

Judge CARTER pointed out, Mr. Speaker, they were going to be forced and are going to be forced to purchase health insurance that has first dollar coverage.

Do you think there's any plans ultimately to expand health savings accounts and let young people who are healthy, as the judge pointed out, and taking care of themselves and exercising and doing all of the right things to buy a health insurance policy they can afford, one with a high deductible, but a low monthly premium, and it has catastrophic coverage, they are not going to be permitted to do that? They are going to have to get these first dollar plans by 2014, and they can't afford it.

I thank the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, for allowing me to share my thoughts. My colleagues, I think, know that I have practiced medicine for 31 years, and I know of what I speak in regard to the American people being opposed to having the Federal Government come in lock, stock and barrel and take over one-sixth of our economy to make decisions that should be made in the sanctity of the exam room between a doctor and a patient.

I look forward to the rest of your comments.

Mr. CARTER. Thank you. Just going over this, this is a welcome sign for all. It may not be all the States now because more have joined in. Let's just look real quickly: Washington, Colorado, Nevada, Texas, Idaho, North Dakota, Arizona, Louisiana, Nebraska, South Dakota, Utah, Michigan, Pennsylvania, Virginia, Indiana, South Carolina, Alabama, Georgia, Mississippi and Florida.

That's a pretty good gallery of the States, and it's not just one region. It's across the country, and it's because the American people are being affected across the country. Ultimately, the courage of these attorneys general will stand up for every American citizen on this issue, and I commend them, and I congratulate them, and I am looking forward to in some small way if I can work with them, because I think it's an important thing.

The gentleman mentioned expert. You know, we say in the legal position an expert is a guy from out of town with a briefcase. I have seen that in the courtroom a lot, and I would have to say I agree with that in some instances. No, we are all in some form experts on the Constitution because we can all stick one in our back pocket and carry it around and we can read it and we can learn what it says. In fact, that's kind of what's going on in the country right now. An awful lot of the people are getting themselves a Constitution and they are reading it. I said, wait a minute, this thing was to restrict government. This doesn't restrict government.

One of the arguments is being made, making the ninth and 10th amendment the commerce clause. The commerce clause says the U.S. Congress shall

have the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States and with the Indian tribes. The ninth amendment says the enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others of the rights retained by the people.

Remember, this Constitution starts off by saying, people have certain inalienable rights, rights that cannot be alienated. Granted by God, that's what the Constitution says by divine providence, and among those are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, which means there's more.

□ 2140

This Bill of Rights and the Constitution sets forth a lot of those rights, but they're not all the rights.

And remember, we go back to what were they starting to do? They were starting to get tyranny off our back; don't let the government impose its will upon us. That's what we started out with when the first Minuteman went to Bunker Hill and Breed's Hill to stand up against the Red Coats. It was because they felt like the government was imposing unfair will upon the individuals in the American colonies.

And then the 10th amendment goes on to say, "The powers not delegated to the United States"—that being the Federal Government—"by the Constitution nor prohibited to it by the States are reserved to the States respectively or to the people." So in other words, the rights that they don't deal with here belong to the States. And if the States are not going to be in charge of those rights, then back to the people. This is a hard concept because some people sitting at home and some people in this body are going to say, how do the people have rights that the government is not protecting? Well, they do. In fact, they took up arms once—and some would argue twice—in our Nation's history because of rights that people thought they had as individuals.

So this is part of this revolutionary republican society that we created. We created a republic and we were created out of a revolution. So we are fighting a basic argument, a basic constitutional argument that goes forward before the Supreme Court sometime hopefully in an expedited manner. And I agree with my friend, Mr. GINGREY, that expediting this is important for the American people.

I guess if there is ever anything written into a bill that turns out to be good news of this bill, it's that it does not get implemented until 2014, which means it kind of gets past a couple of election cycles where it might be an issue before it actually starts happening to us, which gives these Attorneys General the opportunity to carry this through the court system and hopefully to the Supreme Court so the Supreme Court can give us an opinion about this particular health care bill and whether or not we are going to ex-

pand the clause that says U.S. Congress can regulate commerce to the point where it can regulate individual activity of human beings to the point where it says you must buy something because it's for the good of you and the good of the Nation even if you don't want to buy it. That is where we are going to go and that is the question they are going to have to answer. It is going to be exciting to see what the conclusion is.

I have a tremendous amount of faith in the judicial system. And even though I have many times disagreed with the U.S. Supreme Court on issues, I have always—and still to this day by the oath I took, both as a judge and the oath we take as Members of Congress to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution against all enemies foreign and domestic. Now, that oath says the ultimate sovereignty, we declare it to be the Constitution. I have always had confidence that our Supreme Court, even when I disagreed with them, over the long haul it would all be for the good of the Constitution. I look forward to that opinion that is going to come out of the United States Supreme Court.

Tonight I have to cut this a little bit short. We will be back talking about this on other days. So I thank my colleague for joining me, I thank my other colleagues for listening, and I yield back the balance of my time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

MEMORIALIZING DOROTHY HEIGHT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON) is recognized for 60 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and exclude extraneous materials on the subject of memorializing Dorothy Height.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, we come with heavy hearts today to memorialize a woman who made such a great impact on us who passed away early this morning.

Dorothy Height was a founding matriarch of the American civil rights movement whose crusade for racial justice and gender equality spanned more