



United States
of America

Congressional Record

CORRECTION

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 156

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, MARCH 22, 2010

No. 44

House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 22, 2010.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ANN KIRKPATRICK to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 30 minutes and each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, limited to 5 minutes.

DARK DAY FOR AMERICA

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Yesterday was an historic day in this Nation. The problem for our citizens is that it was historically dark. Madam Speaker, it's raining in Washington today. It's raining because our Founders are weeping. Our Founders are weeping over the incredible vote taken yesterday that was an affront to federalism, an affront to individual liberty, and an affront to freedom. And it's distressing—so very distressing—to so many citizens across

this land because they know there were positive solutions—there are positive solutions—to put in place as it relates to the challenges that we face in health care.

As a physician, I know that when you put government in between patients and families and doctors, it is destructive—destructive to the trust that we hold dear in order to bring about the greatest amount of quality health care in our land. It was distressing on another avenue as well, and that is it was so hyper partisan—the hyper-partisan way in which this vote passed. Madam Speaker, the bipartisan vote on this bill was a “no” vote. The vote was 219–212—all Republicans, joined by 34 Democrats, opposing the bill.

In much of the debate yesterday, we heard about how it was being compared to Social Security in 1935 and Medicare in 1965 and the momentous aspects of those votes. Madam Speaker, it's curious to note that on those votes, the House approved the Medicare bill in 1965 by a vote of 313–115, with nearly half of the House Republicans voting for it at that time. In the Senate, it was approved 68–21, with half of the Republicans supporting it. A major difference between that vote and this vote. Social Security passed the House in 1935 by a vote of 372–77, with four-to-one, or 80 percent of the Republicans supporting it in the House, and 75 percent of the Republicans in the Senate supporting it.

So, Madam Speaker, it is so distressing that this bill had to be so divisive—not just for this Chamber, but for our land. The American people are angry. And they're angry because they don't believe that the bill that was passed yesterday includes any of the fundamental American principles that we hold dear for health care—affordability, accessibility, quality, responsiveness, innovation, choices. All of those are things that we believe ought to be in place for health care in our Na-

tion. All of them are violated by the bill that was passed yesterday and reportedly will be signed into law tomorrow by the President.

Madam Speaker, the American people are angry. They want Washington to listen. They deserve Washington to listen. We are about to be a government that no longer has the consent of the governed. Madam Speaker, that's a very dangerous place to be. So I call on Speaker PELOSI and I call on the Democrats—the Democrats in charge in this House—to end the arrogance of one-party rule; end the tyranny of one-party rule; end what Alexis de Tocqueville over 150 years ago said was the only threat to our Nation, and that is the tyranny of the majority. End the tyranny of the majority in this town right now.

The challenges that we have in this Nation are immense, and they can be solved most beneficially, respecting our Founders and respecting our citizens, by working together positively in a truly bipartisan way and by listening and representing our constituents. I call on the Speaker for positive action for freedom and for liberty and for democracy.

HONORING THE LIVES OF DOUG SHRIVER AND RAY WRIGHT

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

Mr. SALAZAR. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Doug Shriver, who was tragically killed with his friend Ray Wright on Friday, March 19, while clearing snow from the roof of Mr. Wright's cabin above Creede, Colorado. Mr. Shriver was my friend and a tremendously respected member of the San Luis Valley and Colorado water community. He was only 54 years old.

□ 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.

H2175

Combined, both of these men held nearly 60 years of water knowledge related to the Upper Rio Grande basin and State of Colorado. Shriver was on the Colorado Ground Water Commission and served as president of the Rio Grande Water Users Association, an umbrella organization for ditch companies along the Rio Grande. All of these board positions were on a volunteer basis.

Doug's service on these boards put him in the middle of the San Luis Valley's successful fight to keep its groundwater, sought by the American Water Development, Inc., and later the Stockmen's Water Company, both who hoped to sell it to the big cities. At the time of his death, he championed the establishment of subdistricts to further protect the San Luis Valley's groundwater, a concept where groundwater users pay a combination of fees and assessments to retire farm ground and reduce groundwater pumping to protect the aquifer. Shriver was a visionary in the San Luis Valley and Colorado water community. He strongly believed that both wildlife and agriculture could live together, and was a vocal advocate for the rural way of life at the Statewide level. A native of eastern Rio Grande County, he farmed potatoes and small grains. He was also an avid outdoorsman, who loved to ride snowmobiles and four-wheelers in the high country. My heart goes out to his family and his wife Carla.

Madam Speaker, today, I also rise to pay tribute and honor the life of Ray Wright, who was tragically killed with his friend Doug Shriver in the same accident while clearing snow from the roof of his cabin in Creede, Colorado. Mr. Wright was my friend and a tremendously respected member of the San Luis Valley and Colorado's water community. He was 56 years old.

Wright served on the Rio Grande Water Conservation District for nearly two decades, with the last 10 years as president. He was also a member of Colorado's Interbasin Compact Committee, a Statewide board tasked with balancing the State's water needs, and had served two terms on the Colorado Water Conservation Board. All of these board positions were on a volunteer basis.

I served with Mr. Wright on the Rio Grande Water Conservation District board. His service on that board put him in the middle of San Luis Valley's successful fight to keep its groundwater, sought by AWDI and Stockmen's Water, who both hoped to sell it to big cities. At the time of his death, he championed the establishment also of the subdistricts to further protect the San Luis Valley's groundwater.

Ray was also a visionary in the San Luis Valley and the Colorado water community. He strongly believed that both wildlife and agriculture could live together, and was a vocal advocate for the rural way of life. A native of Rio Grande County, he farmed potatoes and small grains. He was also an avid out-

doorsman and angler, who built his own bamboo fly rods.

He leaves three daughters—Suzanne, Sarah, and Lauren—as well as his long-time partner, Mona.

HEALTH CARE DEBATE ISN'T OVER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON) is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. OLSON. Madam Speaker, we had a significant event happen in this hall last night. And I don't have a lot to say about it. I'll let the numbers speak for themselves. Over \$500 billion in Medicare cuts for seniors. Over \$500 billion in new taxes for small businesses. In my home State of Texas, over \$24 billion in unfunded Medicaid mandates. This is not the health care reform that the American people want. They want us to work together and come together in a bipartisan manner to have real solutions for their problems. We want every American to have access to quality, affordable health care. Unfortunately, the majority didn't want to deal with us. But this isn't over. They've got to get it passed through the Senate. There are going to be multiple lawsuits across the country and they're going to have to answer to the American people in November of this year.

I found it very telling at the end of the Speaker's speech last night that she had shifted her conversations from health care reform to health insurance reform. This debate isn't about health insurance reform. It's about giving every American access to quality, affordable health care. And I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to achieve that when this bill comes back to the House of Representatives.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m. today.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer: Father of love, source of all blessings, help us pass from our old life of brokenness and sin to the new life of healing and grace.

May Your word today bring good news to those most in need of Your mercy.

In our service to others and this Nation may we find You in our midst as our saving Lord with redeeming power.

Prepare us for the glory of Your kingdom now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. HALVORSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. HALVORSON 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.

CONCERNED CITIZENS MADE A DIFFERENCE

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, the health care takeover vote last night was a battle in the ongoing war between supporters of limited government and the forces of big government. The fight will continue as we promote limited government and expanded freedom.

I was very encouraged in the last year by the activation of concerned citizens who fought hard to protect the doctor-patient relationship and prevent a Federal Government takeover of health care. Yesterday's outcome is sad for America, but don't think for one second citizens didn't make a difference.

After making voices heard loud and clear at town halls and tea party rallies across the country, voters moved on to the ballot boxes in Virginia, New Jersey, and Massachusetts. Washington liberals may have chosen to ignore the message, but citizens can remind them again soon that they are a force which has awakened to support change in the future.

Please know that while these efforts to protect the doctor-patient relationship and prevent a Federal Government takeover of health care were overlooked by a majority of lawmakers, they are certainly appreciated by the majority of freedom-loving Americans across the country.

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

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mrs. HALVORSON asked and was given permission to address the House

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

Mrs. HALVORSON. Madam Speaker, I want to just say that now that the health care bill has passed and the rhetoric and the politics and the noise can be set aside, now we will have an opportunity to let the American people know about what is in it.

This is going to be about accountability, about choice, and about lowering costs. And now, as we are able to let everybody know what this is about, the American people are going to finally be able to see through all this noise.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Mrs. BACHMANN. Madam Speaker, yesterday was a historic day. We saw the passage of the job-killing government takeover of health care, 18 percent of our economy. But we want the American people to know that today many of us are introducing the identical legislation.

I have introduced already the repeal of yesterday's law, as has my colleague STEVE KING, as will many other of my colleagues today. We will not stand for the Federal Government taking over 18 percent of the health care sector.

From the inception of Bailout Nation in September of 2008 until last night, the Federal Government has taken over an astounding 48 percent of the private economy in the last 18 months. This is unprecedented. We will not allow this to stand. That is why we have introduced this important legislation.

This fall we will take back a constitutional conservative majority, and after the next Presidential election we will repeal this bill.

IT'S TIME TO CHILL OUT

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

Mr. FILNER. My colleagues, it's time to chill out. It's time to chill out. Government takeover of the health care system? Let it go.

The private insurance companies are still in charge. Your private doctor is still in charge. You have the choice of where you want to go, what hospital you want to go to. All we are saying—and I am going to say it to my district. I have got 150,000 constituents who don't have health insurance, and 135,000 of them are going to have health insurance after this bill passes. They don't care what your rhetoric is and your fear is. They're going to have health insurance for the first time maybe in their lives.

Kids who are in college will be able to stay on their parents' health insurance. We're going to put some brakes on the health companies' ability to cut

you off for preexisting conditions or just cut you off if it costs too much.

It's time to chill out, Republicans. Let this bill work. Let our constituents finally get health care.

ACORN IS BACK!

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, they're back.

We've all heard about ACORN, and it seems to me that ACORN is nothing more than a criminal enterprise. Here's why. They've been caught helping undercover journalists open a prostitution ring with underage girls. They've been caught in voter registration fraud scams. At least 14 States are investigating ACORN for voter fraud. Even Mickey Mouse can now vote. Imagine that. And ACORN signs up the poor into their membership rolls. The poor give their bank account information, and ACORN deducts membership dues without the express consent of these individuals.

In a bipartisan vote last year, Congress voted to strip Federal funding from this rogue fraudulent organization. Not one dime of taxpayer money should be spent on this group. However, White House Budget Director Peter Orszag has directed all Federal agencies to open the Federal funding floodgates for ACORN again.

Why did the administration trump the will of Congress and the American people? American tax dollars should not fund this apparent band of thieves.

And that's just the way it is.

HONORING ALEJANDRO AGUIRRE

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I would like to recognize an outstanding individual from my South Florida community, Alejandro Aguirre. Alejandro is the editor of *Diario Las Americas*, South Florida's first Spanish language daily newspaper.

Diario Las Americas was founded on July 4, 1953 by Alejandro's father, Dr. Horacio Aguirre. *Diario* helps inform scores of my constituents on current events and matters that impact our local, State and Federal Governments. Alejandro's dedication and professionalism are evidenced by the quality of each publication of *Diario*.

Since 2009, Alejandro has also been president of the Inter-American Press Association. This organization champions freedom of the press and freedom of expression throughout the Western Hemisphere.

The IAPA has spoken out and shined the light of truth on the dark corners of repression throughout our hemisphere. The group has spoken out against the imprisonment of independent journalists in Cuba. The mem-

bers have also spoken out against the growing decay of freedom in Venezuela.

I want to thank Alejandro for his courage, for his service, and, most of all, for his friendship. The Aguirre family is a shining example for us all.

"IF YOU LIKE THE PLAN YOU ARE IN, YOU CAN KEEP IT"

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

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, we heard just a few minutes ago from the other side that it is time to show the American people what is in this bill. I couldn't agree more. It is high time. So with an acknowledgement to Dr. John Goodman at the National Center for Policy Analysis, let me just run through a few of the numbers.

Nineteen million people are predicted to lose their employer-sponsored insurance. Thirty-three million people, the number of people in traditional Medicare, at risk because of cuts in Medicare spending, according to the Medicare chief actuary.

There will be no tax increases for anyone who earns less than \$200,000, except the 73 million people who earn less than \$200,000 who will see their tax bill rise, according to the Joint Committee on Taxation. A 2.3 percent hidden tax on medical supplies, class II medical supplies, sutures, syringes, needles, some pregnancy tests, a 10 percent tax on tanning salons, according to the reconciliation summary, and a \$60 billion hidden tax on health insurance.

To quote, "The average family will save \$2,500 in health care costs by the time I complete my first term as President of the United States." However, according to the Congressional Budget Office, a \$2,100 premium increase for the average family.

There is a lot more like this, and I will be exposing this over the coming days.

ANNOUNCING THE PASSING OF ARTHUR "JIBBY" JIBILIAN

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

Mr. LATTA. Madam Speaker, it is with great sadness that I come to the well to announce the passing of Arthur "Jibby" Jibilian, a World War II hero.

During World War II, Jibby was a Navy Radio Operator who volunteered with the OSS and participated in the largest successful rescue mission of 513 downed airmen behind enemy lines in Yugoslavia. Jibby stayed behind until the very last airman was rescued on December 27, 1944.

The heroic efforts of Jibby and his fellow OSS officers and the Yugoslav people are told in "The Forgotten 500"; however, they have yet to receive any military or government recognition for their actions.

I introduced H.R. 3496, which honors Jibby with the Medal of Honor. He

said, "I am well aware that the Medal of Honor is not bestowed lightly. However, let me say that just being nominated is an honor in itself. Therefore, I am in a win-win situation."

I will continue working on this legislation to honor this exceptional American with the recognition he deserves.

A TALE OF TWO RALLIES

(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, the national media gave a sharply contrasting tale of two weekend rallies.

A gathering of thousands opposing the administration's health care scheme drew overwhelmingly negative coverage. The Washington Post front page described it as a "hideous display." CBS said the health care debate "turned even nastier at the rallies." ABC called the protesters "angry" and "ugly." A Newsweek correspondent described the protesters as "an angry mob." To anyone there, all these descriptions were obviously untrue.

In contrast, an immigration-amnesty rally over the weekend received positive coverage. The Washington Post said "the festive crowd beat drums and waved American flags." CNN said protesters came out to "support the Obama administration in its next big battle." The New York Times said protesters were there to "vent" and that "most flew American flags overhead."

The national media should give Americans unslanted news, not favor rallies that support their liberal agendas.

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 after 6:30 p.m. today.

END VETERAN HOMELESSNESS ACT OF 2010

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4810) to amend title 38, United States Code, to make certain improvements in the services provided for homeless veterans under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.
The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4810

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 "End Veteran Homelessness Act of 2010".

SEC. 2. INCREASE IN AMOUNT AUTHORIZED TO BE APPROPRIATED FOR COMPREHENSIVE SERVICE PROGRAMS FOR HOMELESS VETERANS.

Section 2013 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking "fiscal year 2007" and inserting "fiscal year 2010"; and

(2) by striking "\$150,000,000" and inserting "\$200,000,000".

SEC. 3. IMPROVEMENT OF PAYMENTS FOR PROVIDING SERVICES TO HOMELESS VETERANS.

(a) IMPROVEMENT OF PAYMENTS.—Section 2012 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking "per diem" wherever it appears;

(2) in subsection (a)(2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking "daily cost of care" and inserting "annual cost of furnishing services"; and

(ii) by striking the second sentence;

(B) by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following new subparagraph (B):

"(B) The Secretary shall annually adjust the rate of payment under subparagraph (A) to reflect anticipated changes in the cost of furnishing services and to take into account the cost of providing services in a particular geographic area. The Secretary may set a maximum amount payable to a grant recipient under this section.";

(C) in subparagraph (C), by striking "other sources of income" and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting "the cost of services provided by the grant recipient as the Secretary may require to assist the Secretary in making the determination under subparagraph (A)";

(D) by striking subparagraph (D) and inserting the following new subparagraph (D):

"(D) In making the determination under subparagraph (A), the Secretary may consider the availability of other sources of income, including payments to the grant recipient or eligible entity for furnishing services to homeless veterans under programs other than under this subchapter, payments or grants from other departments or agencies of the United States, from departments or agencies of State or local governments, or from private entities or organizations."; and

(E) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

"(E) The Secretary shall authorize payments under this subsection to each grant recipient on an annual basis but shall make a payment to each grant recipient for each calendar quarter in an amount equal to a portion of the annual amount authorized for such recipient. Upon the expiration of a calendar quarter, each grant recipient shall provide to the Secretary a statement of the amount spent by the recipient during that calendar quarter, and if the amount spent is less than the amount provided for that calendar quarter, repay to the Secretary the balance. If the amount spent by a grant recipient for such purpose for a calendar quarter exceeds the amount provided to the recipient for that quarter, the Secretary shall make an additional payment to the recipient in an amount equal to the amount by which the amount so spent exceeded the amount so provided, as long as the total amount provided to such recipient in a calendar year does not exceed the amount of the annual payment for that recipient.";

(3) in subsection (a), by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following new paragraph (3):

"(3) Payments under this subsection to a grant recipient or eligible entity may be

used to match, or in combination with, other payments or grants for which the recipient or entity is eligible."; and

(4) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking paragraph (2); and

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

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) SECTION HEADING.—The section heading for such section is amended to read as follows:

"§ 2012. Payments for furnishing services to homeless veterans".

(2) SUBSECTION HEADING.—The heading for subsection (a) of such section is amended by striking "PER DIEM".

(3) TABLE OF SECTIONS.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 20 of such title is amended by striking the item relating to section 2012 and inserting the following new item:

"2012. Payments for furnishing services to homeless veterans.".

SEC. 4. SUPPORTED HOUSING PROGRAM OUTREACH.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 20 of title 38, United States Code, is further amended by adding at the end of subchapter III the following new section:

"§ 2024. Supported housing program outreach

"(a) LANDLORD OUTREACH.—(1) The Secretary shall ensure that each medical center of the Department that provides treatment and services under the supported housing program under section 8(o)(19) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)(19)) employs or provides (through coordination with a public housing agency, homeless service provider, or other appropriate organization) one or more specialists, which may include peer specialists who were formerly homeless veterans, for handling housing issues in conjunction with the program under this subsection.

"(2) Such specialists shall conduct outreach to landlords to encourage and facilitate participation in the supportive housing program, mediate disputes between veterans receiving assistance under such program and landlords, establish and maintain a list of dwelling units available for rental with assistance under such program, and carry out other appropriate activities.

"(b) HOMELESSNESS PREVENTION AND RAPID RE-HOUSING ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary shall coordinate with the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to provide assistance to homeless veterans in accessing the Homelessness Prevention and Rapid Re-Housing Program administered by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development for assistance for basic essentials, security deposits for rental dwelling units, and advance payments of the first month's rent for such units."

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end of the items relating to subchapter III the following new item:

"2024. Supported housing program outreach."

SEC. 5. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS PROGRAM TO PROVIDE FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR SUPPORTIVE SERVICES FOR VERY LOW-INCOME VETERAN FAMILIES IN PERMANENT HOUSING.

Section 2044(e) of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by adding at the end the following new subparagraphs:

"(D) \$50,000,000 for fiscal year 2012.

"(E) \$75,000,000 for fiscal year 2013.

"(F) \$100,000,000 for each subsequent fiscal year."; and

(2) in paragraph (3), by striking “each of the fiscal year 2009 through 2011” and inserting “each fiscal year”.

SEC. 6. PROMOTION OF AWARENESS OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS PROGRAMS TO ASSIST HOMELESS VETERANS AMONG HOMELESS WOMEN VETERANS AND HOMELESS VETERANS WITH CHILDREN.

Section 532 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting after “homeless veterans” the following: “(with a special emphasis on promoting awareness of such assistance among homeless women veterans and homeless veterans with children)”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) each will control 20 minutes each.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

□ 1415

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

Madam Speaker, this is the first of a series of six pieces of legislation that will benefit our Nation's veterans. This Congress, and certainly this committee, has been concerned with these veterans in our daily work, and we are proud to present these items which will help prevent veterans' homelessness, protect National Guard employment, help veterans keep their home, give veterans a cost-of-living adjustment.

Before I begin on this package, Madam Speaker, I just would like to briefly comment on a little item that came up yesterday during the debate on health care.

One of our veterans service organizations and the ranking member of our committee claimed that the bill that we would pass would hurt veterans' health care. I just want to point out on behalf of all the Chairs on this side of the aisle, all the legal opinions that have been made, veterans' health care is not affected by the health care bill that we passed. All the benefits will be retained. Nobody will be penalized for being part of the veterans health care system or any other part of veterans health benefits.

Congress actually received a letter yesterday from the Vietnam Veterans of America which said: “It is unfortunate that some continue to raise what is now even more clearly a false alarm that is apparently meant to frighten veterans and their families in order to prompt them to oppose the pending legislation. While there is a legitimate debate as to whether or not the pending health care measure should become law, Vietnam Veterans of America does not appreciate spreading rumors that are not accurate by any political partisan from any point of the political spectrum.”

I just want to allay any fears that veterans have about this health care legislation. And certainly our committee, should anything arise that was unintended, we will move quickly to make sure that veterans health care is kept at a high quality and no one is penalized for having veterans health care

in this country. So I want to point that out, Madam Speaker.

Now, to get back to the bill we have, H.R. 4810, under consideration. Almost half the homeless on the street tonight, Madam Speaker, are veterans—anywhere from 150,000 to 200,000. This is a national disgrace. It is our national disgrace. It's been an issue that I have been working on since I came to Congress when I joined the Committee on Veterans' Affairs almost 18 years ago. Now that the Democrats have the majority, we want to put forward a plan, as our Secretary of Veterans' Affairs has announced, a plan to end veterans' homelessness within 5 years. Zero tolerance. That's going to be our policy.

Today we have the opportunity to take bold action to combat homelessness, but, as I said, we have a willing and eager administration to make sure that we achieve this goal. President Obama and his Secretary of Veterans' Affairs have, as I said, pledged to end homelessness over the next 5 years. Our Secretary has committed to expanding proven programs and launching innovative services to prevent veterans from falling into homelessness.

This bill before us, H.R. 4810, does three important things to provide the administration with the necessary tools to combat homelessness:

First, the bill would provide additional funding for the Grant and Per Diem Program, which provides grants to community agencies so they can, in turn, provide transitional housing, health services, and other supportive services to homeless veterans. Providing needed resources to the local agencies that care for our homeless veterans is just one way our grateful Nation can support the vital and compassionate work performed in communities all across the country.

Second, this bill helps low-income veteran families who are occupying permanent housing from becoming homeless by extending powerful and effective support services. Examples of these services include outreach, case management, and assistance in obtaining benefits from the VA, as well as public benefits from State and local agencies.

Finally, H.R. 4810 helps the increasing number of female veterans who end up being homeless. This is especially magnified for our women veterans coming home from Iraq and Afghanistan, who are four times more likely to become homeless than their male counterparts. My bill would direct the Department of Veterans Affairs to focus outreach efforts on homeless women veterans and homeless veterans with children.

This powerful bill is the result of significant work by the entire committee. I would like to thank the chairman of our Subcommittee on Health, MIKE MICHAUD from Maine, and Ranking Member HENRY BROWN from South Carolina for the bipartisan leadership they demonstrated on this bill. I'd also like to recognize the important con-

tributions of our colleagues HARRY TEAGUE of New Mexico, CIRO RODRIGUEZ of Texas, and PHIL HARE of Illinois. Each of these Members are true advocates for homeless veterans and introduced legislation helping homeless veterans that are now key provisions of this bill. I'd also like to thank our staff from the Health Committee, especially our staff director, Cathy Wiblemo, who has worked so hard on this legislation for such a long time.

There are hundreds of thousands of servicemembers returning from Iraq and Afghanistan. It is our duty as a Nation, when we put our men and women in harm's way, to care for them when they return. We must also live up to the promise to honor the service and sacrifices of our veterans from previous conflicts. This is an opportunity today, Madam Speaker, to make a difference in the lives of veterans who are sleeping in cars, looking for public housing, searching for relief, and feeling helpless.

I urge all of our colleagues to pass H.R. 4810 to provide the help and support that our homeless veterans need and deserve.

I would reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. STEARNS. I would say to the chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, Mr. FILNER, he just did a 1-minute where he said, Let it go, let it go. So I'm a little surprised he's bringing up the health care bill and talking about it prior to these six wonderful bills we're going to pass on Veterans' Affairs. But since he brought it up, I think it's probably appropriate that I return with our side of this issue, because, as he pointed out, last night the House of Representatives passed the Senate bill, which was the government setting up exchanges—which these exchanges include taxes, they include mandates and regulation, and it's phased in over a number of years to 2014. But there are some problems, frankly, with that bill. If there were no problems, then IKE SKELTON, who's chairman of the Armed Services Committee, would not have brought it up 2 days ago, sort of furiously to try to get it in, because he voted against the health care bill.

So the chairman of the Armed Services Committee voted against the Senate health care bill last night. The day before that, he brought up the idea that we have to protect DoD veterans who are on TRICARE. That's probably one of the flaws in the bill that's being sent to the President. It has some serious ramifications for our military and dependents under TRICARE, Madam Speaker, for veterans' widows, orphans, and for children suffering from spina bifida as a result of a parent's exposure to Agent Orange during the wars in Korea and Vietnam. As deputy ranking member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I joined with Ranking Member STEVE BUYER, of our committee, and Armed Services Committee Ranking Member BUCK MCKEON to introduce

H.R. 4894 to protect the Department of Defense and the VA beneficiaries.

So I'm a little surprised that the Democrat leadership didn't take up our bill. Instead, they passed a more limited bill introduced by, as I mentioned, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, IKE SKELTON, which, after reading it, provides limited protection for TRICARE beneficiaries but not the DOD and VA health care systems and the VA health care benefits. Moreover, I was also surprised to learn from the Congressional Budget Office there could be a cost associated with our bill, the \$4.4 billion, so-called, for the cost of our bill. I'm an original cosponsor.

So what are the implications for these beneficiaries? Simply, it means that the government takeover of health care could result in a savings of \$4.4 billion made on the backs of servicemembers, widows, and orphans, and children suffering from spina bifida as a result of a parent's exposure to Agent Orange. I don't think the public realizes that. So I think it's important to get this information out, and I'm hopeful that we can solve this problem.

Over the weekend, there were a lot of claims made that there is no problem for TRICARE and VA health care beneficiaries under the Senate health care bill that was passed by the Democrats yesterday. Well, frankly, there is, and it's a big problem. As I mentioned earlier, Madam Speaker, if it wasn't a problem, then IKE SKELTON, the Armed Services Committee chairman, would not have been here 2 days ago trying to offer a scaled-down bill to correct the problem. He would not have taken his own bill, H.R. 4887, to the floor in a quick effort to solve this issue.

So it's important to reiterate that this bill does not protect the DOD and VA health care systems. It doesn't fully address TRICARE either, as a result of the CBO score of H.R. 4887. The Ike Skelton bill does not stop \$4.5 billion from being cut from TRICARE, but we think ours will. The veterans service organizations know what is happening. The American Legion, the VFW, DAV, and the National Association of Uniformed Services have all supported our bill, H.R. 4894, which they believe will protect veterans.

So, Madam Speaker, I hope that the House Democrat leadership will see fit to act as soon as possible to allay the fears of all these veteran service organizations as soon as possible to correct the measure with H.R. 4894, to stop these cuts and to protect the individuals and their families who have served and sacrificed on behalf of our Nation and, I might add, to allay the fears of men at war who think when they come back they will retire or possibly be under Champus/VA.

With those comments, let me then move to the bill that we're considering. I rise in support of H.R. 4810, End Veteran Homeless Act of 2010.

Now, my colleagues, this bill would amend Title 38 of the United States Code to make certain improvements in

the services provided for homeless veterans. This important legislation represents a combination of a number of bills that moved through the Veterans' Affairs Committee, and I believe truly exemplifies the manner in which our committee can and does work together in a bipartisan fashion to bring forth legislation that improves the lives of our veterans.

It is with a deep and personal commitment that I and everybody else on the Veterans' Affairs Committee embrace and aggressively want to tackle the challenge of homelessness and veterans and forward our mutual goals of ending this chronic problem among our veterans.

Since the enactment of the Homeless Veterans Comprehensive Assistance Act back in 2001, which significantly expanded the VA's homeless program, we've seen a significant number of previously homeless veterans returning to leading productive and sober lives. H.R. 4810 continues that proactive approach by permanently extending a VA program that provides grants to entities that help low-income families that are homeless, transitioning to permanent housing, or already in permanent housing; increasing the annual amounts authorized for VA's Homeless Grant and Per Diem Program from \$150 million to \$200 million; and encouraging the VA to expand its promotion for homeless veterans to include programs for homeless veterans that are female or that have children.

VA's latest estimate indicates that about 107,000 veterans were homeless on any one given night last year. With the unemployment rate for veterans from Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom aged 18 to 24 standing at a staggering 21.1 percent, more simply must be done to ensure that our veterans come home not to joblessness and homelessness, but to supportive communities and meaningful employment.

□ 1430

I recently had the pleasure of participating in the grand opening of the new HONOR—Hope, Opportunities, Networking, Outreach, and Recovery—Center in my congressional district in Gainesville, Florida. This newly renovated comprehensive VA homeless center includes a 45-bed domiciliary to care for disabled and homeless veterans with special medical needs. The HONOR Center will also have program offices for outreach, grant and per diem, and other essential services, including a special area that's designated just for women. The HONOR Center will provide a full continuum of care and a homelike environment and will provide homeless veterans with family-style dining and special recreation areas including a nice library with a meditation room and a full-time recreational therapist.

The HONOR Center has been in development for nearly 3 years, and I was very pleased and proud to see such a

wonderful resource for homeless veterans open in my congressional district in Gainesville, Florida.

So, Madam Speaker, H.R. 4810, the End Veteran Homeless Act, is one important step in achieving our goal of eliminating homelessness among veterans. But still, my colleagues, it is only one step. While I support its passage, I look forward to continuing to work hard in the future to make sure America's veterans are welcomed back from service with open arms, good jobs, and happy and healthy homes.

Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time. I would like to thank Chairman FILNER and Ranking Member BUYER, who unfortunately couldn't be here this morning, of the Veterans' Affairs Committee as well as Chairman MICHAUD and Ranking Member BROWN of the Subcommittee on Health for bringing this bill forward. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4810 and do their part to ensure that not a single one of the brave men and women who fight in uniform to defend our rights come home to a life without a job and a home.

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

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, a famous President once said: "We have nothing to fear but fear itself." The deputy ranking member—I didn't know we had such a title—is spreading fear, and I would just like to make it clear to every veteran, every family of veterans, and all Americans, there will be no reduction of any benefits of any veteran in the veterans health care system. There will be no taxes. There will be no diminution of services. Let's just make that clear.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 4810.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FILNER. I urge my colleagues to unanimously support the bill. I have no further requests for time and yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4810.

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. FILNER. 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.

NATIONAL GUARD EMPLOYMENT
PROTECTION ACT OF 2010

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1879) to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for employment and reemployment rights for certain individuals ordered to full-time National Guard duty, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1879

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 “National Guard Employment Protection Act of 2010”.

SEC. 2. REEMPLOYMENT RIGHTS FOLLOWING CERTAIN NATIONAL GUARD DUTY.

(a) REEMPLOYMENT RIGHTS.—Section 4312(c)(4) of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “or” at the end of subparagraph (D);

(2) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (E) and inserting “; or”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(F) ordered to full-time National Guard duty under the provisions of section 502(f) of title 32 when the period of duty is expressly designated in writing by the Secretary of Defense as covered by this subparagraph.”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Subparagraph (F) of section 4312(c)(4) of title 38, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), shall apply with respect to an individual ordered to full-time National Guard duty under section 502(f) of title 32, United States Code, on or after September 11, 2001, and shall entitle such individual to rights and benefits under chapter 43 of title 38 of such Code on or after that date.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

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

I would like to thank Congressman MIKE COFFMAN of Colorado who is here with us for introducing the National Guard Employment Protection Act of 2010. One of the protections provided by the Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act, or USERRA, is to require employers to support a servicemember’s absence for up to 5 years if called to active military duty. At the time when USERRA was enacted into law back in 1994, Congress intended to minimize the disruption to the lives of servicemembers as well as to their employers and prohibit discrimination against persons because of their service in the military.

Unfortunately, current statute does not provide National Guard members who are ordered to full-time active duty with the same protections. This is especially disheartening at a time when our Guard is called up to active duty in support of missions to secure the homeland or provide relief abroad. And of course since 9/11, the Guard has been doing almost half of the fighting

in Iraq and Afghanistan. Many of them are bumping against the 5-year USERRA protection for their civilian jobs, and H.R. 1879 seeks to address this inequity and extend reemployment rights for those ordered to full-time National Guard duty.

Congressman HARRY TEAGUE of New Mexico worked with Congressman COFFMAN to add a provision to allow the Secretary of Defense to designate which duties qualify. So I would like to thank the gentleman from Colorado and the gentleman from New Mexico for their bipartisan efforts on this important bill. It is time, Madam Speaker, that Congress ensures that members of the National Guard are afforded the employment protections they deserve. I urge all my colleagues to join me in support of this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1879, as amended.

This bill amends title 38 United States Code to provide for employment and reemployment rights for certain individuals ordered to full-time National Guard duty. Madam Speaker, it’s well known that the National Guard and Reserve units have carried a significant load in the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. Many of these units have served multiple combat tours, and others have provided homeland security services, such as maintaining an airborne alert here in the D.C. area. Additionally, Guard units have performed heroically at times when natural disasters like Hurricane Katrina devastated New Orleans.

As a result of these demands, many of the members of the Guard have accumulated significant active duty time and are now in danger of exceeding the 5-year limit on active duty that is protected under the Uniform Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act, or USERRA. So I’m pleased that our colleague MIKE COFFMAN from Colorado has taken the action to recognize that active duty performed under title 32 should be added to the types of duties exempted from the 5-year limit. I also thank Chairman HERSETH SANDLIN and Ranking Member BOOZMAN of the Subcommittee on Economic Opportunity for their bipartisan work, as well as Chairman FILNER for bringing this bill to the floor.

With that, Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to Mr. COFFMAN, a fellow veteran who served in the Army and the Marines in the first gulf war and second gulf war in Iraq.

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. I thank the gentleman from Florida.

Madam Speaker, I am proud to stand before you today in strong support of H.R. 1879, the National Guard Employment Protection Act. I created this legislation in order to extend the same reemployment rights for all of our National Guard personnel regardless of whether they are assigned to a homeland security mission or deployed over-

seas to Iraq or Afghanistan. Under current law, the members of the National Guard who are called up for active duty in support of homeland security missions inside the United States are not provided the same reemployment rights to their civilian occupations that other members of the National Guard and Reserve have when they are called to active duty for overseas military assignments.

There is no doubt that the soldiers and the airmen serving in the National Guard must have the same reemployment rights irrespective of where they are ordered to serve. The bill recognizes that those who are called up for homeland security missions can face the same hardships and challenges in trying to return to their civilian employment as someone who has been away from their civilian occupation due to an overseas military assignment.

With the passage of H.R. 1879, National Guard members will no longer have to worry about being put into a position where they are forced to choose between retaining their civilian employment or serving our Nation in a critical homeland security mission.

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1879, as amended, the National Guard Employment Protection Act of 2010.

I have no further requests for time, so I yield back the balance of my time.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1879, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FILNER. I want to urge everybody to support this important legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1879, 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. FILNER. Madam Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair’s prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

RECOGNIZING THE 65TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BLINDED VETERANS ASSOCIATION

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 80) recognizing and honoring the Blinded Veterans Association on its 65th anniversary of representing blinded veterans and their families.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H. J. RES. 80

Whereas, at 8:45 a.m. on March 28, 1945, 100 blinded members of the Armed Forces who served in World War II formed the Blinded Veterans Association at Avon "Old Farms" Army Convalescent Hospital in Connecticut;

Whereas the founders of the Blinded Veterans Association were a cross-section of heroes and pioneers who not only shaped the rich history, philosophy, and knowledge of education and rehabilitation of the blind, but also provided insight into current and future challenges facing the blind and engaged in continual advocacy efforts to ensure that services for all blinded persons would be unique and specialized;

Whereas, on March 28, 2010, the Blinded Veterans Association will mark its 65th anniversary of dedication to blinded members of the Armed Forces, veterans, and their families;

Whereas in 1946, General Omar Bradley, of the Veterans Administration, appointed the Blinded Veterans Association as the first official representative for blinded veterans for the filing of claims and appeals to the Veterans Administration, making the Blinded Veterans Association only the eighth veterans service organization to receive such authorization;

Whereas the Blinded Veterans Association was originally incorporated in New York State as a nonprofit association, and then moved to Washington, DC, in 1947;

Whereas in 1958, the 85th Congress approved the Congressional Charter for the Blinded Veterans Association;

Whereas from its early beginnings, the Blinded Veterans Association encouraged the blinded veterans it served "to take their rightful place in the community with their fellow men and work with them toward the creation of a peaceful world", and it has continued to advocate for the war-blinded to regain independence, confidence, and self-esteem through rehabilitation and training; and

Whereas many people of the United States recognize March 28 of each year as Blinded Veterans Day; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress—

(1) expresses appreciation for the efforts of the Blinded Veterans Association in improving the rehabilitation services, education, and benefits for blinded veterans of the United States;

(2) supports the goals and ideals of Blinded Veterans Day; and

(3) calls upon the people of the United States to observe Blinded Veterans Day with appropriate programs and activities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 80, recognizing and honoring the Blinded Veterans Association on its 65th anniversary of representing blinded veterans and their families, sponsored by Mrs. HALVORSON of Illinois. Mrs. HALVORSON, as a first-term Member, has been incredibly active and committed to veterans on our committee.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois to further explain the bill.

Mrs. HALVORSON. I thank Chairman FILNER for yielding.

Madam Speaker, it was truly a privilege to introduce H.J. Res. 80, which recognizes and honors the Blinded Veterans Association on its 65th anniversary. Madam Speaker, this simple resolution helps to honor the service and sacrifice of the more than 165,000 blind or visually impaired veterans.

The resolution helps us to remember that on March 28, 1945, 100 blinded members of the Armed Forces who served in World War II formed the Blinded Veterans Association in order to help veterans and their families meet and overcome the challenges of blindness. The following year, in 1946, General Omar Bradley of the Veterans Administration, appointed the BVA as the first official representative for blinded veterans for the filing of claims and appeals to the Veterans Administration. This made the Blinded Veterans Association only the eighth Veterans Service Organization to receive such distinction and responsibility.

In 1958, Congress followed General Bradley's lead and echoed his recognition of the BVA by officially approving the BVA congressional charter. Since that time, the BVA has encouraged and assisted blinded veterans to take their rightful place in the community with their fellow men and work with them towards the creation of a peaceful world.

□ 1445

Their leadership continues to advocate for the war-blinded to regain independence, confidence and self-esteem through rehabilitation and training. Almost 13 percent of the evacuated wounded servicemembers in Iraq and Afghanistan have suffered a serious eye injury of one type or another. This means that the Blinded Veterans Association's services are just as crucial today as they were 65 years ago.

H.J. Res. 80 recognizes the extraordinary members and work of the BVA, and the good that they do for America's visually impaired veterans. I thank the members of the BVA for their service and strongly encourage my colleagues to do the same by voting in favor of this resolution.

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

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, not only does the BVA provide support for our Nation's blind veterans, the organi-

zation also provides inspiration and support for their family members via the Kathern F. Gruber Scholarship Awards. This worthy scholarship enables spouses and dependent children of blinded veterans to achieve their goals in higher education.

Our blinded veterans have made tremendous sacrifices on behalf of our Nation to ensure our safety and our freedom. It is altogether appropriate that we honor them this day and join the Blinded Veterans Association in celebrating its 65th anniversary.

Obviously I am a strong supporter of H.J. Res. 80, a resolution to recognize and honor the Blinded Veterans Association on its 65th anniversary of representing blinded veterans and their families. As all of us know, recovering from the tragic loss of sight is a traumatic and life-changing event. Veterans who are burdened with this loss are forced to relearn almost every task associated with normal daily activities. Such rehabilitation is a difficult but necessary challenge blinded veterans must overcome to integrate back into civilian life. The Blinded Veterans Association was established specifically to help these severely injured veterans and their families during this most difficult period.

On March 28, 1945, 100 blinded members of the Armed Forces who served in World War II formed the Blinded Veterans Association. Just a year later, in 1946, General Bradley of the Veterans Administration appointed the BVA as the first official representative for blinded veterans who were filing claims and appeals to the Veterans Administration. This made the Blinded Veterans Association the eighth veterans service organization to receive such authorization.

Chartered by Congress in 1958, the BVA has worked throughout the years assisting blind veterans in acquiring Department of Veterans Affairs disability compensation and health care benefits, as well as other Federal and local benefits. Thanks in large part to the efforts of the BVA, there are now ten blindness rehabilitation centers located at various VA medical centers across this country.

Madam Speaker, along with this legislation, which obviously you can see how important it is, we wanted to honor today these blinded veterans on their 65th anniversary. But, Madam Speaker, our committee also had requested consideration of H.R. 4360, a bill to designate the blind rehabilitation center in Long Beach, California, as the Major Charles R. Soltes, Jr., O.D. Department of Veterans Affairs Blind Rehabilitation Center. This legislation has the support of the entire California delegation and the major veterans service organizations in California and would further honor blind veterans to whom Major Soltes provided so much service and so much sacrifice.

I would like to inquire, if it is appropriate to the Speaker, or perhaps

Chairman FILNER, if they could explain why this very important bill was not permitted consideration on the floor today?

Mr. FILNER. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEARNS. I yield.

Mr. FILNER. As the gentleman knows, we included that bill on a list of seven bills that we asked to be taken up on the floor, and we were scheduled for six of them. That is as far as I know.

Mr. STEARNS. I understand he is saying that it wasn't put in the loop at the moment, it wasn't put on the schedule, but I think you are also saying that this is the type of bill that you support and you believe should be part of a vote on the floor. Can I assume you support this bill?

Mr. FILNER. If the gentleman would continue to yield, I was one of the Californians who signed the original petition, and I support the bill. We are as mystified as you are.

Mr. STEARNS. Well, Madam Speaker, I think it is unfortunate that this bill to honor an individual who did so much for our blind veterans community and paid the ultimate sacrifice in service to his country, this particular bill is not being considered this afternoon. Many of us are disappointed, and we will work with Ranking Member BUYER and Chairman FILNER, since he is a signee on the unanimous delegation letter, to have it brought to the floor at the earliest opportunity.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the joint resolution.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.J. Res 80, "Recognizing and Honoring the blinded veterans association on its 65th anniversary of representing blinded veterans and their families," a bill sponsored by my colleague from Illinois, Congresswoman HALVORSON.

H.J. Res. 80 will honor those who have sacrificed greatly for this nation and have lost their eyesight in the process. These veterans have given great contributions and made incredible personal sacrifices so that all of us in this country might live in a safe and secure nation and world. When we pay tribute to the service of our brave veterans, we acknowledge the great debt that this Nation owes them.

Because I realize that our veterans deserve our very best, I introduced H.R. 1240, the Vision Impairment Specialist Training Act (VISTA), passed into law as part of larger bill. The provisions of VISTA help our nation's blind and low-vision veterans by establishing a scholarship program for students seeking training in blind rehabilitation. There are more than 160,000 legally blind veterans in the

United States, but approximately 35,000 are currently enrolled in Veterans Health Administration. Members of the armed forces are important to our nation and we show them our appreciation by taking care of them when they no longer can serve.

Caring for our veterans also means giving them our time. I have had the honor of visiting with some of our wounded soldiers at Walter Reed Army Hospital in Washington, D.C. Many of these soldiers were recovering from some of the most horrific wounds imaginable. But what made the most indelible impression on me was that to a man and woman, there was no self-pity or anger at their fate. Instead of anger or sorrow there was only concern for their fellow soldiers and pride in the certain knowledge that they had fought valiantly on behalf of a country they loved. There is no reason that any of our veterans should not receive the highest care from all of us in this country. I hope all Americans take the time to visit their local VA hospital and thank the wounded for their service to our country." We must do everything possible to let our veterans know how much we value their service.

We all know that no one has paid a higher price than the brave men and women through the years who gave the last full measure of devotion to their country. Whether it is the ultimate sacrifice of life or the loss of limb or the loss of time with family and friends, we owe our veterans an enormous outstanding debt of gratitude. So, let us celebrate and recognize our blinded veterans during the 65th anniversary of the Blinded Veterans Association.

It is out of my profound respect and gratitude for all who wear and have worn the uniform of the United States that I continue to work so hard to pass legislation that will ensure that veterans receive the health care, job opportunities, housing assistance, and educational benefits they deserve. Caring for our veterans also means giving them our support when they need it.

Madam Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to support H.J. 80.

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues' unanimous support, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution, H.J. Res. 80.

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. FILNER. Madam Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

HELPING HEROES KEEP THEIR HOMES ACT OF 2009

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the

bill (H.R. 3976) to extend certain expiring provisions providing enhanced protections for servicemembers relating to mortgages and mortgage foreclosure, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3976

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 "Helping Heroes Keep Their Homes Act of 2010".

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF ENHANCED PROTECTIONS FOR SERVICEMEMBERS RELATING TO MORTGAGES AND MORTGAGE FORECLOSURE UNDER SERVICEMEMBERS CIVIL RELIEF ACT.

(a) EXTENSION.—Paragraph (2) of section 2203(c) of the Housing and Economic Recovery Act of 2008 (Public Law 110-289) is amended—

(1) by striking "December 31, 2010" and inserting "December 31, 2015"; and

(2) by striking "January 1, 2011" and inserting "January 1, 2016".

(b) PROTECTION FOR SURVIVING SPOUSE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 303 of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. App. 533) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(e) PROTECTION FOR SURVIVING SPOUSE.—With respect to a servicemember who dies while in military service and whose death is service-connected, this section shall apply to the surviving spouse of the servicemember if such spouse is the successor in interest to property covered under subsection (a)."

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Subsection (e) of section 303 of such Act, as added by paragraph (1), shall apply to a surviving spouse of a servicemember whose death is on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

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

Madam Speaker, I want to thank Congressman TOM PERRIELLO of Virginia for introducing H.R. 3976, the Helping Heroes Keep Their Homes Act of 2010. Mr. PERRIELLO is one of the first-term members we have on our committee. They are incredibly active and committed. Mr. PERRIELLO hit the ground running in his first year and is here today with a bill that will make an immediate difference in the lives of our Nation's military veterans.

I yield to Mr. PERRIELLO to explain the bill.

Mr. PERRIELLO. Madam Speaker, I am proud to stand in support of H.R. 3976, the Helping Heroes Keep Their Homes Act, a bill that I introduced to help ensure that our veterans have the resources they need to confront the myriad of challenges in today's economic environment.

Homeownership is the touchstone of the American dream. H.R. 3976, the Helping Heroes Keep Their Homes Act, will reauthorize home foreclosure protections to prevent lenders from foreclosing on veterans' homes within 9

months after the end of military service. Unfortunately, some of the protections established in Public Law 110-289 are scheduled to expire at the end of this year. This bill will ensure that these critical protections remain available to our veterans.

H.R. 3976 is a commonsense bill that has been supported by the Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Legion, and the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs. I appreciate the bipartisan support on this bill, the chairman's leadership and others', and I urge all members of this body to join me in supporting our military families by voting in favor of this bill.

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, if I might digress, I just wanted to thank Mrs. HALVORSON on H.J. Res. 80 for introducing the resolution, and the chairman and Mr. BUYER for bringing that joint resolution to the floor. I think that is important to remind all of my colleagues.

Madam Speaker, I also rise in support of H.R. 3976, as amended, a bill to extend certain expiring provisions providing enhanced protections for servicemembers relating to mortgages and mortgage foreclosure.

Madam Speaker, Public Law 110-289, the Housing and Economic Recovery Act of 2008, extended the protections against foreclosure and related actions on servicemembers' homes contained in the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act from 90 days to 9 months following lengthy deployments. Extensions of these protections will sunset December 31, 2010.

To address the continuing lengthy deployments by our servicemembers, the Veterans Home Preservation Act of 2010 would simply extend the mortgage-related sunset days contained in Public Law 110-289 through December 31, 2015. The bill also adds a new clause that would apply these same mortgage protections to a surviving spouse of a servicemember who dies while in military service and whose death is service connected.

Madam Speaker, these are good provisions that are appropriate given the current economic climate. I thank the authors of the bill, Mr. PERRIELLO, as well as Chairman HERSETH SANDLIN and Ranking Member BOOZMAN for their fine work, and the Veterans' Affairs Committee chairman, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. BUYER, the ranking member, for bringing this legislation to the floor.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FILNER. I have no further speakers, and I am prepared to close.

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3976, as amended, a bill to extend certain expiring provisions providing enhanced protections to servicemembers relating to mortgages and mortgage foreclosure.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, it is unfortunate that these protections are

still needed. Two years ago or so we went through this major foreclosure crisis. We unfortunately, have not solved it and expect a recurrence, and we must protect and serve these brave men and women in uniform with the same commitment and dedication with which they protected and served us.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 3976, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3976, "Helping Heroes Keep their Homes Act of 2009," a bill that will prevent mortgage lenders from foreclosing on a veteran's home after their service.

Strengthening comprehensive programs by investing in our veterans, requiring housing counselors to grant more housing opportunities at each Veteran Affairs centers is the right thing to do. It is my distinct honor to stand here today to support a bill that will allow us to show our appreciation to our veterans who are in danger of losing their homes and possibly becoming homeless.

I really find it unacceptable that an estimated 131,000 veterans are homeless on any given night after honorably serving their country. We are doing our veterans a great disservice. We owe our veterans the utmost respect, appreciation, and definitely a home to come home to after serving as a member of our Armed Forces. In these challenging economic times, we must do more to provide for our veterans basic needs. H.R. 3976 shows that all Americans take pride in our veterans service to this Nation, and just as the military doesn't believe in leaving a soldier behind on the battlefield, I believe that I speak for all Americans that we don't believe in leaving our veterans behind . . . we must help them push forward.

In these challenging economic times, with returning veterans experiencing unemployment rates in the double digits, we must do more to provide for our veterans' basic needs. This legislation shows that the U.S. is grateful for our veterans' service. Just as the military pledges to leave no soldier behind on the battlefield, this Nation will leave no veteran behind when they come home. This bill will allow us to show our appreciation and honor the service of veterans who have served this country and who now look to us to serve their needs.

Madam Speaker, these veterans have given great contributions and made incredible personal sacrifices so that all of us in this country might live in a safe and secure nation and world. Ensuring that our veterans are safeguarded from losing their homes is a small step towards repaying the insurmountable debt that all of us owe to all veterans. We must do everything possible to let our veterans know how much we value their service. We would be irresponsible and ungrateful if we acted otherwise.

Madam Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3976.

Mr. FILNER. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3976, as amended. 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 California (Mr. FILNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3976, 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. FILNER. Madam Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

VETERANS' COMPENSATION COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 2010

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4667) to increase, effective as of December 1, 2010, the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4667

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 "Veterans' Compensation Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act of 2010".

SEC. 2. INCREASE IN RATES OF DISABILITY COMPENSATION AND DEPENDENCY AND INDEMNITY COMPENSATION.

(a) RATE ADJUSTMENT.—Effective on December 1, 2010, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall increase, in accordance with subsection (c), the dollar amounts in effect on November 30, 2010, for the payment of disability compensation and dependency and indemnity compensation under the provisions specified in subsection (b).

(b) AMOUNTS TO BE INCREASED.—The dollar amounts to be increased pursuant to subsection (a) are the following:

(1) WARTIME DISABILITY COMPENSATION.—Each of the dollar amounts under section 1114 of title 38, United States Code.

(2) ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION FOR DEPENDENTS.—Each of the dollar amounts under section 1115(1) of such title.

(3) CLOTHING ALLOWANCE.—The dollar amount under section 1162 of such title.

(4) DEPENDENCY AND INDEMNITY COMPENSATION TO SURVIVING SPOUSE.—Each of the dollar amounts under subsections (a) through (d) of section 1311 of such title.

(5) DEPENDENCY AND INDEMNITY COMPENSATION TO CHILDREN.—Each of the dollar amounts under sections 1313(a) and 1314 of such title.

(c) DETERMINATION OF INCREASE.—

(1) PERCENTAGE.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), each dollar amount described in subsection (b) shall be increased by the same percentage as the percentage by which benefit amounts payable under title II of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq.) are increased effective December 1, 2010, as a result of a determination under section 215(i) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 415(i)).

(2) ROUNDING.—Each dollar amount increased under paragraph (1), if not a whole dollar amount, shall be rounded to the next lower whole dollar amount.

(d) SPECIAL RULE.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs may adjust administratively, consistent with the increases made under subsection (a), the rates of disability compensation payable to persons under section 10 of Public Law 85-857 (72 Stat. 1263) who have not received compensation under chapter 11 of title 38, United States Code.

SEC. 3. PUBLICATION OF ADJUSTED RATES.

The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall publish in the Federal Register the amounts specified in section 2(b), as increased under that section, not later than the date on which the matters specified in section 215(i)(2)(D) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 415(i)(2)(D)) are required to be published by reason of a determination made under section 215(i) of such Act during fiscal year 2011.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

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

I rise in support of this bill which ensures that hard-earned benefits for disabled veterans and their surviving family members keep pace with their living expenses. This bill, like the last, was introduced by Mr. PERRIELLO of Virginia. It will benefit each disabled veteran or survivor from the World War I era through the conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan.

I yield to the hardworking, active, and committed Mr. PERRIELLO for an explanation of the bill.

Mr. PERRIELLO. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and Madam Speaker. Today I rise in support of H.R. 4667, the Veterans' Compensation Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act of 2010, a bill that I was proud to introduce in support of America's veterans.

Over 140 years ago, President Lincoln called upon our Nation "to care for him, who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow and his orphan." This charge is as compelling today as it was in 1865. It underscores the important role that our veterans play in defending our freedoms and the obligation we all have as a Nation to provide our brave veterans the care they need once returning home.

□ 1500

H.R. 4667, the Veterans Compensation Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act of 2010, will provide an increase to the rates of basic compensation for disabled veterans and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation to their survivors and dependents, along with

other benefits, in order to keep pace with the rising cost of living. The disability COLA would become effective December 1, 2010, and will be equal to that provided on an annual basis to Social Security recipients.

In these challenging economic times, our disabled veterans depend upon these tax-free payments not only to provide for their own basic needs, but for those of their spouses, children, and parents as well. Without an annual COLA increase, these veterans and their families would see the value of their hard-earned benefits slowly erode. We would be derelict in our duty if we failed to guarantee that those who sacrificed so much for this country receive benefits and services that fail to keep pace with their needs.

Doing right by veterans must always be a top priority for Congress. I believe that passage of this bill will send a clear message of support to those who wear the uniform of the United States military, a message that says we will never forget your service and sacrifice and that a grateful Nation will take care of you when you return from the front lines of freedom.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill on behalf of this Nation's veterans and continue the bipartisan support that we showed in the committee.

Mr. FILNER. Thank you, Mr. PERRIELLO, and again I want to thank you for your service to our Nation's veterans.

I reserve the balance of our time.

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4667, the Veterans' Compensation Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act of 2010. This legislation would increase, effective December 1, 2010, the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rate of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

Now, this COLA adjustment includes veterans disability compensation, additional compensation for dependents, clothing allowance, dependency and indemnity compensation to surviving spouses and their children. This is an important annual authorization which provides much needed assistance to our Nation's veterans, and, obviously, I encourage all my colleagues to support the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, I have no further speakers and am prepared to close.

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, I'd like to thank my House colleagues, Mr. HALL of New York, chairman of the Disability Assistance and Memorial Affairs Subcommittee, and Mr. LAMBORN of Colorado, the ranking member of the subcommittee, as well as the House bill sponsor, Mr. PERRIELLO of Virginia, for their leadership on H.R. 4667. I also thank Chairman FILNER and the ranking member, Mr. BUYER, for advancing this bill. I urge my colleagues to support it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, just like our military men and women did not hesitate to offer to lay down their lives to defend our freedom and the way of life that we cherish, we will not hesitate to defend the funds necessary to support themselves and their families.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 4667.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FILNER. I urge my colleagues to support the COLA bill, H.R. 4667.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, HR. 4667.

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. FILNER. 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.

ENERGY JOBS FOR VETERANS ACT

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4592) to provide for the establishment of a pilot program to encourage the employment of veterans in energy-related positions, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4592

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 referred to as the "Energy Jobs for Veterans Act".

SEC. 2. VETERANS ENERGY-RELATED EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF PILOT PROGRAM.—To encourage the employment of eligible veterans in the energy industry, the Secretary of Labor, as part of the Veteran's Workforce Investment Program, shall carry out a pilot program to be known as the "Veterans Energy-Related Employment Program". Under the pilot program, the Secretary shall award competitive grants to three States for the establishment and administration of a State program to make grants to energy employers and labor-management organizations that provide covered training, on-job training, apprenticeships, and certification classes to eligible veterans. Such a program shall be known as a "State Energy-Related Employment Program".

(b) ELIGIBILITY FOR GRANTS.—To be eligible to receive a grant under the pilot program, a State shall submit to the Secretary an application that includes each of the following:

(1) A proposal for the expenditure of grant funds to establish and administer a public-private partnership program designed to provide covered training, on-job training, apprenticeships, and certification classes to a significant number of eligible veterans and ensure lasting and sustainable employment in well-paying jobs in the energy industry.

(2) Evidence that the State has—

(A) a population of eligible veterans of an appropriate size to carry out the State program;

(B) a robust and diverse energy industry; and

(C) the ability to carry out the State program described in the proposal under paragraph (1).

(3) Such other information and assurances as the Secretary may require.

(c) USE OF FUNDS.—A State that is the recipient of a grant under this section shall use the grant for the following purposes:

(1) Making grants to energy employers and labor-management organizations to reimburse such employers and organizations for the cost of providing covered training, on-job training, apprenticeships, and certification classes to eligible veterans.

(2) Conducting outreach to inform energy employers, labor-management organizations, and veterans, including veterans in rural areas, of their eligibility or potential eligibility for participation in the State program.

(d) CONDITIONS.—Under the pilot program, each grant to a State shall be subject to the following conditions:

(1) The State shall repay to the Secretary, on such date as shall be determined by the Secretary, any amount received under the pilot program that is not used for the purposes described in subsection (c).

(2) The State shall submit to the Secretary, at such times and containing such information as the Secretary shall require, reports on the use of grant funds.

(e) EMPLOYER REQUIREMENTS.—In order to receive a grant made by a State under the pilot program, an energy employer shall—

(1) submit to the administrator of the State Energy-Related Employment Program an application that includes—

(A) the rate of pay for each eligible veteran proposed to be trained using grant funds;

(B) the average rate of pay for an individual employed by the energy employer in a similar position who is not an eligible veteran; and

(C) such other information and assurances as the administrator may require; and

(2) agree to submit to the administrator, for each quarter, a report containing such information as the Secretary may specify.

(f) LIMITATION.—None of the funds made available to an energy employer through a grant under the pilot program may be used to provide training of any kind to a person who is not an eligible veteran.

(g) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Together with the report required to be submitted annually under section 4107(c) of title 38, United States Code, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the pilot program for the year covered by such report. The report on the pilot program shall include a detailed description of activities carried out under this section and an evaluation of the program.

(h) ADMINISTRATIVE AND REPORTING COSTS.—Of the amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations under subsection (j), two percent shall be made available to the Secretary for administrative costs associated with implementing and evaluating the pilot program under this section and for preparing and submitting the report required under subsection (f). The Secretary shall determine the appropriate maximum amount of each grant awarded

under this section that may be used by the recipient for administrative and reporting costs.

(i) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:

(1) The term “covered training, on-job training, apprenticeships, and certification classes” means training, on-job training, apprenticeships, and certification classes that are—

(A) designed to provide the veteran with skills that are particular to an energy industry and not directly transferable to employment in another industry; and

(B) approved as provided in paragraph (1) or (2), as appropriate, of subsection (a) of section 3687 of title 38, United States Code.

(2) The term “eligible veteran” means a veteran, as that term is defined in section 101(3) of title 38, United States Code, who is employed by an energy employer and enrolled or participating in a covered training, on-job training, apprenticeship, or certification class.

(3) The term “energy employer” means an entity that employs individuals in a trade or business in an energy industry.

(4) The term “energy industry” means any of the following industries:

(A) The energy-efficient building, construction, or retrofits industry.

(B) The renewable electric power industry, including the wind and solar energy industries.

(C) The biofuels industry.

(D) The energy efficiency assessment industry that serves the residential, commercial, or industrial sectors.

(E) The oil and natural gas industry.

(F) The nuclear industry.

(j) APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary \$10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2011 through 2015, for the purpose of carrying out the pilot program.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

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

Madam Speaker, the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics recently released survey data showing unsettling numbers on the employment rates of newly returning veterans. Last year, the unemployment rate for our Iraqi and Afghanistan veterans was over 10 percent. Even more disturbing were figures showing that the jobless rate of young veterans exceeded 20 percent.

Congressman HARRY TEAGUE, a first-term member of our committee from New Mexico, proposed an innovative way to provide training for veterans in the energy industry. He introduced this act, H.R. 4592, the Energy Jobs for Veterans Act.

I would yield to Mr. TEAGUE for further explanation of the bill.

Mr. TEAGUE. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of my bill, H.R. 4592, the Energy Jobs for Veterans Act. I would like to thank Chairman FILNER for bringing this legislation to the floor and Chairwoman HERSETH SANDLIN and Ranking Member BOOZMAN for their assistance in crafting this legislation. Finally, I would like to thank the Democratic

and Republican professional staff of the Economic Opportunity Subcommittee, namely, Juan Lara, Javier Martinez, and Mike Brink, for their work and expertise.

Madam Speaker, our dependence on foreign oil threatens our national security and the lives and safety of our men and women in uniform serving their country overseas. When the fierce global competition for petroleum drives up the price of crude, millions upon millions of dollars flow into the coffers of nations that don't like us too much. In too many cases, that money has financed weapons and operations that have resulted in the deaths of American soldiers.

What can we do about it? It's simple. Produce our energy in America, instead of importing it from Iran, Saudi Arabia, Nigeria, and Venezuela.

How do we do it? Also straightforward. We invest in the production of energy right here in America. We produce clean-burning American natural gas. We extract liquid fuels from algae. We construct wind and solar farms. We make our homes more efficient, and we invest in nuclear power.

What's the result? We keep our money at home. We create energy jobs all over America, and we bolster our national security.

My bill means that those who fought for their country abroad would be able to continue their work for the security of our country when they return home by getting a job and a career producing our energy right here in America.

My bill says, if you risked your life for your country fighting enemies funded by foreign oil purchased with American dollars, then you can come home and continue your work for our national security, this time with a career in the energy industry.

The Energy Jobs for Veterans Act will incentivize employers to hire veterans for jobs being created by American energy. The bill instructs the Department of Labor to award competitive grants to three States to establish programs to reimburse employers and other organizations for providing on-the-job training and apprenticeship programs for veterans that are employed by energy companies. The bill will allow States to reimburse employers for training and apprenticeship provided to veteran employees.

Unlike other employment programs for veterans that fund training but don't guarantee employment, the Energy Jobs for Veterans Act incentivizes companies to hire veterans in the first place, and ensures that veterans are learning on the job and collecting valuable work experience from the beginning.

Eligible energy employers are those involved in the energy efficient building, construction, and retrofits industry, the renewable electric power industry, the biofuels industry, the energy efficiency assessment industry, the oil and gas industry, and the nuclear industry.

This is a pilot program and it's 100 percent competitive. The Secretary of Labor must make the awards to the most competitive applications for funds. If this works, we can expand to more States and different industries.

Madam Speaker, now let's get down to why it is really important.

On March 12th, the Labor Department announced that the unemployment rate last year for young Iraq and Afghanistan veterans hit 21.1 percent. The number was well above the 16.6 percent jobless rate for nonveterans of that same age group, 18–24. As of last year, 1.9 million had deployed for the wars since 9/11. Many have struggled with mental health problems, addiction, and homelessness as they return home. Difficulty in finding work can make the adjustments much harder.

Our veterans were on the front lines defending our freedom. We can't leave them behind now. I urge my colleagues to join me in passing this bill.

I will enter into the RECORD these seven letters of support for my bill from my congressional district.

MARINE CORPS LEAGUE OF NEW MEXICO,
March 22, 2010.

Representative HARRY TEAGUE.

SIR: I have just received a copy of Bill H.R. 4592.

I am Marine Corps League Department Commandant for the state of New Mexico. You have the support of the League as well as my personal vote of approval of H.R. 4592. The returning service personnel need all the assistance we as Americans can give them.

Sincerely,

VERNON MOLLAN,
Commandant of Marine Corps League,
State of New Mexico.

SAPPHIRE ENERGY,
San Diego, CA, March 8th, 2010.

Hon. HARRY TEAGUE,
U.S. House of Representatives, Longworth
House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE TEAGUE: Sapphire Energy commends you for taking bold measures to both expedite the development of our green economy and provide on-the-job training to America's veterans, through H.R. 4592, the "Energy Jobs for Veterans Act." This bill addresses three of our nation's most pressing concerns—energy independence, climate change, and job creation—by helping veterans integrate seamlessly into the domestic energy industry. As the leading company in the algae-based fuels industry, Sapphire Energy applauds you for your consistent leadership on these issues at large, and specifically as it relates to this bill.

Our war heroes fought to secure America's freedom abroad, and should be given an opportunity to continue their work here at home. H.R. 4592 enables them to do so, by preparing them for a life-long career in the thriving domestic energy industry, which will ultimately help America achieve its foremost security imperative: energy independence. No one has put more on the line to help secure America's security—and no one is better suited to continue doing so on the home front—than our Nation's veterans. As such, Sapphire Energy lends its full support to this initiative, and your concerted efforts to enact the "Energy Jobs for Veterans Act."

Sincerely,

TIM ZENK,
Vice President of Corporate Affairs,
Sapphire Energy, Inc.

LAS CRUCES GREEN CHAMBER
OF COMMERCE.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TEAGUE: On behalf of the Las Cruces Green Chamber of Commerce, which represents over 300 businesses in Dona Ana County, I'd like to express our support for H.R. 4592. The Energy Jobs for Veterans Act will not only provide much needed incentives to make sure that our veterans can find well-paying jobs but also make sure that our growing energy sector has a pool of well-trained workers. This would be an excellent boon to our community.

Sincerely,

NICK VOGES,
Las Cruces Green Chamber of Commerce.

CENTER OF EXCELLENCE FOR
HAZARDOUS MATERIALS MANAGEMENT,
Carlsbad, NM, March 10, 2010.

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN: The Center of Excellence for Hazardous Materials Management (CEHMM) is a non-profit organization in Carlsbad, NM with a research and development program to convert algae to biofuel. The Center of Excellence is committed to the hire of individuals who can think on their feet, follow direction and wish to contribute to a green energy venture with tremendous potential.

I believe that many veterans meet all of these criteria, and we welcome applications from this esteemed group. CEHMM currently employs several veterans who have been excellent employees.

CEHMM fully supports the "Energy Jobs for Veterans Act" and would welcome the chance to participate as a member of the biofuels industry.

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS C. LYNN,
Executive Director.

STATE OF NEW MEXICO
DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS' SERVICES,
Sante Fe, NM, February 24, 2010.

HARRY TEAGUE,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

HONORABLE CONGRESSMAN TEAGUE: New Mexico is striving to provide services to our veterans that will enable them to transition into society by providing avenues for employment and business training.

The proposed Energy Jobs for Veterans Act will allow New Mexico to increase the outreach to recently discharged veterans to provide training in the emerging energy-related fields such as wind, solar, biofuels, geothermal, nuclear, as well as oil and gas.

New Mexico is a mostly rural state and this very important piece of legislation will go a long way to provide training and outreach to those veterans who live in rural areas of our state where we currently see a high unemployment rate. The men and women who proudly and bravely served our country deserve all of the opportunities possible when it comes to job creation. They were first in line to raise their hand to defend this country and we believe they should be first in line for jobs when they are discharged.

We appreciate all the support and hard work that you have provided to New Mexico veterans and we fully support this legislation.

Respectfully,

JOHN M. GARCIA,
Cabinet Secretary.

VFW VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES, DEPARTMENT
OF NEW MEXICO,
Glencoe, NM, March 22, 2010.

Hon. HARRY TEAGUE,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

CONGRESSMAN TEAGUE: The Department of New Mexico, Veterans of Foreign Wars, strongly supports H.R. 4592 Energy Jobs for Veterans Bill. We share the same vision "Those who fought for their country abroad would be able to continue their work for the security of our country when they return home—by getting a job, and a career, producing our energy right here in America."

Sincerely,

RAUL SANCHEZ,
Commander,
Department of New Mexico, VFW.

PNM RESOURCES,
Albuquerque, NM, March 11, 2010.

Hon. HARRY TEAGUE,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE TEAGUE: PNM Resources commends your thoughtful leadership in the development of our green economy and your support of on-the-job training to America's veterans through HR 4592, the "Energy Jobs for Veterans Act." This bill addresses three of our nation's most pressing concerns—energy independence, climate change, and job creation—by helping veterans integrate seamlessly into domestic energy industry. As the largest utility in New Mexico and one of the first utilities to support climate legislation, PNM Resources applauds you for your commitment to diligently address these issues and your leadership on this bill.

America's veterans should have every opportunity to utilize and develop their skills domestically. HR 4592 prepares our veterans for a life-long career in domestic energy industry, which will ultimately help America achieve its foremost security imperative: energy independence. No one has put more on the line to help secure America's security our Nation's veterans. As such, PNM Resources lends its full support to this initiative, and your concerted efforts to enact the "Energy Jobs for Veterans Act."

Sincerely,

JIM FERLAND,
Senior Vice President, Utility Operations.

Mr. FILNER. Thank you, Congressman TEAGUE, for your strong advocacy on behalf of our veterans. This innovative and competitive idea will ensure that our returning veterans have the employment opportunities they require to make the difficult transition into the civilian workforce, while also addressing America's need for energy independence.

Madam Speaker, Congress must act to ensure our returning veterans have employment opportunities as they strive to reintegrate into the civilian workforce. This bill would help do just that.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, I also rise in support of H.R. 4592, as amended, a bill to provide for the establishment of a pilot program to encourage the employment of veterans in energy-related positions.

Madam Speaker, I think the final bill is better. I applaud the manner in which the bill was developed. As originally introduced by Mr. TEAGUE, the

bill would have established a Department of Labor grant program to subsidize employers for salaries paid to newly hired veterans working in the energy sector.

The ranking member of the Subcommittee on Economic Opportunity, Mr. BOOZMAN, Dr. BOOZMAN, expressed some reservations, some concerns about the approach, and he offered to work with Mr. TEAGUE to craft a bill that would pay for skilled development, providing on-the-job training for veterans in the energy sector. And to the credit of Mr. TEAGUE, he's worked with our side in a bipartisan manner.

I believe we have a better bill that will promote greater veterans employment results in the long run. I liken it to helping a veteran, in a way, instead of perhaps giving him something for a day, we're also giving him the opportunity to learn so that it will be for a lifetime.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, I have no further speakers and am prepared to close.

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, once again, I thank Chairwoman HERSETH SANDLIN for her leadership and Ranking Member Dr. BOOZMAN and Mr. TEAGUE for their work to bring us a bipartisan bill. I urge my colleagues to support it, as amended, to provide for the establishment of a pilot program to encourage the employment of veterans in energy-related positions.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, as we conclude this package of six bills that I think do so much for our Nation's veterans, this committee has been proud to work in a bipartisan way to get these bills to the floor.

I would like to remind my colleagues that this committee, in the last 4 years, has, in fact, done a tremendous amount for our Nation's veterans. We have increased the health care budget by more than \$20 billion, 60 percent increase in health care for our Nation's veterans. We've updated the GI bill and have a GI bill for the 21st century that about 200,000 students are taking advantage of in this first year of the bill.

We are helping to improve access for our rural veterans, for our women veterans, and, as we show today, to make sure we bring an end to our homeless veterans. So we are very proud of the work that we are doing for the veterans that we are so proud of.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FILNER. And as I close, Madam Speaker, I would ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material, both on the previous bill, H.R. 4667, and the current bill, H.R. 4592, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4592,

"To provide for the establishment of a pilot program to encourage the employment of veterans in energy-related positions," a bill sponsored by my colleague Congressman TEAGUE from New Mexico.

H.R. 4592 increases job opportunities increase job opportunities for veterans by reimbursing employers for the cost of providing on-the-job training for veterans in the energy sector through a new "Veterans Energy Related Employment Program" of competitive grants.

We have an obligation to ensure that our veterans can continue to use their expertise and talents that they have so ably used in serving this great nation. We can do this by showing our appreciation of the service of veterans and actively provide opportunities for them to work. These veterans have given great contributions and made incredible personal sacrifices so that all of us in this country might live in a safe and secure nation and world. It is time that we pay up and stand up for our heroes. For, what is the price of freedom?

As President Kennedy once said, 'The price of freedom is high, but Americans have always paid it.' And no one has paid a higher price than the brave men and women through the years who gave the last full measure of devotion to their country. Whether it is the ultimate sacrifice of life or the loss of limb or the loss of time with family and friends, we owe our veterans an enormous outstanding debt of gratitude.

From Bunker Hill to Yorktown, from Washington, D.C. to the Battle of New Orleans, from Bull Run to Gettysburg and Antietam to Appamattox, brave Americans gave their lives so that the nation might live. And from Alsace Lorain to Verdun, and Normandy to Berlin and Pearl Harbor to Okinawa, from Inchon and Corregidor to Vietnam, Lebanon, Grenada, Kuwait, Afghanistan, and Iraq, Americans have nobly sacrificed their lives so that the world may live in freedom.

The debt of gratitude we owe to the soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen who answered their nation's call and made supreme sacrifices can never be repaid. But the nation can follow President Lincoln's admonition to 'care for him who has borne the battle, and for his [family].' Indeed, it is the least we can do.

It is out of my profound respect and gratitude for all who wear and have worn the uniform of the United States that I continue to work so hard to pass legislation that will ensure that veterans receive the health care, job opportunities, housing assistance, and educational benefits they deserve. Caring for our veterans also means giving them our support when they need it.

Madam Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4592.

Mr. FILNER. I would urge my colleagues to support this bill. 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 California (Mr. FILNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4592, 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. FILNER. Madam Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a

quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m.

□ 1833

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. TEAGUE) at 6 o'clock and 33 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4899, DISASTER RELIEF AND SUMMER JOBS ACT OF 2010

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 111-454) on the resolution (H. Res. 1204) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4899) making emergency supplemental appropriations for disaster relief and summer jobs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4849, SMALL BUSINESS AND INFRASTRUCTURE JOBS TAX ACT OF 2010

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 111-455) on the resolution (H. Res. 1205) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4849) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives for small business job creation, extend the Build America Bonds program, provide other infrastructure job creation tax incentives, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 4810, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 4667, by the yeas and nays.

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

END VETERAN HOMELESSNESS ACT OF 2010

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4810, 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 California (Mr. FILNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4810.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 413, nays 0, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 170]

YEAS—413

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

King (IA)	Moore (WI)
King (NY)	Moran (KS)
Kingston	Murphy (CT)
Kirk	Murphy (NY)
Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Murphy, Patrick
Kissell	Murphy, Tim
Klein (FL)	Myrick
Kline (MN)	Nadler (NY)
Kosmas	Napolitano
Kratovil	Neugebauer
Kucinich	Nunes
Lamborn	Nye
Lance	Oberstar
Langevin	Obey
Larsen (WA)	Olson
Larson (CT)	Olver
Latham	Ortiz
LaTourette	Owens
Latta	Pallone
Lee (CA)	Pascrell
Lee (NY)	Pastor (AZ)
Levin	Paul
Lewis (CA)	Paulsen
Lewis (GA)	Pence
Linder	Perlmutter
Lipinski	Perriello
LoBiondo	Peters
Loebsack	Peterson
Lofgren, Zoe	Petri
Lowey	Pingree (ME)
Lucas	Pitts
Luetkemeyer	Platts
Lujan	Poe (TX)
Lummis	Polis (CO)
Lungren, Daniel	Pomeroy
E.	Posey
Mack	Price (GA)
Maffei	Price (NC)
Maloney	Putnam
Manzullo	Quigley
Marchant	Radanovich
Markey (CO)	Rahall
Markey (MA)	Rangel
Marshall	Rehberg
Matheson	Reichert
Matsui	Reyes
McCarthy (CA)	Richardson
McCaul	Rodriguez
McClintock	Roe (TN)
McCollum	Rogers (AL)
McCotter	Rogers (KY)
McDermott	Rogers (MI)
McGovern	Rohrabacher
McHenry	Rooney
McIntyre	Ros-Lehtinen
McKeon	Roskam
McMahon	Ross
McMorris	Rothman (NJ)
Rodgers	Roybal-Allard
McNerney	Royce
Meek (FL)	Ruppersberger
Meeks (NY)	Rush
Melancon	Ryan (OH)
Mica	Ryan (WI)
Michaud	Salazar
Miller (FL)	Sánchez, Linda
Miller (MI)	T.
Miller (NC)	Sanchez, Loretta
Miller, Gary	Sarbanes
Miller, George	Scalise
Minnick	Schakowsky
Mitchell	Schauer
Mollohan	Schiff
Moore (KS)	Schmidt

Schock	Shuler
Schrader	Shuster
Schwartz	Simpson
Scott (GA)	Sires
Scott (VA)	Skelton
Sensenbrenner	Slaughter
Serrano	Smith (NE)
Sessions	Smith (NJ)
Sestak	Smith (TX)
Shea-Porter	Smith (WA)
Sherman	Snyder
Shimkus	Souder
Shuler	Space
Shuster	Speier
Simpson	Spratt
Sires	Stark
Skelton	Stearns
Slaughter	Stupak
Smith (NE)	Sullivan
Smith (NJ)	Sutton
Smith (TX)	Tanner
Smith (WA)	Taylor
	Teague
	Terry
	Thompson (CA)
	Thompson (MS)
	Thompson (PA)
	Thornberry
	Tiahrt
	Tiberi
	Tierney
	Titus
	Tonko
	Towns
	Tsongas
	Turner
	Upton
	Van Hollen
	Velázquez
	Visclosky
	Walden
	Walz
	Wasserman
	Roskam
	Schultz
	Waters
	Watson
	Watt
	Waxman
	Weiner
	Welch
	Westmoreland
	Whitfield
	Wilson (OH)
	Wilson (SC)
	Wittman
	Wolf
	Woolsey
	Wu
	Yarmuth
	Young (AK)
	Young (FL)

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN MEMORY OF THE LATE HONORABLE FRED HEINEMAN, FORMER MEMBER OF CONGRESS

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask our colleagues to observe a moment of silence in memory of our former colleague, Representative Fred Heineman, who represented North Carolina's Fourth District in the 104th Congress. Fred passed away Saturday, March 20, at the age of 80.

Fred Heineman was first and foremost a man who sought to serve his country. He was a marine, a law enforcement professional, and a Member of Congress.

He started out as a beat cop in Harlem. During his 25-year career with the New York Police Department, he shut down organized crime, he rooted out police corruption, and he tried to keep young people away from drugs and crime by giving them positive alternatives to the streets.

In 1979, he came to Raleigh, North Carolina, to serve as the capital city's chief of police. Fred played a role in making that city what it is today, one of the best places to live and raise a family in our country. I worked with him while he served in that role and admired his commitment to the State that became his home.

In 1995, Fred came to this body, serving in the 104th Congress from 1995 to 1996. In the Halls of Congress, he eschewed the title of Congressman or Representative, preferring instead to be called, simply, "The Chief."

Over the last few days, I have heard his former colleagues on the police force and in this institution recount the ways he affected their lives. Fred's colleagues respected his expertise on issues of public safety and his strength of conviction. The nature of this institution, I firmly believe, is such that those who remain true to their convictions, who fight for what they believe in, leave it with pride in the service they have rendered.

Fred is survived by his wife, Linda, and six children. I wish to offer condolences to her and the rest of the family on behalf of my wife, Lisa, and me, and on behalf of colleagues in this body.

I would now like to yield to my colleague from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE), the dean of our delegation, for his thoughts.

Mr. COBLE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

When Fred Heineman—and you've pretty well touched on it, David, most of it—when Fred Heineman came to this people's House as a result of the 1994 election, I went to him one day and I said, what are your committees of choice? He said, well, I'm not sure. I said, why don't you select House Judiciary? He said, well, my legal background is not that formidable. I said, your law enforcement background is formidable indeed. He said, well, I'm

NOT VOTING—16

Barrett (SC)	Dicks	Neal (MA)
Blunt	Hoekstra	Payne
Buyer	Kilpatrick (MI)	Shadegg
Courtney	Lynch	Wamp
Davis (AL)	McCarthy (NY)	
Davis (TN)	Moran (VA)	

□ 1904

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

not sure I could be assigned to Judiciary.

I then went to leadership and told them about Fred Heineman. They perhaps knew him but didn't know the great details that David has just shared with us, and I said I think he would like to be on the Judiciary Committee. He was, in fact, assigned to the Judiciary Committee. Then my chairman of the Judiciary Committee asked me if I would introduce Fred to the Judiciary Committee during his first meeting as a member.

I went to Fred, and I said, Fred, I would like to introduce you as the former chief of police of the Raleigh, North Carolina, police department, but I would also like to introduce you as a cop. I said, would you be offended by that? He looked into my face, and he said very proudly, "That's who I am. I am a New York cop." And with those words, he told me that he valued his time on the Raleigh police force as chief very significantly, but he valued equally significantly his time as a New York cop.

I thank you, David, for taking time to honor the memory of Fred Heineman and, as you said, we wish our best to Mrs. Heineman and the family.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I thank my colleague and now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to request that our colleagues rise and honor Fred Heineman with a moment of silence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If Members will please rise, the House will observe a moment of silence.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

VETERANS' COMPENSATION COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 2010

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4667, 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 California (Mr. FILNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4667.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 407, nays 0, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 171]

YEAS—407

Ackerman	Austria	Bean
Aderholt	Baca	Becerra
Adler (NJ)	Bachus	Berkley
Akin	Baird	Berman
Alexander	Baldwin	Berry
Altmire	Barrow	Biggert
Andrews	Bartlett	Bilbray
Arcuri	Barton (TX)	Bilirakis

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

Royce	Skelton	Smith (NE)	Smith (NJ)	Smith (TX)	Smith (WA)
Ruppersberger	Slaughter	Smith (NE)	Smith (NJ)	Smith (TX)	Smith (WA)
Rush	Smith (NE)	Smith (NJ)	Smith (TX)	Smith (WA)	Snyder
Ryan (OH)	Smith (NJ)	Smith (TX)	Smith (WA)	Snyder	Souder
Ryan (WI)	Smith (TX)	Smith (WA)	Snyder	Souder	Space
Salazar	Smith (WA)	Snyder	Souder	Space	Sarbanes
Sánchez, Linda	Snyder	Souder	Space	Sarbanes	Scalise
T.	Souder	Space	Sarbanes	Scalise	Spratt
Sanchez, Loretta	Space	Sarbanes	Scalise	Spratt	Stark
Sarbanes	Speier	Scalise	Spratt	Stark	Stearns
Scalise	Spratt	Schakowsky	Schauer	Schiff	Schmidt
Schakowsky	Stark	Schauer	Schiff	Schmidt	Schock
Schauer	Stearns	Schiff	Schmidt	Schock	Schrader
Schiff	Stupak	Schmidt	Schock	Schrader	Schwartz
Schmidt	Sullivan	Schock	Schrader	Schwartz	Scott (GA)
Schock	Sutton	Schrader	Schwartz	Scott (GA)	Scott (VA)
Schrader	Tanner	Schwartz	Scott (GA)	Scott (VA)	Sensenbrenner
Schwartz	Taylor	Scott (GA)	Scott (VA)	Sensenbrenner	Serrano
Scott (GA)	Teague	Scott (VA)	Sensenbrenner	Serrano	Sessions
Scott (VA)	Terry	Sensenbrenner	Serrano	Sessions	Sestak
Sensenbrenner	Thompson (CA)	Serrano	Sessions	Sestak	Shea-Porter
Serrano	Thompson (MS)	Sessions	Sestak	Shea-Porter	Sherman
Sessions	Thompson (PA)	Sestak	Shea-Porter	Sherman	Shimkus
Sestak	Thornberry	Shea-Porter	Sherman	Shimkus	
Shea-Porter	Tiahrt	Sherman	Shimkus		
Sherman	Tiberi	Shimkus			
Shimkus	Tierney				

NOT VOTING—22

Bachmann	Davis (TN)	Moran (VA)
Barrett (SC)	Dicks	Neal (MA)
Bishop (GA)	Fallin	Olson
Bishop (NY)	Hoekstra	Payne
Blunt	Johnson, Sam	Shadegg
Buyer	Kilpatrick (MI)	Wamp
Chandler	Lynch	
Davis (AL)	McCarthy (NY)	

□ 1919

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. FALLIN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 171, I was unexpectedly detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to attend several votes today. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on final passage of H.R. 4810 and "aye" on final passage of H.R. 4667.

COMMEMORATING RETIREMENT OF DETROIT RADIO PERSONALITY DICK PURTAN

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

Mr. McCOTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the retirement of WOMC-FM radio host, Mr. Dick Purtan, after 45 years on the air in Detroit.

During his career, Mr. Purtan has become a beloved Detroit institution and recognized radio personality nationwide. For his work at WOMC-FM, Mr. Dick Purtan has been inducted into the Michigan Broadcasters Hall of Fame, the National Radio Hall of Fame, and won the Marconi award for being the Nation's top radio personality.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Dick Purtan will be remembered for his award winning personality and as a philanthropist and friend to Metro Detroit. As we celebrate his retirement, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing his many achievements and honoring the contributions he made to our community and country.

CONGRATULATING UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS AT PINE BLUFF

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express congratulations to the small liberal arts college that I attended that started with seven students when it began, a historically black college, in Pine Bluff, Arkansas.

Of course on Friday evening, they played Duke University. It was a major accomplishment for their athletic department. They didn't win, they didn't place, but they did show; and I congratulate them for a tremendous effort.

CONGRATULATING THE 2010 EDINA BOYS HOCKEY TEAM

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to congratulate the Edina High School boys' hockey team on their recent Minnesota Class 2-A State championship title. In a highly anticipated championship game, Edina beat a very strong Minnetonka team to clinch their seventh State hockey title.

After jumping out to a 4-0 lead after the first two periods, the Hornets had to hold off a strong third-period charge from Minnetonka before finishing with an impressive 4-2 victory. The win was a total team effort, with four different players scoring goals and the Hornet defense and goaltending protecting the lead until the final horn sounded.

Edina was led by a great coaching staff and, more importantly, was supported by a large contingent of students, faculty, parents, friends and family throughout the tournament. To each of them, as well as every member of the championship team, I want to offer my congratulations.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

(Mr. AL GREEN of Texas addressed the House. His remarks will appear

hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

CONGRATULATING THE SAIPAN SOUTHERN HIGH SCHOOL MANTA RAY CONCERT BAND

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Speaker, when we open our hearts to our young people—give generously our support and encouragement—those young people consistently exceed our expectation.

Let me tell you of the story of a dedicated group of students from a tiny island in the western Pacific Ocean, and the teachers who supported and encouraged them. Because on April 20, those students, the Saipan Southern High School Manta Ray Concert Band, exceeding any reasonable expectation, will be performing at one of America's premier musical venues: Carnegie Hall in New York City.

Saipan Southern High School opened just a few years ago, in 2002. Southern was a beautiful new facility, but it needed to be filled with life and with heart. The new students and new teachers quickly adopted the motto “un eskuela, un korason”—one school, one heart—and began to bring their school to life.

One of the new teachers was William DeWitt. Mr. DeWitt is a wonderful musician himself and his new Saipan Southern music and band students were enthusiastic to learn. But few had any musical training. Yet within a few months of opening, Saipan Southern enjoyed the first performance of its very own band, the Manta Ray Concert Band, and quickly “un eskuela, un korason” became more than just a motto because the musical rhythms of the Manta Rays became the heartbeat of Saipan Southern.

The band performed at pep rallies, sports competitions, for the PTA, at graduation. It seemed whenever Saipan Southern had an event, the beat of the Manta Rays provided the musical backdrop. By 2005, the Manta Ray Concert Band had reached a level of proficiency that allowed them to take on the complex Latin rhythms and jazzy dissonances of West Side Story for a production at Saipan Southern.

And their reach extended beyond their school, as they began performing—and entertaining—for the annual Taste of the Marianas festival, Northern Marianas College Charter Day, the Western Pacific Judicial Council Conference, and many other community events. How that heartbeat grew stronger.

In 2008 and again in 2009, the Manta Ray Concert Band captured First Place Gold awards at the Tumon Bay International Music Festival in Guam. Student members of the Manta Ray Concert Band joined the Official Youth Orchestra at the 2008 Summer Olympics and performed in Beijing, China.

Today, the Saipan Southern High School band program has grown to more than 150 aspiring student musicians. The Manta Ray Concert Band has studied under guest conductors from Guam and Japan. They have played for dramatic productions of *My Fair Lady*, *A Winter's Tale*, and *It's a Wonderful Life*. They host their own concerts and perform at others as well. The Manta Ray Concert Band typically presents more than 20 performances annually.

Throughout their exemplary rise, these young musicians and their teachers have struggled with lack of finances, with lack of instruments, with the difficulties of travel for a band of students of various ethnicities and citizenship. But they have not lost heart. Nor have they forgotten that music can fill the hearts of others. When a security guard was brutally murdered at a sister school, the Manta Rays played to raise funds for the grieving family. After a shooting rampage left four dead on the island of Saipan, the Manta Rays raised spirits and funds for those in mourning.

The Manta Ray Concert Band certainly deserves recognition. But they won their most recent distinction solely by virtue of the quality of their music. Still under the dedicated direction of William DeWitt, they auditioned for the right to play at this year's New York International Music Festival at Carnegie Hall. And on April 20, with some of the most accomplished high school and college bands, the Manta Rays will fill the storied venue with their heartbeat.

As usual, they will not be playing for themselves but for others. The band is dedicating its Carnegie performance to Peter Le'au, the first principal of Saipan Southern High School, who, as the Manta Rays' program notes, “is courageously fighting to recover from a recent illness.”

Mr. Speaker, I hereby submit this tribute to the Saipan Southern High School Manta Ray Concert Band, along with individual names of each band member performing at Carnegie Hall as well as of their esteemed band director and school principal, for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. They are:

Eun Joung Ahn, tenor saxophone
 Ken Alvarado, trumpet
 Naomi Cabrera, percussion
 Scott Cabrera, trumpet
 James Camacho, clarinet
 Crista Ching, trombone
 Joe Ray Dela Cruz, tuba
 Anna Rose Deleon Guerrero, percussion/lo-gistician
 Mereylen Denora, trumpet
 Pedro Dueñas, alto saxophone
 Kevin Fejeran, baritone
 Rodolfo Guiao, Jr., baritone saxophone
 Jun Yeop Han, tenor saxophone
 Hyun Rock Jang, horn
 Joseph Jang, percussion
 Chan Young Kang, percussion
 Haneul Kim, flute
 II Ho (Ted) Kim, trombone
 Shin Hye Kwon, flute
 John Craig Lamberto, clarinet
 Bo Mi Lee, flute
 Ji Won (Rebekah) Lee, flute

Trini Macduff, flute
 Leagine Mendiola, clarinet
 Genevieve Ngiraibuuch, clarinet
 Fumi Nimura, clarinet
 Momoko Nishikido, trumpet
 Maria-Theszary Omar, flute
 David Paek, trombone
 Albert Palacios, alto saxophone
 Jaynine Parico, percussion
 John Park, clarinet
 Joshua Roberto, trumpet
 Joshua Sablan, horn
 Roseanna Sablan, percussion
 Elejohn Solomon, clarinet
 Min Jung Song, clarinet
 So Jung Song, alto saxophone
 Jonellie Torres, percussion
 Donovan Tudela, bass clarinet
 Krysthian Villanueva, alto saxophone
 William DeWitt, Teacher
 Craig Garrison, School Principal

□ 1930

BORDER SECURITY

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. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Once again, there's a new push for an amnesty bill to pass this Congress. Yesterday, tens of thousands of people marched in Washington, D.C., wanting amnesty. And it was interesting. As I looked over this very peaceful crowd and all those people marching, I wondered why there were no American flags.

In any event, amnesty is not the answer. Even the talk of amnesty causes a flood of people to come across our southern border. Amnesty is no answer to the problem because the problem is the lack of border security. The violence is already out of control in the border region. Thousands more people illegally crossing the border will make an already dangerous situation a much worse disaster, so we have to start with the basics.

First, we must secure the border. We must start with securing the border from the criminal enterprises, including the drug cartels. Just over a week ago, an American consulate employee and his wife were murdered in Juarez, Mexico. Lesley Enriquez, 35, and her husband, Arthur Redelfs, 34, were murdered in a drive-by shooting near the Santa Fe Bridge. The husband of another U.S. consulate employee was also gunned down on the Mexican side of the border.

Murders and kidnappings have caused the closing of the U.S. Embassy in Reynosa until further notice. The U.S. State Department is now rushing to relocate consulate employees in Juarez, Tijuana, Nogales, Nuevo Laredo, Monterrey, and Matamoros, all because of the violence on the border and the kidnappings. Shoot-outs in the streets have killed thousands of people, mostly Mexican nationals.

The drug cartels are fighting each other and fighting law enforcement for control over the lucrative drug routes into the United States. Good people

from both sides of the border are being placed in harm's way by these murderous thugs. Even an armed Mexican military helicopter intruded into the United States airspace in Zapata County, Texas. The intentions of this incursion are still unknown.

Over a year ago, Texas Governor Rick Perry asked for Homeland Security Secretary Janet Napolitano for a thousand troops at the border to help with the increasing violence and to prevent the drug cartels from entering the United States. The Governor has asked for more Predator drones for increased surveillance. He was trying to head off this escalation of violence that has occurred recently. The help he requested has never come, and the Governor's request for more troops and drones at the border has been ignored for over a year.

In response to the murders of these Americans, Governor Perry again eventually asked for help. He asked for surveillance planes and a thousand fresh troops at the Texas border with Mexico to help stem the violence. Secretary Napolitano said she would "look at" the request, but she thinks there's already enough troops on the border. So Governor Perry has decided he can't wait around on the Federal Government, even though it's the Federal Government's responsibility to secure our borders. He's ordered Texas National Guard helicopters to the border to support law enforcement that is on the border already. They're trying to fight the border violence spillover into the United States.

Texas military forces have requested and obtained OH-58 Kiowa and UH-72 Lakota helicopters to be used to fly up and down the Texas-Mexico border along the Rio Grande River from Brownsville to El Paso, Texas. Of course, their number and exact location will not be disclosed for security purposes.

I've had the opportunity to be on the Texas-Mexico border with our Texas Air National Guard and fly up and down that region to see firsthand the problem of the incursions into the United States, all because the border is not secure. I would hope our Federal Government would support the Governor's actions.

The Federal Government should actually do something to stop the violence and secure the border. It is the first responsibility of government to protect the people, and that includes the people who live along other international borders. We should send more troops. The violence is getting worse every day. Our border sheriffs and law enforcement are outmanned, outfinanced, and they're outgunned, but they're doing everything they can to protect the citizens along the Texas-Mexico border from the violent drug cartels that have come into the United States.

Every single county and city and town along the border needs help in the border war. It is irresponsible to leave

these people defenseless. Once again, it affects good people on both sides of the border, Mexicans and Americans as well.

Cartels are waging war on our border. People are not only sneaking across into the United States, they're shooting their way into our country. The violence is exploding into America's border communities. So it's time to put an end to this madness, send sufficient troops to the border, and uphold the national responsibility to protect the citizens of this United States.

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.)

WATERLOO

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. As the dust settles, Mr. Speaker, on the Capitol today, I read an article called "Waterloo," by President George W. Bush's speech writer, David Frum. I think it sums up nicely what we've just witnessed, and I wanted to share some excerpts with you.

He began, Conservatives and Republicans today suffered their most crushing legislative defeat since the 1960s. It's hard to exaggerate the magnitude of the disaster. Conservatives may cheer themselves that they'll compensate for today's expected vote with a big win in the November 2010 elections, but, first, it's a good bet that conservatives are overly optimistic about November—by then, the economy will have improved and immediate goodies in the health care bill will be reaching key voting blocs. Second, So what? Legislative majorities come and go. The health care bill is forever.

Now comes the hard lesson: A huge part of the blame for today's disaster attaches to conservatives and Republicans themselves.

At the beginning of this process, he says, we made a strategic decision. Unlike, say, Democrats in 2001, when President Bush proposed his first tax cut, we would make no deal with the administration. No negotiations, no compromise, nothing. We were going for all he marbles. This would be Obama's Waterloo, just like it was for Clinton in 1994.

The hard-liners overlooked a few key facts: Obama was elected by 53 percent of the vote, not Clinton's 42 percent; the liberal bloc within the Democratic congressional caucus is bigger and stronger than it was in 1993-1994; and, of course, the Democrats also remember their history and also remember the consequences of the failure of 1994.

This time, when we went for all the marbles, we ended up with none.

No illusions, please. This bill will not be repealed. Even if Republicans scored a 1994-style landslide in November, how many votes could they muster to reopen the doughnut hole and charge seniors more for prescription drugs? How many votes to re-allow insurers to rescind policies when they discover a pre-existing condition? How many votes to banish 25-year-olds from their parents' insurance coverage? And even if the votes were there, would President Obama sign such a repeal?

We followed the most radical voices in the party and the movement, he says, and they led us to abject and irreversible defeat. They were leaders who knew better, would have liked to deal, but they were trapped. Conservative talkers on Fox and talk radio whipped the Republican voting base into such a frenzy that dealmaking was rendered impossible. How do you negotiate with somebody who wants to murder your grandmother or, to be more exact, with someone whom your voters have been persuaded to believe wants to murder your grandmother?

I've been on a soapbox for months, he says, now about the harm that our overheated talk is doing to us. Yes, it mobilizes supporters, but by mobilizing them with hysterical accusations and pseudo-information, overheated talk has made it impossible for Representatives to represent and elected leaders to lead. The real leaders are on TV and radio. They have very different imperatives from people in government.

Talk radio thrives on confrontation and recrimination. When Rush Limbaugh said he wanted President Obama to fail, he was intelligently explaining his own interests. What he omitted to say, but what is equally true, is that he also wanted Republicans to fail. If Republicans were to succeed—if they governed successfully in office and negotiated attractive compromises out of office—Rush's listeners would get less angry. If they're less angry, they listen to the radio less and hear fewer adds about Sleep Number beds.

So today's defeat for free-market economics and Republican values is a huge win for the conservative entertainment industry. Their listeners and viewers will now be even more enraged, even more frustrated, even more disappointed in everybody except the responsibility-free talkers on radio and television. For them, it's a mission accomplished. For the cause they purport to represent, it's Waterloo—ours.

This is a very good self-reflective view of what happened yesterday.

SITUATION IN AFGHANISTAN

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

Mr. JONES. Today, I was going through some of the newspapers on the

Internet and I found a very interesting article that I wanted to bring to the floor. This was Newsweek, March 19, 2010, and the title is, "The Gang That Could Not Shoot Straight."

Six billion dollars later, the Afghan national police cannot begin to do their jobs right, never mind relieve American forces. I'm going to repeat that. Six billion dollars later, the Afghan national police cannot begin to do their jobs right, never mind relieve American forces.

Mr. Speaker, this is a rather long article, but I just want to read part tonight and I will read some tomorrow night, because I think about the men and women in uniform—God bless them all—over in Afghanistan and Iraq. I think about the situation they're in. I'm not an expert on history, but I know enough about history to know that any nation that ever tried to conquer Afghanistan never did. They basically failed.

From this article: America has spent more than \$6 billion since 2002 in an effort to create an effective Afghan police force—buying weapons, building police academies, and hiring defense contractors to train the recruits—but the program has been a disaster. More than \$332 million worth of invoices for police training were approved, even though the funds were poorly accounted for according to a government audit, and fewer than 12 percent of the country's police units are capable of operating on their own.

Let me repeat that. More than \$332 million worth of invoices for police training were approved, even though the funds were poorly accounted for according to a government audit, and fewer than 12 percent of the country's police units are capable of operating on their own.

Ambassador Richard Holbrooke, the State Department's top representative in the region, has publicly called the Afghan police an inadequate organization riddled with corruption. I'm going to also repeat that, Mr. Speaker. Ambassador Richard Holbrooke, the State Department's top representative in the region, has called the Afghan police an inadequate organization riddled with corruption.

During the Obama administration's review of Afghan policy last year, this issue received more attention than any other except for the question of U.S. troop levels, Holbrooke told Newsweek. We drilled down deep into this. The worst of it is that the police are central to Washington's plans for getting out of Afghanistan.

□ 1945

Mr. Speaker, I will again tomorrow night read another portion of this article. What it is saying—and what we in Congress need to keep in mind, we can't even fix the streets in my home town in eastern North Carolina, yet we're spending billions and billions and billions and billion of dollars in a country that at best is living in the 16th century.

We've debated health care this week-end. We have other issues we'll be debating. And even though these issues are very important to the American people, how in the world can we keep wearing out our troops overseas, spending billions and billions of dollars that we can't even spend here in America?

So, Mr. Speaker, as I do every night because my heart aches for the military and those who have lost their lives, the families, I will ask God to please bless our men and women in uniform. I will ask God to please bless the families of our men and women in uniform. I will ask God in His loving arms to hold the families who have given a child dying for freedom in Afghanistan and Iraq, and I will ask God to please bless the House and Senate that we will do what is right in the eyes of God.

I will ask God to give strength, wisdom and courage to President Obama that he will do what is right in the eyes of God. And three times I will say, God, please, God, please, God, please, continue to bless America.

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.)

HONORING CAPTAIN TEJDEEP SINGH RATTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize and honor one of my constituents, Captain Tejdeep Singh Rattan, for graduation today from the U.S. Army's Officer Basic Leader Course. Captain Rattan was recruited and commissioned by the U.S. Army in 2006 as part of the health professionals scholarship program. After completing his final year of dental work, he joined the U.S. Army Officer Basic Leader Course.

Before joining the Officer Basic Leader Course, Captain Rattan contacted me to indicate his strong desire to continue serving the Nation he loves as a U.S. Army dentist while abiding by his Sikh articles of faith. These articles of faith include wearing a Sikh turban and maintaining uncut hair, including a beard. At the time of his recruitment, he was assured by Army recruiters that his articles of faith would be accommodated, only to later be informed that he must abandon his Sikh articles of faith in order to continue his duties as a United States Army officer.

After learning of his case, I led a number of my House and Senate colleagues in sending letters to Secretary Gates, requesting that the accommodations be made for Captain Rattan and all other Sikh Americans who wish to serve. Thanks in part to our efforts,

Captain Rattan's accommodation request was granted. I am grateful to Secretary Gates and then-Secretary of the Army Pete Geren for reviewing and ultimately granting the accommodation. They have both shown tremendous foresight in recognizing that our Nation's 21st-century fighting force should incorporate all aspects of American society.

Sikhs fought bravely in defense of our Nation in both World Wars, the Korean War and the Vietnam War. At present, Sikhs serve in the militaries of Great Britain, Canada and India, among others, and as United States peacekeepers, often working closely with American troops in troubled regions.

Throughout our Nation's history, the military has succeeded in training individuals from diverse backgrounds and communities to achieve one unifying goal, to protect and defend the United States. By denying Sikh officers the ability to appropriately practice their religion while serving, the Army denies itself access to the important talents and abilities of these individuals who are willing to fight and die for our Nation.

No American should have to choose between his religion and service to our country. At a time when this country is fighting two wars overseas, we can ill afford to turn away skilled, accomplished and patriotic young Americans like Captain Rattan who wish to serve. Captain Rattan's achievement today underscores the importance of preserving diversity in our Armed Forces. It is a testament to one of the most fundamental values, freedom of religion upon which our Nation was founded and which makes the United States a beacon of hope and liberty throughout the world. I wholeheartedly congratulate him on this very important occasion.

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.)

STATES' RIGHTS

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, you know, we have seen for some time the Federal Government, since 1913, usurping States' rights. This Federal Government, this Congress, the House and Senate with the complicity of both Republican and Democratic Presidents, sending to the States unfunded mandates demanding that they come up with millions and billions of dollars that they didn't have, just out of the blue. We've now come up with one that

many States believe will bankrupt them.

How did we get here? Well, in 1913 the constitutionally sanctioned process of electing Senators was changed by the 17th Amendment. That was put in the Constitution after great debate, and what it required was that the State legislatures, the States select—not the overall population of the State—but the State legislatures would select the U.S. Senators. That was a check and balance on the Federal Government's usurpation of States' rights because if any U.S. Senator came up here and voted such an unfunded mandate upon the State, he was going to quickly be recalled, as has happened before.

But the appeal—and I don't know how I would have voted on the 17th Amendment because it sounds so good. You know what, we ought to let all the people in the State elect our U.S. Senator. And once that was done, once that amendment was passed, there was no further check on States' rights and the protections afforded in the 9th and 10th Amendments that reserved all power not specifically enumerated, as it says here, in the 10th Amendment: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

Both Republicans and Democrats have violated that concept. And what could the States do about it? After 1913, they had no power to do anything about it. They didn't have an Army as big as the United States, and we didn't want secession again. We didn't want another civil war. It should be done legislatively and diplomatically and within legislative bodies, however they were called, and within the framework of the U.S. Constitution.

Well, the Constitution, when it was drafted, addressed that point, and it's very clear. And perhaps it took a government to run away, as one State representative or Governor said, The mother of all unfunded mandates. The States—there are 39 of them that have so far said, We're not going to take this anymore. We're going to do something, whether it's going to be legislative, litigation, whatever. We're going to stop this. But the truth is, it may take years to get through the courts to the Supreme Court. It may take years.

So here's the solution: it was in the Constitution all along. It's called article V of the United States Constitution. Now we know that article V has been used many times by this first line, "The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary"—we know that's been used many times. The House and Senate agree we need an amendment, and so they call for the amendment to be produced. But something—I haven't been able to find it. It's been done before, but it can be. It's there. But here it is: "Or, on the Application of the Legislatures of two-thirds of the several States shall"—it means Congress shall, Congress shall, that it's not any choice that Congress has.

If two-thirds of the States apply and say, We want a convention—not a Constitutional Convention because this can be restricted by the Congress—but an amendment—one amendment would be all that was necessary to return a check and balance on the Federal Government, give the States what the 9th and 10th Amendments reserved to them. Two-thirds of the States make application, Congress shall call in a convention for proposing amendments—not rewriting the Constitution. And this is a procedural issue that the Supreme Court has always said, with regard to procedural issues, That's political. It's procedural. Congress, you do it however you want to. We're not touching that. We're not going to issue a decision. That's what this should be. This is how we return control and some sense of order to the States.

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: THE CRISIS OF CONSENT

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

Mr. MCCOTTER. So this is what change looks like. If he were here, Mr. Speaker, in this time of momentous national distress, I would remind the President of the United States that he is not a leader of a party or an ideology. He is the leader of our country, one founded not to ameliorate others but to inspire the world.

As families lose their jobs, their homes and their dreams for their children, as our troops fight in sacrifice in foreign fields for our liberty and security, President Obama's obsessive-compulsive pursuit of an abominable government takeover of health care has defied the public's objections, despoiled this, the people's House, and further alienated Americans from their representative government.

As President Obama's campaign mantra of "hope and change" has degenerated into tax and hate, reputable surveys prior to this vote report: the public overwhelmingly thinks that the U.S. Government is broken. Only 21 percent of the public thinks it is being governed with its consent. Only 26 percent of the public trusts the Federal Government most of the time or always; 56 percent of Americans think the Federal Government has become so large and powerful that it poses an immediate threat to the rights and freedoms of ordinary citizens; 70 percent believe the government and big business typically work together in ways that hurt consumers and investors; and 71 percent of Americans think the Federal Government is a special interest.

In the wake of this health care debate, despicable dysfunctional process and product, it is clear the most dangerous special interest is Big Government and President Obama is its lobbyist. In contrast to Americans' faith in themselves, every major piece of legislation proffered by the President and his Democratic Congress expands and empowers Big Government at the expense of the people, possessed of a smug, cynical, patronizing view of Americans as dependents desiring State benefits, this arrogant administration and its enablers have defied the American people and bipartisan opposition in Congress to unilaterally jam through a trillion-dollar government takeover of health care.

Why? For so many Americans, the answer is that this President and his Democratic Congress think they are smarter than you, want to run your life, and want to make government your ruler, not your servant. It threatens not only our health care system but it tears the social fabric of our Nation. Instead of working towards a more political Union, the President exacerbated the disorder of our Nation and wrought an experiment in human freedom and self-government on the precipice of implosion.

To do so the President has the power, but not the right. Thus he has merely scored a Pyrrhic victory over the American people. Ultimately, his government-run medicine scheme will be repealed and replaced because America's strength and salvation remains her free people, not a person.

And this November, America's sovereign citizens will remind the President and Democratic Congress that we the people do not work for government. The government works for us. No, the President and his Democratic Congress will not break us beneath Big Government. Devoted to our freedom and a more perfect Union, we will keep the faith, trust the public, calm the chaos, and heal our country.

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

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

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

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

□ 2000

HEALTH CARE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) is

recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor this evening to anchor an hour for the Congressional Black Caucus on health care reform. I have several of my colleagues here to join me. Interestingly enough, three are from three of the relevant committees that put the bill together in the House.

When I left my private practice of 21 years, I promised my patients that I would continue to do everything I could to ensure that they got the health care they needed, even though I was leaving the practice. Too many were uninsured. Too many had several chronic diseases. Too many could not afford even 1 month's supply of medicine. And our low-capped Medicaid funding was of very little help.

Last night our Democratic leadership and my Democratic colleagues helped me make good on that promise. Because of the landmark legislation that we passed last night, the most momentous piece of legislation since Social Security, Medicare and the civil rights bills, not only my constituents but all Americans will have access to affordable, quality, and comprehensive health care. And African Americans and other minorities will benefit because of the provisions that are included to reduce the disparities that Surgeon General Heckler called an affront to American ideals and to the genius of American medicine.

So tonight some of my colleagues will help to explain the many benefits of the bill we passed last evening and the way that our communities will be able to be helped by the legislation.

I would like to first call on the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee and the Health Subcommittee who played a very important role in developing the bill as it went through Energy and Commerce.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Let me thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time, and thank her for all of her good work on the legislation. For the past 12 to 14 months, I have watched you as you have worked tirelessly to get a finished product that we can all be proud of. And so I want to thank you on behalf of the 600,000 people that I represent in the First Congressional District of North Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, every President in this country for the past 50 years or more has tried to reform health care. Unfortunately, all of them have failed, both Democrat and Republican. We have a health care system in this country that is in serious need of reforming. And President Barack Obama, during the Presidential campaign of 2008, campaigned on the platform that if elected, he would bring health care reform to the American people and for the American people. It was a hotly contested campaign, as we can all remember, but he was victorious because the American people had confidence that Presi-

dent Obama had the ability and the vision to bring people together to enact this worthwhile legislation and to do other great things for our country.

Well, we started the 111th Congress, and President Obama told us from day one that he was ready to deliver on the promise that he made to the American people. And so we in the Energy and Commerce Committee and Congresswoman CHRISTENSEN and many of us worked very hard to put together a good, strong piece of legislation. But I can tell you that we would not have enacted this bill last night without the courageous, visionary leadership of President Barack Obama.

In the Energy and Commerce Committee, we worked very hard to craft legislation that we were very proud of. At the same time as we were doing our work, the United States Senate was also crafting a piece of legislation and they completed their work on Christmas Eve, as we all remember. Well, what the American people may not fully understand is that in this body, before we can have a piece of legislation delivered to the President's desk, both the House and the Senate must agree. And so during the Christmas holidays, the Democratic leadership from both Chambers worked very hard to try to reconcile the differences between these two bills.

The unfortunate thing, Mr. Speaker, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, is we had no participation, no help whatsoever from our Republican friends on the other side of the aisle. When I say we had no help at all, we actually had none. The fact of the matter is that out of the 178 Republicans who serve in the House of Representatives, not a single one worked with us on this legislation. We tried unsuccessfully on many occasions to try to include Republicans in our deliberations, but there was apparently a strategic decision, a political decision on their part to not participate.

Over on the other side of the Capitol, the same thing happened in the United States Senate. Out of the 40 Republicans who serve in the Senate, not a single one worked with us. And so it was Democrats who had to try to get this legislation shaped and to get it ready for passage. And so during the Christmas holidays, the Democratic leadership worked very hard. They worked through Christmas Eve and New Year's Eve and all through the holidays to try to reconcile their differences. And finally toward the end of the holiday season, there was a compromise between the Chambers and we reached a decision on this legislation.

The problem was that we lost a seat in the United States Senate. Due to the unfortunate passing of our hero, Senator Edward Kennedy from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, we lost a Democratic seat in the United States Senate. Senator Kennedy's replacement was not from the Democratic Party. We found ourselves with less than the supermajority that is required in the United States Senate.

So President Obama called the leadership together many times, and we decided that we would go forward, notwithstanding the fact that we had a setback, that we would go forward and that this House of Representatives would take up and pass the Senate-passed bill, and that is important. That is a point that I want to make tonight. The bill that we passed last night was parliamentarily correct. It conformed with all of the rules of the House and the Senate. The bill that we passed last night was the identical bill that the United States Senate passed on Christmas Eve with 60 votes. We passed that bill last night in the House with 219 votes in favor of passage. We only needed 216 votes to get it done. Today the bill is on the President's desk, and we will go down to the White House tomorrow morning for the signing of the Senate bill that was passed by the House of Representatives.

Now here is the problem that we have. The Senate bill that we passed has some shortcomings. It has some areas that need improving, and so the President has worked with the leadership here in the Congress and we have come up with some fixes, if you will, with some amendments, with some changes to the Senate bill that will make it better. We all know about the provision in the Senate bill that was put in by a single Senator, that is going to be removed, and there are going to be other provisions of the Senate bill that will be removed.

Last night, not only did we pass the Senate bill but we also passed the fixes that the President asked us to pass, and those fixes are now pending in the Senate for consideration this week.

Senator REID, the majority leader in the United States Senate, has told us that the Senate will begin working on the fixes tomorrow after the President signs the bill. But, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN and Mr. Speaker, we have made monumental progress. No President has ever been able to do this, but because of the vision and the masterful leadership of the President and the Speaker of this House and the majority leader and the majority whip all working together, we have been able to finally pass this legislation.

This legislation does not go into effect immediately. There will be a phase-in. As you can imagine, we cannot reform the health care system in America and the health insurance system in America overnight. It is going to take time. But I can tell you, and I can tell the American people, that by the year 2019, 95 percent of the American people will have health insurance and access to quality health care. That is what we promised the American people. That is what we are going to deliver. There will be a phase-in starting within the first 6 months of this year.

We are going to help our seniors with their prescription drugs. Those who fall into the doughnut hole, they will be given a stipend to help them purchase. We will allow families to maintain

their children on their insurance policy up to age 26. So there will be a gradual phase-in.

Finally, let me conclude by saying that I represent a low-income district. The First Congressional District of North Carolina that I represent is the fourth-poorest district in the United States of America. We have a lot of low-income people, and I am happy to report to my constituents and to people all across America that for the first time in our history, individuals will be able to qualify for Medicaid. Low-income individuals will be able to get Medicaid. Right now families can qualify for Medicaid, but not individuals. An individual who makes less than \$14,400 a year will get Medicaid. A family of four that makes less than \$29,000 a year will be able to qualify for Medicaid, which is free. For an individual who is between the incomes of \$14,400 a year and \$43,000 a year, you will be able to get assistance. You will be able to get a subsidy in purchasing insurance. If you are at the low end of \$14,400 a year, you will pay \$36 a month in order to get a quality insurance policy. If you are at the high end of \$43,000 a year, you will pay \$342 in order to get a high quality insurance policy.

Now for a family of four, it is a little bit more but it is very affordable. For a family of four that makes \$29,300 a year, your premiums will be \$73 to insure four people in your family. At the high end, if you make \$55,000 a year, you will pay \$369 a month. We have made tremendous progress with the passage of this bill. We are very proud of the progress that we have made, and I just want to publicly thank the Speaker of the House of Representatives, NANCY PELOSI, the majority leader, STENY HOYER, and the majority whip, Mr. CLYBURN. I want to thank all of the leadership and the chairmen of each one of the relevant committees who participated in this bill: the Energy and Commerce Committee under the leadership of HENRY WAXMAN and formerly JOHN DINGELL; the Ways and Means Committee under the leadership of Mr. LEVIN from Michigan, formerly under the leadership of Mr. RANGEL; and the Education and Labor Committee under the leadership of GEORGE MILLER from California. All of these committees, working together with the Budget Committee led by JOHN SPRATT of South Carolina and LOUISE SLAUGHTER from New York leading the Rules Committee, all of these individuals working together to get us to the point where we were last night.

The passage of this bill is monumental. It is historic. Yesterday was not an ordinary day in the House of Representatives. I thank my colleagues who voted for this legislation. I look forward to the results that it will yield.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. I thank Congressman BUTTERFIELD, and thank you for going through the process that we have gone through over the past year because it has been a little difficult, I

think, for the American people to understand, and I think you helped to clarify how we got to where we were last night, and also you were able to clarify what some of those exchange subsidies and Medicaid would mean to the average family.

I just wanted to say before I recognize Congressman SCOTT, when you look at the uninsured that are going to be helped in this country—10.8 percent of non-Hispanic whites are uninsured. The uninsured rate for African Americans is 19.1 percent; for Asian Americans, 17.6 percent; and for Hispanics, the Latino Americans, the uninsured rate is 30.7 percent. So just providing coverage for the 32 million Americans that will be covered for the first time by this legislation will make a big difference in the lives of people of color and their families. But insurance is not enough, and there are other provisions that we will talk about a little later.

□ 2015

But at this time, I'd like to yield such time as he might consume to the gentleman from Virginia, Congressman BOBBY SCOTT, who not only is on the Education and Labor Committee, which played a major role in crafting the original House bill, but also on the Budget Committee, a senior member of the Budget Committee, which had a major role in preparing and reporting out the reconciliation bill that we voted on last night.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Thank you very much. And I want to thank you, Dr. CHRISTENSEN, for your hard work and dedication. The Congressional Black Caucus is fortunate to have a leader in health care who is a physician and knows health care and, particularly, a physician with an expertise in public health. So we're very fortunate, and I want to thank you for bringing us together. You've worked long and hard on health issues, and particularly those issues in which there are health disparities, where African Americans suffer disproportionately in some diseases and knowing what we can do about it.

Mr. Speaker, America has been debating health care for 100 years, and we've come to some agreements. We know, for example, and I think there's general agreement within this House, that the status quo is unsustainable; 14,000 Americans losing their health insurance every day. The costs are going up. Twenty years ago, the average American family spent about 7 percent of the family income on health care and now it's 17 percent, and it's going and continuing in that direction.

Millions have no insurance at all, particularly those with preexisting conditions who are unable to get any insurance. So we know that one thing that, if we're going to deal with the problem, one thing that we have recognized is that any solution that's going to be meaningful has to be comprehensive. You cannot solve the problem of preexisting conditions, those with preexisting conditions not getting insurance unless everybody has insurance.

If people can wait until they get sick before they buy insurance, many people will wait until they get sick before they buy insurance. And those in the insurance pool, on average, will be sicker and sicker; the cost, average costs will be higher; more people, healthy people will drop out; and the costs will spiral out of control. We know that. So we know if we're going to deal with preexisting conditions, it has to be in the context of a system where virtually everyone is buying insurance.

We know that we have to make some comprehensive changes. We know we need to debate the issues. But, unfortunately, during the recent debate, we've heard complaints. We've heard some blames. We've heard a lot of misrepresentation. We've heard some slogans and even name calling. And yesterday, we finally took a huge step in guaranteeing quality and affordable health care for all Americans, and we have a bill that we can discuss. You can talk about what might be in the bill, what isn't. We have a bill. And let's talk about what's in the legislation.

First, the bill will provide affordable health care insurance for over 30 million Americans who are uninsured today, including those with preexisting conditions. The gentleman from North Carolina has outlined how affordable it is. Those at the very low end of the spectrum will pay very little. Those much higher up in the spectrum will pay more, but it's still easily affordable, particularly when you compare it to what people are having to pay today.

These bills will provide security for those who have insurance because 14,000 Americans will no longer lose their insurance every day. And those who have insurance will not have to watch the cost of their insurance skyrocket every year.

And insurance companies would be no longer able to cancel policies right when you get sick by looking back and finding a little comma out of place or something so they can cancel your policies when you most need them.

They also can't stop making payments in the middle of your illness, because we remove lifetime caps on benefits. Just because you have a very expensive and chronic disease, with the insurance that we're providing, you will get the medical care that you need.

No longer will those with health insurance have to pay copays for preventive services. And those with insurance won't have to go bankrupt, because the bills provide affordable limits on copays and deductibles.

Most of the people in bankruptcy court are there because of health expenses. And most of those there because of health expenses have insurance, but their copays and deductibles are such that they still have to lose everything in bankruptcy court.

And because the legislation will provide affordable health insurance to vir-

tually all Americans, families with insurance will no longer have to pay an extra \$1,000 a year to offset the health care costs for those that show up in the hospitals without any insurance.

Seniors will no longer have to fall into the doughnut hole where they're paying premiums and getting no benefits.

Our youth will be able to stay on family policies until they're 26 years old.

Small businesses will see significant savings in health insurance because they can purchase insurance with the same price advantages as big businesses do now with the large cost advantages of volume. And many small businesses will also receive tax credits, temporary tax credits to help them provide insurance for their employees.

This plan is more than paid for. CBO projects significant savings during the first 10 years and huge savings in the next 10 years. The major funding for it is treatment of unearned income for those making more than \$250,000, just like earned income.

Whatever your earned income, you pay a Medicare tax on that income, if it's earned income. If it's unearned income, stocks and bonds and trading and dividends and interest, you don't pay a Medicare tax on that.

The major funding in this provides that whatever your income, you will be paying a Medicare tax. So those making more than \$250,000 will pay on their unearned income just like everybody else is paying on their earned income.

The gentleman from North Carolina has indicated some of the provisions that go in fairly soon. Most won't go into effect until 2014 because it takes time to put all of the provisions together and get them active, but there are a lot of things that go into effect right away.

Small business tax credits, for those small businesses to make employee coverage more affordable, tax credits up to 35 percent of the premiums will go into effect immediately.

We will also begin to close the doughnut hole. For those seniors in the doughnut hole, we'll provide a \$250 rebate to help them, and gradually we will eliminate the doughnut hole.

Pre-preventive care under Medicare. Right after the bill becomes effective, we'll eliminate copayments for preventive services and exempt preventive services from deductibles under the Medicare program. So those who are getting preventive services won't have to pay copays and deductibles.

There's help for early retirees. We'll create a system to help offset the costs for those businesses that are providing health care for early retirees, those 55 to 64. Before they get on Medicare, there will be a program to help those. Those are very expensive to cover, and many companies want to cover them but can't afford it. We will provide an affordable way for them to cover them.

We will end rescissions. There will be a ban against insurance companies

from dropping people when they get sick.

There will be no discrimination against children with preexisting conditions. We will prohibit health insurance from denying coverage to children with preexisting conditions.

There will be a ban on lifetime limits and coverage. We will prohibit health insurance companies from placing lifetime caps on coverage. So if your chronic illness is very expensive, they can't cut you off right in the middle of treatment. There will be a ban on annual limits on coverage. And there won't be a complete ban early on, but we will tightly restrict any new plan's use of annual limits to ensure that you can get all of the health coverage that you need. Eventually, there will be a total ban on lifetime benefits.

Free preventive care under all new private plans. We will require all new private plans to cover preventive services with no copays and with preventive services being exempt from deductibles.

We will provide a new independent appeals process to ensure that consumers in new plans have access to an effective internal and external appeals process so that, if you're not treated properly by your insurance company, you have an effective means to appeal.

There'll be immediate help for those with preexisting conditions. Eventually, those with preexisting conditions will get insurance just like everybody else, won't be able to discriminate against those with preexisting conditions. But until the plan is fully implemented, those with preexisting conditions will be able to buy from a high-risk pool that will be subsidized because, obviously, the cost of that insurance will not be, should not be affordable, but we'll make it affordable with subsidies. So those with preexisting conditions can get relief right away.

It extends coverage for young people up to their 26th birthday on the family policy. If young children aren't getting health insurance on their job or while they're in school, they can stay on their parents' policy up until their 26th birthday.

We significantly increase funding for community health centers, and that starts right away. So within the next 5 years, we will absolutely double the number of patients being seen at community health centers. And we'll start making investments in training programs to increase the number of primary care physicians, nurses, and other public health professionals. All of that goes into effect right away.

Now, some are criticizing the plan, and it's interesting to listen carefully to the criticism. With all of what this bill does, one of the criticism is, Well, the bill has too many pages. Another is, We don't like the order in which we're casting the votes. Look at all of this comprehensive health care, and all they can talk about is the order we're voting in and the number of pages.

Now, some believe that the program is unconstitutional, and, when pressed,

they'll also say that, Well, Medicare is unconstitutional, too, and they want to repeal Medicare. And when we talk about repealing Medicare, I'd like to refer everyone to the budget introduced by the lead Republican on the Budget Committee. The long-term budget on that committee offered by the Republican side does not include a Medicare program. It includes a little voucher program where the cost increases will not keep up with medical inflation, so gradually, year by year, the value of that voucher erodes to the point where, 50 years from now, it'll be worth about 25 percent of the costs of medical care for senior citizens. They will allow it wither on the vine. So when you talk about Medicare being unconstitutional, be careful, because they actually want to repeal Medicare as we know it.

Others complain that it takes away their freedom to be uninsured. I was first elected to the Virginia House of Delegates in 1977. This is the first year I've heard anyone talk about their urgency of the need to enjoy the freedom to be uninsured.

Now, I'd like to—they say, well, they're going to debate it during the campaign for reelection, and I can't wait, because what will the campaign be?

Seniors, get back in that doughnut hole where you belong. We're going to repeal the law.

Young adults, get off that family policy and get out there on your own.

Small businesses, give those tax cuts back and start buying insurance at the retail rate rather than the wholesale rate. Pay 18 percent more like you're doing today.

Those with preexisting conditions, give me that policy back. You weren't supposed to get the policy. That was in the legislation that we want to repeal.

I can't wait for that debate because, as I said last night before we took that important vote, I said that future generations will look back at the votes we cast last night just as today we look back at the votes on Social Security and Medicare. And when they passed Social Security and Medicare, the votes were not unanimous. There were those that voted "no." But future generations will look back and see that many of us proudly voted in favor of health care for all. And I hope they look back with the same pride on those votes we cast last night as we do to the votes cast in favor of Social Security and Medicare.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Thank you, Congressman SCOTT. And thank you for going over the provisions and those that come into play this year, when the President signs the bill, when the reconciliation bill is signed, and which provisions start perhaps in a year or so, because it's very important to understand that as this bill is passed, within 6 months, many of the provisions that provide, that stop the exclusion for children with preexisting disease, for example, is already in place,

that the doughnut hole will start to be closed, that we'll start to build our primary care workforce to meet the needs of the 32 million newly insured, and that the small business tax credits will begin, all within 2010.

□ 2030

I would like to now yield such time as he might consume to my co-chair of the Congressional Black Caucus Health Task Force and also a valued member of the Ways and Means Committee—again, one of the committees that had a major responsibility for crafting the bill and the pay-fors in the bill that we passed in the House and the bills that we worked on and passed last night.

Thank you, DANNY, for joining us.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Thank you very much, DONNA, and I want to thank you for the tremendous leadership that you have shown the whole time that we have been together in Congress. As a matter of fact, we came in at the same time, and you've been engaged in health activity before getting here and you have been a leader ever since.

As I listened to Representative BUTTERFIELD, I was reminded of the fact that the Bible says that where there is no vision, the people perish. And I think we have been very fortunate to have a bold, courageous, and visionary President as the leader of this country. As a matter of fact, he was bold enough, brave enough, and visionary enough to say that we are going to reform health care delivery. And many people thought that that was a far stretch, that it was a far reach because people had been trying to do it, had been talking about it, but had not been able to accomplish it. And I guess as the boys on the street would say, And then along came Barack. Along came President Obama.

I know that there are thousands and thousands of people who have been engaged in the struggle to push health care forward. And, DONNA, I can imagine that you have been in thousands of hours of discussions over the years with the National Medical Association, with the American Public Health Association, with the Black Nurses Association, with the National Dental Association, with the National Association of Social Workers, all of these groups.

I was thinking of my own experiences in terms of having worked in health care prior to running for public office having sat on the boards of hospitals, having worked in neighborhood clinics, having been president, as a matter of fact, of the National Association of Community Health Centers; and so that goes back at least 30 years. Individuals have been opened.

And although the 1-hour that we're doing tonight was taken out under the auspices of the Congressional Black Caucus and your leadership, the last person who called my office just before I came over was not black. It was not an African American. As a matter of fact, he was a non-African American gentleman who called the office, and I

happened to answer the phone. And he says, Is this the office of Congressman DANNY DAVIS? And I said, Well, yes, it is. He says, Well, I just want to leave a message for the Congressman. And I want you to tell him that I actually cried when this bill was passed, when that vote was taken. And I just want him to know that people in my community and my family and my neighborhood have been waiting for this day. And I said, Well, I want to thank you for calling. He said are you the Congressman. I said, Well, yes, I am.

And I represent a district—I call it the most interesting piece of geography in North America. There is nothing quite like it. It includes the Gold Coast in Chicago, all of downtown Chicago, the Magnificent Mile, downtown Chinatown, Greektown, Old Town, New Town, Brushfield. But it also includes pockets of poverty. It includes suburban districts. It has 21 hospitals in it, four medical schools, 92 community health center sites, of course, research institutes. So you can imagine what a bill like this means to the people of my district.

For example, it will improve coverage for 334,000 of my residents. Not 3,000. Not 4,000. But 334,000. It will provide tax credits for up to 158,000 families, 14,000 small businesses.

The doughnut hole, it will remove the doughnut hole ultimately for 76,000 beneficiaries who right now have those experiences. It's going to extend coverage to 52,500 uninsured individuals who currently go to the county hospital when they have to get the health care who experience episodic care and living in a county where the taxpayers are always crying, of course, about the heavy burden of having to pay for health care for these individuals. And so the coverage is so impactful.

My congressional district also trains an awful lot of medical personnel. As a matter of fact, at the University of Illinois of Chicago, we train more African American physicians than anybody else in the country other than Meharry and Howard. We train nurses, we train inhalation therapists, we train medical personnel that go all over the world because we have the largest medical center district in the country.

And so health care is a big piece, a big part not only of the service but a big part of the economy. And people who have never, ever before in their lifetimes had any health insurance at all now can feel safe, comfortable, and secure in having the coverage that they need.

This legislation, in my mind, is the most impactful health legislation that we have seen since Medicare and Medicaid. And someone was asking me the other day, they said, Well, you know, the Medicare, the money that we spend—I said, Well, you know, there is no point in talking to me about Medicare. I am confident that both my mother and my father would have died sooner had there not been Medicare. As a matter of fact, my mother went 150

miles sometimes to get to the hospital so that she could receive dialysis for an ailment that she had.

There are people that live all over rural America who've had no access to health care at all. There are people in inner-city America who live close to the medical center district where we have all of these resources; we have resources but they have no money. Therefore, they cannot access the resources, and they have to pass by all of these hospitals. They have to pass by all of these resources and know that they cannot access them.

I agree with my colleagues who have suggested that that has been a magical piece of work. African Americans often wonder where are people placed. Well, it just happens that there were African Americans on all of the committees of Judicial—all of the committees. Three members of Energy and Commerce—of course you, DONNA, Representative BUTTERFIELD, Congressman BOBBY RUSH, all on Emergency and Commerce; five members of the Congressional Black Caucus on Ways and Means. Much of the time that we were discussing and debating this bill, CHARLES RANGEL was in fact the chairman and had a great deal to do.

I will just mention that in addition to the health components of this legislation are the tremendous increases in education for minority-serving institutions like Historically Black Colleges and Universities, Hispanic serving institutions, Native American institutions, institutions for Pacific Islanders. So comprehensively it does education, it does health, and it is just great. And I'm so delighted.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. I am pleased to yield to Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. DAVIS, I want to thank you so much for the presentation you've made. And I just really enjoy the stories that you tell and the way you represent the people of your congressional district.

You know, all of us have unique congressional districts. We say that all of the time. No two Members of this House are identical. You have your district and I have my district, and each one is unique.

As I travel throughout my district in North Carolina, many people tell me that they have health insurance but it's not worth the paper that it's written on. They are counted as insured; but in reality, they are uninsured.

For example, a gentleman in my district told me that he has had insurance for more than 10 years on the job and he pays \$200 a month out of his paycheck, but he's never used it. And when I asked him why he hadn't used it, he said because the deductible is \$5,000 per year and as far as he was concerned, he is uninsured.

I went into another part of my district and went to a dialysis center, and a young man there told me that he had been insured by a very reputable insurance company and that he needed a kidney transplant and his sister do-

nated a kidney to him. And it was a successful transplant and it worked very well. But after 2 years, his insurance company stopped paying for the anti-rejection medication that he needs for his kidney. And he lost the kidney, and now he is back on dialysis and the government is paying hundreds of thousands of dollars a year to sustain him.

Those are the types of stories that I hear in my district, and they are so sad.

There's a minister in my district who was—he is a married man, and he and his wife had a family policy and they were paying \$400 a month for insurance. And the minister was diagnosed with prostate cancer, and his wife was diagnosed with a neurological condition; and because of those two conditions, the insurance company raised the premiums for \$400 a month to \$3,500 a month, which was more than his income. Those are the types of stories that I am hearing in my district.

And I want to find out if the same thing exists in urban America. I'm in rural America. Do you hear those types of stories in urban Chicago?

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. I yield to Mr. DAVIS.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. You know, you wouldn't think it but, yes, as a matter of fact. Gee, I would hate to be in a situation especially at my age and not have health insurance and preexisting conditions be a factor in whether or not I could get a policy. I mean, it would probably be sky high, off the roof. You could never get it.

And this is just such a great development. It's enough for us to be talking about for the next 5 years again.

I want to just thank you, DONNA. I really do. Because much of what we do is process. I mean, consent is certainly a part, but it takes hours and hours. It takes negotiations, interaction. You've been there all the way. You've been our leader on health care, and it's such a pleasure to serve with you and know of your tremendous dedication to this cause.

□ 2045

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. I thank you for those kind words, but I can say without any hesitation that each one of us here this evening, in our own capacities, and in the committees that we serve, and in the subcommittees that we serve, have really put in a lot of hours and have really helped to shape the final product that we are so proud of having voted on last night. And the Congressional Black Caucus played a major role in shaping that.

Congressman BUTTERFIELD mentioned Medicaid and the expansion of Medicaid, and we talk a lot about food desserts, but in many of the poor communities around this country we have provider desserts. The low reimbursement rates that have traditionally been paid and for Medicaid providers has caused hospitals and many health care providers not to be able to sustain

practices or keep their doors open in poor communities.

This bill will change that. We will be increasing the reimbursement to Medicaid providers at the same level as Medicare and hopefully that that will encourage more physicians and providers to come into the poor neighborhoods where many of the patients are Medicaid beneficiaries and provide the care that they need.

You know, the turn of the 19th century one of our great intellectuals, W.E.B. Du Bois, spoke about the peculiar indifference to the poor health of African Americans in this country. And I am so grateful to be a part of a group of 42 individuals in the Congressional Black Caucus who have worked over the years, over the 40 years of our existence, but particularly in this last year as we have shaped this bill, to begin to end that peculiar indifference to the state of our health.

Some of the other areas besides the Medicaid expansion and the improved reimbursement to providers to encourage them to come back into poor communities is the expansion of the workforce. We know that as the 32 million people begin to come into the health care system that we are going to need so many more providers. But we are also an increasingly diverse society here in the United States, and so there is great emphasis on diversifying that workforce. I am talking here about some of the disparity provisions, the provisions in the health care reform bill that are targeted at reducing those health disparities that African Americans and other people of color have suffered from for so long. And part of reducing those disparities is making sure that we have a diverse workforce to work within those communities.

So in addition to encouraging, through programs like the health care opportunities program and increasing funding for that, increasing funding for the National Health Service Corps program, which pays individuals 4 years of their medical tuition, in addition to increasing loan repayments, especially for individuals who practice in poor and rural areas, we also have included provisions that provide additional support to institutions, minority-serving institutions, as Congressman DAVIS spoke of, the HBCUs, the Hispanic-serving institutions and the tribal colleges, but also any institution that has a history of training underrepresented minorities.

Those professions would be for physicians, for nurses, for nurse educators, and there is a specific section that deals with increasing the public health workforce, a very important part of the workforce when we talk about the emphasis that we are now going to be putting on prevention. In addition to that, there are mental health workers for our communities.

We also have grants to community-based organizations to train community health workers who, I think, will

be the backbone of the new health infrastructure, especially in communities that are poor, that have not had good health over the years, where people from within those same communities will be trained to be able to do outreach and support to people in their communities.

There is a provision that expands and strengthens the Office of Minority Health in the Department of Health and Human Services and adds two new offices, one in the Food and Drug Administration and the other one in the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, two important agencies that do not have a specific office focus on minority health.

And at the National Institutes of Health, where we have had a Center For Minority Health and Disparity Research, we now will elevate that, with the signing of the Senate bill tomorrow, to an institute where that institute will have more, more funding, to begin with, but also more influence over the research that's done at NIH in every area to ensure that the concerns and the interest and the impact on minority populations or any population that is experiencing health disparities will be considered.

Data collection is another area that we have been able to insert provisions on, and not only to collect data on disease but to also talk about and collect data on racial ethnic minorities, gender, and to follow the disparities in Medicare and Medicaid, to monitor those disparities and to report on those disparities so that they can be corrected.

I want to speak lastly about the issue of the territories. This was something that, of course, the delegates from all over the offshore areas of the United States worked very hard on, and we were very lucky, blessed, to have the full support of the Congressional Black Caucus, Hispanic Caucus and Asian Caucus, and of our leadership. We would not have had the inclusion in this monumental landmark legislation were it not for the support of our colleagues in those caucuses and the support of our leadership.

So I want to especially thank our Speaker again, she has been thanked many times here this evening, but for her strong support and for her strong leadership; our Majority Leader, STENY HOYER; our Majority Whip; the chairs of the committees, the relevant committees here in the House, Chairman RANGEL and also Chairman LEVIN, Chairman WAXMAN, Chairman Emeritus DINGELL, Chairman MILLER, and all of the entire leadership team for giving us the support, and really the entire Democratic Caucus, for encouraging us and supporting us and ensuring that, no, we don't have full State-like treatment, as the 50 States, but we do have a significant increase in Medicaid and the ability to be included into the exchange, and I want to thank our leadership for that.

We are coming close to the end of our time, and if there is no other issue that

my colleagues want to raise, I want to thank them for joining me here this evening and helping to explain to the American people what is actually in the bill, clearing up some of the misconceptions and some of the misunderstandings that are out in the public.

Again, we are very proud to have been a part of this process and to have passed the bill that we did last evening, and we look forward to the President signing it tomorrow.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material under the Congressional Black Caucus Special Order on health care reform this evening.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I first would like to thank my dear friend and colleague, Doctor DONNA CHRISTENSEN of the Virgin Islands for anchoring this special order hour. I cannot think of a more fitting person to lead us in a discussion of health care tonight than Dr. CHRISTENSEN, who is not only a medical doctor, but also the co-chair of the CBC's Health and Wellness Taskforce along with Congressman DANNY DAVIS of Illinois.

Dr. CHRISTENSEN has been at the forefront of our fight to ensure that health care reform makes significant strides toward eliminating racial and ethnic disparities, and achieving disparities for residents of the U.S. territories. Thank you, Dr. CHRISTENSEN for your leadership and your hard work.

I'm Congresswoman BARBARA LEE of the Ninth Congressional District of California and chairwoman of the 42 member strong Congressional Black Caucus. I stand here brimming with pride and joy because of what we did here last night after such a long journey that began many decades ago.

Yesterday morning members of the Congressional Black Caucus attended church services together, where we were reminded of the moral imperative to reform health care.

Strengthened by the power of prayer we forged ahead with clarity of purpose, courage and determination, undeterred by the losing hateful rhetoric and threatening tactics of anti-health care protesters.

Last night, my colleagues and I cast a historic and monumental vote to improve the health and wellness of millions of Americans who suffer because they are uninsured and under-insured and because of massive gaps in our nation's health care system.

I spend a lot of time in emergency rooms with my 85 year old mother and my sister who has Multiple Sclerosis. I see these people—the uninsured. They are desperate. Many are hard working people who may have lost their jobs, or simply fallen on hard times, or have never even had the opportunity to make their way in society. Some of them can't hold a job because they are chronically ill. This is simply unacceptable.

So, the members of the Congressional Black Caucus cast our votes for all those peo-

ple who deserve health care but simply can't afford it. We cast our votes for our senior citizens who will see their prescription drug costs go down. We cast our votes for our children and grandchildren, so that they can live longer, fuller and healthier lives. We cast our votes in the memory of those people who didn't have preventive care and died prematurely.

Throughout the long and arduous process culminating in the historic vote last night, many members of the CBC worked tirelessly to make sure that this bill holds insurance companies accountable and included a number of cost-saving provisions. We were vocal advocates for provisions in the bill to combat health disparities, illnesses and diseases that disproportionately affect our community.

The statistics are startling, but they are clear:

Nearly one in five African Americans (19%) is without health care insurance.

African Americans in general spend a higher percentage of their income on health care costs compared to their white counterparts (16.5% vs. 12.2%). However despite spending a larger share of their income on medical care, African Americans face continuing health care disparities.

African Americans also tend to reside in areas without hospitals or hospitals that have limited resources and may affect the quality care they offer. This is particularly a problem for hospitals in predominately African American communities where Medicaid reimbursements are low, charity cares is higher, and there is a shortage of health care providers who find it more difficult to maintain a practice.

African Americans suffer from higher percentages of chronic diseases such as heart disease, kidney disease and diabetes which are perpetuated by a lack of access to quality care. Currently, 48% of African American adults suffer from a chronic disease compared to 39% of the general population.

To those who suffer from those health disparities, our vote last night carried significance similar to the passage of the Civil Rights Act in that it fulfills a dream that has been elusive for far too long and for far too many Americans.

Among the key provisions in the legislation that CBC members fought to have included are:

Expanded support for community health centers, which play a vital role in expanding access to preventive and other care in our nation's most vulnerable communities.

Key health equity provisions: greater support for programs that will increase the racial and ethnic diversity in the nation's health workforce, as well as improved data collection so that we can better measure health inequities and develop solutions to end all health disparities.

Strengthening the existing Office of Minority Health at HHS, creating new Offices of Minority Health across HHS agencies, and establishing the National Center on Minority Health and Health Disparities at NIH as an Institute.

Inclusion of coverage for residents of the U.S. territories, including a significant infusion of new Medicaid dollars, as well as access to the Exchange so that Americans in the territories will have access to affordable, high-quality health insurance plans.

The bill guarantees transparency on rates and enables state insurance commissioners to

recommend to the National Insurance Commissioner whether a particular insurer should participate in the Health Insurance Exchange, taking into account excessive or unjustified premium increases in making that determination. This will hold private insurers accountable, ensure affordability and help provide quality coverage for American families:

Expansion of community health centers.

This bill makes several immediate reforms that will directly improve the health and wellness of millions of Americans. Some of those provisions are:

Offers tax credits to small businesses to purchase coverage;

Provides relief for seniors who reach the Medicare prescription drug donut hole;

Provides immediate access to insurance for Americans who are uninsured because of a pre-existing condition through a temporary high-risk pool;

Requires new plans to cover preventive services and immunizations without cost-sharing;

Requires new plans to cover an enrollee's dependent children until age 26;

Prohibits pre-existing condition exclusions for children in all new plans;

Prohibits individual plans from dropping people from coverage when they get sick.

I could go on because the list of all the good things in this bill are many.

So to put it simply, this bill is a victory not only for our constituents, but for all Americans because it will make us a stronger and healthier nation.

HEALTH CARE

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. Mr. Speaker, I, too, am coming to the floor of the House tonight to try to clarify for the American people some of the things that have happened here over the weekend. As you know, we passed a very big bill last night, hasn't been quite 24 hours, it was about 11 p.m. Eastern time when everyone else in the country was watching basketball tournaments and otherwise engaged with weekend activities, this House was in full session, the place was packed, Democrats and Republicans, and we passed a bill that had been passed by the Senate on Christmas Eve.

Now, I remember when I first got here, Republicans were in the majority, and when we would pass major pieces of legislation, if there was an all-day fight, we would be accused of waiting until the dark of night to try to sneak this legislation through. Now, I have never been one who would pass on the chance to attribute to coincidence that that can be adequately explained by conspiracy, but how is it that we passed, in the Senate, this very difficult legislation the day before Christmas when America was engaged in other activities, and then here on the floor of the House last night at 11 o'clock on a Sunday when most every

other honest American was doing something other than watching their Congress.

I do have to address some of the things that I just heard mentioned from the other side. Remember that there were two pieces of legislation passed here last night. One was the previously passed Senate bill which the House passed. That one is on its way down to the White House. That's going to be signed by the President. That's going to be the law.

And then we also passed a sham bill, a bill that might be called a fig leaf because no one really likes the Senate bill. The Speaker of the House said that herself. No one wants to vote for the Senate bill, and I agree with the Speaker. No one wanted to vote for the Senate bill. So how did they get their side to vote for the Senate bill? Well, they said don't worry, we are going to fix the problems that you don't like in the Senate bill, and we will do that under reconciliation so it's only going to require 51 votes over in the other body, don't worry, we will get that taken care of.

The only problem is, the Senate bill that we passed here last night had already passed the House before last summer—you might not recognize it because it was a housing bill then, but it passed the House last summer—went to the Senate, got changed into a health care bill and then got brought back to the House. And the question before the House, will the House now accept the amendment, the Senate amendment to H.R. 3590, the answer was affirmative, and the bill is on its way down to the White House for a big signing ceremony, probably tomorrow.

Now, what's going to happen to the reconciliation bill? It also passed, and it passed, and went back to the Senate. And is there anything that compels the Senate to take up that bill and work on it? Why, no, there is not.

In fact, the Senate might rationally argue, I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, the other body might rationally argue that, hey, we already passed our health care bill, we passed it on Christmas Eve, you guys apparently liked it because you ratified the amendments we had to it, and last we saw, it was on its way down to Pennsylvania Avenue to the White House. So why would we pick up this contentious package of fixes in the bill?

You know, quite honestly, the oxygen may have all gone out of the room for health care legislation in this Congress. Fourteen months is a long time to have fought this thing, and the Senators may just not have the stomach to pick this thing up and fight through it again.

So some of the things that we need to be careful about when people are talking about the bill—and I will do this too, many of us here in the House are not that familiar with the Senate bill that we just passed because it was the Senate bill. We had a health care bill that was marked up in my committee

and passed out of committee over my objection July 31. I didn't like the bill, but I knew it. I submitted amendments and some of those were even accepted. So I had a lot of familiarity with that bill.

Now, that bill went to the Speaker's office, sat there for a couple of months, got changed all around. All of my amendments got pulled out, every other Republican's amendments were pulled out of that bill. It became a 2,000-page bill, even with the loss of those amendments, and was brought back to this House in early November, and this House passed the House bill.

□ 2100

We knew the House bill. Many of us were—although we didn't like the House bill, we were fairly comfortable with what it contained and what it didn't contain. The Senate bill is completely different. Most of us did not ever see the Senate bill before the Senate brought it up on Thanksgiving and then passed it right before Christmas.

Mr. Speaker, quite honestly, many of us felt like we'd already read a lot of health care bills this year; do we really need to read that Senate bill? Maybe not. Because the Senate will pass it and then the normal procedure is we call a conference committee. We go to conference committee and we debate both sides, get to the debate the House bill, the Senate bill, Republicans and Democrats, a true bicameral process. We're finally going to have that open and transparent process that was promised to us and we'll read the conference report. We won't have to worry about the Senate bill because it's all going to be changed anyway.

Except that didn't happen because, for whatever reason, the Democrats did not want to do a conference report. They say it's because Republicans were going to block the appointment of conferees. But, Mr. Speaker, I would just point out to you that in December and early January there were 60 Democratic votes in the Senate, 256 Democratic votes here in the House. There wasn't much we could block, even if we wanted to. So how we would have blocked the appointment of conferees is anyone's guess, but I did hear that mentioned several times during the debate. So let me just set that point straight.

They thought they could just put things together on their own outside of a conference, and they were doing a darn good job of it. The last week in December, the first week in January on into the second weekend in January, people were meeting in this Capitol, meeting in this building, in the new Capitol Visitors Center, and putting together the pieces, cutting secret deals with unions, cutting secret deals with this group and that group, and we were going to have a bill that would just be blessed by both sides. No conference report. Not necessary because we'll just bring a new bill to the floor that will be the amalgamated bill. The Senate will vote for it. They've got 60 votes.

The House will vote for it. They've got 256. And if they don't lose too many, then they can pass pretty much whatever they want. Then we'll have a health care bill.

What happened in that scenario was that the second Tuesday in January they had an election in the State of Massachusetts. As a consequence of that election, suddenly the Democrats' 60-vote supermajority in the Senate was no more. Now, the new Senator was not seated for several weeks after that election and there was still time to come together with a hasty conference committee and get that thing done or even push through that amalgamated bill, but, for whatever reason, they didn't do that. It really looked for a while like things might just languish indefinitely.

Now we all know the story. In those last 10 days, the President really engaged, the White House engaged, and the Speaker's office engaged. They were just going to get this bill through the House because that was the quickest way—they always say a line is the shortest distance between two points. The shortest distance to getting health care legislation passed in this Congress, in this President's first half of his first term, was to pass the Senate bill through the House. It was something no one wanted to do. No one wanted to vote for that bill. It had awful things. Most of us don't know all of the awful things in that bill because it was the Senate bill. We passed House bills. We knew the House bill, but we heard the minority leader say it last night from this floor. Most of you on the Democratic side do not know what's in that bill.

Now, I dare say, today you've learned a lot of what's in that bill because you've got the phone calls from the press the same as I have. Suddenly, the press got real curious about what was in the Senate bill and they're asking all kinds of questions. So tonight perhaps we can deal with some of those. But one of the things I wanted to point out at the very beginning, be careful what you talk about when you hear us talk about what's in the bills, because both sides of the aisle, both Democrats and Republicans, may not be quite sure what's in the bill.

We heard testimony, or we heard the speeches on the other side here just a moment ago about how Medicaid rates now were going to be plussed-up for primary care doctors. Medicaid rates will become Medicare rates. Well, that actually, in fact, is only for primary care doctors and it is only for 2 years, but it is also only in the reconciliation bill. Did we pass the reconciliation bill? We did in the House. They haven't in the Senate. What did we pass that has passed the Senate? The Senate bill. And that does not have that plus-up in Medicaid rates. In fact, the expansions of Medicaid that we have now put forward that were in the Senate bill, the expansion of Medicaid, will be reimbursed at standard Medicaid rates,

which vary from State to State. But I will tell you, as a medical provider, those put a lot of providers back on their heels, because those rates do not pay the cost of delivering the care, and there is only so much of that kind of business you can do in an average day and still keep your doors open.

So there is a problem with expanding Medicaid to larger and larger populations. The provider community is going to find it difficult to be able to absorb that many more Medicaid patients into their practices because the reimbursement rates are going to remain low. In fairness, it was fixed in the reconciliation bill, but if the Senate doesn't take that up, it never happens. It was the skinniest of fig leaves because it's not there when you need it. What is there is the Senate bill, which is on its way down to the White House, and that will be the law of the land, which will expand Medicaid, to be sure, but does it have the enhanced Federal matching in there for Medicaid? In one State it does. In one State it does. The reconciliation bill was going to fix that so all States would have what that one State now has in the Senate bill, but it is the Senate bill, and only one State has that enhanced Federal match for Medicaid: the State of Nebraska. The famous Cornhusker kickback.

So what happened here last night, what transpired on the floor of the House last night was really dramatic and, in many ways, a fitting end to the 14 months of chaotic process that had brought us to this point. We've heard over and over and over again—and I don't want to belabor the point, and this may well be the last time that I discuss the process that brought us here. But it is worth mentioning, because over and over and over again last night during the debate we heard, You Republicans obstructed at every step of the way. Remember, there's 177 of us; there's 256 of you. We can't obstruct anything, particularly the House of Representatives, where majority rules on almost everything.

And, oh, by the way, the Rules Committee really rules. And the Rules Committee has a nine-to-four advantage for the Speaker. There's not much you can do with 177 Republicans in the House of Representatives if you want to obstruct. Well, you can all hang together and make a principled vote that we're all against this. And that's indeed what has happened.

But the real debate was an internal debate within the Democratic caucus, because had they had the votes, they could have done this in February. Had they had the votes, they could have done this in January. They could have done it in December, the day after Christmas, as opposed to the day before Christmas when the Senate bill was passed. If they'd known this was what they were going to end up with, maybe they should have just done that and saved everybody 3 months of additional anxiety.

The fact of the matter remains, Republicans did not obstruct this bill. Democrats obstructed this bill. Democrats and, oh, yeah, one other thing. They never had the popular support of the American people. Now think about that for a minute. We passed a bill that's going to affect in a very profound and personal way the next three generations of Americans. That's a pretty big bill. One-sixth or one-seventh of the Nation's economy. That's a pretty big bill.

Now, we've heard over and over again, if you're going to do something like that, it needs to be bipartisan. So Republicans should have signed onto the bill. Republicans should have backed the bill. Republicans should have been there. But, wait a minute. The people did not want this bill. Poll after poll after poll has shown, fill in the blanks—52 percent, 55 percent, 60 percent—of the people did not want this House-passed bill, did not want the Senate-passed bill, did not want what the United States Congress was going to do to health care.

Now, if you don't have popular support, then even if you've got 256 Democrats and, now, 59 Senators and the White House, it's very difficult to get your Members to—it's a very technical term we use here in the House of Representatives. It's called, "walking the plank for your leadership." It's very difficult to get your Members to walk the plank for leadership when everybody back at home is howling mad because of what you're doing. And I'm sure many people felt—the old saying that Everett Dirksen used to have, "When I feel the heat, I see the light."

A lot of people saw the light when they went back home. Now they came back to Washington and got their arms twisted and things promised and things promised to be withheld and goodness knows what and they lined up and walked the plank last night. That's what we saw.

□ 2110

People are voting in favor of things they said they would never do. They misled their constituents back home. People turning at 90-degree intersections to principles that they've held for a long time. It was painful to watch. I felt some sorrow for people I saw on the Democratic side having to make these very tough gut-wrenching decisions.

These are good people that are well intentioned, but they got pushed into a corner from which there was no escape. And that corner was the Speaker of the House and the President of the United States. And as a consequence, this bill passed, a pretty slim majority. Not a single Republican. In fact, the only thing that was bipartisan about this bill last night was the opposition because you had 30 Democrats standing with 177, or 178 now, Republicans. That was the bipartisan block on this bill, but they were in opposition.

This bill presents a real problem for the American people. The American

people don't like it. The American people don't want it, but now the American people have it. Now ideally—and people have asked me all day long, Well, what are you, as a Republican, going to do about this now? And the answer is, You fix what you can, and you work toward repeal of the bill.

Now working toward repeal of the bill, you've got to ask yourself. There likely will be bills introduced today and bills introduced tomorrow that will call for the repeal of the bill. I may very well sign on to one or more of those bills. But with the same vote total that we had last night, do you think any of those bills are even going to be brought up for debate? Is the Speaker of the House, is the majority leader going to bring up one of those repealed bills and say, Let's go through this argument and see if any of our Members now feel differently? Well, they could. And there is history there. There is precedent there.

In the late 1980s, this House passed a seriously flawed catastrophic coverage bill for Medicare. They charged Medicare recipients the premium for that catastrophic insurance; and all across the country, people said, Wait a minute, we didn't want that. We didn't ask for that. You're charging us for something we didn't ask for or want. And the seniors in this country rose up, and the very famous pictures of then-chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Dan Rostenkowski, being chased out of his own town hall by senior citizens who objected to what they had done. And Congress did come back in short order and repeal that bill. Will that happen now? I don't know. That's a pretty painful thing for people to have to go through. We'll see.

We've got an Easter recess coming up. If people do town halls and they get that kind of reaction, maybe we'll be back here talking about one of those repealed bills. But honestly, Mr. Speaker, I think that's a pretty heavy lift to repeal this bill that we passed last night, this bill that's now on its way to the White House to become public law. It's pretty difficult to do that in this Congress because it's not likely that there will be the votes. And then, of course, on the Senate side, it's really not likely that there would be the votes. And if it happened, the President likely would feel differently about it and would exercise his authority to veto that repealed bill, and it is unlikely to get to the threshold of a veto override, two-thirds of the House and two-thirds of the Senate to override a Presidential veto.

In fact, if America has the reaction to this bill that I think they're going to have, there may be many more Republicans and many fewer Democrats here in the House of Representatives next year. I don't know if that number will be enough to change the majority control of the House. It sure could be. It certainly looks increasingly likely from the degree of anger and how upset people are that talk about this bill out

in the middle part of America. But I don't know if there is the political will to change the majority makeup of the House. Again, even if there is, sure, we'll bring that repealed bill up. We'll bring it up pretty quickly and send it down to the White House, and the White House will veto it. I doubt that there will be a new Congress that's seated that will also have the ability to override a President's veto. Again, that's a tall order, two-thirds of the House, two-thirds of the Senate. So I don't know within the time frame between now and January of 2013, if the numbers work out, for this Congress to have the ability to repeal the bill. It's worth trying. It's worth testing. But I don't know if that's a realistic trajectory.

Well, then, what can we do? I think it is extremely important to at least begin to work on some of the more egregious portions of this bill. And I will just tell you, one of the things that really bothers me about this bill that we did is the instituting of an individual mandate to purchase health insurance. Now surely it is the responsible thing for every American, every family to have health insurance against the unlikely but frightening occurrence of some of the diseases that can happen to us as human beings. It's the responsible thing to do. But just because it's the responsible thing to do does not mean that your Federal Government has the responsibility to require you to buy it. We've never done that in this country. Simply as a consequence of being born or living in this country, your Federal Government now says that you're going to buy this product.

In fact, when the bill was passed, people said, Well, under the commerce clause, we have the authority to do that. But that kind of turns the commerce clause on its head. The commerce clause is there to protect commerce, but coercing someone to buy a good or service or product and then invoking the commerce clause to protect that transaction really seems to be going at things the wrong way. Now, if an individual State wants to say as a condition of living in our State, there is a mandate that you will buy health insurance—and there are States that have done that, and if their State legislature passes that legislation, and their Governor signs it, and the citizens of that State are okay with that, then good on 'em. That's fine. That is their prerogative. That's one of the things that a State government is there for. If they pass an individual mandate, and the people turn out the State legislature, well, then they learned their lesson. But that's a different set of circumstances than having the Federal Government make that decision that we're going to require everyone to purchase insurance. In my opinion, mandates have no place in a free society; and in my opinion, mandates are not going to get us the kind of coverage numbers that people expect it to.

You stop and think for just a minute, for a mandate to work, there has to be general knowledge that this mandate is there; there has to be general knowledge of the penalties that one would possibly incur for not complying with the mandate; and there must be general knowledge that those penalties will be swiftly and surely administered.

Now, we do have a model for that in this country, and that is called the Internal Revenue Service. The Internal Revenue Service says that everyone who earns income has to pay a percentage of that income in income tax. In fact, it's withheld from most of us from our paychecks every month. But that income tax must be paid, and we all know that, and we all know that if we don't pay our taxes, we may not know exactly what's around the corner, but most of us know it's something we really don't want to find out about.

Now, with such a draconian mandate for Federal income taxes administered by the Internal Revenue Service with such a mandate, you would expect the compliance rate to be pretty high. Well, it is. But it might be lower than what you might think. The compliance rate is around the order of 85, 86 percent. That's with a pretty severe mandate.

What about health insurance? Right now it's voluntary. As I said, it's the responsible thing to do. People should have coverage. People want to have coverage. In this country, most people are covered by employer-sponsored insurance. There is another 8 to 15 percent covered in the individual market. But insurance is a responsible thing to do. And in the voluntary program of insurance that we have in this country, what is the problem that we hear about over and over again? We've got 15 percent of our population without health insurance. Well, that does mean conversely you have 85 percent with insurance. And what is the compliance rate with the IRS? It's pretty close to the same number.

□ 2120

So are you going to get more of that 15 percent to sign up for health insurance if you put this very draconian, liberty-stealing mandate from the Federal Government out there? I don't think so. I think mandates have no place in a free society; and as a consequence, I don't think they belonged in this bill.

Further, what did the stock market do today? It jumped up a bunch, didn't it. You might say, well, see that proves the point, Americans so wanted this health care bill to pass the House of Representatives that they rejoiced by going out and running up the stock market. Or perhaps because insurance companies and pharmaceutical companies are going to profit so much by the fact that you now have to buy health insurance, that their prices went up. Their stock went up because people looked at futures and forecasting and said, wait a minute, insurance might

be a good stock to buy because in just a short period of time, everybody in the country is going to have to buy insurance.

Wouldn't it be a better approach, instead of mandating people to buy insurance, and again, I don't believe you are going to get a reduction in insurance rates by demanding that everyone buy health insurance, because what incentive is there for the insurance company to hold the price down? There isn't any. If anything, there is an incentive to raise rates because you have to buy it, otherwise the IRS is coming to visit grief upon your household. So the insurance companies may be feeling pretty good about this bill that we just passed last night because they are going to sell a ton of product. You are going to have to buy it, or you get into all kinds of trouble. The IRS is going to come and raise billycane on your head if you don't buy this insurance. So the insurance companies are feeling okay with this.

And the pharmaceutical companies, yes, they came to the table with a big bunch of money, and they gave up something to get this health care bill passed. But at the end of the day, the closure of the doughnut hole, yes, but it is for brand name products you get that discount, so they will sell more of that branded product which is the most expensive product, and people are going to blow through that area where they have to match some of the expenses and the catastrophic coverage will kick in pretty darn quick. Pharmaceutical companies may stand to gain a great deal from the passage of this bill. So it is really no surprise that the stock market went up today. Drug companies and insurance companies, they may look to be doing okay in this brave new world order that we gave to the American people last night.

A very famous quote from the Speaker earlier in the debate on all of this was: We need to go ahead and pass this bill so people can find out what is in it, and then they will really like it after the fog of the discussion is removed.

In fact, I have heard essentially that same statement on the floor here today. One of my friends on the Democrat side said, You know, finally, all of the rhetoric can be put aside and people will see what is in this bill, and they will really like it.

So let's talk about what is really in this bill, and I will leave it up to the American people how much they like it. We have already talked about the individual mandate. Absolutely unprecedented. The government has never required people to buy a good or service as a condition of lawful residence in the United States. That is a quote from the Congressional Budget Office.

It will be invoked under the commerce clause. The power to regulate commerce among the States is not unlimited. And here is a thought: What if the courts allowed this to stand? What if that power was in fact unlimited? Your imagination almost cannot han-

dle what some of the things that your Federal Government might decide to do if we removed that power, or we removed that condition on exercising that power.

Some of the other things that are going to be found in this bill are tax increases. I know I heard it over and over again during the debate that the Republicans shouldn't mislead people about tax increases in the bill, but they are there for all to see. Go to the Web site Thomas, the Library of Congress Web site, and download the CBO letter on S. 3590, the Senate-passed bill, and look at some of the tax increases that are there.

Medicare cuts, are they there? Yesterday the Democrats kept saying, There are no cuts to Medicare in this bill. Well, there darn sure are. Again, looking at the tables at the back of the CBO report, some of them look to be pretty darn significant. Reductions in annual updates to Medicare fee-for-service payment rates over the period 2010 to 2019, that is a 10-year budget cycle, that is a cut of \$86 billion. Medicare Advantage rates based on plan bids, that is cut \$118 billion. Medicare and Medicaid disproportionate share hospital payments, that is cut \$43 billion over that 10 years. Community living assistance services and supports, that is cut \$70 billion over 10 years.

One of the things that is really disingenuous about these cuts, and they have it laid out year over year in the Congressional Budget Office report, and the next 4 or 5 years those cuts are actually pretty modest, and then they really kick in the last 5 or 6 years. And we all know there is a big Presidential election coming up again in 2012, and so perhaps it is no accident that those cuts are diminished in the early years and then expanded in the out-years.

Payment adjustments for home health care, that is almost \$40 billion in reduction. Again, Medicare disproportionate share hospital payments down significantly. That is one of the significant things. It is hard for people to understand what is a disproportionate share hospital payment. Some hospitals see—and remember I told you that Medicaid doesn't really reimburse providers the cost of providing their care. Now no one cares so much about the doctor because who needs doctors in the health care system anyway, but we do care about hospitals. And hospitals historically have been protected. If they see what is called a disproportionate share of uninsured patients or underinsured patients, Medicaid where the reimbursement rate is low, they get a plus-up from the Federal Government, and it is called a disproportionate share payment.

One of the things that they did in the State of Massachusetts, they said we are giving all of this money to hospitals for disproportionate share payments, what if we just took that money and helped people buy insurance? Everybody is insured, and then you don't need to provide the dis-

proportionate share payments any longer.

But you take a State like mine, a State like Texas, where a great number of the uninsured happen to be in the country without a valid Social Security number, for whatever reason. Now we heard the President of the United States stand here in this House in September and say very clearly that no one who is in this country illegally will be able to participate in any of these benefits. If that is correct, and Texas has a problem with people who are in the country without the benefit of a Social Security number who also happen to be uninsured, they won't be eligible for any of these benefits. They won't be eligible for any of the subsidies in the exchanges. They won't be able to access the insurance that Congress is passing. That is not necessarily a bad thing. You don't want to provide an incentive for someone to come into the country without going through the proper channels. So what are we going to do in a State like Texas where we have vast numbers of uninsured who are there without benefit of a Social Security number? They are still going to access care through the emergency rooms of our safety net hospitals, but we are also at the same time cutting those disproportionate share payments to those hospitals. So the hospitals are actually catching the grief from both sides. Their uninsured and underinsured populations are going to go up, and their reimbursement rates are likely to stay low, and disproportionate share payments are going to go down. That is a business plan that may make sense to the Federal Government, but I bet it doesn't make sense to most hospital administrators who run our safety net hospitals around the country.

So anyway, when people tell you that the Republicans are misleading, we are trying to scare you on the Medicare cuts, they are outlined in the Congressional Budget Office report, and they are as plain as day for everybody to see. The subtotal for Medicare cuts: A negative \$430 billion over 10 years. Add the other community-living reductions of \$70 billion, and that is \$500 billion. That is what you have heard Republicans saying for the last several months. You are going to cut Medicare by \$500 billion. At the same time, you have more people coming into the Medicare system, and you are really doing nothing to hold down the cost of delivering medical care.

□ 2130

You're creating a situation where you're actually going to increase the stress on the system, not decrease the stress on the system; additionally, \$500 billion in new taxes coupled with that \$500 billion of Medicare cuts. The President stands in front of us and says, And this bill will be paid for; in fact, this bill will reduce the deficit.

Well, you're leaving out a big part of one of the things that didn't get fixed

in the Senate bill. You've heard me talk before about what's called the sustainable growth rate formula. This is the formula under which doctors are reimbursed in Medicare.

Back in 1988, the institution of the, what's called, relative value payment scale, RBRVS, whatever that acronym stands for, every year we tended to try to ratchet down reimbursements to physicians because we felt, if we didn't, they'd just spend too much money.

Well, what has happened over time, of course, as doctors' reimbursement rates have gone down, they've tried to see more and more patients so that their bottom line didn't suffer. And, as a consequence, the spending has gone up and the SGR has had exactly the opposite effect of what was intended.

We are in a real problem with this formula right now. This year, there were projected to be cuts of almost 21 percent to doctors who provide services to our Medicare patients. The payment rates for part B in Medicare were going to go down by one-fifth. For some specialties, it was going to go down even more than that. But just in general, it was going to go down about 21 percent.

We put a stay on that just about a week ago with a bill that passed by voice vote in this Congress, so it wasn't a recorded vote, and this put a stay on that cut until November. What happens then is anyone's guess because we didn't fix the problem in the House-passed bill. I mean, we didn't fix the problem in the Senate-passed bill. That bill's going down to the President for his signature.

What's going to happen to the doctors in Medicare? Well, Congress needs to fix that. Why hasn't Congress fixed that, by the way? It's been going on for years. Started with the Democrats, then it got worse under Republicans, and it's getting a whole lot worse now that the Democrats have retaken the majority.

Well, why didn't anybody fix that? The reason they don't fix it is because it scores, by the Congressional Budget Office, as a cost, a cost that is, no one really agrees upon the price, but it's somewhere between \$250 billion to \$350 billion. It could even be more than that if you tried to protect some part B premium payers from the rapid expansion of Medicare costs, Medicare part B costs caused by the rapid increase in repealing the SGR.

Remember that part B premiums are based on a formula: 25 percent of the actual cost of administering the part B program. We add another big cost to the part B program in the repeal of the sustainable growth rate formula, and Medicare recipients, Medicare participants in the part B program may see their premiums go up even faster than they've seen them go up the past several years.

So that's a problem. If we are honest about addressing the problem, it is likely to be \$350 billion to \$400 billion. But it could be scored as low as \$250 billion if you use some smoke and mir-

rors, which we try to do when we do budget things.

Nevertheless, it's still a big amount of money that will have to be added to this bill, and we didn't do it. We just simply didn't do it. The congressional Democrats told the Congressional Budget Office, don't score the SGR repeal in this bill.

Now, the House will tell you that, Hey, we passed an SGR repeal last November, didn't get any Republican support. Oh, wait, they got one. Okay. It was me. But that bill was going nowhere and everybody in this House knew that was going nowhere. In fact, the Senate had previously rejected the same bill 10 days before. So that was another fig leaf.

Oh, we're going to take care of the doctors. Let's pass this SGR repeal. And, Oh, the rascals in the Senate or the rascals on the Republican side wouldn't let this thing stand.

But the fact of the matter is it hasn't been fixed. The fact of the matter is the Democrats are in charge. The fact of the matter is they need to tell us how they propose to deal with that. This kicking the can down the road—and we did it, too, when we were in power. But this kicking the can down the road is making the problem a lot worse, and it is really putting our seniors at risk of not being able to access physicians. Just look at the statistics out there.

A company called Medicus that is a doctor search firm did a survey in December. And kind of depending upon how you ask the question, they said, If the Democrats' health care bill passes, will that affect your decision to retire or continue practicing medicine? If the public option was contained within the bill, almost 45 percent of physicians said they would consider retirement. That doesn't mean 45 percent of doctors will retire, but it meant nearly half of the doctors in this country would seriously look at it. Doctors who were near retirement age, about a quarter of them, about a quarter said, Seriously consider retiring early. Doctors who were nowhere near retirement age, about a fifth of those said, Yeah, I could see myself having to get out of this.

Now, if you remove the public option from the equation, if you remove the public option, the number goes down, and it's about 30, 31, 32 percent of doctors who would consider retiring early. A significant number of those who are already near retirement age, about 20 percent of doctors who were near retirement age would consider retiring early, even with the public option out of the Democrats' health care plan. And about 7 percent, 7 or 8 percent would if they were nowhere near retirement age. But still, that's a lot of doctors who are considering retiring if we pass one or two of these bills.

Let's leave the public option question alone for just a minute. We need to come back to that later because that is a significant part of this, but amongst

the things that are in the bill that people may want to know about are these tax increases, are the Medicare cuts.

Of course, one of the big fights here last night was would the bill contain what's called the Hyde amendment language that would prevent Federal funding for abortion. A lot of controversy ensued. The bottom line is the Senate-passed bill did not contain the Hyde amendment language. The Stupak language that passed in the House bill in November did, but that wasn't the bill we were debating. That wasn't the bill we were passing.

Again, another fig leaf was trotted out in the form of an Executive order. But how many Executive orders did President Obama repeal on his first day of office, Executive orders that President Bush had had in place? It was a ton of them.

Now, the President, to his credit, did say that he would not tear up the Executive order the first day after the bill is passed, but I don't recall if he made a promise about the second day or the third day or the fourth day.

The fact of the matter remains that protection against using Federal funds for abortion, for paying for abortion is pretty tenuous right now, and that thread could be snapped at any time. And the fact is the American people just don't know at this point. And it's a shame, because we could have had that argument. We could have had a more solid amendment. But the fact of the matter is we didn't do that.

Other things in the Senate-passed bill:

The special deal for Nebraska, the Cornhusker kickback, it is in the Senate bill. It did pass. It's on its way down to the President for signature. Does that violate any constitutional principle like equal protection under the law? It might. It might. If the good, long-suffering, taxpaying citizens of Texas now have to subsidize Medicaid in Nebraska, that might get some suspicion from the Supreme Court of violating the 14th Amendment, but we'll have to see.

A special deal for Florida where their Medicare Advantage would not be cut in certain counties in southern Florida. Medicare Advantage cuts, as I pointed out to you, are going to be steep and significant in this bill, but the three counties in Florida will not sustain those cuts. Again, equal protection under the law. That may be a violation of the equal protection clause of the Constitution.

In fact, my attorney general back home in Texas said the Federal health care legislation passed tonight violates the United States Constitution and unconstitutionally infringes upon Texans' individual liberties.

□ 2140

To protect all Texans' constitutional rights, preserve the constitutional framework intended by our Nation's Founders, defend our State from further infringement by the Federal Government, the State of Texas and other

States will legally challenge the Federal health care legislation.

So what looked like a Federal health care bill may in fact have represented a bill for full employment for lawyers in this country.

There are some other bad provisions. There is a tax on the so-called Cadillac health insurance plans. Remember that was supposed to be fixed in the reconciliation bill, but the reconciliation bill is not the law of the land. The Senate bill is the law of the land and that Cadillac tax is in there. So for individuals with incomes under \$250,000, they're going to get a significant tax if they have one of the high-end insurance policies. Clearly, that is a broken promise by the administration.

Boy, construction firms. I mean, who did they irritate in the Senate? Construction firms were singled out for higher taxes. In the Senate language, the employer mandate only exists or a fine if you don't provide—if your employees have to access care under the exchanges with subsidies. The fines don't kick in until you have more than 50 employees, but construction firms, there is a much smaller number. Single digits. If they're employed by a construction firm, they will have to pay an employer mandate or an employer fine.

Now, here's one of the provisions that is really—I don't think people know about it. I'm not sure if they do know about it and they understand it, but this new board that has been created in the Senate bill. One of the ways that they attempted to deal with Medicare spending was to assemble this board, this board of commissars and commissioners who are going to set Medicare spending targets, and they will do that and they will set those targets. Yes, they have to come back and be voted on by Congress, but we just have to vote them up-or-down. We can't amend them. We can't say, well, we're just going to plus them up a little bit and reduce this one down a bit. We've got to take the whole board of recommendation as a slate. It's an up-or-down vote here on the floor of the House.

I will just tell you when Congress has to be the enforcers on these things, look what we've done with doctor payments over the years. We're supposed to reduce them, but we really didn't because we didn't want to face the wrath from doctors for seniors so we took the easy way out and gave them a 1-year stay on that. And the consequence on that is the tab continued to run on those doctor payments. So now it's as high as \$20 billion that—I am sorry, a 20-percent cut that will have to come out of doctor payments.

We might do the same thing with this independent board, or we would lack the courage to vote on the cuts anyway if we didn't like the way they came down to us. Congress does have a history of doing that.

Some other provisions of the bill double-counts some Social Security pay-

roll tax revenues, double-counts the premiums collected for what was called the CLASS Act. That was one of the great bait-and-switch things that was included in this bill. We're going to provide long-term care insurance. You pay for that \$50 a month and then you can get a benefit of \$50 a day if you need to access long-term care insurance. Well, this actually scores as a savings because for the first several years it is in play, more premiums are collected than money is paid out. But guess what happens in the second half of, or the second 10 years of, these expenditures? Those payouts are going to exceed the premiums paid. And that is going to be an unmitigated disaster.

And the real pernicious part of the CLASS Act—look, people my age, if they can afford it, they should buy long-term care insurance. Don't wait on the Federal Government to give it to you. Don't believe you're going to get it from Medicare for you. It's only for a short period of time. Yes, you can get long-term care under Medicaid, but you've got to spend yourself to near bankruptcy before you get any of that benefit.

The sensible thing to do if you can afford the premium is to buy a long-term care policy.

The CLASS Act is going to tell people, Hey, you don't have to worry about that. Pay your \$50 a month for long-term care. You're covered. That's nonsense. The coverage is thin. It will not be there after a period of time because that program is going to pay way too much money after a few years. And the problem with long-term care insurance is the longer you wait to buy it, the higher the premiums are going to be. For people who are in their early fifties, it's something worthwhile to look into.

But we're going to send a message to the next 10 years of Americans who are turning—Don't worry about it; We've got you covered with the CLASS Act. There is no coverage at all there. In fact, it is going to be an unmitigated disaster when people start trying to access that. Besides that, anyone who's paid for long-term care, anyone who's had a family member in a long-term care facility, does 50 bucks a day really take care of what you need in a long-term care facility? It's nowhere even close.

The bill double-counts some of the Medicare cuts. So we get to count them once, and we get to count them a second time.

Texas is really going to suffer under a reduction in disproportionate share funding. Drug makers will face an annual fee of \$2.5 billion. But you know what? That \$2.5 billion is not going to come out of the CEO salaries. It's going to come out of product sales. So that will be passed on to the consumer. So although they look like they're being all great and helping out the President and putting out \$2.5 billion, this goes back to the Americans who buy their product.

In 2011, this bill will limit flexible spending accounts to \$2,500 per year. Yeah, you'll still be able to have your FSA, but you will be limited on the amount you can put into it.

Here's one that really most people are not aware of. There is a medical device manufacturers' fee which is again going to be passed on to the end user, the consumer, the patient, which is you. Continuing on the time line in 2011, there is a health insurance provider fee—\$2 billion in 2011, \$4 billion in 2012, and then it goes up from there rather dramatically. Again, a tax on health insurance providers.

Who do you think is going to pay that, the CEO of the big insurance company? Probably not. The guy that's buying the insurance? Probably. Again, I talked about this before. In 2013, the excise tax of 40 percent will be imposed on the Cadillac plans. In 2013, new Medicare taxes on individuals earning more than \$200,000 a year and couples making more than \$250,000 a year, the Medicare tax on your withholding is going to rise to 2.35 percent. There is going to be a new 3.8 percent tax. Starting in 2013, a new 3.8 percent tax on unearned income. Dividends, interest, capital gains. 2013, an excise tax of 2.9 percent imposed on the sale of immediate medical devices.

Now, not all medical devices—and we all heard the stories about the Band-Aids when the Senate was talking about this. There will not be a Band-Aid tax. This will be for so-called class 2 and 3 medical devices. Class 2 devices would be syringes, sutures, some testing that a doctor might do in their office. Some of those testing kits will be taxed at that 2.9 percent rate.

Let me tell you something here. As a doctor, you don't get to pass that tax on to your patient because most of your patients that come in that are insured, you actually see them at a contractual rate. So whatever the code is, there is a contractual rate for that code and it doesn't include that 2.9 percent tax. And employers with more than 50 employees must pay a fine of up to \$3,000 if employees receive tax credits to purchase insurance.

So billions of dollars are going to be spent to hire thousands of new IRS employees needed to collect the taxes. Yet three out of 10 doctors says if Congress goes against their will and the will of the American people and passes this bill, they may retire from practicing medicine. So that's what the people are going to get—more IRS agents, less doctors.

Simple equation. How does that equal health care reform?

Ideally, we would repeal the entire bill and start over with real reforms. It seems unlikely that's going to be able to happen. Really, Members on both sides of the aisle that were concerned about this bill last night need to work together to repeal the more egregious portions of this bill and ultimately work toward the repeal of the entire bill when the make-up of the Congress

and the White House has sufficiently changed to allow that to happen.

Let me talk a little bit again about the Senate-passed bill. We're not talking about the reconciliation bill. We're not talking about the House-passed bill. Remember the Senate-passed bill in December? There was a Senator from Connecticut who said, I cannot vote for a bill if it's got a public option in it.

□ 2150

Maybe it's because there are a lot of insurance companies in Connecticut, I don't know what the reasoning was, but that Senator was very firm that they would not have his vote, and they needed every vote they could to get to 60, so the public option was very reluctantly stripped out of the Senate bill. But is it really going? And the answer is it might not be.

Now, you have heard that several States around the country are looking at, I believe it's up to 37, was the last count, are looking at either filing a constitutional challenge or somehow exempting their State from participating in this new Federal legislation, and that also means that they may not set up the State-based exchange that the bill, the Senate bill, calls for.

Well, what happens in a State that doesn't set up an exchange? Is there not going to be any exchange, so there won't be any insurance in the exchange available to citizens of those States? You would think so, because States should ultimately have sovereignty, except that there is a little known Federal agency called the Office of Personnel Management that is going to be charged with setting up a State-based exchange or a national exchange that every State that doesn't have a State-based exchange, that their citizens can buy through this national exchange. And the Office of Personnel Management, in the language of the bill, is required to set up one insurance company, one for-profit insurance company, and one not-for-profit.

Does this federally administered, national exchange, not-for-profit, insurance company begin to look a lot like the public option that was discussed in the Democrat's bill in the House? The answer is, of course it does.

The Office of Personnel Management currently administers the Federal employee health benefits plan here for all Federal employees, not just in Congress, but all employees. So they are a relatively small agency. That's a big insurance plan, but still, as Federal agencies go, that's a relatively small agency.

It is going to have to rapidly ramp up with a great number of new employees. Perhaps that's one of the ways we are going to deal with unemployment is to hire more people in the Federal Government. But the Office of Personnel Management will have to get considerably larger, and this Office of Personnel Management will now be the de facto public option as it administers

the not-for-profit that's in the national exchange that is available to people who are in States that don't set up a State-based exchange.

It is a public option by another name. Unfortunately, the Senator that sought to prevent that from happening did not see the way this was going to work out in their own Senate bill. So when I say the doctors who look at retiring from practice, if there is a public option in the bill, perhaps the more they get to understand that this public option is really in the bill, maybe they will rethink their willingness to continue to work within the system.

Are there other ways to change this bill that we passed last night? Certainly, everyone ought to be treated equally under this bill, and they haven't been. Maybe that's one of the technical fixes we could work on so that there is no geographic disparity, there is no racial disparity. People, equals, ought to be treated equally, and that is one of the things that really we should work on.

I think we should work on getting rid of the individual mandates and the employer mandates. Certainly we could encourage comprehensive coverage for seniors. Right now, look what we are doing to Medicare Advantage. Look what we are doing to putting the tax on the supplemental insurance.

We really should, rather than discouraging seniors from having a Medicare Advantage plan or a supplemental plan, maybe we ought to encourage that. After all, the Medicare Advantage plans are doing what we asked them to do. We asked them for care, coordination, disease management, expanded health IT, expanded use of physician assistants, nurse practitioners, paraprofessionals.

Medicare Advantage plans are performing those functions. They are just now getting to the point where they are really starting to see the cost savings that we all said would be there if they would do those things, and now we are going to take them away. Okay, never mind, we shouldn't have done it anyway, so sorry about that.

Allow health insurance to be sold across State lines. We have talked about this a lot. If you want competition, don't have the Office of Personnel Management create a nonprofit that everyone is going to compete with. That's only one other bit of competition. Let the 1,300 insurance companies that exist in this country, let them compete. Let them compete up on the Internet, let them compete across State lines.

The portability of insurance, Congress attempted to address that back in 1996, arguably made kind of a mess of things. But if we would do things that would establish and create an enhanced portability of insurance, we would go a long way towards establishing a longitudinal relationship, a patient with their insurance company.

If you go from job to job, you don't change insurance companies. You have

your insurance company, and you can take it with you. Allow private insurance and alternatives to Medicaid and SCHIP, special health savings account for the chronically ill, health insurance plans to specialize in solving problems for the chronically ill.

All of these things are out there and within our purview. These are all things we should undertake to fix the egregious problems that are in the Senate bill.

\$13 BILLION A YEAR FOR HEALTH CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I very much appreciate being able to address you here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives and what has been referred to in the past as the world's greatest deliberative body—and what has to struggle to reach that standard these days, I would say, Madam Speaker.

You know, we are not done yet. This legislation passed the House sometime this morning. I will just say, first of all, I am grateful that this usurpation of American liberty technically in its final phase didn't take place on the Sabbath during Lent, although most of the machinations, debates, and battles, and some of the votes, actually did take place on the Sabbath during lent.

Our Founding Fathers would have considered it a serious violation of the standards of decency to assault liberty on the Sabbath, especially during Lent, and I consider it the same. Sacrilegious may have been something that would have come to mind.

But what we have seen is the Senate version of the bill, which has come over here to the House and was voted on and debated on first, and voted on. And the identical form is the Senate—was the legislation that most of us heard President Obama refer to, and I believe it was in the conference February 25 at the Blair House, as ObamaCare.

Thirty-some million more people put on the rolls, and many of them on Medicaid rolls, many of them don't quite fit the standards that seem to be the highest ideals of the initiation of this legislation. The argument is, if there is \$130 billion, it will be reducing the deficit over a 10-year period of time, \$130 billion over 10 years. The American people can move a decimal point one place to the left and figure out what that is annually, \$13 billion a year by their calculations.

Madam Speaker, I could take you down through the list of the spending that has been out of control by this Congress. It all has to be initiated here, promoted by the President of the United States, trillions, trillions of dollars added up, \$700 billion in TARP, \$787 billion, which rolled into over \$800 billion and the economic stimulus plan, of which only 94 percent of Americans believe did any good, and that

trillions that have been added, that have been advanced by the U.S. Treasury and the debt and the deficit that's created by the Obama budget, and we're being told that we should give up 100 percent of our personal control of our own health insurance and health care in America and completely transform the entire health insurance industry, the entire health care delivery system, when we have 85 percent of the people in America that today are insured and 85 percent of them are happy about it.

And we would transform the entire health care delivery system and the health insurance system in America for what? And the argument is, we will reduce the deficit by \$13 billion a year.

Madam Speaker, I would point out that if we were interested in reducing the debt by \$13 billion a year, it would be a piece of cake to take \$13 billion out of the abusive lawsuits that are being driven by the trial lawyers in America. These numbers come to us in stark relief.

The health insurance underwriters give us a number that 8.5 percent of the overall health care costs in America are driven by the abusive lawsuits. That 8.5 percent, when you do the calculation, comes out to be \$207 billion a year. That's the cost of defensive medicine, the litigation, the unnecessary settlements that come, not the part that makes people whole, and the part that goes directly into the pockets of the trial lawyers in America, who are bringing lawsuits and driving physicians to do defensive medicine to the point where it's been going on so long that it's taught in our med schools how you protect yourself from litigation.

□ 2200

You spend the money on unnecessary tests instead. That's my low number, \$207 billion a year, which is the Health Insurance Underwriters. That's 8½ percent. These numbers and estimates go from \$207 billion up to \$210 billion a year, which is the number that's produced by a Government Reform Committee analysis, on up to \$650 billion a year.

So if we were really serious about trying to reduce the deficit, we can do this to \$13 billion a year for the entire massive ObamaCare legislation that was rammed and force-fed through this Congress, at a tremendous amount of bone twisting. \$13 billion a year and \$130 billion over 10 years. Think, if we could abolish the abusive lawsuits and finally end the unnecessary tests, those that are defensive medicine, and take that waste out of our health care system. If we could save \$200 billion a year up to \$650 billion, you've got to be a piker to brag about \$13 billion when you're the President of the United States. And the money that they spent to twist the arms here to get down to that. And then, to add the reality to this that the \$13 billion a year—I'll say the round number of \$130 billion in deficit reduction by the CBO, which was

under a tremendous amount of pressure. We'll find out if they're legitimate or not over time, but their credibility may fall into question. I don't question it here tonight, Madam Speaker.

But here are the things to calculate that aren't part of this calculation when people hear that number of \$130 billion deficit reduction. That is a half a trillion dollars in Medicare reimbursement rates that are cut out of the reimbursement process today; \$500 billion cut out of Medicare. Nobody believes this Congress will vote to cut that spending. Nobody believes that. The people that voted for this bill don't believe that, and the people that voted for this bill will not vote to cut Medicare for half a trillion dollars. That's an accounting gimmick that's designed, like a red herring, to throw the hound off the trail.

Another one of those components of this calculation is \$569.2 billion in tax increases. Tax increases on medical equipment, for example. Tax increases across the whole plethora of things that add up to \$569.2 billion. And another calculation—and we will get the precise number in a moment—\$200-plus billion for the doctors fix.

So when we add this up, Madam Speaker, \$500 billion for Medicare to cut the slash of the underreimbursed Medicare as it is today. According to the CMS, the Centers Medicare & Medicaid Services, the Federal Government, by their calculation of cost, not by the actual cost of providers, only reimburse 80 percent of the Medicare costs to deliver their services. And still, they would cut half a trillion dollars out of them?

Add the half trillion to the \$569 billion in tax increases, and now you have 1 trillion, 69 billion, 200 million in cuts with the tax increase on one side, the cut in Medicare on the other side. Those two things change the revenue of this. You add to that the \$200 billion that is the doctor fix, and now you're up to that area of about \$1.25 trillion dollars of funding that are distorted in the calculations of the Congressional Budget Office, because they do what? They do the calculation on what's presented to them.

And we're supposed to be elated over a CBO score of a deficit reduction of \$130 billion that I guarantee you, Madam Speaker, and I would guarantee to the American people as well, we will never realize such a thing. We will see a complete transformation of our health care system, except that we have launched an effort to repeal this abysmal piece of legislation.

I would be very happy to yield so much time as he may consume to the relentless doctor and Congressman from Texas, who lives this and has made a pledge of his life's effort to come here and get this health care policy right in America. And he can't have slept very well last night.

Dr. BURGESS.

Mr. BURGESS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

There's lots of things I could say. Let me say this on the physician fix in Medicare, because that has been something that has been left out of the equation. The Democrats do say that they passed a bill last fall that the Republicans tried to block and the Senate won't take up, but the fact of the matter is they haven't got it done.

What does it really cost to repeal the sustainable growth rate formula? I have some familiarity because this is something I have worked on ever since I first got here. Three years ago, the Congressional Budget Office score to repeal the sustainable growth rate formula was in the neighborhood of \$290 billion over 10 years.

But what happens, as we all know, every year that we don't fix the SGR, that dollar figure that should have been saved gets added on to the cost of the fix. There is no way that the cost of fixing the sustainable growth rate formula is 1 dollar less than \$300 billion. It is likely \$350 billion or more.

What many of us conveniently choose to ignore is that there will have to be something done to protect seniors who are part B participants, because the premium paid by the seniors in part B is, by law, fixed at 25 percent of the cost of the part B program the previous year. Well, if you add that much money to the cost of the part B program, guess what's going to happen to that senior's 25 percent of their premium? It's going to go up significantly.

Well, in Congress, sometimes we don't like to do that because it makes people mad at us and they get grouchy around election time and they won't vote for us, so we are likely to do something to hold seniors harmless from that rate increase. And, as a consequence, that makes the cost of repealing the SGR even higher.

When you hear people talk about perhaps it can cost as much as \$400 billion to repeal the SGR, they are talking about, yes, the true cost of repealing the SGR and a protection for seniors—at least low-income seniors—in the part B program. All of that is going to cost money. That's the reason that that number gets inflated so high.

Yes, there were some tricks and gimmicks that were used when the Democrats had their bill here in the fall to hold that cost down to, I think it was, \$240 billion or \$250 billion. The fact of the matter remains that it is a huge expenditure completely left off the CBO, Congressional Budget Office, tally sheet. As a consequence, you're not being honest with the American people if you said, Well, this is going to be the greatest revenue saver of all time. Nonsense. Start that story with, "Once upon a time," and finish it with, "And they lived happily ever after," because it is truly a fairy tale or a bedtime story, except it's kind of scary when you think of what your children are going to have to face with the amount of debt we are laying at their feet.

Again, this has been through both the Republican and Democratic-controlled House of Representatives that we have let this happen. It's not to put all the culpability at the feet of the Democrats on the SGR formula, but they are culpable in this regard: They are not attesting to it. They are not accounting for it in this formula or in this score sheet, this tally sheet they have. And then they're going blithely around the country talking about how this is going to save the greatest amount of revenue that anyone has ever seen in peacetime.

The President is going to have a signing ceremony tomorrow for the bill that we passed. He is then embarking upon a tour to sell the American people on the concept of what we passed. That's getting a little backwards, isn't it? Shouldn't we have engaged the American people and gathered the popular support from around the country for this bill before we passed it through the House and the Senate and signed it down at the White House?

This has been their problem all along. I have said it before, but it bears repeating. If you do not have popular support for a measure this large, then it's no great surprise that the people push back. And because the people pushed back, yeah, the Republicans didn't want this and they didn't vote for it, but it was the Democrats within their own conference, within their own caucus. This was a fight in the Democratic caucus. Because how can you go home and face your constituents when they have told you over and over and over again in town halls, telephone town halls, emails, cards, faxes, letters, they have told you over and over and over again. We don't want you to do this. We don't trust you.

The congressional approval rating right now is 17 percent and dropping. We don't trust you to do this. You won't read the bill. You won't take the insurance yourself. Why should we believe you that you can do something this large?

□ 2210

Now had we taken an alternative approach, which was rejected by the President, rejected by the Speaker of the House, but had we taken an alternative approach and said, Let's take three things that are really bugging people and try to fix them, and maybe if they see we can do that, maybe they'll give us the permission to work on a few more things.

So instead of a 1,000-page bill that became a 2,000-page bill that became a 3,000-page bill that became a 4,000-page bill—and this was a 4,000-page bill, by the way. There was 2,700 pages in the Senate legislation, and then another 1,300 pages in reconciliation. That's a lot of pages for the American people to have to sort through on a weekend. And many brave souls, I'm sure, tried. Rather than doing a 4,000-page bill, let's do three or five 50-page bills and try to take care of some of the problems.

You know, here's the sad part. Because a lot of the benefits are shifted out so far because it's just going to take a long time to build the infrastructure and the bureaucracy to administer these things, they're ironically going to do some of the things that JOHN MCCAIN suggested during the campaign. They're going to create risk pools for people with preexisting conditions, and subsidize these risk pools, and get people some help right away. That's a good thing. I would support that. I would have supported that a year ago, had we said, Look, we know we want to work on a big health care bill, but let's get some help for the people that are really needing it right now.

And that poor group of people with preexisting conditions, there is a way we can help them. The Congressional Budget Office scored that at about a \$20 billion cost over 10 years' time. I personally think it's going to be a little bit higher. But that's a far sight less than a trillion-dollar bill. So why didn't we do that a year ago? Why didn't we have a hearing on it in my committee? Why didn't we call in some experts and say, How do you get this done? We are still going to pass a big bill at some point, but we just really want to help these poor folks who have preexisting conditions today.

Why didn't we have a hearing on, What do we need to do to help people who are perhaps facing early retirement, a way to buy into Medicare? Or is there some other type of insurance product that might be out there? Might we do something in the marketplace that would allow a product to be developed and sold for them? We didn't even try. We didn't have a hearing. We didn't talk about it. We just said, No, we're going to do mandates. We're going to do a public option. We'd love to do a single-payer if we thought we could pull the wool over the American people's eyes for just a few more days, and this is what we want to do.

The reality is that people would look back at it and say, No, you can't do that to us. Mandates are unconstitutional. What about equal protection under the law? This deem and pass thing that they flirted with for a few days really got people in a snit until they finally backed off on that. But why be so duplicitous? Why be so fancy about passing these things? Make it a straightforward bill. Make it the number of pages that someone could reasonably read in one sitting, and tell people what you're going to do, tell people what you're going to propose.

Even better yet, go out amongst the people and find out what they want. This is what I did with my nine principles that I have developed for health care reform that were up on my Web site—or perhaps are still up on my Web site. I listened to the people in my town halls. I listened to the people who were on my telephone town halls. They said, Help us with preexisting conditions. Sell across State lines, fairness

in the Tax Code, liability reform, blah, blah, blah. That's what we want.

Why didn't we do it that way? Instead we have this gargantuan bill that we shoved down the throats of the American people. And I don't know, we're stuck up here in Washington. We're insulated inside the cocoon. Our phones have been shut down all weekend. Our faxes have been overloaded. So we don't really know what people are thinking out there. But I've got a hunch they're not happy about what we did last night. I'm sorry to have consumed so much time. I will yield back to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Texas. And I know that since he had a little trouble sleeping last night, if he has a little longer period of time to vent himself tonight, he may be able to get caught up with this and rest a little. But I do not believe that we're going to be forgetting this, nor will we be backing off.

The first order of business this morning issued a bill draft request to repeal this legislation that passed the House last night, the Senate version of the bill. It's not curious at all that it's happened more than one of us has stepped forward to do that. I'll continue to work on that cause and work to have legislation that can repeal the Senate version of the bill and can be converted into a discharge petition that can then bring a repeal to the floor of the House. There are 212 House Members who voted against it. That means if they will all stick to their convictions—and there was one resignation last night, so that means we have seven more on top of that—that if all of those would sign on the courage of their convictions and seven would have a conversion, we would be able to bring a repeal to the floor of the House. That's one of my efforts, Madam Speaker. And I intend to remain committed to that.

Going back on Dr. BURGESS's comments with regard to cost, he said the doctors' fix has to be in the area of \$360 billion. I spoke of the \$500 billion cut in Medicare reimbursement rates as part of that bill and tax increases in there, aggregate, that are \$569.2 billion. The things that aren't in this bill that change the overall cost of the bill totals \$1.4292 trillion that, if they were presented in a fashion that was designed to inform the American people, would have shifted the balance of that scoring from, I'd say, a deficit reduction of \$130 billion to a deficit increase of \$1.429 trillion, minus \$130 billion. So we would be in the area of \$1.3 trillion is what the additional cost of all this is that is masked by the cuts in Medicare, the tax increases that people don't seem to be focused on or animated by, and by the necessity to pass a doctors' fix. All of that. And the net, that would be the net deficit that was created by this bill, when you subtract those numbers, works out to be \$1.3 trillion, a net deficit created by this bill.

All of this to solve a problem that the President has identified as us

spending too much money on health care. So we spend too much money on health care, and the economy's in a downward spiral—this is all the President—and we can't fix the economy unless we first fix health care. The problem with health care is we spend too much money, and the President's solution is spend a lot more. Speaker PELOSI's solution is spend a lot more.

So that's what got done last night, Madam Speaker. The American people end up with a huge liability that goes on to our children, our grandchildren; and babies yet born will be paying interest on a debt that shows no sign to be reduced anytime within the calculations of the people that are in control of this country today, that being the White House, the gavel here, in the White House, and the gavel in the United States Senate.

So when Dr. BURGESS talks about a story that begins with "Once upon a time" and ended with "happily ever after," I don't know if there is a happily ever after for America. But we're living in a once-upon-a-time time, Madam Speaker.

Now, I wanted to take up this issue and roll us back to the Stupak amendment and what happened here in the House last night. The Stupak amendment was brought forward in the weeks before the November 7 first passage of the House version of the bill. It was driven, I think, by the best merits of seeking to prohibit American taxpayers from having to fund abortions. I would like to prohibit abortions; but if we can continue to prohibit American taxpayers from having to fund abortions, at least we're maintaining the current status quo.

That changed last night, Madam Speaker. But the Stupak amendment was motivated and designed to prevent Americans from having to pay for the elimination of innocent unborn human life. That was properly motivated, and it was very hard work here in this Congress. Every Republican supported the Stupak amendment. There were 64 Democrats who voted for the Stupak amendment. Everyone got at least some cover to be able to say, I am pro-life.

That went on from November 7, this cover of being pro-life Democrats, until last night, Madam Speaker. And now it's a legitimate question to ask, Is there such a thing as a pro-life Democrat? Or was it always a political position that was contrived to posture to pacify constituents rather than a deeply held internal conviction that one is willing to stand and sacrifice for? I'm having trouble at this point finding a real pro-life Democrat. I'm sure some of them in their most private world do care a lot about ending the destruction of innocent unborn human life.

But after the Stupak amendment, after the long negotiations that took place, after the events that took place yesterday of Congressman STUPAK in one room, the pro-choice people in another room, shuttle diplomacy going

back and forth, and finally about 4 o'clock yesterday, Congressman STUPAK held a press conference and revealed that the Stupak 12, the dozen that had pledged that they would hold out to defend innocent unborn human lives and oppose Federal funding of abortion, decided that they had found a solution that would take them off of the pressure hook and out of the pressure cooker that was being put there by the Speaker.

□ 2220

We have to believe if the Stupak 12 would have stuck together, this anti-liberty, anti-life bill would have failed last night. But it did not.

Now what was the rationale that came before that Stupak press conference yesterday? And in the Stupak dozen, I would point out that we still don't know who they all are. We probably know who some are, but we don't know who they all are. And you can't count votes in this United States Congress or any legislative body unless the people that are on the list are public.

If they say I will be a "no" on the Senate version of the bill unless there is a fix that will put real pro-life language in it, if they will step up at a press conference and take their position and make that pledge before God and man, you can generally count on them. But a lot of them were pledged by Congressman STUPAK, but they were anonymous, Madam Speaker.

I never believe an anonymous oath stuck for anything because they can always flip and vote the other way. And when pinned down later on, they can say, I was never one of the Stupak dozen. So they had the option. Those who were not public, those whose names didn't leak out into the press, they all had the option to vote yes or no. If they voted no on the bill because it didn't have pro-life protections in it, then after the final vote, they could always say, Well, I stood up for innocent, unborn human life. I was one of the Stupak dozen.

But if they voted yes, Madam Speaker, and when they were accused later on of flipping their position and not sticking with their publicly announced convictions on pro-life, they could always say, Well, I was never part of the Stupak dozen. I really didn't make that pledge or that oath. I was not part of that deal. So don't write me into this presuming I flipped positions and didn't stick to my convictions because I never announced my convictions. That is what goes on when people who are supposedly part of a coalition remain anonymous and their names do not become public. Their public statements are not part of the record. And so therefore they can vote any way they want to vote and always hide from the accountability. They don't have to give or keep their word. And for months, the Stupak dozen remained anonymous.

And now we have to wonder, was there a single Member of Congress, was

it all Democrats on that dozen, was there a single one that had the courage of their convictions that put up a vote to defend innocent, unborn human life? Or did they all find a way to slip into the excuse of, the President of the United States is going to sign an Executive order that will take the Stupak language and make it the law of the land. That is the summary of the Stupak conference yesterday, as I heard it.

The President's Executive order makes protection of innocent unborn human life from the assault of American taxpayers' dollars, pro-life American taxpayers' dollars protected by an Executive order of the President of the United States.

Now, I have to believe that a duping has taken place here. We are the people who have to take an oath, and we are glad to do it. An oath to uphold the Constitution of the United States. We take that oath right down here on the floor together, and I carry the family Bible in to take my oath, to uphold this Constitution of the United States. And we are upholding a Constitution—what we understand the text of the Constitution to mean. And what it was understood to mean at the time of its ratification.

It cannot be anything else. It cannot be a living, breathing, growing, moving, changing, morphing organism. The Constitution has to mean what it says. If it doesn't mean what it says, it is no guarantee whatsoever. It is simply a document that allows a judge or a manipulating attorney to manipulate society however they choose to do so. Or the Constitution could just become instead a shield that an activist judge can hold up and say, that is the Constitution. It was my job to interpret it as a growing, moving, changing, morphing document; and because society has changed, the Constitution has to adapt to it. That is nuts.

It is nuts to think that the Constitution has any value if we are going to put it in the hands of an activist judge and have it turn into something that is malleable, that they can shape in their hands however they want to. There wouldn't be any reason for a Constitution if it was growing, moving, changing, and morphing. The text of it has to mean what it was understood to mean at the time of the ratification of the basic document, the Bill of Rights, or each of the amendments in their time as they came through.

And the Founding Fathers put provisions in place so if we weren't satisfied with this Constitution, its text in its original understanding, then we could amend it. A fair amount of wisdom. It is a high bar. But still, it needs to be a high bar to amend the Constitution because this is our guarantee.

And to think that we would have Members of this United States Congress at this very high and presumably well-educated, well-informed, and sophisticated level, that would take an oath to uphold this Constitution, each

2 years as they are seated in this Congress, and believe somehow this Constitution doesn't mean what it says, that there really isn't what you would call a separation of powers, that the executive, the legislative and the judicial branches of government somehow are not defined specifically in here with our individual duties. All legislative powers are vested in the Congress; they are not vested in the President of the United States.

You don't have to read very far into the Constitution, Article I, section 1, "All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and a House of Representatives." All legislative powers, Madam Speaker.

And yet, Congressman STUPAK and the other 11 of the Stupak dozen found it convenient to believe that this doesn't mean what it says, that a President of the United States can amend the legislation of the land, the law of the land, by Executive order? Who could dream of such a thing? What kind of country could we have if the President can amend the legislation, the Federal code, by Executive order? Any President could come in on a whim and amend the very reasoned deliberations of the House and the Senate that we have come together and concurred in, and sent the document to the President of the United States to be signed into law, and the President could then just simply sign an Executive order to change it?

If the President can do that, why didn't he just write the entire socialized medicine ObamaCare package? If he can run this country by Executive order, we don't need a legislative branch, unless we come together to appropriate money. And why can't you do that by Executive order, too?

This is the kind of thinking that subverts our Constitution. And this initiated and promised from the President of the United States, who used to teach constitutional law at the University of Chicago as an adjunct professor. I will just read this again, just in case we forget what Article I, section 1 says. "All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives."

The gentleman from Michigan and the 11 other gentlemen and gentleladies who are either publicly part of the Stupak 12 found something that was the best deal that they could find to let them do what they were probably willing to do for a long time before they finally capitulated, and that is vote for this socialized medicine bill, because that is where the political power has gone. So they will migrate where political power is instead of standing on their convictions to defend innocent, unborn life.

How can it be that the President of the United States will sign an Executive order that alters the legislative language of the United States Con-

gress? What utter arrogance on the part of the White House. What utter naivete, at best, on the part of the Members of this Congress that buy into such a thing.

□ 2230

Madam Speaker, I'm not without experience in this category. I didn't just open up the Constitution and read Article I, section 1. I have a deep and long history with defending the Constitution and the separation of powers.

And, in fact, as a State senator, I exercised that at some expense to myself and my family. As a State senator, I took an oath to uphold the Constitution of the United States and the Constitution of the State of Iowa. And some time in 1999, I received a fax that came from an anonymous source, and I never found out where, but it was a photocopy of an article that was written in the Washington Blade here in Washington, D.C., and it said, at that time State of Iowa Governor Vilsack, now Secretary of Agriculture, had signed an executive order, an executive order that granted special protected status for sexual orientation and gender identity. And it was—I want to say it took great credit for that executive order advancing the special rights of people who often read the Washington Blade newspaper.

It seemed to me that somebody had a little bit of extra exuberance that somehow that information would be sent out here to Washington and it would be posted in the paper and nobody in Iowa would have probably picked up on it, but I think somebody out here found it, cut it out, and faxed it to me. That was on a Wednesday evening. I read that article, checked the Iowa Administrative Bulletin, and there on page 632 of the Iowa Administrative Bulletin I found the executive order.

Now, the Governor had had a press conference that day. He'd talked about several other actions on his part, but he didn't talk about the executive order, executive order number 7, granting special protected status for sexual orientation and gender identity.

And I went to our attorneys and I said, I believe this is a violation of separation of powers. I believe he is legislating by executive order, and I believe it's a constitutional violation. And even our attorneys on our side of this analyzed it and said, No, you're wrong. This is very carefully written and artfully drafted and nuanced in such a way that it isn't a violation of the Constitution, and this executive order will stand.

And it didn't make sense to me, and they couldn't explain it to me. And often I find out, if they can't, it isn't just because I can't understand it; it might be they don't either.

So I sat down at the word processor and I put all the language in section 19B.2 of the Iowa Code. I typed it in so I had the words to work with. Then I took the executive order number 7 on

page 632 of the Iowa Administrative Bulletin and I patched that in to the code of the civil rights section of the Code of Iowa, Iowa law, just like our Federal Code here, Federal law. And where it struck out words in the Iowa Code, I put strike-throughs in them; and where it introduced words, I put underlines in them, and pretty soon I had a document that showed me what the Code of Iowa would read like if that executive order were allowed to stand.

And it was clear to me that the Governor had legislated by executive order. He'd added two more categories to the special protected status of the Civil Rights Act which was patterned off of title VII of the Civil Rights Act in the Federal Code. So it was clear to me that the Governor, the chief executive officer of my State, had legislated by executive order. I didn't have anybody that agreed with me, but I believed it.

So I sat down and I wrote up an analysis of it. And I set that up and I sent it out to about a dozen of the people out there whose judgment I trust, and I asked them to give me an opinion. And that was on a Thursday night.

And before I got an opinion back from anyone, I was driving down the road that Friday morning about 10:15 or so, maybe 10:30, listening to one of our radio talk show hosts, our top radio talk show host in Iowa, who happens to be one of the people that's talking on WHO radio. And that is the original station where Ronald Reagan had a microphone when he learned the broadcasting business, so anyone that has access to that microphone has a legacy to uphold.

And as our talk show host was talking, he brought up this executive order, which I didn't think anybody knew about but me, and he began going down through a list of items that he objected to and an analysis of it. And as I listened, as I drove down the road, it occurred to me that this sounds a lot like the points that I had sent out the night before to my friends for their opinions. And I pulled my pickup truck—where I come from, they're just a pickup—off on the gravel road at an intersection and I dialed on my cell phone into that radio program.

And he asked me what I thought and I told him. I said, I believe the Governor is legislating by executive of order. I believe it's a constitutional violation of the separation of powers.

And he said, What are you going to do—at the time—State Senator? He said, What are you going to do, Senator? And I said, I'm going to sue the Governor.

And he asked me, Do you have the support of the legislature? I said, There are 150 of us between the house and the senate, and if 149 of them think it's a bad idea, I am suing him anyway, because he's violated the Constitution of the State of Iowa by legislating by executive order.

Now, to move this longer story into a shorter version, Madam Speaker, it comes down to this. I followed through

on that. There were a number of people that joined me as plaintiffs. I'm very glad that they did. They were stalwart, and we stood together. But the case of *King v. Vilsack* went before the courts, and the courts found in my favor and in the favor of the Constitution and in the favor of the people that stood up to defend the Constitution, and they vacated the executive order because it was unconstitutional. It was an attempt by an executive officer to legislate by executive order rather than allow the constitutional authority of the legislative branch to make those decisions. And so that executive order number 7 was vacated by the courts.

And I believe it was a help to the administration, the Vilsack administration, so that they didn't follow down that path and continue to try to run the State of Iowa without regard to respect for the legitimate authority of the legislative branch.

Well, now Governor Vilsack is the Secretary of Agriculture. We've had our times together, but I'm appreciative of that time, because that gave me the background and that gave me the responsibility to analyze these issues and come to a fundamental conclusion.

If a Governor can't legislate by executive order, neither can a President. It's the height of arrogance to think that you can do so by executive order, especially when the President has so much on the record that would say otherwise.

And I would point out that President Obama was very, very critical of President Bush for his signing statements, not executive orders, that—essentially not an executive order that it would amend a statute that hasn't even gotten to the President's desk yet, but a signing statement that points out reservations about constitutionality of certain segments of a bill.

And here is what President Obama said of signing statements. This is March 9, 2009. He's been inaugurated for a couple of months, a month and a half now. And the title of this memo is, from the White House, "Memorandum for the Heads of Executive Departments and Agencies; Subject: Presidential Signing Statements."

Now, remember, this is the President who, as a candidate, was critical of President Bush for his signing statements. And he says this: "In recent years, there has been considerable public discussion and criticism of the use of signing statements to raise constitutional objections to statutory provisions."

This is the President who has objections to the utilization of signing statements, which I have some of those same reservations to be objective in this.

And he goes on and says: "There is no doubt that the practice of issuing such statements can be abused," an implication President Bush abused those.

Continuing, "Constitutional signing statements should not be used to sug-

gest that the President will disregard statutory requirements on the basis of policy disagreements."

I'd better read that again. "Constitutional signing statements should not be used to suggest that the President will disregard statutory requirements on the basis of policy disagreements."

That's President Obama as recently as March 9, 2009. And here he is, March 21st, now the 22nd, 2010. So let's just call this a year and a couple of weeks later, the President of the United States apparently believes that he can go beyond the signing statement, even though he's critical of signing statements and the "constitutional signing statement should not be used to suggest that the President will disregard statutory requirements on the basis of policy disagreements."

Well, there apparently is a policy disagreement between Bart Stupak and the other 11, however anonymous they might be, and those who are willing to vote for this bill, regardless. But we know the President of the United States doesn't disagree with the policy in the bill that he's about to sign tomorrow.

□ 2240

He and BART STUPAK disagree, as do the 11, as does every Republican that voted for the Stupak amendment and presumably some of those that are part of the 64 Democrats that did the first time around.

But the President's taken a position that signing statements are to be used carefully and with great restraint even though he said as a candidate he didn't support signing statements at all. And now the same President is telling us that he can amend a piece of legislation that's been fought over since last July by everybody in America, finally passes the House of Representatives, goes to the President's desk, and he's going to amend it by executive order to keep our STUPAK happy. And I went to court to sue a Governor who is now the Secretary of Agriculture successfully to make the point that the chief executive officer of the State or the United States has no authority to amend legislation by executive order. *King v. Vilsack*'s in the books. This executive order doesn't have any weight or substance. It will either be thrown out in court or will be disregarded. Mr. STUPAK has to know that.

That is another thing that the President went on and said with signing statements. With these considerations in mind and based upon advice of the Department of Justice, the President, speaking through this memo, I will issue signing statements to address constitutional concerns only when it is appropriate to do so as a means of discharging my constitutional responsibilities. In issuing signing statements I shall adhere to the following principles: Ya-da-da.

Only when it is appropriate to do so as a means of discharging my constitutional responsibilities. The President

doesn't have a constitutional responsibility to sign an executive order. It would alter the language in the legislation. That is the responsibility of this Congress. And to think that there would be a piece of legislation that was passed here that could not have passed if the convictions of the people that were required to vote for it would have been reflected in their vote. But no. The false promise of an executive order brings about the flip of a dozen votes and a bill that couldn't pass—in fact, a bill that couldn't pass the United States Senate today passed the floor of the House last night, and it's on its way to the President because the President promised an executive order that would, in effect, amend the legislation that will soon be signed into law. It is a constitutional violation. I have been to court to prove it.

And I would go further and say why would anybody believe that it is the intent of the President to follow through on such a thing if, in the ultra-hypothetical situation, he really had an authority to sign an executive order that would bring about this effect? Why would anybody believe this?

I went back today and a looked through the transcripts of the Illinois State Senate. And here's what I found. State of Illinois, 92d General Assembly, regular session, Senate transcript 20th legislative day, March 30, 2001. Not so old in our time.

Where's the President on the issue of protecting unborn human lives? Well, before the Illinois legislature, several times the Illinois Born-Alive Infants Protection Act was introduced, it was introduced to provide legal protection to all born babies wanted or not, including the right—and it gave them the right to medical care. Then-Senator Barack Obama voted multiple times against such legislation. The President has not stood up to defend innocent unborn human life. When he was asked at the Saddleback Church in August of 2008 when his life began or when life begins, his answer was, That is above my pay scale.

Well, he seemed to think it was not above his pay scale when he spoke on the floor of the Senate that day. And the sum total of the dialogue of the President would tell any careful reader with a somewhat critical eye that the President of the United States must believe that a woman who was seeking an abortion, even though the baby survived the attempted abortion, has a right to a dead baby anyway.

Here's what I read from that transcript on that day, which is March 30, 2001. The floor of the Illinois Senate. And the question came from Senator Obama: "Thank you, Madam President. Will the sponsor yield for questions?" Presiding answer responded: "He indicates he will."

In which case State Senator Obama followed with this. He said: "This bill was fairly extensively debated in the Judiciary Committee, and so I won't belabor the issue. I do want to just

make sure that everybody in the Senate knows what this bill is about, as I understand it.

“Senator O’Malley, the testimony during the committee indicated that one of the key concerns was—is that there was a method of abortion, an induced abortion, where the—the fetus or child, as—as some might describe it, is still temporarily alive outside the womb. And one of the concerns that came out of the testimony was the fact that they were not being properly cared for during that brief period of time that they were still living. Is that correct? Is that an accurate sort of description of one of the key concerns in the bill?”

Senator O’Malley, presiding officer, apparently responded and then from, yes, Senator O’Malley, the sponsor of the bill, said, “Senator Obama, it is certainly a key concern that the—the way children are treated following their birth under the circumstances has been reported to be, without question, in my opinion, less than humane, and so this bill suggests that appropriate steps be taken to treat that baby as a—a citizen of the United States and afforded all the rights and protections it deserves under the Constitution of the United States.”

That is Senator O’Malley.

Senator Obama responded: “Well, it turned out—that during the testimony a number of members who are typically in favor of a woman’s right to choose an abortion were actually sympathetic to some of the concerns that your—you raised and that were raised by witnesses in the testimony. And there was some suggestion that we might be able to craft something that might meet constitutional muster with respect to caring for fetuses or children who were delivered in this fashion.”

Senator Obama continued: “Unfortunately, this bill goes a little bit further, and so I just want to suggest, not that I think that it’ll make too much difference with respect to how we vote, that this is probably not going to survive constitutional scrutiny. Number one, whenever we define a pre-viable fetus as a person that is protected by the equal protection clause or the other elements in the Constitution, what we’re really saying is, in fact, that they are persons that are entitled to the kinds of protections.”

In any case, watching the clock tick down, Madam Speaker, I’m going to follow with this—let’s see, “that they are persons that are entitled to the kinds of protections that would be provided to a—a child, a 9-month-old—child that was delivered to term.” In other words, he draws a distinction between the unborn child that is struggling for life after an attempt of abortion and the child that is 9-months-old.

And he goes on and says: “That determination then, essentially, if it was accepted by a court, would forbid abortions to take place. I mean, it—it would essentially bar abortions, because the equal protection clause does

not allow somebody to kill a child and if this is a”—so he admits that. He admits then abortion is killing a child if you allow that child to be named as a citizen of the United States by law.

Now continuing: “And if this is a child, then this would be an anti-abortion statute. For that purpose, I think it would probably be found unconstitutional. The second reason that it would be found unconstitutional.

“This essentially says that a doctor is required to provide treatment to a pre-viable child, or fetus, however way you may want to describe it. Viability is the line that has been drawn by the Supreme Court to determine whether or not an abortion can or cannot take place.”

Not true, actually, Madam Speaker. They didn’t draw that line. They made exceptions for life or health of the mother and that includes now, according to *Dole v. Bolton* as to economic or the familial health of the perspective mother, who I consider as a mother that day.

It goes on, and I will just bring this to a conclusion, as the President of the United States continues all of this dialogue on the floor of the Illinois Senate, standing up in opposition to the Born-Alive Infants Protection Act which protects the life of a child that has survived an abortion from being pushed off into a cold room and starved to death so no one can hear that child scream itself to death, the President argues in the substance of this that this woman has a right to a dead baby.

□ 2250

It concludes this way: “As a consequence, I think that we will probably end up in court once again, as we often do on this issue, and, as a consequence, I will be voting ‘present.’”

This President said he would vote “present” on the issue of the Born Alive Act, which is the most outrageous position, and it finds itself in direct contradiction to the Born Alive Act, which is almost identical to the Illinois act that was passed unanimously in this United States Congress, in the House, and by a voice vote in the Senate, or vice versa; I actually don’t remember which way, without opposition in each Chamber, but opposition in the Chamber of the Illinois Senate, by the President of the United States, who now we are going to trust to write an Executive order that’s not going to be constitutionally upheld, that doesn’t have the convictions of the President, but it gives just the smallest of fig leaves for the Stupak dozen. That’s what the American people have seen, Madam Speaker. That’s what brings some of their outrage.

But shifting subjects and bringing this into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and towards the conclusion, I will point out a press release that does give me some hope. This is a press release that also comes from Chicago, AP. The headline is this: “ACORN disbanding because of money woes, scandal.” It’s

an article by Michael Tarm, and it was filed at 8:57, fairly fresh news for us.

It says, “The once mighty community activist group ACORN announced Monday it is folding amid falling revenues—6 months after video footage emerged showing some of its workers giving tax tips to conservative activists posing as a pimp and a prostitute.

Hannah and James, in 6 months, according to this article, have brought about the destruction of ACORN, ACORN the criminal enterprise, ACORN that has been involved in advocating for a Community Reinvestment Act and then deciding they are the brokers of who is writing the most bad loans in bad neighborhoods. ACORN, the organization that admitted to over 400,000 false or fraudulent voter registration forms, ACORN that has been under multiple prosecutions in multiple States, at least 14, I believe it is 16 States in the country for voter fraud, voter registration fraud and a number of other activities.

ACORN, the organization that was raided in New Orleans, Louisiana, at their national headquarters, and the Attorney General of the State of Louisiana brought out a massive amount of records, copied those records for ACORN, and they are being sorted through to this day. ACORN, the organization that seemed to want to change the shingle but it couldn’t change the faces of the people that were running the organization, and the pressure that’s come in this Congress to shut off funding to go to ACORN; the United States Senate shut off funding to ACORN. Thanks to Senator MIKE JOHANNIS, who offered the amendments to get that done.

And then there was a judge, Nina Gershon, in the Eastern District of New York, who decided that Congress didn’t have a constitutional authority to end funding to a multiple criminal enterprise entity because we failed, our government failed, our Solicitor General apparently failed to make the argument before the Eastern District of New York that Congress had some motive other than punitive. And so there was an unprecedented decision made by Judge Nina Gershon, and she ruled that it was a bill of attainder and we should not have punished ACORN, and that ACORN has access to, and should, to Federal funding for grants and contracts, not only what’s going on in the past, what’s going on now, but in the future, because they have been successful in the past, and Congress failed to prove.

Well, there isn’t going to be that center of ACORN to appropriate funds to as long as we keep the pressure up, Madam Speaker. America is a better place because of this good news tonight.

I am not convinced that this is the end of ACORN. I think people like that re-form again and shape new organizations and come back in an insidious way, but we have got to follow and track all the money all the way down.

We have got to stand up for the principle of life, we have got to stand up for the Constitution. We have got to respect article 1, section 1, where all legislative authority is vested in the Constitution of the United States.

Follow through on ACORN. The sun did come up this morning, even though it was behind the cloud, and there is still some free air left in America.

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

OMISSION FROM THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF SATURDAY, MARCH 20, 2010 AT PAGE H1818

DISCHARGE PETITIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XV, the following discharge petition was filed:

[Omitted from the Record of March 20, 2010]

Petition 10. March 15, 2010, by Mr. WALTER B. JONES on the bill H.R. 775, was signed by the following Members: Walter B. Jones, Joe Wilson, and Adam H. Putnam.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today and the balance of the week on account of official business.

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. SABLON) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SABLON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MALONEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFazio, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCDERMOTT, 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. MCCOTTER, for 5 minutes, today and March 23 and 24.

Mr. LATTA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GOHMERT, for 5 minutes, today.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 3590. An act entitled The Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 23, 2010, at 10:30 a.m., for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

6723. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of 4 officers to wear the authorized insignia of the grade of brigadier general, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

6724. A letter from the Assistant to the Board, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the System's "Major" final rule — Truth in Lending [Regulation Z; Docket No. R-1370] received March 19, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6725. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Employee Benefits Security Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Multiemployer Pension Plan Information Made Available on Request (RIN: 1210-AB21) received March 4, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

6726. A letter from the NIH Associate Director for AIDS Research and Director, Office of AIDS Research, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting Fiscal Year 2011 Trans-NIH AIDS Research By-Pass Budget Estimate and Trans-NIH Plan for HIV-Related Research; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6727. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Insurer Reporting Requirements; List of Insurers Required To File Reports [Docket No.: NHTSA-2009-0050] (RIN: 2127-AK46) received March 4, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6728. A letter from the District of Columbia Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a copy of the report entitled, "District's Earmark Process Needs Improvement", pursuant to D.C. Code section 47-117(d); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6729. A letter from the District of Columbia Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a copy of the report entitled, "District's Earmark Process Needs Improvement", pursuant to D.C. Code section 47-117(d); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6730. A letter from the Associate Deputy Director, Central Intelligence Agency, transmitting the Agency's annual report prepared in accordance with Section 203 of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002, Pub. L. 107-174, for Fiscal Year 2009; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6731. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Financial Report of the United States Government for Fiscal Year 2009; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6732. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Human Resources, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6733. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Human Resources, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6734. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Human Resources, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6735. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; PIAGGIO AERO INDUSTRIES S.p.A. Model PIAGGIO P-180 Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2009-1116; Directorate Identifier 2009-CE-061-AD; Amendment 39-16193; AD 2010-03-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 4, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6736. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation Model S-92A Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0066; Directorate Identifier 2009-SW-52-AD; Amendment 39-16190; AD 2009-23-51] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 4, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6737. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Model 767-200, -300, and -300F Series Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0031; Directorate Identifier 2009-NM-266-AD; Amendment 39-16192; AD 2010-03-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 4, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6738. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Empresa Brasileira de Aeronautica S.A. (EMBRAER) Model EMB-135BJ, -135ER, -135KE, -135KL, and -135LR Airplanes; and EMB-145, -145ER, -145MR, -145LR, -145XR, -145MP, and -145EP Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0659; Directorate Identifier 2009-NM-060-AD; Amendment 39-16191; AD 2010-03-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 4, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6739. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revision of Area Navigation (RNAV) Route Q-108; Florida [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0885; Airspace Docket No. 09-ASO-17] received March 4, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6740. A letter from the Ambassador, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the 2010 Trade Policy Agenda and 2009 Annual Report on the Trade Agreements Program, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 2213(a); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6741. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's FY 2007 annual report on the Child Support Enforcement Program, pursuant to Section 452(a) of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6742. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting First Quarterly Report of FY 2010 under The Veterans' Benefits Improvement Act of 2008, pursuant to Public Law 110-389; jointly to the Committees on the Judiciary and Veterans' Affairs.

6743. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting a copy of the Railroad Retirement Handbook; jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FILNER: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 4810. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to make certain improvements in the services provided for homeless veterans under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs (Rept. 111-449). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FILNER: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 1879. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for employment and reemployment rights for certain individuals ordered to full-time National Guard duty; with an amendment (Rept. 111-450). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FILNER: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 3976. A bill to extend certain expiring provisions providing enhanced protections for servicemembers relating to mortgages and mortgage foreclosure; with amendments (Rept. 111-451). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FILNER: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 4667. A bill to increase, effective as of December 1, 2010, the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes (Rept. 111-452). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FILNER: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 4592. A bill to provide for the establishment of a pilot program to encourage the employment of veterans in energy-related positions; with an amendment (Rept. 111-453). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PERLMUTTER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1204. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4899) making emergency supplemental appropriations for disaster relief and summer jobs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes (Rept. 111-454). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CARDOZA: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1205. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4849) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives for small business job creation, extend the Build America Bonds program, provide other infrastructure job creation tax incentives, and for other purposes (Rept. 111-455). 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 Ms. WATSON:

H.R. 4900. A bill to amend chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code, to create the National Office for Cyberspace, to revise requirements relating to Federal information

security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. MORAN of Kansas:

H.R. 4901. A bill to repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Appropriations, Ways and Means, Education and Labor, the Judiciary, Natural Resources, House Administration, and Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCKEON:

H.R. 4902. A bill to establish additional research, study, and reporting requirements for the Department of Defense working group reviewing the possible repeal of current United States policy concerning homosexuality in the Armed Forces, referred to as Don't Ask, Don't Tell and codified as section 654 of title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. BACHMANN (for herself, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. ISSA, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. INGLIS, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. LATTA, and Mr. KING of Iowa):

H.R. 4903. A bill to repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Education and Labor, the Judiciary, Natural Resources, House Administration, Appropriations, and Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 4904. A bill to prohibit the use of funds for implementation or enforcement of any Federal mandate to purchase health insurance; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BAIRD (for himself and Mrs. BIGGERT):

H.R. 4905. A bill to guide and provide for research activities at the Department of Energy Office of Science, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

By Mr. GORDON of Tennessee:

H.R. 4906. A bill to reauthorize the Advanced Research Projects Agency-Energy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

By Mr. CARNAHAN (for himself, Mr. TONKO, and Ms. GIFFORDS):

H.R. 4907. A bill to establish Energy Innovation Hubs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 4908. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Education to make grants to support fire safety education programs on college campuses; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. BACHMANN:

H.R. 4909. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2168 7th Avenue in Anoka, Minnesota, as the "Richard K. Sorenson Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BURTON of Indiana:

H.R. 4910. A bill to repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and enact the Empowering Patients First Act in order to provide incentives to encourage health insurance coverage; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Natural Resources, Education and Labor, Ways and Means, the Judi-

ciary, Rules, the Budget, Appropriations, House Administration, and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COOPER:

H.R. 4911. A bill to repeal specific provisions in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. HALVORSON (for herself, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Ms. GIFFORDS):

H.R. 4912. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to eliminate the required reduction in the amount of combat-related special compensation paid to disabled combat-related uniformed services retirees retired under chapter 61 of such title whose disability is attributable to an injury for which the members were awarded the Purple Heart; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HIMES (for himself and Mr. KLEIN of Florida):

H. Con. Res. 256. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that any official within the Government of Iran at the level of deputy minister or higher or officer within the Iranian Revolutionary Guard is presumptively ineligible for a travel visa to the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 40: Mr. NADLER of New York.
 H.R. 211: Ms. JENKINS, Mr. HARE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. MARCHANT.
 H.R. 413: Mr. COOPER, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. ARCURI, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.
 H.R. 450: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
 H.R. 836: Mr. MCNERNEY.
 H.R. 952: Mr. BOREN.
 H.R. 1020: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
 H.R. 1074: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 1132: Mr. BILBRAY and Mr. ELLISON.
 H.R. 1210: Mr. CONYERS.
 H.R. 1250: Mr. ELLISON.
 H.R. 1351: Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
 H.R. 1352: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. PETRI, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. ADLER of New Jersey.
 H.R. 1362: Mr. CASTLE.
 H.R. 1398: Mr. DENT.
 H.R. 1430: Mr. PRICE of Georgia.
 H.R. 1796: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
 H.R. 1829: Mr. GRIFFITH.
 H.R. 1835: Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California.
 H.R. 1879: Ms. GRANGER and Ms. GIFFORDS.
 H.R. 1956: Mr. HARPER.
 H.R. 2156: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
 H.R. 2308: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
 H.R. 2485: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.
 H.R. 3070: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
 H.R. 3156: Ms. RICHARDSON and Mr. RANGEL.
 H.R. 3407: Mr. GERLACH.
 H.R. 3764: Mr. GONZALEZ.
 H.R. 3936: Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, Mr. SCHOCK, Mrs. DAHLKEMPER, Ms. SUTTON, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
 H.R. 4021: Mr. SIREs.
 H.R. 4090: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 4122: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas and Mr. POLIS of Colorado.

H.R. 4241: Mr. BOREN and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 4392: Ms. RICHARDSON.

H.R. 4396: Mr. SKELTON.

H.R. 4402: Mr. POLIS of Colorado.

H.R. 4415: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.

H.R. 4430: Mr. AKIN.

H.R. 4538: Ms. BORDALLO.

H.R. 4543: Mr. HONDA, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. HERGER, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. STARK, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FARR, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. COSTA, Mr. NUNES, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. DREIER, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. CHU, Ms. WATSON, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. WATERS, Ms. HARMAN, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. BACA, Mr. CALVERT, Mrs. BONO MACK, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. ISSA, Mr. FILNER, Mr. HUNTER, and Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 4603: Mrs. BACHMANN.

H.R. 4615: Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts.

H.R. 4684: Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts.

H.R. 4709: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.

H.R. 4755: Mr. VISCLOSKEY.

H.R. 4800: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 4806: Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 4812: Mr. HINOJOSA and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 4815: Mr. CONAWAY.

H.R. 4856: Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. MARSHALL.

H.R. 4864: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

H.R. 4865: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia and Mr. SARBANES.

H.R. 4894: Mr. REICHERT.

H.R. 4896: Mr. HUNTER and Mr. LATTA.

H.J. Res. 79: Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.J. Res. 80: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H. Con. Res. 98: Mr. CLAY.

H. Con. Res. 252: Mr. BACA and Mr. LAMBORN.

H. Res. 173: Mr. LATOURETTE and Mr. HILL.

H. Res. 252: Mr. MAFFEI.

H. Res. 763: Mr. PENCE and Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H. Res. 859: Mr. RUSH.

H. Res. 913: Ms. CASTOR of Florida and Mr. RUSH.

H. Res. 992: Mr. SHIMKUS.

H. Res. 1016: Mr. OLVER and Mr. FATTAH.

H. Res. 1033: Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. MCCARTHY of California.

H. Res. 1060: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. BARTON of Texas, and Mr. MACK.

H. Res. 1116: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN and Mr. MCCARTHY of California.

H. Res. 1121: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr.

ISSA, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. CHINGREY of Georgia, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. LINDER, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

H. Res. 1181: Mr. LAMBORN.

H. Res. 1191: Mr. SOUDER.

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. OBEY

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Appropriations in H.R. 4899, the Disaster Relief and Summer Jobs Act of 2010, do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. SPRATT

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on the Budget in H.R. 4899, the Disaster Relief and Summer Jobs Act of 2010, do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9(d), 9(e), or 9(f) of Rule XXI.