



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JANUARY 6, 2011

No. 2

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 6, 2011

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
January 6, 2011.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MICHAEL K. SIMPSON to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

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

You, O God, are our refuge and our strength. History has taught us You are a helper close at hand in times of distress. We shall not fear, even when the whole Earth is unstable and seems to rock. Our human frailty has revealed that we can easily be shaken. Nations are in tumult, mountains of power fall, and economic waves rage and foam.

You alone, Lord God, cannot be shaken. Each dawning day finds You as our stronghold. Your voice works wonders over all the Earth. Wars are pushed to an ending, but You alone break the bows and snap the spears that pierce the soul. You burn off our shields with Your fire, and we hear once again Your voice: "Be still and know that I am God; supreme over all the nations, supreme over all the Earth."

O God, be our stronghold, now and forever.
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Pledge of Allegiance will be led by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. GOWDY).

Mr. GOWDY 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 PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 10 requests for 1-minute speeches from each side.

THE HISTORIC SOUTH CAROLINA DELEGATION

(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. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to welcome the

four new members of the South Carolina delegation to the 112th Congress.

This past election, the voters of South Carolina let their voices be heard. The message was loud and clear: limit spending, with the largest Republican South Carolina delegation in over 130 years. The voters can rest assured the message was heard in Washington.

These four conservative, successful small business leaders were elected based on their principles. Promises to reduce spending, limit government, and attain fiscal responsibility will now be real priorities.

The people of South Carolina will benefit the most from this dynamic young team. The enthusiasm they bring is energizing. Congressmen TIM SCOTT, JEFF DUNCAN, TREY GOWDY and MICK MULVANEY are welcome to Federal public service. We will work together in making this the most accessible and accountable delegation for the people of South Carolina.

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

PROMOTING THE GENERAL WELFARE

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

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, the new Republican majority has decided that today we will read the United States Constitution, which I guess is a good thing. But like every other American, I can and do read it for myself. In fact, I did it this morning and came across

☐ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., ☐ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

the phrase “promote the general welfare.”

Next week, the new Republican majority will put forward a bill to repeal health care reform; to tell seniors, go back to a world where you can choose between your prescriptions and your food; to tell our children, go back to a world where an insurance company can deny you coverage because you had the misfortune to be born with a disease. That is what they are doing next week.

Listen hard, listen hard today to those words, “promote the general welfare.”

THIS ILLEGAL ACT

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this new Congress must be committed to listening to the will of the people and following the Constitution. Immediately we must right a wrong that has been forcibly placed like chains on the American people.

The unhealthy national health care bill bruises the doctrine of the Constitution. The people don't want the government stealing their individual liberty to make health decisions. Congress must repeal this totalitarian act.

In a few moments, Congress this day, on this new day, will read the Constitution on the House floor, the sacred rule of law for this Nation. Nowhere in this document of wisdom does the Federal Government have the omnipotent authority to force any American to buy any product or face criminal penalties, whether it is a car, health insurance, or a box of donuts.

The nationalized health care bill is an unconstitutional oppression of the American citizen. We will repeal this injustice. On this new day, we stewards of the Constitution must right this wrong, this illegal law that has been coerced upon the people without their consent.

And that's just the way it is.

CONDEMNING THE NEW YEAR'S DAY ATTACK ON A COPTIC CHURCH IN EGYPT

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

Mr. SIREs. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to condemn the senseless and heinous attack that took place on New Year's Day in Alexandria, Egypt, during a Coptic Christian mass ushering in the new year.

The suicide bombing that took place 20 minutes into 2011 took the lives of 23 Christians and wounded more than 90 others. Although no one has claimed responsibility for the attack, the Egyptian Government has linked the al-Qaeda terrorist organization to this brutal attack. Whoever the perpetrators may be, their actions epitomize the definition of evil and remind us of the constant struggle around the world

against terrorism. Security must remain a priority in Egypt and all freedom-fighting nations.

This event illuminates the unprecedented prejudice facing this minority population and the evident inter-religious struggle and violence that is plaguing Egypt. This deplorable act of violence is yet another example of the escalation of violence against Egypt's Coptic Christians, who make up about 10 percent of the population.

I offer my condolences to the families of victims who perished in the bombing, and I hope the Egyptian Government honors their promise with a swift and thorough investigation of this vicious crime.

AMERICAN ENERGY, AMERICAN JOBS

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

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, well, here we go again. Gasoline: \$3, \$4, and soon \$5 a gallon. Oil at \$100 a barrel. Yet America's offshore resources total more than 86 billion barrels of oil and 420 trillion cubic feet of natural gas, enough oil to replace imports from Saudi Arabia and Venezuela for the next 80 years. But the administration's moratorium says “no” to American oil and “yes” to OPEC.

We don't have to buy hundreds of billions of dollars worth of oil from OPEC, borrow \$900 billion from China, run a massive trade deficit or raise taxes. The revenues and leases from offshore exploration can bring up to \$3.7 trillion in Federal revenue to slash our deficit, build clean power plants, clean up our air and water, increase renewables, and rebuild our crumbling highways and bridges—all while creating millions of jobs and trillions in economic output.

I hope my colleagues will join me as I reintroduce the bipartisan American Conservation and Clean Energy Independence Act so we can work on securing America's prosperity and American jobs using American resources.

Stop talking; start building.

VOTE “NO” ON REPEALING THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

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

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak against the reckless attempt to repeal the Affordable Care Act.

The new law has already put in place critical protections to help our families across this country. I want to tell the story of one family in my district whose life has been dramatically helped by this law, the Strong family of Santa Barbara.

Bill and Victoria Strong's daughter, Gwendolyn, was diagnosed at age 6

months with a rare disease, muscular spinal atrophy. Her care is extremely expensive; and before the new law, the Strong's lived in constant fear that Gwendolyn would reach her policy's lifetime limit, no longer be covered for treatments and be uninsurable because of her pre-existing condition.

The elimination of lifetime caps has given the Strong's peace of mind. They are guaranteed Gwendolyn will receive the care she needs and their family is protected from bankruptcy.

Repealing these safeguards will take that security away. It would put this courageous little girl at risk of having her health care cut off when she needs it most and it would put this inspiring family at risk of bankruptcy.

I urge my colleagues to stand for all those who are benefiting from the law, as the Strong family is. Vote “no” on repealing the Affordable Care Act.

□ 1010

ROADMAP TO ECONOMIC RECOVERY

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, while this is my first opportunity to address the House, it won't be my last. The people of eastern and southeastern Ohio sent me here to be their voice, and I intend to be that voice. On their behalf, I will speak out—loud and clear—on the issues that matter to the working people of my district.

People sent me here for one primary reason: They think Congress has lost its way. And my constituents gave me a map they want us to use to get back on the right path. It's a simple map, drawn in bold, unmistakable strokes. Americans want us to be true to our founding principles, and the roads are open for all. But there are no shortcuts for special interests.

But, most of all, this roadmap was made in America and paid for upfront. That's how our spending must be. We owe it to taxpayers to disclose what our votes will cost and be clear about how they're paid for.

And, finally, Mr. Speaker, the map my citizens gave me leads in one very clear direction—toward economic recovery for every American. That's the way I'm headed. And I will cast my votes here with that in mind.

HEALTH CARE REPEAL AND IMPACT ON JOBS

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

Mr. BACA. All throughout Congress, the Republicans consistently asked, “Where are the jobs?” They asked this last year. Yet in their first major action, the House Republicans are showing their true colors: playing politics at the expense of hardworking Americans.

Under the Republican plan to repeal health reform, small businesses will not be able to receive \$40 billion in tax credits that will allow them to cover employees; insurance premiums will continue to rise, forcing businesses to cut benefits and lay off employees; and they will add to the deficit, exploding it to \$1 trillion over the next 20 years, creating more uncertainty in our economy.

Instead of serving hardworking American families, Republicans would rather have American small businesses serve greedy health insurance companies. Republicans are proving yet again that they are indeed the party of “no”—no relief, no health care, no jobs.

I urge my colleagues to stand with American small businesses and workers and resist any attempt to repeal health reform.

HOLD ON TO THE CONSTITUTION

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

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, in a few moments, the United States Constitution will be read for the first time in a long time in this Chamber. And I, for one, Mr. Speaker, am glad to see this welcomed day come.

I know there are those that will dismiss it as symbolic. But I remember the words of Daniel Webster when he said, “Hold on, my friends, to the Constitution and to the Republic for which it stands. Miracles do not cluster, and what has happened once in 6,000 years may never happen again. Hold on to the Constitution, for if the American Constitution should fail, there will be anarchy throughout the world.”

Mr. Speaker, I hope, as we go forward in this new Congress, that we will all hold Mr. Webster’s words in our hearts.

DON’T TAMPER WITH HIGHWAY TRUST FUND

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

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, despite repeated warnings yesterday from groups as diverse as the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the Ironworkers, the Laborers, the American Trucking Association, even the Motorcycle Riders of America, Republicans adopted a new rule which allows Congress to tamper with the transportation authorization fund and the highway trust fund. And despite the protests from the majority that it wasn’t doing it, yesterday, UBS-PaineWebber put out a stock advisory that transportation construction companies were being downgraded because of the damage that the Congress did yesterday.

Mr. Speaker, the transportation and construction sector of our country is in a depression. There is 25 percent unemployment. The last thing this country needs is to tamper with the highway

trust fund. And yesterday, that’s what the new majority did.

The Democrats will fight to restore the transportation authorization fund, make sure that America has the transportation system that it needs, and get people back to work in the hardest-hit sector in the American economy.

TIME TO GET TO WORK FOR THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

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

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, yesterday we began a very important new chapter in the history of this great Nation as we began the 112th Congress. I was so proud to join so many of our new Members in taking the oath of office. The enthusiasm and the commitment that was shown by our new colleagues, as well as those of us who were honored enough to be re-elected, to take on the great challenges facing our Nation, I think, will be remembered as a historic pivot for our country.

The Constitution, which we will soon read here on the floor of the House, states that one of the primary purposes of the Federal Government is to “preserve the blessings of liberty for ourselves and our posterity.” For far too long, the Federal Government has been mortgaging those blessings for our prosperity by burying them under a mountain of debt. And that must end.

We have a responsibility, Mr. Speaker, to make the tough decisions to cut spending, to eliminate the Federal deficit and begin to pay down the immense debt that threatens the opportunities that will be available for our children and our grandchildren. Our work will be difficult but it must be done. Let us all face up to these challenges and get to work.

TAKING THE OPPOSITE APPROACH

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

Mr. WALZ of Minnesota. Yesterday a new Congress was sworn into office, and just like the one before it, a top priority is to get our economy moving in the right direction. I’m profoundly disappointed, though, that the new majority of the Republicans has decided to take the opposite approach: skyrocketing the debt, denying rights, and making sure we kill jobs.

Seniors in my district now have access to better preventative care and help with paying for expensive drugs. Americans who have worked long and hard throughout their life have earned that peace of mind. Young people in my district are now being put back on their parents’ insurance after being denied for preexisting conditions. Repealing the health care bill will take those benefits away, will kill jobs, will sky-

rocket the debt, and will ensure that insurance company CEOs make health decisions for you, not you and your doctor.

Many of you may know I represent the world-famous Mayo Clinic in my district. They provide the highest quality patient-centered and affordable care the world has ever known, and I would like to leave you with a short quote they put out right before we voted on the health care bill last year: “Reforming health care in America is essential. The status quo is not sustainable.”

MILLARD SOUTH HIGH SCHOOL

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

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday afternoon a suspended student at Millard South High School in suburban Omaha opened fire. Assistant Principal Vicki Kaspar was killed, and Principal Curtis Case remains in serious condition. After fleeing the school, the student killed himself.

This morning Nebraska has been blanketed by a profound wave of shock and sorrow. My heart goes out to the victims and their families and the innocent schoolchildren whose first day back at school was shattered by this nightmarish act. Today school is closed as counselors begin to help the community to try to cope and make sense out of what can be considered a senseless act of violence.

I ask for this body’s thoughts and prayers, Mr. Speaker, to be with those students and teachers, their families, and all members of the Millard South community in the aftermath of this horrific tragedy.

REJECTING REPEAL OF AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of my constituent, David Zoltan-Breiger, 33 years old, who now has coverage under Illinois’ Pre-Existing Condition Plan thanks to the Affordable Care Act.

David has diabetes. Because of his preexisting condition, he couldn’t get insurance for over 2 years after losing his job. David is absolutely elated that he no longer has to wait for hours in the emergency room to get lifesaving insulin. Without coverage, the ER was his only option. Instead, he now has regular visits with the doctor and can avoid the medical crises that had become a frequent nightmare.

What happens to David under repeal of the bill? He, like so many others, would lose coverage and once again be at the mercy of insurance companies.

We cannot go back. We must reject the Republican call for repeal of the Affordable Care Act.

□ 1020

THE TRAGEDY AT MILLARD SOUTH

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

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I want to follow up with my colleague JEFF FORTENBERRY's thoughts.

The school in my district, Millard South, endured the ultimate tragedy when a student, who was suspended, returned with a gun. He walked into the assistant principal's office and shot her. Ms. Kaspar later died.

My profound sorrow of this incident—the ultimate parents' nightmare. My kids attend that school district; so we were getting the call about the lockdown. I don't think there is anything more disturbing to a parent anywhere than when the veil of safety of a school has been pierced by such violence.

The principal, who was also shot, is going to survive. He is also a neighbor of ours, and so I am glad that he will be fine.

I ask this floor and our colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join the Omaha community in expressing the depth of our sorrows. I ask for your prayers for not only the students of that school but for all of the teachers, for the family of the assistant principal who died, and for the principal who is fighting for his life right now. I appreciate everyone's concern.

THE HYPOCRISY OF THE ELIMINATION OF PAYGO

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

Mr. MORAN. Horrible tragedies like that cited by the two previous speakers remind us that there are simply too many guns too readily available to too many children. It has got to stop.

On a very different subject, though, Mr. Speaker, when Ronald Reagan ran for President, he said that any President who does not submit a balanced budget should be impeached. He never did balance a budget. In fact, the only times that our budget has been balanced was during the Clinton administration as a result of what is called PAYGO—that you don't increase spending without increasing a concomitant amount of revenue; and you don't cut taxes without immediately cutting the same amount of spending. That worked. We had three successive years of budget surpluses, and we passed on a \$5.6 trillion projected surplus to the Bush administration.

Yet, as soon as the new Republican Congress came in at the beginning of the 21st century, they eliminated PAYGO. Two wars, two deep tax cuts and a massive expansion of Medicare were never paid for. As a result, we had a \$9 trillion fiscal reversal. When the

Democrats came back in, we reinstated it; but yesterday the new Republican Congress exempted \$5 trillion from PAYGO—\$4 trillion of unpaid-for tax cuts and \$1.3 trillion of savings we could have gotten from health care reform.

It is the height of hypocrisy and deeply disappointing.

THE 14TH AMENDMENT OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES

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

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I first want to extend the sympathies of Colorado and of the Representatives to our friends from Nebraska. We suffered the Columbine tragedy a number of years ago, so we definitely understand how painful something like this is.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose for me rising today is to talk about what has been given to this country in the form of the Constitution, particularly in the 14th Amendment.

I would say to my friend from Texas, "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."

Until we passed that affordable health care act, people with pre-existing conditions were being denied equal protection of the laws. We passed that. They now have freedom from discrimination. Yet my friends on the Republican side of the aisle want to take away that freedom. That's wrong. That's wrong for people in my district and for millions of people across the country because they, their kids, their families, and their friends have different physical conditions that require attention and must be covered and not discriminated against.

THE SUPREME COURT NEEDS A LESSON

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, in a few minutes, we are going to have the reading of the United States Constitution—a show for the American public—for anybody who knows anything about constitutional law knows that it is up to nine men and women as to what the Constitution says.

When the Constitution was originally drafted—and I love it and I defend it—it didn't give women the right to vote, and it said slavery was permissible. Until the vilified Warren Court, in its correct decision in Brown v. Board of Education, it said separate was equal, and we knew it wasn't. African Americans were held back with Jim Crow laws.

Five people on the Supreme Court, not the whole nine, can make decisions that change the way the Constitution is interpreted.

Bush v. Gore, an abomination of a case that determined the Presidency for 8 years and took away States' rights. The Citizens United case funded the opposition that turned in the majority that the Republicans now have.

Making corporations the equal of people and putting money into politics poisoned the political system. The Supreme Court should read the Constitution. They need a lesson.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under clause 7(b) of rule XX, the Chair confers recognition for that purpose.

A call of the House was ordered.

The call was taken by electronic device, and the following Members responded to their names:

[Roll No. 7]

Ackerman	Cardoza	Edwards
Adams	Carnahan	Ellison
Aderholt	Carney	Ellmers
Akin	Carson (IN)	Emerson
Alexander	Carter	Engel
Altmire	Cassidy	Eshoo
Amash	Castor (FL)	Farenthold
Andrews	Chabot	Farr
Austria	Chaffetz	Fattah
Baca	Chandler	Finler
Bachus	Chu	Fincher
Baldwin	Cicilline	Flake
Barletta	Clarke (MI)	Fleischmann
Barrow	Clay	Fleming
Bartlett	Cleaver	Flores
Barton (TX)	Clyburn	Forbes
Bass (CA)	Coble	Fortenberry
Bass (NH)	Coffman (CO)	Fox
Becerra	Cohen	Franks (AZ)
Benishek	Conaway	Frelinghuysen
Berg	Connolly (VA)	Fudge
Berkley	Cooper	Galleghy
Berman	Costello	Garamendi
Biggert	Courtney	Gardner
Bishop (GA)	Cravaack	Garrett
Bishop (NY)	Crawford	Gerlach
Black	Crenshaw	Gibbs
Blackburn	Critz	Gibson
Blumenauer	Crowley	Giffords
Bonner	Cuellar	Gingrey (GA)
Bono Mack	Culberson	Gohmert
Boren	Cummings	Gonzalez
Boswell	Davis (CA)	Goodlatte
Boustany	Davis (IL)	Gosar
Brady (PA)	Davis (KY)	Gowdy
Brady (TX)	DeFazio	Granger
Braley (IA)	DeGette	Graves (GA)
Brooks	DeLauro	Graves (MO)
Brown (FL)	Denham	Green, Al
Buchanan	Dent	Green, Gene
Bucshon	DesJarlais	Griffin (AR)
Buerkle	Deutch	Griffith (VA)
Burgess	Diaz-Balart	Grimm
Burton (IN)	Dicks	Guinta
Butterfield	Dingell	Guthrie
Calvert	Doggett	Gutierrez
Camp	Dold	Hall
Campbell	Donnelly (IN)	Hanabusa
Canseco	Doyle	Harman
Cantor	Dreier	Harper
Capito	Duffy	Harris
Capps	Duncan (SC)	Hartzler
Capuano	Duncan (TN)	

Hastings (FL)	McClintock	Ryunyan
Hastings (WA)	McCollum	Ruppersberger
Hayworth	McCotter	Rush
Heck	McDermott	Ryan (OH)
Heinrich	McGovern	Ryan (WI)
Heller	McHenry	Sánchez, Linda
Hensarling	McIntyre	T.
Herger	McKeon	Sanchez, Loretta
Higgins	McKinley	Sarbanes
Himes	McMorriss	Scalise
Hinojosa	Rodgers	Schakowsky
Hirono	McNerney	Schiff
Holt	Meehan	Schilling
Honda	Meeks	Schmidt
Hoyer	Mica	Schock
Huelskamp	Michaud	Schrader
Huizenga (MI)	Miller (FL)	Schwartz
Hultgren	Miller (MI)	Schweikert
Hunter	Miller (NC)	Scott (SC)
Hurt	Miller, Gary	Scott (VA)
Inslee	Miller, George	Scott, Austin
Israel	Moran	Scott, David
Issa	Mulvaney	Sensenbrenner
Jackson (IL)	Murphy (CT)	Serrano
Jackson Lee	Murphy (PA)	Sewell
(TX)	Myrick	Sherman
Jenkins	Nadler	Shimkus
Johnson (GA)	Napolitano	Shuler
Johnson (IL)	Neugebauer	Simpson
Johnson (OH)	Noem	Sires
Johnson, E. B.	Nugent	Slaughter
Johnson, Sam	Nunes	Smith (NE)
Jones	Nunnelee	Smith (NJ)
Jordan	Olson	Smith (TX)
Kaptur	Olver	Southerland
Keating	Owens	Speier
Kelly	Palazzo	Stearns
Kildee	Pallone	Stivers
Kind	Pascrell	Stutzman
King (IA)	Pastor (AZ)	Sullivan
King (NY)	Paul	Sutton
Kingston	Paulsen	Terry
Kinzinger (IL)	Payne	Thompson (CA)
Kissell	Pearce	Thompson (MS)
Kline	Pelosi	Thompson (PA)
Kucinich	Pence	Thornberry
Labrador	Perlmutter	Tiberi
Lamborn	Peters	Tierney
Lance	Peterson	Tipton
Landry	Petri	Tonko
Langevin	Pingree (ME)	Towns
Lankford	Pitts	Tsongas
Larsen (WA)	Platts	Turner
Larson (CT)	Poe (TX)	Upton
Latham	Polis	Van Hollen
LaTourette	Pompeo	Velázquez
Latta	Posey	Visclosky
Lee (CA)	Price (GA)	Walberg
Lee (NY)	Price (NC)	Walden
Levin	Quayle	Walsh (IL)
Lewis (CA)	Quigley	Walz (MN)
Lewis (GA)	Rahall	Wasserman
Lipinski	Rangel	Schultz
LoBiondo	Reed	Watt
Loeb sack	Rehberg	Waxman
Lofgren, Zoe	Reichert	Webster
Long	Renacci	Weiner
Lowey	Ribble	Welch
Lucas	Richardson	West
Luetkemeyer	Richmond	Westmoreland
Luján	Rigell	Whitfield
Lummis	Rivera	Wilson (FL)
Lungren, Daniel	Roby	Wilson (SC)
E.	Roe (TN)	Wittman
Lynch	Rogers (MI)	Wolf
Mack	Rohrabacher	Womack
Maloney	Rokita	Woodall
Manzullo	Rooney	Woolsey
Marino	Roskam	Wu
Matheson	Ross (AR)	Yarmuth
Matsui	Ross (FL)	Yoder
McCarthy (CA)	Rothman (NJ)	Young (FL)
McCarthy (NY)	Roybal-Allard	Young (IN)
McCaull	Royce	

SWEARING IN OF MEMBER

The SPEAKER (during the call). While the call of the House will continue and Members are coming to record their presence, it is the intention of the Chair to administer the oath of office to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO appeared at the bar of the House, and the Speaker administered the oath of office to him as follows:

Do you solemnly swear or affirm that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter, so help you God.

Congratulations.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. Under clause 5(d) of rule XX, the Chair announces to the House that, in light of the administration of the oath to the gentleman from Oregon, the whole number of the House is 435.

The call of the House will continue.

□ 1054

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this rollcall, 404 Members have recorded their presence.

A quorum is present.

READING OF THE CONSTITUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 5(a) of House Resolution 5, the Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) for the reading of the Constitution.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind all Members that they should not traffic the well while Members are under recognition.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may inquire.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, we appreciate the leadership shown to bring this document for reading today; but I do want to inquire of the Chair and perhaps the gentleman who is the author of this effort today, Mr. GOODLATTE. The language, as I understand it, that we will be reading today does not include some of the original language of the Constitution of the United States. On multiple occasions amendments have purported to change some of the intent of the original document.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman have a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. INSLEE. I do have. My parliamentary inquiry is, will we be reading the entire original document without deletion, or will we be reading a document with deletions that may or may not have been accomplished by respective amendments?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 5(a) of House Resolution 5, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia to read the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. INSLEE. And may I inquire of the gentleman, if I may inquire before we start this process, if he would explain to us so that we will all be on the same page.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not recognized for that purpose.

Mr. INSLEE. I ask unanimous consent to ask the gentleman to yield for a question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia is not recognized for debate. This is not a debate.

Mr. INSLEE. I will wait till Mr. GOODLATTE is recognized, and I will ask him to yield so we can have clarity of this.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for the reading of the Constitution, not for debate.

Mr. INSLEE. If I may ask unanimous consent to ask Mr. GOODLATTE to yield for just a question so we all understand the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Washington have a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. INSLEE. Yes. My parliamentary inquiry is, may I ask the gentleman to yield for 30 seconds to ask a question of the derivation of this language that we will all be reading in good faith and in good spirits today?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is not in order at this point.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, as a part of the opening remarks, I will explain and I hope answer the question of the gentleman from Washington.

This morning, for the first time in the history of the House of Representatives, we will read aloud the full text of the Constitution of the United States. We hope this will inspire many more Americans to read the Constitution.

The text we are reading today reflects the changes to the document made by the 27 amendments to it. Those portions superseded by amendment will not be read.

In order to ensure fairness for all those interested in participating, we have asked Members to line up on a first-come first-served basis. I will recognize Members based on this guidance.

In order to ensure relative parity and fairness, I may recognize Members out of order to ensure bipartisanship and balance. Two Members, one from each party, will be recognized out of order. Each Member will approach the podium and read the passage laid out for him or her.

The Speaker and two members of the leadership of each party will begin the reading, and then I will recognize Members in order. I thank the Members of both parties in advance for their participation in this historic event.

□ 1100

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Chairman, a point of parliamentary procedure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may inquire.

Mr. HONDA. Now that the process has started, would the gentleman from

Washington's original question about parliamentary procedure be in order at this time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In light of the modicum of debate by the gentleman from Virginia, that would be appropriate.

Mr. INSLEE. If I may make a unanimous consent to ask Mr. GOODLATTE a question so that we all do understand the nature of the language that we will be reading today, I think it would be very helpful to us on a bipartisan basis.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Virginia may yield for that purpose.

Mr. INSLEE. I thank the Speaker.

Mr. GOODLATTE, could you explain to us the decision-making process about which language to read today?

And the reason I ask is, through our American history, we have had a series of amendments that were intended to change the original document, but the amendments do not make specific deletions to specific language in the original document, and it has been up to us to ascertain the intent of the amendments to figure out which language is operative or not. But the language has not specifically been deleted by the amendment, so it could be subject to some interpretation of which language really has been removed and which has not.

So I think it would be helpful to the Members if you explain to us how the determinations of what to read have been made or not made so that we will all be on the same page as to congressional intent.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I thank the gentleman for his question.

We have consulted with the Congressional Research Service of the Library of Congress. The Library of Congress actually maintains a copy of the Constitution which includes those sections that have been superseded by amendment. So we are not reading those sections that have been superseded by amendment. And we have arrived at that determination based upon our consultation with the Congressional Research Service.

Mr. INSLEE. And would the gentleman accept the premise that since we have not been able to review the exact language we will be reading today—I will wait for a moment, Mr. Speaker. We do want to have a good bipartisan success here today, and this is a special moment for us all.

So I guess the question is: I take it that since we have not had discussion about which language to read or not, that this is not intended to create any statement of congressional intent about the language but, rather, to do our best to have a moment of comity to read the language as best as we can ascertain it. Is that correct?

Mr. GOODLATTE. I think the gentleman has stated that very well.

Mr. INSLEE. I thank you. And I very much appreciate your leadership in bringing this to our attention today.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, if I may ask unanimous consent to address Mr. GOODLATTE.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Virginia yield for that purpose?

Mr. GOODLATTE. I yield to the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized. There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. I thank the gentleman for his kindness.

Let me first begin by saying that I think every Member of this body is approaching the reading of their Constitution with the most sacred possible spirit in what is clearly an unprecedented moment in the history of the Congress of the United States. And I don't take it lightly when my colleague or when others, before we begin the reading of our sacred document, are raising questions about what we would be specifically reading, what specifically will be redacted based upon amendments or based upon the recommendations of Libraries of Congress.

But I also want to be very clear, Mr. Speaker and Mr. GOODLATTE, I recognize that this is a request, that in reading those redacted—and this is very emotional for me. This is very emotional, I know, for a number of Members, given the struggle—and I am not trying to give a shot at the process. Mr. GOODLATTE knows me and he knows the spirit in which I'm approaching this—given the struggle of African Americans, given the struggle of women, given the struggles of others to create a more perfect document, while not perfect, a more perfect document, to hear that those elements of the Constitution that have been redacted by amendment are no less serious, no less part of our ongoing struggle to improve the country and to make the country better, and our sense in our struggle and whom we are at the Congress of the United States at this point in American history and our desire to continue to improve the Constitution, many of us don't want that to be lost upon the reading of our sacred document.

So with that said, I thank the gentleman for yielding. And I just wanted to indicate that this is done with sincerity. It is not done to take a shot at the idea of reading the Constitution. But certainly, when we were informed, for example, that the three-fifths clause would not be mentioned and that other elements of the Constitution which justify why some of us fight for programs in the Congress will not be written in the redacted version, it is of consequence to whom we are.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I thank the gentleman for his comments, and I take them very much to heart as has our leadership.

In fact, in recognition of the gentleman's concern, I mentioned in my comments that only two Members would be recognized out of order to read sections. One is the gentleman from Texas

(Mr. SMITH), the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, who will read the first article of section 3 dealing with the judiciary. The other is the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS), who many regard as the foremost advocate for civil rights in the Congress, he will read the 13th Amendment. In that regard, we hope to address the concern that you raised.

Mr. GOHMERT of Texas. Mr. Speaker, if I may ask unanimous consent to address the gentleman from Virginia.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman yield for that purpose?

Mr. GOODLATTE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized. There was no objection.

Mr. GOHMERT. Out of the same deference and respect for this document that we revere, I think it is important that we use the language of the Constitution itself. They are not deletions; they are amendments. And, in that respect, we go by the "amended" document, not by the "deleted" document. There are too many that have fought and died for those amendments to call them deletions.

Mr. GOODLATTE. It is an amended document. We are going to read the document as amended.

I thank the members of both parties in advance for their participation in this historic event, and I thank the leadership and Members for providing for this reading in the rules of the House.

It is now my distinct honor to yield to the Speaker of the House to begin the reading.

Mr. BOEHNER. "We the People, of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the minority leader, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. "Article I, section 1: All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the majority leader, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR).

Mr. CANTOR. Article I, section 2: "The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

"No person shall be a Representative who shall not have attained to the age of 25 years and been 7 years a citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, be an inhabitant of that State in which he shall be chosen.

"The actual enumeration shall be made within 3 years after the first meeting of the Congress of the United States, and within every subsequent term of 10 years, in such manner as they shall by law direct."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the minority whip, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Article I, continuation of section 2: "The number of Representatives shall not exceed one for every 30,000, but each State shall have at least one Representative; and until such enumeration shall be made, the State of New Hampshire shall be entitled to choose three, Massachusetts eight, Rhode Island and Providence Plantations one, Connecticut five, New York six, New Jersey four, Pennsylvania eight, Delaware one, Maryland six, Virginia ten, North Carolina five, South Carolina five, and Georgia three.

"When vacancies happen in the representation from any State, the executive authority thereof shall issue writs of election to fill such vacancies.

"The House of Representatives shall choose their Speaker and other officers, and shall have the sole power of impeachment."

□ 1110

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from California, the majority whip, Mr. MCCARTHY.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Article I, section 3: "The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State for 6 years; and each Senator shall have one vote."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ROTHMAN).

Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey. "Immediately after they shall be assembled in consequence of the first election, they shall be divided as equally as may be into three classes. The seats of the Senators of the first class shall be vacated at the expiration of the second year, of the second class at the expiration of the fourth year, and of the third class at the expiration of the sixth year, so that one-third may be chosen every second year."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY).

Mr. CONAWAY. "No person shall be a Senator who shall not have attained to the age of 30 years and been 9 years a citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, be an inhabitant of that State for which he shall be chosen."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT).

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. "The Vice President of the United States shall be President of the Senate, but shall not have no vote, unless they be equally divided. The Senate shall choose their other officers, and also a President pro tempore, in the absence of the Vice President, or when he shall exercise the office of President of the United States."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

Mr. WALBERG. "The Senate shall have the sole power to try all impeachments. When sitting for that purpose, they shall be on oath or affirmation. When the President of the United States is tried, the Chief Justice shall preside, and no person shall be convicted without the concurrence of two-thirds of the Members present."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CRITZ).

Mr. CRITZ. "Judgment in cases of impeachment shall not extend further than to removal from office, and disqualification to hold and enjoy any office of honor, trust or profit under the United States; but the party convicted shall nevertheless be liable and subject to indictment, trial, judgment and punishment, according to law."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

Mr. POE of Texas. Section 4: "The times, places and manner of the holding of elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations except as to the place of choosing Senators."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER).

Mr. WEINER. Section 5: "Each House shall be the judge of the elections, returns and qualifications of its own Members, and a majority of each shall constitute a quorum to do business; but a smaller number may adjourn from day to day and may be authorized to compel the attendance of absent Members in such manner and under such penalties as each House may provide."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WOMACK).

Mr. WOMACK. "Each House may determine the rules of its proceedings, punish its Members for disorderly behavior and, with the concurrence of two-thirds, expel a Member."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS).

Ms. EDWARDS. "Each House shall keep a Journal of its proceedings and from time to time publish the same, excepting such parts as may in their judgment require secrecy; and the yeas and nays of the Members of either House on any question shall, at the discretion of one-fifth of those present, be entered on the Journal."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER).

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. "Neither House during the session of Congress shall, without the consent of the other, adjourn for more than 3 days nor to any other place than that in which the two Houses shall be sitting."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Section 6: "The Senators and Representatives shall receive a compensation for their services to be ascertained by law and paid out of the Treasury of the United States. They shall in all cases, except treason, felony and breach of the peace, be privileged from arrest during their attendance at the session of their respective Houses and in going to and returning from the same; and for any speech or debate in either House, they shall not be questioned in any other place."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS).

Mr. PITTS. "No Senator or Representative shall during the time for which he was elected be appointed to any civil office under the authority of the United States which shall have been created or the emoluments whereof shall have been increased during such time; and no person holding any office under the United States shall be a Member of either House during his continuance in office."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Section 7: "All bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives; but the Senate may propose or concur with amendments as on other bills."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON).

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. "Every bill which shall have passed the House of Representatives and the Senate shall, before it become a law, be presented to the President of the United States. If he approve he shall sign it, but if not he shall return it, with his objections to that House in which it shall have originated who shall enter the objections at large on their Journal, and proceed to reconsider it."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN).

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. "If after such consideration two-thirds of that House shall agree to pass the bill, it shall be sent together with the objections to the other House by which it shall likewise be reconsidered, and if approved by two-thirds of that House, it shall become a law."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. GOWDY).

Mr. GOWDY. "But in all such cases the votes of both Houses shall be determined by yeas and nays, and the names of the persons voting for and against the bill shall be entered on the Journal of each House respectively."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from California (Mrs. DAVIS).

Mrs. DAVIS of California. "If any such bill shall not be returned by the President within 10 days, Sundays excepted, after it shall have been presented to him, the same shall be a law

in like manner as if he had signed it, unless the Congress by their adjournment prevent its return, in which case it shall not be a law.”

□ 1120

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LoBIONDO).

Mr. LoBIONDO. “Every order, resolution, or vote to which the concurrence of the Senate and House of Representatives may be necessary (except on a question of adjournment) shall be presented to the President of the United States; and before the same shall take effect, shall be approved by him, or being disapproved by him, shall be re-passed by two-thirds of the Senate and House of Representatives, according to the rules and limitations prescribed in the case of a bill.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

Mr. LANGEVIN. Section 8: “The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE).

Mr. LANCE. “To borrow money on the credit of the United States; to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes; to establish a uniform rule of naturalization, and uniform laws on the subject of bankruptcies throughout the United States.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. “To coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin, and fix the standard of weights and measures; to provide for the punishment of counterfeiting the securities and current coin of the United States; to establish post offices and post roads.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

Mr. HENSARLING. “To promote the progress of science and useful arts, by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE).

Mr. INSLEE. “To constitute tribunals inferior to the Supreme Court; to define and punish piracies and felonies committed on the high seas, and offenses against the law of nations.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. “To declare war, grant letters of marque

and reprisal, and make rules concerning captures on land and water; to raise and support armies, but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than two years.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

Mr. HOLT. “To provide and maintain a navy; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; to provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections and repel invasions.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CANSECO).

Mr. CANSECO. “To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the militia, and for governing such part of them as may be employed in the service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively, the appointment of the officers, and the authority of training the militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. “To exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever, over such district (not exceeding 10 miles square) as may, by cession of particular States, and the acceptance of Congress, become the seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like authority over all places purchased by the consent of the legislature of the State in which the same shall be, for the erection of forts, magazines, arsenals, dockyards, and other needful buildings.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEST).

Mr. WEST. “And to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING).

Mr. KEATING. Section 9: “The migration or importation of such persons as any of the States now existing shall think proper to admit, shall not be prohibited by the Congress prior to the year 1808, but a tax or duty may be imposed on such importation, not exceeding 10 dollars for each person.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK).

Mrs. BLACK. “The privilege of the writ of habeas corpus shall not be suspended, unless when in cases of rebellion or invasion the public safety may require it. No bill of attainder or ex post facto law shall be passed.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER).

Mr. PERLMUTTER. “No capitation, or other direct, tax shall be laid, unless in proportion to the census or enumeration herein before directed to be taken. No tax or duty shall be laid on articles exported from any State.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Washington (Ms. McMORRIS RODGERS).

Ms. McMORRIS RODGERS. “No preference shall be given by any regulation of commerce or revenue to the ports of one State over those of another; nor shall vessels bound to, or from, one State, be obliged to enter, clear, or pay duties in another.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA).

Mr. HONDA. “No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law; and a regular statement and account of the receipts and expenditures of all public money shall be published from time to time.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER).

Mr. GARDNER. “No title of nobility shall be granted by the United States, and no person holding any office of profit or trust under them, shall, without the consent of the Congress, accept of any present, emolument, office, or title, of any kind whatever, from any king, prince, or foreign State.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ).

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. “No State shall enter into any treaty, alliance, or confederation; grant letters of marque and reprisal; coin money; emit bills of credit; make any thing but gold and silver coin a tender in payment of debts; pass any bill of attainder, ex post facto law, or law impairing the obligation of contracts, or grant any title of nobility.”

□ 1130

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. POMPEO).

Mr. POMPEO. “No State shall, without the consent of Congress, lay any imposts or duties on imports or exports, except what may be absolutely necessary for executing its inspections laws; and the net produce of all duties and imposts, laid by any State on imports or exports shall be for the use of the Treasury of the United States; and all such laws shall be subject to the revision and control of the Congress.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

Mr. RANGEL. “No State shall, without the consent of Congress, lay any duty of tonnage, keep troops, or ships of war in time of peace, enter into any agreement or compact with another State, or with a foreign power, or engage in war, unless actually invaded, or in such imminent danger as will not admit of delay.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from New York (Ms. HAYWORTH).

Ms. HAYWORTH. Article II, section 1: “The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America. He shall hold his office during a term of 4 years and together with

the Vice-President chosen for the same term, be elected as follows:"

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE).

Mr. PAYNE. "Each State shall appoint, in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct, a number of electors, equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress; but no Senator or Representative or person holding an office of trust or profit under United States shall be appointed an elector."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. "The Congress may determine the time of choosing the electors and the day on which they shall give their votes, which days shall be the same throughout the United States."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

Mr. PALLONE. "No person except a natural born citizen, or a citizen of the United States at the time of the adoption of this Constitution, shall be eligible to the office of President."

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

The Chair notes a disturbance in the gallery in contravention of the law and rules of the House. The Sergeant at Arms will remove those persons responsible for the disturbance and restore order in the gallery.

The gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PALLONE. "Neither shall any person be eligible to that office who shall not have attained to the age of 35 years and been 14 years a resident within the United States."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GRIFFITH).

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. "The President shall, at stated times, receive for his services a compensation, which shall neither be increased nor diminished during the period for which he shall have been elected, and he shall not receive within that period any other emolument from the United States, or any of them."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. RICHARDSON).

Ms. RICHARDSON. "Before he enter on the execution of his office, he shall take the following oath or affirmation: I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will faithfully execute the Office of the President of the United States and will to the best of my ability preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTI).

Mr. LATTI. Section 2: "The President shall be Commander in Chief of

the Army and Navy of the United States and of the militia of the several States when called into the actual service to the United States; he may require the opinion in writing of the principal officer in each of the executive departments, upon any subject relating to the duties of the respective offices, and he shall have the power to grant reprieves and pardons for offenses against the United States, except in cases of impeachment."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. "He shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur, and he shall nominate, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, judges of the Supreme Court, and all other officers of the United States, whose appointments are not herein otherwise provided for, and which shall be established by law."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY).

Mr. CASSIDY. "But the Congress may by law vest the appointment of such inferior officers as they think proper, and the President alone, in the courts of law, or in the heads of departments."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE).

Ms. DEGETTE. "The President shall have power to fill up all vacancies that may happen during the recess of the Senate, by granting commissions which shall expire at the end of their next session."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Section 3: "He shall from time to time give the Congress information of the state of the Union and recommend to their consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient; he may, on extraordinary occasions, convene both Houses, or either of them, and in case of disagreement between them."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. "With respect to the time of adjournment, he may adjourn them to such time as he shall think proper; he shall receive ambassadors and other public ministers; he shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed and shall commission all the officers of the United States."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT).

Mr. CHABOT. "The President, Vice-President, and all civil officers of the United States shall be removed from office on impeachment for, and conviction of, treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH), the chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. "The judicial power of the United States shall be vested in one Supreme Court and in such inferior courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish. The judges, both of the Supreme and inferior courts, shall hold their offices during good behavior and shall, at stated times, receive for their services a compensation, which shall not be diminished during their continuance in office."

□ 1140

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Section 2: "The judicial power shall extend to all cases, in law and equity, arising under this Constitution, the laws of the United States, and treaties made, or which shall be made, under their authority, to all cases affecting ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, to all cases of admiralty and maritime jurisdiction."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD).

Mr. FARENTHOLD. "To controversies to which the United States shall be a party, to controversies between two or more States, between a State and citizens of another State, between citizens of different States, between citizens of the same State claiming lands under grants of different States, and between a State or the citizens thereof and foreign States, citizens or subjects."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY).

Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana. "In all cases affecting ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls and those in which a State shall be party, the Supreme Court shall have original jurisdiction. In all the other cases before mentioned, the Supreme Court shall have appellate jurisdiction, both as to law and fact, with such exceptions and under such regulations as the Congress shall make."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE).

Mr. PEARCE. "The trial of all crimes, except in cases of impeachment, shall be by jury and such trial shall be held in the State where the said crimes shall have been committed; but when not committed within any State, the trial shall be at such place or places as the Congress may by law have directed."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ALTMIRE).

Mr. ALTMIRE. Section 3: "Treason against the United States shall consist only in levying war against them or in adhering to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort. No person shall be convicted of treason unless on the testimony of two witnesses to the same overt act, or on confession in an open court."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER).

Mr. TURNER. "The Congress shall have power to declare the punishment of treason, but no attainder of treason shall work corruption of blood or forfeiture except during the life of the person attained."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CARNEY).

Mr. CARNEY. Article IV, section 1: "Full faith and credit shall be given in each State to the public acts, records, and judicial proceedings of every other State. And the Congress may by general laws prescribe the manner in which such acts, records and proceedings shall be proved, and the effect thereof."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HARRIS).

Mr. HARRIS. Section 2: "The citizens of each State shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

Mr. SCHIFF. "A person charged in any State with treason, felony, or other crime, who shall flee from justice and be found in another State, shall on demand of the executive authority of the State from which he fled be delivered up, to be removed to the State having jurisdiction of the crime."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GIBBS).

Mr. GIBBS. Section 3: "New States may be admitted by the Congress into this Union; but no new State shall be formed or erected within the jurisdiction of any other State; nor any State be formed by the junction of two or more States, or parts of States, without the consent of the legislatures of the States concerned as well as of the Congress."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. "The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to prejudice any claims of the United States, or of any particular State."

Mr. GOODLATTE. Section 4: "The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a Republic form of government, and shall protect each of them against invasion; and on application of the legislature, or of the executive (when the legislature cannot be convened) against domestic violence."

Article V: "The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, or, on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, shall call a convention for proposing amendments, which, in either case, shall be valid to all in-

tents and purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States . . ."

I now yield to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY).

Mr. FORTENBERRY. ". . . or by conventions in three-fourths thereof, as the one or the other mode of ratification may be proposed by the Congress provided that no amendment which may be made prior to the year 1808 shall in any manner affect the first and fourth clauses in the ninth section of the first article; and that no State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from California (Ms. MATSUI).

Ms. MATSUI. Article VI: "All debts contracted and engagements entered into before the adoption of this Constitution shall be as valid against the United States under this Constitution, as under the Confederation."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

Mr. GARRETT. "This Constitution and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof and all treaties made, or which shall be made under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, any thing in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. "The Senators and Representatives before mentioned, and the members of the several State legislatures, and all executive and judicial officers, both of the United States and of the several States, shall be bound by oath or affirmation to support this Constitution; but no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. Article VII: "The ratification of the conventions of nine States shall be sufficient for the establishment of this Constitution between the States so ratifying the same."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO).

Ms. HIRONO. "The word 'the' being interlined between the seventh and eighth lines of the first page; the word 'thirty' being partly written on an erasure in the 15th line of the first page; the words 'is tried' being interlined between the 32nd and 33rd lines of the first page; and the word 'the' being interlined between the 43rd and the 44th lines of the second page."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON).

Mr. TIPTON. "Done in convention by unanimous consent of the States

present the 17th day of September in the year of Our Lord 1787 and of the independence of the United States of America the 12th in witness whereof we have hereunto subscribed our names."

□ 1150

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now recognize the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CARNAHAN).

Mr. CARNAHAN. Signers of the Constitution. George Washington, President and Deputy from Virginia.

Delaware: George Read, Gunning Bedford, Jr., John Dickinson, Richard Bassett, Jacob Broom.

Maryland: James McHenry, Daniel of St. Thomas Jenifer, Daniel Carroll.

Virginia: John Blair, James Madison, Jr.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. From the State of North Carolina: William Blount, Richard Dobbs Spaight, Hugh Williamson.

From South Carolina: John Rutledge, Charles Cotesworth Pinckney, Charles Pinckney, Pierce Butler.

From Georgia: William Few, Abraham Baldwin.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT).

Mr. MCDERMOTT. New Hampshire: John Langdon, Nicholas Gilman.

Massachusetts: Nathaniel Gorham, Rufus King.

Connecticut: William Samuel Johnson, Roger Sherman.

New York: Alexander Hamilton.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. YODER).

Mr. YODER. New Jersey: William Livingston, David Brearley, William Paterson, Jonathan Dayton.

From Pennsylvania: Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Mifflin, Robert Morris, George Clymer, Thomas FitzSimons, Jared Ingersoll, James Wilson, and Gouverneur Morris.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

Mr. LEVIN. The Preamble to the Bill of Rights: "Congress of the United States, begun and held at the City of New York on Wednesday, the 4th of March 1789."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mrs. ROBY).

Mrs. ROBY. "The conventions of a number of the States, having at the time of their adopting the Constitution expressed a desire in order to prevent misconstruction or abuse of its powers, that further declaratory and restrictive clauses should be added, and as extending the ground of public confidence in the government will best ensure the beneficent ends of its institution."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. ROSS).

Mr. ROSS of Arkansas. "Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, two-thirds of both Houses concurring that the following articles be proposed to the legislatures of the several States, as

amendments to the Constitution of the United States . . .”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BONNER).

Mr. BONNER. “. . . all or any of which articles, when ratified by three-fourths of the said legislatures, to be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the said Constitution.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HANABUSA).

Ms. HANABUSA. “Articles in addition to, and Amendment of the Constitution of the United States of America, proposed by Congress, and ratified by the legislatures of the several States, pursuant to the 5th Article of the original Constitution.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. GIFFORDS).

Ms. GIFFORDS. The First Amendment: “Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the government for a redress of grievances.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. GUINTA).

Mr. GUINTA. The Second Amendment: “A well-regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

Mr. SHERMAN. The Third Amendment: “No soldier shall, in time of peace, be quartered in any house without the consent of the owner, nor in time of war, but in a manner to be prescribed by law.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. Amendment Four: “The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH).

Mr. LYNCH. The Fifth Amendment: “No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a grand jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the militia, when in actual service in time of war or public danger.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS).

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. “Nor shall any person be subject for the same offense to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against

himself; nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER).

□ 1200

Ms. SPEIER. The Sixth Amendment: “In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND).

Mr. WESTMORELAND. “And to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the assistance of counsel for his defense.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI).

Mr. LIPINSKI. Amendment Seven: “In suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed \$20, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved, no fact tried by a jury shall be otherwise reexamined in any court of the United States, than according to the rules of the common law.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES).

Mr. FLORES. Amendment Eight: “Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. WALZ).

Mr. WALZ of Minnesota. The Ninth Amendment: “The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. Amendment 10: “The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.”

I now yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. “The judicial power of the United States shall not be construed to extend to any suit in law or equity, commenced or prosecuted against one of the United States by citizens of another State, or by citizens or subjects of any foreign state.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GRAVES).

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Amendment 12: “The electors shall meet in their respective States, and vote by ballot for President and Vice President, one of whom, at least, shall not be an inhabitant of the same State with themselves; they shall name in their ballots the person voted for as President, and in distinct ballots the person voted for as Vice President.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. “And they shall make distinct lists of all persons voted for as President, and of all persons voted for as Vice President, and the number of votes for each, which lists they shall sign and certify, and transmit sealed to the seat of the government of the United States, directed to the President of the Senate.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. STUTZMAN).

Mr. STUTZMAN. “The President of the Senate shall, in presence of the Senate and House of Representatives, open all the certificates and the votes shall then be counted. The person having the greatest number of votes for President, shall be the President, if such number be a majority of the whole number of electors appointed; and if no person have such majority, then from the persons having the highest numbers not exceeding three on the list of those voted for as President.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. “The House of Representatives shall choose immediately, by ballot, President. But in choosing the President, the votes shall be taken by States, the representation from each State having one vote; a quorum for this purpose shall consist of a member or members from two-thirds of the States, and a majority of all the States shall be necessary to a choice.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOUTHERLAND).

Mr. SOUTHERLAND. “The person having the greatest number of votes as Vice President, shall be the Vice President, if such number be a majority of the whole number of electors appointed, and if no person have a majority, then from the two highest numbers on the list, the Senate shall choose the Vice President.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. CHU).

Ms. CHU. “A quorum for the purpose shall consist of two-thirds of the whole number of Senators, and a majority of the whole number shall be necessary to a choice. But no person constitutionally ineligible to the office of President shall be eligible to that of Vice President of the United States.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Amendment 13, section 1: “Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction.”

Section 2: “Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. RIGELL).

Mr. RIGELL. Amendment 14: "All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT).

Mr. WATT. "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."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN).

Mr. WITTMAN. Section 2: "Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each State, excluding Indians not taxed. But when the right to vote at any election for the choice of electors for President and Vice President of the United States, Representatives in Congress, the executive and judicial officers of a State, or the members of the Legislature thereof, is denied to any of the male inhabitants of such State, being 21 years of age, and citizens of the United States, or in any way abridged, except for participation in rebellion, or other crime, the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of male citizens 21 years of age in such State."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. CLARKE).

□ 1210

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Section 3: "No person shall be a Senator or Representative in Congress or elector of President or Vice President, or hold any office, civil or military, under the United States, or under any State, who, having previously taken an oath, as a Member of Congress, or as an officer of the United States or as a Member of any State legislature."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. ELLMERS).

Mrs. ELLMERS. "Or as an executive or judicial officer of any State, to support to the Constitution of the United States, shall have engaged in insurrection or rebellion against the same, or given aid or comfort to the enemies thereof. But Congress may by a vote of two-thirds of each House remove such disability."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL).

Mr. ISRAEL. Section 4: "The validity of the public debt of the United States, authorized by law, including debts incurred for payment of pensions and bounties for services in suppressing in-

urrection or rebellion shall not be questioned. But neither the United States nor any State shall assume or pay any debt or obligation incurred in aid of the insurrection or rebellion against the United States, or any claim for the loss or emancipation of any slave; but all such debts, obligations and claims shall be held illegal and void."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

Mr. GOSAR. Section 5: "The Congress shall have the power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article."

Amendment 15, Section 1: "The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Section 2: "The Congress shall have the power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

Amendment 16: "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."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON).

Mr. OLSON. Amendment 17: "The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, elected by the people thereof, for 6 years; and each Senator shall have one vote. The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. LARSEN).

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. "When vacancies happen in the representation of any State in the Senate, the executive authority of such State shall issue writs of election to fill such vacancies: provided that the legislature of any State may empower the executive thereof to make temporary appointments until the people fill the vacancies by election as the legislature may direct."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from New York, (Ms. BUERKLE).

Ms. BUERKLE. Amendment 19, passed by Congress June 4, 1919, ratified August 18, 1920: "The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

"Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCHWARTZ).

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Amendment 20: "The terms of the President and the

Vice President shall end at noon on the 20th day of January, and the terms of Senators and Representatives at noon on the third day of January of the years in which such terms would have ended if this article had not been ratified; and the terms of their successors shall then begin."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE).

Mr. SCALISE. Section 2: "The Congress shall assemble at least once in every year, and such meeting shall begin at noon on the third day of January, unless they shall by law appoint a different day."

Section 3: "If, at the time fixed for the beginning of the term of the President, the President elect shall have died, the Vice President elect shall become President."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN).

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. "If a President shall not have been chosen before the time fixed for the beginning of his term, or if the President elect shall have failed to qualify, then the Vice President elect shall act as President until a President shall have qualified; and the Congress may by law provide for the case wherein neither a President-elect nor a Vice President-elect shall have qualified, declaring who shall then act as President or the manner in which one who is to act shall be selected, and such person shall act accordingly until a President or Vice President shall have been qualified."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. HURT).

Mr. HURT. Section 4: "The Congress may by law provide for the case of the death of any of the persons from whom the House of Representatives may choose a President whenever the right of choice shall have devolved upon them and for the case of the death of any of the persons from whom the Senate may choose a Vice President whenever the right of choice shall have devolved upon them."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO).

Mr. SERRANO. Section 5: "Sections 1 and 2 shall take effect on the 15th day of October following the ratification of this article."

Section 6: "This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PLATTS).

Mr. PLATTS. Amendment 21, passed by Congress February 20, 1933, ratified December 5, 1933:

Section 1: "The 18th article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States is hereby repealed."

Section 2: "The transportation or importation into any State, Territory or

possession of the United States for delivery or use therein of intoxicating liquors, in violation of the laws thereof, is hereby prohibited.”

□ 1220

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. SCHRADER).

Mr. SCHRADER. Section 3: “This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by conventions in the several States, as provided in the Constitution, within 7 years from the date of submission hereof to the States by the Congress.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MEEHAN).

Mr. MEEHAN. Amendment 22, passed by Congress on March 21, 1947.

Section 1: “No person shall be elected to the office of the President more than twice, and no person who has held the office of President, or acted as President, for more than 2 years of a term to which some other person was elected President shall be elected to the office of President more than once.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. NUNNELEE).

Mr. NUNNELEE. “But this article shall not apply to any person holding the office of President when this article was proposed by the Congress, and shall not prevent any person who may be holding the office of President, or acting as President, during the term within which this article becomes operative from holding the office of President or acting as President during the remainder of such term.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. “But this article shall not apply to any person holding the office of President when this article was proposed by the Congress, and shall not prevent any person who may be holding the office of President, or acting as President, during the term within which this article becomes operative from holding the office of President or acting as President during the remainder of such term.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. FLEMING).

Mr. FLEMING. Section 2: “This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

Mr. GARAMENDI. Amendment 23, passed by Congress June 16, 1960; ratified March 29, 1961.

Section 1: “The District constituting the seat of Government of the United

States shall appoint in such manner as Congress may direct:

“A number of electors of President and Vice President equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives in Congress to which the District would be entitled if it were a State . . .”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE).

Mr. ROYCE. “. . . but in no event more than the least populous State; they shall be in addition to those appointed by the States, but they shall be considered, for the purposes of the election of President and Vice President, to be electors appointed by a State; and they shall meet in the District and perform such duties as provided by the 12th article of amendment.”

Section 2: “The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY).

Mr. COURTNEY. Amendment 24, passed by Congress August 27, 1962; ratified January 23, 1964.

Section 1: “The right of citizens of the United States to vote in any primary or other election for President or Vice President, for electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Representative in the Congress, shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State by reason of failure to pay any poll tax or other tax.”

Section 2: “The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT).

Mr. DENT. Amendment 25, passed by Congress July 6, 1965.

Section 1: “In case of the removal of the President from office or of his death or resignation, the Vice President shall become the President.”

Section 2: “Whenever there is a vacancy in the office of the Vice President, the President shall nominate a Vice President who shall take office upon confirmation by a majority vote of both Houses of Congress.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD).

Mr. LANKFORD. “Whenever the President transmits to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives his written declaration that he is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, and until he transmits to them a written declaration to the contrary, such powers and duties shall be discharged by the Vice President as Acting President.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY).

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Section 4: “Whenever the Vice President and a majority of either the principal

officers of the executive departments or of such other body as Congress may by law provide, transmit to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives their written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President shall immediately assume the powers and duties of the office as Acting President.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER).

Mrs. HARTZLER. “Thereafter, when the President transmits to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives his written declaration that no inability exists, he shall resume the powers and duties of his office unless the Vice President and a majority of either the principal officers of the executive department or of such other body as Congress may by law provide . . .”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK).

Mr. FITZPATRICK. “. . . transmit within 4 days to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives their written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office. Thereupon, Congress shall decide the issue, assembling within 48 hours for that purpose if not in session.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GIBSON).

Mr. GIBSON. “If the Congress, within 21 days after receipt of the latter written declaration, or, if Congress is not in session, within 21 days after Congress is required to assemble, determines by two-thirds vote of both Houses that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President shall continue to discharge the same as Acting President; otherwise, the President shall resume the powers and duties of his office.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN).

Mr. HULTGREN. Amendment 26, passed by Congress March 23, 1971; ratified July 1, 1971.

Section 1: “The right of citizens of the United States, who are 18 years of age or older, to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of age.”

Section 2: “The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.”

□ 1230

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FINCHER) who will read the last amendment of the Constitution.

Mr. FINCHER. Amendment 27, originally proposed September 25, 1789; ratified May 7, 1992.

“No law varying the compensation for the services of the Senators and Representatives shall take effect until an election of Representatives shall have intervened.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, with apology to those few Members who were waiting to read, we have now completed the first reading aloud of the United States Constitution.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, our expectation was that the new Republican majority would read the Constitution as written and its subsequent amendments. There is a broad body of law and interpretation that has developed from 1787 until the adoption of the last Amendment in 1992 that has turned our Constitution into a living document, paid for by the blood, sweat and tears of millions of Americans from the Revolutionary War, through the Civil War to even our current conflicts.

The new Republican majority and their redacted Constitutional reading gives little deference to the long history of improving the Constitution and only seeks an interpretation of our Constitution based on the now, not the historic, broad body of law and struggle that it has taken to get there. It leaves out the need to continue to refine the Constitution so that we have a more perfect union.

The 10th Amendment remains the center of conservative ideology. It reads, “The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.”

The 112th Congress’ Republican majority is building its agenda around the 10th Amendment. It is determined to limit the scope of Congress’ activity to legislation “reserved” to the United States. Then, all other rights are in the purview of the states. Under this historic logic, slavery was a state right protected by the Constitution and the 10th Amendment. But slavery by definition is not a human right, and therefore states rights cannot be human rights. That is why for the last five Congresses, I’ve introduced a series of Constitutional amendments that would improve the document for all Americans by guaranteeing essential rights.

Currently, the right to vote is a state right—subject to local interpretations of who should vote and how. That results in thousands of different systems, all with different rules and different regulations. It means education is a state right, which means a child’s likelihood of success is based on where he or she is born and the quality of schools that happen to be there. It means health care is a right, and God help you if your state, county or city cannot provide access to high quality care.

I will soon reintroduce the following amendments, in the hopes of creating a more perfect union:

H.J. Res. 28—Guaranteeing the right to vote to all Americans

H.J. Res. 29—Guaranteeing the right to an education of equal high quality

H.J. Res. 30—Guaranteeing the right to health care of equal high quality

H.J. Res. 31—Guaranteeing the right to equality and to reproductive rights to women

H.J. Res. 32—Guaranteeing the right to high quality housing

H.J. Res. 33—Guaranteeing the right to a clean and safe environment

H.J. Res. 34—Guaranteeing progressive taxation

H.J. Res. 35—Guaranteeing the right to full employment and balanced growth

H.J. Res. 36—Abolishing the electoral college, and providing direct election of the President and Vice President

I hope my Republican and Democratic colleagues will join me in converting a reverence for the Constitution into a movement to improve it on behalf of all Americans.

APPOINTMENT—PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 11 of rule X and clause 11 of rule I, and the order of the House of January 5, 2011, the Chair announces the Speaker’s appointment of the following Member of the House to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence:

Mr. ROGERS, Michigan, Chairman.

RESOLUTION TO CUT CONGRESS’ BUDGET

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 22) reducing the amount authorized for salaries and expenses of Member, committee, and leadership offices in 2011 and 2012.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 22

Resolved,

SECTION 1. REDUCTION IN MEMBERS’ REPRESENTATIONAL ALLOWANCE.

(a) ALLOWANCES ADOPTED IN 2011 AND 2012.—The amount of any Members’ Representational Allowance established in accordance with section 101 of the House of Representatives Administrative Reform Technical Corrections Act (2 U.S.C. 57b) for 2011 or 2012 may not exceed 95 percent of the amount of the Allowance so established for 2010.

(b) INTERIM REDUCTION PENDING ADOPTION OF NEW ALLOWANCE.—Until a Members’ Representational Allowance is established in accordance with section 101 of the House of Representatives Administrative Reform Technical Corrections Act (2 U.S.C. 57b) for 2011, the amount of such Allowance, as in effect on the date of the adoption of this resolution, is reduced by 5 percent.

SEC. 2. REDUCTION IN AMOUNT AUTHORIZED FOR SALARIES AND EXPENSES OF HOUSE LEADERSHIP OFFICES IN 2011 AND 2012.

(a) REDUCTION.—The head of any House leadership office may not authorize the disbursement of any amounts appropriated for salaries and expenses of such office during calendar year 2011 or fiscal year 2012 at a rate exceeding 95 percent of the rate provided for such salaries and expenses for fiscal year 2010.

(b) DEFINITION.—In this section, a “House leadership office” is any office whose salaries and expenses were appropriated for fiscal year 2010 under the heading “House leadership offices” in the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2010.

SEC. 3. REDUCTION IN AMOUNT AUTHORIZED FOR EXPENSES OF COMMITTEES IN 2011 AND 2012.

(a) PRIMARY EXPENSE RESOLUTIONS.—The aggregate amount authorized for expenses of

committees of the House of Representatives for 2011 and 2012 under primary expense resolutions adopted by the House under clause 6 of rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives may not exceed 95 percent of the aggregate amount provided for expenses of committees under such resolutions for 2009 and 2010.

(b) INTERIM FUNDING PENDING ADOPTION OF PRIMARY EXPENSE RESOLUTIONS.—Notwithstanding paragraph (c) of clause 7 of rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives, each committee described in paragraph (a) of such clause shall be entitled for each month during the period specified in paragraph (a) of such clause to 95 percent of the amount otherwise determined under paragraph (c) of such clause.

SEC. 4. REDUCTION IN AMOUNT AUTHORIZED FOR SALARIES AND EXPENSES OF COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS IN 2011 AND 2012.

The chair of the Committee on Appropriations may not authorize the disbursement of any amounts appropriated for salaries and expenses of the Committee during fiscal year 2011 or fiscal year 2012 at a rate exceeding 91 percent of the rate provided for such salaries and expenses for fiscal year 2010.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 5(b) of House Resolution 5, the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRADY) each will control 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today is a momentous day. We are all here together as Members of a new Congress and, more importantly, at the cusp of a new era in America’s political life. I find it humbling and most appropriate that while yesterday we were ceremonially sworn in in this historic House Chamber and appropriately voted on a transparency-enhancing rules package, today we began our proceedings with a reading of the United States Constitution. The Constitution not only establishes our polity and our framework of government, it enshrines as our fundamental law the proper role of government.

Mr. Speaker, as we promised in our Pledge to America, today’s reading was an affirmation of our commitment to return this government back to its proper role—a smaller, less costly, more accountable one.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us, introduced by my colleague from Oregon, is extremely important to today’s affirmation. And it is no accident that this is our first piece of legislative business in this the 112th Congress.

This legislation is significant because, along with our other activities here on the House floor this week, this bill committing ourselves to a more responsible and efficient stewardship of

the taxpayers' dollars demonstrates, we hope, to the American people that we are listening.

Mr. Speaker, the people's House should act first and lead by example. Everybody knows that across this country families and small businesses have cut their spending, are paying off their debt, and are striving to live within their means. We should do the same, and this legislation is a beginning. It will do that by having an immediate impact, and I would like to thank the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) and his transition team for their hard work and their constructive ideas.

Under this resolution, each leadership, committee and Member office in the 112th Congress will receive no more than 95 percent of its 111th Congress funding level. In fiscal year 2011, this will mean a savings of \$1 million from leadership offices, a savings of \$8.1 million from committee budgets, and a savings of \$26.1 million from, collectively, the Members' office budgets. For those who may not know, the Members' office budgets are the specific amounts that are given to Members so that they can carry out their functions as Members of Congress. It includes the ability to communicate with their constituents, it includes paying for their staff, it includes paying for their transportation from their district to Washington, D.C. and back; it includes the rental on their district offices. In other words, it is the money that is utilized for Members to carry out their official activities. These are important jobs that Members are required to do if in fact we are to represent our people appropriately. Nonetheless, even though these are important things that we do, we should try to be even more efficient in the way that we do them. That is the purpose of this legislation before us.

Mr. Speaker, these are substantial cuts in budgets, in budgets that frankly cannot continue indefinitely on an upward trajectory. We must all find ways to do more with less, to enhance our productivity, and to ferret out waste or inefficiencies wherever they may be. With that being said, this initial savings is only a down payment on future efforts. My colleagues and I on House Administration are dedicated to continuing savings and reductions in spending in other areas as well. Thus, for fiscal year 2012, we have committed to keeping this 5 percent reduction in place. We are also directing all House officers, such as the Clerk, the Sergeant at Arms and the Chief Administrative Officer, to find savings within their own organizations without sacrificing their services and the excellence they pride themselves on maintaining; in other words, to do what all Americans are attempting in their own lives, finding ways to do more with less. We look forward to hearing from these and other House offices in specificity as to what their cost-savings plans will be.

As has been said by our Speaker, we have committed to cutting domestic

spending and returning non-security discretionary spending to 2008 levels. If we could live on that level of spending a mere 2 years ago, surely we can find ways to do so again. Again, American families are doing it. American businesses are doing it. We must try as well.

Mr. Speaker, listening to the American people and restoring the proper role of government means decreasing spending, ending our deficit mentality, and fostering job creation. These are the virtues that have made this country great and will sustain us in the future.

I want to publicly thank my colleague from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) and his transition team for the efforts that they have put into this legislation, and I would urge all of my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as a staunch advocate for strong, accountable stewardship of hard-earned taxpayer dollars, I applaud any effort to responsibly address this concern. I travel back and forth to my district every day in the city of Philadelphia, and I spend a large portion of every day listening to constituents as they voice their concerns over our economy and the real impact it has on their day-to-day lives. Certainly this House must take steps to ensure that resources are effectively utilized, administered and accounted for. To that end, I support this resolution and encourage my colleagues to do so as well.

During the 111th Congress, significant steps were taken by the House leadership to expand transparency and responsible use of taxpayer dollars. At the direction of Speaker PELOSI, the Committee on House Administration under my chairmanship worked with the office of the CAO to introduce the House statement of disbursements in an online, electronic format. For the first time, constituents, the media and other concerned individuals could review every penny spent by Members, committees and leadership offices.

Through the Green the Capitol initiative and with the cooperation of the Architect of the Capitol, we rolled out enhancements designed to increase the energy efficiency of the Capitol Complex, resulting in cost savings.

Under the Democratic majority, we put in place requirements that only vehicles meeting lower greenhouse emissions standards were eligible for MRA-funded lease payments. Not only does this have a positive environmental impact, it also reduces fuel costs, since these vehicles are generally more fuel efficient.

The cost savings that were introduced were done so responsibly and with a constant eye on ensuring that Members have the resources they need also to be able to serve their constituency. That's ultimately the reason why

we are here. I look forward to exploring additional, responsible cost savings opportunities with Chairman LUNGREN in the spirit of bipartisanship cooperation that we have enjoyed for many years, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution.

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

□ 1240

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) who spent an enormous amount of time beginning immediately after the elections to bring us to this point.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman of the House Administration Committee for his help and assistance as we worked through the transition. I also want to thank the ranking member the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRADY) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS) as well who were designated by then-Speaker PELOSI to be a formal conduit for us on the transition. They were most helpful and gave us good insights. And I want to thank all the Members who participated and the staff whom we reached out to in a survey across this campus to say, How can we do this better? How can we be more efficient with our time and the taxpayers' money? Where can we cut costs?

Today is that first installment. There is an old saying that the journey of a thousand miles begins with a single step. Ladies and gentlemen, this is a single step forward, but it is a \$35 million first step. We think we can at least save that in this effort today, and leadership really starts at the top.

The American people have spoken loudly and clearly. They are very concerned about the economy and their jobs and their communities and they are equally and deeply concerned about the deficits that have been racked up by both parties over time. We have to turn that around, or we end up looking like some of these countries elsewhere around the globe that are facing financial ruin if they don't change. We have to change, too, and we are asking ourselves to take the first step here and save at least \$35 million.

As the gentleman from Pennsylvania has pointed out and the gentleman from California has pointed out, this is the first installment. Our management team in this organization is looking at each department on how they can achieve additional savings. As you know, we have an Inspector General that looks at everything on Capitol Hill and identifies ways we can improve safety and security and cut costs and be more efficient, so we are letting them do their management piece.

Now, I was a small business owner for 22 years with my wife out in Oregon. I understand that if you don't watch the pennies and the nickels, you will never get to the dollars. You have to look at

everything you do in real time to try and squeeze out efficiency, and I think we have done that.

As Republicans, our pledge to America was to do exactly that across the government, and you will see oversight hearings about policy, oversight hearings about job-killing regulations because we want to get America working again. And I know my colleagues on the other side of the aisle share that view, that it is the private sector jobs that we have to get restored in this country. We have to grow the economy and create jobs and put Washington's fiscal house back in order, and we will take the first steps today with this legislation and this resolution.

So, specifically, we cut we believe \$35 million out of our own budgets. It is a 5-percent reduction, except, I should point out, the Appropriations Committee will actually suffer a 9-percent reduction, and they came forward with that level. I applaud them for that.

This is firm, but flexible. Members will still determine within their budgets how they are spent. We don't micromanage here. We treat you as adults, and we are going to treat government agencies as adults. But we will expect results because the American people spoke clearly in November and said, we want transparency, we want openness, we want accountability, we want you to cut deficit spending, and we want you to create private sector jobs.

So, Mr. Chairman, I think we have begun that process today. I thank my colleagues on the other side of the aisle for supporting this bipartisan effort.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. I also would like to thank Mr. WALDEN for allowing us to participate, myself and Mr. ANDREWS from New Jersey.

I certainly do not want to get you in any kind of trouble here today, but we did have some ideas that happened to fall into and come into implementation of your plan. I know that was just great minds thinking alike. It wasn't that it was our idea that did that. But I am talking especially toward the schedule. I do appreciate that. I appreciate you allowing us to participate in what you have done there and look forward again to working with you in the future.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. At this time, Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), the chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this is a historic time for this Congress, this House and my committee. I can say without a moment's hesitation that this day represents a crucial turning point for our Nation as this new Congress begins a path to fiscal sanity.

With this resolution today, Congress will begin immediately to reduce spending, starting here and now with

our own office budgets and our committee budgets and the like.

To demonstrate my strong commitment to slashing spending, reducing our national deficit and getting our economy back on track, I have directed my own committee budget to be cut not by 5 percent, Mr. Speaker, but by 9 percent, nearly double the amount of reduction proposed for other House offices. What the Appropriations Committee is saying to all other committees is, we see your five; we raise you four. So we are cutting 9 percent.

This year, the Appropriations Committee will be ground zero for a wide range of reductions across the Federal Government; and by cutting our own budget first, Mr. Speaker, we are showing we are willing to lead by example.

This is a critical time for the Appropriations Committee, as we will carry out the most expansive reduction of discretionary spending in the history of this country. Under my watch, the Appropriations Committee will be an instrument of change, to enforce the will of the American people.

My Republican colleagues on the committee and I are ready to stand and fight for the American people and show that we are serious about our commitment to rein in government spending and control our exploding deficits. Yet it is important to remember that slashing spending to save taxpayer dollars and reducing the size of government is a means to an end. We must always keep our eyes on the ultimate goal—improving our economy, getting our people back to work and safeguarding the Nation's financial security for the future.

The one and only mandate that we received from the American people in November, in my judgment, was to put our economy and jobs first. This is why people came to the polls and voted for a change in this body, and this is the duty that we must fulfill.

To this end, it is clear that this Congress cannot let favored, yet troublesome, programs slip by or allow turf battles to cloud our shared interest in protecting the taxpayer. Our budget ax will swing wide and true, and no area of the Federal Government will be immune from our scrutiny and cuts. Sacred cows are, for all intents and purposes, extinct.

Mr. Speaker, we have a big job ahead of us. While this resolution is a small step forward, it is a giant leap to show, in a very personal and practical way, the commitment we have to reducing spending and getting our economy back on track. The first drawn blood is ours.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW).

Mr. CRENSHAW. I want to thank the gentleman for yielding the time.

I rise in strong support of this resolution. What does it do? You have heard

quite simply that it saves the American taxpayers millions of dollars. How does it do it? Quite simply, it says we are going to spend less money in this House.

These are difficult times, and we can't just keep on doing things like we have always done them. We have got to change things. No more perks, no more privileges, no more waste. We have a chance with this resolution to, in the House, look at ourselves in the mirror and say we are going to lead by example.

□ 1250

The American people have been making these tough choices all along. I think it's time that this House put its own house in order. But we have to remember that actions speak louder than words. Difficult times mean leaders have to lead. We have a chance to take a bold step to say that we're going to try to stop this culture of spending that we've all gotten used to and say, Let's start a culture of savings.

Now, that's not going to be easy. It's going to be hard. It's going to be painful. It's going to be difficult. It's going to be tough. But we must do it. And that's where we begin to start. That's what this resolution does. It says that we're going to take the first step. We're going to cut our own spending. We're going to do more with less. And I think right now we can do a whole lot more with a whole lot less. I know that, you know that, and I think the American people know that. But we all know that we need money to provide services.

Right now, it seems to me that government needs something more. We need discipline to rein in spending. We need courage to make the right decisions, even when they're hard. And we need to seize the challenge to provide services in these difficult times. We've got to make sure that every task of government is accomplished more efficiently and more effectively than it ever has been before, because if life is going to change in America, life has to change here in Washington. And this is the first step.

So I urge the adoption of this resolution.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. At this time I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Alabama (Mrs. ROBY), a member of the transition team.

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, our Nation is on an unsustainable path. Over the last 2 years, all we have seen from Washington is more spending, more borrowing, and more debt. The American taxpayer has been burdened with \$3 trillion worth of bailouts and buyouts. Never before has the government spent so much while the people received so little. One of the goals of the transition team was to restore fiscal responsibility to Congress. And I would like to thank the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) for his leadership on that transition team.

Working families all across America have been forced to tighten their belts during this economic downturn. The Congress should be no different. Our proposal would cut Members' representational allowances by 5 percent. It will save the American taxpayer at least \$35 million annually over the next year.

No one is suggesting that this is a silver bullet. In fact, it is far from it. Reducing our soaring debt will require this Congress to deeply commit to the tough choices that will be required to put our Nation back on track. But, in many ways, our budget woes began in this Chamber. And so, too, should they end. This resolution is a symbolic start to this process.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. On the campaign trail for the last several months we've heard two things from people. We've heard: cut spending, cut spending, cut spending. And the other thing we heard consistently was: live by the decisions that you make in Congress.

Well, today we have a great opportunity before us. We have an opportunity to do both—to start cutting spending—\$35 million-plus in spending cuts—starting with us. It means that we start first and foremost by living with the decisions that we make. A 5-percent deduction in our MRAs gives us an opportunity to not spend the money so that other folks in families and small businesses have an opportunity when not paying taxes to invest more money in the future of their country and their families.

Second, as we consistently live under our own decisions, we tell the American people that we are simply "listening." I heard constantly that the American people want a Congress that listens; that hears what they're saying; that understands their pain and then does something about it. The first step in that direction is for us to start living within our own means and to tell the American people that we hear them.

If we want to restore the confidence of the American people in their elected officials, we must start by doing things like this—cutting ourselves first and asking the rest of the government to follow.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, at this time it is my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER), a member of the transition team.

Mr. GARDNER. I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. Speaker, today I am glad to support a resolution that puts away the knives of politics and instead pulls out the shears of budget cutting. Thank you to Representative WALDEN for your work on the transition committee to again restore accountability and transparency by leading by example in one

of the most historic institutions this world has ever witnessed.

Throughout my time in the State legislature of Colorado and throughout the past several months I have talked to constituents around the Fourth Congressional District of Colorado about the need to lead by example—the need to start in our own backyard first to cut our budgets to make sure that we are leading by example. Just a couple of rows from here in this Chamber when we took the oath, my 7-year-old daughter accompanied me to witness the transition of power. But that means nothing if we cannot lead by example. And I will have failed her as a 7-year-old child, and every child like her, if we do not lead by example—and we start today by cutting our own budgets.

The 5 percent cut to our budget is not massive, but it is monumental. And it's something that we must all take seriously, our efforts to begin leading the American people. Around this country, citizens of the United States are looking to Congress for signs of hope—signs of hope that we have learned a lesson that this Congress has spent too much, grown too much, and that we will put our own house in order.

Mr. Speaker, today I have the honor of standing in support of a resolution that says to the American people we will indeed lead by example. We will begin in our house first.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, at this time it gives me a great deal of pleasure to yield 1 minute to the majority leader of the House of Representatives, the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR).

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. Speaker, our new majority will be a results-driven Congress with one clear goal: to create jobs and generate economic growth. Our defining principle will be "cut-and-grow." Cut spending and job-killing regulations and grow jobs and the economy.

Our mission is urgent. For the economy to grow, families, businesses, and financial markets need to know that we are serious about cutting spending. If we don't act, the threat of future tax increases, inflation, and higher borrowing costs will continue to serve as an anchor on the economy.

Beginning the new Republican majority by cutting our own congressional operating budgets sends the right message. The days of families and small businesses tightening their belts while the Federal Government goes on a spending spree are over. This self-imposed 5-percent cut to our own House operating budgets will save American taxpayers more than \$35 million immediately. I hope that Federal agencies across the spectrum will follow suit and find ways to cut their own budgets.

This legislation is a small, but significant, step toward promoting a culture of opportunity, responsibility, and success. I urge my colleagues to support it.

□ 1300

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to yield 3 minutes to another gentleman who served us well on the transition team, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KINZINGER).

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of House Resolution 22. In fact, it is an honor to give my first speech in the House of Representatives on this issue.

When I went around in the campaign, I heard from the people of the 11th District of Illinois repeatedly about a number of things, but at the forefront, it was "cut spending." We have a massive deficit. We have lived the last few years acting like we can just spend money and never worry about it; but we saw a massive change in the last few months, and it is time for us to heed that message. How better to do it than to lead by example?

As well as hearing about our needing to cut spending, I heard about humility a lot and about a majority that needs to lead with a sense of humbleness. I think this is key, to lead by example, but we need to wrestle the beast of spending. I don't have kids yet, but someday I will, and when I do, I don't want to live with the responsibility that I continue to shovel debt and debt on top of them and make them have to handle that now.

As a member of the military—and I've been doing that for 8 years—I also understand what sacrifice is, and I understand that folks have been fighting on the outside for the defense of our country. It is time for us now to fight on the inside for the defense of our country. \$35 million isn't going to solve all of our budget problems, but it's a good first step. This is the first step in a probably very painful process where we have to understand and wrestle with this beast and where everybody is going to have to sacrifice, but it is the first step and a very necessary step to ensure that we are leaving our children a Union, a country, far better than the one we inherited.

So to the people of the 11th District of Illinois and to the people of America, let me say the freshman class and the Republican majority have heard your voice. We heard what you said on November 2. We are going to seriously cut spending, and we are going to start with our own budget. We are proud to do it, and we are going to step forward and lead and make you proud.

Thank you so much for the opportunity to address this issue.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. At this time, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. HARPER), a member of the House Administration Committee.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am eager to enact the Republican governing agenda that focuses on creating jobs, driving down spending and shrinking the size of the Federal Government.

Republicans will take swift action to turn America from the failed economic policies of the last 2 years to the conservative principles to promote prosperity through individual freedoms and liberties. Our plan includes initiatives to pay down the national debt and put the Federal Government back on a path to a balanced budget. This goal can be achieved by employing fiscally conservative policies—just like this.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government is broke, borrowing 41 cents of every dollar that we spend. Nearly one in 10 American workers is unemployed while the Federal Government has added 100,000 new jobs. Washington continues to record trillion dollar deficits despite the fact that family budgets get smaller and smaller. The government cannot continue to grow while Americans' wallets shrink.

As lawmakers, we must lead by example. For this past Congress, my first term, my congressional office has come in under budget, voluntarily returning approximately 10 percent of the Members' representational allowance. This gesture has not impacted the quality of our representation and our constituent services. During this time period, my office has replied to over 37,000 emails and letters and has connected with nearly 82,000 constituents via teleconference.

I urge Congress to follow this example by providing taxpayers with a fiscally responsible operating budget. Our path to a balanced budget begins today, and it begins with this vote.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, at this time, it is my privilege to yield 3 minutes a new member of our House Administration Committee but a veteran of this House, the gentleman from Georgia, Dr. GINGREY.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I thank Mr. LUNGREN. I thank Mr. BRADY. I thank Mr. WALDEN and the members of the transition team, many of whom have spoken on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, clearly, it is time for us—we Members of Congress of the House of Representatives—with House Resolution 22, to show good faith and regard to tightening our belts. It has been said by other Members that cutting the Members' representational allowance is kind of routine for a lot of the Members.

I know that, this past year, I returned something like \$160,000 of the MRA to the Treasury and, over the course of my 8 years in Congress, in the aggregate, some \$900,000. Quite honestly, that is more than a 5 percent cut. So it can be done, and many Members have done that as well.

We have concerns, of course, as to where that money goes to. Does it go

to truly reducing the deficit and long-term debt?

I will be introducing, Mr. Speaker, legislation later on today that by law requires that that money that is turned back in goes back to the taxpayer. Yet this piece of legislation, House Resolution 22, is something that I think will have wide, if not unanimous, bipartisan support.

As I say, the former chairman of this committee, Mr. BRADY, now the ranking member of the current chairman's committee, my good friend DAN LUNGREN from California, is of the same mind in regard to fiscal responsibility and doing what is right for the American people.

On November 2, they were telling us, Look, we are sick and tired of you guys who just keep throwing money at things, like the \$1 trillion cost of the stimulus bill and another \$1 trillion for the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act. Some people recognize that better as ObamaCare. But, you know, when you've got \$1.4 trillion worth of deficit for 2 or 3 years in a row, no wonder you add \$5 trillion to the long-term debt, and you get up to something like \$14 trillion.

So, Mr. Speaker, at a time when there is a 9.8 percent unemployment rate and when families across the country are forced to tighten their belts, I wholeheartedly believe that Congress should lead by example. That is what we are doing with this bill.

I appreciate my colleagues giving me time to weigh in on this. I fully support it, and I look forward to being a member of the committee.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER), who has done great work in the past about the operations of this House.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we have a spending problem here in the Congress of the United States. We know it. All the Members here know it, and certainly the American people know it as well. Over the past few years, we have run deficits of over \$1 trillion each year, and we have driven our national debt to over \$14 trillion.

On November 2, 2010, the American people spoke out in a very loud and clear voice: Stop the reckless spending. The Republican majority elected on November 2 heard the call of the American people, and we will start the spending cuts today by cutting our own budgets by 5 percent.

You know, since my election to Congress, I have always tried to be a good steward of the money that is appropriated to my budget to serve my constituents. In the last Congress, I returned, actually, about 11 percent of the money that was allotted. In 2009, I returned nearly 8 percent to the Treas-

ury, and in 2010, I expect that return to be almost 14 percent. I am sure that many Members can make similar claims here.

A cut of 5 percent for Members, for leadership offices, and for committees is a very important first step in getting our spending under control. Some may say that 5 percent doesn't cut nearly enough, but certainly, it is a welcomed change, and we are going in the right direction rather than in the wrong direction of increasing these Members' allowances that we have seen for too many years.

If we cannot cut our own budgets, how can the American people expect us to start cutting spending?

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in sending this important message to the American people that we are very serious about cutting spending. We get it. We heard what the American people said in this last election, and we are starting here, right now, with ourselves.

□ 1310

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I would make an inquiry as to whether the gentleman has further requests for time.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. I don't think so, no.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. If the gentleman is going to yield back the balance of his time after his statement, I will do the same on this side.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman, my friend from the great State of Pennsylvania, who has worked on a bipartisan basis, most of the time, and what I mean by that is about 85 percent or 90 percent of the work we do on our committee has to do with making this place work, helping Members do the job that they were elected to do to represent their constituents, and making sure this institution of the House of Representatives works. There is a sense of a pride of the institution that I think marks our committee, and we try in a very real way to work, both on the Democratic and Republican sides, to ensure the productivity of the membership here and to ensure that, frankly, the people get their money's worth.

About 10 or 15 percent of what we have to do has to do with election law, and I might say that that's not always as obviously bipartisan, but we've always done it in the spirit of civility and always done it in the spirit of respect for one another, and for that, I would like to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, this is an important vote. In comparison to a trillion-dollar budget and trillion-dollar deficit people

might say this is a small amount. It is not a small amount. It is a serious 5 percent cut with respect to the operations of this House in very, very significant ways. It is a down payment on the future actions of this House with respect to other operations of the House, but as we scan across the entire Federal Government, this marks the down payment on that new vision.

So I would once again like to thank the Congressman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN).

I have just discovered that I do have another speaker here, and with the indulgence of my friend on the other side, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WALSH).

Mr. WALSH of Illinois. I apologize. I snuck up on you there.

I rise today to support H. Res. 22 in the House. We were elected this past fall to do what we said we were going to do: To lead by example when it comes to spending and tightening our own belts. Following through on this key pledge that we made in the Pledge to America I think is vital. We're taking the first step before we ask others to tighten their own belts, and it's important to understand this is a first step, hopefully, in an ongoing effort to continue to cut costs.

This will impact each and every one of us, and I think it's very important to the American people that they see we are talking the talk and walking the walk.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise in strong opposition to the House Resolution 22, which would cut Congress's budget by five percent in 2011 and 2012. The proposed cut undermines Members of Congress's ability to serve their constituents and perform official duties.

Today, many communities around the Nation are recovering from the Great Recession. Members' offices are flooded with phone calls from constituents who are facing foreclosure and having problems with their Social Security and Medicare. Furthermore, millions are looking toward Members of Congress for information on government programs, help on constituent casework, finding contracting opportunities with the federal government, and how to apply for federal grants. Lastly, it is imperative constituents can voice their opinion on proposed legislation to our staff. Today's draconian attempt to reduce Members of Congress's budget would hamper their ability to fulfill these essential tasks for our fellow Americans.

At a time of economic crisis, a well functioning democracy cannot survive the "starve the beast" syndrome. Specifically, Congress needs talented staff to properly and judiciously advise Members on proposed legislation and help communicate our work to our constituents. A recent article in *Politico* found that the majority of congressional staff has not had an effective pay increase in many years. If we go down this road, eventually we will not be adequately staffed to fulfill the critical needs for Members.

The resolution today extends the failed mantra that government is the problem. In the run up to the Great Recession, many impor-

tant federal regulatory agencies were severely underfunded and could not carry out their vital missions. The House of Representatives needs to reflect on this lesson and reject this failed right wing philosophy. I urge my colleagues to oppose today's proposal.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, today I voted for H. Res. 22, to cut the House operating budget by 5%. It is important for the government to lead by example, especially during these tough economic times.

I would hope that having demonstrated that even the legislature itself is not exempt from budget cuts, that the Republican leadership would reconsider its decision to declare off limits major areas of government spending and savings.

Repealing the Affordable Care Act would be inconsistent with these efforts to reduce costs. The non-partisan Congressional Budget Office said that repealing health care would cost the American taxpayers \$240 billion over the next 10 years. This is in addition to raising the average cost of health care for most Americans and leaving 32 million uninsured, and is something our economy cannot afford.

This is especially important when looking at defense spending. The Pentagon budget, growing at a rate far above inflation, is also the source of the greatest waste and inefficiency. GAO studies have documented tens of billions of dollars of waste, inefficiency, and in some cases, money that can't be accounted for at all.

Even the Pentagon itself is making commitments for budget reduction and efficiency. Just today, Secretary Gates reached out to members of Congress to outline how he intends to trim \$100 billion from within the Pentagon over the next five years. I hope these conversations don't fall on deaf ears.

Every part of the budget deserves careful attention. I'm pleased that we're starting with the legislative budget; I hope it will serve as a symbol that no part of the budget should be off limits, making the Defense Department the next source of inquiry, and not the last.

I look forward to working with all members, on both sides of the aisle, to help the government lead by example, improve efficiency and improve our fiscal standing.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution to Cut Congress's Budget. The American people are hurting and they deserve responsible leadership. This legislation, however, is an effort to deceive the American people into thinking that this new Congress is making a real effort to reduce the deficit. In fact this Congress is on a path to grow the deficit even further without providing any help to the American people.

As families cut their budgets to get their fiscal house in order, Congress should do the same. I have returned \$109,000 to the Treasury since I took office and will take further efforts this year to save taxpayer money. That is why I am confident that a five percent reduction in the budget for Congress will be manageable for Members and staff and good for the United States.

I understand why this bill is on the floor today and I support this bill. Unfortunately, it is a symbolic and purely political gesture.

This majority recently passed rules that will exempt tax cuts from complying with the PayGo rule, guaranteeing a ballooning of the government's debt. In addition, they repeal a rule that prohibits reconciliation bills from in-

creasing the deficit, further paving the way for tax cuts, regardless of the impact on the deficit. The hypocrisy continues with an exception for the cost of repealing health reform. In fact, repealing health reform explodes the federal deficit by \$230 billion over the next ten years and \$1 trillion over the next two decades, while stripping Americans of important benefits. It's pure hypocrisy to add \$1 trillion to the deficit, and then tell the American people we are doing something about the deficit by cutting our own budgets by 5%.

I would remind the new majority that PayGo rules in the 1990s led to enormous budget surpluses. It was the Republican controlled Congress that repealed the PayGo rules allowing Republicans and President Bush to cut taxes and engage in two wars without concern for the deficit. We are paying for their mistakes today and we will be paying for them for generations. I regret that today's Republican majority appears to be the same as the old.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill and then to fight for real fiscal responsibility that puts the middle class first.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 22, a resolution that will reduce House budgets by 5% across the board for the 112th Congress. I commend the author of this legislation—my colleague from the Energy and Commerce Committee, Mr. WALDEN—for his leadership on this resolution and for the work he has done over the past few months in leading the Republican transition efforts.

On November 2, 2010, the American people spoke very clearly at the ballot box to stop the out-of-control spending here in Washington. They were rightfully tired of the \$1 trillion so-called "Stimulus" bill and the \$1 trillion ObamaCare bill.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, these bills are largely to blame for \$1.4 trillion deficit for Fiscal Year 2010 that has ballooned our national debt to \$14 trillion.

Mr. Speaker, at a time when there is 9.8% unemployment and families across the country are forced to tighten their belts, I wholeheartedly believe that Congress should lead by example.

H. Res. 22 provides for a 5% reduction for each Member's MRA, which I—as a new Member of the House Administration Committee—believe is a good starting point for us to rein in federal spending.

I know that some of my colleagues across the aisle will criticize this proposal for being an act of political theater or not going far enough, so I would ask them a simple question. If—as Members of Congress—we cannot support proposals to cut our own budgets, then how can the American people trust us to make much more difficult budget decisions down the road to reduce our massive debt?

Mr. Speaker, as families across the country continue to struggle financially, it is imperative that we show fiscal restraint, and there is no better place to start than here in the halls of Congress.

I ask all of my colleagues to support H. Res. 22.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution before the House today to reduce the budgets for Members' offices as well as leadership and committee offices in the House of Representatives.

At a time when so many of our constituents are struggling to make ends meet in a difficult

economy, and with the federal deficit as high as it is, the House and Senate must keep looking for ways to tighten our belts. During the last Congress, under the leadership of Speaker PELOSI, we voted to freeze the salaries of Members of Congress in 2010 and again for 2011. The resolution before the House today would save an additional \$35 million.

While this resolution saves \$35 million, the Republican leadership will be bringing a health care reform repeal bill to the Floor next week that will blow a one trillion dollar hole in the budget. Not only would the Republican repeal bill turn back the clock on the significant reforms and consumer protections and jeopardize health care for millions of Americans, their repeal bill would also add \$230 billion to the deficit over the next 10 years, and a jaw-dropping \$1 trillion of red ink over 20 years. These are not my figures, but those of the non-partisan Congressional Budget Office.

In a word, if cutting \$35 million from Congress' budget is a step in the right direction towards reducing the deficit, adding \$1 trillion to the deficit by repealing health care reform takes us about 28,570 steps in the wrong direction.

I urge support for the resolution before the House today and strong opposition to the Republican health care repeal bill next week.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support this resolution. Let's make it a bipartisan effort. Let's show that we have the commitment of the membership here towards responding to the reality of our times.

I yield back the balance of my time. The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 22.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 408, nays 13, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 8]

YEAS—408

Adams	Bilbray	Calvert
Aderholt	Bishop (GA)	Camp
Akin	Bishop (NY)	Campbell
Alexander	Bishop (UT)	Canseco
Altmire	Black	Cantor
Amash	Blackburn	Capito
Andrews	Blumenauer	Capps
Austria	Bonner	Capuano
Baca	Bono Mack	Cardoza
Bachmann	Boren	Carnahan
Bachus	Boswell	Carney
Baldwin	Boustany	Carson (IN)
Barletta	Brady (PA)	Carter
Barrow	Brady (TX)	Cassidy
Bartlett	Braley (IA)	Castor (FL)
Barton (TX)	Brooks	Chabot
Bass (CA)	Broun (GA)	Chaffetz
Bass (NH)	Brown (FL)	Chandler
Becerra	Buchanan	Chu
Benishek	Bucshon	Cicilline
Berg	Buerkle	Clarke (MI)
Berkley	Burgess	Clay
Berman	Burton (IN)	Cleaver
Biggart	Butterfield	Clyburn

Coble	Herrera	Beutler
Coffman (CO)	Higgins	
Cohen	Himes	
Cole	Hinchey	
Conaway	Hinojosa	
Connolly (VA)	Hirono	
Cooper	Holden	
Costa	Holt	
Costello	Hoyer	
Courtney	Huelskamp	
Cravaack	Huizenga (MI)	
Crawford	Hultgren	
Crenshaw	Hunter	
Critz	Hurt	
Crowley	Inslee	
Cuellar	Israel	
Culberson	Issa	
Cummings	Jackson Lee	
Davis (CA)	(TX)	
Davis (IL)	Jenkins	
Davis (KY)	Johnson (GA)	
DeFazio	Johnson (IL)	
DeGette	Johnson (OH)	
DeLauro	Johnson, E. B.	
Denham	Johnson, Sam	
Dent	Jones	
DesJarlais	Jordan	
Deutch	Kaptur	
Diaz-Balart	Keating	
Dicks	Kelly	
Dingell	Kildee	
Doggett	Kind	
Dold	King (IA)	
Donnelly (IN)	King (NY)	
Doyle	Kingston	
Dreier	Kinzinger (IL)	
Duffy	Kissell	
Duncan (SC)	Kline	
Duncan (TN)	Kucinich	
Edwards	Labrador	
Ellmers	Lamborn	
Emerson	Lance	
Engel	Landry	
Eshoo	Langevin	
Farenthold	Lankford	
Farr	Larsen (WA)	
Fattah	Larson (CT)	
Fincher	Latham	
Flake	LaTourette	
Fleischmann	Latta	
Fleming	Lee (NY)	
Flores	Levin	
Forbes	Lewis (CA)	
Fortenberry	Lewis (GA)	
Fox	Lipinski	
Frank (MA)	LoBiondo	
Franks (AZ)	Loebsack	
Frelinghuysen	Lofgren, Zoe	
Fudge	Long	
Gallegly	Lowe	
Garamendi	Lucas	
Gardner	Luetkemeyer	
Garrett	Lujan	
Gibbs	Lummis	
Gibson	Lungren, Daniel	
Giffords	E.	
Gingrey (GA)	Mack	
Gohmert	Maloney	
Gonzalez	Manzullo	
Goodlatte	Marchant	
Gosar	Marino	
Gowdy	Markey	
Granger	Matheson	
Graves (GA)	Matsui	
Graves (MO)	McCarthy (CA)	
Green, Al	McCarthy (NY)	
Green, Gene	McCaul	
Griffin (AR)	McClintock	
Griffith (VA)	McCollum	
Grijalva	McCotter	
Grimm	McDermott	
Guinta	McGovern	
Guthrie	McHenry	
Gutierrez	McIntyre	
Hall	McKeon	
Hanabusa	McKinley	
Hanna	McMorris	
Harman	Rodgers	
Harper	McNerney	
Harris	Meehan	
Hartzler	Meeke	
Hastings (FL)	Mica	
Hastings (WA)	Michaud	
Hayworth	Miller (FL)	
Heck	Miller (MI)	
Heinrich	Miller (NC)	
Heller	Miller, Gary	
Hensarling	Miller, George	
Herger	Moore	

Mulvaney	Stivers
Murphy (CT)	Stutzman
Murphy (PA)	Sullivan
Myrick	Sutton
Nadler	Terry
Napolitano	Thompson (CA)
Neal	Thompson (MS)
Neugebauer	Thompson (PA)
Noem	Thornberry
Nugent	Tiberi
Nunes	Tierney
Nunnelee	Tipton
Olson	Tonko
Oliver	Tsongas
Owens	Turner

Upton	West
Van Hollen	Westmoreland
Velázquez	Whitfield
Vislousky	Wilson (FL)
Walberg	Wilson (SC)
Walden	Wittman
Walsh (IL)	Wolf
Walz (MN)	Womack
Wasserman	Woodall
Schultz	Wu
Waters	Yarmuth
Watt	Yoder
Webster	Young (FL)
Weiner	Young (IN)
Welch	

NAYS—13

Ackerman	Honda	Schakowsky
Clarke (NY)	Jackson (IL)	Towns
Conyers	Lee (CA)	Woolsey
Ellison	Moran	
Filner	Payne	

NOT VOTING—11

Bilirakis	Pence	Stark
Gerlach	Rivera	Waxman
Lynch	Runyan	Young (AK)
Paul	Smith (NE)	

□ 1339

Messrs. ELLISON, MORAN and HONDA changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida and Mr. MEEKS changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution 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. RIVERA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 8 I was unavoidably delayed. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Mr. RUNYAN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 8 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Mr. GERLACH. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 8 due to a bell malfunction in my office, I was unable to get to the floor to vote. Had I been in attendance, I would have voted "aye."

□ 1340

PERMISSION TO INCLUDE EXTRANEIOUS MATERIALS

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include extraneous materials and a statement entered into the RECORD directly after the reading of the Constitution.

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

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a concurrent resolution of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 2. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the rotunda of the Capitol for an event marking the 50th anniversary of the inaugural address of President John F. Kennedy.

The message also announced that pursuant to provisions of Public Law

107-306, as amended by Public Law 111-259, the Chair, on behalf of the Majority Leader, after consultation with the Chairman of the Select Committee on Intelligence, announces the appointment of the following individuals to serve as members of the National Commission for Review of Research and Development Programs of the United States Intelligence Community:

Gilman Louie of California.

Troy Wade of Nevada.

WELCOME HOME 101ST AIRBORNE DIVISION'S TASK FORCE RAKKASAN

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I humbly rise today to welcome home the heroic soldiers of the 101st Airborne Division's Task Force Rakkasan after a year's deployment in Afghanistan.

Mr. Speaker, this morning we read aloud the document we are all sworn to protect and defend. None defend that document and our freedom better than those deployed in harm's way. Many of the members of the Rakkasan have been deployed five times since September 11. They are part of the most deployed unit in the history of the U.S. Army. They have my profound gratitude for that service.

These brave soldiers served in and around Khost, Afghanistan. Together with their Afghan allies, they took 2,000 insurgents out of the fight and cleared the way for expanded Afghan governance. The Rakkasans arrived in a region that was controlled by the Taliban. They leave an area where children are free to go to school, play cricket, fly kites, all activities that the Taliban forbade.

Tomorrow, Tennessee will welcome these heroes home. We will open our arms and embrace them and thank them for their service and their sacrifice. We will also remember those who are not returning. I hope that my colleagues in this body will take a moment today to reflect on how our service should honor the service of those who serve us so well.

GEORGIA STATE TROOPER FIRST CLASS CHADWICK LECROY

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

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in memory of Georgia State Patrol Trooper First Class Chadwick LeCroy, of Marietta, Georgia, my hometown, who was killed in the line of duty by an unrepentant thug on Monday, December 27.

At the young age of 38, Mr. LeCroy was a highly respected husband, father, and public servant. He graduated from the 85th Georgia State Patrol Trooper

School in August of 2008 and had been a highly respected law enforcement officer in the Atlanta area ever since.

Trooper First Class LeCroy is the 27th Georgia State Trooper to be killed in the line of duty, and he leaves behind his wife and two young sons.

A hero like Trooper First Class LeCroy will not be forgotten, and I join his family and friends in mourning this momentous loss to them. I ask my colleagues to join me in remembering this loyal and heroic Georgian.

FIRST ANNUAL DAN MARINO FOUNDATION WALKABOUT AUTISM EVENT

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, January 29th, the Dan Marino Foundation will host its first annual WalkAbout Autism event at Sun Life Stadium in Miami from 10:00 to 2:00. One hundred percent of the proceeds will benefit our south Florida community-based programs that help children with autism and their families.

The Centers for Disease Control states that one out of every 110 children in the U.S. has autism. Autism impairs social interactions and communication skills. While some autistic children will grow up to function in society, others, many others, will need some level of professional care all of their lives.

Since its creation in 1992, the Dan Marino Foundation has raised over \$30 million to support research, services, and treatment serving children and young adults.

I urge all south Floridians to participate and help make this first annual WalkAbout Autism event a success. Our combined efforts will help assure that all money raised here stays here and benefits programs in our south Florida community.

Let's all WalkAbout Autism.

□ 1350

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.

REMEMBERING TOM VANDERGRIF

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

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Judge Tom Vandergriff was a Member of the House of Representatives from January 1982 until December 1984. He was defeated for reelection in November of 1984 by Dick Armeey, moved back

to Texas, and switched parties from the Democrat Party to the Republican Party. In 1990 he was elected county judge in which he served from 1990 until 2007. He passed away on December 30, 2010. His memorial service is tomorrow afternoon at the University of Texas at Arlington's Texas Center from 1 till 3.

Judge Vandergriff was a personal friend of mine. When I first was given part of Arlington in the redistricting process in 1992, he agreed to be my co-chairman for my campaign. He was just an absolute gentleman and helped in every way possible. One of the most unique things about Judge Vandergriff is that in his entire political career, which spanned from 1951 until 2007, he never held a political fund-raising event for himself. He did actually accept political contributions obviously but he never solicited and he never held an organized political event that he himself organized on his behalf. I thought that was astounding in the modern political era to be as successful politically as he was without having to go out and do the numerous fund-raisers that most of us have to do.

We are going to miss Judge Vandergriff. He's got a list of accomplishments a mile long. He was mayor of Arlington from 1951 until 1967. During his tenure as mayor, he was able to get the General Motors assembly plant located in Arlington; he helped get the Texas Rangers, which were then the Washington Senators, to move to Arlington, and was able to attend the World Series this past October in which he saw the Texas Rangers first of all win the American League and then fight valiantly against the San Francisco Giants who ultimately won the World Series.

He wanted to be a broadcaster. He went to USC in Los Angeles, applied for a broadcasting job in 1947, and was not successful in getting that broadcasting job. It went to somebody named Chet Huntley, who later became an anchorman on NBC News. Judge Vandergriff returned to Texas to assume a role in his family's Chevrolet dealership with his father, which he maintained that dealership except for times when he was a U.S. Congressman in some capacity.

We're going to miss Judge Vandergriff. We give our condolences to his family. Again, he was a Member of Congress from 1982 until 1984 and he will be missed.

On December 30, 2010, Texas lost a lion. Tom Vandergriff, former mayor of Arlington, Texas, former County Judge of Tarrant County, and former Member of the United States Congress, left this life at the age of 84. All of us in North Texas will mark time from the moment we heard of the loss. The loss is monumental.

Few people have had such a positive impact on the development and quality of life of North Texas, and no one has had a greater impact on Arlington. His friends and admirers are legion, his accomplishments legendary. He was the personification of an ideal, the ideal of

a selflessly devoted public servant who always put the people ahead of personal gain or ambition.

Arlington history is generally divided into two epochs: BV and AV, Before Vandergriff and After Vandergriff. He first sought and won elective office in 1951 when he became the "boy mayor" of Arlington at the age of 25. At the time Arlington was a small town on the railroad midway between Dallas and Fort Worth. Vandergriff saw the town's potential and set out to make it a center of prosperity in its own right while fostering a new spirit of cooperation within the North Texas region. Arlington, now the 49th largest city in the U.S. with 370,000 people, would never be the same, and neither would North Texas. Indeed, it was Vandergriff who coined the phrase, "Metroplex", which is still the term usually applied to describe the Dallas-Fort Worth area.

His first major achievement was convincing General Motors executives to locate their new automobile assembly plant in Arlington. His family owned a Chevrolet dealership in town, which gave him access to General Motors Corp. Upon hearing that GM planned to build a plant in North Texas, he sold Arlington as a superior location by telling GM, as he would later tell the story, that if they put the plant in Dallas, it would make Fort Worth angry; if they put it in Fort Worth, it would make Dallas angry. He ended his pitch by convincing them that if they put it in Arlington, everybody would be happy. The plant produced its first automobile in 1954 and today is the only GM plant in the U.S. that makes full-size SUVs.

The GM plant began a building boom in Arlington that has lasted more than 55 years. Knowing a small town on well water could not sustain rapid growth nor accommodate the needs of industry, Vandergriff convinced the voters of Arlington to pass an initiative to build a large reservoir to meet the town's future needs. The effort proved to be as controversial as it was monumental for a small town, but the initiative passed, and Lake Arlington was built. The project was ridiculed by many in Arlington and dismissed by others in the region as "Vandergriff's Folly", but the folly became "the miracle lake" upon its completion. Large equipment was being removed from the site in 1957 when one of the worst and longest droughts in Texas history broke, and it began to rain. The lake, which experts believed would take years to fill, was full in 18 days. The lake ensured the explosive growth that came in the decades of the '60s, '70s, and '80s that made Arlington, Texas one of the fastest growing cities in America.

As a college student at the University of Southern California, Vandergriff was very familiar with Anaheim and by the late 1950s was aware of the tremendous economic impact tourism had on the city after the opening of Disneyland theme park in 1955. He knew, because of Arlington's central location, that the same benefits could accrue to his city with a product of similar appeal. It came as no surprise to those familiar with the Vandergriff vision for Arlington when he became instrumental in establishing the Six Flags Over Texas theme park in 1961. The park was an instant hit, and people all over the southwestern United States began traveling to Arlington for family styled entertainment. The first of the Six Flags parks, it still operates at its original location in Arlington.

But Vandergriff didn't stop there. A devoted baseball fan, he was determined to bring pro-

fessional baseball to North Texas. The effort took years and saw hopes dashed time and again before he finally convinced owner Bob Short to move his Washington Senators to Arlington in 1972. The effort did not endear him to the people of the Nation's capital. On one of his many visits to meet with Short, he was unceremoniously kicked out of a taxicab when he made the mistake of telling the cabbie why he was in town. The Washington Senators became the Texas Rangers Ball Club, and Tom Vandergriff became the team's biggest fan and supporter. When his beloved Rangers won their first American League Pennant by beating the New York Yankees in Arlington last October, Vandergriff was there in the ballpark he helped build to cheer them on.

Today, Arlington is host to more than seven million visitors each year and is the second most popular tourist destination in the state, bringing millions of dollars in revenue to the city annually. The city's entertainment district boasts Six Flags theme park, the Texas Rangers Ballpark, a new Dallas Cowboys football stadium, the National Bowling Congress and Museum, Hurricane Harbor water park, and clusters of shops and restaurants that make Arlington the City of Wow for millions of Texans.

In his 26 years as mayor, two years as a member of Congress, and 16 years as County Judge of Tarrant County, Vandergriff championed two more causes relentlessly: regional communication and cooperation and helping the University of Texas at Arlington become a major institution of higher learning. Believing that everyone in North Texas would succeed if they worked together for the good of the region, Vandergriff spent decades finessing, cajoling, and winning over the leaders of other cities in the region. He led the effort to establish and became the president of the North Central Texas Council of Governments which today is the Metropolitan Planning Organization for all of North Texas. He was a strong advocate for regionalism well into his eighties, and the economic might of the region is a testament to that effort.

Vandergriff's efforts on behalf of his hometown university are equally impressive. When he became mayor, Arlington College was a tiny two-year institution affiliated with Texas A&M that was formerly a military school and then an agricultural college. Vandergriff knew it could be more, and if Arlington were to succeed as a city, so must its college. He led the effort to make the college a four-year university. Working with then-governor John Connally, he succeeded when the college became a full university within the University of Texas system in 1964. Today, the University of Texas at Arlington is the largest UT campus outside of Austin and the fastest growing university in the state. It is quickly becoming a major research facility and contributes more to the local economy than any industry in the city.

There is more, of course, much more. In a life lived as fully and as well as his, there is always more to tell: his unwavering support and leadership of Arlington Memorial Hospital, his support and leadership of the Arlington Chamber of Commerce, his support of local public schools, his support of a long list of non-profit agencies, his decades as an active member of the United Methodist Church, and his roles as husband, father, grandfather, and mentor to a very long list of aspiring leaders.

All of this almost didn't happen, at least not in Texas.

Vandergriff was born on January 29, 1926, to W. T. and Charles Vandergriff in Carrollton, Texas. The family relocated to Arlington when Tom was 12. After graduating from Arlington High School Vandergriff attended USC where he earned a bachelor's degree in 1947. He married his high school sweetheart, Anna Waynette Smith in 1949. Blessed with a deep, sonorous voice that he used with perfect diction, he prepared for a career in radio and broadcast journalism. After graduation he applied for and was a finalist in the competition for what he thought would be the job of his dreams, but he lost out to another young applicant. Vandergriff returned to Texas to join his father's automobile dealership, disappointed and convinced that he was a better candidate for the broadcast job. The young man who got the job was Chet Huntley.

Chet Huntley would gain fame as an NBC news anchor and reach millions of listeners nationwide, but the loser in that early competition, Tom Vandergriff, would touch millions in North Texas in ways that were deeper and arguably more significant. Many have their own stories to tell about Vandergriff, many humorous because he possessed a wonderful sense of humor, many thankful because he touched so many with acts of kindness large and small, and many inspirational because he inspired us, goaded us, and led us to be greater than we thought we were and achieved things we never thought possible. All in North Texas are better off today because Tom Vandergriff was here, and our children and grandchildren will have better lives even though they will never know him. Those of us who did will never forget him.

Well done, good and faithful servant.

I now yield to Congresswoman KAY GRANGER of Texas who wishes to speak also on behalf of Judge Vandergriff.

Ms. GRANGER. Today we remember with great fondness Tom Vandergriff. Tom was a leader in everything he did. He was a man who saw challenges and tried to solve them. He found opportunities and made them work for us. He had a vision that he always reached for. He never accepted the status quo. He was always working for what ought to be.

As a successful businessman, a mayor, a Member of Congress and a county judge, he did so much to promote economic development and opportunities to make Tarrant County, Texas which it is today. Just think of this: Starting as, what he was called, the boy mayor, he was 25 years old. He served his community, helping Texas bring General Motors, Six Flags Over Texas, the Texas Rangers, all to north Texas. He had a vision to anticipate the needs of a growing community and population. But more than that, he was a decent and kind man. His grace was matched only by his courage, and his personal character was exceeded only by his compassion for others. He was the epitome of a great public servant. He will be missed but not forgotten; and our thoughts and prayers are with his family.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Denton, Congressman BURGESS.

Mr. BURGESS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As a member of the Tarrant County delegation, I also want to stand in remembrance of Tom Vandergriff and his 55-year career in public service. Thirteen years it took him to bring major league baseball to Arlington, Texas, and he took the team from Washington, DC that was then known as the Senators; had to fight two Presidents in a bipartisan fashion, both Lyndon Johnson and Richard Nixon.

Judge Vandergriff was the original representative from the 26th District of Texas when it was formed after the 1980 census. My fondest memory of Judge Vandergriff is, however, as the voice of the Texas Rangers. Along with Dick Risenhoover, he would do the broadcasts. They were spellbinding and exciting and kept me away many times from my graduate school studies.

To his family, we offer our prayers and condolences. Thank you, Judge Vandergriff, for 55 excellent years in public service.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I know we have a new protocol for recognizing former Members who have passed away. Is it appropriate under our rules to have a moment of silence for Judge Vandergriff? And if so, how would I request such a moment of silence?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would recommend that the gentleman from Texas consult with the leadership on making such requests.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. So it would not be appropriate at this time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct, and the gentleman's time has expired.

□ 1400

THE MINDLESS REPEAL OF THE ACCOUNTABLE CARE ACT

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, we have a new leader in the House and a new majority, and next week they are going to begin their legislative activity with a stunt. It is a stunt they are bringing out here to pretend that they are repealing the Accountable Care Act that was passed in the last session. They know it won't pass the Senate, they know the President isn't going to accept it, so it is being done simply for their base. Now, I object to doing stunts like this when they affect real people's lives.

I just would ask you for a minute to consider what the repeal of this means to middle class families in this country. I am a physician. There are other physicians on the floor. They know how this repeal will affect people in this country.

In September, we already had go into effect the ability of families to put

their children on their health insurance up to the age of 26. This repeal will say, if you have got a 25-year-old who has cystic fibrosis and is on your health care plan and getting their medications through your health care plan, we are going to take it away from you. That is what they are saying in this.

They are saying for preexisting conditions, if you were trying to get a health care plan and your wife or your son or you have a preexisting condition, you can be denied by an insurance company. We have already passed a law that says that can't happen. It went in in September. Yet the Republicans are going to come out here and say to the middle class in this country, we are going to take away your protection against insurance companies denying you coverage.

It goes on and on and on, but I want to focus on one particular part of this bill. This bill has the largest middle class tax cut in history—the largest tax cut for the middle class in history—because the tax cuts in this health care bill to help the middle class are used for giving credits to people when they buy insurance. People buy insurance, they get a tax credit. It is the largest one in history.

Let me say that again so you get it: They are going to vote next week. They are going to stand out here with a straight face and vote to repeal the largest middle class tax cut in the history of this great Nation that will be worth \$110 billion that they will take away from the middle class.

Now, a few weeks ago we passed a tax bill out of here and we had to give tax cuts to people who make millions and millions of dollars—millions. They said if you don't give the tax cuts to the rich, we are not going to give them to the middle class. The entire Republican Caucus voted against tax cuts unless millionaires got them. Well, we should have learned from that that this repeal will be just more of the same—take \$110 billion away from the middle class by taking a repeal of this law.

You don't have to take it from me. This isn't me making this up. Families USA, a nonpartisan group, has put out this information, and everybody understands it. Now, upstairs in the Rules Committee right now, I could be up there talking but I decided I will talk here first and then go up there and try to get this amendment offered in the bill that will be on Friday. ALLYSON SCHWARTZ and GWEN MOORE are up there already working on this. But it would prevent a repeal effort from increasing taxes on moderate-income or low-income individuals, including through the elimination of tax credits for health care premiums as provided under the health care reform law. We would exempt that one part out of the repeal.

I don't know what success I will have up there, but we will go and try, because it is worth trying. It is worth pointing out how absolutely unthink-

ing this is. It is a mindless thing to come out here with this repeal.

IMPLEMENTING REAL GOVERNMENT REFORM

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

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Madam Speaker, my remarks will be about saving money, but I can't help but take an opportunity to respond to the previous speaker, my good friend, the gentleman, the good doctor from the State of Washington.

I would say to him, Madam Speaker, and to my colleagues, when we repeal ObamaCare, which we will do in this House next Wednesday, parents will once again be able to afford a health insurance policy on which to include their adult children. That is what we will be doing.

As far as this \$110 billion worth of savings we lose in repealing ObamaCare, Madam Speaker, we spent \$1.1 trillion to save \$110 billion. Hey, Madam Speaker, it is true that you can indeed go broke trying to save money.

With that, Madam Speaker, let me get on to my 5-minute discussion.

I rise today to encourage my colleagues to recall the conversations they had with their constituents during the recent campaign season. As we begin the 112th Congress, to remember that the American people spoke with a resounding voice, didn't they, on November 2. They told us to abide by the Constitution, to rein in spending, bring about economic stability, create jobs, and end the culture of crafting legislation in the dark of night, 2,400 pages on the health care bill, outside of the view of the public.

In order to fulfill this mandate, we must fundamentally change the way we do business here in Washington. I have taken the first steps by introducing several legislative initiatives this week, and they are all centered around the pursuit of meaningful government reform.

Madam Speaker, transparency is an integral part of this package and a necessary element for real government reform. For the first time, the Constitution, a document critical to understanding our parameters and responsibility, was read right here in the House today, on the House floor.

I am proud to have introduced a bill as part of my initiative stating that any legislation brought to the floor must cite its constitutional authority. Many may find it surprising to know, Madam Speaker, that while votes taken on the floor of the House are available on the Net to view, or on the Web site, that is not necessarily the case in committee. Therefore, my package also contains a committee transparency bill. It would require committee votes to be posted online, on the committee Web site, within 48

hours, so the American people are kept better informed of what their Members are doing and how they are voting in committee.

Madam Speaker, the rejection by the American people of the Democrats' reckless spending emphasizes the importance of fiscal responsibility, doesn't it? This is the reason I incorporated the Congressional Budget Accountability Act into my plan.

Each year, my colleagues and I receive a fixed budget for all office expenses. We call that the MRA, or the Members' Representational Allowance. This bill would codify that our unused MRA funds must be returned to the Treasury for debt and deficit reduction.

Along these lines, I have also included what is called the Fiscal Responsibility Act, which will preclude any Member of Congress from being eligible for a pay adjustment, a so-called COLA, if we have incurred a budget deficit in the previous fiscal year.

We may not have a balanced budget amendment, Madam Speaker, but that doesn't mean we can't balance the budget, and I want to hold our feet to the fire. This is yet another way that we can do that.

Also in the package, Madam Speaker, is a bill to prevent Federal employees from engaging in union activity on official time. It is amazing that this goes on, but we have estimated that in a 5-year period of time we could save the taxpayer over \$600 million and \$1.2 billion in a 10-year period of time.

Put simply, it is unacceptable that government employees paid with, yes, your tax dollars, are currently permitted to spend time during their workday performing union activities. I have already given you the savings.

Equally unacceptable is that legislators in Washington commonly attach legislation that cannot pass on its own merits to unrelated must-pass bills. Let me give you an example, Military Construction-VA.

A couple of years ago, we passed that out of committee with an almost 100 percent bipartisan vote. The Democratic majority held that bill up for 100 days because they wanted to attach an unpopular bill, something like the Dream Act or Don't Ask, Don't Tell, some controversial bill, and put our veterans at jeopardy. They literally held them hostage. This bill, Madam Speaker, would say from now on, no attaching unpopular bills to good stand-alone bills, especially if they are for our veterans and the military.

Madam Speaker, in conclusion, while these bills may seem like a small start compared to the big challenges we have ahead of us in this Congress, the 112th, it is a pathway to start changing business as usual in Washington and fulfill the promises we made on November 2 to the American people.

□ 1410

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentle-

woman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

THE PROSPERITY CONGRESS

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my hope that historians will look back on the 112th Congress as the session that restored American prosperity and to express my strong agreement with the new leaders of this House who have declared that every action of this body must be measured against this goal.

We speak of jobs, jobs, jobs, but jobs are merely a byproduct of prosperity. And prosperity is the product of freedom. Government does not create jobs or wealth. It merely redistributes them. Jobs and wealth can only be created through the free exchange of goods and services in a free market. Government's role is to create and protect the conditions which promote prosperity.

If I give you a dollar for a cup of coffee, what's going on in that transaction? I'm telling you that your cup of coffee is worth more to me than my dollar. And at the same time, you're telling me that my dollar is worth more to you than your cup of coffee. We make that exchange and both of us go away with something of greater value than we took in. Each of us goes away richer. That's the freedom that creates prosperity. That simple exchange, whether it's for a cup of coffee or a multibillion-dollar acquisition, is what creates wealth.

But now suppose some third party butts its nose into this transaction: Oh, no, the coffee has got to be between 110 and 130 degrees and it has to include a swizzle stick; it has to be consumed more than 25 feet from the point of sale. And on and on and on. Every one of these restrictions reduces the value of that exchange for the one or the both of us.

That's the fundamental problem that we face today. Our government has not only failed to protect the freedom that creates prosperity, but it has become destructive of that freedom. To create jobs, we must restore prosperity; and to restore prosperity, we must restore freedom. We must restore the freedom of choice that gives consumers the ultimate say over the output of our economy. In a free and prosperous society, consumers vote every day with their own dollars on what kind of light bulbs they prefer or on how they want to get to work or what foods they like or how much water they want to put in their toilets or what kind of cars they want or what kind of housing they desire. These consumer choices signal every day what things are actually worth and what our economy will actually produce.

Government is destroying the elegant simplicity of this process, and Congress must reverse this destruction. We must restore the freedom of individuals to enjoy the fruits of their own labor so that they can make these decisions for themselves once again. That's why excessive government spending is so destructive to prosperity. It destroys the freedom of individuals to make their own decisions over what to spend and where to invest their own money. It robs them of both the ability and the incentives to create prosperity.

Presidents like Coolidge, Truman, Reagan, and Clinton, who have reduced government spending relative to GDP, all produced dramatic increases in productivity and prosperity and the general welfare of our Nation. And Presidents like Hoover, Roosevelt, Bush, and Obama, who have increased government spending relative to GDP, all produced or prolonged or deepened periods of economic recession and hardship and malaise. Our government is now embarked upon the latter course, and this Congress must reverse this direction.

Government has an important role to play in the marketplace. It's there to ensure that representations are accurate and that contracts are enforced. You have to tell the truth. You have to keep your promises. And government has an important role to play in ensuring that. Government exists to ensure that the currency is stable and reliable and that property rights are secure. When it fulfills this fundamental role, it maximizes the freedom that a buyer and seller have to assess their own needs and resources and to make those exchanges that allow both to go away better off than they were.

Madam Speaker, let us together revive and restore the freedom and prosperity of this Nation and fulfill that sacred command inscribed on our Liberty Bell: "To proclaim liberty throughout all the land, and unto all the inhabitants thereof."

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

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

REPEAL OF HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. ENGEL. This coming Wednesday, in really the first order of real business of the House, we are voting on health care reform repeal. The new Republican majority has decided that this is the most important issue, even though they know that it's political theater, a charade. It may pass the House, but it won't pass the Senate, and certainly the President would veto it. So this is not becoming law.

At a time when we have so many pressing issues, I am really saddened that the majority wants to conduct this political charade. If there are problems with the health care law, we don't have to repeal it. We could change parts of it. We could tweak it. We could put out of the bill what we don't like and keep in the bill what we do like. But, unfortunately, the attitude and the decision has been made to try to repeal the whole bill.

My constituents understand that as we speak now the Rules Committee is discussing what kind of amendments to allow. And we know no real meaningful amendments, if anything, are going to be allowed. The Republican majority coming in says they're going to have open rules. And we're not going to have really an open rule on the first bill that they're going to attempt to pass, which is a repeal of health care reform. I think that's wrong. I think there are many of us who feel strongly that there ought to be some amendments that we can put in to ensure that the good coverage that we have achieved in the health care bill is kept.

Surely, it's not everything that's wrong with the health care bill which my colleagues oppose. I want to ask them, since they want to repeal the bill, are they against the part of the bill which says that you can keep your child on your health care coverage until age 26? I think my constituents like that, and I think theirs do as well. Do they want to repeal the part that says that an insurance company can no longer deny you coverage because of a so-called preexisting condition? I think that's something that all constituents like and appreciate. Do the people that want to repeal the health care reform bill want to say to insurance companies that it's okay to put caps on people, so when they pay their premium year in and year out and then they finally get sick and ask for coverage, the insurance companies can tell them, Well, sorry. Not only do you have a preexisting condition, but there's also a cap on benefits, either an annual cap or a lifetime cap. So, therefore, we're not going to cover you at all. I don't think anybody's constituents want that part to be repealed.

And what about the doughnut hole for seniors in Medicare part D? Seniors have found it very, very difficult. They get part of their prescription drugs paid for and then there's a doughnut hole which is for a long time. They have to pay for everything themselves while at the same time still paying their monthly premiums to the government. And then, at the end, they get the government to come in and help them. That has put a tremendous burden on seniors. And what the health care bill which was passed by the last Congress does is it eventually removes that doughnut hole for seniors. Seniors can get back money, and it starts right away, where they can get back money to pay for those prescription drugs.

So I think that we hear a lot about the lame-duck session and how we all

work together and how the big question of the new Congress is going to be: Is it going to be a stalemate; is it going to be gridlock; or is it going to be people coming together in a bipartisan fashion to try to work together? If the first bill that the Republican majority is putting on the floor is any indication, it seems to me that they have chosen gridlock. And I'm really sorry about that. Because I will admit there are some things in the new health care law that should be changed, and that we should work across the aisle together to make sure that changes. But to repeal the provisions that benefit my constituents and everyone else's constituents all across America, to me makes no sense whatsoever.

The big insurance companies have had it too big, too long. And my Republican colleagues, unfortunately, are right in bed with them. And I think that is something that the American people ought to see. Who do we care about, the big insurance companies? Or do we care about the average American who is struggling day in and day out to get health care coverage? We have almost 50 million Americans without coverage. And it's not only the people who are not covered now, but it's working people who will find out in the days and months ahead if there is no health care bill, that they will be added to the rolls of people who are uncovered, and that people working hard will find out that the 50 million will swell to 60 million, 70 million, and maybe even more.

□ 1420

So it is going to affect all of us because the health care costs have been rising way, way beyond the rate of inflation, and that is why we needed to have health care reform.

I would say to my friends on the other side of the aisle: Let's not posture politically. Let's try to put our heads together and work in a bipartisan fashion to do something for the American people. If there is something in the bill that needs to be changed, then we should change it, but repeal is not the answer.

Every major bill, from Social Security, to the Civil Rights bills of the 1960s, to Medicare and Medicaid, all had to be tweaked after they were passed. All had to be changed a little bit. It is the same thing with this bill. We should not repeal it. We should fix it.

OMISSION FROM READING OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION—ARTICLE IV, SECTION 4; ARTICLE V

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, earlier today, the historic occasion of the first reading of the United States Constitution here on the floor of the House took place, and it was a very

good bipartisan occasion where nearly one-third of all the Members of the House of Representatives participated in that reading. Unfortunately, during the reading, one of the Members, while he was reading from the notebook at the podium, turned two of the pages, and two pages of the Constitution were not read.

So I ask unanimous consent that I now read those pages and that they be placed into the reading of the Constitution as it occurred earlier today so that we have a complete reading of the Constitution.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I will now read at the end of article IV, section 4.

"The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a Republican form of government, and shall protect each of them against invasion; and on application of the legislature, or of the executive (when the legislature cannot be convened), against domestic violence.

Article V.

The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, or, on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, shall call a convention for proposing amendments, which, in either case, shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States."

That is the portion that was omitted earlier and that, by unanimous consent, is now included in the reading of the Constitution.

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.)

OUR HOMELAND, THE FORGOTTEN THIRD FRONT

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. Madam Speaker, more border agents are being sent to the border. The border, as we all know, is violent, dangerous, and it is not safe. Drugs and guns and people and money cross back and forth across the border because two nations do not have operational control of that border. The border is desolate. It is hard. It is a war zone—but Madam Speaker, I am not talking about the border of the United States with Mexico. I am talking about the southern border, or the border with Pakistan and Afghanistan.

That's right. Border Patrol agents from the United States are going to Afghanistan to protect the Afghan border

from the Taliban coming in from Pakistan. It is a war zone over there, and the Secretary of Homeland Security, Janet Napolitano, has said we are going to contribute Border Patrol agents to protect the border of Afghanistan. There are already 25 there, and more are on the way.

Now, Madam Speaker, why are Border Patrol agents from the United States going to Afghanistan?

The marines and our soldiers and our troops over there can do the job. More importantly, we need the Border Patrol agents over here. "Homeland security" means that the Secretary of Homeland Security protects the American homeland, not the homeland of some other nation.

We need the help.

In fact, we need the military on our southern border. Our border is a war zone. Drugs and people and money crisscross our border with Mexico. It is a violent place. It is the third front. More recently, we have had several people murdered on the battlefield on our border. Let me relate three of those.

One of those was a 27-year-old female police chief in Mexico—right on the border with the United States. Chief Hermila Garcia was on the job for 51 days, and she was shot down, shot seven times by the drug cartels. A recent homicide on the border.

Border Patrol Agent Brian Terry was shot in the back while he was protecting our border. Ironically, he had been to Iraq and Afghanistan as a soldier, as a marine, and now he was back here, killed on our border.

Then David Hartley, a citizen, was murdered on Falcon Lake, in Texas, when he was with his wife, Tiffany, as they were viewing an old mission. Shot and killed by the drug cartels.

Our homeland is not protected adequately, and it is time that we put Border Patrol agents on our border but also that we put the National Guard on our southern border. It is the third front. Homeland Security should protect it.

And that's just the way it is.

AFGHANISTAN

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

Mr. JONES. Madam Speaker, today, I have a photograph of Tyler Jordan, whose father, Phillip, was a marine gunnery sergeant killed in Iraq. I saw this photograph about 5 years ago in a national paper, and I felt that I needed to have this photograph for myself to be able to be reminded of war and the pain of war.

On Tuesday, I had the privilege and humbling experience to visit the wounded warriors at Walter Reed. I saw the pain these heroes were experiencing from the severe injuries they received fighting for this country. That's why today I show you the photograph

of Tyler Jordan's pain as he holds a folded flag at his father's funeral. This boy's pain and the pain of the heroes at Walter Reed are the reasons I've joined my colleagues in both parties in asking President Obama to bring our troops home.

Madam Speaker, this country has many problems. Maybe I am wrong, but sadly, it seems to me, the war in Afghanistan seems to be on the back burner.

Before Christmas, I read from a Washington Post article that quoted President Karzai as saying he now has three main enemies—the Taliban, the United States and the international community. He said in that article that, if he had to choose sides today, he would choose the Taliban.

There have been many articles written questioning the success of our troops in Afghanistan, but our troops have been successful. So why keep them in a country, risking their lives, when the President of that country supports the enemy?

The Afghan Government is corrupt. Not one American life should be sacrificed for such a dysfunctional, corrupt government.

In mid-December, President Obama released a review of the American strategy in Afghanistan that painted a positive picture of the progress being made there. This review is, at best, dubious. I agree with two national intelligence reports that were also released with a more realistic, negative assessment on the state of the war and our chance for success.

As I have said before, we are spending approximately \$7 billion a month, which is \$234 million a day, to fight a winless war for a corrupt government. Why do we continue to spend \$234 million a day so that some other child has to know Tyler's pain?

In closing, I would like to ask God, as I do every day on the floor when I speak, to please bless our men and women in uniform. I ask God to please bless the families of our men and women in uniform. I ask God, in his loving arms, to hold the families who have given a child dying for freedom in Afghanistan and Iraq.

I ask God, please bless this House and Senate that we will do what is right in the eyes of God for the American people; and I will ask God to give wisdom, strength, and courage to the President of the United States that he will do what is right in the eyes of the American people.

And I will say three times: God, please, God please, God, please continue to bless America.

□ 1430

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

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

THE PEOPLE'S HOUSE SHOULD LISTEN TO THE PEOPLE: BRING OUR TROOPS HOME FROM AFGHANISTAN

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, this week as the 112th Congress begins, there is a lot of talk from the Republicans about ending business as usual and doing things differently than before. But for all the supposed change afoot, there's one critical matter on which the new majority is fully embracing the status quo—the war in Afghanistan that is now nearly a decade old. This war has been going on so long that 55 percent of my colleagues weren't here when it started.

We've heard plenty about changing the House rules, about changing the way we conduct the Nation's business, about changing the relationship between the government and the people. We've even heard about how a new law that will provide affordable health care to all Americans is somehow the greatest threat to the Republic and the constitutional order.

But on the subject of war—a disastrous war that has taken the lives of more than 1,400 Americans in Afghanistan and cost taxpayers some \$366 billion—the new congressional majority is interested in no change whatsoever.

In his speech yesterday, Speaker BOEHNER spoke of giving government back to the people. In his speech he talked about honesty, accountability, and responsiveness. Look, if he meant that, he should be listening to the 60 percent of people who believe the war in Afghanistan is not worth fighting. A clear majority of Americans realize what so many in Washington refuse to acknowledge—that this war represents an epic failure, a national embarrassment, and a moral blight on our Nation.

On this matter of life and death, this issue that will determine how history judges the United States, most of the Representatives in the House, in the people's House at that, have told the people that their point of view doesn't matter, that we know better than what they know. As usual, the people are way ahead of their policymakers, just as they were 4 years ago on Iraq. They may hear reassuring platitudes from Washington about how we're on track, but they can see the news for themselves. They can see that the security situation is in decline, that casualties are up, that the Taliban is strong, and that Afghan governance is ineffective at the very best and corrupt at the worst.

So I can't think of anything more patronizing than to tell them not to worry their pretty little heads about the war, that us grown-ups in Washington have it all taken care of. We're not bowing before them, Madam Speaker; we're sticking our finger in their eyes.

Do we truly believe it's about them and not us? Do we truly believe that we are caretakers whose only legitimacy derives from our employers who elected us? If that's true, then it's time for the Representatives of the people's House to start listening to the people.

With that, it's time to bring our troops home.

SPENDING CUTS IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

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. Madam Speaker, I appreciate an opportunity to talk about a subject that I think has been on a lot of Americans' minds over particularly the last couple of years, and it's the subject of spending cuts in the Federal Government.

Now, unless people are perhaps tuned in to some other planet, they realize that the Federal Government is spending more money than we take in, and so we're running all of these deficits. Therefore, the idea is that we need to do some spending cuts. So that's what we wanted to talk about here for a little while, and I'm joined by some good friends and some very trusted Congressmen on this subject.

Just to try to frame what we're talking about a little bit—and I usually have some charts to go along with this, but the charts haven't been printed yet—if you take a look, these are pretty simple numbers. If you take a look at the spending projection for 2011, it's \$3.834 trillion, and the income projection is \$2.567 trillion. The two numbers aren't the same, as you notice, and basically we're spending more than a trillion, close to a trillion, trillion and a half dollars that we don't have. And that suggests, for most Americans that have some level of common sense, that we're going to have to make some cuts in spending. So that's the overall subject, and I think it's one that gets everybody's attention and that we need to give some thought to.

Now, obviously, right off the beginning of the bat, the new party, the Republicans, are running the House, and we're trying to start off setting a good note in being fiscally responsible. There's a fund that's allocated to each Congressman for them to run their office, to make their airplane flights, to pay phone bills, and things like that. We cut that 5 percent just as, in the sense, an indication of the fact that we're serious about doing this spending cut. That certainly doesn't get us to where we have to go, but at least it's a start.

There are a number of different ways we can approach this subject, but one of the other things that we'll be voting on this week, aside from the 5 percent cut in congressional budgets, is the fact that we want to get rid of this tre-

mendously expensive government takeover of the health care in America. It's known as ObamaCare, I suppose. And I'm joined by good friend who has joined me on the floor many times in the past 2 years, a medical doctor from Georgia, Dr. GINGREY, and he is somebody who knows, inside and out, not only the medical profession but this bill which has the government taking over all of health care.

Now, as you can imagine, that would be expensive. It would be expensive to American citizens. It would be expensive to businesses and expensive to the Federal Government. So, one place we can start talking about spending cuts is what we'll be voting on before too long, which is to get rid of this government takeover of health care, and for that reason, I would like to recognize my good friend, Dr.—Congressman—GINGREY from Georgia.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Missouri yielding, and I know that when he was referring to my medical expertise in regard to knowing that subject inside and out, no pun was intended when he mentioned that.

I do know a lot more about health care, probably, than I do about government spending, but one thing's for sure, Madam Speaker, as the gentleman pointed out: We are spending way too much money. And I think the figures today, this year, last year, we spent a third more than we took in. I mean, you know, we have a revenue stream from taxation of the American people, and yet we went beyond that by \$1 trillion of borrowed money; and, of course, of the nondomestic creditors, the largest one is China. They hold a lot of our debt. They happen to be, now, the second largest economy in the world at \$9 trillion GDP.

We had about a \$15 trillion GDP, but the thing that is so scary and frightening about that is we owe \$14 trillion. So our debt to GDP ratio is approaching 100 percent. So, you know, when we stand up, Madam Speaker, as we're doing right now and talk about this issue, we're almost in panic, and we should be because we're right on the precipice, right on the edge of becoming part of the PIGS acronym—Portugal, Italy, Ireland, Greece, Spain.

□ 1440

And, you know, we point the finger at them. But goodness gracious, it's like the Bible scripture that I'm sure the Representative from Missouri probably knows by heart. But it goes something like, If you've got a plank in your own eye, you shouldn't be pointing out the speck in somebody else's. We've got a plank in our own eye. And this is why in this 112th Congress, we have a huge challenge, don't we, my colleagues? We have a huge challenge. We're up to it. We're up to it, and I hope that we are going to be up to it on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. AKIN. So let's say that we get what you've been working for, and let's

just say by some great miracle that we were able to stop that ObamaCare. Now that would save a whole, whole lot of money, wouldn't it, in terms of—

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Well, reclaiming the time that the gentleman yielded to me, Madam Speaker. Absolutely. The gentleman from Washington, our esteemed colleague, a physician, Mr. MCDERMOTT was on the floor a little earlier talking about, well, what we were trying to do in repealing ObamaCare, or the formal recognition of that bill, Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

Mr. AKIN. I call it socialized medicine. That's easier, but go ahead.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. That's a lot easier, socialized medicine, Madam Speaker; but that's essentially what it is. That is essentially what the former majority party was pushing towards.

But the gentleman who spoke said, Well, it's a stunt. These Republicans know they can't repeal ObamaCare. And, furthermore, even if they did, it would be at a cost of \$200 billion. And what I pointed out to him, Madam Speaker, as he was leaving the floor was, You know, that's really interesting. It's going to cost us \$200 billion, if that's accurate, to repeal while it cost us \$1.1 trillion to enact. So you can literally go broke saving money, can't you. And by golly, we're going to repeal it because that's what the American people want.

If we fall short in our efforts, despite 110 percent on this side of the aisle or, well, in this body and in the other body, then we have a backup plan B. And I know my colleagues would like to talk about that.

So I will yield back to the gentleman from Missouri, and let's continue the discussion.

Mr. AKIN. Well, I appreciate your medical expertise and your overview. Obviously, if the Federal Government isn't jumping into taking over all of health care, there is going to be a lot more in the private sector. We will maybe get into that a little bit about what really should the Federal Government be doing, and what should we allow States to do, and what should we allow the free market economy to do.

It seems like the way things are working today, we've got Georgia very well represented. And Congressman TOM GRAVES from Georgia has joined us before on the floor. You always have an interesting and articulate perspective. This is kind of a pet topic for a lot of us that think that government isn't a servant anymore, but it's the master. So if you say, Hey, let's start cutting government, that's kind of an interesting topic. I would like you to join us, please, TOM.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Well, I thank the gentleman from Missouri. And you're right. I mean, today, what a breath of fresh air to hear the syllables of the Constitution recited from Members all throughout this body, leading into this topic and this discussion because we really want to address

spending cuts and the proper role of government. What better way to start it than reciting the Constitution today. And hopefully Members of this body listened and heard. They didn't get up and just read a sentence or two or an amendment. They actually consumed it in their mind and are starting to understand what it means. Because for too long, the Federal Government has been kicking the can down the road on spending. Saying, Oh, elect me; elect me, and we will cut spending. When you look at the data, it's clear: deficit spending has occurred at an average, just in the last fiscal year, of probably \$110 billion a month deficit spending.

Mr. AKIN. Oh, wait. And \$110 billion a month. That used to be the deficit in a whole year.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Right.

Mr. AKIN. Wow, we are setting all kinds of records in the wrong direction.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. You are right. And that leads up to this discussion that we are hearing now in the media which I don't know where they've been over the last several months talking about the debt ceiling. Well, the reason we're approaching and about to pierce the debt ceiling is this deficit spending that has occurred from the previous leadership here in the House as well as the administration who is still there.

And as we approach this debt ceiling, we have got to push spending cuts more and more and more. And I'm thankful that I just was sworn in for the second time yesterday—

Mr. AKIN. We're glad to have you back again, and we thank the good people of Georgia for making a good decision there.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Well, thank you. But being appointed to the Appropriations Committee, it is clear, and I have made it clear to my constituents, that I am not going on as a spender. I'm going on as a saver. It seems for far too long Members would seek to be on appropriations because they wanted to spend money. Well, guess what. It's a new day, a new era. And it's a just fresh day when you have Members going on to say, Here is how we are going to save money. So what a great debate we are going to have in the next several weeks.

Mr. AKIN. That's good. Now, let's get on to this just a little bit more. Let's try to get into the details in terms of procedurally. Okay, now you've got a new Congress. Republicans are in the majority, and we've got the problem. When you take a look at the numbers and we're spending a third more than what we're taking in, we know we've got to do some cutting. But yet one of the things that people want to pin us down on, okay, you guys are such big mouths about cutting spending, what are you not going to fund? Because there is going to be some group that is going to get mad at you. So how are you going to it approach it?

And one thing that I know in State governments they do sometimes is

they say, Well, what we've got to do is, we're 10 percent over budget, so we need to cut 10 percent off of everything. That makes it seem to be fair. And that would be one way you might approach what we've got going on.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Oh, you are absolutely right. I think what we've heard about repealing ObamaCare—yesterday I introduced the legislation again to defund it, to take away all authorizing funds going to the legislation as well, which is another step forward. You know, why don't we defund some czars. That's a whole other discussion that we've all seen.

And then as we move back to those 2008 levels, and we might need to go even just a little bit further and begin cutting more and more and more, I mean, are the decisions going to be difficult? Sure, they are. But that's why your constituents and mine elected us to come here and make those tough decisions.

Mr. AKIN. Congressman GRAVES, let me lay out two ways you could approach it. If you've got just a little bit you've got to cut, you could maybe take a little bit from everything. But there's another way you could take a look at it when you've got to cut one-third. One way you could do it would be to say, What are the essential functions that the Federal Government has to do, and what are things that we really don't have to do because a State could do it or the private sector could do it?

I yield to the Chair.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS

The SPEAKER. If Representative SESSIONS of Texas and Representative FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania would present themselves in the well.

Messrs. SESSIONS and FITZPATRICK appeared at the bar of the House, and the Speaker administered the oath of office to them as follows:

Do you solemnly swear or affirm that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter, so help you God.

Congratulations. You are now officially Members.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER). The gentleman from Missouri may resume.

Mr. AKIN. So we were just talking about now you've got the situation with the Federal Government spending a third more than it takes in. So we've got to figure out some way of how we're going to skin this cat.

And one way is to just try to take a certain 10 percent or whatever the percentage is. Actually, it would be 33 percent off of everything or whatever. Or what you could say would be, what are the things that we have to do, and

what are the things that maybe are nice but we can't afford it, and what are the things that may be actually unconstitutional. And I suspect when you're one-third over budget, it's going to be hard to just do a set percentage across the board. I suspect we're going to get into, I think, some very interesting questions about what's really constitutional and does the Federal Government really have to do that function? Maybe it's an important thing to get done, but maybe the Federal Government shouldn't do it. So I just wondered if you wanted to jump in on that subject.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Yes, I would be happy to just add a little bit more to that.

I think a few approaches you could take when you ask the question, Is it duplicative? Is it occurring somewhere else? Is another agency or Department doing it? And that is after you've cleared the hurdle. Is it a role of the Federal Government in general itself? Then you could also ask, is it something you could devolve back to the States? Have we usurped the States in which I would think many Members of our conference here would probably agree. In some cases, the Federal Government has overstepped its bounds, and it's time to remove ourselves from the States and allow the States to take over.

But you know, from a business owner's perspective, what if you looked at the Department heads or the agency heads, and you said, You go back and you cut 25 percent and you bring back your recommendations; and then you show us a budget estimate with 20 percent cuts and then one with 10 percent, empower those agency heads to make those decisions, to analyze their Departments and come back.

□ 1450

While we're also on the theme of physicians, we're taking a surgical approach as well as pulling out those unnecessary programs. So that would be some approaches I would take.

Mr. AKIN. Well, those are some great recommendations here. To reinforce what you've said, I didn't have time to get some of the charts that we normally have printed, but here's some examples.

We've got 342 economic development programs. Do you think we really need 342 of them? Talk about duplicative. That seems to make your point.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. With unemployment at what?

Mr. AKIN. 10 percent or whatever. 130 programs serving the disabled. Do we need 130? Maybe it would be better to consolidate, just do a couple of good ones.

And then 130 programs serving at-risk youth. And so these are all of these things where you say it doesn't even make common sense. We have to really start getting into analyzing, first of all, should we even be doing it, and then, if we should, do we need hundreds of programs doing something that should be done with one or two.

I see that Dr. GINGREY is back at it again. He just couldn't sit still when we talk about cutting things. So just welcome to the discussion.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding back to me. And I know we've got two other colleagues on the floor that want to speak. I can only stay for a few more minutes because of a prior engagement, so thank you for giving me an opportunity kind of in front of the queue, if you will.

But I'll tell you, one of the things in regard to how you cut, is it by picking and choosing, or in one fell swoop across the board?

You know, we just passed a bill, last vote of the day, in regard to our own budgets. And that was a 5 percent across-the-board cut, Madam Speaker, in our member representational account, our expense account that we're allotted each year to pay the salaries of our staff members, and to have a round trip flight back to our districts once a week. And those budgets vary a little bit, depending on, obviously somebody from California is going to have more travel expense than somebody like myself and Representative GRAVES from Georgia. But we just basically voted to cut 5 percent.

And I, quite honestly, and this question that has come up, Madam Speaker, my colleagues talk about, well, how do you do it? I just think we more and more need to look at this thing and say there are no sacred cows. And let these Departments make their case for why maybe there shouldn't be an across-the-board, 2 percent, 3 percent, 4 percent cut. I know I voted in favor of that every time it comes up on these appropriations bills. We didn't get to vote on any in the 111th Congress because our Democratic colleagues didn't get their work done. But this is something we need to really look at carefully.

I know that most people, Madam Speaker, are reluctant to talk about cutting Homeland Security and cutting national defense, particularly when we have two wars going on and certainly not wanting to cut the veterans benefits. But there's waste, fraud and abuse and duplication of things across every spectrum of this Federal Government. If we're going to get serious about it, we need to have an adult conversation.

And, Madam Speaker and my colleagues, that includes entitlements as well, because if we don't address entitlements, we're looking at one-sixth of the budget; and we're never going to get there just addressing that small portion of the budget.

With that, I yield back and continue to listen to my colleagues.

Mr. AKIN. Hey, Doctor, it's a treat to have you on the floor. And I'm going to run over to, moving a little bit from Georgia to the West, to the great State of Utah, and Congressman BISHOP, you've joined us on the floor a number of times. And one of the questions that—let's say that you were on the

Budget Committee or something, and you're trying to prioritize, how are you going to—guns and butter, how are you going to prioritize defense versus endowment for the arts or whatever it is?

How do we crack this nut about trying to reduce Federal spending? I would appreciate your perspective.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Let me try and hit, for just one moment, two potential areas to address that particular question, and it goes back to the fact that we did read the Constitution on the floor today.

You know it's amazing, as P.J. O'Rourke once said, that the Constitution is 16 pages, which is the operator's manual for 300 million people. The operator's manual for the Toyota Camry, in contrast, is four times as large, and it only seats five.

But you also contrast that with what we have done in the lame duck session when the Senate's omnibus spending bill, it's not 16 pages, it was 1,924 pages. Those are the kinds of issues we're talking about. And I think if we really want an answer of how we make those decisions, we go back to the document that was read this morning.

The general welfare clause today usually puts the emphasis on the word "welfare." When they wrote that thing, they put the emphasis on the word "general." What the Federal Government should do is that which affects all of us.

Monroe, Madison, Jackson vetoed road projects because they said those road projects didn't meet the general welfare. When Savannah burned to the ground, Congress had a great deal of empathy for Savannah, but it did not actually appropriate any money for Savannah because they said giving money to Savannah to rebuild would simply help Savannah and was not general welfare.

Now, I made this speech once on the floor a couple of years ago, and I got a nice letter, kind of, from a lady in Alabama who took me to task and listed all the programs that she thought were viable and good and she wanted continued. And I said, ma'am, you actually missed the ultimate point. The point is not should these programs be available for citizens. The point is, who should be responsible for providing those programs?

Not every idea has to germinate, be funded, be appropriated, be regulated from Washington. The States are equally competent. And if, indeed, we divided our responsibilities together, we could provide better services for the people for a cheaper price.

Now, Mr. AKIN, if I could just give one second of a simple example. David Walker has written a great book called "The Rebirth of Federalism," where he simply made the effect that dangling money we don't have in front of cash-starved States does not necessarily help out the States or us, or the taxpayers who have to foot the bill for both levels of government.

For example, he said when we put conditional grants to States with

strings attached that eventually become regulations and mandates, it undercuts both the inter-level cooperation between those two bodies, and it is a term he invented called "creeping conditionalism," which means the cost to the taxpayer actually increases.

By doing his estimates, the Safe Drinking Water Act of 1986 cost the States \$2 billion to \$3 billion more than the States would have spent to provide their own safe drinking water. From '83 to '90 he estimated that the regulations imposed by the Federal Government was \$9 billion to \$13 billion more in local taxes that did not provide a benefit to the citizens. It was just the creeping cost to them.

So our mandates, supposedly with free money given to States, end up costing the taxpayer not only for the free money we don't have, but costs the States to do more than they would have done or needed to do to actually address the problem.

Mr. AKIN. To meet the mandates. You know, interestingly, and I can't help but piggy back just a little bit on your point, gentleman, it used to be a very boring place to be a Congressman down here because there were almost no laws on the books. Do you know the Federal laws, to begin with, in terms of laws about right and wrong, were, one of them was a law against piracy on the high seas. Another one was against counterfeiting. Another one was a law against espionage. Those three laws were the main laws on the books federally. And what did they have in common? Well, just exactly your point. Piracy, counterfeiting and espionage against our country were against the general welfare. They were laws that affected everything. So laws against murder and rape and stealing and all that kind of stuff were all State laws because the States made all those laws. So you had a very limited jurisdiction federally.

And now, as you say, we've got all of these different sorts of creeping red tape which keep costing. In an insidious way, everybody's cost of living keeps slipping up, but you don't really know why, who's nibbling all the money out of your wallet. But it's because of a lot of those things that you're talking about. And I appreciate that perspective you shared with us.

I promised my good friend from Louisiana, Congressman SCALISE, he has become, this last year or two, an expert on oil rigs and oil spills and everything, but good on many other topics as well. And when we start talking about government, I've got to let you have a piece of the action, my friend.

□ 1500

Mr. SCALISE. I want to thank my friend from up the Mississippi River in Missouri, Madam Speaker, for yielding to me and talking about this important issue, because there seems to be a lot of energy as we are talking about energy in this House.

I think yesterday was so exciting to see not only the gavel ceremoniously

passed from NANCY PELOSI to now Speaker BOEHNER, but also that these principles that are in the Constitution be restored to the people.

This is the people's House, and it should operate as the people's House. And I think now it's starting to get back to those principles that we articulated today when we read the Constitution, a real uplifting experience. It is sad, unfortunately, to note as we look through history that this was the first time that the entire U.S. Constitution was read on the House floor. I think this should be an event that occurs every new Congress so that we reestablish and remind ourselves just what we are up here to uphold.

As we talk about the spending issues of the country, I think one area that shows you where spending has gotten out of control is, if you go to the 10th Amendment of the Constitution, as I know my friend from Utah is such a proud proponent: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

And yet, if you look, so many of the things that we are doing up here in Washington, that this Federal Government has gotten so expansive in doing, have absolutely nothing to do with powers that were delegated in the Constitution.

In fact, one of the big debates we are going to have here this week, our first week here under this new Congress, is about this government takeover of health care that a Federal court just ruled is not constitutional. The Federal Government, under Federal court ruling now, does not have the authority to mandate that American citizens have to buy a private product as a condition of citizenship.

So I think the fact that not only today did we put our money where our mouths are by voting to cut our own budgets, because as we are talking about cutting all throughout government where there is duplication, where there are departments that shouldn't even exist, these czars, these 30 or so shadow government figures that are running their own, almost, cabinets, like a secret cabinet that is running out there, and every one of them has multimillion dollar budgets and staffs, and they are not accountable to anybody except the President—not to the people, not to the Senate, that the Constitution says they should be doing. We are going to be going and looking at all of those areas to make serious cuts.

But then we also have to look—and of course tomorrow we will be voting on the start of the process—to repeal ObamaCare and do what the courts have already said—this isn't constitutional; it shouldn't be on the books—and get rid of that constitutional mandate with all the bad taxes and other things that go with it.

But then we have got to look at creating jobs. And I think that's where

you get into an area where, while we are cutting spending, which we need to do aggressively, we also need to unleash the potential of the individual.

It is not government here in Washington that makes this a great country, and really the greatest country in the history of the world. It's the power of our people back home—the small business owner, the stay-at-home mom who is raising a family—the people that actually make this country work. And there is no place I don't think any more evident of what is wrong with Washington and hurting that opportunity than in my home State where you have got this permissorium going on since after the BP disaster in the Gulf of Mexico. It's the President's policies, not the actions and failures of BP. It's the President's policies that, according to the White House, have put 12,000 people out of work through what is called a permissorium.

The government has said all of the companies that didn't do anything wrong, the companies that played by the rules, that follow all the best safety guidelines in the world and had no problems, now the government has shut them down, put them out of work, and they are not even issuing permits.

Mr. AKIN. I can't help but just jump in a little bit.

It just keeps coming back to my mind, as you talk about the particular situation of the job-killing mandates that are coming from the administration, I keep thinking an awful lot of Americans must be starting to feel the same way I do: that the government is not a servant anymore; that it's a fearful master.

We were warned by the forefathers that if you let your government, your Federal Government get out of control, it will become a fearful master. It seems to me that that's kind of what is starting to happen. And I think the last election was an understanding across the whole country that this government needs to be put back in its proper place, being a servant of the people and doing programs that are constitutional instead of things that people just think of, wow, it would be a great idea if we mandate this or mandate that.

And here you have an example of an area that's already had a tough hit from the oil spill, and we are going to take businesses that have done nothing wrong and we're going to basically shut them down because of some mandate. Somehow or another, I just don't see that as being government of the servant. Do you?

Mr. SCALISE. In fact, it's exactly the opposite of the government being the servant. It's the government being the oppressor. And as I mentioned, 12,000 jobs have already been lost in south Louisiana alone. And these aren't my numbers; this is the White House. And the White House and the President's response to that was, well, they could just go get unemployment.

These aren't people who want to get on unemployment rolls. They are hard-

working people who love and have a great, strong work ethic. They want to be contributing to America's energy security. But it's this administration that has shut them down and not allowed them to go back to work drilling safely.

And I'm not talking about BP. I'm talking about the companies who have played by the rules all along, who have never had any safety problems because they follow a higher standard. They are the ones that have been shut down and put out of work.

And not only is it affecting Louisiana in terms of the 12,000 jobs; it has now affected America's energy security, because right now, nationally, this is a time, once you get out of the summer, where gas prices typically start falling again. But what are we seeing? We are seeing the opposite of that. Now gas prices are breaking over the \$3-a-gallon mark in many States because, in part, this administration has changed our energy policies where we have shut off more areas of energy production in America, which means these Middle Eastern countries, many of whom don't like us, other foreign countries are now producing the energy that we need, which reverses our trade balance. It sends billions of dollars and thousands of jobs to foreign countries out of America, and then it makes our country less secure, which is why we are approaching \$100-a-barrel gasoline now, because the Americans have basically said through President Obama's policies: We are going to shut off most of our sources of known energy. But, of course, our demand for energy hasn't dropped in the country, so that means we are now going to have to be more reliant on many of these foreign countries who don't like us.

So it has not only devastating consequences in terms of 12,000 lost jobs in south Louisiana, but also devastating effects on America's energy security which now we are seeing reflected in these gas prices that are now breaking \$3 a gallon.

Mr. AKIN. Congressman, you have talked about Louisiana, and I appreciate that perspective, and that's the specifics.

If we sort of back up a little bit from what you have said and take a look, and the subject here that we are talking about today is cutting government. If you take a look at the Department of Energy, the Department of Energy was founded years and years ago with the purpose of making sure that we were not dependent on foreign oil.

Now, that department has grown with more and more and more buildings and bureaucrats and people in it I'm sure with well-meaning intention. But as the Department has grown, we have become more dependent on foreign oil. Now, there is something in that equation that's fundamentally nuts, so we have to take a really good look at this subject.

I am interested, too, and sometimes I point out to my constituents, I think

people don't understand this, but our opinions in this Chamber are pretty divided. If I were to say to some of my constituents that there is a big difference between Republicans and Democrats on the abortion issue, they would go, Gee, whiz, no big surprise. But they may be surprised to know that if you look at voting records, there is a bigger difference on development of American energy between Republicans and Democrats than there is on the abortion issue. So there is a difference of opinion as to whether or not we need to become energy independent in this country.

And I'm glad you've got the common sense to say we need to be energy independent; we need to develop all of our resources for energy. And the fact that you have taken a strong stand on that, Steve, I think you are doing a great job for Louisiana, and it's a treat to have you joining us here today and bringing that expertise.

I am going to run back over to Georgia in a little bit and jump over here to Representative GRAVES. Jump in, please.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Well, thank you for yielding some time. And, Madam Speaker, this should be the final few minutes of my discussion as I am going to leave and yield to the gentleman from Utah. I sort of want to follow up on what he said. But before I do, I want to point out that the Republican Study Committee, which I believe all of us are members of and actively a part of, is putting together a rescissions plan which has \$2.6 trillion in cuts identified already that would occur over the next 10 years and an amazing set of proposals that, to me, as we stand here today in the majority, JOHN BOEHNER as our Speaker that we nominated, we elected, and we are still talking about spending being the number one issue. That's how committed we are.

Going back to the gentleman's statement, he was referring to the Constitution and the general welfare clause in the Preamble there. I thought I would bring up an interesting point, because it says to "promote the general welfare," not "provide the general welfare." An interesting distinction there. And what a notion we have taken from a central government role to want to provide for everyone.

But if you go one clause prior to that, it says, "provide for the common defense." Not "promote," but "provide" common defense and "promote" general welfare. Two distinct differences and clauses. And we have certainly mistaken that second clause there.

□ 1510

Mr. AKIN. That is such a good point. I don't think it does any harm to repeat that. Let's go back to it again. We are talking about the preamble to the U.S. Constitution, it sets the whole framework for what this country rests on, and you've got two words that are

loaded with meaning. The first one is the general defense. That's national security. The general defense is general. It's security for every State, for every American, rich or poor, black or white, male or female. When Americans are secure, Americans are secure; and we use Federal money to do something that is general. And it's not to encourage it; it's to provide for that defense.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Clearly the word is provide for common defense.

The next phrase or clause is then promote general welfare. Not provide. Promote the general welfare.

Mr. AKIN. Now I think there were Federalist papers that were written to help make that point and to define the fact that to promote general welfare is not a clause big enough to run tanks through and say that anything that seems like a nice thing to do for somebody is constitutional.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. You're right. I will wrap up with this, two quotes from two very different Presidents. Ronald Reagan once said: "Revenue is not the problem; spending is the problem." We all know that. But then another quote is this: "Increasing America's debt weakens us domestically and internationally. Leadership means the buck stops here. Instead, Washington is shifting the burden of bad choices today onto the backs of our children and our grandchildren. America has a debt problem and a failure of leadership."

Mr. AKIN. Now who was it who said that? Was that Ronald Reagan?

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. "Americans deserve better." End quote. That was then-Senator Barack Obama on the Senate floor.

Mr. AKIN. So there's a big difference between Senate and Presidency apparently.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. A big difference.

But he is absolutely correct that America has a debt problem and a failure of leadership. Mr. President, here is your opportunity.

Mr. AKIN. And the interesting thing is that if you take George Bush's biggest deficit year, which was when Speaker PELOSI was here in Congress, 2009, his biggest deficit was one-third of the first Obama, which was \$1.4 trillion. So what is the connection between the quote and the action? I think what we need to do is to take a very, very good look at what really is constitutional.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. I think the connection is in his quote—a failure of leadership.

Mr. AKIN. A failure of leadership. His own words.

Thank you, Congressman. It has been a treat to have you joining us here this afternoon.

I want to run back over to Utah to my good friend, Congressman BISHOP.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Thank you.

I do appreciate the Congressman from Georgia talking about the difference between "provide" and "promote."

Let me just go with one historical example of how that works, because I think in one of your earlier questions it was said, How are we actually going to handle this spending problem? Part of it is we have to think outside the box and make some things that have been common assumptions not necessarily have to survive.

And instead of going with some issues that we're funding right now, which may be too close to people, let me just go back to history. In most of the history books that I do, that I have seen, when we taught high school history, they always talk about how this nation came together with the uniting of the railroads, the UP and the Central Pacific joining together and how the Federal Government subsidized that process and was the only viable way of getting that done. We provided the railroad system.

One of the concepts, though, as I was reading another book that took a closer look on this issue is that not only did the Federal Government help with this railroad building craze but the idea that the Federal Government became involved changed the mechanism in which railroads were built and the kinds of ways they were built.

We paid railroads for every mile of track that was laid, which meant you gave them more money if they went to a mountainous route than on flat land. So many of those routes took a very circuitous route going through some elevated terrain because they got more money than if they had just taken a simpler flat route. One of the, I won't mention which one but they refused to put up masonry supports. They put up wooden culverts only for their train tracks. In the winter they laid track over ice which meant as soon as the thaw came, the tracks disappeared. Much of our railway system had to be rebuilt within 2 years of its actual completion.

I live in the State of Utah and my only national monument is the Golden Spike National Monument in my district in which both the Union Pacific and the Central Pacific came and they passed one another continuing to lay track because they were paid for it by the Federal Government, until Congress finally told them not to track off and link up somewhere; and they picked Promontory Summit which is in the State of Utah in my county to finally link up.

Ironically enough, in 1893 James Hill built—maybe the Madam Speaker has the name of this railroad—Northern Railroad that went from Chicago to Seattle. He did that without any government subsidies whatsoever. He paid private property for renting his lines even during the panic. It survived. It was functional. It was profitable.

Sometimes we make assumptions that only the Federal Government has the ability of doing things when in reality we don't. And we forget that once again if we were to make States a true partner with us in projects, States

have the ability of being creative, much more than we do; they have the ability of providing justice for its circumstances much more than we do; and more importantly if the States make a mistake, it doesn't harm the entire country. I think ObamaCare may be one of those particular examples, where State creativity was going on a proper road with some wonderful ideas that were stopped dead in their tracks, no pun intended, by ObamaCare.

Mr. AKIN. It is interesting that you talk about, there was a great little short book, and I don't remember the title of it, gentleman, that came out with some of the very facts that you just mentioned, and it was a study of how the government in the 1800s got involved in the six major industries in America because the assumption was that the Federal Government has to get involved in these big industries to make us competitive in an industrial world. They got involved in the oil industry, the steamship industry, the steel industry; of course the railroad industry.

The example you're talking about, again the government created this incentive that you're paid by the mile. So among other things they did, they used cheap steel rails which wore out right away and wooden ties that were not treated, and also they wouldn't blast which was expensive to go up a steep grade but they would make these long grades back and forth. The result was the company that used all the government money had a rail line that you couldn't maintain it. And, as you said, the northern route was done totally with private money. They had to scrimp and borrow. They built a little piece at a time. At the end of what they could built, they would form a little town and they would give them free shipping to encourage the trade and they built the railroad in pieces that way using the cash that they had. And that, like the other industries, the steamship, steel and the oil industries, the same pattern occurred where the Federal Government got involved, the businesses that were using Federal money all went bankrupt.

So there was an example where again you think the government's got to get involved. The answer was every time the government got involved, the companies went bankrupt. That's a good principle.

Let's get over, though, to take a look at this big picture of how in the world do we deal with the budget. One of the big things that everybody has been taking a look at, and I know you know this, gentleman, and that is that we have this new category that are called entitlements. That is, we passed some law; the law then runs like a machine and spits out money to people. If you get enough of those machines going spending money, pretty soon you've spent a lot of money. We've gotten to the point now where Medicare and Medicaid, Social Security, are spending

almost half of the revenue that the government is taking in.

So when you deal with that, as we take a look at overspending, people have projected that if you let Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid continue as they are, there will come a time when there will be no money for anything else in the budget at all. These are some of the hard choices that we have to face.

It seems to me, gentleman, as we have made an emphasis on the Constitution; in fact, in the rules package that was passed yesterday, we have created a new mandate that every bill that comes to this floor has to have a constitutional justification. I think that's the start of where we really have to get at this problem, and that is, what really is the job of the Federal Government and can we afford to be all things to all people.

I just wanted to let you piggyback on that.

□ 1520

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I appreciate that very well, because, to be very honest, this is not an easy task which this Congress faces. We have spent probably eight or nine decades digging the hole which we are in. To think that there is a simple way of getting out of it is naive. To think that in one year we could get out of this is maybe also naive. We have to think in terms of moving forward in a general direction that would go there.

I am very proud that the rules that were passed yesterday will enable this body, if we decide to do it, to take the time to think outside the box with new ideas. The idea that for the first time since the 1960s we have set aside a specific time during the day so that the committees could function will allow every Member on this floor to sit and work in a committee to come up with ideas to reach this goal of how we can control or at least limit the runaway spending that we have had.

Mr. AKIN. I need to stop and interrupt just a minute here, because you will never say this, but, Congressman BISHOP, you were one of the main people that helped put that rule in place and I think the whole country needs to say a big "thank you" to you, because what you are doing is trying to make Congress just a little more efficient and do a few commonsense things.

A lot of people might not say this thinking outside the box, but the box is small down here sometimes, and you have provided us with the idea that we are actually going to get into some of these questions and we are going to approach them in a systematic kind of way. We are going to take time and not have votes running all day long so people can't focus on their work, and say now, systematically, what do we have to do to deal this problem?

I congratulate you on the first step, and also the rules package that says you have got to have a constitutional justification for everything you bring

to the floor. I think we are starting on the right spot.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. You make me embarrassed right here. I wish I could take full credit for the time management plans that we are implementing here. I may have said it, but somebody else had to make the decision to go forward with it. I think it was the right thing to do because it requires us, instead of running around in circles like a bunch of squirrels on a treadmill or chipmunks on a treadmill wasting a lot of time, we try to focus our energies so that when we are on the floor it makes some kind of difference.

Let me just give one other historical example of what I think we need to be doing and dedicate ourselves, since I have been throwing out too many already.

I believe it was in the first Congress that the issue came up of postal roads, where to draw the line, where would the postal roads for the new Post Office go. There is some kind of economic benefit of having actually mail dropped along a route.

But Congress, eager to get out, said let's just allow the President, the executive branch, to decide where the postal routes will be, which seems to be a logical thing to do. And I believe it was Congressman Paige, I hope from Virginia, who stood up and said, no, our job of Congress is to legislate, which includes taking the time to agree on where those postal routes will go. It is not our responsibility to give it to an executive branch or a bureaucracy or some other group to come up with all the details. And he forced Congress to stay there, and they did their job.

Too often we as Members simply have the tendency of coming up with a grand and noble idea, and they say all right, we will empower. I think the language in the TARP bill is a perfect example of where we empowered the Secretary of the Treasury to make all kinds of decisions which were legislative decisions by their very nature.

Well, I hope what this schedule allows us to do and what you were talking about is to say we have a great deal of work to be done here. We are still looking at ideas. I am sure there are great ideas that are out there that will be coming from the people as time goes on, but we have to make sure we dedicate the time to not simply running around in circles playing silly games, but coming here and zeroing in on our task.

It was said by you, it was said by the gentleman from Georgia as well as the gentleman from Louisiana, it is the spending. That is our problem. That is what is hurting jobs, that is what is hurting Americans, that is what is bloating our budget. We need to zero in on that, and until we do that, we will never come close to meeting what the American people expect the Congress to do, nor what we really morally need to do.

I yield back to the gentleman.

Mr. AKIN. Well, I think that Ronald Reagan, you know, he had a way of

putting complicated things in simple words. He said we are buying more government than we can afford. That is not a bad summary of the situation. And it hasn't gotten better since Ronald Reagan was here—we are buying more government than we can afford.

I appreciate your historic examples. Of course, there is no way Congress can do the example of the postal roads that you made out when we are trying to basically do everything under the sun, be all things to all people. We are going to have to make some decisions saying this is a nice thing to do, but it could be done by a State government or it could be done by the private sector.

We are going to have to make some of those choices and just say, look, there are some things that the private sector and the States cannot do and we better fund that first. Certainly, providing for the common defense is one that has to be up at the front end, because the other governments can't do that, and the individual citizens can't do that. Whereas when it comes to some of the other kinds of things, such as in the energy areas or education or insurance or a lot of those things, they could be done by other governments.

When we start to get into this, hey, let's start to do something that feels good about this subject and turn it over to a bunch of administration bureaucrats, we have really lost control of where we are, and I appreciate your bringing us back to ground zero.

Now, there have been some shifts. Here is one that is kind of interesting, and it is the tradeoff. They always talk about the tradeoff between guns and butter, between defense and basically welfare programs.

If you go back to 1965, the entitlement spending was 2.5 percent of GDP of the overall budget, 2.5 percent in 1965 was entitlement. Defense was 7.4 percent. Now we have shifted to 2010, the estimate is 4.9 percent is national defense. We have gone from 7.4 down to 4.9 percent, while entitlements has gone from 2.5 percent to 9.9 percent in entitlements.

That is getting to that area where if the entitlements continue to climb, if you just look at demographics, there will be no money for defense or anything else and the budget will be dominated by just simply Medicare, Medicaid and Social Security.

So we are going to have to ask ourselves what are the top priorities. We are going to have to fund those and do a good job at those. That is what I was getting at. I don't think we can have the mentality of just saying we are going to take 10 percent out of everything or 30 percent out of everything. I think we are going to have to make some decisions. Some we may not want to cut, we just want to make them more efficient and leave that amount of money in it, and other ones we may say it is not a matter of cutting it, we don't even need the thing at all. Let's just get rid of that entire functional area. That is where we have to be going.

But, again, where we started today is the right place, with the U.S. Constitution, and making the key distinctions that the Constitution makes so clear. There is a difference for providing for defense and then basically encouraging general welfare.

I appreciate your very specific historic examples. If you remember the name of the book, there was a book, I don't know if it was the same one you were quoting from, but it had examples of those six industries. All of them where the government was in subsidizing the corporations, there was all kinds of corruption and the companies all failed, and the ones that stayed away from government funding were the ones that stayed in business. Just a fascinating study.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. If I could just add one comment to that as well. I think it is very clear that we need to say it is not that the Federal Government will always be bad and is incompetent at doing things. The problem the Federal Government has is the size of the Federal Government.

Any big industry has waste, fraud, and abuse, and that is one of the reasons why if we could coordinate and work with local governments—that is why the old cliché that the government that is best is the one that is closest to the people. It is not necessarily that they are smarter or better; it is because they don't have the problem of size in a one-size-fits-all issue and they have the freedom to be creative.

As you were talking about, especially with the entitlements, this is an area in which creativity is going to be the most important element. And some things, especially with the cost of Medicare, are driven by one-size-fits-all Federal mandates and Federal decisions, when allowing creativity could help us solve this problem.

I also want to say one other thing too when your comment about the general defense is so significant. It is not because we are funding for the defense of the America today. The decisions we make, the plans we make for defense today will not come to fruition for another 10 to 15 years, and indeed, the ability for us to have diplomacy in the future depends on wise decisions that we make today.

I appreciate the gentleman from Missouri coming with this issue. This is something that the people care about, something that the Congress cares about. I think the fact that we just passed a 5 percent cut on ourselves with overwhelming bipartisan support says that this is the direction we should be taking, and we should continue to talk about this over and over and over again. I appreciate you allowing me to be part of this.

□ 1530

Mr. AKIN. It's just a treat, Congressman BISHOP, to have you here with us today talking about a very important subject, something that is on the front of the minds, I think, of many Ameri-

cans, understanding that we are buying way too much government than we can afford. Certainly, the guiding compass and the guiding light for us has got to be the U.S. Constitution. And the fact is that we had hundreds of years of history, or at least a hundred of years of history, where the Constitution has stood us in very good stead. And when we get away from our foundational documents and principles, that's when we really start to get into trouble.

The principle on defense that was just made—I have to underscore, I'm on the Armed Services Committee. We deal with defense issues day in and day out. And the problem in defense is that the things that are on the drawing board today won't be fielded for probably 10 years in the future. So decisions that we're making today are going to have their effect a long way out. And that's why we have to be particularly careful. The situation in defense is one that, as you take a look around the world, we are rapidly being challenged by China and Russia, and we are not keeping up in those arms situations where we do not have the capability diplomatically to have options that were otherwise available before when we had put enough funding into defense.

And so as we see entitlements increasing way, way, way up and defense being cut down as a percentage of GDP, we are risking not doing the most fundamental principle in the preamble of the U.S. Constitution, which is providing for the national defense. And our objective, of course, is not parity. We're not trying to be equal with other nations. Our objective is to be overwhelmingly superior. That's why we don't have wars, because of the fact that people say, We don't want to take on the United States. And it's why we can be a great Nation of peacekeeping, because of the fact that we have been strong and successful and set a good example for other nations.

So what we have before us is a very difficult question. It is the question of politics in America. If you take a look at all of the fights, the debates, the discussions that go on in politics in America, most of it revolves around this question, and that is: What should the Federal Government be doing? Should it be spending more or less? Should it be doing that at all? Or, are we doing a good enough job? That's what the discussion and debate is about. And until we get back to the Constitution, until we start asking the question, "Is it necessary for the Federal Government to do this function?" we will never solve this problem of overspending.

The current Congress—and this is my opinion, but one that I think other Congressmen that I have discussed this with share, and that is we have another problem, and that is the House and the Congress is a product of a lot of time. There are various fiefdoms and ways that we have gotten accustomed to doing things which may not be very logical or practical.

I've been here 10 years. I have learned about authorization and appropriations and about the Budget Committee and the way we do things. But if we're going to seriously get at this problem, other than shaving a few percent here or there, if we're going to seriously get at the problem of having to radically reduce our appetite for spending, it's going to require changes in the structure of this Congress. And that will be one of the things that you can see we've already started on and are continuing and pledging to continue to do—to take a look at our rules and how the organization is set up so that we can make those hard choices and decisions.

There has been a commitment that those decisions will be made in a transparent way; in a way that everybody who is elected to be a Congressman, so that every district in this country will have somebody that can stand up and have an opportunity to weigh in and have an opinion. You won't see, as we had in the last Congress, bills that are being written in the Speaker's office and brought to the floor and rammed through in the dead of night. You're going to hear open debate, a lot of discussion, and a lot of ideas being discussed. I think that's a good thing and a proper thing. But, ultimately, we have to deal with the question: What are the essential functions that must happen in Federal Government?

Now, I've just heard that there are going to be some very significant cuts in defense. That's very concerning to me. Why would we be taking the Defense Department and doing major cuts there and no other department in government is being looked at? This is something that some of us will probably react to some because we believe we have to control spending, but why do you single out the Department of Defense? We're fighting two wars. Why are you going to whack that budget when you have all these other budgets that have never been touched whatsoever? And so we have to take a look at those percentages. When you see entitlements going very, very high, defense budget going low, that signals that we've got to be careful about the choices we're making, because the choices we make today, 10 years from now, your sons or daughters or my grandsons and my granddaughters may be affected by those choices.

So we start out a new Congress, I think, on the right foot. Emphasis on the U.S. Constitution; emphasis on the fact that we have to be responsible; emphasis on the fact that everybody in every congressional district is going to have a piece of the action; and the fact that we're going to have to be responsible, we're going to have to be cutting Federal spending. You cannot run, as we have in the first 2 years of the Obama administration, with \$1.4 trillion deficit. And that will stop.

REPEAL OF THE AFFORDABLE HEALTH CARE ACT

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. Madam Speaker, it's a great privilege to be here on the floor with you. Congratulations to you and the other new Members of the Republican Party.

We have some extraordinarily important tasks ahead of us. This afternoon, I'm going to be joined by some of my colleagues. We've just heard a very useful discussion on the role of the Constitution and how it plays into it. And indeed, today we did spend about 3 hours reading through the Constitution, and I think it was to all of our benefit. We started off with the new Speaker actually reading the preamble. I think that's a good place for us to start, because we're going to discuss health care today and we're going to discuss an effort by the majority party, the Republicans, to repeal the Affordable Health Care Act that was passed last session. And this issue has become a constitutional issue, so reading the preamble to the Constitution and Article I, section 8 is useful.

"We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare"—promote the general welfare—"and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States." And then later, in article I, section 8, "Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States."

It's about the general welfare of the United States that we'll be discussing in this next hour, and that's the welfare of the people of the United States. It speaks to us, the citizens—all of us—whether we are a newborn baby or a senior in the last of life—how do we provide for that general welfare?

Last year, in a major step forward, the first time in more than nearly four decades, this Congress, together with the Senate and the President, passed the Affordable Health Care Act, a very, very important and extremely useful step in providing for the welfare—that is, the general welfare—of the American population. It's a law that makes life better from birth to retirement. Part of this law, a very, very important part of it, deals with what we call the Patient's Bill of Rights—the Patient's Bill of Rights, vis-à-vis, the insurance industry.

I think all of us can go back to our districts, to our homes, and even to our own lives and find numerous episodes where the insurance industry has said, No, you cannot have this procedure; or,

No, you cannot have coverage because you have a preexisting condition.

□ 1540

Today, we are going to talk about the Patients' Bill of Rights and the Republican effort that is now underway in the Rules Committee in this building, as we speak, to write a rule that they will bring to the floor next week, without one hearing, to completely wipe out this extraordinarily important effort to provide for the general welfare of the American people. We are going to discuss that in great detail.

Now, for me, this is a very important part of my life. I spent 8 years of my life as the insurance commissioner in California, taking on the insurance companies, trying to force them to honor their commitments, to force the insurance companies to pay the claim of a patient who had undergone chemotherapy, to provide insurance that was contracted for and not to rescind that health care policy. I cannot even begin to count the number of cases that came before me as insurance commissioner where the insurance companies would rescind a policy because the person suddenly became ill and had a very expensive episode.

The Patients' Bill of Rights prohibits that. We are going to talk about that. I want to start here, and then I'm going to turn this over to my colleagues.

I am going to give an example of a very dear friend who lived here in Washington. He was a Peace Corps volunteer, married. He was working here in Washington, DC, as the director of the National Peace Corps Association, the returned volunteers. He had a child. That child had a severe disability—kidneys didn't work. He was insured. His wife was insured. The pregnancy was insured. The delivery was insured. But that child, on the day the child was born with that preexisting condition of kidney failure, was uninsurable under the parents' policy.

That kind of action is prohibited by the Patients' Bill of Rights. No more would that happen to men and women, families, pregnant women across this country who deliver babies that have some problem. Those babies will be insured whatever the condition might be.

Our colleagues on the Republican side will bring to this floor next Wednesday, without one hearing in any relevant policy committee, a repeal of the Patients' Bill of Rights. What of the babies that are born in the future that have some issue? How will they be provided for?

The rest of the story is this family has spent 20 years now struggling to provide the health care services that their child needed. They have been close to bankruptcy many, many times. They have struggled through it. The child is no longer a child—a young adult—and under the law today, he has health insurance.

Is that what the American public wants from the Republican Party—the

repeal of that Bill of Rights that guarantees coverage for that young man? I think not.

Let me now turn to our colleague from the great State of Virginia.

BOBBY SCOTT, would you please share with us your own views and how this is going to affect the general welfare of the American people.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Thank you, and I appreciate your hard work. Thank you for organizing this Special Order so we can discuss the problems with repealing health care.

You have gone all through the need for health care during your life and how the bill provides assistance for those with preexisting conditions. It limits insurance company abuses, like what's called a "recision," when you have paid your premiums all these years and then finally get sick, and they want to cancel your policy right when you need it. There are lifetime and annual limits on benefits where they pay a certain amount, and once they get to that, you can be in the middle of a treatment, and they're not going to pay another dime for the rest of your life or at least for the rest of that year. There are many people with chronic diseases who hit up upon these limits very frequently.

You have talked about young people on their parents' policies, who are working, who finally get jobs. They don't cover benefits. Up to 26 years old, they can stay on their parents' policies.

We have talked about prevention, the importance of prevention. A lot of people, because of copayments and deductibles, can't afford their annual checkups. This bill provides for annual checkups without copayments and deductibles.

For those senior citizens in the doughnut hole, where they get no benefits, adding insult to injury, they have to continue paying their premiums, and get no benefit. We have assistance for them.

It is outrageous that they would elect to try to repeal this. No hearings. No nothing. Just put a label on it and call it "ObamaCare" and then expect people to go along with the repeal. You just can't label things and expect people, by virtue of the label, to take action. They call it "government-run health care." No. Government-run health care was the single-payer plan. That was defeated.

The option of a public option would have been nice. People talk about choice. Well, in the plan that's on the books today, they have the choice of all the plans of anybody who wants to sell insurance in their States. They have a choice of all of them. It would be nice to have an additional choice—a choice of a public option where you have the choice of a policy that is not run by a for-profit corporation with a financial interest in denying you coverage or canceling your policy. It would be nice to have that option. You don't have to pick it, but it's just nice to have that option.

One of the things that we want to make sure is that we have as many options as possible, including a public option if we can ever get there; but when we talk about repeal and replace, there is no replace tomorrow in the rule that they are suggesting. They just want it repealed. We want to know what they're going to replace it with and what they're going to leave out.

Are they going to leave out the part where people with preexisting conditions can get covered? Are they going to say, "No, you can't get covered"? Does the insurance company get to decide who has the privilege? Are health insurance companies going to tell young people under 26 to get off their parents' policies? Are they going to tell those in the doughnut hole to get back in the doughnut hole where they belong? Are they going to talk about those who can't afford prevention to get prevention? Are they going to tell those who are going to run out of coverage because of the limits, "No, that's enough. You've had enough, and you can't get any more coverage"?

What are they going to tell all of these people?

We need to make sure that we keep this policy, all of these provisions, intact. I have no idea what they want to replace it with, but I think, if they went step by step and if the people looked at the provisions of the bill, they would elect to keep everything that's in the bill today.

Now, there are some things that people don't like. When you have a good plan, you have to pay for it. Unfortunately, they're not paying for it. We were fiscally responsible. When we passed it, we were under PAYGO. They've repealed a lot of that so that they can go trillions of dollars in the ditch without paying for it. We paid for it. In fact, the CBO originally said that the first 10 years of the program would reduce the deficit by \$140 billion. Now the estimate is \$200-some billion in the next 10 years. So it is fiscally responsible.

There are things we can do better together than everybody out for their own. We need to oppose the repeal of this health care to make sure that people have the protections and the Patients' Bill of Rights that they have under this legislation.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you very much.

You've raised about seven of the major issues that are involved in this repeal that the Republicans will bring to this floor next Wednesday without one hearing in any relevant policy committee, a repeal that will affect every single American—that will affect their well-being, their health, their ability to get health insurance, and their ability to stay healthy.

□ 1550

So we have an enormous issue before us and we want the American public to be aware of what's going on here. It is the repeal of the Patient's Bill of Rights.

Let me move on to one of our other colleagues from Tennessee. Mr. STEVEN COHEN, if you will join us, please.

Mr. COHEN. Thank you. I appreciate the opportunity to share with you, and I want to first start because this day has been a day that started with the reading of the Constitution which is a document that we all revere. I have a little pocket copy of it right here, and we revere it. We pledge when we take our oath of office to protect and defend and support the Constitution, but we all know that it's interpreted by our Supreme Court, and it's Supreme Court history would have been better today for people to understand.

And you mention that the foundation of the particular health care bill is in the preamble: We, the people of the United States, to form a more perfect union, establish justice, et cetera, promote the general welfare.

Also, in article I, which is the legislative article, section 8, it says that the Congress shall have the power to regulate commerce among the several States; and further, it says in article I that the Congress shall have the authority to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers and all other powers vested by this Constitution of the Government of the United States, in either Department or office thereof. So, in my opinion—I'm a lawyer, but there's lawyers on both sides—there's plenty of justification for this health care bill.

Do you know next week when the Republicans will try to repeal this opportunity for Americans to get health care and wipe out these pre-existing conditions clauses, et cetera, will they be coming under the idea that health care is not part of the general welfare? Will they be coming basically on a constitutional argument that they may make that this wasn't allowed to require a person to buy insurance even though we can, of course, require a person to sign up for the draft and lose their liberty for a while and serve in the Army—and we can do that, we can conscript soldiers, but we can't make them buy insurance. Is that what they're going to say, or are they going to come and talk about these things that Mr. SCOTT talked about and say that we don't think it's good policy for parents to have their children on their insurance until they're 26 or it's not good policy for women with breast cancer to get treatment at a certain amount? What are their tactics?

Mr. GARAMENDI. Well, I would assume that they will try to go into their interpretation of the Constitution and avoid the very difficult argument of forcing or eliminating the Patient's Bill of Rights and allowing the insurance companies to engage in gross discrimination based upon sex. Clearly, women are discriminated against by the health insurance companies unless the Patient's Bill of Rights is there to protect them. Similarly, the two examples that you gave, pre-existing conditions, I cannot imagine that they

would even attempt to successfully or even would be unsuccessful to argue that somehow these protections for the individual are not worth having.

I think they will go into some obscure interpretation of the Constitution. We'll see. There's going to be a debate on the floor. Unfortunately, there will be no hearings to precede that, and there will not be a discussion of the details.

Mr. COHEN. And they will control the amendments that will be permitted to be discussed on this floor. I know Speaker BOEHNER said we were going to be able to have amendments and be able to have good discourse.

Mr. GARAMENDI. As you know—I saw you in Rules Committee earlier today—it is my impression that the Rules Committee is going to prohibit any amendments on the floor. We'll see. I mean, that has yet to be decided by the Rules Committee. We don't know, but surely the one amendment I would propose is: don't do it, maintain the Patient's Bill of Rights, maintain these protections that we all need.

There's not a person in this Nation that is not subject to the possibility of an incident that would become a reason for rescission. That's my experience. Eight years hammering the insurance industry, you have got to honor your contract. Yet because of the laws, they were able to wiggle out of an expensive incident.

Mr. COHEN. When I was a child, I had polio when I was 5 years old in 1954. I was fortunate. My father was a doctor, and so sometimes professional courtesy, but I'm sure he had insurance that covered my hospitalization. But there were years later, I think it was 11 years later I had a tendon-lengthening operation that was immediately related to my polio and necessary on my Achilles tendon. That wouldn't have been permitted necessarily if they could use the pre-existing condition such as polio to have denied coverage; and whether or not how my father dealt with the expense and whether it's because he was a physician, I don't know; but I'd hate to see children in the same situation and parents in the same situation not be permitted to get that type of coverage later on.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I don't know if you were a Member of Congress at the time, but we all under this law would have the same policy that every American would have. We wouldn't have any different policy than the American public would have, and the question about rescission, and you're a prime candidate should you lose office, which you shouldn't, to be uninsurable if the Patient's Bill of Rights were repealed.

Under the Patient's Bill of Rights, if you were to leave Congress, you could get an insurance policy because the pre-existing condition that you have, polio, and an operation resulting from the polio would go into play as a pre-existing condition, and you would not be able to get an insurance policy.

Mr. COHEN. Let me, if I can, read something that I've had prepared for

today that came from a constituent's story, John Hopkins; and I know John Hopkins. He's a very important and active member in my community and contemporary. He sent me an email, and Mr. Hopkins requests I share this story with the House as we consider repeal of the Affordable Care Act. I want to share it with everybody here on C-SPAN.

John was diagnosed with two unrelated cancers during his life. If you know anything about cancer, getting it twice for unrelated reasons is almost unheard of, but it happened to John Hopkins. Midway through his first bout with cancer, he was, of course, dropped from his health insurance plan. He was left with a medical bill that wiped out his and his wife's entire retirement savings, as well as the value of their house. They were never able to repay the debt in their lifetime. When he was diagnosed with a second bout of cancer 2 years later, he had no health insurance because there was no insurer anywhere in the market who would offer him a policy because of the pre-existing condition.

He got some coverage in Tennessee because of a plan called Access Tennessee for uninsurables, but it was limited to \$250,000 a year. As we all know, annual limits are set to be phased out by 2014 because of this law, and lifetime limits are already a thing of the past. A quarter of a million dollars may seem like a lot of coverage; but when somebody needs something like a bone marrow transplant to cure their leukemia, that single treatment would exceed the annual cap.

My Republican colleagues have decided their first priority as the new majority will be repealing the Affordable Care Act; and when they vote to do this, they will be voting for the following: denying Mr. Hopkins the ability to enroll in a health insurance plan that doesn't discriminate against him for daring to be diagnosed with cancer again. They will deny John Hopkins the ability to enroll in a health plan that will actually continue to cover his treatment after he exhausts the current annual cap of \$250,000, an amount that many cancer patients meet in a matter of weeks upon diagnosis, let alone those who are fighting two cancers over a number of years.

And it will send a message to John Hopkins and every other single American who has ever been diagnosed or will ever be diagnosed with a disease like cancer that they're on their own when it comes to coverage, that sure they're free to get treatments and meet with their doctors, undergo laborious and life-saving surgeries year after year, just so long as they can foot the bill or try to keep it under the annual cap, because when it comes to cancer, budgeting your treatment should surely take precedence over anything else. Right?

Mr. GARAMENDI, I am ashamed that we are considering repeal of this affordable health care bill; and when I

see these numbers about \$250,000 and I think of the fact that the Republicans were against any caps on taxes, they realize \$250,000 annual income in many places is a middle-income salary, but for limitations on health care, they think the insurance company should determine that and that's enough; and if you have got cancer, it's not enough.

Another friend of mine Facebooked me, Jimmy Barrasso. Jimmy worked for a long time for a company in Memphis. He's always been successful. He lost his job with that corporation. Because he had high cholesterol, he had difficulties getting insurance, and it took him a long time to find private insurance because of that pre-existing condition. He just sent me this on Facebook. He was friending me and he mentioned it, and I wanted to relate it.

There are so many people in this country who are getting benefits and will get benefits and many of the benefits don't go into effect until 2014, and the idea that this Congress, the 112th, as its first act would do such harm to the general welfare of the American public is hard to fathom.

□ 1600

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. COHEN, thank you so very much. Your closing sentence needs to be repeated. That the very first piece of legislation taken up by the new Republican majority in the 112th Congress is to repeal the Patients Bill of Rights. It's unfathomable.

Let me now call on FRANK PALLONE, our colleague from the great State of—yes, it is—New Jersey.

Mr. PALLONE. Well, first of all, let me thank you, my colleague from California, and each of the other speakers here for the contribution they have made tonight, and particularly when I listened to my colleague from Tennessee talk about those particular cases of individuals that were impacted, because that's really what this is all about.

Again, it is amazing to me that the first act of this new Republican majority is to try to repeal a bill, health care reform, that really is making a difference for people on a personal level, particularly with the patient protections.

You know, I thought to myself when I was coming down here: Who benefits from repeal? Who could possibly benefit from repeal? Because, as many of you talked about, all the people who are going to be harmed by it, who would benefit from it? And the only group I could think of that would benefit from the repeal are the big insurance companies because, if you think about it, what do they want to do? They want to keep increasing premiums. I read that in your State—I don't know, you may have already mentioned it—Blue Cross/Blue Shield, whatever, is talking about a 50-something percent increase. I cannot fathom these double-digit increases.

And, of course, as this health care reform kicks in, it's going to be more and

more difficult for the types of increases that we've seen in premiums that these big health insurance companies have put forward. And the reason the insurance companies want to get rid of the Patients' Bill of Rights and reinstitute all of these discriminatory practices, whether it be denying care because of preexisting conditions or reinstating lifetime caps or, you know, the different protections that we've seen kick in, the reason they want to do that is also money-oriented. In other words, they have to pay out money. You talked about the cancer person.

I was up at the Rules Committee earlier, and Ms. SLAUGHTER was talking about someone who had cancer and was treated and ran into the lifetime cap, and then the cancer reoccurred and she didn't have any more coverage because she had hit the lifetime cap. And that's a perfect example. They want to have lifetime caps. They want to have annual caps. They don't want preexisting conditions. They don't want your kids on your policy because it saves them money. The way that they make profits and pay dividends to their shareholders is by raising premiums and having discriminatory practices that eliminate the people that cost money because they need health care. I mean, it's that simple.

And already, and just in the last few weeks, provisions have kicked in that go against that. The President announced—or the White House announced, I think around Christmas-time, new regulations that say that any premium increase that's over 10 percent will be scrutinized. And under the provisions of this bill and the new regulations, these increases are not allowed to go above 10 percent. On January 1, the provisions kicked in that said that 80 percent of your premium costs had to be used for benefits, couldn't be used for insurance company profits, couldn't be used to pay back dividends to the shareholders. So all of these initiatives that are already kicking in, they basically make it more difficult for the insurance companies to make a big profit, and the consequence of that is that health insurance becomes more affordable.

I was up at the Rules Committee earlier. It was interesting because, I think you mentioned, my colleague from California, or one of you mentioned that we, under this bill, under the health care reform that's in place now that they want to repeal, we get the same health insurance, as Congressmen, as any other American.

You know, I still have people write to me and say, well, you know, You have your own policy, but you want to give me this lousy coverage that I'm going to get under the health care reform. And I have to write back and say, No, that's not true. You may hear that on some TV station or something, but it's simply not true.

We specifically wrote into the bill that we have to go into the exchanges just like everybody else. We are going

to be different from other Federal employees, as Congressmen, because we go into the exchanges.

So, at the Rules Committee today, one of the Republican Members who is very supportive of repeal said that he specifically wasn't going to take health insurance as a Congressman, and he wanted me to know that because he was voting for repeal. And I said, Well, that's very nice and that's commendable for you, but I, frankly, think that every Member of Congress who votes for repeal should say, I don't want health insurance from the Federal Government, because if you are going to deny it to everyone else, you should deny it to yourself. Just the way we're saying that we are going to get the same coverage as everyone else, well, if you don't want anyone else to have the coverage, then you shouldn't get it yourself.

And I know that some Members have already taken issue. There was one Member from Maryland who came to the orientation, a Republican Member from Maryland who apparently was a big advocate for repeal. And he said that he was inquiring because his Federal health insurance didn't take effect, as a Congressman, until February 1. We were sworn in yesterday, but I guess it takes 30 days before the insurance actually kicks in. He was complaining about the fact that had he to wait until February 1 to get his health insurance, as a Congressman. Well, you know, again, if you're going to vote for repeal next week, you shouldn't be worried about when it's going to kick in. You shouldn't be taking it at all, in my opinion.

So there is a lot of—I don't know what the phrase is—smoke and mirrors or whatever the word is that is going on around here on the other side of the aisle in how they are viewing this. And my point is, you know, there is a lot of protection here for people. Don't deny them that unless you're going to deny it to yourself. But more than that, think about who is helped by this repeal—only the big insurance companies. They are the only ones that are going to benefit.

I know you were the insurance commissioner, and so you know exactly what I'm talking about.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I do have some experience on that. I wanted to deal with that. It's called the medical loss ratio, and the insurance companies have cut a fat check for themselves over the years by taking a big premium and then paying a very small amount of it out for the medical coverages.

In this legislation, the Patients' Bill of Rights, and in the Affordable Health Care Act, they can't do that. They've got to pay, for the individual policies, 80 percent and, for the group policies, 85 percent for medical services.

So what was the very first thing they did after this bill was signed into law? We passed it last year, and the President signed it. The very first thing they did was to run down to the Health

and Human Services Department and say, Oh, but our advertising ought to be included as a medical expense, and, Oh, these expenses for these kinds of employees, mostly statisticians and the like, that's a medical expense. Fortunately, the administration said, No, we think not.

So what we're trying to do with this legislation is make sure that when we pay a dollar, at least we get 80 cents back in medical services. Our friends on the other side would repeal that and allow the insurance companies to take that money—or at least a larger portion of that money—put it in their pockets, give it to their CEOs, whatever, but not use it for medical services. Medical loss ratio is really important.

And the other thing you mentioned needs to be understood also, and that is the ability of the governments to review, not to say “no,” but to shine that big, bright spotlight onto the insurance company premium increases. Is it justified? Yes? No? What are your costs and so forth? What ratios are you using in medical losses and the like? So that spotlight of information is required under the law. Many, many things in the law.

Mr. COHEN, I see you stood up, anxious to make a comment here, so please do. And then I notice behind you our colleague from Maryland has joined us. And eventually, I want to start talking about seniors. So please, Mr. COHEN, go forth.

Mr. COHEN. I wanted to ask you a question. Because I had said, and I was, I think, incorrect, when I suggested that the first thing the Republicans wanted to do was repeal the affordable health care bill. It's one of their first major priorities. But the first thing they did was today, and we joined with them. It was bipartisan. It was to cut 5 percent from our Members' representational allowances, a small amount of money in the big picture, of course. But the deficit was the issue that they were highlighting.

What would the repeal of the Affordable Health Care Act do to the deficit? That's the big issue, because that's one of our big issues.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Well, Mr. COHEN, it just happens that we prepared this little blue chart here. Actually, it probably ought to be in the red. The repeal of the Affordable Health Care Act obviously deals with the Patients' Bill of Rights, but it also deals with the deficit.

□ 1610

This week, the Congressional Budget Office, nonpartisan, not Democrat, not Republican, they answer to neither party. They answer to the general public. They said that the repeal of the Affordable Health Care Act will increase the deficit by \$230 billion, \$230 billion in the next 9 years, and in the out years, the next 10 years, well over 1 trillion, \$200 billion increase in the deficit.

Mr. COHEN. And that's money we owe China; is that right? So it's okay to issue these securities and pay the Chinese the interest to be able to finance it, and our children and their grandchildren will be paying this if they don't have preexisting conditions where they can get insurance to cover the illnesses they may have to stay alive to pay these taxes.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Our children, grandchildren, and indeed those of us that are living for another 10 to 15, 20 years, we're going to pay twice. We're going to pay the insurance cost, the health care cost that's not covered by the insurance programs. The example you gave of the individual with two bouts of cancer going to pay the full cost of that because the limitation goes back into place, so you get to pay for your health care, and you're going to have to pay off the deficit also, makes no sense whatsoever. But, hey, that's what they want to do, without one hearing by any of the relevant committees.

Mr. COHEN. Consistency is the hobgoblin. Right? Thank you, sir.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I notice that our colleague from Maryland has joined us, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. DONNA EDWARDS. I know you were interested in this. You were talking about it earlier today on the floor and in committee, so please.

Ms. EDWARDS. I'm so pleased to join you today and to talk about health care. And I feel very personally about health care, as somebody who went for a long time without any health care coverage and worried like Americans do all across this country. They did prior to our really investing in reform for the American people. And so I know that anxiety.

And I was thinking about some of our constituents, constituents in Maryland's Fourth Congressional District, and around the country, who, today because of what we did in the Democratic-led Congress in passing landmark health care reform legislation, are better off today. And we haven't even fully implemented the benefits for the American people.

I think about a letter that I got from a gentleman who lives in my district in Olney, Maryland, a small town, Olney, Maryland. And he writes to me that his son, Mike, was 25 going on 26, and he could receive health care insurance coverage. When he wasn't able to get it, he needed it and he couldn't get it. And he got a letter from Blue Cross/Blue Shield saying to him that his son could continue to be covered until his 26 birthday. And what he did was he did what a lot of American families do, they're wiping the sweat from their brow because they know that they can now keep their young people on their health care plan until they're 26. I have a 22-year-old. I was feeling exactly the same way.

I got another letter from a woman who actually does health care policy, but she lives in my district; and what she said to me is that her daughter had

a preexisting condition and she was very concerned, but she was an older young person, 20-some years old, 20 years old with a preexisting condition, really worried that she wouldn't be able to provide health care. And then she got the notice for COBRA coverage, which we've all said, you know, the backup is COBRA. It turned out that that was going to be an extra \$400 to \$500 a month for her to have COBRA coverage to make sure that she didn't lose her health care when she actually lost her job.

Well, now, this parent, actually, for the cost of about \$70 or \$80, as opposed to \$400 or \$500 a month, can keep their young person, their child, their young person on their health care coverage.

I think this is a great benefit for America's families, for families who work every day and actually have health care coverage.

I heard us earlier discussing premium increase hikes, and I want to tell you something. I know when we were working on health care reform, and many of us, very concerned about people who don't have insurance and need coverage. But most Americans all across the country actually do have some form of health care coverage. And you know what they're worried about? They're worried about those premiums going up at astronomical rates. And I've heard from my constituents, 20, 30 percent premium hikes.

Well, because of what we did in this health care package, insurance commissioners, like you were a commissioner, insurance commissioners all across the country now have the power vested in them to be able to actually say, you know what? We're going to put a check on these companies. And so in States like California, a big State like California and Connecticut and Maine and Colorado and Maryland, all across the country, that's what these insurance commissioners are doing. And they're not saying the Feds do it for them; it's the States.

And of course we heard here this morning, as we read the Constitution, a reminder that States are in a great position to look at what insurance companies are doing in their States, to regulate what's happening in their States, and to say to them, you have to stop taking money away from consumers, away from patients by raising your premiums excessively.

And so these are real accomplishments for the American people and for people who go to work every day. And so I'm glad to be here actually talking about these benefits with the American people.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you so very, very much. Before I turn to our colleague from Virginia, you reminded me of two very quick stories. One, on Monday I was at the inaugural for the Governor of California. Jerry Brown is back again. And a lobbyist that I knew when I was insurance commissioner representing health insurance companies came up to me and he put his fin-

ger in my chest and he said, don't let them repeal the law. Now, I'm not going to give his name. He'd lose his job immediately.

And I said, I'll do everything I can, but why? You represent them. Why?

And he said, I have two children. Both are type 1 diabetics. They're approaching 23 years of age. They will be out of luck. They will never be able to get an insurance policy if this bill is repealed. The Patient's Bill of Rights gives that lobbyist for the health insurance industry an opportunity to see his children get health insurance.

Now, I have six children of my own. Patty and I do. All six of them have gone through that age of 23. It is the scariest time for a parent. You graduate, you get a diploma, and you also get an exit from the insurance that you've had perhaps for your entire life. This law provides another 3 years after you graduate, that period of time where it's almost impossible nowadays to find a job that provides insurance to give that insurance.

Mr. SCOTT, please join us once again.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Thank you very much. And I appreciate your hard work and leadership on this. You've talked about the problems in health care with government. It's just not a government problem. If you ask any human resources executive about the major problems they have and benefits package, it's the ability to afford health care. Health care costs are going out of control. If you have an employee with a preexisting condition and he's in the group, then they do the actuarial study, you start getting bills that you can't pay. You ask any human resources what's happened to their insurance costs over the years. It's just going through the sky. And if you look at the employee portion of health care, it goes from zero participation to a little bit more copays, more deductibles, more cost for the family, on and on and on. Everyone has a great deal of insecurity about their ability to do health care.

And then you look at the idea, what happens if you lose a job? If you have a preexisting condition, you will not be able to get health care until this bill passed.

With all this insecurity, your ability to get health care, your ability to be able to afford it in the future, all of these problems, all of these problems in the future, what is the response from the other side about what to do about that kind of insecurity?

They say, well, just be strong and go without insurance like me. Well, that is not a particularly attractive solution for those that don't have an alternative, don't have a spouse where you can just jump, you know, you can say I'm not going to take government policy, I'm going to use my spouse's policy; we have an alternative. Or if they're so wealthy, they don't need the insurance.

□ 1620

Most Americans aren't in that situation. They need health insurance. And

this is what is provided. You have access to it, and it is affordable.

Everyone in America will be able to afford health insurance in 2014 because those that can't afford it will have subsidies to make sure that they can. So everybody will be able to get it.

If you make less than \$88,000, you can get health care for less than 10 percent of your salary. That is not the case now. If you are in the \$20,000, \$40,000, \$50,000 a year bracket, if you can get insurance, it's going to be a lot more than that.

So with this bill people have the security of health insurance that they don't have now. And the bizarre suggestion, just go without insurance, is not particularly nice when you have children that may have a little ear infection. Rather than have them lose their hearing, you can deal with it when it is a little infection, these problems don't grow out of control. We need that security. This bill provides it.

And in terms of seniors, seniors are particularly helped under this legislation. Those that can't afford the copays and deductibles can get their annual checkups without any copays and deductibles. We are helping fill in the doughnut hole. It will take a little time, but eventually there will be no doughnut hole where they fall in and have to pay all of the drug costs. We provide more community health centers so they will have better access. We are training more doctors and nurses so they will have more professionals. You have a chart that extends Medicare. Medicare is extended. We know that Medicare will go broke if we don't do anything. It extends the solvency of Medicare. It lowers prescription drug costs. All of these things that seniors have a particular interest in, all of that will be lost if this bill is repealed.

Mr. GARAMENDI. If I might interrupt you for just a moment, Mr. SCOTT. You are into an issue, an area that is profoundly important to the seniors of America.

The discussion last year as this bill was passing was that somehow this piece of legislation would harm seniors by taking away Medicare benefits. It was not true last year. It is not true this year. However, if our Republican colleagues are successful in repealing it, they, the seniors, will be seriously harmed.

I want to make this point very, very clear and ask my colleagues to join us perhaps from their own personal experience in their districts. You started going through this list here. This legislation actually extends the solvency of Medicare by reining in the costs and by giving seniors specific pre-illness care so that they will be able to get preventative care free, free annual checkups. They can't get it today, but under this legislation seniors can get free annual checkups, which reduces the cost, because you get to the illness quicker.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. You said that people were scared about what might

happen. They also said things about small business, this would bankrupt small businesses.

First, small businesses are exempt from the requirements under the bill, so it can't possibly hurt them. But those small businesses that want to provide health care for their employees are given tax credits to help them do so. So it can't possibly be hurting small business. But for the senior citizens, they have all of the benefits that you have listed on the chart that will be lost if this bill is repealed.

Mr. GARAMENDI. You mentioned the doughnut hole, the prescription drug doughnut hole. Every senior that was in the prescription drug doughnut hole last year, 2010, received a \$250 check to help them pay for their drugs. In going forward, the doughnut hole will be lessened and lessened, and eventually, 9 years from now, will disappear. There will be no doughnut hole.

You talked about the quality of care. Extremely important, quality of care. Thank you for bringing that up. More primary doctors, more geriatric care from nurses and doctors, an extraordinary important part of the legislation, not just only for seniors. You also mentioned the community-based and of course the preventative care. All of these things are there, and all of them will disappear if the Republicans are successful with their legislation next Wednesday that will be brought to this floor without one hearing to discuss any of these issues in a relevant policy committee.

Mr. COHEN, please join us.

Mr. COHEN. Let me ask a question. I was just thinking here, it's an honor to be in the House of Representatives and with a Constitution that's so beautiful that it says we are to promote the general welfare.

We are among other industrialized nations on this earth. What do the other industrialized nations on the earth do about health care for their citizens?

Mr. GARAMENDI. Well, I'm not sure I heard your question, so please say it again.

Mr. COHEN. What do the other industrialized nations in the world do for health care? Do they program policies like ours, where 32 million people don't have health insurance reform and they are not mandated to get insurance? What do they do?

Mr. GARAMENDI. Well, I think you are asking me a rhetorical question, because you know the answer and I think most Americans know the answer, that all the industrialized nations—we are not talking about China, but we are talking about Korea, Japan, the European countries, the European Union. All of those countries provide universal health insurance coverage. Universal.

Everyone, including tourists who happen to show up—and this I know from one of my daughters who fell off a stair at the Leaning Tower of Pisa. She fell, went into an emergency room,

they took an MRI, bandaged her up, and said, "Get out of here." And she said, "Well, I haven't paid." "Well, you are covered." That was in Italy.

Mr. COHEN. And does the United States not have one of the greatest discrepancies of wealth between the richest and the poorest in the industrialized world as well? So are we saying to our wealthy people, "You can afford health insurance so you can get it," but for those people who are poor, "Too bad"?

Mr. GARAMENDI. The other countries of the world don't look at it that way. They look at it as a right for their citizens to have access to health care, and they provide the health insurance. There are different ways of doing it. Germany, France, Britain, Canada all do it differently, but they all do it.

Incidentally, the health statistics in all of those countries are considerably better than America, and America is placed at the bottom of the industrialized countries in terms of our health care, how healthy we are, how long we live, how sick we get. We are at the bottom. In fact, we are often with developing countries in the statistics. We spend almost twice as much as any of those other countries.

So the Affordable Health Care Act goes after many, many things beyond the Patients Bill of Rights and the senior issues. Thank you so very much for raising that issue.

We have about maybe 10 more minutes. Mr. PALLONE.

Mr. PALLONE. Well, I just wanted to talk a little bit about prevention, and particularly in terms of seniors, which you mentioned, and what it means in terms of people's health and also the cost to the government, because some of the things that we've mentioned with regard to seniors have already taken place.

This summer under the bill, seniors who fell into the doughnut hole got a \$250 rebate. Beginning January 1, they get a 50 percent discount on brand-name drugs if they fall into the doughnut hole in 2011.

You mentioned the copays for preventative care, whether it's your annual wellness treatment or other kinds of tests like mammograms or colonoscopies, for example. The reason that we are eliminating the 20 percent copay for these things, the reason we are trying to fill up the doughnut hole, it all goes back to prevention. Because if people get their drugs and they don't end up getting sick and going to the hospital, if they get these tests or they have the annual wellness checks, they stay healthy, they don't go to the hospital. And when they go to the hospital, if they are on Medicare, it just costs the government more money.

So this is the way we save money. We save money. And what does that mean? It means that the debt is decreased. It means that the solvency of Medicare you have on the chart is extended.

I don't know if we have talked much about that. One of my amendments in

the Rules Committee today is—a lot of seniors tell me, they come up to me and say they are worried about the fact that Medicare may become insolvent and there wouldn't be enough money in the trust fund to pay for it. The bottom line is that the health care reform bill extends the judgment day, if you will, when the solvency problem becomes an issue much further. And if you have the repeal, the solvency problem hits us 6 years from now, in 2017, from what I understand.

So another problem with repeal is not only does it increase the deficit, but it also is only 6 years from now that we would have to deal with this Medicare solvency problem. And what is that going to mean? That is going to mean probably cutbacks in benefits for senior citizens. Because if you don't have the money, you are going to have to cut back on the benefits. It is amazing to me how they can continue to talk about this repeal.

The other thing they keep saying on the other side of the aisle, the Republicans say, well, the reason we want the repeal is because this health care reform is killing jobs. Nothing could be further from the truth.

□ 1630

The fact of the matter is that under this health care reform because the cost of health care premiums for employers will be significantly reduced, they will be able to hire more people. Part of the problem that we have with competition with other countries, you mentioned all these other countries, all these other industrial countries that have free health care, universal health care. That means that the employers don't carry the burden of that. So when they hire someone if the government is paying for it, they don't have to worry about that for their employees necessarily. If the cost of premiums go down, then the costs of hiring somebody goes down in the United States.

In addition to that, there are all kinds of jobs created in the health care professions because, as everyone gets covered and everybody needs a primary care doctor, you're going to need more doctors, more nurses, more health aides because people will get that kind of preventative care. So there are jobs created with the preventative care in handling people, to make sure they stay healthy or they stay well.

It is unbelievable to me when they talk about repeal. What the Republicans should be doing is spending the first few days of this session talking about how to improve the economy and create jobs, not repealing health care. I think the American people have moved on. They don't want to hear this. They want to know what this Congress is going to do to create jobs and improve the economy. We've already dealt with the health care issue and they want us to move on.

Mr. GARAMENDI. We have about, maybe 3 minutes, 4 minutes, and I am going to turn now to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

Mr. COHEN. I just wanted to add one thing. Thank you.

The gentleman from New Jersey brought up an issue, and he said that it was not true that it was costing jobs. There is some respected group, I think it's called FactCheck. They were on national news giving the biggest lies told in politics in the last year. The number one biggest lie—this independent group—was the Republican mantra of government run or government mandated health care. It's just a fact. That's the biggest lie told the American public. And it came from the leaders on the other side, it came from these halls where they are immune from defamation suits. Because it's not government run health care. It's unheard of, unfathomable, that the other side would use the fact that they're immune from prosecution in any other jurisdiction or court for words that aren't true to do that and in politics to say it was government run health care, the biggest lie of 2010, and it comes to the floor next week.

Mr. GARAMENDI. We are going to wrap this one up. I see the gentleman from Kentucky is here and he will probably carry on with health insurance. Maybe a couple of us will be asked to join him.

We have really today focused on a broad range of issues: The patients' bill of rights; the way in which the repeal would harm individuals who have pre-existing conditions; young children from infancy; the 23- to 26-year-old coverage.

We also discussed a little bit about how this affects business and, of course, we went into some detail about senior citizens. All of these are critically important issues. We will be discussing these in the days ahead. I do hope the American public will really pay attention, because this next week, particularly as we move towards Wednesday, is going to be absolutely critical to the American people. It's a question about will all of us in America be able to get health care coverage that is affordable and provides us with the opportunity to have the health care that we need.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WEBSTER). Members are reminded that remarks in debate are properly addressed to the Chair rather than any perceived television viewing audience.

HEALTH CARE DEBATE

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. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I can tell you that I am pleased to address you, Mr. Speaker, here on the floor of the United States

House of Representatives and welcome you to this great deliberative body which becomes instantly far more deliberative than it has been over the last 4 years. This is part of it.

As I deliberate and I listened to the gentleman from Tennessee, I have to make the point that when you challenge the mendacity of the leader, or another Member, there is an opportunity to rise to a point of order, there is an opportunity to make a motion to take the gentleman's words down. However, many of the Members are off in other endeavors. I would make the point that the leader and the Speaker have established their integrity and their mendacity for years in this Congress, and I don't believe it can be effectively challenged, and those who do so actually cast aspersions on themselves for making wild accusations.

I came to this floor, though, Mr. Speaker, to talk about the weather, and as I listened to the speeches that have gone on before in this previous half-hour or hour, it actually changed the subject for me. I think there are many things that need to be brought out and clarified, given this, that we have debated this health care bill. We debated this health care bill for, oh, close to a year. It was announced in Rules Committee earlier today that there were, I believe they said, 100 hours of markup in committee. Well, it wasn't the bill that passed. It was 100 hours of debate and markup on a different bill. They switched bills at the end. That's a matter of public record and fact, also.

But the American public understands what happened. They understand that the Speaker of the House said, We have to pass the bill—meaning ObamaCare, Mr. Speaker—in order to find out what's in it. When that bill was passed, to set the record also straight, I don't think there is another time in the history of this Congress that there was a bill of this magnitude—in fact I'm certain there is not—that passed the House of Representatives without the majority support of the House of Representatives for the bill that was before us.

It is a fact of record, it's a fact of judgment, it's a fact of history, that there had to be conditions that were attached in order to achieve the votes necessary to squeak that bill by and pass ObamaCare here in the House on that day last March. If people forget, Mr. Speaker, what I'm talking about, it's this: Remember, there was a switch on the bill. The bill that was marked up in committee is not the bill that came to the floor, not the bill that had hearings on it and had markup. But there were also conditions. We should remember there were the Stupak Dozen, the Stupak Dozen who said we insist that there be an amendment brought forward that will protect so that the language that's in the bill doesn't fund abortion through a Federal mandate. They held out on that to get that vote. Little did I know up

until that Saturday afternoon that the gentleman who was doing the negotiating had already committed to vote for the bill, and the Stupak Dozen were anonymous people. Furthermore, they had negotiated with the President of the United States who made a commitment and followed through on it to sign an executive order that would pacify or mollify the anonymous Stupak Dozen under the presumption, unconstitutionally and completely outside the bounds of the separation of powers, that the President of the United States could effectively amend legislation by executive order and promise he's going to do so before the bill was even brought to the floor for a vote. That happened in this Congress.

Another condition of that was, this is a condition that came after the then-chair of the Rules Committee, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), had offered the idea that they should just deem that the bill passed so they didn't have to go on record of voting for this bill; because they knew how bad it was. They knew how politically vulnerable they were. They knew that Speaker PELOSI was making many of them walk the plank. A lot of those people are not here in this 112th Congress because of that action. But as I talked about why this bill didn't have the support of the Congress and in the form that was before us, why the majority did not support it, the majority votes that day in its form, because there also had to be another deal on top of this. This was the deal that the Senate had to pass a reconciliation package which was designed to amend the bill that had not yet been brought to floor of the House for a vote. I don't know that it's the first time in history that there's been a shenanigan like that played, but it's the first time in my knowledge that there has been a bill certainly of that magnitude that came before this Congress that was not the bill that came through committee, that was pledged to be, I put it in quotes, amended by a Presidential executive order, and further amended by a reconciliation bill that would later pass the United States Senate.

That's what we have before us with ObamaCare. And it became the law of the land on that date of March 30, 2010; passed over here in the House, if I remember correctly, on the late evening of March 21 or the early morning of March 22, Sunday night. I remember my long walk home that night. I remember telling myself, I'm going to sleep until I'm all rested up and then I'm going to wake up and figure out what to do.

I didn't sleep very long. I couldn't sleep with that policy imposed upon the American people with the realization that it would become the law of the land. And about 2½ hours later, I got up and went to my word processor and typed up a request for a bill to repeal ObamaCare. I filed that request at the opening of business that day, the first opportunity in the first minutes of that day.

□ 1640

I want to thank and congratulate MICHELE BACHMANN. I didn't know it, she was awake in the middle of the night doing the same thing, and her bill draft came down within 3 minutes of mine, exactly the same words. That bill draft was turned into a discharge petition with this huge Pelosi majority in the 111th Congress, and the discharge petition gathered 173 signatures, bipartisan by the Pelosi definition at least, Mr. Speaker. And that was part of the foundation that I think actually did shake this country.

There was a statement made in the Rules Committee when they were deliberating on the rule for H.R. 2 that we had said that the sky would fall if ObamaCare became the law of the land, and they said the sky didn't fall. Well, Chairman UPON, now chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee, said, yes, it did. The sky did fall.

When you look at the 87 freshmen new Republicans that are seated over on this side, the nine freshmen Democrats on this side, I think that any political pundit would tell you there was a political earthquake in America that was brought about in large part by the imposition of this liberty-stealing unconstitutional ObamaCare bill that is before this Congress now.

This Congress was elected to come here and repeal ObamaCare, get a handle on the debt and the deficit and lay the foundation so that private enterprise can start to have faith in the future of this country again and they can create the jobs under the framework that we are hopeful we will be able to bring through.

But we are truthfully not in a position yet where the House of Representatives can lay all of the economic foundation that is necessary for free enterprise to have enough faith and confidence to invest our capital in a robust fashion.

What we are in a position to do now with a new Congress and a new Speaker is to be able to play an effective defense against the existing majority in the United States Senate and the President of the United States, who has frantically been digging holes through his Keynesian economics-onsteroids theory and dug such a deep hole that we have watched NANCY PELOSI preside over an additional \$5.2 trillion in debt, and we have watched the Obama administration run that up under their term of only a couple of years of about \$3 trillion.

And it has got to stop. The American people did this. They were looking at President Gulliver Obama, and they were the Lilliputians that came to the polls on November 2 and tied him up with all their little electoral ropes and said to the new freshmen class, join those incumbent Republicans that are there and any discerning Democrats that are willing to join, and there will be some join on this vote tomorrow and on Wednesday to repeal ObamaCare, and take the shovel out of the hands of

the President and certainly take the gavel out of the hand of NANCY PELOSI. That is what happened.

Now, I take you back through this history, because it is being rewritten again. How can they go before the Rules Committee, stand here on the floor of the House before the American people, Mr. Speaker, and take the position that somehow if they just explain it one more time and one more way, that the American people will now have some left-wing light bulb come on in their head? It is not going to happen.

The American people have seen clearly. They washed the lenses off and they have looked down through the lens of the Constitution and fiscal responsibility and common sense and they were appalled at that liberty-stealing bill of ObamaCare, and they said repeal that monstrosity, because the destiny of America will be forever diminished unless we do.

This is the charge that this new Congress has. It is the voice of the American people, and it is the respect that we must have, and my gratitude for God's gift to America, the freshman class that was elected in 2010 and sworn in here right here on this floor yesterday afternoon, and they will affect the agenda of this country for many Congresses to come; and it will be a responsible agenda that brings us to a balanced budget and begins to reduce the deficit that this country has, not just the deficit spending, but reduce the national debt.

We must get to the point where we can begin to pay down the national debt, and we start with this Congress. We start by rolling back the spending to 2008 levels. We started here today with a vote that cut our own budgets by 5 percent. It is not a lot of money; and, yes, it is symbolic, but it is the symbolism that compels us to follow through. If it is good enough now for those of us in this Congress that voted on that, it is also good enough to bring that policy back through the United States of America.

Well, so what I have heard is the Members on the other side of the aisle that still stand here and defend ObamaCare, the ones that are left, they have four talking points about the bill that they think are compelling, and they must believe that it offsets all of the horrible things about ObamaCare.

First they say that, well, remember, the President had all of these promises about what he was going to do with ObamaCare. And he is the first one that I know of that attached the word "ObamaCare" to it in a public way. It was at the Blair House during the health care summit, February 25, 2010, when the President of the United States referred to his own bill as ObamaCare. So that is the shorthand version for all this long thing. They don't want to say ObamaCare. I don't know why. That is how everybody knows it, and that is how everybody understands it.

So under ObamaCare, they say there are four—they don't list only four, they just give you the four—four redeeming components to ObamaCare that apparently offset all the horrible things about it, and these four redeeming conditions are these:

That it requires insurance companies all across America with a Federal mandate to provide for policies that must keep your children on there up until age 26. They think that is something that America has fallen in love with as a really good brainy solution.

Now, I know there are Republicans that support the idea of insurance policies being extended to age 26; but, Mr. Speaker, what a lot of people don't know in this country is there are at least two Members in this Congress that were elected before age 26, and had ObamaCare been implemented before they were elected to office, they would have, could have, been on their parents' health insurance plan.

Now, isn't that a nice thing, when you wean them off of their parents' health insurance plan and you transition them over and put a pin on their lapel and say, now, run the country. They haven't had a single minute of their own health insurance policy until we get here, and actually we have a responsibility for it here. We pay our chunk of the premiums, like any other Federal employee.

But I just think it is ironic that there would be such a strong argument that people elected to Congress could come here, walk in that door, come down here before the Speaker's rostrum, raise their hand and take the oath of office, and at that moment still be on their mommy and daddy's health insurance policy.

I wanted my kids to grow up. When they turned 18, I told them my responsibilities are now done. I am going to nurture you and give you advice and counsel you, and I will help you where I can. But I am not obligated, guys. We did our best for the first 18 years. We will do our best for every year. We will love you all our lives, but you got to start pulling your own load. Now I look at three grown sons in their thirties, all married, five grandkids, each an entrepreneur in their own right, pulling their own load, and I am glad that they didn't have to stay unweaned until age 26.

But if the insurance companies want to do that, you should be able to buy the policy. If States want to mandate, I think it is not a good policy, but they can do so constitutionally, and then if a person is tired of paying those kind of premiums, you can move to another State and vote with your feet. There are some States in the Union here that I would move out of because I can't afford the health insurance in them. There are other States one could think about moving to because of the opposite.

Here is the second point: preexisting conditions. They always tie this preexisting conditions in with the word

“discrimination” because it is like a civil rights code word. So if an insurance company says I don't want to provide insurance policies to people who have preexisting conditions who wait until they get sick before they buy a policy, the health insurance purchasing equivalent of waiting for your house to be on fire before you go buy property and casualty insurance, how many rational people, Mr. Speaker, in this country, would make the case that we ought to have a guaranteed issue for our fire insurance on our house? Couldn't we then just, you know, set up our little BlackBerry with an automatic send and wait for the fire alarm to go off, and on the way down the steps to bail out of the burning house, you just click “send,” and automatically they have to give you a policy so that your house could be rebuilt if it is on fire.

We wouldn't do that. It is ridiculous because it defeats the logic of insurance. The logic of insurance is you want to be insured against a catastrophe, and you want to share that risk with other people who want to be insured against a catastrophe. It is true for fire insurance, it was true for flood insurance until the Federal Government took it over, and it needs to be true with health insurance.

But we will address preexisting conditions; and we will have a legitimate debate on preexisting conditions here in this Congress, in committee hearings, before committees, amendments offered, amendments allowed and amendments offered and debated and voted up and down.

My position is that if the States want to prohibit the consideration of preexisting conditions, they may do so. Our State has a high-risk pool, and we fund part of those premiums with the high-risk pool out of the State treasury.

□ 1650

I think that's a good idea. I have worked to develop that and expand that in my time in the State legislature. I think it's worthy of consideration that the Federal Government could take a look at those State high-risk pools and find ways to help those States provide those kind of backstops because there will always be people that are unfortunate. It won't always just be those that are irresponsible. There are also those that are unfortunate. And so we need to take that into consideration. But to have the whole debate about just those that are unfortunate and not take into consideration those that are responsible, those that are taxpayers, those that are funding, those that are the engine of our economy that are being discouraged by these kind of Big Government, socialized medicine, unconstitutional policies like ObamaCare.

Here's the third one. A 26-year-old with insurance, preexisting conditions. Oh, yes, the discriminatory preexisting conditions policy. It's not discrimina-

tory. It's logical and rational. Would you say that it's a discriminatory policy to not allow people to buy property and casualty insurance if their house is on fire? It's not discrimination. It defies common sense. So I'm not going to let them get by with that word.

Here's a another thing, though. Doughnut hole. They say they fixed the doughnut hole and we would unfix the doughnut hole. The truth is that low-income people have that fix. There is a backstop for that doughnut hole. It's not the hole that they say it is. Furthermore, they raise fees elsewhere to fill the doughnut hole. So it's not fixed. It's just another transfer. So some people are beneficiaries and other people pay the extra money. I am not particularly animated about that, although I thought we should not have had that doughnut hole created here in 2003.

In any case, their next argument is against lifetime caps. If States want to provide lifetime caps, let them do that. But if individuals want to buy policies that have lifetime caps because the premiums are lower, let them make that decision as well, Mr. Speaker. But I envision the day that we have free markets that are engaged in this. We want to preserve the doctor-patient relationship. We want to preserve the free market effect of this so that when people make decisions about their health and their lives, they have some tools to work with.

I want to be able to in this Congress, this 112th Congress, advance the idea and seek to pass legislation that's pretty consistent with Chairman DREIER's. I would expand it a little more. He's advanced the medical savings accounts. I would add we need to advance health savings accounts, HSAs. In 2003, with the expansion of part D, we put language in that established HSAs, health savings accounts. It allowed in the first year for a couple to establish a health savings account with a maximum amount in it of \$5,150, indexed for inflation so it could grow. I don't remember what those numbers are today, but that's the calculus, from \$5,150 on up.

Well, that's a good deal. ObamaCare slashed that in less than half and capped the HSA maximum amount at \$2,500. Why? Because they don't want people to be independent, and they don't want them to be able to make their own decisions. If they do that, then they might undermine this effort of expanding the dependency class in America, which is what ObamaCare is designed to do, because expanding the dependency class expands the Democrat Party, and that increases the political base. And it seems illogical to the people. Well, there's the logic I've just applied to it, and now, Mr. Speaker, they do understand that this is about politics. It's about expanding the dependency class. And it's about diminishing the independence and the spirit of Americans.

And so the lifetime caps piece is the fourth one. Twenty-six year olds, preexisting conditions, doughnut hole,

lifetime caps. That's the things they talk about. Four things. That's it? Do they redeem those 2,500 pages of disaster? Do they then overrule and trump the Constitution of the United States of America? I say no, Mr. Speaker. They cannot, they must not, they should not. And I hear this debate also about an increase in our deficit of the number, I think it was \$232 billion, if—not if anymore, it's when—we repeal ObamaCare.

Well, that deficit, and they want to know, Will you offset that deficit with spending cuts? Yes, sir. We will be happy to offset a deficit with spending cuts. But I would make this argument instead. When you have an unconstitutional bill in front of you, and if you're weighing \$232 billion and you want to debate whether or not that's a reason or not to repeal an unconstitutional bill. You can set no price on the Constitution of the United States of America. If it's a trillion dollars, you repeal the bill anyway because it's unconstitutional. And you don't sit back and twiddle your thumbs and wait for the court to resolve this for you. I'm glad that there's litigation going on in the judicial branch. I'm glad that Judge Hudson found with Virginia on the constitutional component of the Interstate Commerce Clause. I'm glad there are efforts out there in the States to deny the implementation of ObamaCare. All of these things going on.

But we took an oath to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States here yesterday. We took it all in good faith. We said so. And when we have an unconstitutional bill before us, Mr. Speaker, it is our obligation to repeal that bill. Our judgment of the Constitution is not a judgment that defers across and down the line of Independence Avenue. We don't go to the Supreme Court and genuflect and say, If you change the meaning of the Constitution, my oath applies. Our oath applies to our understanding and conviction of the text in the original understanding of the Constitution and the various amendments as they were adopted. That's what the Constitution has to mean or it is no guarantee whatsoever to the people in this country.

They rose up and they changed this majority in this House, and they did so because they're a whole group of millions of constitutional conservatives, including the Tea Party groups, and they said, Enough unconstitutional activity, enough of this theft of our liberty. We are not going to pass the debt and deficit on to the succeeding generations. And it was \$230 billion was the point, not \$232 billion, to make it accurate.

But I noticed today in the Republican Study Committee that chairman JIM JORDAN read from an article written by Tony Blankley in *The Washington Times*, December 20, 2010. And it caught my ear. And so I looked it up. And I'd like to just close with this concept that was delivered by Tony Blankley shortly before Christmas this

year. He wrote about an experience in China and how they were worried that if they don't keep the growth going in China that they will create expectations and the peasants in China will be unruleable. If you give them expectations, then you have to meet those expectations. Well, we in America, we trust in our expectations.

And so he writes this. He said what happened on November 2, was that the American people went to the polls and said, I want more liberty and less government. I want more liberty and less security about my future. And he puts it in these words. And I think they're excellent words. No other people in the world would have responded to economic danger by seeking more liberty and less government protection. No other people would have thought to themselves, if I have to suffer economically in order to not steal from my grandchildren, so be it.

I pray we would have come to that decision a generation ago instead of a couple of months ago, Mr. Speaker. But this Congress has come to that decision at the direction and the effectiveness of the American people. And we will follow through on that pledge, and we'll ask them, Keep sending us more people like this freshman class to help get this job done so that in our time we can hand the keys of this Chamber and this government over to the next generation in sound fiscal fashion, sound constitutional fashion, not with diminished liberty, but with expanded liberty, and the pillars of American exceptionalism refurbished by our generation, thanks to the will of the American people.

REPEALING HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and congratulations on your election.

It's a great pleasure to be here today. I could spend the next half hour responding to my colleague from Iowa. I think it's fascinating just that one comment, that he talks about reading the Constitution and then talks about how this is an unconstitutional bill. Well, obviously, he apparently stopped at article II and didn't get to article III, which stipulates that the judiciary and the Supreme Court ultimately decide what is constitutional in this country, not Members of Congress.

The Constitution was read today. I'm glad it was. It's always good to remind ourselves of this great foundational document that we all respect, that all of us—all 435 Members of the House—swore to protect and defend yesterday.

□ 1700

In the Constitution, in article I, section 5, it says each House may determine the rules of its proceedings. Yes-

terday, the Republican majority in the House put forth a group of rules changes that will determine how this Congress will operate over the next 2 years.

It was fascinating, in light of our discussion about health care, in light of our discussion about the costs of health care, that one of the things it did, these rules changes that Republicans passed, was basically to vest extraordinary power on one Member of the House of Representatives to determine essentially what the cost, what the deficit or the debt, the budget implications on a particular piece of legislation might be, and the relevance of this to the debate we are in now about the Republicans' proposal to take away all of the privileges of rights and benefits granted by the Affordable Care Act that we passed in the 111th Congress and that I was proud to support.

One of the things that it said was, if there is a vote to repeal the health care bill, the Affordable Care Act that we passed last year, that we basically decide that we don't have to abide by PAYGO rules—in other words, saying that, just because the Congressional Budget Office determined that the Affordable Care Act will save the taxpayers \$230 billion over the next 6, 7 or 8 years and then another \$1 trillion in the following 10 years, we don't have to make the same kind of adjustments that we do for other kinds of additional expenditures. The Republican philosophy is, if you reduce revenues in any way to the government, that's fine; and it doesn't affect the deficit.

Now, a lot of the debate we had in the last Congress over the health care act I heard time, after time, after time, and we heard this with tax cuts and many other things: oh, a business can't operate like this. A family can't operate like this. Well, in fact, I think, in this particular case, that analogy is really relevant because, if I have a family, a two-income family, and all of a sudden one of us loses our job and loses our income, it's really interesting that we could take the position that, oh, it didn't affect our budget, and it didn't affect the family deficit. Just that loss of revenue didn't matter. All we're concerned about is how much we spent. All we're concerned about is the expense side.

What the Republicans have basically done under this new regime, with this new set of rules that they passed yesterday, is to say that there are two separate ledgers—one dealing with expenditures, one dealing with revenue—and that they don't affect each other. It is an astounding philosophy of operation that we are about to embark on.

Under this new rule, when the Bush tax cuts for the very wealthy expire in 2 years, we would not have to account for that loss in revenue to the Federal deficit even though, when we start writing checks and we start trying to borrow money to pay for the deficit, we are going to have to come up with that money. They say, no, it doesn't affect the deficit.

If we repeal the Affordable Care Act, which the CBO says will save \$1.3 trillion over the next two decades, that's money that we aren't going to have to borrow from somebody else. They say, oh, that's not part of the budget. We don't have to compensate for that.

So it's fascinating that they basically set up these two sets of books, and now they give the power to the chairman of the Budget Committee, who in this case is Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin—a very thoughtful, honest man. You give him the power, however, to make a decision that whatever the CBO says doesn't matter. He can deem, or decide, exactly what the impact of any provision or any act of Congress is on the budget. One person.

Now, I come from Kentucky. We're a big basketball State. Last week, we had a game, a big-game rivalry. Kentucky and Louisville played. It didn't come out the way I would have liked it to. But I had to think, when we set up these rules, that would be like Louisville and Kentucky playing and saying to Coach Pitino of Louisville or Coach Calipari from Kentucky, You get to make all the calls in this game. Our players are going to play. They're going to compete hard, but Coach Pitino, we're taking the refs off the field. You're the one who's going to call fouls. You're going to make all the decisions.

That's basically what the Republicans have done.

What they also said and decided in this process is that the health care reform bill—changing it, repealing it—will have no impact on the deficit, no impact on the budget. That's fascinating because, for the last year and a half, when we debated the Affordable Care Act, they kept talking about how this was going to balloon the deficit, how it was going to explode the deficit. Trillions of dollars it was going to cost the American taxpayer. Well, now they say, No, it has no impact at all on the deficit because you have to understand, if it costs nothing to repeal it, then there was no cost to passing it.

So one has to question who has been honest in this debate. Who has been honest in this debate?

I understand that finding referees as to who is right and who is wrong and what facts are salient and which facts are accurate has been a difficult process. My colleague Mr. KING said that, you know, all of a sudden, we keep talking about this, and expect a liberal light to go on in people's heads. Well, we need some light on this subject because there have been billions and billions of dollars spent to create darkness about the impact of this bill, and that process proceeds today.

So I think, as we debate this proposal of the Republicans to do away with many of the benefits which we are so proud of and which millions of Americans are beginning to feel now, we should have the kind of discussion that is honest, that is open, and that sheds light on the subject. No one can do

that better than my colleague from the great State of Maryland, DONNA EDWARDS.

Ms. EDWARDS. Thank you for yielding, Mr. YARMUTH.

You know, as I listened to this discussion, I thought, I wonder what taxpayers are thinking about with this discussion. I wonder about those taxpayers who go to work every day but who, through no fault of their own, can't afford to buy health insurance even though they work every day and they pay taxes every day.

I thought, well, under the Affordable Care Act, indeed, for those people, we get to, you know, put a little bottom under them so they can be covered, so they can, you know, go to work and take care of their families and can also have the security of knowing that their families are going to be covered with health care.

I thought about the discussion earlier on this floor where our colleagues on the other side of the aisle talked, you know, somewhat disparagingly of the young people who maybe finish college or trade school and go to get jobs, but there is a gap in health care coverage because they've turned 22 or 23 years old. They're working for a living, doing what they need to do. They've gone to school. They've gotten trades, maybe, and they can't afford health care coverage. So their parents get to say, You know what? For all of our peace of mind and for your security, we're going to, you know, pay for that health care coverage under our plan.

Mr. Speaker, as I stand here today, I think about my son, who has just gotten a job. There was this period, and I remember when I received that notice from our health insurance company. That notice, you know, was a shocker to me because it basically said, You're done.

Had we not had this provision in the Affordable Care Act that enables parents like me and other parents around the country to have the peace of mind of being able to keep our children, our young people, our young working people on our health care plans, I don't know what working families would do out there.

Mr. Speaker, I thought also about a conversation that I'm going to share with you, a conversation with some seniors that I had, as I was spending New Year's Eve with friends. One of the seniors said to me, as we were talking about health care. You know, I have a medical condition. I'm spending thousands of dollars, and I've fallen into the doughnut hole, and it is really taking a chunk out of our pocket.

I had the privilege on December 31 of saying to this family, Do you know that, as of January 1, as of the next day, in 2011, your prescription drug that has fallen into that doughnut hole will actually receive a 50 percent discount?

□ 1710

They had no idea. I was glad to be able to share it with them. They're not

my constituents. They live in somebody else's State, but it's great to be able to share that with them. And that's the experience many of our seniors all across the country are having right now as they realize that they won't have to bear the burden of out-of-pocket costs for prescription drugs that fall through a doughnut hole because they can't afford it anymore. Their young people will be able to be covered until they're 26. If you experience domestic violence in a handful of States, that's a preexisting condition. Guess what? Insurance companies will no longer, as we move into the implementation of our health care reform bill, be able to call that a preexisting condition.

And so I will close and allow you some additional opportunity in your time, but I do want to say that it was really compelling to read the Constitution here on the floor of the House of Representatives today, and again, a very important reminder of our obligation as elected officials to look out for the general welfare of the people, and I can think of no better way to do that than making sure that we protect the health insurance, the health care that Americans have been guaranteed because of what we were able to accomplish with the Affordable Care Act.

Mr. YARMUTH. I thank the distinguished Congresswoman from Maryland for her comments, and I'm actually kind of glad that Congressman KING brought up these major benefits which are now helping families across this country.

Ms. EDWARDS talked about the benefit of adding your son or daughter under 26 to your policy, and Mr. KING basically pooh-poohed that—I don't know if that's exactly a good legislative term, but kind of ridiculed that. And then he talked about lifetime limits and how lifetime limits were not necessarily something that we should worry about in spite of the fact that almost a million Americans a year, historically, over the last few years, have gone bankrupt because they either had no insurance or their insurance was inadequate and they lost everything they had because of health care costs, because of a cancer diagnosis or serious accident. These are real-life stories. These are not abstractions.

And I understand that we have many colleagues on the other side of the aisle who believe, with almost a religious zeal, in certain things like the perfection of the marketplace, in spite of the fact that we've seen time after time after time in this country, not too long ago with the financial system, how our markets often fail, how we have created or allowed to be created enormous sources of power and concentrations of economic power in this country that have basically distorted the marketplaces, and that is very, very true in the area of health insurance.

We have many, many States in which one company, one company, one insurer will dominate the insurance market, 85, 90 percent of the insurance in

that State sold through one insurance company. That is not something that the drafters of the Constitution envisioned. So it's nice to believe in free market principles—and I think Democrats believe in free market principles as well as Republicans do—but the fact is, in real life, not in a history philosophy book or political science philosophy book, in real life markets fail, markets get distorted, and that is when the government is responsible for protecting the general welfare of the population as the Constitution says.

Because we've been joined by another colleague, we want to return to this issue of rules because, again, the budgetary rules that the Republicans have set up to govern this next Congress are creating some incredibly difficult situations for our States, our localities, and our people. And one of those areas in which this has been particularly true—and I know I've been contacted by transportation officials in Kentucky about how dangerous they think these new rules may be, and JOE COURTNEY from Connecticut has joined us to talk about that implication of the new rules that we are going to be operating under.

So I yield to gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. COURTNEY. Thank you, Mr. YARMUTH, and I appreciate the fact that you are putting the spotlight on this issue which is really extraordinary in terms of what's just happened in the last 24 hours.

As you know and as Congresswoman EDWARDS knows, the real workhorse infrastructure transportation funding in this country is the highway trust fund. That is a mechanism which was set up by the Congress. It has a dedicated revenue source, gas taxes, and since 1998, there has been a rule which the Congress has operated under which says that the 5-year transportation plan authorized by the Congress cannot be tampered with by a bill that's brought to floor of the House. If it is, then that bill is ruled out of order. And the purpose of that is to make sure that the transportation plan, which is done on a 5-year increment, has sanctity, has consistency so that State DOT's like yours in Kentucky or Maryland or Connecticut can actually move forward on multiyear projects which, of course, most road construction, bridge construction falls into that timeline.

Well, you know, this has been the operating rules of the House since 1998. Yesterday, the Republican rule which was adopted astonishingly rescinded that protection in terms of procedure for the transportation trust fund, again, the mechanism which ensures that States get appropriate funding for highways.

So a coalition grew up over the last 3 days, including Laborers' International Union, Ironworkers, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the American Trucking Association, the Motorcycle Riders of America, people who actually care about making sure that our roads

and bridges have the adequate support to make sure that, again, as a growing country we are going to be able to move people and goods from one place to the other in appropriate fashion.

By the way, our competitors around the world are moving past us at Mach speed in terms of their transportation infrastructure investment.

Nonetheless, this coalition warned the new majority that this new rule was going to upset, again, the consistency which transportation funding requires. The new majority went ahead with that rule, adopted it, claims that they, in fact, were not doing that to the transportation trust fund, but interestingly, the markets say otherwise. UBS-PaineWebber issued a downgrade to transportation construction companies on the Wall Street stock exchanges, and their stocks declined yesterday in the wake of the adoption of this rule. And again I, earlier today, submitted press accounts that describe, in fact, the sequence of what actually happened.

We are talking here about a sector of the U.S. economy that's not in a recession; it's in a depression. The construction trades right now are looking at unemployment rates of 25 percent. Rather than shrinking and inhibiting the transportation and infrastructure of this country, we should be investing in it. And let's be very clear here. There is not going to be any private investment that's going to fill the gap that's being created by undercutting the sanctity of the highway trust fund.

The fact of the matter is this is done through public dollars, and every generation going back to, really, Jefferson has understood that this is essential to have an economy that can actually thrive and grow. And as I said, we have now left the highway funding of this country subject to the whims of the annual appropriations process. That is not the type of horizon in which planning can actually take place at State DOTs, and it doesn't surprise me that the folks in Kentucky have contacted you. The people at DOT in Connecticut have certainly done the same, and all across the country. Again, management, labor, public sector groups that care about highways, they are just incredulous, particularly at this time with the weakness of this economy, that this House has adopted that type of rule.

Mr. YARMUTH. I thank the gentleman.

And reclaiming my time, the analogy I used earlier was with families, and we all know we're in a difficult budgetary situation. We know we're running huge deficits right now, and we know that the money that we are spending, a large portion of it we are borrowing because tax revenues can't support it. This Republican majority now has basically taken the position that they're going to strangle this government and put a cap on expenditures. And certainly I understand that's part of their honestly held philosophy, but if you're

a family and you've got two kids high school age and two income earners, one of them loses their job, are you going to then say under no circumstances am I going to borrow money to help pay for the college education of my two teenagers so they can have a better life and they can be prepared to meet the demands of the future; I'm just going to keep cutting expenses?

□ 1720

And that analogy seems to be working here, particularly with regard to transportation as well and the investment that we have to make.

Mr. COURTNEY. That's right. And families make that decision to make capital investments along exactly the same lines, whether it's to fix a roof, you know, put a new driveway in, buy a house. Again, that's done through financing, debt financing. And it's, again, the way that particularly the middle class kind of deals with those challenges. But there's no question that in terms of our own country's history, going back in time, again, even to the beginning of our government, even during the Civil War when the finances of this country were completely going from almost day to day, Abraham Lincoln did not pull back in terms of the need for us to invest in rail, land-grant colleges.

Again, this was in the middle of the worst conflict in the history of this country, but yet he still saw the need for us, as a Nation, to still continue to invest in the future, and we borrowed funds. Because those types of investments, investing in people through education or investing in infrastructure comes back to benefit the economy long term, and the multiplier effect is much higher than the actual pricetag of those initial investments.

Mr. YARMUTH. I thank the gentleman. Again, I go back to these rules that have been adopted now in the House, and they basically give extraordinary unprecedented power to one person to set these budget limits to decide the budgetary impact of an investment in infrastructure or a health care law, the repeal of a health care law or, for instance, the repeal of many of the advances we made in terms of education funding during the 111th Congress.

And it seems to me that, as I read through the Constitution, the Founding Fathers probably didn't anticipate that we would basically disenfranchise 434 Members of Congress in making these incredibly important decisions about how we raise revenue, which is specifically a power that has been given for initiation to the House of Representatives, or to spend tax revenue, that that kind of power would vest in one person and that you would set up a set of rules that sets up two sets of books and say, If you drop revenue, if you cut taxes, if you have a loss in revenue, that has no budget implications; but everything you spend has to be offset somewhere along the line.

And I think in terms of not just investment in infrastructure but also investment in research, medical research which probably is the real answer to our long-term health care financing costs. If we can control or cure diabetes and cancer and make an impact on heart disease, these are the things that are really going to help us in the future. But to set up these kind of rules which basically, again, disenfranchise not just 434 Members of Congress but, in the process, virtually every American citizen from the process of deciding what money should be spent and invested in some very, very important aspects of the general welfare.

And I would like to yield to the gentleman from Maryland, DONNA EDWARDS.

Ms. EDWARDS. I thank the gentleman for yielding. And it occurred to me as we heard this discussion—and thank you to Mr. COURTNEY for raising these issues with us, Mr. Speaker. Because it occurred to me that while we should be spending our time focused on job creation—and we know that a core for job creation for the 21st century for this country is in our investment in our transportation infrastructure, really putting people back to work. And instead, we are relitigating what the American people thought we had finished with—health care.

So here we are with a rule that then says to us, Even as the bipartisan debt commission has said that we need to invest in the Nation's infrastructure—those are investments that create jobs, jobs where taxpayers are paying into the system so that we have revenue, so that we can invest in our infrastructure—that we are going to be constrained from doing it. And I am reminded that in the last Congress, in the 111th Congress, every Member, I believe, of our Transportation and Infrastructure Committee wrote to the President of the United States saying, We need to do a long-term transportation and infrastructure bill so that our States can begin to really put people back to work. And here we are in the 112th Congress, led by the Republicans who have put forth a rules package that will constrain our ability to create jobs in this country.

Mr. YARMUTH. I thank you for that contribution. And we've also been joined by the gentleman from Tennessee, Congressman COHEN, and I would like to yield to him.

Mr. COHEN. Thank you, Mr. YARMUTH.

Indeed, the issues that Mr. COURTNEY brought forward in his 1 minute today were alarming to me because my hometown of Memphis depends upon transportation. That's what makes it America's distribution center, the roads, the rivers, the runways, and the rails. And if we don't have moneys to go into helping our airports—where Federal Express is located in my district, and in your district, Mr. YARMUTH, UPS—because that's how we move products all over the world. From those hubs, we

move commerce. And that is why it's so important that we have an FAA Reauthorization Act passed, a lot of which would be expenses to modernize the structure and the transportation bills that Mr. Oberstar, who was one of the great Members of this House but is no longer a Member, tried to get passed last year to both stimulate the economy in the short run and in the long run, as Mr. COURTNEY said, with that multiplier effect by creating jobs. It's roads that take goods to market, that move commerce, that move raw materials. And I was hoping and do hope that we will have bipartisan efforts to have transportation, FAA reauthorization bills pass that will move this economy forward.

The economy is still in a difficult spot, and we can't really see that the economy is improving if we continue to cut spending, particularly in places such as transportation, infrastructure, and the airport infrastructures. That's so important. So it was distressing news to see this happen.

It is difficult to see how we can get ourselves out of this near depression that was caused by the Bush administration with cutting spending. I know Paul Krugman has people who don't think he is correct all the time. I happen to think he is correct most of the time. And the Nobel Prize people aren't always correct. But when they gave him the Nobel Prize for economics, some of the brighter people in the world thought he was pretty good on economics. And it's his belief that we need to do more spending, and I concur with him. I would hate to see us lead this economy—it's about to get out of the ditch—put it back in the ditch.

Mr. YARMUTH. I thank you for that.

As we wind down, pursuing the analogy with families and also with small businesses, I mean, people legitimately borrow money, and businesses legitimately borrow money for two reasons. One is for survival, to eat, to pay salaries if you are a small business. And they borrow money for investments. We have plenty of investments that we can make in this country that are desperately needed. Infrastructure being one, education being another, medical research being a third category.

And we basically have been told by the Republicans that there is no basis, no justification for spending any more money. And because we're in a deficit situation, borrowing more money—except when it comes to giving tax breaks for very, very wealthy Americans, millionaires, billionaires hedge fund managers, and the like, that's okay. We can do that, and we can balloon the national debt to do that, but we can't do it to help people, to provide people's health care, to invest in needed infrastructure, to invest in the things that will make this American economy the kind of economy that we will all be proud of, that will work for everyone, that will truly live up to the ambitions of the Founding Fathers when they wrote the Constitution that

we read today, to create a more perfect union. That's what we are all about. And we'll continue, as Democrats and now as Members of the loyal opposition in this body, anyway, to fight for the kind of balanced and intelligent investment and restraint of spending that will get us to the world that we all envision.

So I thank my colleagues for joining me today.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded not to traffic the well while another Member is under recognition.

ISSUES FACING THE 112TH CONGRESS

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

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to address the House on this historic day, this historic day when we have had the entire body read the Constitution of the United States. As that process went on, there was some wonderment in the audience about why we were doing it and what it would mean. But as I listened to the different bipartisan Members reading the Constitution, I felt a gravity come through the institution that we began to listen to and hear and read the words of our Founding Fathers as they set us on this great experiment called the American Republic, the Republic which was turned loose for the first time, a government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

□ 1730

And on this historic day, we have to contemplate what our tasks are as they lie ahead. For myself, I see the most important thing in front of us as being economic growth, jobs; and we have to wonder what we're going to do about that.

As I traveled around the district, after the election, we did—we have 18 counties, and we did 18 different town hall meetings, listening to the people of the district after the election. And the overriding concern is what are we going to do about jobs and what are we going to do about the economic future of the country.

I think people are alarmed at the policies that they have seen come out of Washington. They're alarmed at the spending. They're angry that Washington has not been listening, and they're just upset with the policies in general.

The last election sent two very clear messages: number one, you, in Washington are not listening to us; number two is that we don't like what you've been doing.

So, as we contemplate the future, we have to try to get our hands around the

economic growth question, and we have to ask ourselves why do we not have job creation at this time in our history.

As a business owner, I can tell you that the most important thing that we face right now is uncertainty. Now, that uncertainty originates from inside the government, so our government is doing the things which freeze our job creation in its place.

The uncertainty arises on two basic fronts. First of all, taxation, and second, regulation.

And so our friends across the aisle were just asking, why are we talking about the health care bill when that's been debated and discussed? If we narrow it down to job creation, if we narrow it down to the economic uncertainty or certainty, I hear business owners every day saying, we're going to have to lay off one or two people, maybe up to 10 percent of our workforce. Maybe we're going to have to lay off more to get below that threshold because we cannot afford the mandates that are given to us in this health care bill.

So, number one, that's taxation and uncertainty all in one piece. The health care bill hires 16,000 IRS agents, but does not hire one doctor. You can always tell by the functionality, not by the name of a bill, what it does, but by the functionality. And when it hires 16,000 IRS agents and no doctors, you can guess that it's more about taxing the American public than it is about providing health care. And we're seeing that play out in the job market across the United States.

People are frozen into place, wondering what it's going to mean in additional cost for their companies. So rather than leaving those people on the payroll, they're actually shrinking the payroll at a time when we need employment; 9½ to 10 percent unemployment for extended periods of time is not what makes people secure about the future. So that's one piece of the health care bill.

The second piece of the health care bill that is freezing job growth and job creation in its tracks is the regulatory environment. This is a time with baby boomers moving into retirement age, retirement age brings more expenses, more health care costs, and we should be seeing a growth in jobs in the health care industry nationwide. But instead that industry is frozen regulatorily. People don't know what the future is going to bring, and so that job growth that should be occurring to take care of our seniors is actually frozen in place by the regulations in this bill.

So, again, we began with the idea that we want to create jobs and grow the economy. We have to assess those things, those elements which are creating the impediments to growth, taxes and regulation. Then we can walk through our economy one section at a time to find the same thing is occurring, and we would begin to understand more clearly and more definitely that

our government is the problem in job creation.

For instance, if we took a look offshore, we all saw the problems with BP. That was on the TV every day. And I think BP should be 100 percent accountable and responsible.

It was my business—my wife and I had a service company, we fixed and repaired down-the-hole problems in oil wells. So we're familiar with the things, the decisions that were being made by the company out there as that well progressed towards a catastrophic failure.

Now, I do not believe—even though I think BP should be accountable—I do not believe that we should have killed one job in relation to that. When an airliner crashes, we don't stop all airlines. We bring the Nation's best people together, we determine what happened, and we determine how to make it not happen again. That's what we should be doing offshore. We should be bringing the Nation's best together, letting them analyze the problem, and then making sure it does not occur again.

But instead, the Obama administration implemented a moratorium, and that moratorium shut down the drilling offshore. We have 33 deepwater platforms. Those deepwater platforms cost billions to make, sometimes 15 years to manufacture them, and we have now shut them down; no economic activity at all.

Now, any business will tell you that they've got to have revenue from their investment. And so now then those deepwater rigs are beginning to steam away at about two or three knots per hour to foreign countries. Some have already gone to Africa, South America; and those jobs will never occur offshore in the U.S. again. I think that that's an over-response from the Obama administration, and I believe that one of the things this Congress should do is pull the pendulum back to the middle.

Yes, we should protect our environment. Yes, we should hold the companies accountable; but, no, we should not have killed one job. So I think in the early days of this Congress, we should make that a clear differentiation between the parties or between philosophical views of how to return the country. I think that we should make those clear distinctions that this group of people should be back on the payroll; and, yes, we should keep our environment clean, and we will hold those who make problems accountable.

And I think the American people are looking for that balance, that pendulum to come back toward the middle to where we say we can protect, we can preserve and we can create jobs simultaneously. And that is one of my sincere hopes that we begin to do this in these early days.

There's an economic truism that says when you raise taxes, you kill jobs. When you lower taxes, you create jobs. People would say, well, how do we create more jobs? The answer is, if you really want to do it, you should lower

taxes. And that's what this bill was saying right at the end in the lame duck session to extend the Bush tax cuts. It was saying that we should not raise taxes on any single American.

Now, you have the partisan debate that says we shouldn't be lowering taxes on billionaires. Well, frankly, there are very few of those. Many of the people who fall in that \$250,000-a-year and above income are simply small business people.

For instance, just last week, we had a dairy owner saying, you know, we run \$1 million a month through my small dairy. We only have 50 or 60 employees, but it costs us \$1 million a month to milk cows, to pay the feed and, hopefully, we get enough revenue. And yet these are people that you're going to drive the taxes up on. As you drive taxes up on your job creators, what you do is you take away their ability to create more jobs.

Now, if any of you have any cash left in the bank, which is questionable at this point, you wouldn't know that cash in the bank has almost zero worth. You get 0.0025. You get one-quarter of 1 percent interest on your money in the bank. So any company today is looking to reinvest its money to create cash flow, rather than holding cash in the bank.

But the uncertainty, the tax uncertainty and the regulatory uncertainty causes us to be uncertain about the future, and it causes us not to create jobs. And so we, in this body, have a tremendous obligation and a tremendous responsibility and even the—we can create the right perception, the right certainty if we'll simply take the right steps to just cause the mental framework of America to say, yes, we now know where we're going in the future; we now can invest with a certain amount of predictability.

And I think that it is our God-given responsibility at this point in our history, to do everything we can to start rebuilding our economy. So there are those who would say, but we can't do that. We might take jobs back from some foreign country.

The entire world's economy takes its heartbeat from the U.S. economy. We're about 25 percent of the world's economy.

I was in Germany several years ago to visit the soldiers in Landstuhl who had been wounded. In the evening time we met with about 100 different German corporations and they said, please fix your economy. When you, the U.S., sneeze economically, we, the world catch flu economically.

□ 1740

So that gives you some understanding of our responsibility to fix our economy. So, systemically, I think that we should walk through each industry one at a time to see what this government has been doing to kill or freeze jobs. I think that once we look offshore and realize that we are killing those jobs, we are sending those jobs

to, say, Venezuela—I'm not sure who among us would want to do that, but that's, in effect, what is happening—I think that we should do what it takes to bring those jobs back.

I think then, systemically, as we work our way through the country, we should ask ourselves about the 27,000 farmers in the San Joaquin Valley, 27,000 farmers that used to make their way, make their payments to the bank, make payroll, buy fertilizer, buy seeds, buy new tractors, invest in diesel, invest in repairs of the tractors. That's the whole growing economy. But a couple of years ago, because of the 2-inch silvery minnow, that entire economic region was simply shut down; that is, we are choosing all on behalf of a species preservation and none on behalf of the human species' job creation.

I think that the American people are expecting us to find the balance. I think they are expecting us to keep the species alive, maybe in holding ponds and release them by the millions into the rivers, but I think they are expecting us to find a solution to the job creation in the country. And I think that we can do it better than by simply saying, by some judge's order, that an entire economic subculture is simply going to disappear.

Now, the farmers haven't been working in a couple of years. Many are on assistance. They are not making their payments for the land. The banking system is less stable in the region. And, in the process, we are importing food which is far less safe to consume. We are importing from Central America, South America, maybe Mexico, and we have no control over what pesticides they use. So we have been seeing increasing inputs of food into our economic system here in the U.S. which are less safe. We saw the lead poisoning from China. We see these things every day. Why we would do that on behalf of some rigid philosophical viewpoint is simply exasperating Americans at this point.

Another issue in which we should look, if we are systemically looking at the way our economy is being frozen in its tracks, is our entire timber industry. We used to have a thriving timber industry here in this country. In New Mexico, we had a thriving timber industry that was almost as big as the oil and gas industry. We employed 20,000 people in the timber industry at one point. Today, New Mexico, like many of the other States, employs zero. We have nobody working in the timber industry.

Now, in full disclosure, during the last campaign I did have a guy come up and say, "That's incorrect. We have eight." He said, "I started a small lumber mill, and we are processing small diameter trees and we hired eight people."

But imagine what would be going on in New Mexico if we had our communities with those timber jobs that used to be there. Our tax base would increase, the number of jobs would in-

crease. We would have people paying Federal income tax, State income tax. But instead, those economic potentials have been shifted away to another country.

Now, I love the Canadians, but I think that we should have the jobs in New Mexico that we shipped to Canada. The idea, when we put the spotted owl regulations into effect, was that we were going to send these jobs to third-world countries. That's not what happened. They went to the economically closest neighbor, the one with the least transportation costs, and we gave the jobs to them.

I think that in this country people are tired of our government choking down the job base, the economic base for different regions, and we can work our way across the country and assess these.

I think the American people are expecting us in this new Congress, as we go through the Constitution as we read it on the floor, I think they are expecting us to redesign and reinvent government. I think they are expecting us to take a fresh look, do a forensic audit of the entire government to see what is working properly and what is working improperly. And when we do that, I think they expect us to cause efficiencies to occur in the government and cause efficiencies in the regulatory framework to where we can protect the species, protect the environment, protect the worker, and have the job creation on the other side of the pendulum, find that spot in the middle where we can do both.

I think Americans are alarmed, I think that they are afraid, and I think that they are angry over the way that Washington has been functioning. The last election said so. I do not think the last election was about Republican politics. I think it was a message that we want things to straighten up in America.

If we are going to straighten things up in America, the most important thing to do is set about job creation and economic growth. If we will grow the economy about 3 percent to 3.5 percent—and that's what we have averaged for the last 70 years, so understand that that's not an unachievable goal. But if we will grow our economy in that range, then all the problems begin to dissipate. The shortages and budgets in the Federal Government begin to dissipate. The shortages in our State budgets begin to dissipate. That is the only answer. I have never seen a company save its way to prosperity.

So I agree with our leaders and I agree with the Republican Party that we should be looking at spending cuts throughout our government. We should be finding more efficient, more effective ways to find governance. But I do not think we can find our way to prosperity in simply the budget cuts, but instead we have to look at tax certainty and regulatory certainty to create the economic growth that is there.

Now, I said earlier that tax cuts create jobs, and you might want to know

how that actually plays out. One guy in Artesia, in New Mexico, Mr. Swift, said it most clearly. He said: "I drive bulldozers. For me to create one job takes \$340,000. Now," he said, "if the government is taxing away my profits, then it takes longer to accumulate the \$340,000." He said, as I mentioned earlier, "That money in the bank is absolutely no use right now. I would rather have it in the bulldozers. But the government takes it and taxes it away, and then it takes me longer to create a job."

So you see this stagnant economy one job at a time because we are taxing too high, we are spending too frivolously as a government. And the American people are looking for solutions, and I think that we, as Republicans, have the right idea in tax certainty, regulatory certainty. And the job creation will begin then from the private companies.

Now, people have asked: What about the stimulus bill? Well, the stimulus bill was never going to create jobs, because what it does is it taxes away from that bulldozer operator who was going to create the job with his \$340,000, and then it gives that tax money over here to someone else. And they create jobs, but just for a short time, because if they only created jobs with that input of stimulus money, then that's not a legitimate long-term job in the first place.

What we are looking for is sustained economic growth from jobs that come by private companies investing private capital. This is a capitalist society. Capital is the building block, and capital is generated by profits. As we tax away the capital, then we convert ourselves into a stagnant, nongrowing economy.

It's all fairly basic, but it just gets confusing when we here in Washington want to take the money from our job creators and spend it ourselves. There is something in politicians that seems to thrive on taking your money and putting it here to create our idea of right and wrong. Let the American people free. Let the American people have their tax money back and they will begin to invest it in growth opportunities.

How many of us are involved in the stock market? We do not want to invest our money in uncertain stocks or uncertain bonds. So the idea of certainty plays out all the way through the investment spectrum, from just your basic small guy buying into the stock market to your small business person who wants to invest in a piece of equipment, a pickup truck, a new room in his office, a new office for someone to provide some service at, a new computer so he can bring on a new IT person. Those are all examples of private investment, private capital creating jobs in the private market.

□ 1750

Now people always say, Well, what about those jobs? If we raise taxes, we

can create more jobs over here in, say, teaching in our schools. Or maybe hire more government agents over here in the Department of Transportation or wherever.

Again the basis of any economy cannot begin at government spending. It has to begin in the private market. When we in the public sector, when we in government take more than generally somewhere in the range of 20 to 22 or 23 percent, what we do is we stifle growth of the economy.

You can look at the full state-run economies. The USSR was a good example. They were above 50, 60 percent. Their government took in that much of the gross domestic product. They eventually collapsed because there was no growth in jobs, no growth in revenue, and then we had a simple failure of the economic system.

Now as we convert from more a private market into a government market, we're going to see the increased pressures of stagnant economies because, again, we're taxing away that ability for private firms to invest private capital. We can never take money from private companies, put it into the government and have the government to run companies.

I give an example that if the government thinks it can run a company, let's let it fix the post office first. That's a business operation that it's in. Maybe you think the post office is running well, but many would disagree that it does.

Another example of why government shouldn't be in business is Medicare, Medicaid. We have been told here in this body that Medicare loses about 20 percent to fraud every year. That's about \$90 billion. Another \$60 billion a year on Medicaid fraud. That's just fraud. That's not waste. That's people cheating the system.

The example was given by 60 Minutes a couple of years ago by a guy in Florida who was making \$400,000 a month selling things he didn't really own to clients of the Medicare system. Now they did exist and they had numbers. And so he had a store front because he said the government inspectors would drive by and they would drive by to see that I actually was there and had a store front but he said I never owned any inventory. So he never had any inventory, selling fictitious things to real Medicare patients, he makes \$400,000 a month. He said on this TV interview, yeah, you caught me and I'm going to jail for 12 years. But there are 2,000 people just like me here in Miami. While I'm in jail, I'm going to lease my list, my mailing list of Medicare patients, to someone else who's going to do the same thing.

If a business were to do that, they would be out of business within the month. But government doesn't ever go out of business. All they do is increase your taxes and you as a private citizen are sitting there trying to figure out around the dining room table how are we going to make ends meet and the

government is simply pouring more money into a system that is leaking it so badly through the fraud and through the abuses that we're never able to have the program function correctly.

The government at this point needs overhaul in a serious way. I think, then, in addition to growing the economy, in addition to creating certainty in regulations and in taxation, one of the great responsibilities this Congress has is in oversight. In that oversight capacity, I suspect that we need to deal with these leakages out of the system that are being taxed away from hard-working families struggling to make ends meet and maybe, maybe just going down a bit on their taxes where they're not trying to sink underwater themselves.

One of the regulatory things that we should do is take a look at the way our banking regulators are operating. What our local banks are being told by the regulators that come from here in Washington, D.C., is that if you make one bad loan, we're going to come take your bank away from you. What that has done is frozen our banks completely in their tracks. They're afraid to lend because that might just be the loan that goes bad on them and then they lose their entire bank. We've seen examples like that across the country. And so our regulators right now again are creating great uncertainty among banks who would be giving the loans that would keep small businesses going; but instead they're afraid, they're uncertain, they don't make loans, and small businesses have the capital that they need to keep operating choked off by a regulatory framework that is wrong.

These are the things that I think compel us in this Congress to do the right thing. Americans are not expecting magic. They're not expecting for us to do the unimaginable. Just start choking off the abuses, choke off the fraud, create a little certainty in the economy so that people can begin to hire, so that our economy will begin to grow, and as it grows, Medicare begins to work better again, Social Security begins to work better if we grow the economy, local and State budgets begin to work better if we grow the economy, and our national budget begins to work better if we choose as a Congress, and there will be many choosing here to obstruct that because they feel that it is somehow wrong to give tax cuts. If they choose to obstruct it, I think we have deep economic troubles lying ahead.

So for me, it's an easy question. If we don't grow, you have great troubles lying ahead, then let's grow. Let's pull out the stops, let's find those balance points in regulation, let's find the taxes where we can lower them to create more certainty and more job growth, let's begin to pull those manufacturing jobs back from around the world that have disappeared. We've driven them out through our overregulation and overtaxation. And I think

when we do that, we will begin to see that this economy will grow and the world economy will grow along with us. If we choose not to do it, I think that we have those troubled waters ahead with higher unemployment, higher taxes, greater dislocation in our budgets nationally. I think then that we're going to see more printing of money. As they print money, then we find that the money in your savings accounts begins to dissipate. We've seen almost \$2.6 trillion printed in the last year and a half or two by Mr. Bernanke. I think that Americans are alarmed at the prospect of hyperinflation.

So, Mr. Speaker, as I conclude tonight, I would just like for this body to really contemplate the risks on the one side that we face but the potential for optimism on the others. I believe that prosperity is possible, but I believe prosperity is a choice. It's going to be a choice on the part of this body as we move forward through the next months.

So our friends on the other side of the aisle will complain about our consideration of health care, and yet all we are trying to do is create tax certainty and regulatory certainty. All we're trying to do is reverse a government takeover of part of the economy in order to create jobs. To me it makes sense. And I understand the arguments from the other side and appreciate that they come with a different point of view.

But I think Americans are looking for us to set aside the partisan differences that we have and to work as Americans. We run as Republican, Independent or Democrat. That's accepted in the American political spectrum. But what's not expected is that we come here and operate with those same partisan viewpoints.

So let's set aside the partisanship now at this point, let's begin to work as Americans to do the right thing, grow the economy, create jobs, give the younger generations a sense that they have a place in the future, that the things they are working for will actually materialize, that there is a ray of hope.

For myself, I have an absolute belief that our economy in the future is going to be better and that there are great days ahead. Winston Churchill's quote gave me that belief. He says, "You Americans always do the right thing."

"After you've tried everything else," he says. We've been in the process over the last 50 years of trying everything else. Now it's time for us to get serious and do the hard work of getting the government in control, shrinking the spending, lowering taxes, creating regulatory certainty, so that this free market can continue to grow and expand through the next generations.

□ 1800

HEALTH CARE AND THE DEFICIT

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

Mr. WELCH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and welcome. I want to also thank the gentleman from New Mexico and welcome him back. Your comments about trying to work together and bipartisanship, that all makes an awful lot of sense to me and I hope to all of us. But welcome back, sir.

We are going to have an opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to use this Special Order half-hour to talk about health care and also about the deficit. We do want to be bipartisan, but we also want to be real. Our job, as you know, is to legislate, and we will be judged by our actions, by our deeds, more than by our rhetoric.

Let me just say that the aspirations that have been enunciated by many of our Republican leaders are ones I quite admire; an open and transparent Congress, more open rules, fiscal discipline, things that are absolutely, fundamentally important to this country, and the question now is whether there is going to be a follow-through on those stated goals. The best way to start looking at it is what is going on with the health care bill, and the decision of the leadership is to repeal health care.

Now, that is a very radical decision, because as much as there are legitimate issues, many legitimate issues about that health care bill, a wholesale repeal as a policy is going to do real damage to real families in this country, in every district in this country, and it is also going to immediately increase the deficit by \$230 billion.

As is known, that is not the opinion of a Democrat or Republican; that is the conclusion of the impartial arbiter, the Congressional Budget Office. So if we are dedicated to fiscal discipline, if we have got to bring down spending, how can we have as our first act as a Congress passing a bill that the Congressional Budget Office says will increase the deficit by \$230 billion? It doesn't add up, obviously.

I am going to pause here because I have some of my colleagues who are going to be called to other locations. I want to start, if I could, with the gentleman from Colorado, Mr. PERLMUTTER.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I thank my friend from Vermont.

I want to piggyback on something that you just said. I hope that we can and we will work with the Republican majority on a lot of issues to get people back to work in America, to stop outsourcing jobs to other countries, to stop importing oil at tremendous price to this country so that money continues to flow away from the U.S. instead of into the U.S. I want to work with them on those kinds of things.

But what I am concerned about is something you just mentioned. The ideology and the radical approach that they are taking to repeal something that was put into place over the last 2 years but has been needed by this country for decades is something that I will fight. Ideological, radical extreme positions are not what the American people want. They want practical, solid solutions where people are treated fairly and equally.

In the health legislation, the Affordable Health Care Act that we passed, the guts of that legislation is about treating people equally. What I mean by that is we stop discriminating against people with preexisting conditions. They are now free from that kind of discrimination. That is so important.

We talked a lot today about the Constitution. Well, prior to the Constitution we had the Declaration of Independence, and the Declaration of Independence starts off, "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal." It probably should have added "women" at that point, but back then it was "all men are created equal."

That is carried forward in the 14th Amendment to the Constitution, and I have prepared a chart of this, of the language, which says no State shall deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

People with prior illnesses, with physical conditions, have been discriminated against because of those conditions and illnesses. That is wrong, it is immoral, and in my opinion it is unconstitutional.

In my district, I was standing at a gas station. A guy comes up to me and he says, You all have to pass that legislation. My daughter has Crohn's disease. I am in a roofing company. I want to start my own roofing company, but because she has this disease, I have to stay here. Otherwise, she will be uninsurable because of her prior condition, and I am stuck in that job.

Well, this bill, the heart of this bill is to give freedom from that kind of discrimination against her prior illness, freedom to that roofer so he can go start his business. That is at the heart of the American way.

In my own situation, I have a daughter with epilepsy. She didn't ask to have epilepsy; that is just part of her makeup. But because of the epilepsy, she is uninsurable, unless she is part of some big group policy.

So in the Affordable Health Care Act, we have done away with that kind of discrimination. We have freed people from that kind of discrimination. The Republican majority, ideologically, radically driven, wants to take that freedom away, and I will fight that today, tomorrow, and next week.

With that, I yield back to my friend from Vermont.

Mr. WELCH. I welcome the gentleman from Maryland, Congresswoman EDWARDS.

Ms. EDWARDS. I thank the gentleman. I am so pleased to be here again. I have been here in the House on this floor for the last hour and a half because I feel passionately, as we all do, about health care. There is not one among us, either personally, as the gentleman from Colorado has expressed, or one of our constituents, who doesn't have a health care story to share.

So I thought that I would actually share with you a story today, Mr. Speaker, from a constituent of mine who lives in the Fourth Congressional District in Maryland. She writes to me that her daughter graduated from college in 2008 and lost coverage under my—this is from her—my health insurance.

She got a job in August 2008 that provided her with health insurance coverage. When she lost that job in June 2009, as millions of Americans have lost their jobs, she was eligible for COBRA, the continuation of her health care. Mr. Speaker, she writes that the COBRA subsidy made it possible for her to continue with that insurance. But then when that subsidy ended in September of 2010, they had to make a family decision, she says, to continue to pay for her COBRA coverage until the end of 2010 when it expired. It was an affordability question.

She continues on: We knew she would become eligible for my insurance at the start of the plan year in January 2011.

And why is that? Because under the Affordable Care Act, she would be able to cover her daughter for her health insurance and would no longer have to COBRA that care.

She continues on: The unsubsidized COBRA premium was over \$400 a month, actually closer to \$500 a month, and it is going to cost me only \$60 to \$70 to add my daughter, now 24, to my employer plan. And some of her doctors who were not in the network under her COBRA plan are in network for my plan, meaning we will not have to pay for their full cost of out-of-pocket costs.

Vicki—I won't say her last name—says to me: I am in the sandwich generation and help with the care of my stepmother who lives in Florida. She falls into the part D prescription doughnut hole every year, so now on January 1 her costs will be reduced because of the health reform legislation as well.

Mr. Speaker, what I am saying to you and what we say to the American people today is that this isn't about numbers and statistics; it is about real people like Vicki and her daughter and her stepmother that she cares for. It is about real people who, in their lives, work every single day or are trying to find work and they don't have health care coverage.

We cannot repeal the Affordable Care Act, because that would be like throwing ice water on the American people.

With that, I yield back.

□ 1810

Mr. WELCH. I want to talk about this question of will promises made be promises kept. It was the recurring question that was asked by our colleagues on the other side of the aisle when we were in the majority. Sometimes it may be uncomfortable because it's a legitimate question. And we have had to be judged according to our deeds and whether they matched our promises.

But there's this rules process under way on this health care bill. There are three issues that have come up. Number one, the fiscal issue. The Congressional Budget Office has said that this legislation will increase the deficit by \$230 billion. And the Congressional Budget Office is the neutral arbiter. And we either—both sides—go by the CBO estimates, or we just say we're going to play this game without a referee and we're going to make up whatever numbers suit our political agenda. That is absolutely wrong. We cannot afford to add \$230 billion to the deficit. My colleagues on the Republican side agree with us on the Democratic side that we cannot do that. It's irresponsible to do it. And this legislation that repeals health care will add \$230 billion to the deficit.

Secondly, there's this question of the open process. As the Member from Maryland said, if we're going to have an open process, there has to be an opportunity for you, for the Member of Colorado, for every Member to offer their amendments, yes-or-no, on whether we can continue protection to folks whether they have a preexisting condition or not.

Right now, the law is if you have cancer, you can go out and buy insurance. Right now, the law is if you have a son or daughter getting out of college or getting out of high school, going into the labor force, they can stay on your policy. Right now, the law is if you have a mom or dad who's on Medicare and you're trying to get preventive care, they can get it for free. Right now, the law is that if you have diabetes or you have cancer, you have a serious long-term medical condition, there's no lifetime cap to cover the medical care that you need.

The repeal legislation would take away from every single American who now enjoys those insurance protections. It would take it away from them suddenly, abruptly, and with nothing to replace it. That's not right.

Now, this is real, by the way. Congresswoman EDWARDS gave a couple of stories—and we all have them in all of the districts, including those who are advocating for repeal. I spoke to Donna Watts who's from Plainfield, Vermont. She works in Burlington, Vermont, with 20 other employees. Four of those people that she works with, along with her, now have their children on their health care policies. Her son got out of high school, got a \$10-an-hour job that came without health care, as most entry-level jobs do.

And the worst happened. He had a car crash: \$20,000 in medical bills. Those are still largely unpaid—and this family takes seriously their obligation to pay their bills. They didn't have insurance. With the passage of the legislation last year on health care reform, Donna Watts was able to put her son, still uninsured, on her insurance. And she is asking me, PETER, does this really mean if we repeal health care that my son loses insurance? And the answer is: Yes. That's not right. We do not need to do this.

And it raises the other question, if this has not got a political agenda attached to it, we have gone from a campaign to governing. And the majority did a great job in the campaign and beat us up pretty good and have the majority now. But with that, of course, comes the responsibility of governing in a responsible way. If you're acting responsibly when you see a problem, you fix it. You don't abolish everything. You don't abolish a banking system in order to correct the problems in the financial world. You don't abolish all of the good things in this health care bill to deal with the things that need to be addressed.

So this is a very, very serious decision that's being made. It's going to be a template for the future of this 112th Congress. Are we going to actually deal with fiscal discipline even when that's inconvenient with our political agenda? The answer to that for the American people has to be: Yes. Are we going to protect the progress that we have made that benefits all of our constituents when it comes to these insurance reforms, and are we going to have an open process in this body so that those of us who have a different point of view are going to have an opportunity for an up-or-down vote?

By the way, that's not about giving us the opportunity to present our amendments. That's about letting our constituents know where we stand. Because at the end of the day that's the only basis upon which they can decide whether to send us back here or send us packing.

At this time I would like to recognize the gentleman from North Carolina, Representative PRICE.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I thank the gentleman for yielding and also for engaging in this dialogue with other Members about the challenge that we're facing to reduce this country's deficit spending and reduce the accumulating debt and at the same time to make certain that quality, affordable health care are available to all of our citizens.

As the gentleman has pointed out very, very ably, those two challenges are intricately related. In fact, one of the main reasons for supporting health insurance reform is because we simply must reduce our deficit spending and must reduce this country's debt. One of the main contributors to our country's escalating debt is the kind of increasing of health care costs that we have

seen in recent years. It's one of the greatest threats to families, to businesses, to the overall economy. Health care has become the fastest growing component of the Federal budget, as the gentleman well knows. Last year, health care accounted for 17 percent of GDP. That's more than twice the average of other developed nations.

Now, the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act corrects the failures of the current system without compromising the many strengths that we know that it has. And so it's very disconcerting here in this first week of the new Congress to see our Republican colleagues not only going after the protections in the health care law, but also almost immediately abandoning their commitment to fiscal discipline.

Now, the figures that I saw this morning show that the Congressional Budget Office, the nonpartisan arbiter of budgets decisions for this body, the Congressional Budget Office has said that the repeal of health insurance reform as proposed by the Republicans would cost the Federal budget \$230 billion over the next 10 years. That's a revised estimate, I understand—even greater than was earlier thought. That is an astounding figure.

Our Republican friends have made a big show out of their commitment to deficit reduction, but they have made an exception. They have clearly made an exception for the repeal of health insurance reform. So not only is this bad health care; not only would it, for example, say to families who only now are being able to insure their children with preexisting conditions, No, we're going to go back to the old way where the insurance companies can deny coverage to your children. What about those families that now are able to include their 24-, 25-year-olds on their families' policies? No, they're saying go back to the old way where that wasn't possible. What about our Medicare recipients who finally are going to get some relief from these uncovered drug expenses, the so-called doughnut hole? They're saying, Oh, no, you're going to have to once again pay those full expenses.

So it's certainly bad policy in terms of health care. But then, to add insult to injury, adding \$230 billion to this country's debt burden over the next 10 years, and to do that without batting an eye, without any kind of recognition that this has an impact on the budget deficit, that's just almost unbelievable that the Republicans would be so audacious as to propose this in the first week of a new Congress.

And then to add another insult to injury, they're violating their very own pledge of openness in the way this is going to be considered. I'm sure this gentleman has been watching, as I have, the Rules Committee all day today. It's astounding. Yesterday, there was this commitment to open rules, to open debate, to the offering of amendments. Today, they're saying, We're going to shut it down. It's an up-

or-down vote. Maybe we'll get around later to some of these other questions, some of the repair aspect of repeal and repair, but right now we're just going to repeal it and let the chips fall.

□ 1820

That is horrible procedure. It's a shutting down of this Congress before we even start. It's horrible budget policy. It's horrible health policy. It's a very, very bad way to start this Congress.

I appreciate the gentleman for calling us together tonight to talk about this, because we need to talk about it. We need to think about it. We need to fight it in every way we can.

Mr. WELCH. Thank you very much, Mr. PRICE.

I recognize the gentleman again from Colorado.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Well, I'd say to my friend from North Carolina that he was talking about the fact that seniors will see this doughnut hole, their prescription drug prices go back up, the costs go back up; but even, I think, more worrisome than that is the fact that, under the Affordable Care Act, those same seniors receive \$250.

In my district in Colorado, the suburbs of Denver, 31,000 seniors received this past fall \$250 in assistance to payments of their prescription drugs. Even with that, we still save the \$230 billion that you were talking about. Yet, when the Republicans repeal this in kind of an "all or nothing" situation, do those seniors have to pay that \$250 back, each of them? I don't know. I think they ought to be worried about that, and that's why this is such an extreme measure.

They are taking away freedoms that belong to the people, that belong to Americans. They are doing it in a radical and ideological way. When they said during the campaign, you know, Let's put people back to work, and let's not spend too much money, they're spending more. They're taking away freedoms, and I am concerned that those seniors are going to have to pay that \$250 back, per senior. The seniors should be concerned as well.

This is a radical act, Mr. Speaker and Mr. PRICE. We have got to fight it. I hate fighting these battles right out of the box, but if they're going to take these kinds of radical positions, we have no choice.

With that, I would yield to my friend from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Thank you. I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy for permitting me to speak just as I appreciate my colleagues coming to the floor to spotlight something that each and every American needs to be deeply concerned about.

I listened, for example, for the last 4 years, as a member of the Budget Committee, to my dear friend and colleague Mr. RYAN talk about the skyrocketing problem of escalating entitlement under Medicare. Absolutely right. There are 79 million of the geezer baby

boomers like me who are going to start collecting Medicare—10,000 a day starting this week and continuing for 19 years—and because of the development of more improvements in health care, not only are there more of us, but we are going to want more complex and expensive care.

My Republican friends were talking about an entitlement crisis. The irony was—and we all heard it on the campaign trail—they talked about slashing Medicare, which they want to repeal starting next week. A great deal of irony. As the independent scorekeeper—the Congressional Budget Office—has pointed out and as you have repeated on the House floor, the legislation will, in fact, save several hundred billion dollars. More important than that, it puts in place reforms that will further reduce entitlement spending.

I know my good friend from Vermont is well familiar with the Dartmouth Atlas in dealing with health care disparities around the country. I come from a part of the country where one of the problems we have is that Medicare needs to be reformed, which is what we started in this legislation. They're relatively modest steps, but they're going to save a couple hundred billion dollars. We need to do more. Rather than repealing these reforms, like stopping unnecessary hospital re-admissions—just that item costs over \$12 billion a year—these reforms could enable us to bend the cost curve. If everybody practiced medicine the way it's practiced in metropolitan Portland, Oregon, which is half the price of McAllen, Texas, or Miami, Florida, there wouldn't be an entitlement crisis for decades to come.

I appreciate my colleagues focusing on the hypocrisy and on the recklessness of trying to repeal health care reform that makes a difference for 32 million uninsured Americans and that provides more benefit for the seniors with their prescription drugs. Most important and under-appreciated is that it would reform Medicare so that, instead of driving us off a cliff over the next 20 years, it would, in fact, help us change how medicine is practiced to provide incentives for value, medical value, rather than just volume.

Mr. WELCH. Thank you, the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time I have?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. WELCH. All right. Let me just ask the gentleman from North Carolina. Would you like to make any closing remarks and then yield to the gentleman from Colorado?

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I thank the gentleman.

I would like to just underscore what our colleague from Oregon has just said.

There is so much concern, obviously—and for good reason—about the future of Medicare. The most conservative estimate I have seen is that

health care reform extends the fiscal solvency of Medicare by 8 years, and some estimates are much more than that. So to simply throw that overboard as well as to talk about this doughnut hole—these thousands of dollars that senior citizens are paying full freight on for medicines they simply must have—and this gap in coverage is ridiculous, and we are finally fixing it. What insurance policy do any of us know about that would have that kind of gap in coverage?

As the gentleman from Colorado said, \$250 payments this year. I mean, I guess this raises the question as to whether even that might be taken back; but in future years, we are going to close that doughnut hole, and we are going to extend the solvency of Medicare. Anybody concerned about the health care for this country's senior citizens simply has to be very, very alarmed about what is going on in this House right now.

Mr. WELCH. Thank you, the gentleman from North Carolina.

I yield for the final word from the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Sure. I appreciate my friends.

You know, instead of amending or repairing, as Mr. PRICE from North Carolina described it, they want to repeal, just take it away.

Well, they're taking away freedoms. They're taking away the freedom from discrimination for prior illnesses, like my daughter with epilepsy, like the daughter who had Crohn's disease, or the friend at the gas station. It's taking away the freedom from cancellation because you get sick, you know, and lose your insurance. You know, it's taking away the freedom to move jobs so you're not stuck in a job, so you can move jobs and not fear losing your insurance. I mean, they're taking away a lot—and maybe this \$250 that went to the seniors. It is a radical move to take these freedoms away, and I hope they think twice and don't vote to repeal.

With that, I would yield back to my friend from Vermont for his final remarks.

Mr. WELCH. Well, I thank my colleagues for being here.

The bottom line is, anytime we pass a major piece of legislation, we should have the humility to acknowledge it can be improved—and we all do. We can make it better. We can make it stronger. But this totally destroys things that we have been fighting for decades to achieve on behalf of the American people: help for seniors with their prescription drugs, extending the financial viability of Medicare, changing and encouraging a new way of delivering health care services, moving away from fee-for-service, volume-driven to patient-centered, performance-based care, and then insurance reforms that put the patients in charge, which acknowledge that we are all in it together. This takes away the absolute unilateral power of for-profit insurance companies to decide whether your daughter or mine has health care.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate your consideration.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

2331

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WEBSTER) at 11 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.

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

Mr. DREIER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112-1) on the resolution (H. Res. 9) instructing certain committees to report legislation replacing the Job-Killing Health Care Law, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2, REPEALING THE JOB-KILLING HEALTH CARE LAW ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 9, INSTRUCTING CERTAIN COMMITTEES TO REPORT LEGISLATION REPLACING THE JOB-KILLING HEALTH CARE LAW

Mr. DREIER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112-2) on the resolution (H. Res. 26) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2) to repeal the Job-Killing Health Care Law Act and health care-related provisions in the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010; providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 9) instructing certain committees to report legislation replacing the Job-Killing Health Care Law, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under clause 5(d) of rule XX, the Chair announces to the House that, in light of the administration of the oath to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK), the whole number of the House is 435.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legis-

lative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. McDERMOTT) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFazio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. McDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. POE of Texas) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today and January 7, 11, and 12.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. McCLINTOCK, for 5 minutes, today and January 7.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today and January 7.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, today and January 7, 11, and 12.

Mr. BARTON of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GOODLATTE, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. ENGEL, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 33 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, January 7, 2011, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

25. A letter from the Office of Research and Analysis, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP): Clarifications and Corrections to Recipient Claim Establishment and Collection Standards [FNS-2008-0034] (RIN: 0584-AD25) received January 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

26. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of 33 officers to wear the authorized insignia of the grade of major general and brigadier general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

27. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's FY 2009 report on Foreign Language Skill Proficiency Bonus; to the Committee on Armed Services.

28. A letter from the Administrator, Rural Housing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Continuous Construction-Permanent Loan Guarantees Under the Section 538 Guaranteed Rural Rental Housing Program (RIN: 0575-AC80) received January 4, 2011, pursuant

to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

29. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Energy Efficiency Program for Consumer Products: Waiver of Federal Preemption of State Regulations Concerning the Water Use or Water Efficiency of Showerheads, Faucets, Water Closets and Urinals [Docket No.: EERE-2010-BT-STD-WAV-0045] received January 3, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

30. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safeguarding Child Support Information received December 30, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

31. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the 2010 Actuarial Report on the Financial Outlook for Medicaid, pursuant to Public Law 111-3, section 506(c); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

32. A letter from the Secretary of the Commission, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Mortgage Assistance Relief Services (RIN: 3084-AB18) received January 3, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

33. A letter from the Chairman, Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board, transmitting a report entitled "Evaluation of the Technical Basis for Extended Dry Storage and Transportation of Used Nuclear Fuel — Executive Summary"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

34. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter from the department on the intention to implement the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia's November 19, 2009 order to release; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

35. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of State, transmitting a report in accordance with Section 3 of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

36. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting the Commission's Performance and Accountability Report for FY 2010; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

37. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries Off West Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; Inseason Adjustments to Fishery Management Measures [Docket No.: 090428799-9802-01] (RIN: 0648-BA44) received January 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

38. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Snapper-Grouper Fishery Off the South Atlantic States; Emergency Rule To Delay Effectiveness of the Snapper-Grouper Area Closure [Docket No.: 101124587-0586-01] (RIN: 0648-BA47) received January 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

39. A letter from the Acting Chief, Trade and Commercial Regulations, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Technical Correction: Completion of Entry and Entry Summary — Declaration of Value (RIN: 1515-

AD61) (Formerly 1505-AB96) received December 28, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

40. A letter from the Director, office of Regulations, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Supplemental Security Income (SSI) for the Aged, Blind, and Disabled; Dedicated Accounts and Installment Payments for Certain Past-Due SSI Benefits [Docket No.: SSA-2008-0050] (RIN: 0960-AE59) received January 3, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

41. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medicare Program; End-Stage Renal Disease Quality Incentive Program [CMS-3206-F] (RIN: 0938-AP91) received December 30, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

42. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's report entitled "Department of Health and Human Services Study of Urban Medicare-Dependent Hospitals"; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

43. 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.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DREIER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 9. Resolution instructing certain committees to report legislation replacing the job-killing health care law (Rept. 112-1). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DREIER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 26. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2) to repeal the job-killing health care law and health care-related provisions in the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010; providing for consideration of the resolution (House Resolution 9) instructing certain committees to report legislation replacing the job-killing health care law; and for other purposes (Rept. 112-2). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California (for herself, Ms. FOXX, and Mr. BOSWELL):

H.R. 196. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, with respect to the offense of stalking; 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. AKIN (for himself and Mr. CARNAHAN):

H.R. 197. A bill to confer upon the United States Court of Federal Claims jurisdiction

to hear, determine, and render final judgment on any legal or equitable claim against the United States to receive just compensation for the taking of certain lands in the State of Missouri, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRIMM (for himself, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. LANCE):

H.R. 198. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a pilot program on dog training therapy; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. CAPITO (for herself, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. MCKINLEY, and Mr. RAHALL):

H.R. 199. A bill to suspend, during the 2-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, any Environmental Protection Agency action under the Clean Air Act with respect to carbon dioxide or methane pursuant to certain proceedings, other than with respect to motor vehicle emissions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BACA (for himself and Mrs. NAPOLITANO):

H.R. 200. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study of water resources in the Rialto-Colton Basin in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GALLEGLY:

H.R. 201. A bill to amend section 12 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 to treat income changes resulting from welfare program requirements for families residing in housing receiving project-based subsidies under section 8 of such Act similarly to such changes for families residing in public housing or receiving tenant-based assistance under such section; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GALLEGLY:

H.R. 202. A bill to amend the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000 to extend and increase the authority for the ombudsman under the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program; to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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 Mr. GALLEGLY:

H.R. 203. A bill to better provide for compensation for certain persons injured in the course of employment at the Santa Susana Field Laboratory in California; to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. GIFFORDS (for herself, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. CRITZ, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. PAUL, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. ALTMIRE, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. OWENS, Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. COSTA, Mr. BARROW, Mr. SCHRADER, and Mr. SHULER):

H.R. 204. A bill to provide for a 5 percent reduction in the rates of basic pay for Members of Congress; to the Committee on House Administration, 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. HEINRICH (for himself, Mrs. BONO MACK, and Mrs. LUMMIS):

H.R. 205. A bill to amend the Act titled "An Act to authorize the leasing of re-

stricted Indian lands for public, religious, educational, recreational, residential, business, and other purposes requiring the grant of long-term leases"; approved August 9, 1955, to provide for Indian tribes to enter into certain leases without prior express approval from the Secretary of the Interior; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. NEUGEBAUER (for himself, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. PAUL, Mr. LAMBORN, Ms. FOXX, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. BROWN of Georgia, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. LAMM, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. CRAWFORD, and Mr. MARCHANT):

H.R. 206. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prevent pending tax increases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PETRI (for himself, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 207. A bill to clarify that schools and local educational agencies participating in the school lunch program under the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act are authorized to donate excess food to local food banks or charitable organizations; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ROONEY (for himself and Mr. KISSELL):

H.R. 208. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the reimbursement of mental health counselors under TRICARE, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 209. A bill to require the Archivist of the United States to promulgate regulations regarding the use of information control designations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 210. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to deem certain service in the organized military forces of the Government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines and the Philippine Scouts to have been active service for purposes of benefits under programs administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CARTER (for himself and Mr. COLE):

H.J. Res. 9. A joint resolution disapproving a rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to the National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants from the Portland Cement Manufacturing Industry and Standards of Performance for Portland Cement Plants; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CUELLAR:

H.J. Res. 10. A joint resolution proposing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia:

H. Con. Res. 6. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the rotunda of the Capitol for an event marking the 50th anniversary of the inaugural address of President John F. Kennedy; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WALDEN:

H. Res. 22. A resolution reducing the amount authorized for salaries and expenses of Member, committee, and leadership offices in 2011 and 2012; to the Committee on House Administration, 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, considered and agreed to.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ (for himself, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. NUNES, and Mr. FLAKE):

H. Res. 23. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Federal Government should not bail out State and local government employee pension plans or other plans that provide post-employment benefits to State and local government retirees; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HOYER:

H. Res. 24. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to permit Delegates and the Resident Commissioner to the Congress to cast votes in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California (for himself, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Mr. BACA):

H. Res. 25. A resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the current Federal income tax deduction for interest paid on debt secured by a first or second home should not be further restricted; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. HUNTER introduced a bill (H.R. 211) for the relief of Roberto Luis Dunoyer Mejia, Consuelo Cardona Molina, Camilo Dunoyer Cardona, and Pablo Dunoyer Cardona; which was referred 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 Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California:

H.R. 196.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. AKIN:

H.R. 197.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution provides, “. . . nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.” The United States Constitution, Article I, §8, cl. 1, vests Congress with the exclusive power “to pay the Debts . . . of the United States.” The Constitution, thus, grants to Congress the exclusive power and authority to define the jurisdiction of the Court of Federal Claims and “the power to waive the res judicata effect of a prior judgment entered in the Government’s favor on a claim against the United States. . . . Congress may recognize its obligation to pay a moral debt not only by direct appropriation, but also by waiving an otherwise valid defense to a legal claim against the United States” United States v. Sioux Nation, 448 U.S. 371, 397 (1980) citing, Cherokee Nation v. United States, 270 U.S. 476 (1926) and United States v. Realty, Co. 163 U.S. 427 (1896).

By Mr. GRIMM:

H.R. 198.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 12/13/14.

By Mrs. CAPITO:

H.R. 199.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3—To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes; and Article 1, Section 8, Clause 14—To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces.

By Mr. BACA:

H.R. 200.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. GALLEGGLY:

H.R. 201.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution, amending conditional grants-in-aid under the spending for the general welfare.

By Mr. GALLEGGLY:

H.R. 202.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of Section 8, Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. GALLEGGLY:

H.R. 203.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8, Article I of the Constitution.

By Ms. GIFFORDS:

H.R. 204.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress is required by Article I, Section 6, of the Constitution to determine its own pay. This legislation is also consistent with the Twenty-Seventh Amendment of the Constitution.

By Mr. HEINRICH:

H.R. 205.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. NEUGEBAUER:

H.R. 206.

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.

Sixteenth Amendment—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. PETRI:

H.R. 207.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H.R. 208.

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 that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years: To provide and maintain a Navy”.

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 209.

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 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 210.

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 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HUNTER:

H.R. 211.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority for this legislation is found in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 4 which explicitly provides Congress the power to “establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization.”

By Mr. CARTER:

H.J. Res. 9.

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. CUELLAR:

H.J. Res. 10.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article 5 of the United States Constitution, seen below, this legislation falls within Congress’s Constitutional Authority:

Article 5—The Congress, whenever two thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose Amendments to this Constitution, or, on the Application of the Legislatures of two thirds of the several States, shall call a Convention for proposing Amendments, which, in either Case, shall be valid to all Intents and Purposes, as Part of this Constitution, when ratified by the Legislatures of three fourths of the several States, or by Conventions in three fourths thereof, as the one or the other Mode of Ratification may be proposed by the Congress; Provided that no Amendment which may be made prior to the Year One thousand eight hundred and eight shall in any Manner affect the first and fourth Clauses in the Ninth Section of the first Article; and that no State, without its Consent, shall be deprived of its equal Suffrage in the Senate.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 2: Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. CANSECO, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. REED, Mr. WALSH of Illinois, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Ms. FOXX, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. RUNYAN, and Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 21: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Ms. BUERKLE, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. WEST, Mr. WALSH of Illinois, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. GIBBS.

H.R. 25: Ms. GRANGER.

H.R. 38: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. AKIN, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. MARCHANT, and Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

H.R. 44: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 111: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 121: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. WALSH of Illinois, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. FORBES, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. HANNA, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, and Mr. GERLACH.
H.R. 122: Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. OLSON, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. PEARCE, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. HUNTER, and Mr. SCHOCK.

H.R. 144: Mr. PETERSON, Mr. UPTON, Mrs. ADAMS, and Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 155: Mr. GARRETT.

H.J. Res. 3: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. OLSON, Mr. PENCE, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. POSEY, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. HALL, Mr. LATOURETTE, and Mr. BURGESS.

H. Res. 9: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. HURT, and Mr. NUGENT.

H. Res. 11: Mr. COHEN and Ms. LEE of California.

H. Res. 15: Mr. ISSA, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. WALSH of Illinois, Mr. WEST, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mrs. SCHMIDT,

Mr. HUNTER, Mr. HUELSKAMP, and Mr. RIBBLE.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. DREIER

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Rule in H.R. 2 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF WASHINGTON

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Natural Resources in H.R. 2 do not contain any congressional ear-

marks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. KLINE

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Education and the Workforce in H.R. 2 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. DANIEL E. LUNGREN OF CALIFORNIA

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on House Administration in H.R. 2 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF TEXAS

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Judiciary in H.R. 2 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.