

Mr. LATOURETTE. I thank the gentleman. Just to get to the last two, and then we will come back for another hour another day. This painful business down here on the foot, that's called a corn. And of course during the last election, a lot of people became familiar with an organization by the name of ACORN. Again, when you talk about what was handed out in the Senate, the Senator from Illinois who was the replacement for Senator Obama when he came President Obama, Senator BURRIS, is claiming a provision in Senator REID's manager's amendment that could funnel money to ACORN through the health care bill. Specifically, for those that care, it's on page 150, and it says that "community and consumer-focused nonprofit groups" may receive grants to "conduct public education activities." So we have ACORN. And again, I'm not going to talk about all the other ACORN stuff. But what does ACORN have to do with lowering the cost of health care and making sure that people are provided?

To wrap up, the last one that we have is a kind of tricky medical, the Achilles' heel. And I put the Achilles' heel on this chart because the Achilles' heel of this entire plan, in my opinion, is the will of the American people. The American people have spoken up. They have spoken up in Virginia and New Jersey and Massachusetts. They're speaking up on the streets. They spoke up in August at town hall meetings, and it's a strange thing. I have seen a couple of articles that say that the Senate has a really tough job after they passed their bill around Christmas because they have to go home and try to convince people that a bill they don't want is good for them. I have been in public life for about 20 years. That's a strange paradigm.

So closing thoughts from the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Well, I think it brings the point. It is getting harder and harder to pass legislation that people don't want, for sure. And I think, just very quickly, to let people know of a few basic ideas that we have that will help solve this problem. I mentioned to you a moment ago cost and affordability are what people worry about, and preexisting conditions. How do you deal with those things?

One of the things you can do is allow health insurance companies to go across State lines like any other insurance companies. Form association health plans. Preexisting conditions are only a problem for individual markets, if I'm going out to try to buy it, or small businesses, like I ran. But if you are spreading those risks among hundreds of thousands or millions of people, it's not a problem. Number three is tort reform. We haven't touched on that. Certainly malpractice reform is a major cost bender in this.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Well, just taking back my time for a minute. They say

we have 5 minutes left. So we are going to be okay, and we'll get to Mr. McCOTTER for a closing thought.

But there was a focus group in Massachusetts the night of the election, run by a pollster named Frank Luntz, and there was a physician in the focus group. He mentioned that exact point. He said, Why don't you have malpractice reform? Why don't you stop this needless double testing to make sure that you don't get sued? Actually, when our proposal was put forward, the bean counters indicated that that would save to the system \$56 billion a year.

Now to the gentleman's point about the high-quality plans: Why wouldn't you take that \$56 billion a year out of frivolous lawsuits so that these folks that have negotiated for good-quality health care for their families don't have to pay a 40 percent income surcharge on income that they're not receiving?

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I could not agree more. And I certainly agree with my colleague from Michigan, Congressman MCCOTTER, about the high plans, the so-called wealthy plans. We don't need to be increasing taxes on—Americans can't stand another tax right now.

The other thing you can do in the State is subsidize at a nominal amount of money high-risk pools so that people who do have preexisting conditions—that's another way you can deal with that very simply. And those four or five things we talked about we could all agree on. We could get this done this 90 days or less, right here in the House in a bipartisan fashion. If the President is ready to work with us, I know our side is. I am. I yield back.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Thank you. And I yield to the gentleman from Michigan for his closing thoughts.

Mr. MCCOTTER. I thank the gentleman. One of the fundamental concepts behind this great Nation is that all power is vested in the sovereign people. It is simply delegated to us, as their servants, to do the work of governance on their behalf. You cannot defy the people who sent you here. You cannot tell your employer who is giving a 2-year, 6-year or a 4-year contract that they don't know what they are talking about, that you know better than they do, and you will take their money to convince them of it over a period in time.

I think that what we have to remember here, the true Achilles' heel is not the American public's lack of understanding about this. It is the Congress' arrogant defiance of the wishes of the American people that have common-sense solutions to problems that affect their daily lives, especially in a very difficult time of economic recession, with high unemployment, such as in States like mine, Michigan.

When we think about this, it is a very fundamental proposition. Lincoln

laid it out a long time ago. Whatever happened in Massachusetts and throughout this country, it's not anger. It's not just frustration. It's not vexation. It's the fact that the American people understand what's happening. They have the information, and they do not give their consent to this radical government-run health care bill that was passed by this House or by the Senate or is threatened to be passed again, because Lincoln was right: Why should there not be patient confidence in the ultimate justice of the people? Is there any better or equal hope in this world? The answer remains no, and I would encourage my Democratic colleagues to heed their wisdom.

I yield back.

Mr. LATOURETTE. I thank both the gentlemen for participating. I will just say that in light of this election in Massachusetts, I have hoped that the administration will push the reset button, and we would take the President at his word when he came here to this House. Let's get a bill. Let's get something done on the 80 percent that we can agree about. We can fight for the rest of the couple years on the 20 percent we don't. But let's get something done for the American people.

And not to use percentages, but as our friend here in the Operation game, my folks back home are saying, We need to take care of the things that, Doc, you've talked about. Why though, in order to take care of the 15 percent of the people we have to deal with—that's the estimate—do we have to mess with the other 85 percent? We have to mess with the people who have good quality health care? We have to take \$500 billion out of Medicare? People don't understand it. And I don't blame them for not understanding because I don't understand it either. And I just have to say again, you've got to be kidding.

I thank you both for participating, Mr. Speaker. I thank you and yield back.

#### REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 874

Ms. MARKEY of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask for unanimous consent to be removed as a cosponsor from H.R. 874.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TEAGUE). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

#### THE SMALL BUSINESS AID ACT

(Ms. MARKEY of Colorado asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. MARKEY of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, obtaining and maintaining credit is a serious issue facing most small businesses in this country. The