Foley was defeated by 2 points, a 13-point shift.

Colleagues, Mr. Speaker, does the name Dan Rostenkowski sound familiar? The gentleman from Illinois, Fifth District of Illinois, first elected in 1958. He lost his seat in 1994, despite being a 36-year veteran of this House and chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. In 1992, I say to my colleague, Mr. Speaker, from Ohio, in 1992, Dan Rostenkowski won by 18 points. In 1994, he lost by 13 points. Just a little 31-

point shift. What happened? What happened? We the people decided to put him in the ranks of the unemployed.

I'm not going to read all of the names. Let me just mention one from my own State. Again, 1992. Donald Johnson from the 10th District of Georgia. He was first elected to his first term in 1992. He won by 8 points. He represented my hometown, Mr. Speaker, Augusta, Georgia, home of the Masters. Great area. It's always home to me.

Well, Donald Johnson was one of the last votes for the massive, massive takeover of our health care system, and also, Mr. Speaker, voted for the Clinton increase in taxes. People back home said, Don't vote for that. Don't vote for it and come back and expect us to reelect you, Don Johnson. Don't vote for that bill. But yet I think our former colleague Don Johnson may have been the 117th vote. In 1992, he won by 8 points. In 1994, the gentleman from Georgia lost by 30, Mr. Speaker, lost by a 38-point shift. He was replaced by our great and late, I sadly say, colleague, Dr. Charlie Norwood, who served so honorably in this body until his death about a year and a half ago. He died in office, God rest his soul. Don Johnson wasn't a bad man, Mr. Speaker. I didn't know him personally, but he made a bad vote and he didn't listen to we the people.

Let me mention one other, because I saw her on television earlier today and she was recommending to her Democratic colleagues that they vote for this health care reform, this massive takeover of one-sixth of our economy. She was recommending, indeed, that her Democratic colleagues tomorrow vote "yes" because it was the right thing to do. Well, Ms. Marjorie Margolies-Mezvinsky at the time. Today, I think her name is Marjorie Margolies. She represented the 13th District of Pennsylvania. She was elected in 1992. And it was her decisive vote on Bill Clinton's controversial 1993 budget; it was often argued to be the cause of her downfall. In 1992, she won by about a point. In 1994, she lost by 13 points, and she indeed was the deciding vote. And the people in Pennsylvania said, Marjorie, honey, it's time for you to come on home because you're not listening to we the people.

She said this afternoon on television that she has no regrets. That was 1994. So we're talking 16 years ago. I'm glad she has no regrets, but I don't think she ever intended, Mr. Speaker, to just serve one 2-year term. I don't think a lot of my Democratic colleagues in the majority party, particularly the freshmen and sophomores, had any intention or have any intention of going through the rigors and the expense and the agony and the stress of running to be elected to this House of Representatives to only serve one term.

□ 2215

I don't think so, Mr. Speaker, but that is exactly the fate that is going to

befall them as they listen to some of their colleagues and listen to their leadership and listen to the President of the United States, and they make a decision that maybe the pressure from the leadership or maybe the offers from the leadership are so attractive, the promises, the arm twisting, that they come down here tomorrow, and they forget what we, the people, want them to do, and they make a career-ending vote.

I think it's important that if you don't know your history, you're going to repeat it. And that's why I spend the time talking about—there are many more here that I could mention. But tomorrow is going to be a crucial, critical vote for many Members, and I hope and pray that those who know we, the people, from their district want them to vote "no." Mr. Speaker, I hope they have the courage to do that. And then as long as you're responding to we, the people, you can't go wrong.

You know, when the bill started in the Committee on Energy and Commerce in the House—and I am proud to serve on that committee. I've got a few posters that I would like to share with my colleagues to express to you why it is on this side of the aisle and why we, the people—60 percent, 70 percent across this country—are so opposed to this takeover of our health care system by the Federal Government.

On this first slide, would you just look at the additional bureaucracy that is created as the Federal Government begins to take over. I don't know that in any of the congressional budget scoring that any expense item was assigned to the creation of some 32 additional bureaucratic czars. The health choices administrator, as an example, is every bit as powerful as the Social Security administrator. We talked about today the fact that there are going to be 17,000 new IRS agents so they can peruse everybody's tax return to make sure that they have purchased a health insurance policy. Now not any health insurance policy but one prescribed by the Federal Government. Not maybe a health savings account with a policy that has a low premium and high deductible. But yes, catastrophic coverage that's so popular with our young people because that's what they can best afford. No, that's not going to be permitted. We the people want it, but the health choices administrator is probably not going to allow that to occur.

There will be 32 new bureaucratic agencies and growing all the time. And add to that, as I said, 17,000 additional IRS agents. How did this bill get to the point that we find this at this time? It wasn't easy, I can tell you that. It couldn't get through the Senate until, as I show you on this second slide, many, many political payoffs that are still in this bill.

Remember the Cornhusker kickback? Well, that wasn't taken out. The original bill on the Senate side, this was a special favor granted to one particular

Senator from one particular State, the Cornhusker State. And instead of taking it out, when we, the people, complained, what did the Democratic majority do? They extended the Cornhusker kickback to every State in the Union, so all 50 States will now get this expansion of Medicaid and an unfunded mandate that the States cannot possibly survive with.

The Louisiana purchase. Mr. Speaker, I heard the Senator from Louisiana yesterday on television explaining why she asked for and received the Louisiana purchase payoff—of course, Mr. Speaker, she said it wasn't a payoff. I believe it was in an interview with Greta Van Susteren that the Senator said that, Well, Louisiana has to pay 70 percent of the price of the cost of Medicaid in her State, and the Federal Government pays 30 percent. And that wasn't fair. Well, I was astounded, first of all, Mr. Speaker, to hear that, because it's just the opposite. The State of Louisiana pays 30 percent, and the Federal Government pays 70 percent. And in fact, they've been doing that for many, many years and probably the State of Louisiana pays less into the Medicaid program than almost any other State in the country. Mississippi may be a little bit less. And the reason for that, this FMAP-matching is done based on the average income in the State. So a state that is suffering in poverty, they pay less in the Medicaid program, and we, the people, help them with the Federal match.

Louisiana for many years deserved to only pay 30 percent. But after Hurricane Katrina, Mr. Speaker, I don't know how many hundreds of billions of dollars have been given to the State of Louisiana to help them recover, and in particular in the New Orleans area. They needed it. They deserved it. A natural disaster, mostly through no fault of their own.

But the economy in Louisiana has improved drastically in the last 4, 5 years since Hurricane Katrina and income has gone up. People are making a better wage because of all the construction and all the money that has been poured into Louisiana. And the State of Louisiana and its representatives continue to ask for more. It's like my dad said to me one time, Mr. Speaker, How much more money does a rich person need to be happy? Well, the answer, Mr. Speaker, is just a little bit more, just a little bit more. So I suspect that the ask-fors will never end. But I'm glad—I am very thankful that the State of Louisiana is doing well now, and the average income has gone up. And they are supposed to, by the formula, by fairness, they're supposed to pay a little bit more into the Medicaid program than 30 percent. And yet the Senator insists that, no, that's unfair to Louisiana, and that's what is known now as the Louisiana purchase. It's still in there. Gator aid is still in there. Federal funding of abortion is still in there. And \$500 billion worth of Medicare cuts are still in there.

Mr. Speaker, how in the world can we look seniors in the eye and say to them, We're going to cut this program \$500 billion? What could possibly be the justification for doing that? This program, started in 1965, has an unfunded liability of \$35 trillion over the next 50 years, and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, in the previous hour talked about how cutting \$500 billion out of the Medicare program was going to save the program, even suggesting that that \$500 billion was waste, fraud, and abuse. Yet \$120 billion of it is in the Medicare Advantage Program. Cutting Medicare Advantage 18 percent per year for the next 10 years—and really by 2014, there will be no Medicare Advantage Program.

Why is it that one-fourth of our seniors on Medicare sign up for Medicare Advantage? Because it's cheaper for them, and they get a better benefit. It covers wellness. It covers many preventive screening tests that fee-for-service Medicare does not cover. It gives them an opportunity to have a professional or a nurse practitioner call and make sure that they're taking their medications and they're seen on a regular basis, and yet we're going to eliminate that program. How does that make sense? Mr. Speaker, it doesn't. It doesn't make sense.

So as my colleague from Ohio was talking about, some of the things in this bill that they may pass tomorrow, they may pass with some of the tactics that have been used, like the Cornhusker kickback and the Louisiana purchase and ambassadorship here and ambassadorship there, and you name it and whatever promise, they may pass it. But Mr. Speaker, it's going to be a catastrophe, I think, for our seniors.

Let me just tell you why I think so. And I spoke to the—I call them Tea Party patriots, Mr. Speaker. I don't call them tea baggers. And they're not a bunch of angry white men, as I have heard a lot of folks say. Indeed, the two or three couples who asked me to sign their posters and to pose for a picture with them were African American families. And I was so proud to be asked to do that. I mean, again, all ages, men, and women, white, black, Asian. We, the people, were there today, and I think, Mr. Speaker, they'll be there tomorrow.

But here's what's happening to our seniors, and I had a few minutes to speak to the assemblage of maybe 20,000 people, and I reminded them of the stimulus package of over a year and a half ago. I guess it was maybe February of last year when that massive American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, whatever it was called. But we call it the stimulus bill. I think everybody understands. It was about \$820 billion worth, and a significant portion of that package, Mr. Speaker, was—remember, it was for shovel-ready projects. If the project was not shovel-ready in reference to some of these

construction projects in the various States, then the States couldn't draw down that money from the economic stimulus package; it had to be shovel-ready.

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

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Well, Mr. Speaker, when you're having fun, time really flies. And even when you're not having fun, it flies.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor any time to come speak, to have the privilege of speaking on the House floor. It's been a long day. It's been a long week. I fear there will be longer days, weeks, and years in the future if tomorrow this bill passes, because some of us have seen socialized medicine firsthand. As an exchange student in the Soviet Union, I have seen it back in 1973. I know where this all goes. I've seen where this plays out. And I know that my friends on the other side of the aisle believe their motivation is the highest and the best. I understand that. I understand our friends that are pushing for government control of health care honestly believe the country will be better off if they can only get all health care, health insurance under the control of the Federal Government, and everyone is better off.

□ 2230

I know they believe that, and I know they believe that they are acting in everyone's best interest in pushing for this, but that is not the basis for the founding of this country. And for anyone that has read "The 5,000 Year Leap," I was a history major, I pride myself on being a bit of a historian, and that book gave me an interesting perspective because for nearly 5,000 years when settlers came to a new area and settled down there, they came with basically the same tools. They tried to grow crops and live off the land; and for 5,000 years, there wasn't a whole lot of change.

And then came this incredible experiment brought by people who, like the Pilgrims, came from Holland to England and then to America, people who came to get away from persecution as Christians. And they came here, and after that first horrible winter when the Pilgrims decided to try a new idea and give everybody private property and I live off what you grow, and you can sell or trade what you have left, and this private property concept began to grow and flourish, and free enterprise took over; and in just a few short years, relatively speaking in history, this country advanced more than the whole human race did in 5,000, just in a couple of hundred years. And it was the entrepreneurial spirit was

given a chance to just grow and flourish.

You see what happens when the government takes over health care. In those countries, they meant well. They thought this will be so much better, we will give government-type control choice, and it will be better for everybody. And then you come back to the statistics and we have been told so often that gee, Canada, Europe and England, their health care is so much better than ours. But you compare cancer rates, if you have cancer, you want to be in the United States because your odds of survival are so much better. Why? Because there is liberty and entrepreneurial spirit. There is more ability to take off and develop new things, more research and development right here in this country because of the basis on which we were founded.

My dad was found to have prostate cancer back in the 1990s, and thank God he is still here. I lost my mother in 1991. But if you are found to have prostate cancer in America, you have a 92 percent chance of survival. If my dad had prostate cancer in England, he has a 50/50 chance of living. I know where I would want my father to live.

Now there have been some horror stories that make all of us mad. The example of the lady who was denied coverage when the insurance company knew they should have had coverage, knew they should have provided it and they even had their own internal doctor say, yes, she is covered and you should provide the coverage or she will lose her baby, and they refused to provide coverage and she lost her baby and it went to the Supreme Court. And they said no because the Federal Government passed something called ERISA, and under that law, which is where her policy is, you can't sue for denial of coverage.

There is a provision in here, and I am wondering if that is part of the deal that talked insurance companies, some of them, into buying into this monstrosity. I wonder. But there are coverages that will be covered under ERISA that may not have been covered under ERISA otherwise. As a former judge, those are cases that they filed in State district court. Immediately, the insurance lawyer comes and files for removal, they go to Federal court, and then they get dismissed. You can't sue them under ERISA for denial of coverage. So maybe that was one of the bargaining points for the insurance companies to sign on.

I have seen some of the things that got the pharmaceutical companies to sign on because they were going to force people to buy prescription drugs that they could otherwise buy over-the-counter generic. I have seen those deals.

It has been an extraordinary day. My friend referred to perhaps 20,000. If you look at the area that was filled with people today, and I have heard the park estimates that area, when it is full, is at least 80,000, and that is what it ap-

peared to me to be. It was an amazing day. People want their liberty. They don't want the government to control their health care records. They don't want the IRS to be the extension of the government of the health care that is going to tell them what they can and can't do.

And of course the big news of the week was when we learned that CBO said it was going to cost around \$10 billion to hire around 17,000 new IRS agents because those are the agents that are going to monitor everyone to make sure you are doing exactly what the government in this monstrous bill is telling them to do.

I don't want this. When you look at the survival rates, whether it is cancer or heart disease, it is better here. You have a heart problem, you go have heart surgery, and they can't turn you down because you don't have insurance.

I had a gentleman in east Texas from Canada tell me his father died because he lived in Canada and under the Canadian system, when he was found to need a bypass, they put him on a list where he stayed for 2 years because the Canadian system they had bureaucrats, under their bill, about like this, that moved people in front of him on the list and he died waiting to get his bypass. You don't wait 2 years to get a bypass in the United States.

But there have been abuses. We need to deal with those. We can fix those. I have a health care bill that I filed, and I have got this amended version. I have been trying to get my health care bill scored since last summer. I think so much of Newt Gingrich. He said, Man, you have got to get that scored. That ought to score well, and it could change the whole debate on health care reform because there are a lot of free market ideas that put insurance companies out from between us and our doctors. It tells seniors, you can have your Medicare and your Medicaid if you want them; or, and it is going to be cheaper for the government, we will give you \$3,500 cash in your own debit card account, HSA account, health savings account, you control it with a debit card, and we will buy you private insurance to cover everything above that. There are all kinds of good ideas.

I see friends on the floor here that have brought some fantastic ideas. No one has done more in working to reform health care than Dr. MICHAEL BURGESS over here, but those ideas have been shut out.

I would like to recognize my friend from Georgia who was a member of the legislature in Georgia. He has dealt with these issues. He has been in the debate on these issues and heard hearings on these issues.

I would like to yield to him.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. I would like to thank my friend for taking this hour and for calling and asking me to come help with this hour because I, like the gentleman, have been out today talking to some of the people who have come up.

One thing, Mr. Speaker, that the majority have said to me, Please help us. We don't want this.

I had one lady who came to my office today that has a son that has a condition, and they don't have health insurance. It is her and her husband and her son. They get one unemployment check a month. Their son has \$800,000 worth of insurance bills today, and she said, I do not want this bill. My son has never been denied health care, good care.

Now there was some people, and the night is late, I had some people who drove for 12, 14, 16 hours. And I had one lady who said that they didn't decide to come up until about 2 o'clock yesterday from Georgia. They left their home at 4 and got here at 4:30 in the morning. It is for them that I think myself and my other colleagues are here tonight, to argue for them, because we are not going to change anybody's mind on the other side of the aisle because we don't have the power to change their mind.

□ 2240

I think what has been demonstrated is that if you have the control, if you have the gavel you can offer the deals, as my colleague from Georgia pointed out about the Cornhusker kickback, the Gator aid, the Louisiana purchase. But we have some Members here in the House that haven't been that expensive of a buy. I mean, we've had people fly on Air Force One that all of a sudden got this idea that they needed to switch their vote. I think they would have made a better decision driving around in SCOTT BROWN's pickup truck, personally, than riding on Air Force One.

We've got people that are changing from a "no" to a "yes" that may have a job at NASA. I mean, we don't know of all the deals and all the other things. But we do know that evidently that our Members are cheaper than what the Senators were. We do know that. But we don't understand.

And you were talking, my friend from Texas was mentioning why are the insurance companies for this? He mentioned several reasons. Let me give my friend another one. Four hundred thirty-six billion dollars that the Federal Government is going to be paying these insurance companies in subsidies. That's the reason they're for this bill.

I don't know if the gentleman heard our colleagues from the other side of the aisle that had an hour or so tonight talking about all the free things that this bill is going to give, and not realizing I guess that nothing the government ever does is free. And we need to get that straight. I mean, there's not anything free.

I was noticing downstairs they were talking about the tax credit for homes. They said, come in and apply with us and you get a free calculator. I promise you that calculator was costing somebody something. In the free screenings, in the free preventive screenings, in the free medical supplies, those things aren't free.

Those people that we were talking to today out on this lawn and out on the Mall and out on the steps are the ones that's going to be paying for this. The average American and his tax dollars is going to be paying for it. I've got a list here that I've already read once, and am willing to read it again, about all of the costs that's coming with this bill.

Now, if you had listened to our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, you would think that they believe in Santa Claus and the Easter Bunny and the Tooth Fairy. And that if they pass this bill all the world's problems are going to be solved, that every problem in the world is going to be solved, and our whole problem is going to be solved.

But if you talk to the medical professionals in this country, they'll tell you it's not going to be solved. They'll tell you that our problems are just beginning. They're going to tell you that they're going to leave their practice. I've got doctors that have told me if this thing passes and goes into effect, I will quit my practice.

I want to thank my friend from Texas for taking this opportunity. This is the last special order there will be before we have the vote, the historic vote, on the government takeover of health care. So I think it is important that we understand that we're talking on behalf of the American people, we're talking on behalf of those individuals that took their time and their energy and spent their hard-earned money for transportation up here. We're up here fighting for them. Hopefully, hopefully, they will continue to fight with us.

Because there's only 178 Republicans. And the only thing bipartisan about this 2,700-page bill that's going to pass is the opposition to it. That's going to be Republican and Democratic opposition. That's going to be the only thing bipartisan about this bill. Everything else is a ram-through by the majority that is going to be paid for by the American taxpayers not just in additional taxes, but by all the sweeteners that we don't even know what has gone on to buy these votes that is going to come about tomorrow night.

I hope that people will continue not to give up on us, not to give up on their self, because we don't need to quit. The vote hasn't been taken yet. And to my friend from Texas, and I know you believe in this, but we need to make sure that everybody is in prayer tonight about the decisions that this body is going to make tomorrow.

With that, I will yield back.

Mr. GOHMERT. I thank my friend from Georgia so much. We have also been joined by another Member of Congress, he just has been doing an amazing job, really so powerful. He knows the President firsthand, having debated him back in Illinois in the legislature there. Has great insight himself.

I would like to yield such time as the gentleman from Illinois may use.

Mr. ROSKAM. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I just want to reflect back for a minute and think about a couple of football seasons ago. Remember when the New England Patriots were having just an unbelievable season, just unbelievable, winning game after game after game after game. And it looked like there was just no end in sight. In fact, if you were going to be in the t-shirt business or the tchotchke business or the hat business no one would have thought you crazy if you would have said that the New England Patriots were going to be the Super Bowl champions that year. It was a year or 2 or 3 ago. You know where I'm going.

But there was one little thing that had to happen before the Patriots could get the Super Bowl ring that year. That was, they had to play a Super Bowl. And you remember that. There was a team, the New York Giants, that had a little bit different of a plan. The New York Giants came down and they played that game, and lo and behold the Giants won the Super Bowl.

There is a lot going on inside this Capitol tonight. There is a lot going on inside this town tonight. There is a lot of churn and a lot of burn, and a lot of folks don't know which way they are going to go on this vote. We know one thing for sure: There's going to be 178 Republicans that are going to stand up and vote against this bill. There is also going to be some number of clear-thinking Democrats on the other side of the aisle who either understand fundamentally what this will mean to the country or understand fundamentally that they will run roughshod over their constituents, or for whatever reason are going to come over and vote with us. We just don't know what number that is. So this thing is not done by a long shot.

I was so incredibly encouraged to go out today and to see the folks that were coming out, respectful, solid, clear-thinking Americans. As the gentleman from Georgia said, these folks got up, they drove all night. I got a voice mail from a friend from Illinois. He and his wife were driving all night to get out here. Why? Because they knew that this was the place to be. They knew that this was the time to stand up for freedom.

Ultimately, if you think about it, there is an account in the Bible that I want to take us all back to. We all remember Isaac, Abraham's son, who had two sons himself. One son was Esau, the oldest son, and the other was Jacob. Esau, as the older son in that culture and that time, basically when the old man were to die, Esau, the oldest son, was going to get the lion's share of his father's estate, probably a 90 percent ownership share. Something like that. It was called the birthright.

And as the Bible tells the story, Esau is out in the field and he is hungry. I mean he is really, really hungry. He comes back in, his younger brother Jacob is making a pot of stew. And Esau smells the stew and he says to his younger brother, "Give me some stew."

And Jacob, the younger brother, says to the older one, "Give me your birthright." And Esau, like a fool, said "Yes." Esau traded his birthright for what? For a pot of stew. For nothing.

Now, there's a lot of Americans right now that are anxious. There's a lot of Americans that look out over this economy and this season that we are in and they say, wow, I've not seen this season. I've not seen unemployment like this. I've not seen Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac unravel like this. I've not seen the wheels come off the cart like this. I've not seen it where my children come out and graduate from college and can't get a good job because unemployment has peaked beyond 8 percent even though the White House told me if we spent a trillion dollars that was all going to be fine and fantastic. I've not seen a season like this before.

Ultimately, sometimes there are folks that are listening to that and are feeling that, and are anxious, and they're hungry, and they're fearful, and they're worried. And you know what, they have every right to be. But the temptation—and this is where this group that came in today, these folks that drove overnight, they understand the temptation. And what they are saying and what Republicans are saying in the House of Representatives today, what Republicans are saying in the other body, what they are all saying is, don't take the bait.

□ 2250

Don't give away your birthright as an American for what? For stability? From this town? From this place? Are you kidding? This institution can't balance a checkbook. They can't offer you stability. They can't offer you the hope for your children in the future. Don't take the bait.

And what the American public is saying to political leadership is, Look. We've seen it. We understand it. Yeah. We're fearful. We're uncertain about the future, but we know it's not where that majority wants to take us. We know we don't want to go there. That doesn't end well. That ends in lost opportunity. That ends in calamitous debt that is foisted on our children and our grandchildren.

You know, the gentleman mentioned a couple of minutes ago this IRS empowerment, essentially, that comes as a result of this bill. You think about that. Now, it would be fantastic if the bill really did create more slots, more opportunities for physicians like Dr. BURGESS, for physicians like Dr. PRICE, for physicians like Dr. GINGREY and others. We've got more medical doctors in our conference, House Republicans who are physicians, than ever in history. It would be great if this bill created slots. It doesn't.

You know what it does? It creates slots for IRS agents. Why? Because the Internal Revenue Service is going to be the group, going to be the institution that is empowered if this majority has their way. Think about that. What that

ultimately means is health care areas are going to be sending the functionality equivalent of a 1099 to the Internal Revenue Service telling them who's got the official coverage that Speaker PELOSI has said they need to have.

You got the official coverage, okay. You get the 1099 that comes from the health carrier and it goes to the IRS. But if your name is not on that list and you're a taxpayer, you know what's going to happen? You better come up with some excuse, because if you don't come up with an excuse, do you know who's coming after you? 16,500 new IRS employees, a billion dollars a year, the CBO estimates, \$10 billion over 10 years. For what? For what? For a crushing debt. For an organization to expand authority. And that is absolutely not the direction we need to go.

There are so many reasons to say no, no, no, no, no. This is not what we need to do. And I am so encouraged by the folks who showed up today that said, You know what? We're going to speak out. We're going to speak out. The Republican leader, JOHN BOEHNER, put it best—and then I will close and I will yield back. He said this. He said Democrats may run Washington but the Americans run the country, and that is true.

This would have been done months and months and months ago, but what has happened? The American public has risen up every time. Every time. Every time. Google the phrase "end game," "Democrat's end game." Google that phrase and you will see that they were starting to trot this out at the end of July. Remember? This was all game, set, match, done. Go home. This is going to be done by the August recess. And then one group of people said, No. And that was the American people. The American people said, No. No. We listened, but thank you very much. We don't want this bill. We want you guys to go back to the drawing board and start over.

So the fight is on. This is anything but done. This is anything but finished, and the American public knows it. That majority knows it, because if they had the votes, we would be voting tonight. We would be voting tonight if they had the votes. They don't have the votes yet, and there are still some clear thinkers on that side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, who understand what is at stake.

Mr. GOHMERT. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

You know, the President has been promising Members on the other side, if you will just pass this bill—Speaker PELOSI has been promising people on the other side, if you will just pass this bill, then between now and November, there are going to be things in this bill that kick in that are going to make America love you and want to vote for you in November.

And I was just curious if the gentleman knows what the biggest thing is that kicks in immediately in this bill between now and election time.

Mr. ROSKAM. I have a lot of ideas, but my sense is you've got something on the top of your mind. What is that?

Mr. GOHMERT. The first thing that kicks in are taxes. They kick in immediately. And I know you've dealt with the grass roots. You've been part of the local communities and business community, and the gentleman knows what it is to make a bottom line.

Right now in this economy, can you envision what happens with additional taxes, say an additional 8 percent payroll tax on some of the people you've been hearing from and talking to?

And I would yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROSKAM. It is a crushing thought, actually. Here is the misfortune of this; that there is, in this time in our country, really an understanding that health care does cost too much, and everybody who needs access doesn't have access, and preexisting conditions do jam people up. Those are the things that I am hearing from my district. They say, You know what? That is what we want you to be talking about. We don't want you to be talking about wild-eyed 2,700-page adventures. We don't want to be talking about trillion dollar boondoggles where States in different places across the country, based on political influence, could be manipulating things and cajoling things that you can hardly stand when you hear about them or talk about them with a straight face.

But my district is saying—and I know the gentleman from Tyler, Texas's district is saying the same thing, and that is: Get about the business of fixing this economy. Get about the business of driving health care costs down and, therefore, by driving it down, making it more affordable, and then ultimately deal with preexisting conditions. We can do that. We have a good Republican plan to do that.

But with all due respect to Speaker PELOSI, what she is asking this majority to do—and some of these Members that haven't made up their minds right now—she is asking them to do what you could only characterize as political bungee jumping. Just go right off the bridge. The Speaker hasn't measured the rope. She hasn't measured the rope, and she's saying, No, you all just lean forward. It will be great. Just lean forward just right off that bridge. Just lean forward.

And yeah, I'm sure it looks really good. It looks like it's going to catch. She hasn't measured that rope, and she's asking her majority, unfortunately, to lean over and just, frankly, squander the trust that the American public has put them in.

Mr. GOHMERT. I thank my friend from Illinois so very much.

And, you know, I've been talking to people all over my district, and of course today with tens of thousands of people going through the crowds and hearing from people, talking to people, it has been staggering. But I had a conversation last night before I came to the floor with a gentleman in a small

business. He has under 20 employees, but he was saying, In my 25 years in this business, I have never been so on the bubble as I am right now. I'm hanging on by my fingernails. You put a 2 percent tax on me, much less an 8 percent payroll tax on me, I'm done. I'm out of business, and everybody that works for me is out of business.

And when the number one concern in America is the economy, jobs, and really not just jobs, but careers—we're destroying careers here. They said, Well, people want jobs. No. They need careers. We're destroying them right and left.

Here's an article this week about Caterpillar. They wrote to the President. They said, Please, don't do this. This will cost us a hundred million dollars in the first year. How do you think a company that is in—you know, they're doing okay. They're the world's largest manufacturer of construction equipment, but they have said they're barely hanging on.

The President went to Caterpillar and said they're barely hanging on; we're going to help them. How is helping them putting another hundred million dollar burden on them? That may drive Caterpillar overseas like we have done to so many businesses.

But I'm telling you, my heart breaks for these businesspeople who love their employees that have been with them for a long time, and we're hearing, I don't want to lose my employees. I'm either going to have to close down, have my employees take dramatic pay cuts at a time they sure can't afford it, or I'm out of business. Those are the choices I got.

□ 2300

I appreciate my friend, Dr. BURGESS, a medical doctor, being here with probably more experience in reviewing the alternatives in health care.

I would like to yield him such time as he may use.

Mr. BURGESS. I appreciate the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. ROSKAM from Illinois talked about how the American people want us to fix the economy. And one of the ways we can help that is if we will conclude this discussion we've been having about taking over America's health care system, because I firmly believe that is one of the things that is holding back small businesses across the country that have been having to cut back over the last 18 months. They have been doing what every American family has been doing and say, We will have to make do with a little bit less, maybe we won't hire that extra employee. But they also don't know what we're going to do. Are we going to put an 8 percent payroll tax on them? Are we going to put an \$1,100-a-year energy tax on them? What are we going to do in financial regulation? They are scared to add employees right now in small businesses across the country. And maybe it's only one or two jobs in a location, but extrapolated across the

wider economy, it's thousands and thousands of jobs.

That is the problem with us not dealing with the fundamental problem that is concerning the American people, which is jobs and the economy and being distracted by health care. That is the fundamental problem out there right now with the people. That is the basis for the anger that people are feeling when they see what Congress is doing late tonight and what we are fixin' to do tomorrow, as we like to say in Texas.

Now one of the things that I have heard over and over again, and I have heard the President say it, it is so aggravating to hear, is that Republicans are obstructing this process, Republicans had no ideas to bring to the table, and Republicans could have fixed everything in the last 12 years but chose not to, so now they need to get out of the way.

Let me briefly take each of those points, because it is important for Americans to hear, Mr. Speaker, what has been going on up here this past year. From the standpoint of Republicans obstructing this process, it just isn't so. There are, as the gentleman from Texas said, 178 Republicans. In fact, a few months ago, there were only 177. The arithmetic of the House is if you have 218 votes, you get to do what you say. One hundred seventy-seven Republicans were not enough to stop anything in the House of Representatives unless some Democrats crossed the aisle and voted with us.

And do you know what? That's what started happening. And as a consequence, it's not Republicans who are obstructing this process; it's Democrats. It's a problem they have within their own conference. Why is that? Well, they don't have the popular support of the American people. A poll out just today said 40 percent of the people think we are doing too much and we ought to go back to the drawing board and see if we can't do something more manageable, and 20 percent said we shouldn't be working on health care at all.

Sixty percent, six out of 10 Americans think this is the wrong thing for us to be doing right here right now. So without the popular support of the American people, the Democratic leadership, the Speaker of the House, the President of the United States, the majority leader over in the other body cannot get done what they want to get done. And oh, my God, what is the reason? Those darn Republicans are obstructing us.

Now from the standpoint of Republican ideas, as the gentleman from Texas has said, there have been Republican ideas that have been talked about literally all year long. Now, look, right after the President was sworn in, I was surprised that they didn't come forward with a big health care bill. I was surprised that health care wasn't the number one thing on the agenda because they talked about it. All during

the campaign that's all you heard about was health care, health care, health care. I thought they had a bill ready to go. I thought they had a bill in the works. I thought it would come out of the Senate Finance Committee, the House would simply follow suit, and there we would be, we would have a health care bill.

The fact is if we voted on this health care bill last year, it probably would have passed. The President was extremely popular at that time. Congressional Democrats were popular at that time. There likely would have been nothing that would have been standing in the way. But since they decided to do some other things first, stimulus, cap-and-trade, taking over school loans, whatever else they had on the agenda, because they chose to do other things first, people had a chance to start looking at this bill. And we have heard this story several times tonight. We heard it in the previous hour.

A year ago, I was feeling in my town halls an enormous amount of anxiety, an enormous amount of unease, an enormous amount of energy that was bubbling up to the surface. We want to do something. If you're voting against this stuff, we want to help you. What can we do? What can we do? And people began to figure it out for themselves. They could organize at home and, yes, they can come to Washington, D.C.

So they did over Fourth of July this past year, they did September 12, they sure did in November, and they came back again today. And I couldn't help but think every time I talked to just regular people that were out in the great weather today on the lawn on the west side of the Capitol to hear the speeches and listen to the stuff, they were just regular people from back home who had come up because they were concerned about what they saw happening in Washington. But if it had not been for them, Mr. ROSKAM is right, this bill would have passed in July.

I don't know if people recall that. We had a cap-and-trade bill right at the end of June. After that was queued up and put over the finish line, we were then supposed to take up health care. The bill was dumped into our committee about the middle of July. We were supposed to mark it up over 1 day, 1 day, and then turn it back to the House floor, and we would vote on it and then we would go home for the August recess.

Just take a step back for a minute. You have heard people talk about this all day long. We've been talking about this for a year. We don't need to talk about health care any more. We've been talking about it for a full year. In 1990 and 1991, when my committee, the Committee on Energy and Commerce, marked up a bill that dealt with clear air, the Clean Air Act, they held that markup for I think it was 8 months. My lands, the people in that committee hated each other at the end of that 8 months. But do you know what? It was

the right thing to do, because in the end, it had bipartisan support. In the end, it did get passed. And in the end, it functioned as advertised. But not because they slammed it through, because they did have big majorities back in 1990 and 1991.

It worked because they did it the right way, and even though it was a terribly painful process, and although, again, people on the committee hated each other at the end of those 8 months, still, it was a better way to go about doing major legislation that is going to affect the lives of every American not just today but for generations to come, much better way to do that.

We chose not to do that this year. We chose to ram it through as fast as we could. My committee, which was supposed to do this in 1 or 2 days' time, ended up stretching it out over 8 days. And the reason it stretched out over 8 days is because seven Democrats on my committee heard from people back home during the month of July and they said, Wait a minute, wait a minute. We're getting nervous here. We're hearing all kinds of stuff from back home that people don't like what we're doing. They don't like what we did with cap-and-trade. Now they are looking at what we are doing with health care, and they are saying, put the brakes on. This is going too fast.

Now we didn't end up stopping it in committee. It ended up passing on July 31. But the story is, it passed on July 31. It did not come to the House floor before we went home for the August recess. And then what happened in the August recess? That energy that had been almost palpable in April really, really did bubble to the surface. And we had people in town halls like we have never had before. The little sleepy town of Denton, Texas, early on a hot August Saturday morning I had 2,000 people show up. Later in the day, I went up the road to Gainesville, Texas, up on the Red River, 600 people showed up. I have never had that kind of turnout in town halls. Not everyone agreed with me. Not everyone thought I was doing the right thing. But there was a broad consensus that they did not like what they were seeing with what Congress was doing with their health care.

And you saw it play out over and over and over again across the country. It wasn't just north Texas. It was Michigan. It wasn't just north Texas, it was that way out West, it was that way on the east coast, over in Wisconsin, over and over and over again you saw the scenario replay itself. But do you know what? When I would have those town halls, people would say, we don't trust you with a 1,000-page bill. If the gentleman from Texas would indulge me, remember the good old days when it was only a 1,000-page bill, and he has a 2,700-page bill up there with him tonight? We don't trust a 1,000-page bill. We know you didn't read it. You said you wouldn't take this insurance yourself. Why should we be for that?

But what we are for is some sensible reform. And I heard that over and over

and over again. Yes we would like help with preexisting conditions. In committee, we never had a hearing about is there any way to deal with the problem of existing conditions without resorting to an unconstitutional mandate? I believe that there is. But we never had a hearing on it. We never heard any testimony on that. It was simply, we have to have the mandate because everyone has to have insurance because that is just simply the way it's got to go.

But that's not necessarily so. So what we heard: Help us with preexisting conditions, provide us a little flexibility, and maybe we would like to buy across State lines if it brought the cost down. We would like some liability reform if you don't mind. How about some fairness in the Tax Code so we don't punish the person who is in business for himself as opposed to someone who gets their insurance tax free from an employer. And do you know what? COBRA is awfully complicated and awfully expensive. Could you make that a little simpler for us because people are losing jobs right now, and as they lose jobs, they lose employer-sponsored health insurance. Yeah, you have COBRA where we can make that big payment and keep your insurance, but I just lost my job. I can't afford to make the big payment. And they let their insurance expire.

□ 2310

And then, unfortunately, some major medical crisis may hit, and then they have got a preexisting condition and the cycle repeats itself and repeats itself and repeats itself. These are the things that people told us they want to see.

Now, I do have a Web site, healthcaucus.org. These things that I heard over the summer I have put into legislation, or I have taken legislation that other people have introduced and affixed that to those things that people told me they wanted to see. So at healthcaucus.org, under the issues tab, "Dr. BURGESS' prescriptions for health care reform," you can print that out yourself at home on your own computer, and there are nine things there.

It is not like there is not already legislative language on most of those things, because there is. In fact, if there is a bill number there, I put the bill number beside it. If there is another Member of Congress who has a bill that has been introduced that will cover that issue, I have got their name there and the bill number beside it.

The fact is that there are ideas out there. Some of them are even bipartisan. What a novel concept. But those ideas are out there on paper. We could take them up in an incremental fashion over the next 3 weeks, and we could really be down the road on solving the problems the American people want us to solve.

Instead—instead, it says one-size-fits-all. Washington knows best. Forget governing with the consent of the gov-

erned; we are going to give you this bill. And when we pass it and you find out what is in it, you are really going to like us after all.

I thank the gentleman from Texas for taking this hour. The hours are growing close where this bill will come to the floor for a vote. We are probably getting down to almost the single digit number of hours that remain for America to remain a free country.

This has been such an important debate. I hope people will continue to watch. I hope they will continue to interact with their Member of Congress. Remember, your Member of Congress runs for office every other year. We are people's closest contact with the Federal Government. That is what the Founders wanted. So I encourage people, even though it is late and even though it is on Sunday, this interaction that takes place between a Member of Congress and their constituents is a sacred bond, and that needs to be upheld over this next 24 hours. People do need to let their Member of Congress know how they feel about this. I think that is one of the most critical things that we have been missing in this debate.

I thank the gentleman for his indulgence, and I will yield back to the gentleman from Tyler, Texas.

Mr. GOHMERT. I thank my friend, Dr. BURGESS. And I can assure my friend that it was not indulgence. It is a pleasure and honor to hear someone so knowledgeable about this very issue that is supposedly being brought to a vote tomorrow.

This is big. And if people had heard the President talk back in 2007 and going into this campaign for President in 2008, he made very clear, he has made it very clear that he would sign a bill like this that would be the first step towards socialized medicine. He said this will be the first step.

Canada didn't get there in just one step. You need this step, and then you can transition into full—what is really socialized medicine.

And in his speech today, to encourage Democrats to get on board, he said these words: "This is the single most important step that we have taken on health care since Medicare." Absolutely. Absolutely it is. And that is the step he was talking about 2 years ago, that this is the first step, and then we move into full socialized medicine where the Federal Government controls everything about your health care. It is a huge step. It is a devastating step.

And so you have to think that if there are those Democrats that are still trying to decide between "yes" and "no," you really should think, what is—the President is saying all this good stuff will happen between now and November. Well, there may be a credit here or there, but when my friends that have talked to me about being so close between closing their business, being out of business, and hiring another employee and moving for-

ward, when they get hit with an 8 percent payroll tax and have to go out of business and lay off everybody, or stay in business at a dramatically reduced level and lay off individuals, cut salaries, and those people can't pay their bills and then we lose more mortgages, I don't think people are going to be in a good mood come November.

Now, I know Art Laffer has said—and he is such a brilliant economist—that it is possible that the economy could start improving for one reason, and that is that next January the biggest tax increase in American history will hit, and it will absolutely devastate the economy. So it could be that toward the end of the year, as people start moving to get ready for the massive increase in capital gains and all of the income tax rates that go up, that it may look right before the election like we are starting to have a recovery. Maybe so. But, on the other hand, when you start adding all these taxes now, that changes the equation.

And how our Democratic friends and CBO can tell people with a straight face this pays for itself, when you have got 10 years of income to pay for 6 or 7 years of health care. And then we are told, Yeah, but in the second 10 years it really starts to pay for itself. That has never happened. Do you think Congress is going to sit back and do nothing for the next 20 years and just wait and see for 20 years if things fix themselves?

The Soviet Union didn't get that chance. When they started spending money like this first on the Afghan war and then on the missile defense system, they ran out of money. Nobody would loan them money. They couldn't print it fast enough. They went out of business.

When the President said in his comments these words: "For example, instead of having five tests when you go to the doctor, you just get one." He was being very truthful. Thank God, my mother had many tests over a period of 6 days before they found her brain tumor and she didn't just have one.

I do appreciate the President saying in his speech today the words that, ultimately, the truth will come out. I believe he is right, and it will be devastating for those who were pushing through this government control. And toward the end of his—well, actually there was a lot more speech, but I will just finish with one other mention regarding the President's speech.

He says, "Now, I cannot guarantee that this is good politics." That is very true. You vote for this. I know some people may have districts where they are used to having everything given to them, entitlement districts, and they will need to vote for it because they are used to entitlements. But elsewhere, it is not going to be good politics, and you are looking at the end of some political careers here, unless the President has agreed to give them jobs when they lose their seat.

But you know, this deal with Caterpillar, they are saying they are going

to lose \$100 million in the first year. I have heard about States, like one Goodyear plant in Alabama where the State and local came together and offered \$51 million just to keep the people there and keep the plant open. This bill is going to cost them \$100 million, cost Caterpillar \$100 million. We are going to charge them \$100 million. Do you think companies are going to be able to stay long like that?

And I just want to finish up in my time tonight going back in history, just to remind people before this terrible vote tomorrow. Hopefully, the American people will prevail, people will lose their nerve to force this economy and the health care off a cliff, and then we can come back and we can work together. We can provide real solutions. We have got lots of good ideas. Just let us work together with you to do that, instead of having the President say, as he did at our retreat, I have read all your bills. You know, there is a thing or two. But I have read them. He had not read our bills. He has not read all our bills. We have got lots of things that could be considered.

But you go back to the founding of this country. In 1783, the Articles of Confederation didn't work. They were too loosely woven, no common currency, a lot of problems, so it was falling apart.

In 1787, we had the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia. They talked George Washington into coming back and presiding. He had done what no man had ever done in the history of the world before or since: he led a revolutionary military, won the Revolution, resigned, and went home. He said: I did what you asked.

Well, in 1787 they are telling him: if you don't come back and preside, the 13 States are not going to come back. We are done. The country is over. But all 13 States have agreed to come back if you will promise to preside over the Constitutional Convention.

□ 2320

I mean, what a testimonial for a man—a man of integrity—that he was so beloved. If he would come back, they would come back. They won't come back for anybody else. They knew he was a man who could walk away with power and never look back, because he had done it.

The Convention goes on in Philadelphia. They put blankets over the windows to keep people from looking in and people being distracted looking out, and there was bickering and arguing. It went on and on for nearly 5 weeks. At that point, Benjamin Franklin was 80 years old. He was a little over 2 years away from meeting his Maker, meeting his Judge, meeting his Creator.

Yes, he had sowed some wild oats in his life, and some people thought he was a deist. That's someone who believes God created things or something happened to create things and then that being has stepped back and never

done anything, basically. Well, what some people call a deist today was recognized. He knew he was a couple years more away from meeting his Maker.

Witty and brilliant as ever, he stood up and said these words—well, he started by saying, We've been meeting for nearly 5 weeks. We've accomplished basically nothing. We have more noses than eyes on these votes. Then I want to use his exact words taken down by James Madison. "In this situation of this Assembly, groping as it were in the dark to find political truth, and scarce able to distinguish it when presented to us, how has it happened, sir, that we have not once hitherto thought of humbly applying to the Father of lights to illuminate understanding? In the beginning contest with Great Britain, when we were sensible of danger, we had daily prayer in this room for the divine protection. Our prayers, sir, were heard, and they were graciously answered."

Benjamin Franklin went on. He said, "All of us who were engaged in the struggle must have observed frequent instances of a superintending providence in our favor. To that kind of providence we owe this happy opportunity of consulting in peace on the means of establishing our future national felicity. And have we now forgotten that powerful friend? Or do we imagine that we no longer need his assistance?"

Ben Franklin then went on and said, "I have lived, sir, a long time, and the longer I live, the more convincing proofs I see of this truth—that God governs in the affairs of men. And if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without his notice, is it probable that an empire can rise without his aid? We have been assured, sir, in the sacred writing, that 'except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it.' Firmly believe this; and I also believe that without his concurring aid we shall succeed in this political building no better than the builders of Babel.

"We shall be divided by our little partial local interest; our projects will be confounded, and we ourselves shall become a reproach and by word down to future ages. And what is worse, mankind may hereafter from this unfortunate instance, despair of establishing governments by human wisdom and leave it to chance, war and conquest.

"I therefore beg leave to move, that henceforth prayers imploring the assistance of Heaven, and its blessings on our deliberations, be held in the assembly every morning before we proceed to business."

After that, seconded by Mr. Sherman, it was unanimously adopted, and, from then to today, we have prayer to begin our sessions in here. But, oh, if we could ever come back together as a group and, as the very first Congress did, join and pray together as they did on their knees and come together. As one wrote to his wife, It was such a moving, powerful prayer time, even the surly old Quakers had tears in their eyes.

This is an important time. I thank God for those who have come and made their voices known this weekend. I thank God for the blessings with which we have been enriched, and I hope that people across America will pray to that same God Ben Franklin referred to and that he will move in the hearts of people in Congress that they will do the thing that will bring us together and create a stronger Nation that can survive for another 200 years.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 26 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 0012

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CARDOZA) at 12 o'clock and 12 minutes a.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 3590, SERVICE MEMBERS HOME OWNERSHIP TAX ACT OF 2009, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4872, HEALTH CARE AND EDUCATION RECONCILIATION ACT OF 2010

Mr. POLIS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 111-448) on the resolution (H. Res. 1203) providing for consideration of the Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 3590) 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 other purposes, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4872) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 202 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. LATOURETTE (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of personal reasons.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

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

Mr. HIMES, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, 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. FRANKS of Arizona, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DUNCAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GOODLATTE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CASSIDY, for 5 minutes, today and March 21.

Mr. MCCOTTER, for 5 minutes, March 21.

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

Mr. RYAN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BURGESS, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 14 minutes a.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until today, Sunday, March 21, 2010, at 1 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

6694. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Australia pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

6695. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's report describing the progress made in licensing and constructing the Alaska natural gas pipeline and describing any issue impeding that progress; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6696. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting correspondence from Mr. Chea Mony of the Free Trade Union Workers in the Kingdom of Cambodia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6697. A letter from the Inspector General-Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General for the period April 1, 2009 to September 30, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6698. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6699. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Depart-

ment of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6700. A letter from the Human Resources Specialist, Department of Labor, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6701. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6702. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6703. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6704. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6705. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6706. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of the Army, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6707. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting a legislative proposal relating to the implementation of treaties concerning maritime terrorism and the maritime transportation of weapons of mass destruction; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6708. A letter from the Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's decision not to appeal the decision of the district court in the case of Al Haramain Islamic Foundation v. U.S. Dep't of Treasury (D. Ore); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6709. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's Fourth Quarter Report for 2009 on Settlements by the United States with Nonmonetary Relief Exceeding Three Years and Settlements Against the United States Exceeding \$2 Million, pursuant to Public Law 107-273, section 202(a)(1)(c); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6710. A letter from the Board of Trustees, National Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the Trust's annual management report on its operations and financial condition, pursuant to (115 Stat. 886); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6711. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's statement of actions with respect to the Government Accountability Office report GAO-10-9; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

6712. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting a letter providing additional information on a proposal to implement the settlement of Cobell v. Salazar; jointly to the Committees on Appropriations and Natural Resources.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

[Filed on March 21 (legislative day of March 20), 2010]

Ms. SLAUGHTER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1203. Resolution providing for consideration of the Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 3590) 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 other purposes, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4872) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 202 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010 (Rept. 111-448). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. BUYER (for himself, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. FORBES, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. WOLF, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. PENCE, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. CULBERSON, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. COBLE, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. BILBRAY):

H.R. 4894. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to ensure appropriate treatment of Department of Veterans Affairs and Department of Defense health programs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia:

H.R. 4895. A bill to amend section 1004 of title 39, United States Code, to include that it is a policy of the Postal Service to ensure reasonable and sustainable workloads and schedules for supervisory and management employees and to clarify provisions relating to consultation and changes or terminations in certain proposals; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. MACK, Mr. PENCE, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. AKIN):

H.R. 4896. A bill to authorize the President to utilize the Proliferation Security Initiative and all other measures for the purpose of interdicting the import into or export from Iran by the Government of Iran or any other country, entity, or person of all items, materials, equipment, goods and technology useful for any nuclear, biological, chemical, missile, or conventional arms program; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 197: Mr. ORTIZ.
 H.R. 572: Mr. CHAFFETZ.
 H.R. 1054: Mr. ARCURI.
 H.R. 3186: Mr. HOLDEN and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
 H.R. 3189: Mrs. BONO MACK.
 H.R. 3332: Ms. WOOLSEY.
 H.R. 3448: Mr. GERLACH.
 H.R. 4149: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
 H.R. 4430: Mr. NEUGEBAUER.
 H.R. 4489: Mr. HODES and Mr. DRIEHAUS.
 H.R. 4614: Mr. ROONEY.
 H.R. 4859: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
 H.R. 4862: Mr. FARR, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. BOYD, Mr. HILL, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr.

DICKS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. EDWARDS of Texas, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. FOXX, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. KANJORSKI, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 4887: Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. RAHALL, and Mr. COSTELLO.

H.J. Res. 78: Mr. PETERSON.

H.J. Res. 80: Mr. MILLER of Florida and Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas.

H. Con. Res. 105: Mr. CAO.

H. Res. 989: Mr. DOGGETT and Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.

H. Res. 1078: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. OWENS.

H. Res. 1189: Mr. BARTLETT, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, and Mr. WU.

 CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. SPRATT

The amendment in the nature of a substitute to 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.