

Because AmeriCare builds on the highly efficient Medicare program, the Commonwealth Fund concluded that it would result in the greatest overall savings to the health system of all health reform plans they modeled. Medicare's per capita costs have grown at a slower rate than private health insurance or the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program. Using Medicare as a model will reduce costs for households, employers, state and local governments.

Our Nation is at a crossroads. Our legacy should be a future where our children are not saddled with debt, where they do not fear financial ruin due to an illness. Whether we build a healthy future for our children or not depends upon the decisions we make today. True compassion means offering real solutions, not empty promises.

Working together, applying common sense approaches that build on what works, we can ensure that no-one risks the loss of insurance coverage. All we need is the will to do it.

As we edge closer to our next discussion on health reform, we need to ask, is medical care a civic and social right like police and fire services, education, and environmental protection?

Or is health care "you're on your own?"

I hope I can count on my colleagues and our endorsing organizations to advance a shared vision of higher quality, lower costs, and universal coverage through the adoption of AmeriCare.

Attached is a short summary of AmeriCare. More can be found on my website at <http://www.house.gov/stark>.

AMERICARE HEALTH CARE ACT OF 2007

Overview: The AmeriCare Health Care Act ("AmeriCare") is a practical proposal to ensure that everyone has health coverage in our country. It builds on what works in today's health care system to provide simple, affordable, reliable health insurance. People would be covered under the new AmeriCare system, modeled on Medicare, or they would continue to obtain health coverage through their employer.

Using the administrative efficiencies within Medicare and building on the existing coverage people receive through their jobs today, we can create an affordable, efficient, and stable universal health care system in America—and guarantee access to medical innovation and the world's most advanced providers and facilities.

Structure and Administration: Creates a new title in the Social Security Act, "AmeriCare." Provides universal health care for all U.S. residents, with special eligibility for children (under 24), pregnant women, and individuals with limited incomes (<300% FPL). Sets out standards for supplemental plans with a focus on consumer protection. Requires the Secretary to negotiate discounts for prescription drugs.

Benefits: Adults receive Medicare Part A and B benefits; preventive services, substance abuse treatment, mental health parity; and prescription drug coverage equivalent to the BC/BS Standard Option in 2005. Children receive comprehensive benefits and Early and Periodic Screening, Diagnostic, and Treatment (EPSDT) coverage with no cost-sharing.

Cost Sharing: There is a \$350 deductible for individuals, \$500 for families, and 20% coinsurance. Total spending (premiums, deductibles, and co-insurance) is capped at out-of-pocket maximum of \$2,500 individual/\$4,000 family, or 5 percent of income for beneficiaries with income between 200 percent–300 percent FPL and 7.5 percent of income for

beneficiaries with income between 300 percent–500 percent FPL. There is no cost sharing for children, pregnant women, low-income (below 200 percent FPL). Sliding scale subsidies are in place for cost-sharing for individuals between 200 percent and 300 percent FPL.

Financing: At April 15 tax filing each year, individuals either demonstrate equivalent coverage through their employer or pay the AmeriCare premium based on cost of coverage and class of enrollment (individual, couple, unmarried individual with children, or married couple with children). Employers may either pay 80 percent of the AmeriCare premium or provide equivalent benefits through a group health plan (the contribution for part-time workers is pro-rated). AmeriCare does not affect contracts or collective bargaining agreements in effect as of the date of enactment, and employers may choose to provide additional benefits. Employers with fewer than 100 employees have until January 1, 2012 to comply (employees of small businesses would still only pay 20 percent of the premium).

SALUTE TO HAROLD GAULDEN

HON. MARK E. SOUDER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2007

Mr. SOUDER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to salute my constituent, Harold Gaulden, a former military police officer of the Tuskegee Airmen's fire and rescue squad. Mr. Gaulden has come to Washington, DC today as one of six Tuskegee Airmen receiving the Congressional Gold Medal on behalf of the corps' surviving pilots and support personnel. The reward recognizes their heroism during World War II in facing the twin battles of the onslaught of the enemy abroad and the blight of racism at home.

The Tuskegee Airmen were created by the Army in 1941 as part of an Army Air Corps program to train Black Americans as military pilots, and comprised nearly 1,000 pilots and 10,000 support staff. These men were the first Black pilots in the American military, and Harold Gaulden, originally from Louisiana but now a Hoosier in my district, spent a year at the Tuskegee airbase in Alabama valiantly and diligently helping defend our Nation. Mr. Gaulden remembers such indignities as being able to buy a Coke at the base's PX but being forced to drink it outside. Mr. Gaulden saw segregated mess hall lines at the base—one for White soldiers and German prisoners of war, and another for the Black soldiers. Harold has been an energetic airmen activist for 20 years, speaking to colleges, elementary schools, and community groups about what he and his airmen brethren endured for our country.

The Congressional Gold Medal is the highest civilian award that Congress can bestow upon its recipients, and I was proud to co-sponsor the legislation in the 109th Congress that authorizes this award. I am pleased to see Harold being honored today for his service to our country. Although Harold has said he would gladly fight for his country, medal or not, bravery such as this should not go unrecognized—it is what has made, and continues to make, the United States of America the best nation on earth.

RURAL WIND ENERGY DEVELOPMENT ACT

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2007

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, today I am proud join with my colleague, Representative TOM COLE, to introduce the "Rural Wind Energy Development Act," which would provide an investment tax credit to individuals—homeowners, farmers, and small businesses—to offset the up-front costs of owning a small wind turbine.

Small wind systems are electric generators that produce 100 kilowatts or less of clean and renewable energy to power homes, farms, and small businesses. With these small turbines, individuals can generate their own power, independent from the electric grid. These wind turbines will allow consumers to cut their energy bills and, at times, put power back into the grid. According to the American Wind Energy Association, a single wind turbine can provide \$2,000–\$4,000/year per megawatt or more in additional farm income.

This legislation is necessary because there is no Federal support for small wind systems. The Federal Production Tax Credit (PTC) applies mainly to large utility-scale wind projects, not to individuals who want to install their own wind systems for on-site power. An investment tax credit for small wind systems will help provide stability and certainty for the industry to make the necessary investments to grow. It will also help consumers afford this pollution-free energy. In the 2005 Energy Policy Act, residential solar systems received a similar investment tax credit and saw an increase of more than 20 percent in installations over the last year.

Specifically, this bill would provide a tax credit of \$1500 per ½ kilowatt of capacity for small wind systems, which could be carried over for a customer unable to take advantage of the entire credit within a 1 year period. The bill also calls for a 3-year accelerated depreciation for wind property.

I hope all of my colleagues will join me in supporting this important policy to promote wind power, which produces no harmful greenhouse gas emissions, involves no environmentally damaging natural resource extraction such as mining or drilling, and does not need fuel imported from foreign governments to run.

WORKPLACE REPRESENTATION INTEGRITY ACT

HON. HOWARD P. "BUCK" McKEON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2007

Mr. McKEON. Madam Speaker, the purpose of this legislation is simple: only those legally permitted to work in the United States should be able to make a determination on union representation in their workplace.

It defies logic that anyone who lives in this nation illegally—and works here illegally—is able to decide whether legal workers must join a union. But under current law, unions can obtain signatures during card check campaigns

without differentiating between whether they were signed by legal or illegal workers.

The Workplace Representation Integrity Act simply requires a union conducting a card check to demonstrate that any card presented for recognition be signed by a U.S. citizen or legal alien. In other words, this legislation would ensure the wishes of American citizens are not trumped by the desires of those here illegally.

This measure is particularly critical because under the recently-passed, cleverly-worded Employee Free Choice Act—which I strongly oppose, I might add—the mandatory card check would become the law of the land. And, literally, it would allow union bosses to pick and choose which workers they believe they can most easily pressure into joining the union. At the front of that line may very well be those who work here illegally. These men and women are particularly prone to union intimidation and would be more likely than most to sign the authorization card out of fear.

Indeed, Madam Speaker, those illegally working in this country should not be pressured into making major decisions—such as those involving unionization—that will only serve to further erode the free choice of workers who are lawfully here. Rather than eviscerate the fundamental rights of workers as the so-called Employee Free Choice Act does, the Workplace Representation Integrity Act strengthens American workers' rights. I urge my colleagues to support it.

TRIBUTE TO NELSON W. POLSBY

HON. HOWARD L. BERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2007

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Speaker, for more than 40 years, Nelson W. Polsby was a leading figure in American political science years he served as editor of the subject's premier journal, the *American Political Science Review*, and his friendships and books and articles on the U.S. Congress, the presidency, political parties, elections, and the media made him a mentor to generations of graduate students.

Naturally warm and gregarious—with the comic timing of a master improviser—Nelson helped to build strong communities at his beloved University of California, Berkeley, at its Institute of Government Studies (IGS), which he headed for 10 years, and in the wider political science profession.

Born in 1934, Nelson Woolf Polsby came from Yankee Jewish farming stock, based in Connecticut. His family encouraged his precocious interest in current affairs. In the early 1900s a great-uncle ran for the mayoralty in New Haven as a socialist.

His father, a successful businessman, died after a surgical mishap when Nelson was 11. At prep school (there were not many Jewish farm boys, and even fewer at prep school) he was a brilliant student, turning down offers from Yale and Harvard universities to attend Johns Hopkins. This enabled him to sit in the House and Senate galleries and observe Congress at work.

His academic breakthrough came from his association with Robert Dahl's pathbreaking study of political power in New Haven in the

1950s, *Who Governs?* (1961). His doctorate was published as *Community Power and Political Theory* in 1963 and was quickly regarded as a masterpiece. He argued that rather than a single dominant elite running things, there were different elites in different areas and that this pluralism was compatible with democracy.

Polsby spent 6 years at Wesleyan University, becoming a full professor in 1967. That year he moved to Berkeley, where he remained for the rest of his career, in spite of offers from other universities, including Yale and Harvard. At an early stage, therefore, he had developed his two chief interests; the theory of democracy and how it operates in practice.

He also developed his lifelong interest in Congress, particularly the House of Representatives, in the 1960s. He showed how it had become institutionalized and how the seniority system for allocating key roles developed. He also analyzed how the large contingent of Democrats ("Dixiecrats") from the segregationist and more conservative South, in contrast to the more liberal Democrats from the North, prevented that party from using its nominal majority to give effective leadership to Congress. Later, in *How Congress Evolves* (2004), he explored the decline of the South in the House and the emergence of sharper partisanship in its operations.

In 1964 he and his dynamic Berkeley colleague, Aaron Wildavsky, published *Presidential Elections*. Revised and published quadrennially—its 12th edition is scheduled for publication in the summer of 2007—it remains the standard text on the topic. After Wildavsky died in 1993, Polsby was the sole author and claimed that: "The only difference since Aaron's death is that I win the arguments." His prose was highly readable and marked by wide reading and incisive analysis. Polsby confessed that his insomnia was caused by noticing light in the rooms of colleagues in the early hours of the morning—they were still at work! He quipped: "While Polsby sleeps, Wildavsky publishes."

He also wrote witty pieces on politics under an assumed name, Arthur Clun (borrowed from Angus Wilson's *Anglo-Saxon Attitudes*). They prompted a publisher to offer a book contract to the mystery author. A keen observer of the British political scene, he collaborated with Geoffrey Smith, a political commentator for *The Times*, to publish *British Government and Its Discontents* in 1981.

At 37 he received the accolade of the editorship of the *APSR*. For 6 years he successfully managed, in a relaxed style, the journal's staff and coped with pressures from authors and reviewers.

Polsby was a popular choice to become director of the IGS in 1988. He seemed to know everybody and to have read almost everything. He invited visiting scholars and politicians to talk about their work and their experiences—his good friend, Chris Patten was a regular visitor. He did much to create a friendly atmosphere, and a high point was the afternoon tea at which he presided.

Having basked in the acclamation for his work he was desolate when his term expired in 1999, a consequence of the university's 10-year rule for tenure. The Institute had meant so much to him.

His *Consequences of Party Reform* (1983) was sharply critical of some of the effects of the reforms the Democratic Party made to the presidential nominating process in the late

1960s. These gave increased representation to some minorities (race and gender) but not others, and increased the influence of single-issue groups in the party's deliberations. But they also weakened the party's ability to nominate presidential candidates representative of the broad American public and to win elections. Polsby was always concerned about good government and citizenship.

If Polsby argued with someone it was a mark of his approbation. Speakers who assumed that Polsby, eyes shut and snoring in the audience, was asleep could quickly be confounded when the "sleeper" made a pertinent, or ferocious, intervention.

He received many honors, including an honorary degree from the University of Liverpool. He had the respect of political reporters, and many politicians, for his understanding of the constraints under which they worked, and he drew readily on his encyclopedic knowledge of U.S. politics to provide wise counsel. He regarded his frequent contributions to "round tables" and op-ed pages as part of a professional obligation to inform the public, entertaining "the delusion that too few of my opinions were available to the world at large".

At home, Polsby and his wife Linda provided rich hospitality for their many Berkeley and overseas friends. For a time they jointly wrote a column on restaurants for *California* magazine. He was a keen follower of the local Oakland Athletics baseball team. But most of all he loved passionate argument with friends.

I personally benefited from a number of personal contacts with Professor Polsby over the years. He always had both astute insights into what was going on in politics and a great sense of humor. But the first time I met him was perhaps the most valuable. Two or three days after I was elected to Congress, I was invited to take part in a retreat for new members from California—of which there were eight—at UC San Diego. Professor Polsby was the scholar in charge and his views on how to be effective and what to look for as a new Member of Congress have been of great value to me throughout my entire tenure in the House of Representatives.

Polsby is survived by his wife Linda, their two daughters Lisa and Emily, their son Daniel, and their grandsons Benjamin and Edward.

IN SUPPORT OF THE GREEN
AMENDMENT TO H.R. 1227

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 2007

Ms. LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Green amendment that would extend FEMA housing assistance to Hurricane Katrina victims through December 31, 2007.

A year and a half after the terrible disaster, Gulf Coast residents still face unfulfilled promises, bureaucratic red tape, public neglect, environmental squalor and private exploitation.

This is outrageous and should be condemned. Yet again, the administration's failure to provide for the residents of the region has left it to Congress to make things right. That we are still making the same arguments over and over again to ensure that Gulf Coast residents get what's only fair is unacceptable.