United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JANUARY 20, 2011 No. 8

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Tuesday, January 25, 2011, at 10 a.m.

House of Representatives

THURSDAY, JANUARY 20, 2011

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

Lord God, in You we discover infinite possibilities. May sincere prayer lead to determined action. May those who are doubtful or cynical be renewed in patriotism. May those who feel powerless look within for deeper strength. May those who are most sensitive and loving find authentic ways to express themselves. May those filled with complaints learn satisfying dialogue in another. May those caught in dependences and compulsions be freed. May those overwhelmed with complexity take one step forward. May those with limited resources build upon personal gifts. May those who think themselves incapable be supportive and encourage others. May those who believe deeply discern signs that dreams do come true and prayers are answered.

Lord, may a whole new generation uncover creative responses to that ever-present challenge: ''Ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country.''

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. POE of Texas led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain five 1-minute speeches on each side.

SPENDING AND FOREIGN AID

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, finally Congress says it will rein in out-of-control spending. My neighbors in Texas are a little cynical and say, ''Prove it.'' One suggestion I keep hearing is regarding foreign aid. My friend, Sammy Mahan, a towing service operator, told me to quit giving money to dictators. Well, there's a thought.

There are 192 countries, and the United States gives money to roughly 150 of them. With our economic times, 15 million unemployed and the debt monster looming over us, it's time we reevaluate the citizen money we give away.

Someone has said that ''foreign aid is taking money from the poor people in rich nations and giving it to rich people in poor nations''. And many of these receivers of taxpayer money don't even like us. As my friend, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. LOUIE GOHMERT says, ''We don't need to pay them to hate us. They'll do it on their own.''

We even give money away to China. We should reevaluate the money we give each nation. I suspect Israel and maybe a few others would and should receive U.S. help, but the rest need to go it on their own. After all, we should take care of America first.

And that's just the way it is.

DON'T REPEAL HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Mr. SIRES. Madam Speaker, yesterday was an unfortunate day in this Chamber. The majority party voted to bring our Nation back to a system where insurance companies' needs are placed before those of middle class Americans.

The truth is that millions of Americans are already benefiting from health care reform. Insurers are no longer allowed to discriminate against children and others who are sick; small businesses are receiving billions of dollars in tax credits; and seniors are saving money on prescription drugs and are receiving free preventive care through Medicare, including 72,000 seniors in my district alone.

Printed on recycled paper.

If repealed, these benefits will be removed and the impact on my district will be devastating. The number of uninsured in my district will increase by 104,000 people; 326,000 residents would yet again be vulnerable to insurers' devious practices, such as lifetime limits and rescission; and insurers could once more deny coverage for up to 294,000 individuals in my district alone, including 35,000 children with a preexisting condition.

Madam Speaker, we should concentrate on creating jobs, not repealing health reform for middle class Americans.

HONORING THE GUARDIANS OF THE NATIONAL CEMETERY IN BUCKS COUNTY, PA

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor a group that has made a difference in our country, the Guardians of the National Cemetery in Bucks County, Pennsylvania. This is a group comprised entirely of volunteers who have assumed the mission and duty of performing many of the sacred functions of the National Cemetery in Washington Crossing, Bucks County.

Today, the Guardians, led by their President, Antonio Albano, are 250 members strong. Among this proud group are the visionaries that fought to bring the National Cemetery to its current location in Bucks County. They worked tirelessly through the selection process with the VA not only to select the site, but also to prove that there will always be a dedicated group of individuals willing and able to provide the necessary services to those who rest in this solemn place and to their families.

After the VA made the wise decision to locate the cemetery in Bucks County, the Guardians immediately began the work they have become known for—organizing services on Memorial Day and Veterans Day, as well as placing wreaths on the graves of our veterans. These are just some of the things the Guardians do to bring comfort to the bereaved and to honor those who have served us.

Madam Speaker, honoring the work of the Guardians of the National Cemetery is particularly fitting today, January 20, 2011, because today marks the 1-year anniversary of the first veteran laid to rest at the Washington Crossing National Cemetery, a place that the Guardians have now helped to make hallowed ground.

Tonight, the Guardians will gather to mark this occasion and pay tribute to the veterans who have been laid to rest at the National Cemetery. I am honored to make note of their achievements here on the floor of the House this morning and will be honored to be among them this evening.

HEALTH CARE REPEAL AND JOBS

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

Mr. BACA. Instead of focusing on creating new jobs and helping middle class families, our Republican friends want to turn back the clock. We all know this week's vote to repeal and replace the health reform is nothing but political fiction, with no intention of doing anything to improve health care. It's just a smoke screen. The reality is that a repeal of reform will be bad for our economy and worse for American families and businesses.

In my district alone, repealing health care reform would discriminate against the 305,000 people who suffer from preexisting conditions—129 million nationwide. It would eliminate tax credits for 10,000 small businesses, kick 5,000 young adults off their parents' insurance plans—and 1.2 million nationwide—and it throws more than 5,000 seniors back into the doughnut hole of higher drug costs—2.7 million nationwide.

Let's stand with American families and say ''yes'' to more jobs and ''no'' to all efforts to repeal health reform.

□ 0910

NEXT STEP: REAL REFORM TO OBAMACARE

(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, yesterday the House passed a bill that repealed the liberal unconstitutional health care takeover. I would like to congratulate my colleagues who voted in favor of the repeal of the job-killing health law act. The winning margin was new conservative Members elected in November to truly promote limited government and expanded freedom.

Our work is not yet complete. Today, the House will be voting on true, real health care reform authored by Chairman DAVID DREIER—reform that can make health care accessible, reform that will make health care affordable, reform that will not eliminate small businesses.

I hope all Members will work together for this kind of health care reform. The measure we are voting on today will not deprive seniors of care. It will not create long waiting lines for the sick. It will not burden future generations of Americans with massive debt.

Madam Speaker, this is the kind of health care reform Americans want to see. It's a solution for our families who need to preserve the doctor-patient relationship.

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

LOOKING AT THE VIOLENCE IN TUCSON

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Madam Speaker, in the wake of the tragedy in Tucson 10 days ago, there has been a lot of soul searching, a lot of introspection, and a lot of commentary about what was behind the tragedy there and what motivated Jared Loughner to take the action he did.

It's become the judicious and kind of the politically correct thing to say, Oh, it was just one madman doing something. We can't ascribe responsibility to anything else.

I think that's too easy. I think that's a cop-out.

The fact is that Jared Loughner did not try to attack the community college that threw him out, any of the employers who had fired him, or anybody in his family. He singled out GABRIELLE GIFFORDS, an elected official of the United States Government. And one has to wonder whether all of the talk in recent years about tyrannical governments and the demonization of politicians did not in some way guide that madman to her instead of another target.

I think we need to not just write this off as a senseless tragedy and an inexplicable one. We need to delve into it more deeply and decide whether the rhetoric that's out there in the media environment had something to do with this tragic event.

TWO GREAT PRESIDENCIES

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

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, let every nation know, whether it wishes us well or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, support any friend, oppose any foe to assure the survival and the success of liberty.

Madam Speaker, those are among the brilliant words that 50 years ago today were delivered by President John F. Kennedy as he was inaugurated. In 3 hours we are going to be marking that inaugural with a ceremony in the great rotunda. And I think it's very important, Madam Speaker, as we do that to remember not only John F. Kennedy's commitment to our Nation's security, but to once again underscore his passionate commitment to our economic security by his implementation of pro-growth economic policies that were replicated 30 years ago today when Ronald Reagan became President of the United States and pursued the same kinds of pro-growth policies that President John F. Kennedy pursued.

I hope very much, Madam Speaker, that we can learn from the lessons of both of these great Presidencies.

HEALTH INSURANCE REPEAL

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Madam Speaker, yesterday's action of repealing the health care reform, cynically called the Job-Killing Health Care Act by my friends on the other side of the aisle, is definitely an ironic misnomer—job killing—when the health reform is poised to create 4 million new jobs. The number of jobs created by repeal? Zero.

So we're not about protecting jobs on the other side of the aisle. We are about protecting insurance companies' bottom line.

REMEMBERING ASHLEY TURTON

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I rise to celebrate the life of Ashley Turton. Ashley had an incredible career both in the public and private sectors and was respected by so very many people of every political persuasion. She was a wonderful mother of three children, and her death is especially difficult for those of us on Capitol Hill because we got to know Ashley through her work as ROSA DELAURO's chief of staff. She was part of our family. She was a woman of great skill and a woman of great personality.

We also know her husband, Dan Turton, who also worked on the Hill for many years and served as the chief of staff to the House Rules Committee. He currently works for the White House.

I attended, along with hundreds and hundreds of others, Ashley's memorial service last Friday here in Washington, DC. Those who eulogized Ashley captured her spirit, her determination, and her great compassion.

She was a remarkable woman and will never be forgotten. And our prayers are with Dan and Ashley's family.

INSTRUCTING CERTAIN COMMITTEES TO REPORT LEGISLATION REPLACING THE JOB-KILLING HEALTH CARE LAW

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 26, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 9) instructing certain committees to report legislation replacing the job-killing health care law, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 9

Resolved, That the Committee on Education and the Workforce, the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the Committee on the Judiciary, and the Committee on Ways and Means, shall each report to the House legislation proposing changes to existing law within each committee's jurisdiction with provisions that—

(1) foster economic growth and private sector job creation by eliminating job-killing policies and regulations;

(2) lower health care premiums through increased competition and choice;

(3) preserve a patient's ability to keep his or her health plan if he or she likes it;

(4) provide people with pre-existing conditions access to affordable health coverage;

(5) reform the medical liability system to reduce unnecessary and wasteful health care spending;

(6) increase the number of insured Americans;

(7) protect the doctor-patient relationship;

(8) provide the States greater flexibility to administer Medicaid programs;

(9) expand incentives to encourage personal responsibility for health care coverage and costs;

(10) prohibit taxpayer funding of abortions and provide conscience protections for health care providers;

(11) eliminate duplicative government programs and wasteful spending; or,

(12) do not accelerate the insolvency of entitlement programs or increase the tax burden on Americans.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). Pursuant to House Resolution 26, the resolution is debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules or their designees. The amendment printed in part B of House Report 112–2, if offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MATHESON) or his designee, shall be considered read, and shall be separately debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER).

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

Madam Speaker, today we begin the process of implementing health care reform. I underscore that. Implementing health care reform is what we begin today.

This resolution, H. Res. 9, initiates the second step of a two-part process, which, as we all know with the 245–189 vote last night, saw repeal of the health care bill.

Having taken that action to wipe the slate clean, we're now moving on to the far more challenging task of crafting real solutions for the American people to ensure that we can drive down the costs of health insurance and health care.

This resolution instructs the four committees of jurisdiction to draft legislation that brings about meaningful health care reforms. Furthermore, this resolution lays out 12 clear guidelines that define what real reform is. Some of these guidelines are simply commonsense principles, such as the need for reform that doesn't hurt job creation or the need to eliminate duplicative wasteful spending.

But if there is one overarching principle for true reform, it's that we cannot pick winners and losers. Real reform must be accessible to every American.

If a family is forced to give up a health plan that is working for them, can we call that reform? If a small business must lay off employees to comply with new mandates, can we call that reform? If a doctor is forced to close her family practice because the cost of malpractice insurance is prohibitive, can we call that reform? If government bureaucrats make decisions that should be left to doctors and patients, can we call that reform, Madam Speaker? Obviously not.

Our goal is to increase access to quality health care for every single American, including those with preexisting conditions. H. Res. 9, that we're going to be considering here today, puts us on the path to do just that.

As I said at the outset, this is a tremendous challenge. Achieving the goal of meaningful health care reform, which we all share, will demand an open and collaborative process. The four committees of jurisdiction have a great deal of work ahead of them. This is a process in which we all must contribute—Democrats and Republicans alike.

We have good ideas that are coming from both sides of the aisle, and I believe that they will be considered through this deliberative process. These ideas must be shared, analyzed, and debated. If we all participate in this open and transparent process, I believe that we can address the health care challenges that we face in an effective and meaningful way.

Ultimately, we all hope to arrive at the same place. We all share the same goal, that is, access to quality care for all. That's what House Republicans want to achieve, and that's what my Democratic colleagues want to achieve as well. And that's what President Obama wants to achieve. We all have our own views on how we get there.

□ 0920

In this body alone we have 435 views on the best way to reform our health care system. We owe the American people nothing short of a rigorous and thorough debate. But if we conduct that debate in good faith, Madam Speaker, grounded in the recognition that we all hope to achieve the same outcome, I believe that we, in a bipartisan way, Democrats and Republicans together, can come up with real solutions.

Now, we saw the day before yesterday that the President said that he is willing and eager to work with Republicans on the issue of health care. That's a sentiment that I, and I know my colleagues on this side of the aisle, share wholeheartedly. This resolution, H. Res. 9, puts us on a path towards doing just that. It will begin this critically important process.

So I hope very much that we will have strong, bipartisan support for this resolution. I will say that we have an amendment that will be coming forward, a Democratic amendment that the Rules Committee has made in

order, I am happy to say, that will add to that list that our friend Mr. MATHESON has provided. And I will also say that contrary to the argument that has been put out there that we don't have solutions, there is a wide range of proposals that exist. And we look forward to having this committee process vigorously pursue just that.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Madam Speaker, I rise in very strong opposition to this resolution and very strong opposition to the very closed process in which we are discussing this resolution. Once again, I am deeply disappointed that instead of working to create jobs and strengthen the economy, the new Republican majority continues to focus on reopening old wounds and fighting old battles. The resolution before us today is allegedly the replace component of the Republicans' repeal and replace strategy. I say allegedly, Madam Speaker, because this resolution is not a serious legislative effort. It is a series of talking points. It is a press release.

What this resolution does is ask the committees of jurisdiction to hopefully, maybe someday, if they would be so kind, to report legislation to the House that meets certain vague goals. Instead of repeal and replace, this is repeal and relax. Trust the Republicans to do the right thing. No thank you, Madam Speaker.

Yesterday, this House voted, without a single hearing or markup, without a single amendment, to eliminate the Affordable Care Act in its entirety. The Members who voted for that bill voted to return to the days when insurance companies could discriminate against people based upon preexisting conditions. They voted to eliminate the ban on annual and lifetime limits on care. They voted to eliminate the ability for young people to stay on their parents' insurance plans up to the age of 26. They voted to reopen the doughnut hole in Medicare. Basically, they voted for a tax increase on senior citizens who need prescription drugs. They voted to eliminate tax credits for small businesses who want to do the right thing and provide health insurance for their workers. All of that, Madam Speaker, would have the force of law. All of that was done with real legislative language. But not the resolution before us today.

Instead of real language that would provide real benefits to real Americans, this resolution is simply a collection of empty promises. And the ironic thing is that most of the provisions included in the resolution were actually addressed in the Affordable Care Act. According to this resolution, we should, quote, ''lower health care premiums through increased competition and choice.'' Well, the Affordable Care Act already does that. Of course, many of us argued for a public option, which would have lowered premiums even further with increased competition and choice, but my Republican friends didn't want to have anything to do with that.

The resolution before us today says we should ''preserve a patient's ability to keep his or her health plan if he or she likes it.'' Well, the Affordable Care Act already does that. Increase the number of insured Americans? Well, we did that by 30 million people. Protect the doctor-patient relationship? We did that. And so on and so on.

On the critical issue of people with preexisting conditions, however, it's interesting to see the language that my Republican friends use in this press release that they call a resolution. They say they support, and I quote, ''provide people with preexisting conditions access to affordable health coverage.'' Well, that sounds nice. But what we did in the Affordable Care Act was to actually ban insurance companies from discriminating against those people. I will be very interested to see how my Republican friends handle that critical issue and how much influence the big insurance lobby has around here now that they're in charge. And the doughnut hole? The resolution is absolutely silent on the doughnut hole.

Madam Speaker, health care is of vital importance to every single American. It is a big deal. And to treat health insurance reform as just another opportunity for happy talk and wishful thinking is not the way to do business in the people's House.

I urge my colleagues to reject this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

I do so to say to my friend that I appreciate his very conciliatory remarks. Everyone has acknowledged that this measure is flawed. The President said in his press conference right after the election it was flawed. We have had the courts already throw the mandate out. We need to deal with the problem even before this measure is being implemented. So it seems to me to be absolutely essential that we proceed with this work.

With that, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to a hardworking member from our Rules Committee, the gentleman from Lawrenceville, Georgia (Mr. WOODALL).

Mr. WOODALL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Madam Speaker, I have been a Member of this body for 2 weeks and 2 days, and I could not be prouder to be on the House floor today in support of the chairman's resolution. For the entire last year in my district we have been focused on one thing and one thing only, since March of 2010, and that is the repeal of the President's health care bill.

You know, before March of 2010 my district cared about health care reform. We talked about tort reform, we talked about putting patients back in charge of decisions. We talked about ending the tax preference that businesses get so that we can purchase insurance on our own and own those policies as we do our other insurance policies. But the moment this bill was signed into law, the moment the President's bill was signed into law that discussion stopped and the repeal discussion began. And with the repeal yesterday, we now begin anew the discussion of how properly to reform the system. And I am anxious to have that discussion.

You know, we learned a lot in our time in the minority. One of those things we learned is that bringing simple, straightforward resolutions to the floor is better for the process. It's better for the American people. The Speaker has made that commitment. We continue that commitment today with these instructions to go back to the drawing board and bring things forward one at a time.

Now, I sat through 10 hours of hearings in the Rules Committee, where folks came forward and said go ahead and repeal the bill, but save this one provision. Let's have this one provision stay. Go ahead and repeal the bill, but keep this other one provision. We now have that opportunity. We have now repealed the bill here in the House, and we have the opportunity to bring those provisions forward one by one.

And I will tell you what, I am not going to like all those provisions. And some of those provisions are going to pass the House. And that's the way it ought to be. You shouldn't have a one-size-fits-all, take-it-or-leave-it kind of system. You ought to be able to have that discussion on both sides of the aisle. And I have no doubt that provisions are going to come forth from our committees that I am going to vote ''no'' on, but my colleagues on the left and on the right are both going to vote ''yes'' on, and it's going to pass. And that's the way the process ought to be, one provision at a time, one idea at a time. Tort reform, insurance reform, putting patients back in charge of those decisions, putting doctors back in charge of those relationships.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

Madam Speaker, I think our objection is not with the idea of having a serious debate on these issues. There are areas where we can come together and hopefully make the bill even better. Our objection is the fact that my friends on the other side voted to repeal everything, voted to allow insurance companies to once again discriminate against people with preexisting conditions.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield myself an additional 15 seconds.

They voted to take away the benefit from senior citizens that we put in there to help try to close the doughnut hole in the prescription drug bill. And what do they do in terms of replacing it? They come not with an alternative;

they come with a press release. That's not serious legislating. That's politics as usual.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I am just amazed. I listened to the gentleman from Georgia who just spoke, and he said that in his district all of the focus is on health care and health care repeal. Well, I don't know, when I go home all I hear in my district is jobs and the economy. People are concerned about the economy. They want us to create jobs, they want us to focus mostly on that issue, not on repeal of health care.

□ 0930

The other problem I have with the gentleman from Georgia's comments is he seems to think that because the House passed this repeal yesterday that the health reform is repealed. Well, let me tell everyone it's not, and this is just a ruse. This bill, this health reform wasn't repealed. The Senate isn't even going to take it up. The President has said that he would never sign a repeal bill.

So the Republicans are just wasting their time, rather than focusing on what we should be focusing on, the jobs and the economy. They keep talking about this false repeal that is never going to happen.

Now, I also wanted to say something about what Mr. DREIER said before. He talked about increasing access, increased choices. That's not what goes on if this bill was ever repealed. The choice is now for people who have preexisting conditions, they can't get insurance. They have to pay more if they try to get it, or the kids that are on the policies that would be taken off if we had the repeal, or the people that would again face lifetime caps.

You don't have choices under the old system because you were denied care through the insurance companies' discrimination. The only way you have choices and access is under the health reform that this House and this country have put into law where you are guaranteed you get insurance, even if you have a preexisting condition. You don't have to worry about lifetime caps. You can put your kids on the policies.

So don't talk to me about choices and access. People don't have choices and access with those discriminatory policies that would be put back in place by the insurance companies. As they continue to raise premiums, more and more people will not have access to health care and have access to health insurance. The only way you have access and choices is if we keep the health reform in place.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to my very, very good friend and California colleague, the dean of our delegation, Mr. LEWIS.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I very much appreciate my colleague yielding.

Madam Speaker, I think the entire public knows that America has had in place for a long time one of the finest health care delivery systems in the world. It's the envy of many.

That is not to say that it's perfect. That's not to say that we don't have major challenges like preexisting conditions and like questions of portability. But, indeed, if the people who put in place a health care plan last year had had their way, they absolutely would have taken the next step; that is, to have a centralized, government-run health care system. That's the pattern of their future.

At this moment, Great Britain, which had such a thing in place for some time, is attempting to back off of their system and have more relationships between physicians and their patients. Indeed, they are doing that because their system does not work.

It's very important that we not allow the former majority to take their next step; that is, to have government-run health care. With that, yesterday, we passed a repeal that will take us to conference with the Senate, and, in turn, today we are beginning the process of reexamining where we have been to make certain that we put in place health care that is positive for all Americans, not health care that's run by the IRS.

Madam Speaker, our health care system is the envy of much of the world. That does not mean it is perfect.

There is no question we must resolve major challenges such as pre-existing conditions, portability and cost. But we can deal with these by breaking down barriers between States, liability reform and tax incentives. We certainly do not need IRS-enforced mandates.

Despite the loud and clear protests of the American people, the Democrat leadership of the House and Senate rammed through a job-destroying health care act last year. It created a large and costly new government bureaucracy that gets between doctors and patients. The law includes hundreds of new burdensome taxes, regulations, and mandates on businesses and individuals.

There is no doubt in my mind that supporters of this massive bill would have passed a government-run single payer system if they could have gotten away with it. What they did pass was a first step towards total government run healthcare. The same kind of healthcare system that Great Britain is trying to abandon, because it doesn't work.

We must stop America from going down the path of a government-run, single-payer healthcare system.

Yesterday the House acted on our promise to repeal Obamacare, and today we must vote to start the process of replacing it with common sense, affordable solutions.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my friend from Massachusetts.

Madam Speaker, well, we could have a bill on the floor today that expands fair trade for American companies, but we don't. We could have a bill on the floor today that finds ways to stop sending a billion dollars to the Middle East to buy oil every day and instead create jobs producing energy in America, but we don't. We could have a bill on the floor today talking about ways to regenerate our real estate market and get people buying and selling houses again, but we don't.

What we have is an empty promise that someday, somehow, the new majority will come to the floor with a bill that will fix the health care problem. Quoting from Speaker JOHN BOEHNER, he said on June 18, 2002, ''Instead of focusing on new health care mandates that will increase costs on employers and swell the ranks of the uninsured, Senate Democrats should focus on providing access to health insurance for the 39 million of Americans who remain without health coverage. That should be our first priority.''

So at a time when Republicans had a majority in this House, a President in the White House, and for most of the time a majority in the Senate, their first priority, which was to deal with the health care problem, they didn't do. That's the standard against which we should measure today's promise. It doesn't leave much room for much optimism.

I would say, instead of focusing on yet another empty promise, let's focus on putting Americans back to work.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Madam Speaker, everyone has acknowledged that the legislation that has passed is flawed. Everyone has acknowledged that. The President of the United States, when he said that the 1099 issue imposing mandates on small businesses needed to be rectified in his first news conference after the election, recognized that there were problems.

We had, the day before yesterday, the distinguished assistant minority leader, the former majority whip, Mr. CLYBURN, say that he believes that Republicans and Democrats should work together to improve this bill. We have already had a Federal court determine that it is unconstitutional to impose this mandate. Madam Speaker, we need to work together to resolve the very, very great challenges that we have ahead of us.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Madam Speaker, with last year's important health insurance reform law, we provided real guarantees to American families against insurance monopoly abuses. Today, Republicans tell these families, ''Forget the binding guarantees. We have 12 platitudes for you.''

This isn't a Republican prescription—this is a placebo. And for the American middle class, it's a very bitter pill indeed.

Yesterday, House Republicans, in a remarkable measure, with one vote, decided to increase the national debt, reduce the solvency of the Medicare Trust Fund, raise insurance premiums, and charge seniors more for their health care.

During the last 12 years that these Republicans were in charge, 6 of them with near total domination of the government here in Washington under the Bush-Cheney administration, they failed to enact even one of these 12 platitudes in this flimsy 2-page excuse of a bill. Twelve health care platitudes up now, missing in action for 12 years.

Who wouldn't be for some of them? They are broad platitudes that propose something that they apparently kept hidden under a bushel for the last 16 years and now will unveil. Well, I think it will just be the same old tired, rejected, retread Republican proposals to give more income tax breaks to those at the top.

If you believe that they have got something new to offer to genuinely reform our health care system in a way that will help middle-class Americans instead of health insurance monopolies, I think you will want to buy some of that Republican ice cream that helps you lose weight. Our families don't need Republican platitudes; they need real help.

I will have to stay I think the tea party types are right about one thing. There are dangers from soaring debt, dangers they forgot for a decade. There are dangers from Big Government. But, you know, that's not the only threat our families face. They face threats from big banks and from big insurance monopolies.

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

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. DOGGETT. Our middle-class families are threatened not only from the challenges of government, but from the big pharmaceutical monopolies that charge our people more than anyplace in the world, from the giant insurance monopolies. And sometimes, sometimes our families need government to come down on our side because otherwise those giant economic forces will take advantage of our families by writing out the very protection that the sick and injured need the most, protection that they write into the fine print of an insurance policy that no ordinary person can understand, where they are told that they are not covered anymore, that they have a preexisting condition, that you have reached your policy limits and cannot get the care that your doctor says is vital to sustain your life, that this policy just doesn't cover sick people or that it can be rescinded.

I say we need to provide people genuine protection. That's what we did last year. That's what they want to eliminate this year. Let's be on the side of the people, not the 12 Republican platitudes to benefit insurance monopolies.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to one of the hardworking members of this brand-new class that has come in carrying this strong message, the gentleman from Columbus, Ohio (Mr. STIVERS).

□ 0940

Mr. STIVERS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I voted for the repeal of the health care bill yesterday because I think doing otherwise would have been supporting the status quo, and that's unacceptable. I believe there are some good ideas that were in the original health care bill that can be used and improved; but some of those ideas are in H. Res. 9 today that instruct the committees on next steps on health care.

However, there is one idea that I think we need to add to that list. I think we need to add the allowing of young folks to stay on their parents' insurance through H. Res. 9. In this tough economy, many students are unable to find jobs right out of school. As a member of the State senate, I sponsored a bill that would allow those up to age 30 to stay on their parents' plan, and I just heard from a constituent that his 23-year-old son Justin is back on his parents' insurance.

Moving forward, I'm committed to working with my colleagues in a bipartisan manner to support reforms we agree on, like allowing young adults to stay on their parents' plan. This was included in the Republican alternative last year, and it should be included in the replacement bill this year.

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for his comments in recognizing the fact that the provision that allows parents to keep their children on their insurance until they are 26 is a good idea. But he voted yesterday, along with all the Republicans, to repeal that, to take that away. And this press release that they're now saying is a bill on the House floor here doesn't even address that issue.

So I wish the gentleman would have actually voted with his convictions yesterday and voted against repeal, because what he did, if, in fact, this bill becomes law, will deny parents to be able to keep theirs kids on their insurance until they are 26.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, I rise today to oppose the Republicans' cynical attempt to replace the health care reform law.

Yesterday's decision to repeal the Affordable Care Act was truly damaging to the American people, but today's decision to tout the central reforms of the Affordable Care Act as Republican ideas is simply baffling. If the provisions in H. Res. 9 were really the Republicans' priorities, they would leave the Affordable Care Act intact because all of these provisions exist in the current law.

If we all agree on the importance of keeping young adults on their parents' insurance, prohibiting insurance companies from dropping coverage for the sick and strengthening Medicare, then this spectacle is a colossal waste of time that we don't have. If Republicans really want to guarantee these consumer protections to the American people, they would not stage partisan antics with this kind of resolution.

Even when Republicans had control of the entire government for 6 years, they did nothing to reform our Nation's health care system. And during that time, premiums skyrocketed, the number of uninsured Americans grew to 47 million, and those with insurance saw their benefits decimated. Of course, it would have been great to have the Republicans as willing partners during the last 2 years as we worked hard to pass the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act. Unfortunately, they insisted on being the Party of No even as we incorporated so many of their party's ideas into the law.

Rather than roll back the hard-fought consumer protections and freedoms that unshackled Americans from the whims of private insurance companies, as former Republican Senate Majority Leader Brill Frist said, Republicans should be working with us to build on and improve the health care system.

Not to mention, every potential minute spent in committee focusing on redundant legislation is another minute that we are not helping American families and businesses emerge from this recession. Democrats have pledged to measure all legislation by the proposal's success at creating jobs, strengthening the middle class and bringing down the deficit.

Unfortunately, the Republican majority's hasty vote to repeal the Affordable Care Act fails on all such accounts. The American people deserved and got real reform. This vague resolution stating so-called Republican principles on health care reform is like giving the American people a wish sandwich. There's nothing between the bread, but we wish there was.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds to say to my very good friend that the fact of the matter is the Republicans sent association health plans to make sure that small businesses could drive the cost of health insurance down to the Senate, and our friends in the other body in the other party killed that measure. We put into place for seniors access to affordable prescription drugs. And so we have worked diligently to make this happen.

With that, I am happy to yield 1 minute to my good friend from Fort Myers, Florida (Mr. MACK).

Mr. MACK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, yesterday was a great day for democracy and freedom in this country. Yesterday, the Republican-led Congress voted to repeal a

health care law that was passed by the Democrats that would mandate, that would force people to buy something even if they didn't want to. It's unconstitutional, it's un-American, and it is not what this country stands for.

Now we are hearing a lot of our colleagues on the other side talk about how we want to strip away this and we want to strip away that and we are playing games and this resolution is a game. Well, let me remind you that it was the President of the United States in his State of the Union that talked about tort reform, which was not included in ObamaCare. We intend to include tort reform in this Congress. We also believe that association health plans are very important to ensure that more people have access to health care, something that your side of the aisle failed to do.

There are real ways to do commonsense reforms. It is not by having the government mandate what you have to buy as a citizen of this country. It is unconstitutional. It is un-American.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are advised to remember to address their comments to the Chair and not to others in the second person.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Thank you, Madam Speaker, for maintaining decorum in the House. We appreciate it.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER).

Mr. WEINER. Madam Speaker, we are seeing today that after 75 or so hours of markup, hundreds of hours of hearings, 16 months of long debate, thousands upon thousands of meetings and town halls, the Republicans come to Washington and don't know what they want to do in health care yet. My constituents should understand, and the Speaker should understand, that this resolution says, go back and figure out what we want to do.

Ladies and gentlemen, I would remind you that last year during the health care debate, the Republicans had a chance to offer an alternative. They didn't. Now they come to Washington and say, oh, let's have the committees go try to figure this all out. Yesterday they were the Party of No, and today they are the party of ''we don't know how to go.''

Who are these Republicans? After months and months and months of the national debate, you can go into any coffee shop, any church basement, just about any card game in this country and people have solid ideas about what they think about health care. But not the Republicans. They've got a resolution today that says, hey, committees, go try to figure this stuff out, it's complicated.

And by the way, I don't know, Madam Speaker, if I read it correctly, but I don't think there are any deadlines. I don't think there are any deadlines. I will eat this rostrum if they come back with legislation that actually accomplishes the things that they just repealed yesterday. It's not going to happen.

And this is the fundamental problem that I believe the majority party now has: they have the campaign slogans all down. I just heard the gentleman from Florida do one: ''unconstitutional.'' They have the campaign slogans locked. And I have to give them credit, they were successful with them. They came here, we're against, we're against, we're against. Well, now here it is. Unlike past Congresses that come in all geared up for the things they want to do, they're all geared up with a resolution saying, hey, go figure out what it is that we should do.

The American people deserve a lot better than this. They deserve comprehensive health care that saves them money. That's what was repealed yesterday.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds to say to my friend from New York, it is very interesting that the President of the United States the day before yesterday said that he was willing and eager to work with Republicans to ensure that we rectify this flawed bill. The distinguished assistant minority, the former majority whip, Mr. CLYBURN, said in a program earlier this week that he looked forward to working with Republicans in a bipartisan way to address this.

With that, Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my good friend from Allentown, Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT).

Mr. DENT. Madam Speaker, yesterday the House voted to repeal the misguided health care law of 2010, which is seriously flawed, both in its structure and its practical implementation. I keep hearing discussion about the Affordable Care Act. If one believes the Affordable Care Act will not add to the deficit, I think that one is apt to believe just about anything. But today we have the opportunity to direct the committees to produce practical and effective reforms.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution and commit to working together to enact meaningful reforms that will lower health care costs, expand access to affordable insurance coverage, and foster economic growth and jobs.

The current law is simply unwise and unsustainable. I believe we must replace the misguided policies of the current law with reforms that will address rising health care costs. Specifically, I support medical liability reforms to reduce the practice of defensive medicine. I believe Congress must provide Americans with more options for affordable health coverage, such as low-cost catastrophic plans for younger individuals, patient-driven health care savings accounts, cross-state purchasing and effective high-risk pools or reinsurance models as a backstop.

Again, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution, and let's get on with this serious debate.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield 10 seconds to the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER).

Mr. WEINER. I just want to respond to the distinguished chairman. The President did not say anything about this dastardly flawed bill. He said we should ''implement and improve.'' You say ''repeal and replace.'' You put that to a vote of the American people. Implement and improve is the way we build important legislation in this country.

□ 0950

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 5 seconds to respond.

Madam Speaker, let me say to my friend that the President did say that he is willing and eager to work with Republicans to rectify the problems that are here, and right after the election, he said that he wanted to correct the 1099 issue, recognizing it is a flawed measure.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS).

Ms. EDWARDS. Madam Speaker, I am actually disappointed that I am standing on the floor of the House of Representatives today yet again defending and protecting the rights of the American people to health care.

It is such a shame that yesterday and the day before for 7 hours our Members on the other side of the aisle spent their time deciding for the American people to take away the ability of parents to provide health care for their young people up to age 26.

They spent 7 hours, other than finding jobs, trying to make sure that small businesses who are providing health care don't get a tax credit anymore for the health care that they are providing for their employees.

They spent 7 hours trying to strip away the ability of our seniors to make sure that they don't have to reach into their own pockets, deeper pockets, not deep anymore, to pay for prescription drugs.

Yesterday and the day before they spent 7 hours debating whether it is a good idea for insurance companies to be able to deny people health care for preexisting conditions when they know that at least 129 million of us, 65 percent or so of us, actually have preexisting medical conditions.

So it is really disappointing that here we are yet again with the Republicans saying we took it all away in one day, and now we are going to think about some of it that we might replace again.

Well, we have created a health care law for the American people that is about affordability and accessibility. And I know that the Democrats are going to stand on the side with the President, implementing the law. And thank goodness for the American people. They should know that the Republicans didn't do anything yesterday other than putting a whole bunch of stuff on a piece of paper that has no chance of going anywhere. The paper is not even worth the ink that is printed on it.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, as a native of the Show-Me State, I am very

pleased to yield 1 minute to my friend from St. Elizabeth, Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER).

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Madam Speaker, I am proud to rise in support of this resolution, a bill that would direct committees to craft new health care legislation and which would help steer our country back in the right direction. A serious fix for what ails health care in America will entail more than tweaking the law; it means replacing the health care bill with real reform.

Missouri is the Show-Me State, and last August, 71 percent of Missourians went to the polls and said ''no.'' They rejected this law.

As I go about my district and talk to my employers, they tell me that instead of premiums going down, they have actually gone up 25–40 percent. And instead of improving access to care, we actually have doctors retiring in record numbers.

True reform would be passing significant lawsuit reform so doctors can faithfully perform their jobs of taking care of their patients. I also support increasing access to insurance by allowing small businesses to pool together to get the best plan for their employees.

All along Republicans have offered a commonsense approach to improving our health care system and in a way that controls cost and provides the quality of care that Americans deserve. Today's vote is an important step in realizing that goal.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 12¼ minutes remaining. The gentleman from California has 15¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. At this time I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I am very happy to yield to one of the other new Members who comes with a very strong message here. She is a nurse, and she is from Gallatin, Tennessee. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK).

Mrs. BLACK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise on behalf of the people of middle Tennessee who spoke loud and clear this last year that they do not want the Federal Government dictating their health care. The plan that was signed into law by the President was supposed to increase access to health care and lower costs for American families. However, in the months since the bill passed, it has been shown to do neither. We now know that the health care bill not only increases premiums for families but hinders job creation and is filled with unintended consequences that not only diminish the quality of our health care system but also do great damage to our economy, and increase our deficit.

This new Congress was sent here to follow a more responsible path. Through commonsense, market-based solutions, we can replace a flawed health care bill to have the best health care system in the world.

I am eager to take part in drafting the new Republican plan and focusing on rolling back the individual mandate, eliminating the onerous demands on small businesses, and actually lowering the cost for families and increasing access to quality, personalized health care.

I also look forward to a thoughtful discussion that includes solutions that went ignored before, like tort reform, increasing competition, and tax breaks instead of tax hikes.

As a nurse for over 40 years, my top priority will be making sure our plan honors the doctor-patient relationship that is so sacred in medicine because there is no place for a government bureaucrat in an individual's health care decision.

As a member of the Ways and Means Committee, I am excited to work with Chairman DAVE CAMP and my fellow committee members on a new way forward to responsible health care reform. Let's do the work that the American people sent us here to do.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, may I inquire of my friend if he has any further speakers on his side?

Mr. MCGOVERN. I have further speakers, but there is a time discrepancy; so I will let you catch up.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, let me just say that I don't have other speakers here yet. I have others on their way over to the floor. I understand the disparity that exists in the timing, and I could talk for all that period of time, but I don't want the gentleman to suffer through that. So I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

Mr. GARAMENDI. Madam Speaker, as I am sitting here listening to this, I am thinking this must be something like Alice in Wonderland. This is the most bizarre debate I have heard in a long, long time.

We need jobs. We need to be focusing on the American economy. This particular resolution has no sense of reality. I have heard debates here and discussions on the floor about association health plans. I know about association health plans. I was the insurance commissioner for 8 years in California, having to deal with these non-insurance programs that left hundreds, indeed thousands of people, holding the bag when the association health plans went belly up. It doesn't make any sense.

California has had tort reform for 30 years. We have in the law today in America a protection for every individual in America from the onerous hands of the insurance companies that have continued over the years to deny benefits, to make the doctor decisions, and to literally put people's lives at risk—it's called the Patients' Bill of Rights, and our Republican colleagues want to repeal that. We have a law that is in place. It should be implemented.

The cost issues that have been discussed here on the floor are really a discussion about what has taken place in the past. The law has yet to be implemented with regard to cost containment, the oversight of the insurance companies. All of those things are in the days ahead, and a market system is available with the exchanges. You want to talk about market, that is how you get there, with exchanges.

Replace, repeal—how bizarre is that? Americans have a protection. Yesterday, our Republican colleagues voted to remove their protections. They gave to the insurance companies once again the power to regulate their lives. We cannot allow that to happen. This step today is just Alice in Wonderland.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Res. 9.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DREIER. I would like to yield 1 minute to my hardworking colleague from Lincoln, Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY).

□ 1000

Mr. FORTENBERRY. I thank the gentleman for the time.

Madam Speaker, health care reform, the right type of reform, is important to me and important to every American. The right type of reform will actually reduce costs and improve health care outcomes while we protect vulnerable persons. However, the current health care law, as we all know, is a complicated mess that is going to shift costs to more unsustainable government spending and actually reduce health care liberties.

America deserves better.

Following yesterday's vote in support of the repeal of this law, I believe it is important to craft a new commonsense policy that provides new insurance models for families, farmers, and small business owners. Yet, as to any model that we craft, the replacement must continue to build upon a culture of health and wellness, allow newly insured persons to keep their current coverage and also retain protections for preexisting conditions. This will be important.

So now the hard work begins; but this time we have the opportunity to get it right.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

Ms. MOORE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise as the incoming co-chair of the Congressional Women's Caucus to talk to you a little bit about the impact that repealing this health care law will have on women.

As you all may be aware, women are twice as likely to be dependent upon their spouses for health care, and they are less likely than men to have employer-sponsored insurance. For single female heads of household, this has a devastating impact on the entire family when there is no health insurance. Of course, all of us have heard stories from our districts about the devastating impact the repeal of this law will have on women, and I heard such a story just yesterday:

Meet Nicole Lipski. She is 25 years old, is working part time, and is going to school part time; but, because of the health care law, was able to remain on her dad's insurance. Lucky for her, because just last week she had an infected pancreas and had to have her gallbladder removed in emergency surgery, which cost $13,000 that, fortunately, was covered by her parents' insurance.

You know, this law outlaws gender rating as insurance companies, of course, charge women higher premiums than men for coverage. It also has a disparate impact on women with respect to preexisting conditions—when you consider that being a victim of domestic violence is considered to be a preexisting condition.

Now, you don't have to be a Harvard economist to know that this law is not a job killer, but we do have a Harvard economist to back us up.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 15 seconds.

Ms. MOORE. David Cutler, a professor of applied economics at Harvard, released a new study on January 7, finding that repealing the health care law would destroy 250,000 to 400,000 jobs annually, and many of these jobs will be women's jobs—CNAs, LPNs, x ray techs, RNs, and the cleaning woman who cleans up the emergency room.

This law is a game changer and a lifesaver for women's health and employment opportunities for women.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I am happy to yield 1 minute to my good friend from Cherryville, North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY).

Mr. MCHENRY. Thank you, Chairman DREIER, for yielding.

Madam Speaker, last night House Republicans took a major step in keeping our pledge to America by passing the repeal of ObamaCare. Now we must work to replace this budget-busting law with sensible, market-based policies that actually lower costs for families and small businesses and expand access to affordable care.

Small businesses are the job creators that hold the key to our economic recovery. They cannot afford the hundreds of billions of dollars in new taxes in the ObamaCare law and the new employer mandate as well. Our small businesses need certainty in the Tax Code and certainty in the regulations coming out of Washington. ObamaCare only makes matters worse.

I look forward to an open and transparent debate in this Congress on alternative, affordable solutions. That's what the American people want, and that's what my constituents desire. I would also challenge my friends on the other side of the aisle to listen to the American people and to join our efforts to work towards better solutions to our Nation's health care challenges.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I thank my good friend from Massachusetts for yielding.

Madam Speaker, let me say that the good news is that the only thing that occurred last evening was simply a vote, because the law of the land is still the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act. I hope that the President's words are not twisted, because I agree with him: we are all willing to work together to do the right thing, which is to amend a bill.

I don't understand the understanding of my friends on the other side of the aisle. Repealing the law of the land has nothing to do with questioning some of the provisions. Frankly, they're not even listening to a distinguished doctor, Senator Frist, the former majority leader, who said this bill—our bill—is the law of the land, and it is the fundamental platform upon which all future efforts to make that system better for that patient and that family will be based.

What is there not to understand?

Amend the bill. Don't repeal it.

In fact, Senator Frist said if the bill were on the floor, he would have voted for it. I spoke to some students the other day, and they asked about doctors. This bill has in it scholarships for medical professionals, the bill that we have.

In fact, the issue, of course, is one that you cannot dispute: this bill saves lives, so much so that the Republican majority leader ran to the media to promise seniors that they wouldn't lose the $250 that our bill, the patient protection bill, guaranteed them so that they would have some cover, some cushion, for their prescription drugs.

So, my friends, I know we are doing the right thing. We are all willing to amend, but how ridiculous it is that you would repeal the law of the land or attempt to do so. I know the President still has his veto pen—because this bill will save lives.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to one of our new Members, the gentleman from Oklahoma City (Mr. LANKFORD).

Mr. LANKFORD. Thank you for yielding time.

Madam Speaker, the repeated diatribe from Members on the other side of the aisle that somehow they are the only individuals in this Chamber who care about the health of American families demonstrates again the deep-seated partisanship that we must work to defeat.

We all want great health care in America. We hear the American people loud and clear. They don't like ObamaCare, but they do want something to be done.

We must have real national tort reform to reduce the costs of defensive medicine.

We must encourage medical innovation to deal with the FDA approval process that covers any new discovery in paperwork, costing $1 billion a drug just to get it through the FDA process.

We must open up more options for insurance carriers, allowing someone who is frustrated with the service or the cost or quality of his carrier to fire them and to get a new insurance provider.

We must reject price fixing as a cost-cutting solution.

We must allow every American to choose their own doctors, even pay their doctors directly if they choose to do that.

We must give senior Americans more choices in physicians who accept Medicare patients.

We must provide States with greater flexibility; and we must deal with portability, high risk, and preexisting conditions.

Republicans have friends and family who are dealing with the same medical issues that Democrats deal with. Suffering, disease, and pain have no respect for political affiliation. We just believe that, if you are sick and hurting, you should contact your doctor, not Washington, DC, to see what to do next.

Let's surprise America. Let's work together, and let's get something done. Let's show them that, even with a divided House and Senate, we can reject the gravitational pull of politics, that we can put aside our differences, and that we can work together for the good of those who are most vulnerable.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 20 seconds.

I just want to respond to the gentleman who just spoke. We hear these distortions over and over and over again. We heard them during the campaign, distortions that were perpetrated by my friends on the other side of the aisle and by their allies in the insurance industry, and that, somehow, what we passed was a bill that wouldn't allow you to keep your own health insurance. That's just wrong.

What we passed was a bill that actually provides competition and insures tens of millions more Americans.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

□ 1010

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Speaker, repeal and replace? What about protect and improve? What about improving the bill that is there right now rather than repealing and replacing?

You know, the fact is the Republican Caucus is talking about replacing a bill, and yet whether it's preexisting

conditions or filling in the doughnut hole, I've heard several of them say, ''Oh, we want to keep that.'' But yet they don't want to protect and improve. They just want to repeal. Why? To protect the insurance industry. I can't see any other reason why they are doing this.

The Affordable Care Act is a good bill; and can it be better? Of course it can be better. But that's not what we're talking about doing today. We're talking about taking away benefits that Americans have in their hand. The Republican Caucus is snatching away people who want to get their children on their health care insurance who are under 26 years of age; snatching away free preventative care for seniors; snatching out of the hands of families whose children are trying to be able to get care who may have a preexisting condition; snatching out of the hands of seniors who are filling in the doughnut hole. They are taking away a benefit Americans have right now. This is wrong and it's a shame.

The fact is the Democratic Caucus when we had the White House and both Houses of Congress, within 2 years we brought to the American people a health care bill. When the Republican Caucus has the House for 6 years, between 2000 and 2006, they don't do anything other than do a big fat giveaway to PhRMA.

Mr. DREIER. I yield myself 15 seconds, Madam Speaker, just to say as I had said to my friend earlier, it's interesting that they continue to say that we did nothing. Associated health plans, which Democrats and Republicans like, designed to drive down the cost for small businesses to provide health insurance, was submitted from this Republican House to the other body. The Democrats, in fact, killed that measure. So attempts were made to put into place real reform.

With that, back by popular demand, the Rules Committee member from Lawrenceville, Georgia, for 2 minutes, Mr. WOODALL.

Mr. WOODALL. Thank you for yielding, Mr. Chairman.

Madam Speaker, I return to the well because I wonder if folks have the same small business people in their district that I have in my district. I wonder if folks are doing the same listening in their district that I'm doing in my district. We are here today to respond to exactly what folks have been asking for.

Now to give credit where credit is due, last year before the last Congress expired, Democrats and Republicans came together to extend for 1 year, and I would have liked to have seen it extended longer, but to extend for 1 year the tax cuts that our small business men and women were demanding. But the second part of the indecision that was there in the small business community, of the anxiety that was there, the uncertainty that was there, is what's going to happen with my health care cost. What's going to happen with the health care plan? Now we have not solved that. We have not solved that anxiety. We have not solved that indecision, because we've only gotten one-half of it done. We've gotten it passed in the House, but we've still got to take it to the Senate and we've still got to take it to the White House.

Now again, in the spirit of giving credit where credit is due, I told folks throughout my campaign that I thought the President identified exactly the right two health care challenges, rising costs and access, and then came up with exactly the wrong solutions to those problems. Now we talk about what's going to happen to folks when the doughnut hole change goes away. Well, did we have a chance last year? And I'm new to Congress. Did we have a chance in the last Congress to vote on that standalone doughnut hole closure? I don't believe we did. Did we have a chance in the last Congress to vote on a standalone preexisting conditions solution? I don't believe we did. Did we have a chance in the last Congress to talk about kids under the age of 26 and what they can do? We did not. But what we do, we have this resolution today that is going to give us, for the first time, the opportunity as a nation to vote on those provisions one by one, because the only option Congress had last time under Democratic leadership to vote for a doughnut hole solution, to vote for preexisting condition solutions, to vote for insurance for kids under the age of 26, was to do it with the unconstitutional mandate, a trillion dollars in new spending, and hundreds of new bureaucracies.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 20 seconds.

I would remind the gentleman, because he's on the Rules Committee with me, that we could have had a chance to vote on all those things individually and in fact he did have a chance to vote as to whether or not we could vote on them individually on the floor, but he and the other Republicans on the Rules Committee voted each and every one of those protections down. They voted against protecting people against preexisting conditions. They voted against closing the doughnut hole. They voted against allowing people under 26 to be able to stay on their parents' health insurance.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. They voted against everything.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time had expired.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I would like to yield 30 seconds to our Rules Committee colleague in the name of comity and civil discourse to respond.

Mr. WOODALL. I thank the chairman.

Madam Speaker, I would just say to my friend that I absolutely voted no on every single one of those Rules Committee amendments in the name of repealing the bill yesterday, and now today I have returned to speak in favor of this resolution so that you can work with the committee leadership to bring each and every one of those provisions to this floor for a vote again for the very first time. For the very first time. I'm glad to support you in having that opportunity and I'm pleased to be here in support of this resolution today.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair must ask Members to bear in mind the principle that proper courtesy in the process of yielding and reclaiming time in debate—and especially in asking another to yield—helps to foster the spirit of mutual comity that elevates our deliberations above mere argument.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MCGOVERN. May I inquire, Madam Speaker, how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN. I thank my very, very good friend from Massachusetts.

Madam Speaker, what troubles me with this debate, and I would particularly address myself to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, is that we took two votes yesterday. One was to provide coverage for ourselves; the next really to deny it to our constituents. That I find troubling, because we all have the right for guaranteed coverage regardless of preexisting conditions. We have a choice of easy-to-compare health insurance plans. We have coverage for early retirees. Women have equal premium coverage. We have access to affordable care; low-cost preventive service. All of these things for ourselves but then voted to deny it to our constituents. I find that troubling.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield myself the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 3½ minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, what is before the House today is not a serious legislative effort. It's a series of sound bites that mean nothing. Committees don't have to do anything. Speaker BOEHNER is quoted in The Hill basically saying that he's not going to hold any of these committees accountable. They can do it if they want to; whatever. If they don't, so be it. What we are dealing with here today really is kind of a political ploy, not a serious legislative effort to replace anything.

My friends on the other side of the aisle have gotten up over and over and over again and said, we're really with

you on preexisting conditions, we're really with you on the doughnut hole, we're with you on allowing parents to keep their kids on their insurance until they're 26. But yet they're really not. Because if they were, they wouldn't have voted yesterday to repeal all those protections. And if they were really with us, then we would be talking about today coming to the House floor with a series of initiatives that would actually continue to protect those benefits for consumers. But they voted to repeal all of that.

□ 1020

I want to know, how could anybody in this House, how could anybody, in light of the protections that have been put in place, go back to an individual who is now able to get health insurance because we prohibited insurance companies from discriminating against them for a preexisting condition, how can you go to them and say, well, we're going to change our mind; we're not going to do that anymore?

How do you go to senior citizens who are struggling with that doughnut hole—and we've begun to close it—how do you go to them and say we're going to raise your taxes? How do you do that?

How do you go to a parent whose child can remain on their health insurance because we've extended it to allow them to stay on it until they're 26 and say, well, that doesn't matter anymore? It just doesn't make sense.

That's not what people voted for in the last election. They didn't vote for you to repeal all of those things. What they voted against was this distortion of a health care bill that you put out there, my friends on the other side of the aisle, that was very well funded by the most expensive advertising campaign funded by the insurance companies in the history of our country, this distortion out there. Everybody was against that distortion. That is not the reality.

As the months have gone by and as the reality has become clear to people, as they have seen the benefits and the protections, as people have been able to wrest control of their health care from the insurance industry, as consumers realize they have more and more rights, as there are more and more protections that are built into law to protect people of all ages, people say, well, we don't want you to change that; we want that to be saved.

I will just say one thing. When my friends say, well, we can just do a little bit of this and a little bit of that, you really can't, because it's kind of like a domino effect. Everything has an impact.

So this is a serious debate. And if there is some indignation on this side of the aisle, it is because we know that this is a big deal, and real people who have real challenges affording their health care and dealing with the complexities of the health care system and the inequities of the health care system are now getting some relief, and they will be hurt by what you are doing.

So let's be honest here. What happened yesterday was my friends on the other side of the aisle went on record as saying, We're against everything.

Today, we're going to pass a resolution, I guess, that doesn't do anything, doesn't even require committees to do anything, but it's just for all these nice, feel-good sound bites. That's not a serious legislative effort. That's why people are cynical.

We can do better. I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, there was a very powerful and resounding message that came last November 2, and that is the imperative for us to create jobs and get this economy growing.

The American people are hurting. In my State of California, we have a 12.5 percent unemployment rate. Part of the area I represent has a 15.5 percent unemployment rate in the Inland Empire in southern California. It is essential that we focus our attention on creating jobs, and I believe the step that we are taking today is going to be very, very important as we pursue that goal.

Now, why is that? When we look at what passed last year, was signed last March 23 by the President, it was a measure that imposes mandates on small businesses, jeopardizing their ability to hire new workers. It's a measure that imposes dictates on doctors, a regulatory structure which undermines their potential to hire new employees. It is a measure which, in many ways, jeopardizes our potential to grow the economy because it is a dramatic expansion of the entitlement programs which Democrats and Republicans alike say need to be addressed if we're going to create jobs and get our economy back on track.

One of the things that I think is important to note is that people have said that repeal of the health care bill in fact is going to cost $230 billion based on those CBO numbers that came out. Well, only in Washington, D.C., can one cut a $2.7 trillion expenditure and have it labeled as a cost.

Why is it a cost? It's a cost because the measure that was signed last March 23 imposes a three-quarter of $1 trillion tax increase on working Americans. Now, what does that do to create jobs and get our economy growing? Obviously, it undermines our shared priority of creating jobs and getting our economy back on track.

We know that with the $14 trillion national debt that we have and deficits down the road we need to do what we can to rein in that spending, tackling entitlements and dealing with issues like the one that we're facing today.

Now, having said that, we all know that Democrats and Republicans alike want to ensure that every single American has access to quality, affordable health insurance so that they can have access to quality health care. And I underscore the word ''quality,'' because if one looks at the important research and development that takes place in the United States of America, I believe that the measure that was signed last March 23 and that we voted in this House to repeal yesterday, that that measure undermines the very important pursuit of research and development to deal with many of the diseases that are out there.

So, Madam Speaker, I've got to say that we all say we want every American to have access to quality, affordable health care, and everyone has acknowledged that that bill that was signed last March 23 is in fact flawed. In his news conference right after the election, the President of the United States said that he believed that we need to address the so-called 1099 provisions that impose, again, an onerous mandate on small businesses, undermining their ability to create jobs—exactly what I was saying earlier.

I quoted the distinguished assistant minority leader, the former majority whip, Mr. CLYBURN, who on a program earlier this week said Republicans and Democrats need to work together to rectify some of the problems that exist with this measure.

And, as I said, it was 2 days ago that the President of the United States wrote his editorial in The Wall Street Journal in which he talked about the need to reduce the regulatory burden that is imposed on the private sector so we can get our economy going and create jobs. And he also said on that same day that he is willing and eager, Madam Speaker—willing and eager—to work with Republicans to rectify some of the programs that exist in this measure.

Now, I heard my friend Mr. MATHESON this morning, on National Public Radio, state that there was not a plan out there, and that's the reason that, having voted against the bill, he did not vote for repeal, because there's not a plan out there. I heard that at 7:35 this morning on WAMU. Mr. MATHESON made that statement. But the fact of the matter is, unlike the plan that was signed into law March 23 of last year that did not include the kind of bipartisan participation that we believe is essential, I've got to say that we are planning to proceed with this direction to the four committees that will allow virtually every Member of this House to be involved.

We have 12 items. And I'm happy to say that under this rule we have made in order Mr. MATHESON's amendment that we will be considering in just a few minutes that will add a 13th item to deal with the so-called ''doc fix.'' So that, again, underscores our desire to work in a bipartisan way to address some of the concerns that are there.

Now, what is it that we say needs to be done? And, frankly, the President of the United States has indicated some of these he supports.

We need to make sure that people do have a chance to purchase insurance across State lines, which is now, under McCarran-Ferguson, denied.

We need to make sure that we put into place associated health plans—again, a provision that passed the Republican House but was killed by Democrats in the Senate when we last were in the majority.

We need to do everything that we can to allow for pooling to deal with pre-existing conditions.

We need to make sure that we expand medical savings accounts that provide incentives for people to put dollars aside to plan for their health care needs.

And one of the things that the President of the United States said in his State of the Union message 1 year ago right here in this Chamber, we need to deal with meaningful lawsuit abuse reform so that we can have attention focused on patients and doctors and not on trial lawyers.

So I would say to my friend from Utah, those are five items that are part of our plan that I believe can enjoy strong bipartisan support.

□ 1030

And so, Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 9 so that we can proceed with a bipartisan consideration of this very important goal that we share of creating jobs, getting our economy back on track, and ensuring that every single American has access to quality, affordable health insurance.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution. The House Republican majority has brought this resolution to the House floor claiming that they will take action to replace the health reform bill that they voted to repeal yesterday—yet again, with no specifics. But the Republican record on tackling the issues with our health care system is clear. Between the years 2000 and 2006, health insurance premiums doubled—went up 100 percent—and the profits of the major health insurance companies quadrupled. What did the Congress do during those years to stop those skyrocketing premiums? Nothing.

In contrast, the health reform bill signed by President Obama finally provides the chance to rein in those exorbitant premiums and will reduce the deficit by more than $1 trillion in the next 20 years. It has already put in place important consumer protections, reduces prescription drug costs to seniors by closing the Medicare Part D donut hole, and provides tax credits for small business owners who provide insurance coverage. And Washington Republicans just want the American people to trust that they will come up with a plan—without a single detail, without a timeline, without any track record of addressing this crisis in our Nation.

There are certainly areas where we can improve this historic reform legislation. In fact, the House voted in the last Congress to repeal the 1099 provision on small businesses—House Republicans opposed that effort. But the American people don't want to go backwards by repealing these new rights, and doing so without a specific plan to replace it is simply irresponsible. It's time to stop playing shell games and start working to move America forward.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues vote nay on this resolution.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 9, a measure that directs a number of House committees to begin the process of drafting and reporting to the House individual bills to improve our Nation's health care system.

As you know, the House voted yesterday to repeal the health care reform law that Congress approved last year and which has deeply divided our country. The one thing made clear from that debate is there are a number of areas where all sides agree that we should look first to begin reforming our Nation's health care system. These areas include:

Preserving the rights of patients and families to keep their health plan if they like it;

Ensuring that people with pre-existing medical conditions have access to affordable health care coverage;

Preventing insurance companies from dropping coverage for patients who are sick;

Allowing young adults to remain on the health insurance policies of their parents;

Reforming our nation's medical liability system to lower health care costs by reducing the burden of medical liability policies and eliminating wasteful health care spending;

Protecting doctor—patient relationships;

Lowering health care premiums through increased competition and choice and by making health care policies available across state lines;

Providing incentives to employers to provide health care coverage, rather than fines and penalties on those who do not.

The legislation we consider today directs our committees to look at these issues bill by bill so the House can debate each issue one by one, giving all the members of the House opportunity to provide their input.

Madam Speaker, one of the reasons the nation is so divided over the health care bill enacted last year is that the House did not have the opportunity for a full and open debate on this important issue. We voted to repeal last year's legislation to give us as a nation the opportunity to start over and to do it right this time.

We should start the process again by working to enact the areas above on which we agree and through the repeal effort to undo the problems we see with last year's effort. These problem areas include:

Reversing the more than $500 billion in Medicare cuts that threaten the availability of health care for our Nation's seniors;

Eliminating the Federal mandates that individuals must purchase health insurance, and the penalties imposed upon those who do not;

Eliminating the Federal mandates on businesses that do not provide employees with health insurance, and the penalties imposed upon those who do not;

Eliminating the more than $700 billion in fees and taxes which threaten to stifle our economy and the creation of new jobs at a time when our Nation and our State of Florida struggle to get people back to work.

Madam Speaker, in addition to these concerns is the overall concern about the short-term and long-term cost of the current health care law. Much has been made of predictions by the non-partisan Congressional Budget Office that repeal of this legislation would actually increase the Federal deficit. But CBO's former Director Douglas Holtz-Eakin wrote in The New Your Times just two days prior to it being signed into law that ''In reality, if you strip out all the gimmicks and budgetary games and rework the calculus, a wholly different picture emerges: The health care reform legislation would raise, not lower, Federal deficits by $562 billion.''

He goes on to say, ''Even worse, some costs are left out entirely. To operate the new programs over the first 10 years, future Congresses would need to vote for $114 billion in additional annual spending. But this so-called discretionary spending is excluded from the Congressional Budget Office's tabulation.''

It is no wonder that this legislation is so costly because it creates 160 boards, bureaucracies and commissions and this 2,700 page legislation will require more than 10,000 pages of new Federal regulations to implement fully.

It is this cost to the American taxpayer, this cost to American businesses, and the uncertainty this legislation creates throughout so many sectors of our economy and the health care industry that we seek to correct through this two-pronged effort this week.

Madam Speaker, we all can agree that our Nation can do a better job at providing health care coverage and services to the American people. Many agree that we can also do a better job at bringing about these changes through a more open and deliberate legislative process.

In the end, our goal is to provide a more patient centered health care system in which we preserve the vitally important doctor-patient relationship rather than a government centered health care system in which the government injects itself into the system, mandates certain provisions, penalizes individuals and businesses, and threatens to get in the middle of doctor-patient decisions.

We as a nation can improve the quality and delivery of health care for the American people and that effort begins in earnest this week with the adoption of this resolution.

Mr. HECK. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 9, instructing the committees of jurisdiction to report legislation to replace the job-killing health care law with a more patient-centered set of reforms. This replacement resolution is the first step toward fixing the recent job-killing health care law's serious problems: more than $500 billion in cuts to Medicare, and $150 billion in cuts to Medicare Advantage; crippling taxes and mandates on small business that cost Americans jobs; and overreaching Federal policies that place bureaucrats between patients and their doctor. As a physician, I see firsthand the need to improve our country's health care system. What was signed into law last year did include some good ideas, such as: allowing dependent children to stay on their parents' insurance until the age of 26; eliminating lifetime caps on coverage; and covering individuals with pre-existing conditions. However, these policies were coupled with unsustainable spending that saddles Americans with debt, and compromises their access to quality health care. The American people deserve better, which is why we need to go back to the drawing board and develop solutions that provide stability and security for those with health

care, options for those without, and rein in spiraling costs for everyone. I urge my colleagues to vote yes on this Resolution, so that we can get Americans back to work and give them the health care system they deserve.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this resolution.

The certain result of what the Republican leadership in the House is proposing to do will be to saddle millions of Americans with higher health insurance costs, less coverage, less competition, and higher costs on small businesses and employers across the country.

This resolution is both unnecessary and a grave error in public policy.

It is unnecessary because, by the resolution's very terms, the Affordable Care Act is responsive to each and every one of the objectives outlined in the resolution for responsible health legislation.

For example: We are instructed to write changes to existing law that will ''foster economic growth and private sector job creation.'' In the wake of enactment of the Affordable Care Act, health is among the fastest growing employment sectors in the United States, with a third of the job growth in the entire country last year—over 340,000 jobs in health care and social assistance.

The Affordable Care Act is a jobs creation law and repeal is a jobs loss bill.

The resolution calls for changes in law that ''lower health care premiums through increased competition and choice.'' This is exactly what consumers will get from the health exchanges in the Affordable Care Act—more competition and choice than they have today.

The resolution calls for laws that will ''increase the number of insured Americans.'' The Affordable Care Act already does that—by some 32 million Americans.

Consumers can keep their health plans—just as called for in the resolution.

The law encourages reform of the medical liability system—just as called for in the resolution.

The resolution calls for those with pre-existing conditions to have access to affordable health coverage. The Affordable Care Act prohibits insurance coverage from being cut off for pre-existing conditions.

That is why the Affordable Care Act already meets all the public policy goals outlined in this resolution.

This resolution is also a grave error in public policy.

It is important to appreciate what has been has excluded from the instructions to our committees for changes in the health laws.

As I stated have stated earlier in the debate on repeal of the Affordable Care Act, under the directions to us in this resolution, there will be:

No prohibition on discrimination against over 100 million Americans with pre-existing conditions;

No prohibition on insurance companies cancelling your coverage when you get sick;

No prohibition on lifetime caps and annual limits;

No required coverage for young adults on their parents' policies;

No assistance to seniors struggling to afford the cost of drugs in the donut hole;

No free annual check-ups and preventive care in Medicare;

No tax credits for families and small businesses to pay for health insurance.

All of these reforms are in the law today. None of these reforms will survive if this resolution passes and the committees of jurisdiction follow this terribly flawed blueprint.

I strongly oppose this resolution and urge its defeat.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 9 and the promise of providing health care solutions that bring American's access to quality affordable health care of their choice. This resolution shows that my Republican colleagues and I are committed to the future of health care in this Nation. Allowing the appropriate committees to provide solutions for our Nation's health care problems is the first step to that commitment.

I look forward to exploring and expanding high risk pools to create universal access to those with pre-existing conditions; real and meaningful tort reform so doctors do not have to practice defensive medicine; the creation of small business health plans that generate larger insurance pools and drive down health care costs. We should be rewarding innovation and allowing States more flexibility to create efficient and successful ways in dealing with their uninsured populations; allowing for greater portability for individuals to purchase health care across State lines; encouraging the Nation as a whole to live healthier lives. Lastly, it is absolutely essential to give every American the same tax advantage that Unions and corporations enjoy in the purchase of health insurance.

There is no shortage of great ideas on how to reform our health care delivery system, and most of them steer clear of creating new entitlement programs that will bankrupt our country. In the wake of record debt and deficits now is the time to work together for common sense solutions that provide individuals the access to quality health care without threatening the doctor patient relationship. I am a proud cosponsor of the Resolution we are discussing on the floor today and I look forward to voting for it later today.

Mr. DREIER. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MATHESON

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

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

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment printed in part B of House Report 112–2 offered by Mr. MATHESON:

In paragraph (11) of the resolved clause, strike ''or,''.

In paragraph (12) of the resolved clause, strike the period and insert ''; or''.

Add after paragraph (12) of the resolved clause the following:

(13) enact a permanent fix to the flawed Medicare sustainable growth rate formula used to determine physician payments under title XVIII of the Social Security Act to preserve health care for the nation's seniors and to provide a stable environment for physicians.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 26, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MATHESON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise today to offer an amendment to H. Res. 9.

Although I do not support a wholesale repeal of the legislation, I do believe that there are some bipartisan improvements that can be made to the existing law, and I think now is the time for all of us in Congress to roll up our sleeves and work together.

The goal of this amendment is pretty straightforward. It is set up to maintain adequate health care service, to stabilize the business practice of doctors, and to take into account the long-term economic health of this country.

We all agree that the doctor-patient relationship is a fundamental part of quality health care, but we have found that we have a flawed formula when it comes to setting reimbursement levels. And every year it threatens the ability of doctors to care for their patients, and it threatens the ability of patients to see their doctors.

Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle and stakeholders throughout the health care community, physicians, senior citizens—they all recognize that we have a flawed policy.

How many times in the past have we come together in a bipartisan way over the years in the House of Representatives to provide a temporary patch to this problem without fixing the underlying problem?

In 2010 alone, Congress took five different votes to delay a scheduled cut without stepping up and dealing with a permanent fix to the problem. By an overwhelming vote just a few weeks ago, Congress supported a 1-year delay to a looming 25-percent cut in physician payments.

My amendment is very straightforward and clear. It adds an additional instruction to the committees of jurisdiction over health care legislation to replace the flawed sustainable growth rate formula used to set Medicare payments for doctors. And it requires that Congress adopt a permanent fix to what has previously been an ongoing problem.

It's the right thing to do on behalf of doctors and patients. It's the right fiscal policy as we look for ways to make health care funding more sustainable and more predictable. And as we begin the year looking towards improvements in this extremely complex and yet highly personal and important issue of health care, I think that adopting this amendment would be a good step to move in that direction.

I ask all of my colleagues to support this amendment in a bipartisan way.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I would like to claim the time in opposition to the Matheson amendment.

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

Mr. DREIER. I claim time in opposition to the amendment to say that I support the amendment, Madam Speaker.

I believe that as you look at the list of 12 items that we have in H. Res. 9, they are not to be limited at all. And I think that by virtue of our making the Matheson amendment in order to deal with the so-called doc fix issue, we have made it very clear that we are already beginning at this juncture to work in a bipartisan way in our quest to create jobs, get our economy back on track, and ensure that every single American has access to quality affordable health care.

And so this is, again, the beginning of a very important process. And I'm very pleased that Mr. MATHESON has been able to play a role in fashioning H. Res. 9.

And Madam Speaker, I hope very much that with the President of the United States saying that he is willing and eager to work with Republicans to rectify the problems that exist with the passed health care bill and the fact that Mr. CLYBURN, the assistant minority leader, has said that he wants to work in a bipartisan way to deal with these issues, will lead to strong bipartisan support for Mr. MATHESON's amendment and for the underlying resolution.

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

Mr. MATHESON. I yield 1 minute to my colleague from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of Mr. MATHESON's amendment.

I do want to point out, though, that the Democrats, when we were in the majority, many times tried to pass a permanent fix and did not receive support, I believe, from many Republicans—except I think in one case we did have Dr. BURGESS from Texas' support.

Back in November of 2009, we passed a permanent fix, a doctors' fix. But because we could not get any Republican support—any real Republican support—we had to continue to rely on short-term fixes. We did however, as you know, at the end of the last session pass a 1-year fix, which is in effect now.

But I do think that this is a very commendable response that Mr. MATHESON has, and I certainly intend to support it.

But the difficulty is that the many years when the Republicans were in the majority, they had the opportunity to pass a permanent fix and to deal with this issue, and they always kicked the can down the road and then did not cooperate with us on a bipartisan basis when we were in the majority to try to achieve a permanent fix.

I certainly intend to work with the Republicans to do that, but they are the reason we don't have it now.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I was mistakenly under the impression that the gentleman from Utah had exhausted his 5 minutes, so I would like to reclaim the remaining time that I have.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman may reclaim the time.

There was no objection.

Mr. DREIER. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MATHESON. I have no further speakers. I again want to thank you for the opportunity to have this amendment considered, and I urge support of all of my colleagues.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, as we know under the structure, I have claimed time in opposition to the amendment, but I will state once again that I am supportive of the Matheson amendment. I urge my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans alike, to come together and vote for adding what would be item number 13, which will be the beginning of wide-ranging reform to ensure that every single American has access to quality health insurance so that we can again get our economy back on track and focus on job creation and growth.

With that, I again urge support of the Matheson amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 26, the previous question is ordered on the amendment and on the resolution.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MATHESON).

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on the question of adopting the resolution if that question arises without intervention of a motion to recommit.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 428, nays 1, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 15]

YEAS—428

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Benishek
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harman
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Kucinich
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Olver
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quayle
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)

Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stark
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Weiner
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—1

Conyers

NOT VOTING—5

Costa
Giffords
Payne
Ruppersberger
Young (AK)

□ 1100

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 15, had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The question is on the resolution, as amended.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 253, nays 175, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 16]

YEAS—253

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Holden
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (NY)
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—175

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—6

Giffords
Johnson (IL)
Payne
Ruppersberger
Towns
Young (AK)

□ 1108

So the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately I was unable to vote on H. Res. 9 and wished to express my intentions had I been able to vote.

I had been in the middle of an Agriculture Committee Public Forum with Secretary Vilsack when the first votes were called. I went down on the floor with my notes, as I was the next in line to ask the Secretary questions, and while I was reviewing my notes and questions mistakenly missed the second vote in the series.

Had I been present to vote on rollcall No. 16, to pass H. Res. 9, Instructing certain committees to report legislation replacing the job-killing health care law, I would have voted "yes."

Stated against:

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 16, I intended to vote "no."

□ 1110

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the majority leader, the gentleman from Virginia, for the purpose of inquiring about the schedule for the coming week.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman from Maryland, the Democratic whip, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House will meet at noon for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business with votes postponed until 6:30 p.m.

On Tuesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate and noon for legislative business. The House will recess no later than 5 p.m. to allow a security sweep of the House Chamber prior to the President's State of the Union address. The House will meet again at approximately 8:35 p.m. in a joint session with the Senate for the purpose of receiving an address from the President of the United States.

On Wednesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for legislative business.

During the week, the House will consider at least one bill under suspension of the rules, which will be announced by close of business tomorrow. In addition, we will consider H. Res. 38, a resolution reducing non-security spending to fiscal year 2008 levels or Less, and a bill of the public's choosing—via the

YouCut program—to reduce Federal spending and the deficit by terminating taxpayer financing of Presidential election campaigns and party conventions; saving taxpayers $520 million in mandatory spending according to CBO's estimate last year.

Mr. HOYER. I want to thank the gentleman for informing us of the schedule for the week to come.

I want to thank, at the outset, not only the gentleman but the Speaker as well for the respect and consideration they have given during this current tragic situation that confronted us in Tucson and the critical injuries sustained by our colleague, GABBY GIFFORDS. I want to thank Mr. CANTOR in particular for his very strong statement, as well as the Speaker's very strong statement, that an attack on any individual who serves is an attack on all of us irrespective of party or philosophy. I think we all have raised prayers for the victims who lost their lives, their families, prayers for those who are either in the process of recovering or are now out of danger, and of course for our beloved colleague, Congresswoman GIFFORDS, as well.

So I want to thank the gentleman for his leadership and the Speaker's leadership in joining with our leader and myself in leading the House in what I thought was a very appropriate and united response to that tragedy.

We are heartened by the progress that Congresswoman GIFFORDS is making, and we look forward to her quick return.

Now, Mr. CANTOR, if I can, next week we are scheduled to leave on Wednesday. I know there has been an articulation of an intent to try to get out by noon on the days that we leave. Would you expect that to be the case this next week?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CANTOR. First of all, I thank the gentleman for his kind statements regarding the expressions of grief and support that I think all Members of this body have expressed to GABBY GIFFORDS, her family, and her staff. Our thoughts and prayers remain with all of them, and certainly to the victims and their families. And certainly they all know that we are thinking of them.

Mr. Speaker, as far as the schedule is concerned, if you will recall, the commitment on our schedule was the finishing time would be 3 p.m. on the last day we are here. We specifically had indicated that January is going to be a little different and an exception due to the organizing processes, State of the Union, et cetera. The expectation is to begin that in February, as was originally expressed; although, we do intend to try to be as expeditious as possible on Wednesday. The exact timing of our departure and finishing up depends on the actual rule coming from the Rules Committee, including the amendment debate and the structure for the Presidential election fund bill. We expect an announcement by the Rules Committee chairman later today on that.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comment.

Given that response, can I ask the gentleman: Would he expect there to be an open rule with reference to that bill?

Mr. CANTOR. The gentleman understands, as the Rules Committee chairman presides over the Rules Committee and entertains the submission of amendments. As to exactly, I can't answer that right now, and that will be determined by the Rules Committee.

Mr. HOYER. Not only do I recall that as being a fact, I also recall it as an answer that I used to give the gentleman on a regular basis.

But I am certainly hopeful, as he was hopeful, given the representations of transparency and openness, that there would be opportunities to amend. I know that Mr. VAN HOLLEN spoke to that in the Rules Committee, and I would hope that we could see that policy which has been expressed by your side pursued in this instance as well as future instances. I thank the gentleman for his response.

Let me ask the gentleman: There was some criticism raised when we passed a budget enforcement resolution that we hadn't passed a full budget. In that budget enforcement resolution, as you recall, A, we articulated a specific number; and, B, that number was voted on by the entire House.

□ 1120

It is my understanding that the proposition that will be put before the House next week will provide and give unilateral authority to the chairman of the Budget Committee to set a number and that that number will not be voted upon by the House pursuant to the authority granted in that resolution.

Is that an accurate reading of that resolution?

Mr. CANTOR. To be clear, once the House adopts the resolution next week, the resolution will then instruct Chairman RYAN to cap non-security discretionary spending for the remainder of fiscal year 2011 at fiscal year 2008 levels. That is the purpose of our adopting the resolution, acting as the House as a whole, instructing Chairman RYAN to cap non-security discretionary spending at 2008 levels for the remainder of this fiscal year.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I'd say to the gentleman, I know he shares with me the realization that people across this country—families, businesses—are having to face some tough choices. We started this Congress, I think, together, committed to demonstrating that we are willing to make those tough choices—thus, the resolution for next week.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his response.

I do not want to be argumentative, but I have just received your amended copy of the resolution, and as I read on your second page, it says ''the remainder of fiscal year 2011 that assumes non-security spending at fiscal year 2008 levels or less.''

The implication in that, it seems to me, is that Mr. RYAN unilaterally can set a number which has not been agreed to by the House, but under the power granted in this resolution would bind the House to a number to which it had never agreed.

Is that an accurate reading of that? Could, in fact, under this resolution Mr. RYAN set a number that is less than, as your resolution says, 2008 numbers?

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I say to the gentleman that the resolution provides for the capping of spending levels at '08 levels.

The gentleman also knows that the Speaker has been very consistent in his statements, saying that we are going to have an open rule process when it comes to spending bills. In fact, that is what we said during the last campaign season in the Pledge to America.

So, in working with that commitment as well as the language of this resolution, the budget chairman, Mr. RYAN, will be instructed to enter into the RECORD a cap of spending levels for the remainder of the fiscal year to be placed at 2008 levels.

Mr. HOYER. So would it be therefore accurate that the ''or less'' is superfluous and is not intended to give Mr. RYAN the authority to set a figure at less than 2008 levels?

Mr. CANTOR. I would say to the gentleman I disagree with that characterization of the language ''or less,'' and would just say that, again, the Speaker is committed to an open process on spending bills. I assume that we will see coming to the floor every attempt and effort to try and maintain some sense that this Congress is going to be a cut-and-grow Congress and that we are about trying to find savings everywhere we can so that we can get this country back onto a trajectory of fiscal sustainability.

So I say to the gentleman, no, this is not something that we intend to be meaningless, that we are serious. The cap is consistent with our commitment to the people of this country that the levels of spending for the remainder of the fiscal year will not exceed 2008. It is our hope that we can continue to find additional savings so that, yes, we could even find ourselves below '08 levels; but the cap is 2008 levels.

Mr. HOYER. The point that I am trying to make, and perhaps not as clearly as I need to make it, is that what we are in that resolution giving is to one person—one person—in this Congress the authority, without consideration by this House, to set the number, without hearings, on what we will, as you articulate, cap spending levels at for fiscal year 2011.

As I understand it, there have been no hearings by the Budget Committee, no hearings by the Appropriations Committee, no hearings by the Ways and Means Committee, or by any other committee involved in fiscal matters as to what the ramifications of that cap will be to individual programs or individual Americans.

I share the gentleman's view and have voted consistently, as I voted for the balanced budget amendment, as the gentleman knows, last we considered it, to bring our fiscal house into order. I think neither party can necessarily take sole responsibility for doing so or not doing so when it comes to fiscal balance.

But I do tell my friend that, with respect to transparency and openness and to the inclusion of all the Members of the body, it is, I think, not consistent with that objective to give to one person, however brilliant that person is—and I happen to have great respect, as the gentleman knows and as I have said so publicly in the press, for Mr. RYAN, who I think is a very positive, effective, important Member of this body; but I am not for giving any one person in this body the authority to unilaterally set the number at which we will fund America's government for the next 7 months.

I yield to my friend to see if he might have a response to that because, in his responses to me—and I understand the cap—but at any number below that, at 2007, 2006, 2005 levels, it seems to me this resolution authorizes Mr. RYAN to set such figures as he unilaterally determines is an appropriate figure. In his mind, that may be an appropriate figure; but it is not necessarily the same figure that this body voting in a transparent, open way might select.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I will just respond to the gentleman by saying we are in the position we are in because the majority that he participated in in the last Congress failed to live up to its obligation in passing a budget and in even passing any appropriations bills short of a continuing resolution. That's why we are here today, because there is a mess that has been created from the last majority, and we are trying to clean that up.

We have committed to a transparent and open process; and I have said to the gentleman that, when the CR comes to the floor, we will see Members on both sides of the aisle have an opportunity to amend the continuing resolution according to the way they think that we ought to be saving taxpayer dollars.

So, again, I disagree with the gentleman's assertion that somehow there is a lack of transparency here. We have said all along the cap on our spending will be at 2008 levels for the remainder of the fiscal year. If this House works its will and if Members on either side are able to gain the majority of votes in this House to achieve even more spending below the 2008 levels, then that will be the will of this House.

Again, the gentleman understands well why we are where we are, and we look forward to working together to go and produce a spending resolution here that begins to address the mess that was left before.

Mr. HOYER. Let me ask the gentleman: Is the gentleman representing to me that this resolution will, in fact, result in 2008 levels of expenditure so that Members, who are being asked to vote on this, will have a certitude of the number on which they are voting—that's my only question—so that they will know on what authorization they are giving, what budget direction they are giving, to the members of the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. CANTOR. The budget directive is 2008 levels or less. As the gentleman well knows, the intention is to allow the Appropriations Committee to do its work, to report a resolution to the floor. The body will work its will according to the insistence of the majority and the Speaker that we have an open process on spending bills.

□ 1130

It is our hope that we can work to achieve even greater savings for the taxpayers of this country.

Mr. HOYER. I understand that, and I thank the gentleman. I know that he has indicated that we are going to be considering what I believe to be a $52 million cut—that's important money—to reach your $100 billion. However, if you do it at that level per week, of course, you will take approximately 50 years to get to $100 billion if we consider one every week that we are in session.

My presumption is that you will be informing us of those opportunities to cut as well, giving us opportunities on our side. There may well be Members on our side who want to join in making sure that we spend our money as effectively and efficiently as possible. But we also know and the commissions that have reported know that while these types of expenditures are important to review, I don't know that there have been any hearings on this YouCut. I know that this has been in response to the Web page question that you have propounded to people—I don't know how many responses you have received to that. But are you intending to have hearings in relevant committees on future propositions to cut?

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman, first of all, as far as the $520 million—not $52 million—is concerned, as he knows that is mandatory spending, that is not discretionary spending, and would be different and apart from the commitment that we just spoke about at '08 levels.

I would also say to the gentleman that we will be glad to have hearings once committees are organized. As the gentleman knows, it's been a little bit slow in upstart just given the transition of leadership, et cetera. We are waiting for your side in some instances. But we hear from committee chairmen things are working well, so we hope that committees will be up and organized to have hearings.

But in order for us to deliver on our commitment that we are going to bring up a spending cut bill every week, this body will be considering a bill providing for cutting the Presidential election fund that has been in existence for some time. As the gentleman well knows, this tends to be of some controversy in some quarters. There are those who believe that this is an attempt to drive this country towards a public finance system for campaigns. Obviously there are those in this country who believe that's what should happen. But knowing full well the controversy, I'm sure we will have a robust debate. And I am looking forward, Mr. Speaker, to as many cuts to this fund as the gentleman's side may offer and look forward to a robust debate on the issue.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

And let me ask again, does the gentleman intend, once the committees are up and running—I understand in a transition it takes some time—that the cuts that you are going to propose on a weekly basis will have been subjected to committee oversight and hearings, with the public having an opportunity to testify on the consequences of those cuts?

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I say to the gentleman again, yes, it is our intention to have a full and open debate on all of these issues. As the gentleman recalls, this process began last June, or in the spring or so, that we said we were going to redirect the focus to make sure that we are in line with the will of the people, and that is trying to do everything we can to remind all of us of the import of cutting spending, and therefore this process begins. But yes, to the gentleman's question about hearings, we welcome that and would expect that.

Mr. HOYER. Good. I appreciate that response.

Lastly, I ask my friend, one of the significant issues that will be confronting us in the coming months will be the extension of the debt limit to ensure that America continues to pay the bills that it has incurred and therefore maintain fiscal stability not only in this country but throughout the world. The Speaker and you have both made, I think, very positive comments on the fact that, as unwanted as such a vote may be, it is, nevertheless, as the Speaker pointed out, an adult vote—that I took to mean a responsible vote—to ensure the fiscal stability of our country.

Does the gentleman anticipate a clean up-or-down vote on that issue when it becomes timely to vote on that issue sometime in March of April?

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I would begin by saying to the gentleman, as he knows, it's unclear when the Federal Government will actually hit the debt ceiling, and we will be closely monitoring that date. But before we reach that date, it is very, very important that we prove that this Congress is willing to cut spending. And the House, as the discussion today indicates, will be taking those necessary steps each week that we are here, leading up to an eventual vote. In fact, I would call on the leader on the other side of the Capitol, Mr. REID, to follow suit.

The continuing resolution vote gives us the first real opportunity to demonstrate our commitment to cutting spending. The debt limit will be another opportunity for this Congress to cut spending. And as I think the gentleman knows, I have said repeatedly that we will not accept an increase in the debt limit without serious spending cuts and reforms, and I look forward to joining with the gentleman debate on this House floor. Hopefully we can have the Senate join us, as well as the President, towards that end.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

It's my understanding, from the gentleman's response, that if in the eyes of you or Mr. BOEHNER or your side of the aisle serious spending cuts have not been effected, that you would oppose the extension of the debt limit.

Is that what I hear you saying?

Mr. CANTOR. I would say to the gentleman this: We have been charged with an obligation by the people of this country to get our fiscal house in order. We intend to be very deliberate and focused on cutting spending while making sure we are doing all we can to grow the economy and the private-sector jobs. It is our intent to prove that this House and this Congress—hopefully Leader REID will follow suit—will deliver on that commitment.

The public, as the gentleman knows all too well, is tired of business as usual. They don't want to see this country continue to incur debt as it has in the past without some indication that things are changing, without some indication that serious spending cuts have been implemented and reforms effected, and that will be our intent.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that response. And I hate to keep pressing him, but if his hopes are not realized—and I don't know the answer as to whether they will be, but at some point in time we will be confronted with an alternative of whatever the facts may be with respect to what we are able to pass through this House, the Senate, and get signed by the President, we will be confronted with the consequences of our past behavior, and I underline ''our,'' o-u-r, spending that we have incurred. And I don't want to go through the entire debate that you and I always go through, so I won't do it, but we will be confronted with, as the Speaker says, an adult moment as to whether or not we will, in light of the consequences of past behavior, take actions necessary to preclude America from defaulting on its debts. And I simply ask the gentleman, will we have the opportunity to have an up-or-down vote on that issue under the circumstances where we have reached, as the gentleman points out—we don't know the exact date—the extent of present authority?

Mr. CANTOR. I would say to the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, that the vote on the debt limit comes within the context of our demonstrating a commitment to cut spending, to effect reforms. And the President as well as the gentleman's side here in this House have said both that they would like to see and join us in cutting spending. This debt-limit vote comes in the context of all that we are going to be able to do over the next several months. And we've got to be demonstrating that or frankly the public will not want us to accept any notion that we're going to continue business as usual unless we've demonstrated that things are changing. That's why I continue to say to the gentleman that we will not accept an increase in the debt limit without serious spending cuts and reforms.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

□ 1140

HOUR OF MEETING ON MONDAY, JANUARY 24, 2011

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR A JOINT SESSION OF CONGRESS TO RECEIVE A MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a privileged concurrent resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 10

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Tuesday, January 25, 2011, at 9 p.m., for the purpose of receiving such communication as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FAREWELL TO THE PAGES

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, today we will be saying farewell to the pages who have served this House so well. They are standing in the back of the Chamber here now. We wish to thank you for your service.

I've been on the Page Board for about 30 years. Speaker Tip O'Neill appointed me to that board, and this has been a tremendous group of pages. You've worked hard, you've worked well, and you've worked honorably.

You've seen history. You've seen a change of party control of this House. You've seen our joys and our sorrows. You witnessed the sorrow we all experienced and you experienced when a Member of this House was attacked back in her district.

There is a program called Close Up where people come to Washington, people your age, to observe the Congress, and they learn a lot. It's a great program. But no one sees the Congress as close up as you do. And we appreciate the fact that you recognize that as a great responsibility and a great honor, and you will go back home and tell others about this Congress.

I think you can tell them that everyone who serves in this Congress, even though we may have differences—sometimes very sharp differences—the one thing that does bind us together is that everyone here in this Congress loves this country.

Go back and tell them that we are imperfect people trying to make a more perfect Republic.

I yield, Mr. Speaker, to my colleague on the Page Board, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Thank you, Mr. KILDEE. I appreciate it.

Mr. Speaker, the young men and women who are standing behind the bar and at the back of our Chamber here today are great young men and women who have served us well over this past semester. We appreciate you. Both Ms. Keating and Ms. Sampson have said this is probably the best behaved group of pages we've ever had. I don't know if you want to take it further than that, but you have done a great job and we appreciate you.

Mr. KILDEE. I want to thank Mr. BISHOP and Ms. FOXX, who also served on this committee. We have enjoyed our work, and you've made our work very enjoyable.

DEPARTURE CEREMONY PAGE NAMES FALL CLASS OF 2010

Haley Alderete
Carissa A. Almendarez
Alexandra Baker
Shraddha Batra
Bethany Blakeman
Christopher Michael Tydingco Borja
Derek Kristopher Bowdle
Taylor Brooks
Hunter Layne Chapman
Fernando Chavez, Jr.
Josilyn Chowen
Joseph Cortes
Nicholas Dellasanta
Hannah Elizabeth Dillman
Dominé Ezechukwu
Melissa Lynn Finno
Megan Fleming
Gerardo Flores
Ashley Nicole Flowers
Hector Javier Garcia
Derek Gartee
Megan Greeley
Kallie A. Hargrove
Kaitlin Elaine Hinojosa
Kathryn Elizabeth Hopper
Peter Alex Kanjorski
John D. Kohler
Ra'Nisa Kyles
Olga Lefebvre
Josiah Lippincott
Schaeffer Mallory
Gomez J. Martin

Jacqueline McGrath
Hannah Mery
Meghan Myhill
Diona Okunbo
Rachel Olivares
Tyler Olkowski
Cemal Ozgur
Joshua L. Perry
Tyler Jacob Petersen
Brendan J. Pfaller
Levi Andrew Phillips
Alexis Robbins
William Douglas Rodenberg
Caroline Saca
Nicole Marie Santeiro
Kameron Simmons
Everett Sotelo
Camden Scott Wiggins

COLOMBIA FLOODING DISASTER

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my thoughts and prayers to the people of Colombia in light of the devastating flooding, heavy rain, and destructive landslides that, even as I speak, continue to ravage that country.

This natural disaster, ongoing for several months now, has taken more than 300 lives and damaged or destroyed more than 2,000 homes. In total, more than 2 million victims have been affected by the flooding, and some reports are calling this the worst natural disaster in Colombia's history.

My district in northern Rhode Island is home to many wonderful Colombian families. In fact, Colombians make up the fourth largest Latino group in Rhode Island, most of whom have loved ones in the affected areas of their native country.

So on behalf of the people of the First District of Rhode Island, I would like to express my sympathies to all of those who have been affected by this devastating flooding. We remember those who have died and express our sympathies to those who have lost loved ones, been injured, or lost their homes as a result of this destruction.

I express my wishes for a rapid reconstruction of the damaged areas and return to safety for the families affected by this tragic natural disaster.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BENISHEK). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

PERPETUAL WAR IS EXPENSIVE

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, perpetual war is expensive. We have been militarily involved in the Persian Gulf region now for 20 years. Experts have predicted that the cost of this continuous and expanding war will reach $6 trillion.

The hostilities and our overt involvement in Iraq can be dated back to January 16, 1991, when the defensive Operation Desert Shield became the offensive Operation Desert Storm. Though the end of the Persian Gulf war was declared on April 6, 1991, with a U.S. military victory, the 20-year war was just beginning.

The U.S. and Britain have had an intense interest in controlling the oil of the Middle East dating back to the overthrow of the Ottoman Empire during World War I. This interest expanded during World War II with FDR's promise to protect the puppet governments in the Persian Gulf region, especially Saudi Arabia.

Though this arrangement never sat well with the citizens in the region, a fairly decent relationship remained between the Arab people and the American public. But animosity continued to build with our ever-present military involvement in Iraq.

□ 1150

Our military assistance to the Mujahedeen in the 1980s, now the Taliban, helped the Muslim defenders, one of whom was Osama bin Laden, oust the Soviets from Afghanistan. At that time we were still not seen as occupiers, and the radical Muslims, encouraged by the U.S., were expected to direct all their efforts toward the Communist threat. That all changed with the breakup of the Soviet system and the end of the Cold War when, as the lone superpower left standing, we named ourselves the world's policeman. It was then that the resentment by Arabs and Muslims became directed toward the United States, now seen as an invader and occupier.

Continuous bombing and crippling sanctions against Iraq during the 1990s, the appearance that the U.S. did not care about the plight of the Palestinians, and our military bases in Saudi Arabia led to attention-getting attacks against the United States. The 1998 embassy attacks in Kenya and Tanzania and the attack on the USS *Cole* in the year 2000 were warnings that the war was far from over. The horrible tragedy of 9/11 shouldn't have been a surprise, and many believe it was preventable.

Currently, the war has morphed into a huge battle for control of the Persian Gulf region and central Asia. This involves Iraq, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Yemen, Somalia, and Iran. Foolish policies lead to foolhardy conflicts. Foolhardy conflicts lead to unsustainable costs and a multitude of unintended consequences. To name a few, we have spent trillions of dollars based on the false pretense of defending freedom and our Constitution. The notion has been further solidified that war no longer needs to be declared by Congress and can be pursued as a prerogative of the President. We are now seen by the world not as a peacemaker, but rather a troublemaker and aggressor.

Thousands of American servicemembers have been killed and tens of thousands wounded, with a sharp increase in service-connected suicides. Over 500,000 veterans are seeking medical treatment and disability benefits. Millions of citizens have been killed, wounded, and displaced in the countries on the receiving end of our bombs, drones, sanctions, and occupation. The region has suffered huge environmental damage as a consequence of our military occupation.

Christians from Iraq have suffered the worst rout in the history of Christendom. Iran and Iraq are now better allies than ever, with strong anti-American sentiment. Iraqi political stability is a joke. Ending hostilities in Afghanistan is a dream. China and Iran have been drawn into a closer alliance against the United States. America's uncontrolled deficits are senselessly fueled by needless militarism. We are now much poorer and less safe. There was no al Qaeda in Iraq before we invaded in 2003. Today there is. No weapons of mass destruction were ever found in Iraq.

War always leads to government growth and the sacrifice of civil liberties. In the past 10 years, this has been particularly costly to us, with the acceptance of military tribunals, torture, assassinations, abuse of habeas corpus, and PATRIOT Act-type legislation. Senseless war and senseless destruction and death should not be rationalized as providing a great service in protecting our freedoms, our Constitution, or maintaining peace. The only value that can come of this is to recognize that our policies are flawed and they need to be changed. Without this, history will record that the sacrifices were all in vain.

A policy of peace, friendship, and trade is far superior to one of occupation, entangling alliances, and sanctions which guarantee war. We should pursue such a policy for moral reasons. But if we don't, we will nevertheless be forced to change our ways for economic reasons. It's time to bring our troops home.

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

HONORING SARGENT SHRIVER

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor a great American, my friend Sargent Shriver, a son of Maryland, who passed away this week at the age of 95. He was a public servant who lived a full life dedicated to promoting justice and

opportunity in America and, indeed, throughout the world.

As the first director of the Peace Corps, Mr. Shriver skillfully launched an organization that has strengthened respect for America across the world and has for half a century exposed generations of Americans to the world beyond their borders. Sargent Shriver also made his mark as the director of important anti-poverty programs and as the leader of the Special Olympics movement, a movement that he joined his extraordinary bride, Eunice Kennedy Shriver, in heading.

In the words of his biographer, Scott Stossel: ''Often the things that Sargent Shriver accomplished, starting the Peace Corps in just a few months, or getting 500,000 kids into Head Start programs its first summer when the experts said that 10,000 kids was the maximum feasible, were things that everyone beforehand had said were not realistic, or were downright impossible, Sarge Shriver did.''

Sarge Shriver had a gift for what one of the old War on Poverty colleagues called ''expanding the horizons of the possible.'' I am reminded of Robert Kennedy's quote that he used so often that ''some men see things as they are and say, 'Why?' '' Robert Kennedy said: ''I dream things that never were and ask, 'Why not?' '' Sarge Shriver mirrored that quote. May we all learn from his example. May we honor his legacy of public service by expanding our own horizons of the possible, by caring for those who need our help here and around the world.

Sargent Shriver brought to American life a singular commitment to service. His good work and his historic example will long outlive his 95 years.

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

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

HEALTH CARE REFORM AND REGENERATIVE MEDICINE

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, voters all across the country have rejected the ''government knows best'' philosophy that prevailed during last year's health care debate. In contrast, my Republican colleagues and I believe that American innovation and reduced government intervention are keys to successful health reform that reduces health care costs. After all, reducing the costs of health care should be the primary focus of any health care reform bill. Unfortunately, the highly flawed health care bill that passed last year does not bring down the cost of health care. It drives costs up. If we are ever going to fix health care, we must focus on reducing costs.

For instance, it's estimated that 1 percent of the most seriously ill in America account for more than 25 percent of all health care expenditures. What if we could improve the care of these patients and at the same time reduce costs? We can. We can by harnessing the power of innovation and health research in groundbreaking fields like regenerative medicine.

Regenerative medicine is a highly specialized field that focuses on developing technologies to replace or regenerate organs and tissues using the patient's own cells. These treatments would reduce the cost of chronic diseases by up to $275 billion a year and would dramatically improve the lives of older Americans suffering from terrible, chronic illnesses.

The cost of chronic disease is only going to increase if we don't focus on innovations like regenerative medicine that can revolutionize how we treat illnesses. These costs are going to spiral ever higher mainly because we are in the midst of a major aging of our population. Demographers estimate that in the next 20 years, people in the age range of 65 to 74 years old will increase from 6 percent of the population to about 10 percent of the population, almost doubling. At the same time, people over the age of 75 will increase from 6 percent to 9 percent of the total population. This demographic shift will inexorably drive up the costs of health care as more elderly receive treatment for chronic diseases like late-stage Parkinson's disease, kidney failure, heart failure, or diabetes.

Regenerative medicine has the potential to revolutionize the treatment of all these diseases. But that may not happen. Why not? It's simple. The same kinds of bureaucracy, regulations, and red tape that are stuffed into every corner of the ObamaCare law are holding back the widespread adoption of major medical breakthroughs in this field.

Consider the fact that Dr. Anthony Atala at the Institute for Regenerative Medicine at Wake Forest University has been able successfully to grow bladders for bladder replacement surgeries from the recipient's own cells.

□ 1200

Yet despite several successful bladder transplants, the FDA insists that the institute go through additional costly clinical trials on animals and spend millions of dollars on testing that is clearly unnecessary based on his success with the human transplant surgeries.

This sort of Federal regulatory burden is stifling innovation in America, and the government takeover of health care backed by the Democrats last year imposes still more job and innovation-destroying regulations on health research.

Regenerative medicine has the potential to improve the health of our citizens and return them healthy and whole to the workforce. It holds the promise of hundreds of billions of savings in health care costs and, unlike ObamaCare, will create jobs focused on developing these technologies across the Nation. Congress would be wise to strip away the bureaucracy and red tape that is stifling innovation in fields like regenerative medicine that could lower costs and improve the lives of all Americans.

HONORING ASHLEY WESTBROOK TURTON

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, words cannot describe the depths of my grief as I rise today to pay tribute to the life of my former staffer and dear friend, Ashley Westbrook Turton, who was taken from us in a tragic accident last week. To say that she was taken from us too soon is an understatement. Ashley worked for me for 7 years, first as my press secretary and later my chief of staff. However, she was much more than a former staffer. She was family.

Ashley was, quite simply, remarkable. A native of North Carolina, she was known for her soft Southern accent, bright smile, professionalism, and determination to get things done. After graduating from the University of North Carolina, she first made her mark working for Governor Jim Hunt and then Attorney General Mike Easley, combining politics, policy, and communication. She soon brought her talents to Washington, and she was good at it. Ashley was committed to public service and to making a difference in the lives of others.

Ashley started in my office in 2000 as my press secretary, and we quickly formed a bond of mutual respect and friendship. She later stepped in as my chief of staff and was nothing less than transformative in that role. Ashley's leadership and drive was inspiring, and she was a mentor for many young staffers, not only in my office, but across the Hill. As one former staffer remembered, ''Her work ethic could not be matched. She exemplified class, always cool under pressure.''

Ashley was on the floor day and night, always deepening her understanding of the Congress as an institution and how it operated. She was a bright, articulate, and incredibly dedicated young woman who built a distinguished reputation during her time on the Hill and was respected by colleagues and by Members alike on both sides of the aisle, a fact that was reflected in the many phone calls I received and the statements that were issued in her memory.

Ashley met her husband, Dan, on the Hill; and looking back, it was obvious that these two would wind up together. They shared a seriousness of purpose and liberal values, yet they were not

flashy about any of this and avoided the spotlight. The love that they shared was palpable, the kind that we all dream of finding. I remembered her unbridled excitement about their wedding and her dreams of starting her own family.

Ashley truly enjoyed the simpler things in life, family and close friends. She cherished spending time with Dan and their three children, Shaw, Lane and Mason Grace. Neighbors have often recalled seeing her and Dan wheeling the kids around the neighborhood. Her children were her joy, the light of her light. She wanted nothing more than the very best for them, a childhood filled with love, encouragement, and support. It is difficult to imagine that they will grow up not knowing her as well as we did.

I, like so many others, have not yet come to terms with the reality that Ashley is lost to us. The idea that I will not get a call or email or text from her, just a couple of lines to say hello, is inconceivable to me. I simply cannot imagine my life without her in it.

Ashley was an exceptional young woman whose kind heart, quick wit, unwavering loyalty, and unparalleled professionalism touched the lives and hearts of all those fortunate enough to have known her. And so it is with the heaviest of hearts that I rise today to extend my deepest sympathies to her husband, Dan; her parents, Jim and Diane Westbrook; her brother, Blair; Dan's parents, Tom and Cathy; and Ashley's children, Shaw, Lane and Mason Grace. Ashley's absence has left a hole in all of our hearts that will never be filled.

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

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

THE PASSING OF SARGENT SHRIVER

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, America lost one of her greatest public servants this week. Sargent Shriver dedicated his life to others. He was the driving force behind the creation of Head Start and Upward Bound, opening the door to education for countless children. He was passionate about service, and through his stewardship of the Peace Corps and VISTA, gave millions of others the opportunity to serve. Sarge and his wife, Eunice, were visionary advocates for people with disabilities, and today the Special Olympics empowers young people with intellectual disabilities around the world.

Sargent Shriver's courage under fire earned him a Purple Heart for his service in the Navy during World War II. After directing the Peace Corps and the Kennedy administration and helping launch the War on Poverty in the Johnson administration, Sargent Shriver applied his formidable talents to our Foreign Service as ambassador to France from 1968 to 1970. In 1994, President Clinton awarded Sargent Shriver the Presidential Medal of Freedom, our Nation's highest civilian honor.

Despite all these accolades and well-deserved recognition, those who knew Sargent Shriver knew that he considered his work its own reward. His life was a tireless crusade for peace and justice, willing to lend a hand wherever one was needed and building institutions that could carry his work into the future.

''When our deeds match our ideals,'' Sargent Shriver would say, ''we will be living life as it ought to be lived.'' Sargent Shriver lived life as it ought to be lived.

I extend my deepest sympathies to his five children, Mark, Robert, Maria, Timothy and Anthony, and to their families. I hope they are comforted by the thoughts and prayers of all those who knew, admired, or were helped by Sargent Shriver. His legacy—the children given a head start, the volunteers whose lives were changed and who changed lives in their service around the globe, and the individuals with disabilities now treated with dignity and respect that they deserve—that legacy is with us today and will continue for years and decades and more to come.

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

(Ms. WOOLSEY 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 California (Mr. DREIER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. HURT. Mr. Speaker, the repeal of the health care law and beginning the process of replacing it with market-oriented solutions that reduce health care costs are important steps in the right direction for the people of the Fifth District of Virginia and for our Nation as a whole.

Having heard from so many of my constituents on this issue, I believe that it is essential that we repeal the government takeover of health care that raises costs, increases taxes, imposes burdensome mandates on small businesses, and jeopardizes quality medical care for our people.

I rise today to share an example of the real-life implications that the new health care law has had on one doctor in the Fifth District of Virginia.

□ 1210

His story is not unique. No doubt there are many others in central and Southside Virginia, as well as across the Nation, who are dealing with similar, negative ramifications of this law. His story is an important one to tell. It's a story of the hardships this legislation has caused to the people who have dedicated their lives to serving others.

In 1999, this doctor took a huge risk when he decided to sell his home and move to Charlottesville to buy and operate an Urgent Care Center. The challenges he faced in starting up his own practice did not come without sacrifice. It was over a year before he took home his first paycheck. He and his wife lived on savings and retirement money and did not know if their business would make it until 2004, 5 years later. His sacrifice and hard work proved to be a model for success. Now he has over 40,000 charts and 30 employees, and he provides high quality care to more than 16,000 patients. The average charge per patient visit remains low, while the services rendered provide good quality care, proving that health care at the primary level does not have to come with an overly expensive pricetag.

However, this doctor has made it clear in no uncertain terms that the fear and uncertainty regarding the new health care law threatens both the present and future success of his practice. Due to the tax hikes, added regulations and bureaucracy, and overall government intrusion, the doctor is no longer sure he can afford to stay in business, which means over 16,000 patients in the area served by his practice may lose access to this reliable and affordable care.

What a crushing blow to the innovators that are seeking new ways to provide quality medical care to their fellow man. What a crushing blow to the entrepreneurial spirit for those who are seeking to succeed. And what a crushing blow to the very spirit upon which our Nation was founded. This is just one example of why it is critical and necessary to repeal the government takeover of health care.

To ensure that doctors in the Fifth District can keep their doors open and that the people of the Fifth District of Virginia can continue to afford quality health care, it is critical that we find replacement measures that seek to truly keep costs low while removing the government from the patient-doctor relationship.

We have a great deal of work ahead, Mr. Speaker, but I'm committed to continuing to find the health care solutions that are in the best interest of all central and Southside Virginians.

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

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

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

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

GOVERNMENT OVERSPENDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. AKIN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. AKIN. Mr. Speaker, it is a treat to be able to join you and my colleagues today, and at the beginning of a new year, take on a subject that we have been aware of and increasingly conscious of, the problems relative to our economy, to jobs, but particularly to the Federal Government and its voracious appetite to overspend.

I'm joined by a number of distinguished colleagues today. I think it should be an interesting discussion. We're going to try to keep it simple and look at the big picture and look at the choices that America faces.

Along those lines, here is a sort of a by-the-numbers projection for this year, 2011. And you see sort of a bar graph, these tubes here. This top one is $3.834 trillion, that's $3.8 trillion, and that's what it's expected that the Federal Government is going to spend, $3.8 trillion. The problem here is this other little thing here. This is the income projection. And that's $2.6, if you round a trillion. So 2.6 versus 3.8, which, you can tell by the length of them that we are spending more money than we are taking in. People that have tried to run a budget at home understand that's a very easy thing to have happen, to spend more money than what you have coming in. And the Federal Government has that problem, and it has it big-time. In this case, the difference between the two is more than $1 trillion.

And so that's what we're going to take a look at. And what can we do about it isn't so much a matter if you are a liberal or a conservative really, the fact is it's mathematics. We're spending a whole lot more than we're taking in. And so that is the problem we're going to take a look at. When you do that year after year, spend more than you take in, you start to develop a debt. In our case, we've got a $14 trillion debt. So you have a deficit of $1.6 trillion, but you keep adding these things every year, and pretty soon you build this debt up. And the problem with the debt is that you have to pay interest on the money that you borrowed. And so that also makes things worse. And so now you take a look at the fact that not only are we spending about one-third more than what we have, but we've been doing a bad job of controlling our spending.

In the past, we have also cranked up this debt. The effect of that is that one of the things that comes as far as spending is your cost of the debt service, so the more that you borrow, the more you have to pay interest on your debt, and therefore it just compounds the situation, making it worse. So that's the lineup.

So let's take a look at, well, where are we spending all this money? And one of the things that people that are looking at numbers take a look at is three fairly big what are called entitlements. Entitlements mean that somewhere along the line, the Congress passed a law, and the law works like a little machine. It just spits money out. And anybody who meets certain parameters, the machine will just give them some money. And that's called an entitlement. And so depending on what the entitlement is, it just spends money. And Congress doesn't have to do anything. The money just gets spent. And it is called an entitlement.

The three big ones, of course, are Medicaid, Medicare, and Social Security. And if you project over time how much money those entitlements are going to spend, you find that they are growing. They are growing because of people such as myself, a baby boomer. The baby boomers are getting older, and there's a whole lot of them, and there are not as many people working to pay into the system. And so the cost of these entitlements go up.

And as you see in this chart right here, this is the typical revenue that we get from taxes coming in. It is running at 18 percent. You can see it goes up and down as we have more or less taxes depending on who is in charge of the White House and the Congress. But it averages now, over since 1965, it's averaging about 18 percent. And you see this point out here at 2052 where these three entitlements are going to use up the entire budget. There won't be any money for anything else other than just these three things.

Unfortunately, this chart is optimistic because this is only including these three entitlements. We have other entitlements also. And in fact, at this point we have come really pretty close to it even today.

So our entitlement spending, when you look at the big bar chart up here, pretty much, of our income—about $2.5 trillion, pretty much that income is spent today on various entitlements. It's not just Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security. But there are two other categories, miscellaneous entitlements, that would be things like food stamps and public housing, stuff like that, but also debt service, because you have to keep paying the interest on debt. You put that all together, and that's just about what we've got for income. So we've got ourselves some challenges.

And I'm glad that I don't have to solve all this problem, but we have got some very smart people that are going to join and talk a little bit about this, what are our alternatives and what should we be doing.

The first is a freshman who is already distinguishing himself in the Congress, BILL JOHNSON. He is from Ohio. We are thankful that Ohio sent one of their great sons here, somebody who first of all has a background as a chief information officer in a global manufacturing company. ''Information officer'' means people that deal with the transfer of data and information, but also the data processing side of a company, which is really the communications and lifeblood of a company. He is also somebody who served our country faithfully as an officer in the United States Air Force.

BILL JOHNSON, it's a treat to have you on the floor. We're glad you got elected. You've heard the opening here. We've got a bit of a problem. In fact, we've got a problem that's so big that a lot of people are kind of—in Missouri we have an expression, hunker down like a toad in a hailstorm. A lot of people look at this and they go, oh, my goodness, what are we going to do?

So let's talk about that for a minute.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Well, Mr. Speaker, and to my distinguished colleague from Missouri, thank you so very much for the opportunity to be here. You're exactly right, and you've pointed it out so well. We have a disease here in Washington, and that disease is called ''overspending.'' And it is, by and large, what has brought us economically to where we are today. And the debt that we see is the symptom of that disease.

It's amazing to me how many in D.C., how many in the administration and in the previous Congress, really believe that we can borrow, tax, and spend our way back to prosperity. As a businessman, as a graduate from a business school—I have a minor in business administration—I don't think that there is a business theory in place that says that you can prosper that way.

□ 1220

Mr. AKIN. Let me just stop you. I want to cut in on you.

What you are saying is most businessmen, if you tell them we are having trouble with overspending so what we are going to do is spend some more, they are going to laugh you out of the shop; is that basically what it boils down to?

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. That's right. You know, that kind of thinking has never been good for families. It has never been good for businesses, and it certainly is not good for America. We see where that has left us. Your charts point out that we are on the path to a train wreck here. Yet we see policies

consistently coming out of the administration and out of the previous Congress that continue to punish the job creators.

Take Ohio for example. Since the giant stimulus bill was passed in the previous session of Congress, only three States have lost more jobs than the State I come from, from the great State of Ohio. Unemployment in the district that I represent is another symptom of that disease. We cannot continue down this track of spending and borrowing and punishing job creators and expect America to pull through this economic crisis that we find ourselves in.

Mr. AKIN. BILL, once again you are right on track and right on topic. This is so important because down here in Washington, DC, there are really two very different schools of thought on this; aren't there? There are some people, and I think they are people probably who come from your background as executives in companies, people who had responsibility and had your own small business, and you understand what it takes to make a small business work. And the mind-set of those people when you get into trouble over spending is that you have to either increase your revenue somehow or you are going to have to cut back your spending.

But there is a whole other school of thought down here which to me is kind of weird because I come from the business world, too, and the theory is that somehow you can get the economy going by spending a ton of money, and that is what the ''stimulus'' bill that we passed 2 years ago, it was supposed to create I don't know how many hundreds of thousands of jobs. The projections in terms of the numbers of jobs it was going to produce, it actually lost more than what they projected it was going to do.

At the time, I stood on the floor with a bunch of other people who came here with a business background and said, Hey, this thing isn't going to work. Don't spend this money.

It was at least theoretically excused under the Keynesian sort of idea that if the government spends a lot of money, it ''stimulates'' the economy and everything will be okay. It is like grabbing your belt loops of your boots and lifting up and flying around the Chamber here. It is a bizarre idea. And it was tried by that guy Henry Morgenthau who worked for FDR. They tried it for 8 years, spending money like mad. He appeared before the House Ways and Means Committee and said: It just doesn't work. Now, that was 1938 he told Congress it doesn't work to spend money like that.

So that is one possible way that the Democrats propose, and that is spend lots and lots of money. But we see we are spending so much money, the question is—it isn't working because it created unemployment big time.

Of course you in Ohio with your manufacturing background, we are just killing jobs. Somehow there is this disconnect. You can punish companies and then you are surprised there are no jobs. It is sort of bizarre.

I yield again, BILL.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Thanks.

You hit the nail on the head. We are punishing the job creators. I mentioned in Ohio, only three States have lost more jobs since that stimulus bill went into effect. Now, I don't know the exact number today, but in November, around election time, Ohio had lost over 400,000 jobs.

Mr. AKIN. Are a lot of those manufacturing, BILL?

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Absolutely. Absolutely.

And here is what puzzles me: I don't understand why more don't realize that when you let families and businesses keep more of their hard-earned money, that builds economic confidence. That builds buying power. They invest. They spend more. That's what gets an economy going. They begin to become innovative.

Let me give you an example. Ohio borders on a State that has no sales tax on clothing. One of the first things I saw when I started looking at how I could help the State of Ohio was: How can we keep that sales tax revenue in the State of Ohio? So we started doing the research. We found out that 17 States have sales tax holiday programs.

So I built a grassroots effort to put a sales tax holiday program in place in Ohio. Without going into excruciating detail, having a sales tax holiday around back-to-school time and a sales tax holiday around Christmastime promised to bring upwards of $250 million in additional sales tax revenue into the State coffer, keep retail jobs, and let Ohio families keep more of their money. It was amazing what that program would do. Yet we could not get those on the other side of the aisle in Ohio to understand that and to buy into that concept. It is a simple economic concept.

Mr. AKIN. Just interrupting again, what you're really saying is that you can get more revenue in a State if you back off on taxes?

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Absolutely.

Mr. AKIN. That is an interesting concept, and I would like to pick that theme up. That is something we really need to understand.

I assume you were a member of the Ohio Legislature at one time?

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. No, I was not. I built a grassroots effort to try to address that problem. We were successful in getting a bill introduced into the Ohio State Legislature to put those sales tax programs in place, but it never made it through the system.

Mr. AKIN. Oh, boy.

Well, we have another gentleman here, coming a little farther from the west, Congressman BISHOP, who is joining us. He is also a guy who has had some experience in the business world, and also as a teacher and a leader here on the floor. He has represented his district on some armed services kinds of issues and is somebody who has really earned the respect of his colleagues and has done a great job in setting up some of the new rules that have been established for this Congress.

Congressman BISHOP, I would be delighted to have you join us. You have heard what we are talking about. We have a problem. We are spending too much money, and the question is what should we do about it.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I thank the gentleman from Missouri for allowing me to have some time here, and I appreciate the comments of the gentleman from Ohio illustrating what happens in the States. I think oftentimes we should be looking to the States as an example of what does and what does not work, and we can emulate those concepts here in Washington.

You are right, as you initially said, we have a severe budget problem. There are really only two ways of trying to reconcile that budget problem: We can either raise taxes or we can cut spending.

I think it is interesting to look at some other States. Cal Thomas had a wonderful article this morning—maybe it was last night—that talked about comparing what other States have done. So we see the State of Illinois, another midwestern State whose solution to their problem was to raise the personal income tax 67 percent and their corporate tax rate by over 46 percent.

Mr. AKIN. May I interrupt. You said raise the personal income tax in Illinois. Was it by 6 percent?

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Sixty-seven is what I heard, and 46 percent on corporate taxes. And let's face it, corporate taxes are paid by consumers anyway. So you get hit with it coming or going.

You can compare that with what other States have done, like the neighboring State of Indiana or Wisconsin, Virginia, New Jersey, my home State of Utah, which decided to solve their problem simply by reducing their spending. I am told that Indiana, since 2004, reduced spending by 40 percent.

Mr. AKIN. Whoa, 40 percent. That is a number.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. And it will be interesting to see if the Illinois experience will replicate what happened in Indiana and those other States I listed, and my gut guess is it probably will not.

But when we instituted income tax for the first time in this country, the statute that did that would cap the maximum rate of income tax at 2 percent, even though we only applied a 0.5 percent income tax. I think if people would look at their paychecks today, they would see it slightly different from that original time.

Mr. AKIN. As I recall, gentleman, at that time, weren't there people who said that income tax could possibly get

as high as 5 percent and they were laughed off the floor of the Congress, that income taxes could get as high as 5 percent? Am I right on that?

□ 1230

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. It is alarming, but that is actually accurate. As we found out in that experience, the best tax is, obviously, something paid by somebody else. It was estimated when that original income tax was in place that 80 percent of it would actually come from only four States. Apparently, four States were fighting it, and the rest of the States kind of liked it.

Unfortunately, there was—and I'm not impugning anybody here—a Representative from Missouri at the time who actually did say that a new dawn has broken with this new income tax and that, actually, the government would be more careful with people's money now that we are taking it directly from them than in the past when we simply ran government by taxes coming from tariffs or land sales.

Mr. AKIN. We're not proud of everybody from Missouri, gentleman.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. That certainly does not represent your thinking anyway.

Mr. AKIN. No.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. What happened is, within a short period of time, using World War I as the excuse, that top rate was not at 2 percent or at 5. It was at 75 percent. Now, what we found out is the actual amount of money coming into the country was in a decline, not in an incline.

So, when President Coolidge came into power and initiated the first tax cuts by reducing the rates across the board, the amount of revenue coming into the country actually increased. The same thing happened when President Kennedy tried it, President Reagan, and President Bush, because what we found out was that people with money are not stupid. They had money for a reason and that it was not that they were avoiding their taxes. They had just found an alternative way of investing—in the case of World War I, it was a lot of municipal funds that were going in there that were not taxed—or they simply did not invest their money. They sat on it until such time as they actually had control of their money again.

So the bottom line here is, if we look at the tax pot, or proposal, as a way of solving our problem, all we do when we allow taxes to increase is allow Congress to actually spend more.

It's like going on a diet, which I desperately need. I may change my diet to my only eating good food; but if I eat a whole lot more of good food, it's not going to really solve the problem. There is another problem, too, that goes onto the spending side, which is I can actually be full and malnourished at the same time. If I only eat potatoes as a diet, I may be full; but I'm not helping my body.

When we look at the spending side, which is really the only option that we have, and when we don't look at it in a way of looking at how we are spending, all we're doing is malnourishing us. All the CRs we passed last year, without actually doing a real budget or a real appropriations act, may have flat-lined our spending, but it didn't help us out. It was like eating potatoes all the time, which in moderation are good; but if that's the only consumption you have, we are making serious problems.

Mr. AKIN. I think what I'm hearing you say, gentleman, is that America has been getting high on junk food. At least you have an economic analogy.

Is that where you're going?

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Well, so am I, and I have to admit I love potato chips; but, yes, that's where we're going.

What we need to do is, I think, what this Congress is looking at, which is to try and readjust what we are doing and look at our spending levels, which is why 2008 spending will be a starting point to adjust and look at what we are doing. We have to look at our spending in prioritization so we're not just spending everything. We have to look at what our responsibility as a government is, and we have to look at the spending side seriously.

As the gentleman from Ohio stated and you stated with your charts, if we do not take the spending side seriously as the solution to our problem, we will never find a solution to our problem; and the end result will be disastrous for this country.

Mr. AKIN. I appreciate your thoughts and particularly the direction that you're taking, because my argument would be the problem that we've pointed out with overspending cannot be solved with increasing taxes, and I'd like to talk about that for a minute.

My good friend from Ohio, just hold for a second. I'd like to try to illustrate something.

When I first came here a couple of years back, people talked about the Laffer curve and the idea that you could have the government take more money in by reducing taxes.

Now, I'm an engineer by training, and to me that seemed counter-intuitive. How in the world can the government lower tax rates and take in more revenue? It seemed like such an odd thing. Then I started sort of puzzling it in my mind a little bit.

I thought, Let's say that someone were to appoint you to be king for a year, but the only thing you can tax is a loaf of bread. So you start thinking, Huh, how do I get the most revenue for my country out of a loaf of bread?—because I'm a political guy, and I have to pay the bills of the Federal Government.

So you start thinking. You say, Well, I think I'll put a one penny tax on every loaf of bread that people eat. No one will notice the penny, and I'll take in a certain amount of money. Then you start scratching your head and saying, What if I went the other way? Let's say I taxed a loaf of bread at $10 a loaf. Boy, then I'd get a lot more money in that way. Yeah, but the trouble is nobody would buy any bread.

Common sense would say somewhere between a penny and $10 there is some point in there at which you're going to get the maximum tax you can get on a loaf of bread; and as soon as you go beyond it, your revenue is actually going to fall off because people will stop buying it, and there just won't be any more bread market going on.

So the point of the matter is that there is an optimum level that you can tax. When you go beyond it, you stall the economy and destroy the Federal revenues. Now, that may seem like a theory, but, in fact, it's true. It is what happened.

I'd like to just run through a couple of charts here.

This happened in 2003. In the second quarter of 2003, in May, we passed a big tax decrease in capital gains, dividends and the death tax. What that did was it freed up a lot of money for, BILL, who you've been talking about—the people who own businesses. The death tax ties up a whole lot of money because, you know, somebody dies, and you just hammer him and put a small business or farm out of business. Capital gains and dividends, they're all money that was being tied up because of our Tax Code. So when we reduced those taxes—this is what happened on this black line. I've got three charts here. This black line is when we cut capital gains, dividends and death taxes.

The first thing: look at the gross domestic product of our country. You can see it's spotty in here. We were in a recession. The amount of money we were taking in was not good in these early years.

Here is what happens when we do the tax cut:

You see that there is a jump from 1.1 percent GDP to 3.5, so GDP goes up when we cut taxes. That tells us, hey, the economy is going. It's doing better.

What else happens? Let's take a look at the chart. It's the same thing.

This is May of 2003. This is job losses. Everything below the line is a job loss. We're losing jobs like mad, and we've got some problems with unemployment. Here are a couple of times where we gained some jobs just for a quarter, but these are by the quarter. We're losing jobs. Then—boom—we put this tax cut in place, and look what happens in terms of job creation. We created 168,000 jobs, and here we've lost 100,000. So, first of all, GDP goes up. Job creation goes up, so people go back to work.

Here is the key point: look what happens here to Federal revenues. We have cut taxes here, and Federal revenues are shooting up. Now, that seems like you're defying the law of gravity, but what happened was those taxes were stalling our economy.

So when you've got a recession and when you've got unemployment the way we do, what you've got to do, this would suggest, is you have got to cut taxes, give the money back to the people you're talking about, BILL, who

own those companies. Let them invest—build additional wings on a building, new products, new technology—and when that happens, you pull out of the recession, and it helps you with your revenues.

The bottom line is, when you take a look, going back to our original question of how do we get out of the problem that we are spending too much money, the answer is, if you start taxing, you're going to drive us further into a recession, making the problem worse. So, really, tax increases do not work to fix the problem that we've got going here.

I wanted to jump over, BILL, and allow you to piggyback some.

BILL JOHNSON, from Ohio, is a great freshman Member. Congratulations to those in the State of Ohio for sending us some good people down here.

BILL, please jump in.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Well, you've made so many points there.

I'm a businessman. After my military career, I founded two small businesses. Before I came to Congress, I was the chief information officer for a business, a global manufacturing company; and I sat at the table with our executive leadership team, and we talked about how do we increase the value to our shareholders; how do we make our company more profitable; how do we put ourselves in a position to be able to invest and grow.

There are two sides to that formula. On one side, you've got spending. On the other side, you've got revenue. There is a balancing act. Controlling spending, we've talked about. We've got to stop the out-of-control spending here in Washington, and we're going to address that in this Congress.

□ 1240

But how do we increase the revenue? That is what you've been talking about here for the last few minutes. And you're exactly right, it does not come through tax increases; it comes through letting Americans and businesses keep more of their money because that builds economic buying power, that builds confidence. They invest; they spend.

Now when we did our research on the sales tax holiday back in 2009, what we learned is there were 17 States that had already implemented a sales tax holiday which validated the concept that you just referred to. Take one State, for example, implemented their sales tax holiday in the very first year. In the month that they implemented that sales tax holiday they saw an overall—now there were adversaries that said you can't take that sales tax revenue out of the coffer at a time when we are struggling to meet the State budget. Fortunately, sound minds prevailed and they were able to get the bill through. And in the month that they passed that bill and they had that sales tax holiday, their overall sales tax revenues did not decline; they went up nearly 5 percent.

Mr. AKIN. So what happened—let me see if I understand this. The sales tax holiday was not a total cutting of all the sales tax; it just reduced it much lower.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. That's right.

Mr. AKIN. And by reducing the tax, their revenue increased.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Well, what it was, it eliminated sales tax on certain items like back-to-school items, things that people had to have to get their kids back in school, to put them in college and those kinds of things—clothing, school supplies, computers. For example, many States included computers in those sales tax holidays.

Over the next year, they saw another nearly 5 percent increase in the overall sales tax revenues. By the third year, they saw a nearly 8 percent increase in sales tax revenues. And over a 3-year period, they were looking at close to 20 percent overall sales tax revenue increases over that 3-year period.

Mr. AKIN. By cutting taxes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Because what happened was when people got a tax break on things that they had to have, they would channel those savings into buying things that they wanted to have and that they had been saving up for with their families. And other States started coming across the border to take advantage of that holiday. It's a simple concept that we need others to understand: when you let families and businesses keep more of their money and you put the decision about how they spend that money in their hands, America prospers.

Mr. AKIN. Well, I really appreciate that. That's a real-life example, something that you worked on looking at different States. And it was the same principle of what we've seen.

Now, the idea of cutting taxes in a recession and cutting Federal spending is not new. JFK understood that principle. He cut taxes when he was President during a recession and put us back on a good economic footing. Ronald Reagan had the biggest tax cut just about in the history of the country until Bush came along, and the same thing. People made fun of him, that it was trickle-down economics and all that kind of stuff; but the fact of the matter was the economy became strong, and he had to have a strong economy to face the threats of Communism in the Soviet Union.

And ultimately he bankrupted the USSR because of the fact that our economy was strong enough that they couldn't keep up with us in the arms race, and he basically got them to the point of ''tear down this wall.'' But it was based on this same principle of the fact that he had tremendously cut the taxes which allowed the American economy to surge and allow free enterprise and the businessmen to start making some money.

We're doing the exact opposite. At the Federal level, our income tax is the second highest income tax in the whole world. That doesn't make a whole lot of sense.

Now, I want to go to this problem a little different angle from it, and that is, we've talked about we're spending too much money. We've talked about, really, that raising taxes is not the solution, which means then, by definition, you've got to cut spending.

Well, what are we spending money on? I think that's something we need to take a look at here. And I've got a chart. Before I had the chart that showed Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security. And these things people call entitlements because we passed a law a long time ago, and it just spits money out, more and more money out over time. This chart suggests if you keep your taxes at 18 percent, at a certain point, at 2052, these things get so big, they squeeze the rest of the budget out. The trouble is this chart is optimistic. The problem with the chart is it doesn't include all of the entitlements. There are a lot of entitlements that are not on that chart.

But here, take a look at this, what has happened since 1965. I think this also adds perspective to what's going on in terms of our spending. In 1965, entitlements were 2.5 percent of gross domestic product. It starts here. The red line goes up to the point now that in 2010 the entitlements have gone from 2.5 to 9.9 percent. That's a four-times increase to 2010. The trouble is that's just Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security.

The additional entitlements would go up even further. This is probably saying that since '65, we've had probably about a five-times increase in entitlements. And what's happened in return to national security and defense? The U.S. Constitution says the most basic function for the Federal Government is to provide for the national defense. It may say that we're supposed to promote general welfare, but it specifically—because the only government that we have that can defend our country is the Federal Government. It is the primary function of the Federal Government, in our preamble to the United States, ''provide for the national defense.''

We were spending 7.4 percent of GNP in '65, which has now dropped down to not quite 5 percent of GNP. And we have the problem now with the two wars, with all of our equipment aging. So we're having a whole lot of trouble trying to stay competitive, particularly with China and a lot of their new developments, with national defense because the entitlements are just going nuts.

And so the problem is that we're going to have to take a look at entitlements, not just Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid, but there are other ones too. You've got food stamps, you've got public housing, and you also have the debt service. All of this, when you put it together, is using almost all of the money coming in in a given year. That says we had better get serious about doing some cutting.

And once again, I will come back do you, Congressman JOHNSON, if you

would like to comment on that aspect of where we are.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Well, you hit the nail on the head again. National defense is our number one priority; it has to be. In fact, the oath of office that you and I took on January 5, virtually the same oath of office that the President takes, it says that we swore or affirmed to support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies foreign and domestic. That requirement to provide for the national defense is the number one most important thing that we in the Congress, in the administration are required to do, keep America safe, keep America free, protect Americans and American interests around the world.

There is no question that we must invest in those programs that are going to support our troops in the field. And I agree with you that we must look at the proper balance between defense spending and other spending to make sure that we achieve what we have been charged by the American people to do.

Mr. AKIN. As a good Air Force man, I knew you would come up with the right answer. The point of the matter is if you don't have national security, you don't have any other kind of security.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Well, I often ask my constituents, what is our number one job? What is the President's number one job? Is it to keep us safe, or is it to keep us free? And of course you get a number of different hands being raised. In my opinion, based on the Constitution, the Declaration of Independence, the President's—and therefore the Congress'—number one responsibility is to keep us free, because if we are not free, we will never be truly safe.

□ 1250

And safety is obviously pretty close on the same level. And they play into one another. But our national defense, flowing down from our national security strategy, our national strategy, that's paramount.

Mr. AKIN. I very much appreciate your perspective.

We're joined by another great freshman coming from pretty near by Missouri, from the great State of Kansas, Congressman YODER. It's a treat to have you on the floor. And as you've heard, we've been pontificating here a little bit about how are we going to deal with this. You know, the Federal Government is spending a whole lot more than we take in. So we've got to deal with that problem. We've been talking about the fact that taxing isn't a good solution because if you raise taxes, you drive your revenues down. It means we're going to have to do some cutting. So that's a tough subject.

But I appreciate a little bit of common sense from the great State of Kansas.

Congressman YODER.

Mr. YODER. I appreciate the congressman from Missouri's indulgence for a little time here.

I've been watching this conversation you've been having on the floor, the gentleman has, along with the gentleman, and it seems like we're in the middle of an ideological battle in this country. On the one hand, you have folks on the left that argue that government is the solution to all the problems our country is facing. Unemployment, their argument is that we need to create more government jobs, that Washington can solve these problems.

And out in Kansas we know that it is the private sector. It's the individual that creates jobs in this country. We know that it's hard work and determination. And you can't substitute that with government bureaucrats or government mandates. You can't mandate or regulate someone into prosperity. It just doesn't happen. And that's a real battle that's happening in this country right now, and I think this is a challenge that we've really got to face in this Congress

On the one hand we have more entitlement spending, greater deficits, higher taxes. And the other hand you've got free enterprise, economic freedom, prosperity. And to me, that's the real essence of this challenge: Are we going to create a free enterprise country or are we going to be an entitlement society?

Mr. AKIN. In a way, I think you've really framed things. I appreciate your perspective because you're getting a little bit off at a distance and saying look, there's two choices and the two parties really are very, very different in this. One seems to be the party that wants entitlements. They want food stamps, and they have unemployment. And the other party is saying we want jobs and paychecks. And that's kind of the choice. And if you want jobs and paychecks, you've got to have a free enterprise economy.

If you want the government to just subsidize you and live off of welfare, that's a different perspective.

So what we're seeing is this growth in entitlements, this number is low on this chart because it doesn't have food stamps, it doesn't have public housing, and it doesn't have the debt service. When you put that all together, we're right at the point where the money coming in is just barely paying for all of these entitlements and the debt service. You put that together, that's not a good picture.

And the solution I think most Americans—I bet you that's what your election was about, the fact that we want to have jobs, and we want to see a strong America. We want to see an America that's free. We want to see a Federal Government that doesn't enslave us, doesn't tame us, put us in velvet chains of a welfare state, but rather that allows us to rise the way Americans have always risen to the challenges that each one of us, the dreams we have in our heart to make those happen, to have a chance to fail or to succeed. And that's what made America such an incredible place.

And I appreciate, Congressman YODER, your standing up for those basic American principles and values. And I think what that means is we're going to have to deal with this level of spending.

Congressman JOHNSON, back to Ohio.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. I wanted to comment on what you said and what the gentleman here said about what makes America great.

When people stop to consider that this little sapling of a Nation in terms of age, 230-plus years old, virtually—and we're a baby compared to many of the other nations in the world—yet every modern convenience, virtually every modern convenience known to mankind was birthed right here in this country. And why was that? It was because of that system of free enterprise based on individual freedom. The ability to pursue our dreams, the ability to innovate that created this free enterprise system that we've come to know.

It did not come about in the Halls of Congress. It was not discovered in the deliberation rooms of courtrooms.

It was discovered around the campfires and around the dining room tables, the kitchen tables, the fields, the factories. As America came along, we learned when individuals are allowed to pursue their dreams in an environment of freedom without an oppressive Federal Government taxing them into oblivion, everybody wins. America wins, our allies win, everybody wins.

Mr. AKIN. You know, just even hearing you talk about that, somehow that gets me excited.

You know, I think about it. God made all of these different people, and all of us are different. And from the day that you grow up as a little kid you start thinking about stuff that you'd like to do, whether you want to be a fireman or a doctor or an Indian chief, you know, people kind of talk about that.

And you never really know for most people, they don't really know where their life is going to go, what they're going to achieve or accomplish. But there's something inside human nature that has this idea once you start to get the idea that you can dream and do something cool.

So people have these crazy ideas. And America was full of these crazy people and all of these crazy ideas. They didn't know the ideas were impossible, and they kept trying and trying, and finally the idea becomes maybe vaguely possible and then pretty soon, it actually happens.

You take the crazy guy who built lightbulbs. What'd he build, a hundred, two or three hundred lightbulbs? And somebody said, Boy, you've got to be discouraged, Thomas Edison. He said, No, I've got a couple hundred ways not to make lightbulbs. So I'm even closer to the right solution. You've got to be a little bit pretty entrepreneurial to have that perspective.

So America, if you think about it, this great country was built one dream

at a time by all these people. And one of the great things, Congressman YODER, that you do and Congressman JOHNSON, is you have a chance to serve your people.

What's going to happen—because you're both freshmen—what you're going to find is that through the years, all these people from your district, you'll run into them, and you'll see some sort of a little warehouse somewhere and all of a sudden you realize that thing is a thundering success. Some guy's dream just happened there. And we have a chance to see all of these people around us that have experienced that American dream. And it is cool. But it doesn't happen by a whole lot of redtape and taxes.

Congressman YODER, please jump in.

Mr. YODER. I think what the gentleman is speaking about is the American dream. It's the American free enterprise system. It's the essence of what makes America what it is. And to watch and to see it under threat here in Washington, it angers and it frustrates Americans.

And that's what we saw this last year, Americans coming out to town hall meetings and expressing themselves. They don't feel like their voices are being heard on the floor of the United States House of Representatives. They want people to stand up and to explain that greater spending and greater deficits, that's not the road to prosperity.

The road to prosperity is built brick by brick by hardworking Americans out in Kansas and out in Ohio and out in Missouri and all across this country as they work to put a little of their own money in and build a business or to take care of their family. They work hard. Sweat equity. That's what built this country.

And when they see the folks in Washington believe that that money isn't the people's money, it's Washington's money—and in fact, the folks in Washington, they don't even spend the money they're given; they spend as much as they want, regardless of how much money we have.

So part of this job situation, this American prosperity situation, it comes back to spending. And what we do here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives and how we advocate and stand up for those people that sometimes aren't always heard, that's what we have to do here.

Mr. AKIN. I'm glad that you're joining us in that. In fact, there is a Congressman JORDAN from the great State of Ohio who was, I believe, holding a press conference not so long ago talking about what are some of the things that we're going to cut, because people ask us, you know, what are you going to cut?

Well, one of the things is we're going to reduce the nondefense discretionary spending to 2008 levels. Well, what's that worth? Well, that's a lot of money that you can save that way. We're going to reduce the budget office of every congressman. That was our first week. Your first week here. We cut the congressional budget offices by 5 percent. That's just to let people know we're serious.

Then we read the U.S. Constitution on the floor of the House to say any bill you introduce now has got to be consistent with the Constitution.

But we've got another whole series of things that we're going to do to try to reduce spending, some of them—there is $25 billion in unused Federal property. So what are we going to do with that? Why not sell some real estate? Let's get rid of it. $123 billion is allocated to programs to which government auditors can find no evidence of success.

The one that I find amusing is, the Department of Energy was designed so we wouldn't be dependent on foreign oil. And the department's grown like mad, and we're more dependent on foreign oil than we ever were.

□ 1300

That needs a good question. Eliminate duplicative programs, among which we have got 342 economic development programs. Do we really need 342 of them? 130 programs serving the disabled, 130 programs serving at-risk youth. Program, program, program. Do we need that many? Maybe we need a couple of good ones, but certainly we don't need that many of them. So these are all things that are on the table.

So the proposal that's being made by the study committee has been, instead of having the graph of the discretionary spending going this way, nondefense, they are going to try to flatline that at about 400.

So there are a lot of things going on. It's an exciting time. We realize we are going to have to get efficient in government, and we have to basically go back to where we started.

The government was to be the servant of the people. It wasn't supposed to be the master. We didn't expect the government to pay for everything for us and keep us as little dependents. We simply wanted it to get out of the way. We wanted it to defend our right to life and liberty and the pursuit of happiness, and, beyond that, to leave us alone. Don't bury us with redtape and government regulations and taxes and uncertainties, which we have seen, which have created all the unemployment.

I appreciate two great patriots joining me on the floor today kicking around where we are.

I am very encouraged by our first week or two. First week or two we started by cutting congressional budgets. We read the Constitution on the floor. We put together a rule that says every single bill has to be proven to be constitutional or else it doesn't even get out of the hopper. And then, of course, we took a look at one of the biggest jumps in entitlement spending that America could ever take, which was ObamaCare. And we voted just yesterday to repeal the whole thing.

I will tell you, gentlemen, I know that you were involved back in your own States because you were worried about the fact: If the Federal Government can't manage Medicare and Medicaid without it breaking the budget, what's going to happen if they take over all of health care?

I think what people understand in America intuitively is the fact that if you look at American health care, the front end of it's good. If you get sick, where do you want to get sick? In America, if you have to. The trouble with health care is: How do we pay for it? That part's broken. So the point isn't to scrap the whole thing and turn it over to the government, which is what ObamaCare did. Instead, we're going to fix the things that are broken, but leave the free enterprise part up front, which gives us the best health care in the world.

You guys were here voting for that. And for those of us that were fighting that the last 2 years, I tell you it felt so good to stick your little credit card in the machine and push that you wanted to repeal it. It was something we were all really looking forward to. And you were part of that historic event. And that's just in the first couple of weeks.

I'm looking forward to both of you gentlemen in the months ahead really charting that course back to the American Dream.

If you would like to add—I think we are pretty close on time. If you would like to conclude, a couple of comments, either one.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. I will just sum up with this, because I think you have hit the nail on the head. We can cure this disease. It's called stopping the out-of-control spending. And at every opportunity, we should seek ways to allow American families and American businesses to keep more of their hard-earned money. That's going to result in economic confidence. That's going to result in investment. That's going to result in increased consumer confidence, and it's going to increase and create jobs, and we know that.

I urge my colleagues—I thank you for this time, and I urge my colleagues to join with me in supporting the legislation and those policies that are going to accomplish those goals: cutting the spending, letting Americans keep more of their hard-earned money, and ultimately creating jobs and putting America back to work. And I want to thank you for the opportunity today.

Mr. AKIN. Boy, that's a fantastic, straightforward approach to where we have to go. You take a look at it.

Unfortunately, the gentleman who was here from Utah before, those of us who are in the ''over 60'' category recognize, when it comes to weight, there's two problems: It's either what you eat or how much exercise you get. And you can't really change that very much. The Federal budget problem is the same way. It's either how much

you're going to spend or how much you can tax. And what's happened is we just can't tax anymore, and we're going to have to deal with the spending.

These are some of the items in the proposal that was being made in the press conference today. $80 billion, this is nonsecurity. That means not the defense discretionary spending. We're going to cut that back to the 2008 level. That's just going back a couple years to knock that back. That saves $80 billion. $45 billion, that's a repeal of unspent stimulus funds. That stimulus bill that created all of the unemployment that did not work. There is some of that money still left. We take 45 there.

Two, almost 3 trillion, that's the nondefense discretionary spending to 2006 levels. And also to eliminate the automatic inflation increases now and for the next 10 years. So that saves a whole lot of money there. Sixteen billion dollars, that's return the Medicaid FMAP spending to 2008 levels. And then $30 billion, end the Federal control of Freddie and Fannie Mac. That's also another area that we have got. We have not dealt with that. That created the economic crisis we are in. We have not dealt with the cause of the problem.

You put this all together, you are at about $2.46 trillion for 10 years, which the result of that comes out at flatlining some of the nondefense discretionary. Does that solve the problem? No, it really doesn't. It helps, but still the bottom line is we're going to have to deal with those entitlements that are totally out of control.

You guys have got a lot on your plates. It's a big job. It's going to be an exciting couple years. And I would recognize Congressman YODER, if you would like to make a couple of closing comments. I think we have got about another 5 minutes or so.

Mr. YODER. I thank the gentleman.

And I think what the Congressman from Missouri is discussing, these specific points of how we could reduce spending and how we could bring the Federal budget back towards a balanced budget, which is what Americans want us to do, we've all seen across this country, Americans have, what happens in Washington. They spend as much as they want, regardless of how much money they have, and that has to stop.

This is an opportunity this year, with a new Congress and new energy and new enthusiasm on behalf of the American people, it's a chance to stand up and say, We're tired of the overspending. We're tired of trillions of dollars being spent on programs for which some of which we can't find real tangible results. We're tired of duplication of programs. We're tired of endless bureaucracy and red tape.

Americans want to see action and they want to see bold proposals, such as what you are outlining there, to show that we can actually, truly cut spending. We have heard folks on this floor say we can't cut spending, that it will hurt too much. Well, what hurts is this $14 trillion debt, this legacy we are leaving to our children and our grandchildren. This is an immoral legacy that we're passing along to the next generation.

And I think what the gentleman from Ohio is standing up for, and the gentleman from Missouri, is that this is the time to say enough is enough. It's time to stand up and to start cutting spending and reining in this out-of-control government.

Mr. AKIN. You know, the thing that's exciting to me and encouraging to me, it's not just you gentlemen, but the fact that you came here because America was waking up. America is saying it's time to take back America. We're tired of being bullied by our own government. And we're tired of the idea that what you should do is to be paid for not doing something, and that an existence in America is sitting around and not having a job. What we want is we want Americans to be able to follow the dreams that are in their heart, you know. And the mentality of the fact that anybody looks like they're having fun, we want to tax them, that just doesn't make any sense at all.

And sometimes it seems like it's such a gloomy perspective to think of America as a country which is nothing but the government's going to take care of you. You know, the Soviet Union years and years ago, they had this basic idea the government's going to provide you with a home; it's going to provide you with food; it's going to provide you with medical care; it's going to provide you with an education; the government's going to provide you with a job. That was their formula, and it didn't work worth a hoot. And the Soviet Union collapsed. It's in the dustbin of history.

And here what are we doing? We're trying to look at the government to provide you food and a home and an education. The government's going to provide you health care and the government's going to provide you a job, or if you don't have a job, they'll pay you anyway. That's a formula that didn't work. There's no point in going down that blind alley again.

So what we are coming back to again is the thing that's just so exciting about our country. It's a country of exceptionalism. It's a country that's led the world. It's a country that is a source of hope for people all around the world as they take a look at our country.

□ 1310

It was interesting, during the days of Ronald Reagan, that he got a message out of some of the concentration camps up in Siberia and gulag and different places that were really rough. And the people were thirsty for news of what was happening with America and they were praying for us, because they realized that we were a source of hope and inspiration to the rest of the world.

There was a group of our Founders, came over on a boat, it was called the Lion. It was 1630—it was some of the Puritans under Winthrop—and they wrote something called ''The Model of Christian Charity.'' It was a long, sort of a long Puritan-type document. But it said something about we must consider that we should be a city on a hill, a light to the people around the world.

And that was where Reagan picked that up in his speeches. Of course, it came out of the Bible that we should be a city on a hill, a light to people of the world, a good example and an inspiration so that they would think of also being free from the influence of excessive government.

So that's the challenge that you as freshmen, that all of us, all Americans are facing. I think people are starting to understand this is going to mean some changes. There are going be changes in our behavioral pattern and the fact that we have just got to start cutting back on government and we just can't continue to let the thing run the way we have.

The bottom line, as we get back to it, I want to restate the problem, and the problem is this, that when you put those entitlement programs with the debt service together, we are spending almost the same amount of money as what we take in in revenue. That's not a penny for defense or discretionary spending at all. That's where we are. That's pretty sobering.

That's why the challenge is significant. We are not going to get there overnight. We are not going to balance the budget in 1 year.

I don't even think the most conservative guy in Congress would think that we could do that, that there is any probability that America could adjust that rapidly.

But we can balance a budget and we must. The fact is we have to take steady steps, one at a time, and move forward on this because of the fact that we are protecting that most precious idea that America has been that hope and that bright light on a hill for people all around the world.

The aspect of America and the American Dream, there is something that I talked about sometimes when I was doing some campaigning. I like to throw into the mix there the concept that in following the dream that's in your heart, it takes a certain amount of courage. Those people like Thomas Edison, the people that came by the Statue of Liberty with the shirt on their back and a little change in their pocket, it took guts to do that. It's going to take guts to go where we have to go. But with courage and God's blessing we can do it, gentlemen.

God bless you all.

REPEAL OF HEALTH CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the honor to be recognized here on the floor of the House of Representatives.

Listening to my colleagues in the previous hour has been very interesting to me and, I think, informative to the American people at the same time. We are here now today, the first day after the House has voted to repeal ObamaCare.

I noted yesterday, although not in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mr. Speaker, that yesterday, the day of the big vote that came up, that passed the repeal of ObamaCare here in the House, was the 1-year anniversary of the election of SCOTT BROWN from Massachusetts to the United States Senate.

I would like to take you back, if I could, Mr. Speaker, to that time. Where we were a year ago today, 13, 14, 15 months ago. In fact, I would like to dial us all the way back to, let's say, the beginning of August of 2009.

That was the time that the town hall meetings lit up all across this country. And as we watch and the intensity of the issue of the health care policy unfolded before us here in the House of Representatives, the national debate, the media debate, the talk in the coffee shops and across the backyard fence and in our churches and in our daily lives was focusing on health insurance and health care policy in America.

I would remind you, Mr. Speaker, and those listening into this conversation we are having, that the President of the United States had consistently said that we were in an economic downward spiral. We were in a bad economic fix.

If you remember Henry Paulson coming to this Capitol on September 19 of 2008, and telling us that he needed $700 billion right now without any strings attached to solve what he predicted could likely be the collapse of credit and currency globally, and this Congress, over my objections, most vociferous, and votes, did send that money to Henry Paulson; and some of it got spent the way he intended to.

But this fear of this economy brought about to some degree an increase in the number of Democrat seats in the House of Representatives, and it contributed to the election of Barack Obama as President, and he has said that he inherited some of the worst economic times ever.

And the President of the United States told this country over and over again we are in an economic problem and a downward spiral, and he said, first, we couldn't fix the economy unless we first fixed health care in America. So he made that an issue that went into the middle of the economic calamity, conditions that we had.

I didn't accept that analysis; but he also said that the problem with health care was we spend too much money in relation to other countries in the world, in relation to the overall size of our economy, in relation to the individual dollars that are spent on individual patients.

There is some degree of truth to that, in fact, I think a significant degree, but in areas that the President didn't want to address. So he said we have to fix our economy, and we can't fix it unless we first fix the problem with health care. That includes when they use that term, that means health insurance and health care all together. They have conflated those two terms.

His solution for spending too much money on health care was spend a lot more money on health care.

And now we have an ObamaCare piece of legislation that has been pushed through this House, and we had to vote to repeal yesterday, that spends a lot more money. Mr. Speaker, you don't solve the problem of spending too much money by spending a lot more money.

That would be the health care equivalent of Keynesian economics, wouldn't it, Mr. Speaker, Keynesian economics being that philosophy of John Maynard Keynes, who was an economist and a very influential one in that period of time when Franklin Delano Roosevelt was elected to be our President of the United States, and a similar economic time of downward spiral. Their belief was that you could borrow money and send that money out into the public and get people to spend that money; and if you do that, it would stimulate the economy.

In fact, John Maynard Keynes, perhaps facetiously, in fact—I believe it was facetiously—but I think it's worthy to tell the story that he told—he said, I can solve the economic problems here in the United States. I can solve the unemployment in America by doing this, go out to an abandoned coal mine, drill a whole bunch of holes out into that abandoned coal mine. Fill those holes up full of cash, U.S. greenbacks. Then fill the abandoned coal mine full of garbage.

Now think of that image, Mr. Speaker, an abandoned coal mine with holes drilled in a random pattern all across the face of the abandoned coal mine, deep holes shallow holes, big holes, small holes, fill them full of cash. Then backfill the holes, fill the abandoned coal mine up with garbage.

Then he said, turn the entrepreneurs loose. The entrepreneurs will go in—now I have to fill in the blanks, because that's the only part of the quote that I know—the entrepreneurs would then go in and start to dig the garbage out, haul garbage out to make way to dig into the holes to come up and pull up the cash. Somebody has to support the industry of the people that are hauling the garbage out and digging back down into the holes.

Somebody has to exchange the cash, the garbage-covered cash for clean cash. It's like an industry that would begin in a similar way that a gold-mining town might begin if somebody discovers gold in Colorado, California, or maybe even Iowa one day.

But the idea was if you could get money into people's hands, they would spend it and it will create multiple iterations of an economic activity; and John Maynard Keynes believed that would stimulate the economy. The President believes this also, our current President, Mr. Speaker.

He told us that on February 10, 2009, when he spoke to the Republican Conference; and he said that Franklin Delano Roosevelt's New Deal actually did work, that it was working. But it was in the second half of the 1930s President Roosevelt lost his nerve. He got too concerned about spending too much money and he pulled back.

And in pulling back, that brought about, according to our current President, a recession within a depression. And unemployment numbers went up in the second half of the 1930s because they should have borrowed and given away and spent more money at the Federal Government level.

□ 1320

And he convinced me on that day that this President would not make that mistake. And we're talking, Mr. Speaker, all within the confines of Keynesian economics, which I want to make it very clear I completely disagree with that philosophy. The President does not. And he did not, by his view, make the mistake that FDR did. He has continued to push for more borrowing and more spending and growth in the debt and the deficit. And we continue to see unemployment numbers that push at double digits, 9.8 percent, then down to 9.4 percent. And it looks like that may be a permanent condition until we can get free enterprise to kick back in again.

But this is the approach economically. The President sees this in a downward spiral when he takes the oath of office and goes out and pushes to spend more and more and more money.

And, yes, Mr. Speaker, there will be those who are sitting at home or perhaps in the gallery who are thinking, but some of this started under George W. Bush's Presidency. And it did, Mr. Speaker. But it was all supported by Barack Obama. And it was significantly accelerated after the election and the inauguration of Barack Obama.

And so his approach to solving the economic problem was borrow more money, spend more money, drive this Nation into debt believing that he could stimulate an economy that somehow would come back and pay the taxes to offset the interest and the overhead that this government now has. That's the Keynesian approach.

Well, he used the same approach when it comes to health care, the Keynesian approach to health care, which is this thought: we spend too much money on health care. We can't afford it. We have too many people uninsured. So let's go out here and impose a health insurance policy on another 32 million or 47 million Americans and send the IRS in to enforce the law so that they compel every American to buy a health insurance policy

that is either produced or approved by the Federal Government. Remember, the President wanted the public option. The President is on record in previous years of being for a complete takeover of the health insurance industry which implies the complete takeover of the health care industry in America.

They had the debate during the nomination process between Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton. Hillary Clinton carried the best credentials of her proposals on health care into that campaign. Barack Obama had to offset her strong liberal health care credentials with some of his own. That's what ginned this up. This is what convinced America that we were in a health care crisis, and the President grabbed it and went into the arena of an economic crisis using the Rahm Emanuel philosophy which is ''never let a crisis go to waste'' and sought to bring about the beginnings of socialized medicine here in the United States.

That's the foundation and the backdrop for what we have; and that brought about town hall meetings in August of 2007 and early September, I would add, that were jam packed all across this country. My town hall meetings have never been so full. I had some that were standing room only. Senator GRASSLEY in the same area that I represent had to take one of his meetings outdoors because there wasn't room for people inside the huge building that they had set aside for the town hall meeting. That's just a part of Iowa, but that's a snapshot of the broader picture of the entire United States.

There was intensity. We saw it. We saw it in YouTube. We saw it in the news. We saw Senator Specter I will say getting a message delivered to him utterly clearly in his town hall meetings. We saw Members of Congress that were, to some degree, disrespected in their town hall meetings, which I regret.

We also saw many, many Members of this House and the Senate that did jam-packed town hall meetings and listened to constituents for hours on end and did tele-town halls on the phone so those that couldn't or didn't come out had an opportunity to weigh in. We read the mail. We took the phone calls. We took the emails and the snail mail, all the messages that we could.

Wherever I went, the subject of health care was brought to me starting intensively in August of 2009, carrying throughout the fall of 2009. And as the subject came to this floor and was voted on on November 7 of 2009, that was a Saturday night, when this House passed the House version of ObamaCare over the strongest of objections, the 5th of November, 2009, tens of thousands of people poured into this Capital City, Mr. Speaker, to peacefully petition the government for redress of grievances in a very constitutional fashion.

They were out there in red, white and blue, all the colors of the rainbow, so to speak, making their own signs. They were here on their own dime. They came from every single State. And we know they came from every single State. I've talked to people from most of those States, and the States that had a gap. For example, I didn't talk to anybody from Hawaii. Well, why do I say they come from every State? I met people from Alaska. People from Hawaii went to MICHELE BACHMANN's office as she was out working against the ObamaCare bill and presented and laid on her desk a lei that they brought from Hawaii. They came from every State to peacefully petition the government for redress of grievances exactly in a constitutional fashion.

Fifth of November, 2009, on a Thursday we did a huge press conference out on the West Lawn of the Capitol with numbers of people that ranged in the 30,000 to 40,000 people, small side, up to perhaps 50 to 60,000 people, outside, calling for this Congress to listen to them, to keep this Congress' hands off of their health care.

Well, still their hearts were hardened; and we had another press conference the following Saturday just 3 days later that had thousands of people at it. And still on that Saturday night they brought a vote to the floor that moved the ObamaCare legislation out of the House of Representatives, down the Hall all the way through the end of the Capitol into the United States Senate. That was November 7, a Saturday night of 2009.

And the Senate took it up, and they were looking for a way to, I'll say the Majority Leader HARRY REID and others, were looking for a way to pass ObamaCare in the Senate. And as the maneuvering unfolded, it came to Christmas Eve, Mr. Speaker. On Christmas Eve, most of the procedural maneuvers that the Republicans had in the Senate were exhausted Christmas Eve day. They had 12 more hours that they could have used to delay the vote and 12 more hours of debate that could have been extended. But they decided to shake hands with HARRY REID and allow ObamaCare to come to a vote on December 24 about 9 a.m.

Well, that let everybody get a plane ticket to go home. I wanted them to use every single minute to delay it until as long as they possibly could until 9 o'clock Christmas Eve night. And we know there aren't planes flying out of this town anymore after that. I would have thought if anybody wanted to impose that version of socialized medicine on the American people, if they wanted it, they believed in it that strongly that they had to do it on Christmas Eve morning, they could have just as well done it Christmas Eve night at 9 o'clock and spent their Christmas here in Washington D.C. after they put that great big lump of coal in our stocking, the stocking of the American people.

When I saw that, that was a tactic that energized me more. And I asked one of the well established and very respected Republican Senators what do we do now. What do we do now? Where is our next line of defense? We had 12 more hours. We could have fought this. His answer was, pray, and pray for a victory in the special election in Massachusetts. That was my email back on the morning of December 24 from that exchange. And I thought, I don't think I have the audacity to pray for an intervention in a Senate election in Massachusetts. How could there possibly be a Republican victory in Massachusetts? We know the politics of Massachusetts, and it's 100 percent Democrats—was—in each of their eight congressional seats and in their two Senate seats and had been for a long time. So I thought about that and deliberated on it and thought, that's the only real choice that I have.

And I found myself in Massachusetts the last 3 days of the SCOTT BROWN election; and I found a lot of patriots in Massachusetts, residents of Massachusetts, tea party groups, constitutional conservatives, 9/12 Project people, independents that are constitutionalists with a cause and discerning Democrats that have come over from the other side. I met a couple that had always walked the streets for Democrats, a union couple, both husband and the wife. And they told me that they were done, that they were working for the Republican side, and they would always stay on the Republican side.

I met people there with the deepest amount of patriotism and went to look at Plymouth Rock. And there, of course, in Boston Harbor was the real Boston Tea Party. And why would I have thought that the State that could launch the Revolution and have an actual real tea party, why would I have thought that the Bay State couldn't deliver us a measure of defense and relief from ObamaCare?

And so yesterday—I do the fast forward point now, Mr. Speaker—but yesterday here on the floor of the House of Representatives was the 1-year anniversary from the election of SCOTT BROWN. And I don't think anybody said it into the RECORD, but this Congress, having gone through all of that and seen 87 freshman Republicans elected, the majority turn over, and the American people rise up and send their message in the fashion that was imagined by the Founding Fathers themselves, that this would be the quick reaction body here in the House of Representatives, voted on the anniversary of the election of SCOTT BROWN—which we thought saved us from ObamaCare and ultimately did not—but voted to repeal ObamaCare lock, stock and barrel with no vestige of it left behind, to remove that malignant tumor before it could metastasize and consume the liberty of the American people.

□ 1330

Now, that vote yesterday on repeal, and I mentioned to my family and some people around that I should have been euphoric and I should have been

ready to dance the jig. Truthfully, it was satisfying; it was pleasing. I had a good feeling about what we had accomplished, but it is maybe similar to climbing a mountain, and when you get up there into the altitude and you have reached a place along the way to the summit and the altitude gets a little thin and the effort to get to that point is so great, that effort, that energy that it drains off also drains off some of the euphoria. And if you look up at the balance of that peak and you see you have to scale some pretty steep cliffs to get there, and even though you can see the path and you know you have the ability to do it, you don't feel that euphoria as you go up in the same way you might as you imagined the climb in the first place. And that is how it was here yesterday. You didn't hear a noise come up out of the Republicans on this side. We were respectful of people on the other side of the aisle. We have a legitimate disagreement and a difference of opinion. But the American people have spoken. They filled up this side of the aisle, and every Republican, every freshman that I know of ran on the repeal of ObamaCare. It was a big vote for them yesterday, and it is keeping faith with the American people.

But the better way to describe this vote yesterday to repeal ObamaCare, I think, was described by Winston Churchill at the beginning of the Battle of Britain, and I should have checked the history book, but it was in the early part of World War II. Winston Churchill, speaking to brace up the British people in the war against the Nazis, said: ''Now this is not the end. It is not even the beginning of the end. But it is, perhaps, the end of the beginning.''

I think that is where we are in the repeal of ObamaCare, Mr. Speaker. It is, perhaps, the end of the beginning that we accomplished yesterday, and now we have a long, hard slog, to quote a previous Secretary of Defense whom I greatly respect, and that long, hard slog amounts to this:

The resolution that passed today directs the committees to begin the project of writing replacement language, shaping bills and legislation for replacement language so that we can apply free-market ideals, constitutional ideals, protect the doctor-patient relationship so that we address the abusive lawsuits that are driving up the cost of health care, both in two forms: the cost of litigation and the money that goes to trial lawyers, as well as the cost of defensive medicine and unnecessary tests as doctors try to avoid and minimize the potential for lawsuits. Actually, there is a hearing going on in the Judiciary Committee that I left to come over here to deliver this message, Mr. Speaker.

We will do all of those things, and the work has started here in the House. On top of that, though, we must, as the appropriations process unfolds, we must unfund ObamaCare. It is a constitutional method to put a stop to the development of authorized legislation. It would freeze in place the development of ObamaCare until such time as we can complete the repeal.

Mr. Speaker, I am for and will work to put language in every appropriations bill that prohibits the use of those funds for the purposes of implementing or enforcing ObamaCare; and to do that on every appropriations bill, especially the bill that will come here near the end of February that is necessary to keep our government functioning beyond the expiration of the continuing resolution, which is March 4, coming up in a month and a half or a little better.

We will put language in that continuing resolution that we likely will have to extend this funding. It doesn't have to be for the duration of the fiscal year. If it is for a month or 2 months or for the balance of the fiscal year until September 30, that is fine. But every appropriations bill must have the language in it that shuts off the implementation or the enforcement of ObamaCare and prohibits any funds that were heretofore appropriated from being used for the same. That is the language we need in each appropriations bill.

If we do this, then the President of the United States will, at a certain point, need to sign an appropriations bill to keep the government funding. He will have to agree with the people of America and the voice of the House of Representatives. I also think he has to agree with what I believe is the majority in the United States Senate, Mr. Speaker.

The majority leader in the Senate said that the bill is not coming up. The repeal of ObamaCare is not coming up in the Senate, that he will block it, that he won't bring it up. I think his job is to bring out the will of the Senate, to reflect the will of the Senate, because the people in the Senate are the representatives of the people of the United States of America.

Every Senator over there would agree with me in this: Their constituents deserve every bit as much representation as HARRY REID's constituents do. When one Senator holds the rest of the Chamber up for his own personal will, for his own political agenda, and doesn't allow the will of the Senate to be reflected, that happens in certain leveraged positions over in the Senate, and the nuances of that are not something that I want to comment on.

But I will comment on this tonight, Mr. Speaker, that I will challenge the majority leader in the Senate this: Put the repeal of ObamaCare up on the floor of the Senate for a vote. Give the American people a vote in the United States Senate. Let them hear where everyone of the United States Senators are. Put them on record. If they like ObamaCare so much, vote against the repeal. If you stand where I do, vote to repeal it. I predict that the majority votes are in the Senate today to pass the repeal of ObamaCare.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the American people will put their request over to the United States Senate over and over and over again until that very hot potato, that very large, hot potato gets larger and hotter as it sits in the lap of the majority leader, HARRY REID, until such time as the American people get a vote in the United States Senate.

Yes, I recognize that the President would veto such legislation. But we would then know—and we already know where every Member in the House of Representatives stands. We would then know where every Member in the United States Senate stands, and we would be able to see how much resolve the President has to protect his signature legislation, and whether he cares more about his signature piece of legislation that the American people have rejected than he does about the government of the United States and the broader well-being of the people and the security even of the United States, the functions of government.

So I will go back again, Mr. Speaker, and say, reiterate, the strategy now is this: That this is not the end of our efforts to repeal ObamaCare. It is not even the beginning of the end of our efforts. And it is not the beginning of the end of ObamaCare. But it is, perhaps, the end of the beginning.

We launched this off yesterday and the day before. We had the vote that went up last night. Now we know that Republicans stand unified 100 percent in opposition to ObamaCare. And anybody who will vote to repeal ObamaCare also should be on good solid ground to vote to block any funding that would implement or enforce ObamaCare.

That's the stand we need to take in every appropriations bill while the authorization committees work on the replacement policies, as is reflected by the resolution that passed here in the House of Representatives today.

We have a large task in front of us. I am not daunted by the difficulty of it. I realize it will take a lot of energy and a lot of commitment over the next couple of years to finally accomplish the end of ObamaCare as we, Mr. Speaker, elect a President in 2012 who I hope and trust and believe will run on the ticket of plank number one in his platform, sign the repeal of ObamaCare.

I look forward to that day, Mr. Speaker, when we see the effect of the resistance to the will of the people in the United States Senate. I believe that will put more ObamaCare opponents in the United States Senate during the 2012 election. I believe it will strengthen the ranks of ObamaCare opponents here in the House of Representatives in the 2012 election, and I think that it will also elect a President of the United States who will be taking the oath of office on the West Portico of the Capitol on January 20 in 2013.

Mr. Speaker, here is the image I have in mind. First, earlier in January of 2013, the House will have to repass the final repeal of ObamaCare. The Senate

then, I believe, will take it up and pass that repeal of ObamaCare. And send it where? Message it where?

□ 1340

I hope we message it out to the podium on the West Portico of the Capitol for January 20, 2013, where I hope to be at a good vantage point where I can see the next President of the United States, and tell him, Take the oath of office with pen in hand, and take the oath this way, Mr. Speaker:

''I do solemnly swear to the best of my ability to preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States, so help me God.''

Then, before that new President shakes hands with the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, I would like to see him take his hand down, with pen in it, and sign the repeal of ObamaCare right there during the swearing in ceremonies of the next President of the United States, which will set the tone for the new era that we will be working towards throughout 2011 and 2012.

So, when the Sun comes up on the morning of January 21, 2013, we will be free at last from the burden of socialized medicine, and the freest people in the world will have rejected dependency, will have stood up for independence, and will have stood up for the vitality of the American people.

That, Mr. Speaker, is the vision I have in mind, and I will work on that every day until that is accomplished. That is my pledge to you, Mr. Speaker, and the American people.

It is my privilege to address you here on the floor, and I thank you.

I yield back the balance of my time.

A TIME FOR SACRIFICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, ''On a blistering evening in Phoenix recently, a group of prominent civic leaders met to talk about America. It didn't take long for the conversation to get around to the fall of the Ottoman Empire.

''That's what happens when smart Americans get to talking about politics these days.

''Topic A is the growing sense that our best days as a Nation are behind us, that our kids won't live as well as we did, that China is in the driver's seat.''

Those were the opening words of an October 2010 Time magazine piece, authored by veteran reporter Joe Klein, who canvassed the country during the height of the campaign season.

Klein's assessment of the national mood was underscored by New York Times columnist David Brooks, who recently wrote: ''The current sour mood is not just caused by high unemployment. It emerges from the fear that America's best days are behind it.''

I believe this foreboding national anxiety is born of certain realities—exploding debts and deficits, shuttered factories, rising unemployment, bloated government, and an acrimonious tenor to our national discourse. People fear that America's influence is waning and our ''shining city on a hill'' is dimming.

I must admit to sharing these same anxieties as a father of five and grandfather of 15. I have never been more concerned about my country's future. Yet I do not believe that the realization of these fears is inevitable. We can walk back from the precipice. We have options. Sober-minded people believe that we must dramatically change course, especially as it relates to our ballooning national debt and deficit—and I agree.

Yet, are America and her leaders willing to make the tough decisions that are necessary?

The lyrics in Simon and Garfunkel's song ''The Boxer''—''Man hears what he wants to hear and disregards the rest''—aptly describe the mood in Washington when it comes to addressing Federal spending.

Within days of the President's fiscal commission report on the dire consequences of the failure to address growing mandatory spending, it was business as usual with Congress passing and the Obama administration supporting a tax and spending bill with an $857 billion price tag that included a yearlong ''payroll tax holiday,'' raiding the Social Security trust fund at a cost of $112 billion, without paying for it, thereby increasing the national debt.

So the question before us is: Will Washington summon the courage and the fortitude to make the tough decisions, to govern based on principle and not politics, to lead the country toward a brighter tomorrow even if it means sacrificing in the short term?

Historically, Americans are willing to sacrifice.

Many of our countrymen have made the ultimate sacrifice on our own shores and in distant lands, in places like Antietam, Normandy, Saigon, Kandahar, and Baghdad.

It is on their shoulders we stand—wobbly at times, but stand nonetheless. The Nation's future now falls to us. Will we step up to the plate or will we fail to act?

For too long, routinely increasing the amount of money that government can borrow without taking any action to stem the country's growing debt has been standard operating procedure; but the storm warning signs have been posted, and I am heeding their ominous call.

When Congress is asked to increase the statutory debt limit, which will likely happen in the next few months, I will vote ''no'' unless—and let me be completely clear here—there is a firm commitment to deal with the larger issue or the vote itself is tied to a plan to put America on a path to financial responsibility.

I have come to this decision based on a multitude of factors that I will explore in the remaining time. Consider these grim realities:

Our Nation is now more than $14 trillion in debt. We have accumulated a $1 trillion deficit every year. Just last Thursday, both Moody's Investment Service and Standard & Poor's again cautioned the U.S. that its coveted AAA credit rating is at risk if the country's deteriorating fiscal situation is not corrected.

The practical implications of a downgraded credit rating are severe. The cost to borrow money will rise. Everything from a home loan to a car loan to a student loan will increase. Interest on the debt was $202 billion in 2010. That's nearly $4 billion a week. In 2021, interest on the debt is projected to be $1 trillion a year, or roughly $2.7 billion a day.

Unsustainable debt in Europe and the resulting economic woes and austerity measures led to riots in the streets. Is it just a matter of time before we see that at home?

If we are on the same trajectory as these countries, their unemployment numbers should give us pause. Spain was at a whopping 19.8 percent in December.

Noted historian Niall Ferguson authored a piece in the April 2010 Foreign Affairs, exploring the theory that great empires often decline swiftly. From Rome to the Ming Dynasty to the British Empire, history is rife with examples of seemingly invincible world powers that collapse in a short period of time.

Ferguson adds that, while there are varied theories about why each of these empires declined in such short order, he said, ''Most imperial falls are associated with fiscal crises.''

If paying $202 billion a year in interest alone isn't a fiscal crisis, I don't know what is. Is America heading off a cliff?

Consider that last year a report from the Congressional Budget Office revealed that for the first time in 25 years Social Security was taking in less in taxes than it was spending on benefits. In addition, recent reports found that as 2011 opens, the first of the baby boomers will turn 65 at the rate of 10,000 a day for the next 19 years. Or consider that just over the past decade foreign ownership of U.S. debt has increased significantly from 5 percent 40 years ago to 46 percent today.

If the U.S. does not begin to rein in spending, every penny of the Federal budget will go to interest on the debt and entitlement spending by 2028. This has grave implications for a host of national priorities.

Ferguson is not alone in his warnings.

In 2007, then-U.S. Comptroller General David Walker warned of ''striking similarities'' between America's current situation and the fall of the Roman Empire.

Respected business leader Norm Augustine, who chaired a National Academies' Commission on American Competitiveness that resulted in the landmark ''Gathering Storm'' report, captured well the situation in which America now finds itself when he said, ''In the technology-driven economy in which we live, Americans have come to accept leadership as the natural and enduring state of affairs; but leadership is highly perishable. It must be constantly re-earned.''

□ 1350

He went on to say, ''Unless we do things dramatically different, including strengthening our investments in research and education, the 21st century will belong to China and India.''

As America sinks deeper into debt, we seem satisfied to live utterly in the moment with no concern for the future. And as our own investments in the future lag, China is forging ahead, making critical gains in education while our children are left in the wake.

One woman in Arizona who spoke to Klein during his heartland travel said pointedly, ''We seem to be mired in mediocrity while China is steaming ahead.'' Do we really want the 21st century, this century, to be the Chinese century? Do we really want to leave our children a country mired in mediocrity?

Last year, a 5-year followup report titled ''Rising Above the Gathering Storm, Revisited'' noted that ''Almost one-third of U.S. manufacturing companies responding to a recent survey say they are suffering from some level of skills shortages.'' This failure to train the next generation of engineers and scientists has a direct bearing on our economy. The U.S. graduates only half the number—half the number—of physicists today than we did in 1956.

The Gathering Storm report determined that, for the first time in our Nation's history, the younger generation of Americans is less well educated than its parents, and warned that ''the United States appears to be on a course that will lead to a declining standard of living for our children and our grandchildren.''

Against this backdrop, roughly half of America's outstanding publicly held debt is now foreign owned, with China and Saudi Arabia among the largest holders. Saudi Arabia was home to many of the 9/11 terrorists. Saudi Arabia's radical Wahhabism is taught in some of the most extremist mosques and madrassas, including up on the Afghan-Pakistan border. Their textbooks are filled with hateful messages about minority faiths, including Christians and Jews.

A recent New York Times story reported that, ''Saudi donors remain the chief financiers of Sunni militant groups like al Qaeda.'' Is this a country we want to be beholden to financially? Or what about Communist China? It is well documented by the U.S. intelligence community that China's attempt to spy on U.S. agencies and businesses are the most aggressive of all foreign intelligence organizations and, according to the FBI, ''pose a significant threat to the national security'' and compromise U.S. critical national assets.

China also routinely violates the basic human rights of its own people. Even this week, as Chinese President Hu Jintao is afforded the pomp and circumstance of a White House state dinner, Catholic bishops, Protestant pastors, and Tibetan monks are in Chinese jails for practicing their faith.

I've seen how China plundered Tibet. China's abuses do not stop at home. They are a significant arms supplier to the genocidal regime in Khartoum, Sudan. Do we really want China to be our banker? All of these realities must prompt some soul-searching on the part of our Nation's leadership.

Almost 5 years ago, during the last Republican majority, I came to the floor of the House proposing an independent bipartisan commission to address unsustainable Federal spending. It would put everything on the table—entitlements, all other spending, and tax policy. The SAFE Commission—short for Securing America's Future Economy—would operate in a transparent way, holding public meetings across the country to hear from the American people and give them a vested interest in the outcome. Further, it would require Congress to vote on its recommendations.

I reintroduced this legislation with Congressman JIM COOPER in the 110th and 111th Congresses. Senators KENT CONRAD and Judd Gregg introduced a similar bill calling for a deficit commission that became the blueprint for the President's National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform, or the Simpson-Bowles Commission.

I give credit to the deficit commission. I certainly didn't agree with every part of its report, but the commission's work was an important step in moving the national conversation forward. It put forth serious ideas rather than just kicking the can down the road. And had I been appointed to the commission, while supporting some changes, I would have voted for its final report. I commend its members who voted yes, such as Senator TOM COBURN, Republican of Oklahoma, a champion of low taxes, for having the courage to do so.

The plan set forth by the Simpson-Bowles Commission—supported by a majority of the commission's 18 members—makes it clear that addressing the debt and the deficit isn't just a simple exercise in rooting out waste, fraud, and abuse. It is all well and good to eliminate earmarks, fraud, waste, and abuse and rein in discretionary spending, but these things alone do not come close to solving the debt and the deficit.

The infamous bank robber Willie Sutton reportedly said he robbed banks ''because that's where the money is.'' In our government, the money is in entitlements—Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security. Let me say it again: If we do not deal with Medicare, Medicaid and Social Security, we cannot solve this problem. We need to do it in a way that really fixes the problem for us and for the next generation. We need to do it in a way that strengthens America, creating economic growth and jobs. This will be difficult and at times controversial, but the longer we wait we can be certain that it will become more difficult and more controversial.

The commission's forthright assessment about what is necessary to put us in good fiscal standing was a step in the right direction. The success of any endeavor, however, is predicated on actively involving the American people and must require an up-or-down vote in Congress. The President's commission came up short in that regard.

We have a divided government, which necessitates a bipartisan solution, something that can be passed and be enacted into law, and the sooner the better. If we neglect to do this, America will decline, and it will decline on our watch. We will have failed our children and grandchildren. We will have broken faith with the Founding Fathers and past generations who have sacrificed greatly to make this Nation, our Nation, a shining city on a hill.

We can no longer ignore the albatross of debt around our collective necks. That is why, unless there is a firm commitment to deal with the larger financial crisis or the vote itself is tied to a possible debt solution, I will vote against the debt limit increase. And again, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to consider doing the same.

I don't say this lightly. I am fully aware of the implications. In a recent letter to congressional leadership, Treasury Secretary Timothy Geithner spoke in near apocalyptic terms about the consequences of default. Even if just a fraction of his analysis is accurate, it is clear that this isn't a decision to be made casually. It is precisely because the stakes are so high that I believe the debt limit vote can serve as a trigger to force congressional action that otherwise will not be taken.

The country does not currently have a credit card limit, and we need one in order to stop the mortgaging of our country's future. Failure to act now on fiscal problems will ensure that in the future there will be tax increases and drastic entitlement reductions, and no money for important discretionary spending such as infrastructure, national security, medical research, and education. The longer it takes to address this issue, the more draconian the options will be when the Nation is forced to change course, as it most assuredly will be.

If you are on Social Security or Medicare, you should insist that the Congress and the administration act. If you are a young adult, you should be worried that your generation will be

significantly less well off than your parents' generation.

□ 1400

If you care about America's global leadership, if you yearn for our country to have the resources to combat global scourges, if you hope for the day when there is a cure for cancer and Alzheimer's, you should press Congress and the administration to step up to the plate now.

We must all ask ourselves: Do we want to make a point or do we want to make a difference? If the answer is the latter, then it is clear that this is a conversation we need to be having today. We must not put it off.

At his 1796 farewell address, George Washington admonished his fellow countrymen, ''We should avoid ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden of which we ourselves ought to bear.'' An apt charge for today's political leadership.

A brief word to America's faith community, who should be intimately concerned with the moral component of this crisis. If we say we care about the poor, we must speak up, for they will be the hardest hit if we fail to act. If we say we are passionate about justice, then we must not be complicit in committing a massive generational injustice.

Not only is our current course immoral, it is un-American. Generations past have always passed the torch of the American Dream to their children and their grandchildren. Presently, we're poised to hand off the struggling flicker of a flame.

The implications of an America on decline also has ripple effects the world over.

In a December 5 Washington Post Outlook piece, author Robert Kaplan hauntingly writes, ''America's ability to bring a modicum of order to the world is simply fading in slow motion.'' A look at the daily headlines and we are reminded that the world is a much more dangerous place when our Nation is perceived as weak, or worse yet, when that perception becomes a reality.

Surely we can agree on the enormity of what is at stake. The precise blueprint for how to move forward may seem blurry at times, but the implications of doing nothing must propel us onward.

If we summon the courage to act, I believe we can see a rebirth in America marked by grand innovations in science and technology that are the wonders of the world, advances in medical research that save millions of lives, and further exploration into the remaining frontier of space and much more.

Columnist Tony Blankley wrote recently, ''America has become a great Nation because we have been an optimistic people who insist on both success and liberty. America's can-do spirit has been the wonder of the ages. It has raised us from a handful of farmers to the colossus of the planet. And if we can regain that spirit, there is not a reason in the world that the 21st century will not be the American century—just as the 20th century was.''

I was reminded once again of that unique American spirit on Election Day when I stopped by the Snow White Grill in Winchester, Virginia. While I was there, one man said to me, ''We are ready! We are prepared to sacrifice. We're ready to do what's right.'' And several others at the lunch counter echoed the same.

But the question remains: Are America's leaders prepared to sacrifice? Are America's leaders prepared to do what's right?

Battle lines have been drawn on both sides.

The MoveOn.orgs of the left and the Americans for Tax Reform of the right have wielded their political influence with remarkable effect, only to paralyze the Congress and the Obama administration on arguably the most important issue of our time. I am not prepared to continue to let that happen.

In 1787, on the final day of the Constitutional Convention, Benjamin Franklin was said to have wept when he signed the document. James Madison wrote in a letter to Thomas Jefferson, ''Whilst the last members were signing it,'' he said, ''Dr. Franklin, looking towards the President's chair, at the back of which a rising sun happened to be painted, observed to a few members near him that painters had found it difficult to distinguish in their art a rising sun from a setting sun.''

And then Dr. Franklin remarked that during the course of the session, ''I have often looked at that picture . . . without being able to tell whether it was a rising or setting sun.'' And then Franklin continues, ''Now . . . I have the happiness to know that it is indeed a rising, not a setting sun.''

Every politician loves to say that the sun has barely begun to rise on America and that America's best days are yet ahead.

If we steel ourselves for tough decisions and commit to doing the right thing, if we work for economic and moral rebirth, then we will honestly be able to join the chorus of voices reaching back to our Nation's founding and echoing across the ages which enjoin us to believe that the sun has indeed barely begun to rise on our country and that America's best days are yet to come.

This is a call to action. We are Americans, and we can prevail.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of official business in the district.

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. HINOJOSA) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HOYER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. DELAURO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

The following Members (at their own request) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:

Ms. FOXX, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HURT, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, January 24, 2011, at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

149. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Force Health Protection and Readiness), Department of Defense, transmitting a report to Congress on pain care initiatives provided by the health care programs of the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

150. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification that effective November 7, 2010, the danger pay allowance of 20% for Haiti has been eliminated, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 5928; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

151. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Interagency Working Group on U.S. Government-Sponsored International Exchanges and Training FY 2010 Annual Report, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2460(f) and (g) Public Law 87-256, section Section 112(f) and (g); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

152. A letter from the Chairman, Broadcasting Board of Governors, transmitting a report on the information security program and practices of the Broadcasting Board of Governors, pursuant to Public Law 107-347; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

153. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting Fiscal Year (FY) 2010 Annual Financial Report; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

154. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting a report to Congress on a gift of land in Tulare and Kern Counties, California, from the Wilderness Land Trust, pursuant to Public Law 93-632; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

155. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting a report to Congress on a gift of land in Kern County,

California, from the National Audubon Society, Inc. (Audubon), pursuant to Public Law 93-632; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

156. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Henderson, KY [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0937; Airspace Docket No. 10-ASO-10] received January 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

157. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Crewe, VA [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0692; Airspace Docket No. 10-AEA-16] received January 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

158. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Central City, NE [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0837; Airspace Docket No. 10-ACE-10] received January 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

159. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Benton, IL [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0838; Airspace Docket No. 10-AGL-13] received January 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

160. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Columbus, OH [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0770; Airspace Docket No. 10-AGL-11] received January 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

161. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment and Revocation of Class E Airspace; Vero Beach, FL [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0921; Airspace Docket No. 10-ASO-03] received January 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

162. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Port Clarence, AK [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0354; Airspace Docket No. 10-AAL-10] received January 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

163. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Taos, NM [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0842; Airspace Docket No. 10-ASW-11] received January 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

164. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Rawlins, WY [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0919; Airspace Docket No. 10-ANM-11] received January 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

165. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Johnson, KS [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0841; Airspace Docket No. 10-ACE-11] received January 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

166. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Farmington, MO [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0769; Airspace Docket No. 10-ACE-9] received January 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

167. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Mansfield, OH [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0771; Airspace Docket No. 10-AGL-12] received January 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

168. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revocation of Class E Airspace; Lone Star, TX [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0772; Airspace Docket No. 10-ASW-10] received January 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

169. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a semi-annual report concerning emigration laws and policies of Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Moldova, the Russian Federation, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 2432(c) and (d); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

170. A letter from the Chief Privacy Officer, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's Privacy Office's report entitled, ''2010 Data Mining Report to Congress'', pursuant to Public Law 110-53 (121 Stat. 266); to the Committee on Homeland Security.

171. A letter from the Chair, Board of Directors, Office of Compliance, transmitting the biennial report on recommendations for improvements to the Congressional Accountability Act, pursuant to section 102(b) of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 1302; jointly to the Committees on House Administration and Education and the Workforce.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. AKIN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. AUSTRIA, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BONNER, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. BUCHANAN, Ms. BUERKLE, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CANSECO, Mr. CARTER, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. COLE, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. CRAVAACK, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. CRITZ, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. FORBES, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Ms. FOXX, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. GOWDY, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. HALL, Mr. HARPER, Mr. HARRIS, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. HURT, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. JONES, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. KELLY, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. KLINE, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. LANDRY, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. LATTA, Mr. LEE of New York, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. LONG, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. MARINO, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. OLSON, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PENCE, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. PITTS, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. POSEY, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. ROSKAM, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. ROSS of Arkansas, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. SCHILLING, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. SHULER, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. TERRY, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. TURNER, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. WOLF, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. BOREN, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. CALVERT, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. TIBERI, and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas):

H.R. 3. A bill to prohibit taxpayer funded abortions and to provide for conscience protect ions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and 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 Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. AKIN, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BERG, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BONNER, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CAMP, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. COBLE, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. FLORES, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Ms. FOXX, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. GUTHRIE, Ms. HAYWORTH, Mr. HELLER, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. ISSA, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. JONES, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. KLINE, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. LATTA, Mr. LEE of New York, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. NUNES, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. POSEY, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. QUAYLE, Mr. REICHERT,

Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. ROSKAM, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. TERRY, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. UPTON, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. WEST, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. WITTMAN):

H.R. 10. A bill to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on 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. PITTS (for himself, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. ROSS of Arkansas, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. UPTON, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. PENCE, Mr. FLEMING, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. AKIN, Mr. AUSTRIA, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. CANSECO, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. CARTER, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. CRITZ, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. HALL, Mr. HARRIS, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. JONES, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. KLINE, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. LANCE, Mr. LATTA, Mr. LEE of New York, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. OLSON, Mr. PAUL, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. SHULER, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. TERRY, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. KELLY, Mr. LONG, Mr. ROSKAM, Ms. BUERKLE, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, and Mr. SHUSTER):

H.R. 358. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to modify special rules relating to coverage of abortion services under such Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. COLE (for himself, Mr. AKIN, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. CAMPBELL, Ms. FOXX, Mr. LAMBORN, and Mr. MCCLINTOCK):

H.R. 359. A bill to reduce Federal spending and the deficit by terminating taxpayer financing of presidential election campaigns and party conventions; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BURGESS (for himself, Mr. PAUL, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. JONES, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. HELLER, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. MICA, Mr. BONNER, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. OLSON, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. KLINE, Mr. POSEY, and Mr. NUNNELEE):

H.R. 360. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to provide for participation in the Exchange of the President, Vice-President, Members of Congress, political appointees, and congressional staff; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on House Administration, and Energy and Commerce, 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. FLEMING (for himself and Mr. BOREN):

H.R. 361. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to prohibit certain abortion-related discrimination in governmental activities; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CONAWAY (for himself, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HALL, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. MCCAUL, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. PAUL, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. FLORES, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. OLSON, Mr. CANSECO, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. CARTER, and Mr. SESSIONS):

H.R. 362. A bill to redesignate the Federal building and United States Courthouse located at 200 East Wall Street in Midland, Texas, as the ''George H. W. Bush and George W. Bush United States Courthouse and George Mahon Federal Building''; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CARDOZA (for himself, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. DELAURO, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. SIRES, Mr. COSTA, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BACA, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. SUTTON, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. STARK, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. WELCH, Mr. FILNER, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. KUCINICH, and Mr. QUIGLEY):

H.R. 363. A bill to prevent foreclosure of home mortgages and provide for the affordable refinancing of mortgages held by Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H.R. 364. A bill to repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and to take meaningful steps to lower health care costs and increase access to health insurance coverage without raising taxes, cutting Medicare benefits for seniors, adding to the national deficit, intervening in the doctor-patient relationship, or instituting a government takeover of health care; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, Ways and Means, the Judiciary, House Administration, Natural Resources, Rules, and Appropriations, 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. GRIMM (for himself and Mr. PIERLUISI):

H.R. 365. A bill to encourage, enhance, and integrate Blue Alert plans throughout the United States in order to disseminate information when a law enforcement officer is seriously injured or killed in the line of duty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri:

H.R. 366. A bill to provide for an additional temporary extension of programs under the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Ms. RICHARDSON:

H.R. 367. A bill to prohibit the knowing possession of a firearm near a venue at which a Member of Congress is performing an official and representational duty or campaigning for public office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia (for himself and Mr. SMITH of Texas):

H.R. 368. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to clarify and improve certain provisions relating to the removal of litigation against Federal officers or agencies to Federal courts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, 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. AUSTRIA (for himself, Mr. PENCE, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. AKIN, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. PAUL, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. LONG, and Mr. TIBERI):

H.R. 369. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve access to health care by allowing a deduction for the health insurance costs of individuals, expanding health savings accounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BACA:

H.R. 370. A bill to require financial institutions to offer services to protect seniors from affinity scams, to report suspected affinity scams, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, 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. BLACKBURN (for herself, Mr. UPTON, Mr. PITTS, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BURGESS, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. SCALISE, Mrs. BONO MACK, Mr. BASS of New Hampshire, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. LATTA, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. HARPER, Mr. LANCE, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. OLSON, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. ISSA, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. AKIN, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. BUCSHON, Ms. BUERKLE, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. COLE, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. FLORES, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GOHMERT, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. GUINTA, Mr. HARRIS, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. LAMBORN, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. MACK, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. PAUL, Mr. POSEY, Mr. QUAYLE, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. WALSH of Illinois, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina):

H.R. 371. A bill to repeal title I of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for cooperative governing of individual health insurance coverage offered in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Education and the Workforce, 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. BUCHANAN (for himself, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. STEARNS):

H.R. 372. A bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to deny leases and permits to persons who engage in activities with the government of any foreign country that is subject to any sanction or an embargo established by the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. FOXX (for herself, Mr. CUELLAR, and Mr. KISSELL):

H.R. 373. A bill to amend the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 to ensure that actions taken by regulatory agencies are subject to that Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on Rules, the Budget, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HUNTER (for himself, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. JONES, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. PENCE, Mr. HURT, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. TERRY, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. COLE, Mr. HARPER, Mr. AKIN, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. LONG, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. LANDRY, Mr. LATTA, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. KELLY, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. KLINE, Mr. CANSECO, Mr. FLORES, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. HALL, Mr. HERGER, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. LAMBORN, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. MARCHANT, and Mr. MCKEON):

H.R. 374. A bill to implement equal protection under the 14th article of amendment to the Constitution for the right to life of each born and preborn human person; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILDEE (for himself, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 375. A bill to limit the total value of Chinese goods that may be procured by the United States Government during a calendar year to not more than the total value of United States goods procured by the Chinese Government if any during the preceding calendar year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. KING of New York (for himself, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. BRALEY of Iowa):

H.R. 376. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide recruitment and retention incentives for volunteer emergency service workers; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, 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 Ms. LEE of California:

H.R. 377. A bill to amend the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 to repeal the denial of food stamp eligibility of ex-offenders; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. LEE of California:

H.R. 378. A bill to reauthorize the public and assisted housing drug elimination program of the Department of Housing and Urban Development; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. LEE of California:

H.R. 379. A bill to assist teachers and public safety officers in obtaining affordable housing; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. LEE of California (for herself and Mr. SERRANO):

H.R. 380. A bill to provide that no funds made available to the Department of the Treasury may be used to implement, administer, or enforce regulations to require specific licenses for travel-related transactions directly related to educational activities in Cuba; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. LEE of California:

H.R. 381. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide for grants to increase the number of law enforcement officers on the streets by 5 to 10 percent in areas with high incidences of violent crime; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. LEE of California (for herself and Ms. WOOLSEY):

H.R. 382. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to limit the deductibility of excessive rates of executive compensation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. LEE of California:

H.R. 383. A bill to provide for coverage of hormone replacement therapy for treatment of menopausal symptoms, and for coverage of an alternative therapy for hormone replacement therapy for such symptoms, under the Medicare and Medicaid Programs, group health plans and individual health insurance coverage, and other Federal health insurance programs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Education and the Workforce, Oversight and Government Reform, and Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. LEE of California (for herself, Ms. MOORE, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. RUSH, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. MORAN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. HOLT, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. PETRI, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HONDA, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. STARK, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. POLIS, and Mrs. MALONEY):

H.R. 384. A bill to provide for the issuance of a semipostal to benefit the Peace Corps; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. LEE of California:

H.R. 385. A bill to require poverty impact statements for certain legislation; to the Committee on Rules, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, 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. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California (for himself, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. HARPER, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. GALLEGLY):

H.R. 386. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide penalties for aiming laser pointers at airplanes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, 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. PETRI:

H.R. 387. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that reimbursements for costs of using passenger automobiles for charitable and other organizations are excluded from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H.R. 388. A bill to provide that the detention facility at Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba remains open indefinitely and to require that individuals detained at the facility be tried only by military commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SCHOCK (for himself, Mr. PAUL, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California):

H.R. 389. A bill to prevent funding from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 from being used for physical signage indicating that a project is funded by such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on 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. THOMPSON of California:

H.R. 390. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an exclusion from the gross estate for certain farmlands and lands subject to qualified conservation easements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.J. Res. 21. A joint resolution disapproving a rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; Revisions to the New Source Review (NSR) State Implementation Plan (SIP); Flexible Permits; Final Rule''; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CANTOR:

H. Con. Res. 10. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint session of Congress to receive a message from the President; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. LEE of California (for herself, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. HONDA, Mr. FILNER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. STARK):

H. Con. Res. 11. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should provide, on an annual basis, an amount equal to at least 1 percent of United States gross domestic product (GDP) for nonmilitary foreign assistance programs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. YARMUTH:

H. Res. 46. A resolution restoring the democratic process by providing that section 3(b) of H. Res. 5 shall have no force or effect during the remainder of the 112th Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (for himself, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. RUSH, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. FARR, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. MORAN, Mr. WU, Mr. STARK, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H. Res. 47. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the contributions of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. LEE of California (for herself and Mr. CONYERS):

H. Res. 48. A resolution establishing a select committee to review national security laws, policies, and practices; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. HINCHEY:

H.R. 391. A bill for the relief of Emilio Maya; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. LEE of California:

H.R. 392. A bill for the relief of Geert Botzen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD:

H.R. 393. A bill for the relief of Maria Eva Duran, Jessica Duran Cortes, Daniel Ivan Duran Cortes, and Jose Antonio Duran Cortes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 3.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill is based is Congress's power under the Spending Clause in Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky:

H.R. 10.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted Congress under article I of the United States Constitution, including the power granted Congress under article I, section 8, clause 18, of the United States Constitution, and the power granted to each House of Congress under article I, section 5, clause 2, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PITTS:

H.R. 358.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Protect Life Act would overturn an unconstitutional mandate regarding abortion in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

By Mr. COLE:

H.R. 359.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Amendment XVI to the United States Constitution.

Additionally, since the Constitution does not provide Congress with the power to provide financial support to candidates seeking election to offices of the United States or to U.S. political parties, the general repeal of the presidential election fund is consistent with the powers that are reserved to the States and to the people as expressed in Amendment X to the United States Constitution.

Further, Article I Section 8 defines the scope and powers of Congress and does not include this concept of taxation in furtherance of funding campaigns within the delegated powers.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 360.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to make rules for the government, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the United States Constitution.

In addition, the bill extends equal treatment to all Congressional staff in respect to numerous court interpretations of the 14th Amendment's Equal Protection Clause to the Constitution ''shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States . . . nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.''

By Mr. FLEMING:

H.R. 361.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill makes specific changes to existing law in a manner that provides conscience protections in accord with the lst Amendment of the United States Constitution. Further, this bill creates a private right of action in federal court in accord with Clause 9 of Section 8 of Article I and Clause 18, Section 8 of Article I, of the United States Constitution. Similarly, this bill provides for preventing disbursement of all or a portion of certain Federal financial assistance in accord with Clause 1, Section 8 Article 1.

By Mr. CONAWAY:

H.R. 362.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the powers granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 17 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CARDOZA:

H.R. 363.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to its authority under Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among several States, and with Indian Tribes.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H.R. 364.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GRIMM:

H.R. 365.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri:

H.R. 366.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. 1, §8, Cl. 3 ''To regulate commerce among foreign nations and the several states.''

By Ms. RICHARDSON:

H.R. 367.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia:

H.R. 368.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 9 and 18.

By Mr. AUSTRIA:

H.R. 369.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BACA:

H.R. 370.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 371.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This Act is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H.R. 372.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this legislation rests is the power of Congress enumerated in Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Ms. FOXX:

H.R. 373.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HUNTER:

H.R. 374.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This legislation makes clear that human life begins at the moment of conception and, therefore, the unborn are entitled to the same rights and protections afforded to all American citizens under the U.S. Constitution. In affirming human life begins at conception, the unborn are granted the right to due process under Section 1 of the 14th Amendment which explicitly states, ''no state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.''

The Life at Conception Act allows for constitutional protection for the unborn that they not ''be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of the law'' afforded under the 5th Amendment.

By Mr. KILDEE:

H.R. 375.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution which gives Congress the power ''to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes''.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 376.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: ''The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.''

By Ms. LEE of California:

H.R. 377.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Ms. LEE of California:

H.R. 378.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Ms. LEE of California:

H.R. 379.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Ms. LEE of California:

H.R. 380.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Ms. LEE of California:

H.R. 381.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Ms. LEE of California:

H.R. 382.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Ms. LEE of California:

H.R. 383.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Ms. LEE of California:

H.R. 384.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Ms. LEE of California:

H.R. 385.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California:

H.R. 386.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is justified under the Commerce Clause of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PETRI:

H.R. 387.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 which, in part, states: ''The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, . . . and the Sixteenth Amendment which states: The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration.''

By Mr. ROONEY:

H.R. 388.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8: ''To raise and support armies, but no appropriation of money to use shall be for a longer term than two years; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces.''

By Mr. SCHOCK:

H.R. 389.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress as stated in Article I, Section 9 and Amendment X of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California:

H.R. 390.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1.

By Mr. HINCHEY:

H.R. 391.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 4 and Amendment I, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. LEE of California:

H.R. 392.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

''This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.''

By Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD:

H.R. 393.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4, Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.J. Res. 21.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

''This bill is enacted pursuant to Amendment X of the United States Constitution.''

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 4: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 21: Mr. NUNNELEE.

H.R. 22: Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 27: Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, and Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 104: Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin.

H.R. 121: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 127: Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. NUNNELEE, and Mr. ROSS of Florida.

H.R. 140: Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. NUNNELEE, and Mr. NUGENT.

H.R. 143: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina and Mr. LONG.

H.R. 178: Mr. ROSS of Arkansas, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BONNER, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Ms. BERKLEY.

H.R. 180: Ms. BORDALLO.

H.R. 181: Mr. SCHOCK and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 186: Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. NUGENT, and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.

H.R. 187: Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. PAUL, Ms. HAYWORTH, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. HUELSKAMP.

H.R. 212: Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. MCCOTTER, and Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 213: Mr. LONG.

H.R. 217: Mr. LEE of New York, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. LABRADOR, and Mrs. MYRICK.

H.R. 218: Mr. GUTIERREZ and Mr. PIERLUISI.

H.R. 235: Ms. FOXX, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, and Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

H.R. 261: Mr. HOLT, Mr. WEINER, and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 263: Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 297: Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. BRADY of Texas.

H.R. 299: Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 302: Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. MCCLINTOCK.

H.R. 308: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. DOYLE, and Mr. SARBANES.

H.R. 349: Mr. PETRI.

H.R. 352: Mr. SABLAN.

H.J. Res. 9: Mr. BUCSHON and Mr. CULBERSON.

H.J. Res. 11: Mr. MCCOTTER.

H. Res. 25: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H. Res. 35: Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. HONDA, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. FILNER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. BASS of California, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. MARKEY.

H. Res. 36: Ms. BORDALLO and Mr. DICKS.

H. Res. 44: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.