



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, JANUARY 7, 2011

No. 3

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

FRIDAY, JANUARY 7, 2011

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. MILLER of Michigan).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
January 7, 2011.

I hereby appoint the Honorable CANDICE S. MILLER 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: Lord, our God, You have shown us Your glory. You have redeemed Your people by the revelation of Your eternal Word.

Let Your light now shine within us. Guide us, that we may be led through the darkness found in this world to the radiant joy of Your presence, both 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 her approval thereof.

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois 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 five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

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

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Madam Speaker, today our national debt is \$14.01 trillion. It rolled over to above \$14 trillion for the first time on New Year's Eve last week. On January 6, 2009, the start of the 111th Congress, the national debt was at \$10.63 trillion. This means the national debt has increased by \$3.38 trillion since then—in just 2 short years. This debt and its interest payments we are passing to our children and to all future Americans.

I have been submitting, and will continue to submit, this debt to the CON-

GRESSIONAL RECORD daily, and I will continue to do so until Washington takes responsibility and ends its reckless spending addiction.

SEND YOUR RESUMES

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

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Madam Speaker, as we enter 2011, we find ourselves in the same jobs situation as in 2010. In order to show the huge need for jobs, I will be collecting resumes from Americans who are unemployed or underemployed. I'll submit them for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Unfortunately, submitting these resumes for the RECORD will not get anybody a job.

By collecting these resumes, I hope to dramatize the shameful condition of unemployment and compel Congress to do something about it. I hope to remind my colleagues every day that we work for those Americans who have been left behind but who want to work.

Today, I call on my fellow Americans to send me your resume and your story to resumesforAmerica@mail.house.gov. ResumesforAmerica@mail.house.gov. If you are out of work, send me your resume and story so that I can use it to remind our government of the need to act.

Martin Luther King, Jr. once said: America has issued us a bad check. It has come back marked "insufficient funds." But the vault of opportunity of this Nation is not bankrupt.

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.

H105

Madam Speaker, sending a resume to me will not put you first in line for any job, but it will put you up front and center to remind our government of the need to act.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. BENISHEK. Madam Speaker, while campaigning this fall, people in northern Michigan made it clear that they are not happy with the government takeover of health care. That's why I'm pleased that one of my first votes in Congress will allow me to keep a promise to my constituents and vote to repeal that legislation.

As a surgeon who spent more than 30 years working directly with patients, I view the government takeover of our health care system as an attack on the doctor-patient relationship. Now, as a member of the freshman class of 2011, I invite all Members to join us in repealing this law and developing realistic health care reform that lowers costs, improves insurance options, and puts patients, not government bureaucrats, at the center of health care.

HIGHWAY TRUST FUND

(Mr. BISHOP of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Madam Speaker, the Republican rules package passed Wednesday included a change that could be extremely damaging to our Nation's highway and transit systems over the long term—and to the construction industry, where record unemployment remains twice the national average. Simply put, this rule is a job killer.

The new rule will treat highway trust fund revenue as general spending, tearing down firewalls that prevent funds from being siphoned off for unrelated projects. Removing the "trust" in the highway trust fund will severely inhibit States' ability to plan large, multiyear transportation projects to improve this Nation's aging infrastructure over the long term and to create construction jobs in the process.

But don't take my word for it. The rule change is also opposed by business, labor, and industry organizations alike, such as the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, the Associated General Contractors of America, and the American Trucking Association.

Madam Speaker, this is the wrong time to back away from investments in

our infrastructure and job creation; yet this is exactly what will result from this job-killing rule.

BORDER PATROL AGENTS ON THE MOVE

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, more Border Patrol agents are being sent to the southern border. The border is violent, desolate, and dangerous. Drugs and people are going north. Money and weapons are going south. And the border is a war zone.

Madam Speaker, I'm not talking about the southern border of the United States with Mexico. No. I'm talking about the Afghanistan-Pakistan border. That's correct. Secretary of Homeland Security Napolitano has said, "We are going to contribute Border Patrol agents to protect the border of Afghanistan."

Now, why is Homeland Security making this uninformed decision? Our southern border is a war zone and our Border Patrol agents are needed there. In fact, they need more help. We should send more National Guard troops there to help them stop the invasion of the violent drug cartels.

Homeland Security should protect our homeland, not somebody else's. This ill-advised move by the Department of Homeland Security shows how blissfully ignorant Washington is about reality and the battle on the third front, the southern border of the United States.

And that's just the way it is.

HEALTH CARE REPEAL IS NO GAME FOR AMERICANS

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

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. In the middle of the health care debate, a gentleman came into my office in Waterbury, Connecticut, and delivered a petition signed by 3,000 people. He was fighting two battles—one against the cancer that was ravaging his body and another to keep his health insurance to prevent himself from going bankrupt. This is a situation faced by millions of Americans who have a condition and a disease that is also potentially contributing to the downfall of their entire household. This is a situation that they shouldn't be in.

This is no game, this debate over whether we continue or repeal health care. But it seems to be a game to my Republican friends. This bill isn't going to pass. It's going nowhere. When a CBO estimate emerges saying it's going to cost taxpayers \$230 billion, they just throw it away and come up with their own numbers.

The stakes here couldn't be more serious for that constituent and the 3,000

others who walked into my office in Waterbury, Connecticut. This isn't a game to them. It's a matter of life and death. And the stakes over repeal could not be higher.

□ 0910

A TRIBUTE TO DON TYSON

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

Mr. WOMACK. Madam Speaker, I rise today with great sadness to remember one of America's great entrepreneurs, Don Tyson of Springdale, Arkansas, who passed away Thursday, January 6, 2011, following a brief illness.

The son of Tyson Foods, Incorporated, founder John W. Tyson, Don was former chairman of the board and CEO of a company that began as a family business, supplying feed and baby chicks to local producers. It became a global food enterprise with annual sales in excess of \$28 billion, over 115,000 team members, and operations in five countries. He founded the Tyson Family Foundation and is well-known for his philanthropy in the fields of education, conservation, and the arts.

Don Tyson's "no bad days" outlook on life personifies the true definition of the pursuit of the American Dream. The State of Arkansas and the United States of America have lost an original, and we mourn the passing of this industry legend.

THOU SHALT NOT BEAR FALSE WITNESS

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

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, today is the beginning of a process by which the Republicans will try to repeal the affordable health care bill. It is about 50/50 in popularity in America.

How can a bill with such individual constituent elements that are so popular, such as keeping young people on your insurance until they're 26, eliminating the doughnut hole, and seeing to it that there are more community health centers, be so unpopular? Because the Republican mantra has been—and it was even said today—that it is a government takeover of health care.

PolitiFact, the 2009 Pulitzer Prize-winning journalistic group from the St. Petersburg Times—a nonpartisan group—said that was the biggest lie in political 2010.

Instead of reading the Constitution yesterday, maybe we should have just repeated "do not bear false witness."

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE, THIS IS YOUR WEEK

(Mr. PENCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PENCE. Welcome to the 112th Congress.

While there was much pomp and ceremony this week in welcoming all of the new Members to the House of Representatives, this week belonged to the American people.

The American people sent a deafening message on November 2. It was that they wanted to see this national government end this era of borrowing and spending and of bailouts and takeovers and turn our national government back in the direction of fiscal responsibility and limited government.

Madam Speaker, I rise this morning to say in this first week of this new Congress, if House Republicans got the message, we will keep our promises to the American people and more.

If House Republicans got the message, we won't just extend tax rates for a couple of years; we will extend them permanently.

If House Republicans got the message, we won't just find \$100 billion in cuts; we will find more than \$100 billion in cuts, and we will bring about the kind of long-term reform to change the size and scope of government.

If House Republicans got the message, we won't just vote once to repeal ObamaCare; we will vote to repeal ObamaCare again and again until we consign their government takeover of health care to the ash heap of history—where it belongs.

So welcome to the 112th Congress. The American people, this is your week.

THE CONSEQUENCES OF REPEALING HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, those who want to repeal health care reform should be clear and candid about what they are doing. You just can't expect the people to understand the effect of repeal just because you put a label on it like "ObamaCare" or misrepresent job-creating legislation as a "job killer" or misrepresent legislation that doesn't even have a public option in it as a "government takeover."

Health care reform will close the doughnut hole. It allows young adults to stay on their parents' policies. It means that those with preexisting conditions can get insurance. It provides tax credits to small businesses to help them cover their employees. It creates community health centers and additional health professionals. It prohibits insurance company abuses, like cutting off coverage in the middle of illnesses or unreasonable increases in rates. It means that, in 2014, all Americans will have the security of knowing that they can have health care insurance.

You just don't call or put a label on it or recite a poll-tested slogan. Tell

the public what will happen to the doughnut hole, to young adults, to those with preexisting conditions, to small businesses. Tell the public what is going to happen if we repeal health care reform.

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; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 26 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 26

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House 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. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) seven hours of debate, with 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the Majority Leader and Minority Leader or their respective designees, 90 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, 90 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 90 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget, 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, and 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Small Business; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 9) instructing certain committees to report legislation replacing the job-killing health care law. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and any amendment thereto to final adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules or their respective designees; (2) the amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules, if offered by Representative Matheson of Utah or his designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as

read, and shall be separately debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and (3) one motion to recommit which may not contain instructions.

SEC. 3. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House a resolution, if offered by the Majority Leader or his designee, relating to the status of certain actions taken by Members-elect. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution to final adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except four minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the Majority Leader and Minority Leader or their respective designees.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, it is a great honor for me, for the first time in 4 years, to say, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my very good friend and Rules Committee colleague, the gentleman from Rochester, New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER). During consideration of the resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

□ 0920

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, House Resolution 26 provides for a closed rule for consideration of H.R. 2 and self-executes an amendment by the majority leader, which is required under the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010. This is routinely required and is similar to many provisions that have been self-executed since the enactment of statutory PAYGO.

The resolution provides for 7 hours of debate on H.R. 2, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking member of six committees and the majority leader and minority leader.

It also provides the minority a motion to recommit H.R. 2 with or without instructions.

House Resolution 26 provides for consideration of H. Res. 9 under a structured rule that provides an hour of debate and makes in order an amendment, if offered by Representative MATHESON of Utah. It also provides for one motion to recommit H. Res. 9 without instructions.

Lastly, the rule provides for the consideration of a resolution if offered by the majority leader or his designee relating to the status of certain actions taken by Members-elect under a closed rule.

Madam Speaker, it was just before midnight that my great new colleague

Mr. WEBSTER and I were here in this Chamber, and we filed this rule following a lengthy 12-hour hearing upstairs in the Rules Committee, and I have to say that there were many, many discussions that took place on a wide range of issues, but I think it's very important for us to note that there are those who argue that we should not be taking up this issue because of the fact that we should be focusing on job creation and economic growth.

Well, Madam Speaker, we know that the overwhelming message that came from the American people is that we have to get our economy back on track, we have to create jobs, we have to make sure that those people who are struggling to get onto the first rung of the economic ladder are able to do just that. And that's why, when we look at a \$2.7 trillion expansion of the Federal Government, \$2.7 trillion in new spending, we recognize something that is common sense, and that is, if you're going to expand the size and scope and reach of the Federal Government by that magnitude, it clearly is going to kill the effort to create jobs and get our economy back on track.

And so that's why today, Madam Speaker, we are taking the first step in fulfilling a key promise that we have made to the American people. With this rule, we are setting in motion an effort to repeal President Obama's job-killing health care bill and replace it with real solutions, and I underscore that again because all the attention is focused on the fact that we are going to be trying to kill good provisions that are out there. Madam Speaker, we want to start with a clean slate. We are going to repeal President Obama's job-killing health care bill and replace it with real solutions.

This rule takes two important steps. The first is to allow for consideration of a bill to hit the reset button, so to speak, on the very damaging legislation that was passed last year under the guise of health care reform. The second is a resolution directing each of the committees of jurisdiction to craft responsible, effective, and economically viable health care solutions.

Madam Speaker, the resolution lays out very clearly what real reform looks like. Real reform will help, not hinder, in our goal towards creating jobs. Real reform will lower health care premiums by enhancing competition and patient choice. It will preserve the right of patients to keep their existing coverage if they so choose. It will ensure access to quality care for those suffering from preexisting conditions. It will implement meaningful lawsuit abuse reform so that resources can go to patients and doctors and not to trial lawyers. In short, it will increase access to health care for all Americans without compromising quality or hurting the very important small business sector of our Nation's economy.

Madam Speaker, the underlying replace resolution which I've offered will

begin a robust committee process to tackle the difficult but essential work of achieving these goals and crafting true reform for the American people. This will be a process in which each and every Member, Democrat and Republican alike, will have an opportunity to participate.

Madam Speaker, as Speaker BOEHNER said the day before yesterday when he accepted the gavel, we are returning to regular order. Once again, our committees will be the laboratories, the centers of expertise that they were intended to be. Rank-and-file Members of both parties will play an active role in crafting legislation, scrutinizing proposals, offering amendments, participating in real debate. Critical legislation is not going to be written behind closed doors by a select few.

Today's rule sets in motion a process that will be both transparent and collaborative, but we cannot get to that very important step without clearing the first hurdle, which is to undo the damage that has already been done.

Now, we will hear people say why is it you're considering this under a closed rule. Madam Speaker, this was a clear promise that was made throughout last year leading up to the very important November 2 election. Everyone acknowledges that elections have consequences. The commitment was made that we would have an up-or-down vote on repeal, and that's exactly what we are doing. We must repeal last year's bill before we proceed with replacement.

Just as predicted, the so-called reform bill is having very real negative consequences for our economy and our job market. It is putting enormous burdens on job creators, particularly small businesses, at a time that is already one of the most difficult that we have faced, imposing significant new burdens and penalties while the unemployment rate remains above 9 percent. We got the news just a few minutes ago that it's at 9.3 percent. We're encouraged by that positive drop, but only 105,000 jobs were created, not the 150,000 jobs necessary to be created just to sustain the position that we are in right now. So we still are dealing with very, very serious economic challenges, and that's why we need to take a commonsense approach to, first, repeal this measure and then deal with solutions.

Above all, I will say that the onerous, unworkable mandates that have been imposed are adding greater uncertainty, which is job creation's biggest enemy. Anyone who has spent any time talking with small business owners knows this to be the case. While the economic impact is already quite apparent, the fiscal consequences are looming down the road.

While the bill's authors used a host of accounting gimmicks—and I'm going to get into those further, as I'm sure I'm going to be challenged on this, and I look forward to talking about the accounting gimmicks that have been utilized—while the authors used a host

of accounting gimmicks, as I said, to mask the true costs of this measure, an honest and realistic assessment of the impact on the deficit shows a much clearer and, tragically, a far worse picture.

The Budget Committee has demonstrated the real cost of the health care bill, as I said when I opened, is a staggering \$2.7 trillion once it is fully implemented. It will add over \$700 billion to our deficit in the first 10 years. The words "reckless" and "unsustainable" hardly begin to cover it. This bill is an economic and fiscal disaster of unprecedented proportions. The time to undo it before any more damage is done is quickly running out. Republicans promised the American people we would act swiftly and decisively, and that's exactly what we're doing.

So my friends on the other side of the aisle have asked why there will be no amendments to the repeal bill. Frankly, there is nothing to amend. There is nothing to amend, Madam Speaker, to the repeal bill. Either we're going to wipe the slate clean and start fresh or we're not. Now, that's not to say there aren't some good provisions in this measure, but it is so onerous, nearly 3,000 pages, that we believe that the best way to do this is to wipe the slate clean, have an open and transparent process, and do everything we can to ensure that every single American has access to quality health care and health care insurance.

□ 0930

Now, once that slate is completely wiped clean, we will be ready for this open and collaborative process to develop the real solutions that we have talked about. That's what we promised the American people as we led up to last November 2, and that's exactly what we will deliver here today.

Madam Speaker, first, we undo the damage; then we work together to implement real reform and real solutions. I urge my colleagues to support this rule and then, after we've gone through the 3-day layover requirement next week, which is in compliance with another promise that we made to the American people, I urge my colleagues to support the underlying legislation, H.R. 2, which our colleague, the new majority leader, Mr. CANTOR, has offered, and H. Res. 9, which I have introduced, that calls for our committees to work in a bipartisan way to develop solutions to the challenges that we have out there in ensuring that every American has access to quality health care.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I appreciate my gentleman friend, Mr. DREIER, yielding me time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

What a week it's been. Since being sworn in on Tuesday, the speed in which the Republican Party is working their promises has been dizzying. Speaking of the Republicans' first days

in office, tea party spokesman Mark Meckler summed the week up nicely when he said, “I actually don’t think it would be possible to fall from grace any faster than this.”

In November, the Republican leadership, led by Speaker BOEHNER, traveled to suburban Virginia and made a Pledge to America. Their constituents, including tea party patriots like Mr. Meckler, listened intently as the Republican Party pledged to be fiscally responsible and serve the will of the American people. On page 6 of the Republicans’ Pledge to America, the party states: “With commonsense exceptions for seniors, veterans, and our troops, we will roll back government spending to pre-stimulus, pre-bailout levels, saving us at least \$100 billion in the first year alone and putting us on a path to balance the budget and pay down the debt.”

The pledge was solemnly made by the Republican leadership despite being largely panned as a political stunt. Despite their promise to follow through on their pledge, on Tuesday, aides to the Republican majority said that the pledge to cut \$100 billion was “hypothetical.”

Now today they are moving forward to do the exact opposite of the actions they pledged, as they introduce legislation to repeal the Affordable Care Act. If successful, the Republican legislation will add \$230 billion to the deficit by 2021. This extra \$230 billion won’t be spent rebuilding our crumbling infrastructure, teaching our children, or providing for the millions without jobs. Instead, the \$230 billion will be added to our deficit in order to take health care benefits and protections from those who need them the most.

For example, starting this year, the Affordable Health Care Act will begin to close the doughnut hole for seniors. Under the law, Medicare beneficiaries who fall in the doughnut hole will be eligible for 50 percent discounts on covered brand-name prescription drugs. Repeal this law, and seniors receive no help and will be forced to pay their rising drug costs alone. Those are the types of protections that I fight for today.

Fiscally, Members of Congress face a \$300 billion choice. According to the Congressional Budget Office, we have two options: one, do we keep the Affordable Health Care Act and save \$130 billion by 2021? Or, two, do we repeal the Affordable Health Care Act and add \$230 billion to our deficit by 2021? That may be trouble for some; but for most of us, it is easy. For me, the answer is clear; and I assume to most Americans, it’s clear as well.

Because they can’t win by simply judging apples to apples, the Republican leadership has taken to discrediting the Congressional Budget Office. Yet a quick bit of research will reveal that Republicans have long valued the nonpartisan and reliable work of the Congressional Budget Office and have publicly supported the agency before.

In fact, in 2009 Speaker BOEHNER repeatedly referred to the CBO as a non-partisan institution and relied on their estimates to argue against the Affordable Care Act at the time. But now that the CBO’s estimates are detrimental to their political goals, they have taken to questioning the work.

Republican Senator JOHN CORNYN warned against dismissing the work of CBO just because it’s inconvenient. Two years ago he said, “I believe the professionals at the Congressional Budget Office are doing a difficult but unpopular work. They are speaking the truth to power here in Washington and making the folks who would pass these enormous unfunded bills that impose this huge debt on generations hereafter somewhat unhappy.”

“But I think they are doing an important service by telling us the facts. Last week, I commended the director of the CBO, Dr. Doug Elmendorf, for saying that the CBO will ‘never adjust our views to make people happy.’ God bless Dr. Elmendorf for his integrity and commitment to telling the truth. We need to learn how to deal with the truth, not try to remake it or cover it up.”

Now, I couldn’t agree more with that. The deficit estimates provided by the CBO are the singular authoritative figures upon which we make all of our decisions and have for decades. Even if some don’t like what the numbers tell us, we know that numbers don’t lie.

I will remind my colleagues that today’s actions are not “hypothetical.” We truly face a \$300 billion choice. We can choose to provide invaluable benefits to millions of Americans while paying down our national deficit—remember that it will save \$143 billion over 10 years—or we can choose to end valuable health care protections for millions of Americans and add \$230 billion to the Nation’s deficit.

Madam Speaker, today we are considering the first measure from the Rules Committee of this new Congress, and my Republican friends have already produced one for the record books. Let me give you some of the highlights. First of all, the resolution includes a completely closed process for two separate pieces of legislation. That means we get two closed rules in one. Maybe my Republican friends think they can save taxpayers money by rolling all the closed rules into a single resolution. I think that’s what they meant by bringing efficiency to government.

The first closed rule on the health care repeal bill does most of the heavy lifting. It blocks every single germane amendment submitted to the Rules Committee. Well, that’s not exactly right, though. It actually slips in one change without allowing the House to vote on it. This special amendment, slipped in with the famous deem-and-pass maneuver, is very interesting. It allows the House to pretend that the repeal bill is free, even though the Budget Office says it will raise the deficit by over \$1 trillion. That’s a neat

trick; and now we know the secret weapon for reducing the deficit: a blindfold.

This closed process is especially troubling on the health care repeal because this Republican bill has had no public hearings, no committee consideration, and is not paid for. The second closed rule in this two-for-one package blocks all amendments to another resolution to correct a flaw in the swearing-in process. Apparently the vice chairman of the Rules Committee was conducting legislative business before he was actually a Member of Congress. Maybe amendments are not important here because no Member in the House has seen this resolution, since the rule allows the majority leader to make changes until the moment it is introduced.

But if any of my colleagues are concerned about not having enough time to read this surprise resolution, don’t worry: the rule allows the House to debate it for 4 full minutes, 4 minutes. Have you ever heard of a bill debated for 4 minutes? Fortunately, the rule generously gives the minority 2 of those 4 minutes, and I guess that qualifies as both efficiency and bipartisanship.

Finally, the rule allows the House to consider a sweeping press release from the Republican leadership, a resolution to replace real patient protections with vague rhetoric.

Madam Speaker, this is a very disappointing day for the House Rules Committee. Our first action of the new Congress violates the promises that we heard from our Republican friends: no public hearings, no committee consideration, a completely closed process, legislative text no Member has read, 4 minutes of debate on an important constitutional issue, and so on.

For all those Members who were sent to Washington, like I was, to repair our Nation’s finances, create jobs for millions of the unemployed, help the millions of Americans in need, the decision should be simple. I encourage my colleagues to reject the efforts of Republican leadership, keep our promises to our constituents, and vote to keep the affordable health care law.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 0940

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds to say that Thomas Jefferson said that two thinking people can be given the exact same set of facts and draw different conclusions. Well, I’ve just heard what my friend from Rochester has said. I will say that this is a great day for the people’s House because we are going to, in fact, be implementing the commitment that was made to focus on getting our economy back on track.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to our new colleague from North Charleston, South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT), a very hardworking and thoughtful member of the Rules Committee who was with us for 12 hours up until late last night.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, Mr. Chairman, I will say that it's truly an honor to serve on the Rules Committee. My first experience was a 12-hour experience last night and all day yesterday. What a wonderful opportunity to serve the American people.

This is a great opportunity for all of us in America to kill the jobs-killing health care bill that is taking jobs away from the private sector. I simply want to make six quick points.

The first point is that we all recognize that the cost of insurance is only going up, up and up. There is a misnomer that this bill somehow reduces the cost of insurance. It is simply categorically not true. Shifting who pays for the insurance, the health care cost, does not make the health care cost go down; it is simply going to continue to rise.

Second point, when you design a bill that has tax increase after tax increase after tax increase and say that you are reducing the deficit by increasing taxes, it is inconsistent with the reality that the American people want from their Congress.

Third, the individual mandate is simply unconstitutional. And if the individual mandate is not a part of the bill, if we don't force every single American to buy insurance, this Ponzi scheme simply doesn't work.

Number four, bringing 10 years of revenue in and paying out 6 years of benefit and calling that equal, that's a farce.

Number five, the lifetime benefits, challenging the lifetime benefits. We want everyone in America to have the access to health care without any question. The question we ask ourselves is, from an actuarial perspective, can we pay for it, a \$2.7 trillion expansion, a new entitlement when we have a \$76 trillion unfunded liability on the current entitlement?

We simply cannot continue to dig a hole and call ourselves compassionate. There is nothing compassionate about increasing our entitlements by jeopardizing the future entitlements of all Americans.

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

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I yield my friend an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Finally, the seventh point, we've heard lots of rhetoric about what we're doing to senior citizens and women. What we are facing is an opportunity to stop robbing future generations, to stop the unnecessary impact, the intergenerational cost. Without even taking into consideration the intergenerational costs, we consistently impact unborn Americans with legislation that passed under the former House.

It is good to be in the House with a brand-new Speaker. And thank you, Mr. Chairman, for allowing me to be a part of the Rules Committee.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, the American people made it very clear in the last election that they want us to focus on one thing, jobs. But the new Republican majority has instead chosen to reopen an old ideological battle. I think that's a mistake.

But the good news is that the American people will have the opportunity, right at the outset of this new Congress, to see the clear differences between Democrats and Republicans.

Democrats believe that insurance companies should be prohibited from discriminating on the basis of pre-existing conditions. Republicans do not.

Democrats believe that we should close the doughnut hole and reduce prescription drug prices for our seniors. Republicans do not.

Democrats believe that young people should be allowed to remain on their parents' health insurance plan until the age of 26. Republicans do not.

Democrats believe we should provide tax breaks to small businesses and subsidies to low-income Americans to help them pay for health insurance for their workers and their families. Republicans do not.

And Democrats believe that we need to seriously address the budget deficit. Republicans do not, as the Congressional Budget Office made abundantly clear. The CBO told us yesterday that the bill to repeal health insurance reform would add \$230 billion to the deficit over the next 10 years and another \$1.2 trillion in the following 10 years.

As far as I can tell, this is the most expensive one-page bill in American history: 114 words, that's \$2 billion per word.

And rather than address those budgetary facts, the new Republican majority has simply decided to ignore them, to cover their ears and pretend that the laws of arithmetic do not apply to them.

In their first order of legislative business, the Republicans want to take health insurance reform and toss it in the trash. And how many hearings have they held on the impact of this repeal? Zero. How many mark-ups did they have? Zero. And, most shockingly, how many amendments will they consider in this bill? Zero.

The new majority whip, Mr. MCCARTHY, said after the election last November, and I quote: "When you look at the Pledge to America that the Republicans have laid out, there is a cultural change in there. There is something that opens up the floor that hasn't been done for quite some time, where bills won't be written in the back room, where the bills have to be laid out for 72 hours, where bills actually have an open rule, where people can bring up amendments on the floor."

So much for that. And instead of thoughtful, reasoned legislative language that addresses the health care issues, the Republicans' replace part of their repeal-and-replace strategy is just a list of happy-talk sound bites. It's no more than a press release.

So again, Madam Speaker, I believe we should be focusing on jobs and the economy. And in the meantime, I urge my colleagues to reject this rule and the underlying, reckless bill.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, we have 87 new Republicans in the House of Representatives. There's no more impressive group than the four who are serving with us on the House Rules Committee, among them former Sheriff NUGENT. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Brooksville, Florida.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Chairman, we were there last night in the Rules Committee for 12 hours hearing testimony from a number of individuals on the Democratic side and also on the Republican side.

But let me talk to you about this. Over the past year, I've met with thousands of people from throughout Florida's Fifth Congressional District, whether they be small business owners, veterans, or Medicare recipients. They asked me to promise, promise to repeal ObamaCare. It's clear that the American people know more than our Democratic leadership in regards to what Americans want.

ObamaCare eliminates millions of American jobs, cuts hundreds of millions of dollars from Medicare, raises taxes by almost \$500 billion over 10 years for 6 years' worth of coverage.

Everybody knows that the health care system is broken and that reform is needed. However, the unconstitutional, job-killing mandates of ObamaCare are not the answer.

House Resolution 9 is an important step in Congress working with the American public to find real, meaningful solutions to our Nation's health care needs. This is the people's House, and we should be listening to the people.

House Resolution 9 will allow us to foster economic growth, job creation, lower health care premiums and protect Medicare, and reform the medical malpractice system that is bankrupting America. For all these reasons, I'm grateful to my colleague from California, Mr. DREIER, for introducing House Resolution 9; and I'm proud to be an original cosponsor of that resolution.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), a member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and the underlying bill, the most expensive one-page bill in the history of Congress, and it costs the taxpayers a little over \$200 billion the first 10 years alone, and over \$1 trillion overall.

Not only have the Republicans, as the first bill that we are doing a rule on and facing here on the floor, put forward the most expensive one-page bill in the history of Congress, but it is not paid for, Madam Speaker.

In addition to not being paid for, they have waived many of the notice-for-transparency requirements, the

regular order that they sought to establish with regard to the way that this Congress is run.

Madam Speaker, there were many good ideas and good amendments that were brought forward by Members of both parties yesterday during our session of the Rules Committee. I want to talk about a few in particular.

One, my colleague from Michigan, GARY PETERS, brought a proposal that would have made sure that this biggest one-page expenditure in the history of Congress did not raise taxes on small businesses. Unfortunately, that amendment is not made in order under this rule, and therefore H.R. 2 will be raising taxes on small businesses across the country that are now receiving tax credits for providing health care for their employees.

□ 0950

There was also a lot of discussion, and I think it is important that the American people know, with regard to people with preexisting conditions. Now, we all want to do something for people with preexisting conditions. There was talk yesterday, and, in fact, when we are talking about H.R. 9, there might be discussion in the future with regard to agreeing on high-risk pools for people with preexisting conditions. But what this body is being asked to do today and next week is effectively replace something that works for people with preexisting conditions, namely, eliminating pricing discriminations, with some vague assurance on paper that perhaps some day some committee, some chairman might consider, we ask them kindly to consider something that will do something for people with preexisting conditions. Well, Madam Speaker, that is simply not enough for the people that have the preexisting conditions today, for those who will in the future.

If we want to talk about improving upon health care, there is ample room to do it, but not by eliminating any protections that exist.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, at this time I am very privileged to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished former chairman of the Republican conference, my friend from Columbus, Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

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

Mr. PENCE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the rule, but I rise from my heart with a deep sense of gratitude to the American people to urge my colleagues in both parties to join us as we keep our promise to the American people and next week vote to repeal their government takeover of health care lock, stock, and barrel.

I know Democrats said at the time that they had made history. I said at the time I thought we broke with history. We broke with some of our finest traditions: Limited government, per-

sonal responsibility, and, most profoundly, the consent of the governed.

On a late Sunday night in March, the last majority had their say. On a Tuesday in November, the American people had their say. And that brings us to this moment.

It is remarkable, though, to hear Members in the minority explaining their opposition to this bill. A year ago, only in Washington, D.C., could you say you were going to spend trillions of dollars and save people money. And this morning, only in Washington, D.C., could you say that repealing a \$2.7 trillion government takeover of health care is actually going to cost money.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PENCE. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I wonder if he might repeat that line. I think he said that only in Washington, D.C., can there be an interpretation that cutting \$2.7 trillion in spending is actually going to end up costing the American people.

Is that what the gentleman was saying? I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. PENCE. I thank the gentleman.

Reclaiming my time, yes. It must be mystifying for people looking in this morning to hear about the most expensive one-page bill in American history.

I say again. Only in Washington, D.C., could a Congress vote to repeal a \$2.7 trillion government takeover of health care and the minority says it costs the American people money.

Now, I know they don't like us to call it that, but let me explain. When you mandate that every American buy government-approved insurance whether they want it or need it or not, when you create a government-run plan paid for with job-killing tax increases, when you provide public funding for abortion for the first time in American history, that is a government takeover of health care that violates the principles, the ideals, and the values of millions of Americans, and the American people know it.

Now, look. After we repeal Obamacare next week, we can start over with commonsense reforms that will focus on lowering the cost of health insurance without growing the size of government.

Republicans will waste no time in bringing greater freedoms to the American people to purchase health insurance the way they buy life insurance, the way they buy car insurance. We will deal with responsible litigation reform. We will even use the savings to cover preexisting conditions.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this rule. Join us as we keep our promise to the American people and repeal their government takeover of health care once and for all.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, this is not a dispute between Republicans and Democrats about the \$1.3

trillion. CBO, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, is saying that.

I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Ms. MATSUI).

Ms. MATSUI. I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the rule and the bill before us. The bill would increase the national deficit by \$230 billion, increase costs to individuals, families, and small business owners, and deny the American public the consumer protections they have been seeking for years.

Repeal of the health care law would also mean that young adults would not be able to stay on their parents' plan. This is something that would have devastating effects on constituents of mine such as Elizabeth. Shortly after graduating college, she was dropped from her parents' plan and soon developed a severe thyroid condition. As a result, she had to purchase her own individual insurance plan, which proved to be a severe financial hardship for her and her parents. Thankfully, she was able to re-enroll under her parents' plan as of January 1 because of this health reform bill.

Repeal would also mean that senior citizens in Sacramento would not see any relief from the Medicare part B doughnut hole. The health reform bill would close the doughnut hole, which is critical to seniors in my district. One such senior, Gary, regularly pays over \$2,000 a month for his prescription drugs. Repeal would mean that Gary and the thousands of other seniors in my district would see no relief from this part D doughnut hole. This is unacceptable.

Madam Speaker, a vote against this rule and against this bill is a vote to protect the American public from unfair insurance company practices, to provide relief to young and old alike, and to stay on the path to a fiscally responsible future. I urge my colleagues to vote down this rule and vote against the underlying legislation.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, at this time I am happy to yield 1 minute to a hard-working member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, which will be one of those committees, when we pass H. Res. 9, that will be dealing with ensuring that every single American has access to quality health insurance, our friend from Brentwood, Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, today we do begin a very important process, and it is a solid first step. And I stand to support this rule and to support repeal of this law, because we have on the books a law that doesn't improve the quality of health care. It will not reduce the cost of health care, and it is going to add billions to the exploding national debt.

We have listened to the American people. They are smart, and they know that this law is unworkable. It won't deliver on the promises that they made, and the American people voted in overwhelming numbers to repeal it

and replace it. That is the action that we are going to take.

Congress cannot wait any longer to get this irresponsible law out of our doctors' offices, out of our lives, and off the books.

We in Tennessee have lived through the experiment of government-run health care called TennCare. Tennessee could not afford it, and the American people know that this Nation cannot afford a TennCare-type program on a national level.

I support the rule.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan, our ranking member of Ways and Means, Mr. LEVIN.

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

Mr. LEVIN. This is what the Republicans are after, what their repeal would mean: It would take away from millions of Americans coverage for kids with preexisting conditions, coverage for young adults under 26. Recommended preventive care would be taken away. It would take away lower drug costs for seniors. And this is what the Republican repeal would do. It would give back to insurance companies unreasonable premium increases, unjust policy terminations, rescissions. It would take away this. It would give back profits and CEO salaries to insurance companies, not health care benefits.

□ 1000

It would give back annual and lifetime limits on benefits. It gives back to insurance companies discrimination ability against women.

These are concrete reasons to vote "no" on this repeal, a misfortune for the United States of America.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, at this time I yield 2 minutes to another hardworking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, our friend from Marietta, Georgia, Dr. GINGREY.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, we have heard a lot of arguments on the other side of the aisle in regard to the \$230 billion cost, and on our side of the aisle, of course, only in America can something actually cost \$1.15 trillion and eliminating it then all of a sudden costs \$230 billion. But, yes, Ms. SLAUGHTER, only in America, only in this Congress, numbers do lie.

Let me just say that what we have been talking about on this side of the aisle, of course, is the voice of the American people.

You know, it was about 3,000 years ago that a little shepherd boy walked into that valley of death looking up at all of those Philistines and that 9-foot giant Goliath from Gath. He had that coat of mail, he had the sword, he had the shield, he had the javelin. And what did little David have? He had a little pouch and a handful of stones. But he hit that giant right between the

eyes, brought him to his knees, and then cut off the head of the snake.

That pouch and those little pebbles represent the voice of the American people. That is what we have on this side of the aisle. That is why we are going to pass H. Res. 9 and we are going to pass H.R. 2 next week, and we are going to deliver our promise to the American people to eliminate, to repeal ObamaCare.

The American people spoke loudly. They don't like this bill. The Democratic majority in the Senate and the President have one last chance to make amends. I think they will do it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

Mr. MARKEY. This debate is about health care versus don't care.

The Democrats' health care law lowers prescription drug costs, helps middle class families pay for health coverage for their sick children, and expands health care for 32 million more Americans, reducing the deficit by \$143 billion. The Democrats' health care law helps grandma afford her prescription drugs.

The Republicans don't care about grandma. They want to take back the drug benefits in the new law. GOP used to stand for Grand Old Party; now it stands for "grandma's out of prescriptions." The Republicans' "don't care" repeal shows they don't care about sick children with medical bills pushing families into bankruptcy, that they don't care about grandma and grandpa who need help paying for prescription drugs.

Vote down this rule so that we can help grandma, sick children, and middle class families struggling to pay for health care.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, at this point I am happy to yield 1 minute to another hardworking member of this freshman class, my new friend from San Antonio, Texas (Mr. CANSECO).

Mr. CANSECO. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule and in support of the underlying legislation, the repealing of the job-killing health care act.

Ten months ago, President Obama and his allies in the Democrat-controlled House and Senate committed legislative malpractice when they jammed through the Congress and into law a Washington takeover of health care. They did so despite the overwhelming opposition of the American people. Since its enactment into law, what was already a unpopular law has only continued to become more unpopular.

There is no doubt that we need to reform health care in America. However, it is not done by assaulting individual liberties guaranteed in our Constitution, bankrupting our children and grandchildren, and putting Washington bureaucrats in the personal relationships between our doctors and our patients.

Repealing the health care bill will also help encourage job growth to get

our economy back on track. Our economy is not suffering from a capital crisis; it is suffering from a confidence crisis.

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

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I am happy to yield my friend an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. CANSECO. Policies enacted in Washington, like the health care bill, have injected uncertainty into our economy that has eroded the confidence of Americans to start new businesses or expand current ones to create jobs.

The American people have made it clear they want the health care law repealed and replaced with commonsense alternatives that will lower the cost of health care while also increasing quality and access. After meeting and speaking with thousands of Texans in the 23rd District over the past year, this is their message.

Repealing and replacing the health care bill is one of the promises made to the American people in the Pledge to America. Today, we are making good on that promise as we begin the work of repealing the health care law and replacing it to ensure that the American people can get the health care that they need, when they need it, and at a price they can afford—the Federal Government coming between them and their doctor.

I support the rule.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, this is nothing but a gag rule. I and so many of my colleagues on the Democratic side went up to the Rules Committee yesterday and asked for amendments, and they were almost all excluded from this rule.

The Republican chairman of the committee says there is transparency. He says that there is an opportunity for participation. He can say it as many times as he wants, but it is simply not true.

He also said that this was a commitment to the American people. There is no commitment to the American people here. The only commitment is to the insurance companies. They are the only ones that are going to gain from repeal of this very important legislation, because they want to increase premiums, and they want to institute discriminatory practices again against women, a woman perhaps who has breast cancer and a preexisting condition and can't get insurance, or bring back those lifetime caps, or bring back those annual caps where people lose their insurance if they have had a serious operation and they try to go back again and they don't have insurance, or perhaps the child who is up to 26 and who also will not be able to get on their parents' insurance policy again.

Let me tell you here, the only one who benefits is the insurance company, not the American people.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, may I inquire of my friend on the other side of the aisle how many speakers she has remaining?

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, we have got every minute taken. I am not sure everybody is going to show up.

Mr. DREIER. I am told there are 11 minutes remaining on your side.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), the dean of the House and our leader on health care.

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

Mr. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, if you listen to the Republicans today, they are telling us don't bother them with the facts. Their minds are made up.

They are unaware of the fact that the Congressional Budget Office says that this is going to create 4 million jobs in the health care legislation. They don't tell us that the same Congressional Budget Office says that passage of H.R. 2 is going to increase the deficit by \$140 billion. And they also are telling us the American people want this repeal. They don't.

They understand what this means. It means that no longer are people going to get the protections that the health insurance bill gives. No more protection, if the Republicans get their way, against preexisting conditions and rescissions denying people health care because of something that happened to them down the road before. No longer will Americans be protected against frivolous and improper behavior by the insurance companies.

This is a bad rule. It is bottomed not on facts, but on fiction. And if this body is to legislate and legislate well, we have to have the facts, not fiction, not deceit, not misleading statements by our Republican colleagues.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

□ 1010

Mr. DOGGETT. If you're hit by a truck this afternoon or your child contracts a dread disease, your future ought not to depend on the fine print in an insurance policy you didn't have anything to do with writing. No insurance monopoly should stand between you and your doctor.

Unfortunately, the Republican Party has become little more than an arm of the insurance monopolies. They ask for a vote to further empower those monopolies, and we ask for a vote to empower American families. A vote to repeal is a vote to maintain health care costs as the leading cause of bankruptcy and credit card debt in this country. It is a vote to require seniors to pay more, more for prescription

drugs, and more for diabetes and cancer screenings.

We can stand with American families today or we can kneel to the insurance monopolies. The choice is clear—let's vote for American families.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Vermont, former member of the Rules Committee, Mr. WELCH.

Mr. WELCH. I thank the gentlelady from New York.

I say, Madam Speaker, to my Republican colleagues, you campaigned effectively, you beat us good, you ran on the agenda of defeating health care and repealing it. Now you're doing it. Own it. Admit what it is you are doing.

This is not a campaign. We're playing with fire. We're taking away health care benefits that make a real difference to our families.

Number one, this bill will raise the deficit by \$230 billion. Fiscal responsibility, out the window.

Second, things that matter to families; their kids, starting out getting a \$10 an hour job without health care. They have it now on their parent policies. We're taking it away.

Preexisting conditions. You have cancer and you want to buy insurance, you can. Repeal, you can't. You lose it.

Lifetime caps. If you are with cancer or diabetes and you need that insurance, you lose it before you can go without it.

And preventive care we're taking it away from seniors who are trying to take care of themselves, get those free mammograms, keep the cost of health care down. You are taking it away.

Admit it. Own it. State it proudly. It's what you campaigned on. It's what you're doing. But don't try to sugarcoat what this is about.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Speaker, the issue facing the country is jobs. Instead of repealing health care, we should bring up a jobs bill like the China currency reform. And so I rise in strong opposition to the rule and the underlying bill.

Today I speak on behalf of the millions of Americans who are currently benefitting from the law and yet have been shut out of the legislative process. The way in which this legislation has been brought to this floor is a travesty. Before the Affordable Care Act became law, in the House alone we held nearly 80 hearings on the merits of reform. But this bill to repeal this lifesaving law has not had a single hearing. Not one amendment has been allowed for an up or down vote here today. That's probably because the majority knows hearings would show that the law is already a real success.

While we may disagree on the policy, we should be able to agree on the process. And this, my friends, is not the way to move legislation in the House of Representatives. We've all agreed upon that. That is why I urge my colleagues—especially the new Members who ran on the promise of ensuring an open Congress—to vote against this rule.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you.

There is a lot of talk here on the floor about job killers. Actually this bill, the affordable health care bill, creates some 400,000 jobs. The repeal of it is actually a killer of human beings. Some 40,000 Americans die every year for lack of health insurance. That's the reality. Repeal this bill and you're going to find more Americans dying. Also, you're doing away, with this repeal of the Affordable Health Care Act, of the patients' bill of rights. I was the insurance commissioner in California. I know exactly what the insurance companies will do if this repeal goes forward. They will continue to rescind policies. They will continue to deny coverage. They will continue to make sure that those 23-year-old children that have graduated from college will no longer be able to be on their parents' policies.

This repeal is perhaps the worst thing you can do to Americans in their health care. Besides that, you will significantly increase the deficit, by \$230 billion.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I would like to insert into the RECORD the figures from today's jobs report showing that since the enactment of health reform in March 2010, the economy has created 1.1 million private sector jobs.

UPDATE ON JOB GROWTH UNDER HEALTH REFORM

Today's jobs report exposes the fatal flaw in the Republicans' argument that health reform is "job killing."

Since the enactment of health reform in March 2010, the economy has created more than 1.1 million private-sector jobs.

That's an average of 123,000 jobs created per month in the private sector since the enactment of health reform, compared to an average of 7,000 jobs lost per month in the private sector during the Bush Administration, when our health care system was in a downward spiral and insurers had free rein to raise premiums on families and small businesses by double digits and deny or limit coverage with no accountability or recourse.

12 Straight Months of Job Growth in the Private Sector More Than 1.3 Million Private-Sector Jobs Created in 2010 Unemployment Rate Drops From 9.8% to 9.4%

113,000 private-sector jobs were created in December, the 12th straight month of private-sector job growth.

In all, more than 1.3 million private-sector jobs were created in 2010. That's a dramatic

turnaround from the situation President Obama inherited in early 2009, when we were losing 750,000 jobs a month.

The November private-sector jobs number was revised up 29,000 to 79,000 private-sector jobs created, and the October number was revised up 33,000 to 193,000 private-sector jobs created.

Government employment declined slightly in November; as a result, net payroll growth for the public and private sector combined was 103,000 in December.

The unemployment rate fell to 9.4% in December.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule that we're taking up today instead of focusing on jobs.

The new majority in the House ran on the platform of fiscal responsibility. This bill flies in the face of that promise by adding \$230 billion in the short run and over \$1 trillion in the long run to our deficit.

As important, under repeal, the Medicare trust fund will become insolvent in 2017. That's just 6 years away. Pushing Medicare over the cliff by passing this repeal breaks a sacred trust with our Nation's seniors to help provide health care coverage in retirement after a lifetime of working and paying taxes.

That is why I went to Rules Committee last night with two colleagues and offered an amendment to guarantee that repeal will not go forward unless it is certified that that repeal will not shorten the life of the Medicare trust fund. Sadly, the Rules Committee didn't allow us to help protect America's seniors. They didn't allow that amendment, we will not be able to vote for that amendment on the floor, and I urge a "no" vote on this rule.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 7½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from New York has 5½ minutes remaining.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, then, in light of that, I am very happy to yield 1 minute to a physician, another hardworking member of this freshman class, the gentlewoman from Mount Kisco, New York (Ms. HAYWORTH).

Ms. HAYWORTH. Madam Speaker, as a physician, I understand the profound importance of the goals of the health care bill passed last year—to assure that all Americans have affordable, portable health insurance, providing access to good medical care.

I also understand the disruptions that this law is already causing to our economy—the predictable side effects of legislative bad medicine, and the reason we must repeal and replace it. The bill we will be considering is in no way merely symbolic. It represents the true will of the American people, the majority of whom have stated time after time to this day that they reject this law. The House's vote to repeal is the first step towards assuring that all

Americans will have the quality, choice, and innovation in health care that they expect and deserve. We need to proceed expeditiously, according to the rule on which we vote today, with the understanding that we are taking meaningful and crucial action.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank the gentlelady.

The previous speaker is right. This is not symbolic. It's real. In fact, the Republicans are going to allow the return of the worst abuses of the health insurance industry. Preexisting condition exclusions. Taking away your policy when you get sick. Lifetime and annual caps. Throwing your kids off your policies. The Republican repeal of this bill would enable all those things for their, very, very generous benefactors in the insurance industry.

I haven't had a single constituent—and I know you haven't—beg you to bring back these abuses. Is that what you're doing? Is that what they want? You could take steps right now in fact to rein in this industry, and 400 people in this House voted for it last year. Let's take away their unfair exemption from antitrust laws so they can't collude to drive up prices, they can't collude to take away your insurance, they can't collude to throw your kids off; and all the other anticompetitive things that industry does.

I offered that amendment to Rules last night. The Republicans, despite the chairman of the committee and others having voted for it last year, would not allow it. This is an insurance industry bill plain and simple.

□ 1020

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, at this time I am happy to yield 1 minute to another hardworking physician, a member of this new freshman class, the gentleman from south Pittsburgh, Tennessee, Dr. DESJARLAIS.

Mr. DESJARLAIS. Madam Speaker, today I rise to support the rule and to support the repeal of the Obama health care law. As a physician who has practiced medicine in rural Tennessee under the onerous TennCare law, I know firsthand that this law does not work. It restricts access to health care, it increases the cost, and it does not deliver on the promises the minority made when they passed the law.

The American people have had their say. They do not want this bill. They want it repealed, and they want to see health care reform that will increase access and lower costs.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN).

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. I thank my colleague from the Rules Committee for allowing me to speak.

I rise in strong opposition to this rule on H.R. 2, the Patients' Rights Repeal Act. Just yesterday, the Congressional Budget Office said that this re-

peal would cost \$230 billion in additional Federal debt. It's amazing, this is our first major piece of legislation and the Republicans are already adding to the national debt.

The issue facing our country is jobs. Instead of repealing health care, we should be bringing up a jobs bill like the China currency reform. Where is that bill on the floor with the new majority?

Let me tell you what this bill will do. At least in Texas, we will see tragedy happen. 161,000 young adults will lose their insurance coverage through their parents' health care plan—that's only in Texas—and 2.8 million Texans who have Medicare coverage will be forced to pay copays now for preventative services like mammograms and colonoscopies. Medicare will no longer pay for the annual visit of nearly 2.8 million Texans—and many more Americans for Medicare—and 128,682 Texans on Medicare will receive higher prescription costs if this law is repealed.

Madam Speaker, yesterday Congressional Budget Office said "over the 2012–2021 period, the repeal of health care reform on federal deficits . . . will cost \$230 billion."

Texas and the rest of the nation cannot afford to add an additional \$230 billion in deficit spending.

The issue facing the country is jobs. Instead of repealing health care, we should bring up a jobs bill like China currency reform.

The Republicans came into office promising to reduce federal spending and reduce the deficit, but their first act in the Majority is to try to pass a Rule that would exempt H.R. 2 for statutory PAYGO.

In addition to adding billions in dollars to the deficit, consideration of H.R. 2 would jeopardize the current and future health care benefits of my constituents. The negative effects repealing the Affordable Care Act will have on Texas and all Americans.

Up to 161,000 young adults would lose their insurance coverage through their parents' health plans. Nearly 11.8 million residents of Texas with private insurance coverage would suddenly find themselves vulnerable again to having lifetime limits placed on how much insurance companies will spend on their health care.

Insurance companies would once again be allowed to cut off someone's coverage unexpectedly when they are in an accident or become sick because of a simple mistake on an application. This would leave more than 1.1 million people in Texas at risk of losing their insurance.

More than 1.1 million residents of Texas would not know if they are receiving value for their health insurance premium dollars, as insurers in state would no longer be required to spend at least 80 to 85 percent of premium dollars on health care rather than CEO salaries, bonuses, and corporate profits.

Nearly 2.8 million seniors in Texas who have Medicare coverage would be forced to pay a co-pay to receive important preventative services, like mammograms and colonoscopies.

Medicare would no longer pay for an annual check-up visit, so nearly 2.8 million seniors in Texas who have Medicare coverage would have to pay extra if they want to stay healthy by getting check-ups regularly.

A total of 128,682 Texans on Medicare would see significantly higher prescription drug costs. In Texas, Medicare beneficiaries received a one-time, tax-free \$250 rebate to help pay for prescription drugs in the “donut hole” coverage gap in 2010. Medicare beneficiaries who fall into the “donut hole” in 2011 will be eligible for 50 percent discounts on covered brand name prescription drugs.

Madam Speaker, when Texans and all Americans will soon be finally free from worrying that affordable coverage will not be available to them and their families when they need it the most, repealing the Affordable Care Act would be devastating.

I strongly urge my colleagues to vote no on the rule to consider H.R. 2.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS), the ranking member of Government Oversight and Reform.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I rise in fervent opposition to this rule. Despite ardent promises from Republicans that all bills would be considered under regular order, this resolution has neither been debated nor voted on by a single committee of jurisdiction.

Additionally, the recently passed Republican rules package requires that all legislation be fully paid for—and yet the Republican leadership has already publicly declared that they have no intention of paying for what is estimated to be a \$230 billion increase in the deficit that the repeal of health reform would create by 2021, according to the Congressional Budget Office.

Worse than the Republicans’ already broken promises are what this rule and the underlying resolution would do to children, to seniors, and to all Americans who are suffering from illnesses.

I strongly oppose this rule.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, at this time I am happy to yield 1 minute to another great new Member, the gentlewoman from Archie, Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER), my home State.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Members on the opposite side of the aisle said we need to be passing a jobs bill. Well, this is a jobs bill, because I can testify, as a person who’s newly elected and been on the campaign trail for a while, that in the Fourth District we had small businesses that are not hiring and not expanding because of the health care bill. We have got to repeal this so that we can create more jobs.

I am a small business owner myself, and I can tell you, since this has passed, that health insurance premiums have skyrocketed in anticipation of the mandate that is going to be forced on them. So, if we want to get serious about creating jobs, we need to start by repealing this.

This is also a bill to rein in the runaway spending that is devastating our country, and it’s mortgaging our children’s future. As a mother, that’s important to me. This bill put another \$1.2 trillion of debt on our country. We cannot afford that.

Lastly, this is a freedom bill. The people in my district do not want the government telling them they have to buy a private product and then mandating what is in that product. That is unconstitutional. By passing this last year, you have taken away my freedom, the freedom of the people of the Fourth District, and the freedom of this country. We deserve better.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. SUTTON).

Ms. SUTTON. The issue facing this country is jobs. Instead of rushing to the aid of the insurance industry to reinstate their right to engage in egregious discriminatory practices of discriminating against adults and children alike based on preexisting conditions, instead of allowing the doughnut hole to continue to bear down on our seniors, we should be passing real jobs legislation.

Urgently, we should be bringing up jobs bills that will make a real difference, like putting an end to China’s currency manipulation. We’ve heard the numbers: 2.4 million jobs lost across the country, 92,000 jobs lost in Ohio, and 5,700 jobs have been lost in my congressional district due to China’s deliberate and abusive trade policies. We can do something about this issue today, and we should. It makes a real difference.

I hope that our friends across the aisle will stand with American businesses and American workers and put an end to the abusive practice of China’s currency manipulation.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD).

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule.

Madam Speaker, after Democrats took a shellacking on November 2, I concluded then and now that it was because of the fragile economy and because they thought just perhaps Republicans would have some new ideas about fiscal discipline.

Well here’s what we get. We get a Republican majority that is more concerned about political theatre and messaging to the Tea Party than they are in creating jobs and reducing the deficit. We need a Jobs Bill. Now.

The CBO on yesterday told us what we already suspected. Repeal will increase, yes increase, the deficit by \$230 billion. It will result in 32 million Americans losing their health insurance. And what eclipsed this whole episode was a Republican Rule that exempts Repeal from Pay-as-you-Go rules.

Shame on the Republican majority. Shame on you.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. There are 15 million Americans unemployed as we meet this morning. They do not want us to play politics with health care; they want us to work together to create jobs.

There is a job killer loose in America. The job killer is unfair trade practices that force the outsourcing of our jobs.

There is a proposal that has broad agreement between Republicans and Democrats to bring fair trade back to America. If we defeat the previous question, we will move to amend the rule to make in order the Currency Reform for Fair Trade Act, which simply says this: As the Chinese have been slamming the door shut on our workers and products, we’ve been opening our shelves in American department stores. No more of that. No more outsourcing of jobs. No more unfair trade practices. A fair and level playing field for American workers.

Let’s work together to create jobs and stop the politics and the waste of time of health care. Vote “no” on the previous question.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request to the gentleman from New York, Mr. ELIOT ENGEL.

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

Mr. ENGEL. I rise in opposition to this amendment. It seems that the openness the new majority promised us lasted half a day. And the more things change, the more they remain the same. I urge my colleagues to vote “no.”

□ 1030

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, if we are able to defeat the previous question, I will move to amend the rule to make in order a bill (H.R. 2378) from the last Congress, the Currency Reform for Fair Trade Act, which invokes our anti-dumping laws and provides relief for American workers and companies injured by unfair exchange rate policies.

I yield to the gentleman from New York for a parliamentary inquiry.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. WEINER. Madam Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. WEINER. Madam Speaker, what is the current whole number of Members of the House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The whole number of the House is 435.

Mr. WEINER. Madam Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. WEINER. Can the Speaker certify that all 435 Members have been correctly and duly sworn and have taken the oath of office as required under the Constitution?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is under the information and belief that all 435 Members have been sworn.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, this is the first act of the 112th Congress, and I have to say that I am particularly gratified that we have had six new Members of this 87-Member Republican class participate in this debate because, Madam Speaker, they have come here with a very, very strong, powerful message from the American people.

That message is that we have to make sure that we create jobs and get our economy back on track.

Even though we have gotten this positive news of the reduction of the unemployment rate from 9.8 to 9.3 percent this morning, tragically last month only 105,000 new jobs were created. That is not enough to sustain our economy. You have to create at least 150,000 jobs just to be treading water.

We know that the American people are continuing to suffer, and the message that has come from the American people through these 87 new Members is that we have to have a laser-like focus on creating jobs, getting our economy back on track, and reducing the size and scope and reach of the Federal Government.

My friend Mr. PENCE and I had an exchange in which we said only in Washington, D.C., can saying that cutting a \$2.7 trillion increase—eliminating that, scrapping that—will, in fact, cost money. It's absolutely crazy, but that is what they are arguing; and through their sleight of hand, with the Congressional Budget Office, they are going to continue to claim that it will somehow save money.

Madam Speaker, we are doing what we told the American people we would do. It is very simple. Beginning last year, we said we would have a very clean up-or-down vote:

Should we maintain this \$2.7 trillion expansion with government mandates and increased taxes, or should we repeal it? That's what we are going to be voting on after the 3-day layover next week; and, Madam Speaker, are we, in fact, committing ourselves to doing everything that we possibly can to ensure that every single American has access to quality, affordable health care and health insurance?

That's what the resolution that I have introduced, H. Res. 9, will do. It will direct the six committees of jurisdiction to begin immediately working on ways in which we can drive the cost of health insurance down.

I personally believe that we need to allow for the purchase of insurance across State lines, which is now forbidden under the McCarran-Ferguson Act. I believe that it is very important for us to have associated health plans so that small businesses can come together and get lower rates. We need to

have pooling to deal with preexisting conditions. We need to expand medical savings accounts. And yes, Madam Speaker, the fifth thing we need to do is we need to have meaningful lawsuit abuse reform so that resources can go towards doctors and not trial lawyers.

These are the kinds of things that these new Members are telling us need to be done, and that is exactly what passage of this rule will make happen.

Now, Madam Speaker, let me say I urge support of this rule, and I urge support of the underlying legislation.

Mr. REYES. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express opposition to the rule and the irresponsible move by the Republicans to dismantle health care reform for millions of Americans. There are a multitude of reasons why I am opposing this rule and why it is an affront to the democratic process, but I will focus on three today.

First, this rule shuts out any attempt to change the Republican proposal. After promising a transparent process and an honest attempt to engage Members across the aisle, Republicans went back on their word and closed the door on any meaningful conversation. Yesterday's Rules Committee meeting serves as an example of the extreme tactics being used by the majority to shut out opposition. Thirty Democratic amendments were submitted for consideration, including several that I co-sponsored, aimed at preserving key consumer protections in the health care reform law. One of the most notable provisions includes prohibiting insurance companies from rescinding an individual's health coverage due to illness or imposing annual or lifetime limits. The Democratic amendments would also preserve access to primary care and the medical loss ratio (MLR) provision. This provision requires insurance companies in the individual and small group markets to spend at least 80 percent of the premiums on medical care and quality improvement activities. Finally, the amendments would prohibit repeal if it increases cost sharing or otherwise reduces access to preventive health benefits such as mammograms, colonoscopies, and diabetes screenings. All 30 Democratic amendments were rejected by the Republicans, leaving no room for dialogue or reform.

My second concern is that Republicans are trying to turn back the clock on the Democratic reforms that have allowed millions of Americans to access affordable quality health care across the country. In my state alone, preliminary estimates suggest that 161,000 young people under the age of 26 will become ineligible to remain on their parents' health insurance, 2.8 million Medicare patients will pay more for preventative services, and 128,682 Medicare recipients will pay higher prescription costs. Moreover, Republicans are ignoring warnings from the non-partisan Congressional Budget Office that repealing the Affordable Care Act will add \$230 billion over the next 10 years to the already massive budget deficit.

Third and most importantly, there is an incredible amount of business to be done, and the American people expect that the Republicans will get to work with Democrats and the President to create jobs and build on the progress of the past two years. Instead of obsessing over the repeal of the health care law, Republicans should focus on revitalizing communities like mine on the border by pass-

ing bills that strengthen infrastructure and security. I urge Republicans to take a look at my PORTS Act as an example of bi-partisan legislation that accomplishes both of these goals and will actually benefit the American people. In short, we need to work together to get it done.

I hope that this rule is not the beginning of a session marked by continual efforts to thwart debate and stifle opposition.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this closed rule.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the rule for the consideration of H.R. 2, the Repealing the Jobs-Killing Health Care Law Act.

Instead of focusing on job creation and other efforts to grow our economy again, House Republicans have set the tone for the beginning of the 112th Congress by attempting to ram through a repeal of the most comprehensive health care reform legislation in our history.

They want to "repeal and replace" the Affordable Care Act, but have yet to share with us and the American people what exactly they want to replace it with.

"Just trust us," they say. Well, their idea of trust is voting to strip middle class, working poor, and other vulnerable Americans of their access to affordable, quality health care now, and worrying about the costs later.

What they call a "job-killing health care law" actually creates much-needed jobs and cuts the deficit.

In fact, according to a preliminary estimate from Director Elmendorf of the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office (CBO), repeal of the Affordable Care Act will explode federal budget deficits by \$230 billion through 2021 and by billions more in the following decade.

The bottom line is that Republicans would rather help themselves by taking away over 32 million Americans' health care than help put our nation back to work.

Simply put, a vote in favor of "repeal and replace" is a vote to:

Take coverage away from young adults looking for jobs, children with pre-existing conditions, and low-income families;

Impose lifetime limits on coverage;

Allow insurance companies to spend more on CEO salaries, bonuses, and corporate profits than health care; and

Increase preventive care and prescription drug costs for seniors under Medicare.

Madam Speaker, yesterday in the Rules Committee, I asked all those in attendance whether their health insurance premiums over the past 20 years had gone down. Not one single person, and that would include my Republican colleagues, raised their hands. Need I say more?

I urge a "no" vote on the rule and underlying bill.

Mr. COSTELLO. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H. Res. 26, a rule to provide for debate on H.R. 2, the Republican attempt to repeal the Affordable Care Act.

In September 2010, the Republican Party offered a "Pledge to America." They outlined their promises to create a more transparent and open Congress; to bring bills to the floor under regular order, following consideration by committee; to allow a bipartisan debate under

open rules allowing any member to come forward and have an up or down vote on amendments to major pieces of legislation; and to reject bills that increase the deficit. Most importantly, Republicans promised to work in the best interest of American families.

Just two days after Republicans have taken over the majority in the House, we are back to business as usual under Republican control. This hypocritical rule violates each promise made by Republicans during their campaign and in the rules they adopted for the 112th Congress.

The rule brings to the floor a bill that has never been considered in committee but will repeal a law that was discussed and debated for over a year in committees in both houses of Congress. That is not the regular order Republicans promised.

Democrats brought 30 amendments to the House Rules Committee, seeking an up or down vote to preserve provisions of the Affordable Care Act that prevent insurance companies from denying coverage for those with pre-existing conditions, from canceling insurance coverage for young adults up to age 26, from dropping individuals when they get sick, from maintaining the Medicare Part D Coverage gap. Not one amendment was made in order. That is not the open and bipartisan debate Republicans promised.

The non-partisan Congressional Budget Office estimates the bill this rule brings to the floor will increase the deficit by \$230 billion over 10 years, a cost Republicans conveniently excused themselves from ever having to pay in their rules for the 112th Congress. That is not the fiscal responsibility Republicans promised.

The rule will bring to the floor a bill that takes away health insurance from 32 million people, raises health insurance premiums for millions of American families, increases out-of-pocket expenses and prescription drug costs for Medicare beneficiaries, and puts control over health care decisions back in the hands of insurance companies. That is not the best interest of America's families and seniors Republicans promised.

For these reasons, I strongly oppose this rule that violates the promises made by Republicans and the promises we each made to represent the best interest of our constituents. I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. DREIER. I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 236, nays 182, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 9]

YEAS—236

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

NAYS—182

Ackerman	Braley (IA)	Clyburn
Altmire	Brown (FL)	Cohen
Andrews	Butterfield	Connolly (VA)
Baca	Capps	Conyers
Baldwin	Capuano	Cooper
Barrow	Cardoza	Costa
Bass (CA)	Carnahan	Costello
Becerra	Carney	Courtney
Berkley	Castor (FL)	Critz
Berman	Chandler	Crowley
Bishop (GA)	Chu	Cuellar
Bishop (NY)	Clarke (MI)	Cummings
Blumenauer	Clarke (NY)	Davis (CA)
Brady (PA)	Clay	DeFazio

DeGette	Langevin	Richardson
DeLauro	Larsen (WA)	Richmond
Deutch	Larson (CT)	Rothman (NJ)
Dicks	Lee (CA)	Roybal-Allard
Dingell	Levin	Ruppersberger
Doggett	Lewis (GA)	Rush
Donnelly (IN)	Lipinski	Ryan (OH)
Doyle	Loeb sack	Sánchez, Linda T.
Edwards	Lofgren, Zoe	Sanchez, Loretta
Ellison	Lujan	Sarbanes
Engel	Lynch	Schakowsky
Eshoo	Markey	Schiff
Farr	Matheson	Schrader
Fattah	Matsui	Schwartz
Filner	McCarthy (NY)	Scott (VA)
Frank (MA)	McCollum	Scott, David
Fudge	McDermott	Serrano
Garamendi	McGovern	Sewell
Giffords	McIntyre	Sherman
Gonzalez	McNerney	Shuler
Green, Al	Meeks	Sires
Green, Gene	Michaud	Slaughter
Gutierrez	Miller (NC)	Smith (WA)
Hanabusa	Miller, George	Speier
Harman	Moore	Stark
Hastings (FL)	Moran	Sutton
Heinrich	Murphy (CT)	Thompson (CA)
Higgins	Nadler	Thompson (MS)
Himes	Napolitano	Tierney
Hinche y	Neal	Tonko
Hinojosa	Olver	Towns
Hirono	Owens	Tsongas
Holden	Pallone	Van Hollen
Holt	Pascarell	Velázquez
Hoyer	Pastor (AZ)	Visclosky
Insl ee	Payne	Walz (MN)
Israel	Pelosi	Wasserman
Jackson (IL)	Perlmutter	Schultz
Jackson Lee	Peters	Waters
(TX)	Peterson	Watt
Johnson (GA)	Pingree (ME)	Waxman
Johnson, E. B.	Polis	Weiner
Kaptur	Price (NC)	Welch
Keating	Quigley	Woolsey
Kildee	Rahall	Wu
Kind	Rangel	Yarmuth
Kissell	Reyes	
Kucinich		

NOT VOTING—16

Austria	Cleaver	Maloney
Barton (TX)	Davis (IL)	Pearce
Black	Grijalva	Smith (NE)
Boswell	Honda	Wilson (FL)
Carson (IN)	Jones	
Cicilline	Long	

□ 1056

Messrs. RUSH, COURTNEY, HOLT, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Messrs. GENE GREEN of Texas, CONYERS, and PASCARELL changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. LUETKEMEYER changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 9 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. WEINER. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 236, noes 181, answered “present” 2, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 10]
 AYES—236

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

NOES—181

Ackerman	Braley (IA)	Cleaver
Altmire	Brown (FL)	Clyburn
Andrews	Butterfield	Cohen
Baca	Capps	Connolly (VA)
Baldwin	Capuano	Conyers
Barrow	Cardoza	Cooper
Bass (CA)	Carnahan	Costa
Becerra	Carney	Costello
Berkley	Carson (IN)	Courtney
Berman	Castor (FL)	Critz
Bishop (GA)	Chandler	Crowley
Bishop (NY)	Chu	Cuellar
Blumenauer	Clarke (NY)	Cummings
Brady (PA)	Clay	Davis (CA)

DeFazio	Langevin	Richmond
DeGette	Larsen (WA)	Rothman (NJ)
DeLauro	Larson (CT)	Ruppersberger
Deutch	Lee (CA)	Rush
Dicks	Levin	Ryan (OH)
Dingell	Lewis (GA)	Sánchez, Linda
Doggett	Lipinski	T.
Donnelly (IN)	Loebsack	Sanchez, Loretta
Doyle	Lofgren, Zoe	Sarbanes
Edwards	Lowey	Schakowsky
Ellison	Lujan	Schiff
Engel	Lynch	Schrader
Eshoo	Markey	Schwartz
Farr	Matheson	Scott (VA)
Fattah	Matsui	Scott, David
Finer	McCarthy (NY)	Serrano
Frank (MA)	McCollum	Sewell
Fudge	McDermott	Sherman
Giffords	McGovern	Shuler
Gonzalez	McNerney	Sires
Green, Al	Meeks	Slaughter
Green, Gene	Michaud	Smith (WA)
Grijalva	Miller (NC)	Speier
Gutierrez	Miller, George	Stark
Hanabusa	Moore	Sutton
Harman	Moran	Thompson (CA)
Hastings (FL)	Murphy (CT)	Thompson (MS)
Heinrich	Nadler	Tierney
Higgins	Napolitano	Tonko
Himes	Neal	Towns
Hincheey	Olver	Tsongas
Hinojosa	Owens	Van Hollen
Hirono	Pallone	Velázquez
Holden	Pascrell	Visclosky
Holt	Pastor (AZ)	Walz (MN)
Hoyer	Payne	Wasserman
Inslee	Pelosi	Schultz
Israel	Perlmutter	Waters
Jackson (IL)	Peters	Watt
Jackson Lee	Peterson	Waxman
(TX)	Pingree (ME)	Weiner
Johnson (GA)	Polis	Welch
Johnson, E. B.	Price (NC)	Wilson (FL)
Kaptur	Quigley	Woolsey
Keating	Rahall	Wu
Kildee	Rangel	Yarmuth
Kind	Reyes	
Kucinich	Richardson	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Fitzpatrick	Sessions
	NOT VOTING—15

Austria	Davis (IL)	Jones
Barton (TX)	Dold	Maloney
Boswell	Garamendi	Pearce
Cicilline	Hayworth	Roybal-Allard
Clarke (MI)	Honda	Smith (NE)

□ 1104

So the resolution was agreed to.
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
 A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I am standing on the floor of the House of Representatives where Members of Congress get sworn in, and I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, under the rules of the House and the United States Constitution, can a committee of the House be presided over by someone who is not a Member of the House of Representatives and who is not a member of that committee?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. No. Only sworn Members may serve on committees.

RELATING TO THE STATUS OF CERTAIN ACTIONS TAKEN BY MEMBERS-ELECT

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 26, I send to

the desk as the designee of the majority leader a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

Mr. WEINER. I reserve a point of order, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The Clerk will report the resolution.
 The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 27

Whereas, Representative-elect Sessions and Representative-elect Fitzpatrick were not administered the oath of office pursuant to the third clause in article VI of the Constitution until after the completion of legislative business on January 6, 2011; and

Whereas, the votes cast by Representative-elect Sessions and Representative-elect Fitzpatrick on rollcalls 3 through 8 therefore were nullities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That—

(1) the votes recorded for Representative-elect Sessions and Representative-elect Fitzpatrick on rollcalls 3 through 8 be deleted and the vote-totals for each of those rollcalls be adjusted accordingly, both in the Journal and in the Congressional Record;

(2) the election of Representative-elect Sessions to a standing committee and his participation in its proceedings be ratified;

(3) the measures delivered to the Speaker for referral by Representative-elect Sessions be considered as introduced and retain the numbers assigned;

(4) any submissions to the Congressional Record by Representative-elect Sessions or Representative-elect Fitzpatrick be considered as valid;

(5) any cosponsor lists naming Representative-elect Sessions or Representative-elect Fitzpatrick be considered as valid; and

(6) any non-voting participation by Representative-elect Sessions or Representative-elect Fitzpatrick in proceedings on the floor be ratified.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. WEINER. Madam Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. WEINER. Madam Speaker, I make a point of order that the consideration of this resolution is in violation of the House rules that we just passed in which a new section was created to rule XXI that required at least 3 days' notice to consider legislation, that it be posted on the Internet and we have a chance to review it. It is particularly important in this case since we're dealing with a constitutional issue, one that is without precedent, and I insist on the point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair must observe that the rule cited applies to bills and joint resolutions; and pursuant to House Resolution 26, all points of order are waived.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. WEINER. Madam Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WEINER. Am I to understand that under the rules that were just passed, they are already exempting this resolution, which is of a question of the interpretation of the Constitution of the United States, that it is already being waived, that that new rule requiring 3 days is already being waived?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The rule that the gentleman cites applies only to bills and joint resolutions.

□ 1110

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 26, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER) each will control 2 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I am the only speaker on my side, so I will reserve the balance of my time.

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

I thought that the chairman was going to say that he was going to be brief. Well, he had no choice with this rule. It's a pretty short one.

I just want to say in the brief 2 minutes that we have here that this is a pretty important issue that we are faced with. And I should say just at the outset that I have the greatest respect for my friend, Mr. SESSIONS. I consider him to be a friend. I hope to get to know Mr. FITZPATRICK as well and to call him a friend as well. But what we are dealing with today is perhaps the most basic test that we have of whether we're going to take legislation seriously.

To the great credit of the maker of this resolution, which we just got, it stipulates right in the first couple of sections, we violated the Constitution on our very first day. The constitutional requirement for oath was violated. And I give you great credit for recognizing that in the resolution.

Now you do say that it created nullities, which is, frankly, a way of saying we operated outside this document on the same day we were reading it. When Mr. SESSIONS and Mr. FITZPATRICK stood up in front of a television set and held their right hand up—not unlike about 2,000 of my constituents, I suspect—they were violating a very important part of these proceedings, and yet we have a grand total of 2 minutes on each side, Mr. DREIER, and to my colleagues, in which to debate how to fix that infirmity.

Mr. SESSIONS presided over the Rules Committee during a large portion in which he was not even a duly sworn Member of the United States Congress. Yet we are doing nothing to go back and see would that participation influence proceedings at all.

I strongly urge my colleagues to vote against this resolution, not because Mr. FITZPATRICK and Mr. SESSIONS are not Members of Congress, they clearly are and I congratulate them, but because for the first time in American history, the first time in the history of this body, we are going to pass a fix of a constitutional infirmity with—wait for it—4 minutes of debate when we didn't have the bill until just now. I strongly urge my colleagues to think about the precedent this sets.

I ask the consent of the chairman for an additional 1 minute so we can have an understanding.

Mr. DREIER. I have no authority to do that. We are living under this rule that was passed by the House.

Mr. WEINER. The gentleman may yield to a unanimous consent request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. WEINER. Only does Mr. DREIER have the ability to accede to a unanimous consent request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from California yield for such a request?

Mr. DREIER. I have my time, and I will be utilizing that, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the fact that my friend from New York has stated his respect for Mr. SESSIONS and Mr. FITZPATRICK.

These two individuals were in this Capitol. They were in this Capitol when they took the oath of office. They didn't happen to be in this exact room. Under the standard of collegiality in Jefferson's Manual, it is indicated that they have to be within the proximity of the Speaker.

Madam Speaker, any Member who does not vote in favor of this resolution is allowing the problem to persist. This resolution rectifies the problem which we all realize has happened. I believe that we have a responsibility to this institution, we have a responsibility to the Constitution, we have a responsibility to the American people, and this resolution rectifies a problem that has existed.

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

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

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. WEINER. Parliamentary inquiry, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WEINER. Madam Speaker, under the rules of the House, are the Members of Congress who are not duly sworn entitled to be paid for the days of service in which they were here and were not sworn in?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not stated a proper parliamentary inquiry.

Pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 26, the previous question is ordered on the resolution.

The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. WEINER. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 257, noes 159,

answered "present" 3, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 11]

AYES—257

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

NOES—159

Ackerman	Bass (CA)	Bishop (GA)
Andrews	Becerra	Bishop (NY)
Baca	Berkley	Blumenauer
Baldwin	Berman	Braley (IA)

Brown (FL)	Holt	Peters
Butterfield	Hoyer	Pingree (ME)
Capps	Inslee	Price (NC)
Capuano	Israel	Quigley
Carnahan	Jackson (IL)	Rahall
Carney	Jackson Lee	Rangel
Carson (IN)	(TX)	Reyes
Chu	Johnson (GA)	Richardson
Clarke (MI)	Kaptur	Richmond
Clarke (NY)	Keating	Royal-Allard
Clay	Kildee	Ruppersberger
Cleaver	Kind	Rush
Clyburn	Kissell	Ryan (OH)
Cohen	Kucinich	Sánchez, Linda
Connolly (VA)	Langevin	T.
Conyers	Larsen (WA)	Sanchez, Loretta
Cooper	Larson (CT)	Sarbanes
Courtney	Lee (CA)	Schakowsky
Crowley	Levin	Schiff
Cummings	Lewis (GA)	Schrader
Davis (CA)	Loebsock	Scott (VA)
DeGette	Lofgren, Zoe	Scott, David
DeLauro	Lowey	Serrano
Deutch	Lujan	Sewell
Dicks	Lynch	Sherman
Dingell	Markey	Sires
Doggett	Matheson	Slaughter
Doyle	Matsui	Smith (WA)
Edwards	McCarthy (NY)	Stark
Ellison	McCollum	Sutton
Engel	McDermott	Thompson (CA)
Eshoo	McGovern	Thompson (MS)
Farr	McIntyre	Tierney
Filner	McNerney	Tonko
Frank (MA)	Meeks	Towns
Fudge	Miller (NC)	Tsongas
Garamendi	Miller, George	Van Hollen
Giffords	Moore	Velázquez
Gonzalez	Moran	Visclosky
Green, Gene	Nadler	Walz (MN)
Grijalva	Napolitano	Wasserman
Gutierrez	Neal	Schultz
Hanabusa	Olver	Waters
Harman	Owens	Waxman
Hastings (FL)	Pallone	Weiner
Heinrich	Pascarell	Welch
Higgins	Pastor (AZ)	Wilson (FL)
Hinchee	Payne	Woolsey
Hinojosa	Pelosi	Wu
Hirono	Perlmutter	Yarmuth

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3

DeFazio Fitzpatrick Sessions

NOT VOTING—15

Austria	Honda	Paul
Barton (TX)	Issa	Pearce
Boswell	Jones	Scalise
Cicilline	Mack	Smith (NE)
Davis (IL)	Maloney	Speier

□ 1132

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. AUSTRIA. Madam Speaker, had I been present for votes, I would have voted for the previous question and for adoption of the rule to repeal the Democrats' job-killing health care law, and for H. Res. 27.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HONDA. Madam Speaker, on Friday, January 7th, I was unavoidably detained on account of official business in California and was not present for three rollcall votes on that day.

Had I been present I would have voted: "Nay" on rollcall No. 9 on ordering the previous question on H. Res. 26; "nay" on rollcall No. 10 on passage of H. Res. 26, rule providing for consideration of H.R. 2, Patients Rights Repeal Act, H. Res. 9, Instructing certain committees to report legislation replacing the Affordable Care Act, and H. Res. 27, Ses-

sion/Fitzpatrick Clean up Resolution; and "nay" on rollcall No. 11 on passage of H. Res. 27, Session/Fitzpatrick Clean up Resolution.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Speaker, I regret my absence in the House today as I was in my district attending to personal business. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on rollcall votes 9, 10, and 11.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 7, 2011.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Under Clause 2(g) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I herewith designate Robert Reeves, Deputy Clerk, to sign any and all papers and do all other acts for me under the name of the Clerk of the House which they would be authorized to do by virtue of this designation, except such as are provided by statute, in case of my temporary absence or disability.

This designation shall remain in effect for the 112th Congress or until modified by me. With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS,
Clerk of the House.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I congratulate the gentleman from Virginia on his election as majority leader of his party. He and I have had the opportunity to work together over the recent years. It's been a positive relationship, and I look forward to continuing that positive relationship, albeit in my diminished status.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland for those kind remarks. I want to also reiterate my pleasure of being able to develop a positive working relationship with him, understanding full well there will be disagreements, but there is probably a lot more that we can agree on, and I look forward to exploring those avenues. I want to congratulate him on his election to the position of Democratic whip, and I look forward to working in this relationship. I know that these roles have been reversed now in these colloquies, so I look forward to that as well.

Madam Speaker, on Monday, the House is not in session. On Tuesday, the House will meet at 12 p.m. for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business, with votes postponed until 6:30 p.m. On Wednesday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legisla-

tive business. On Thursday and Friday, the House will not be in session to accommodate the Republican retreat.

On Tuesday, we will consider at least one bill under suspension of the rules, which will be announced later today. We will also begin consideration of H.R. 2, the Repealing the Job-Killing Health Care Law Act. I expect the House to complete debate on H.R. 2 Wednesday afternoon.

Also, on Wednesday, Madam Speaker, the House will consider H. Res. 9, instructing certain committees to report legislation replacing the job-killing health care law.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for outlining the schedule. There was an interesting article in The Washington Post today about your job-killing comments always being attached to the health care bill. There are obviously some of us who know full well that was not part of the title, as I'm sure the gentleman would admit, and that in fact it does not do that at all. In fact, we think it creates jobs. But, in any event, I thank the gentleman for announcing the schedule.

I want to say we're disappointed, however, as he was when he was in my position, that we don't have a committee process for this very important piece of legislation. I think it's important from your perspective and it's important from our perspective, although we may have different perspectives on whether it should pass or fail. But it is an important piece of legislation. There was no committee process and no hearings; no opportunity for the public to be heard on the bill; no opportunity for the Members to testify with respect to that bill; no witnesses were heard. Furthermore, under the rule, of course we have been given no opportunity to amend.

The gentleman, when he was in my position, repeatedly indicated how disappointed he was that there were no amendments allowed on certain bills. I want to reiterate that concern. And given the lack of amendments, I want to clarify when he believes will be the finishing of votes on Wednesday. I understand debate will begin on Tuesday and it will conclude on Wednesday.

Mr. CANTOR. I would ask the gentleman to repeat the question.

Mr. HOYER. What time do you expect to conclude business on Wednesday?

Mr. CANTOR. I would say to the gentleman, Madam Speaker, that it is our intention to conclude by 7 p.m. on Wednesday.

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

In light of the fact that your side has made a pledge to allow ample time for Members to read and consider it, and notwithstanding that they have already not pursued that as vigorously as I think you would have hoped and perhaps we would have hoped as well in the 112th Congress, I was wondering if the gentleman can enlighten us on what he expects to consider the rest of January, after next week, so that

Members might have opportunities to anticipate issues that you're going to be bringing forward.

Mr. CANTOR. As to the inquiry about openness and the ability for Members to have time to read the bills as well as for the public to realize its right to know, we on our side believe in making sure there is that adequate time, and we posted on Monday legislation coming to the floor for this week and next. So I would say to the gentleman from Maryland, Madam Speaker, that it is our intention to uphold our commitment to the 3-day rule to allow for the public's right to know, as well as Members themselves to understand, what it is we're voting for.

As to the gentleman's comments regarding the up-or-down vote on ObamaCare repeal, if the gentleman has looked at the postings online, he will know that the repeal resolution is a page and a half. This is a repeal of a bill that was the subject of significant legislative time and other over the course of the last 2 years. It is clear that the public has litigated and, in essence, has decided its position on that bill, given the results of November's election.

□ 1140

It comes down to whether you are for ObamaCare or you are against it. That is what the vote is.

Again, a page and a half is what the bill is, so we have committed to continuing in the vein of an open process when it comes to trying to get it right as far as replacing the health care status quo. We have committed and the Speaker has committed to making sure that our committees will go through regular order. Members of the minority and majority will have ample time to engage and participate in the discussions around what type of health care Americans deserve and what type of health care they want, which is how we will proceed when it comes to the so-called "replacement" resolution and its implementation.

I would also point out to the gentleman from Maryland that the Rules Committee has accepted the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Utah as far as a suggestion that he had regarding the SGR formula and the reimbursements for physicians under the Medicare program.

Again, we are trying to work in a fashion that is as open and as inclusive as we can. As the Speaker said in his remarks—and he was correct—we had no open rules under the last Congress. We intend for that not to be the case here. I know that the gentleman joins me in the desire for us to be able to work together, and we believe that that will provide the best way forward for that.

As to the gentleman's question about the remainder of January, Madam Speaker, we intend to focus on the theme of this Congress, which is "cut and grow." We are going to be talking about ways to cut spending. We are

going to live up to our commitment to bring a spending cut bill to the floor each and every week, Madam Speaker.

We also intend to focus on what it is that is impeding job growth in the economy, and we will be asking our committees to begin focusing on regulations that are being promulgated and pursued throughout the administration and its agencies that are precluding job growth. It is our hope, though, Madam Speaker, that these committees—our committees—will be fully organized by the end of the month so we can begin a process of regular order.

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

Obviously, the health care bill that he and his party seek to repeal had probably more consideration, more open debate, more transparency, more amendments, and more hearings than almost any bill that I have considered as a Member of this Congress over the last three decades—full and open consideration, amendments offered from both sides in committee on a very ample basis; but I am glad to hear that you agree that there has been ample debate time for that. There has not been any debate time in committees—or amendments—on the repeal of that law.

I am certainly hopeful that the gentleman does not mean to say that if the majority party concludes that the American people have already decided on the issue that that will be the exception to the rule that you have put forth in terms of full and ample notice, debate, the amendment process, and transparency. I would certainly hope that that would not be the case. I don't expect it will be the case, and I hope it won't be.

Let me say in addition that I am very pleased that the majority party allowed in order the amendment by Mr. MATHESON. As you know, we tried to have a permanent fix to the reimbursement of doctors who took Medicare patients. Unfortunately, the minority party in the Senate, which had the opportunity to do that, precluded us from accomplishing that objective. So I am pleased. That needs to be done. We need to have a stable funding expectation by doctors when they provide services to Medicare patients—to seniors—as we want them to do and as we want them to continue to do. So I am pleased that you allowed that amendment, and I would hope Members on your side will be supporting that amendment as we will on this side.

Let me ask you now, Mr. Majority Leader, as I am very concerned, and I expressed this on the floor. Your rules, in my view, provide for some \$5 trillion to be incurred in additional deficits. They allow that because you have exempted almost all of the possible reductions in revenues—tax cuts, reductions in revenues—withstanding no reduction in spending. Well, if you reduce revenues and you don't reduce spending commensurately, inevitably, you will create large deficits, which in-

evitably will be paid by future generations.

That has been the experience that, again, I have had when we had significant tax cuts in the 1980s and in the last decade of 2000–2001 to 2003—when we created very large deficits.

My presumption is that you will be finding commensurate reductions in spending to your tax cuts that you will want to continue. If you don't do that, deficits will inevitably follow. The majority party has not done that in years past. Is it your expectation that that will occur in the future?

The question I want to ask you as well is that you have provided in your rules for essentially ignoring CBO scores—the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, which has issued a preliminary score for the Republican Patients' Bill of Rights. They believe it will increase the deficit by \$230 billion in the first 10 years by repeal and \$1.2 trillion in the second 10 years.

My question is: Having deemed in the rule today a provision allowing the chair of the Budget Committee, Mr. RYAN, to ignore the CBO score, will the majority continue to ignore CBO scores on legislation for the rest of Congress or will we be fiscally responsible, in my view, and adhere to the advice and counsel we receive from CBO?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the Democratic whip.

Madam Speaker, I respond to his first question by saying that Washington doesn't have a revenue problem; it has a spending problem. We believe that it is better to allow folks to keep more of their hard-earned money so we can see a return to growth in our economy, and we are dedicated to making sure we deal with the spending problem here in Washington.

As I said before to the gentleman, we are intending and will bring to the floor each and every week a bill to cut spending. We are very focused, as you know, on bringing spending down to 2008 levels to make sure that we are abiding by our commitment to live according to the same rules that everyone else does. While businesses and families are living within their means and tightening their belts, there is no reason in the world that Washington can't as well. I am sure the gentleman agrees with me on that.

As for the issue surrounding the CBO, the issue that we have and the dispute we have is not with the Congressional Budget Office. The CBO score is what is put in front of them, and the reality is the ObamaCare bill, Madam Speaker, relied on smoke and mirrors and budgetary shell games in order to present the picture that it presents or alleges to represent.

Madam Speaker, there is nothing that has changed about the flawed assumptions underlying the old score of the ObamaCare bill. Only the dates have changed. These are the same gimmicks, producing more false deficit reduction and, in fact, real spending increases. In fact, as the gentleman

knows, Medicare's chief actuary says that the ObamaCare bill represents a maze of mandates, tax hikes, and subsidies that will push costs up. The bottom line, Madam Speaker, is we need to stop arguing about "inside baseball" budget gimmicks.

□ 1150

There's no question that a new, open-ended entitlement program will grow unsustainably fast, will drive costs up, and could potentially bankrupt this Federal Government, as well as our States.

Mr. HOYER. I want to say to my friend, the continuing rhetoric is Washington doesn't have a revenue problem, it has a spending problem. Americans in every family that I know understand that their revenues directly impact on their spending and vice versa, and if they don't, they have a real problem. If they don't have enough revenue to meet their expenditures, they've got a problem, and if their spending exceeds their revenue, they have a problem.

I tell my friend, I understand what you're saying, and I've heard this rhetoric all of my career here in the Congress. When President Reagan was President, we never overrode a Presidential veto of an appropriation bill because it spent too much. If he vetoed it, it spent too much, he never had a veto overridden. Nevertheless, we incurred an additional \$1.5 trillion in deficits. Under President George H.W. Bush, we didn't override any veto of his, and we incurred an additional \$1 trillion. That was \$2.5 trillion plus.

Under the Clinton administration, of course, in the economic program as you and I both know that your party universally opposed, we had a surplus, the only President in your lifetime and I think in mine, which is substantially longer, that's had 4 years of surplus. Now, I know you say, the response that Mr. DREIER gave to me, is that, well, yes, we took over the Congress in 1995. That's correct. And of course not only did you take over the Congress in 1995, but in 2000, you took over the Presidency as well and controlled the House and the Senate and the Presidency.

And during that period of time, we didn't pass any appropriation bills on our side. You were in full charge during the Bush administration's first six years, and \$3.5 trillion of deficit spending was incurred, making a total of over \$5 trillion of deficit spending during the time that your party took the position that we didn't have a revenue problem, we had a spending problem.

Well, it ended up being a \$5 trillion deficit problem, adding to the deficit for our children and for my grandchildren and for my great-granddaughter, and I'm concerned about that. And that is why I'm so concerned about statutory PAYGO, sticking with CBO scores, and accommodating our spending and revenue. They are both related, obviously, and to ignore that eliminating revenue without eliminating spending does cause deficits I think is to ignore reality.

So I would hope my friend would talk to Mr. RYAN of the Budget Committee and bring us legislation which would, in fact, do what you and I want to do; that is, eliminate the deficit. If we've got two messages during this past election, in my view, it was, A, focus on creating jobs. We've got to get to work. Americans are hurting. We had some good job numbers this month. We've created over 1.3 million jobs this past year as opposed to losing almost 4 million jobs in the last year of the Bush administration. That's progress. But as I've said so often, it's not success. Success will be when every American who wants a job, willing to work, can find a job, and they can support him or her and their families.

But we need to not pretend that revenues and spending are not inextricably related, and that if we give up revenues before we do the difficult thing, the tough thing, the adult thing, as Mr. BOEHNER said, and cut the spending, then cut the revenues if Americans are buying it, then we ought to be paying for it and not passing along the bill to our grandchildren, and I would hope the gentleman would pursue that.

If the gentleman wants to respond to that, I want to say something about health care briefly.

Mr. CANTOR. You know, Madam Speaker, the gentleman and I have gone through these discussions for the last 2 years, and when we get into discussing the past, I normally posit a quote from Winston Churchill when he said, If we open a quarrel between the past and the present, we shall find we have lost the future.

And what my response is, Madam Speaker, we are looking to see that we do take the tough steps and cut spending. So I'm hopeful with all the renewed enthusiasm that all of us have gained after the election towards fiscal sanity that the gentleman and his caucus can join us and vote with us in terms of the spending cuts that we'll be bringing to the floor every week.

The gentleman speaks about revenues, and absolutely, as an ongoing concern, this government has to be concerned with that. But we first and foremost must understand—and I think both of us realize, Madam Speaker, that in order to have revenues, we've got to have a growing economy—and so there is balance, and that is where perhaps our two visions diverge, but it is my hope that we can work together by putting priorities in place, cutting spending, growing the economy. And that's the formula by which we will be operating, and I'm hopeful we can operate in that formula together.

Mr. HOYER. I appreciate the gentleman's comment, and briefly in closing, Madam Speaker, let me say this. I hope we can cooperate, but we do have a divergence, as my friend pointed out, and that's of course the nature of what the House of Representatives does, debates different points of view. Frankly, my experience, as I have said, is that when we diverged in a point of view in 1993,

when my Republican friends took the position that accommodating revenues to spending would, in fact, from their perspective, be a job killer—they talk a lot about job-killing legislation. They all voted against that legislation in 1993, and in fact, some of my colleagues on my side of the aisle lost their election because of voting for that piece of legislation. In fact, however, it helped create the most robust economy anybody in this Chamber has experienced in their lifetime. It created over 22 million jobs, as opposed to losing 8 million jobs in the last administration under President Bush, so that there was a substantial difference which you can see, touch, and feel and read about and know about.

So I tell my friend, yes, there's a difference of opinion, but there's no difference of opinion on what happened, and when Winston Churchill, who you quoted before and of whom I'm a great fan, one of the things that Winston Churchill was most known for was trying to remind his British friends: don't forget what dictators and despots do—and I make no aspersions, I want to make that clear. I'm simply saying he believed strongly in learning from the past and not continuing to make mistakes and not continue to do what failed in years before.

So I agree with the gentleman in looking at the past for instruction on how to make the future better and to create those jobs that both he and I want to create and that America certainly is looking for us to create.

I thank the gentleman for this colloquy.

—

HOURLY MEETING

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

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

There was no objection.

□ 1200

—

COLOMBIA FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

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

Mr. RIVERA. Madam Speaker, I rise today for the first time to address the House and express my strong support for passage of a free trade agreement with Colombia. Colombia is America's fourth-largest trading partner in Latin America, and the U.S. Department of Commerce estimates that 9,000 American companies trade with Colombia, most of which are small businesses and many of which operate in my district in south Florida.

While 90 percent of Colombian goods enter the U.S. duty free, American

companies still pay tariffs for U.S. goods to enter Colombia. The Colombia Free Trade Agreement would eliminate obstacles and immediately boost U.S. exports to Colombia. By passing a free trade agreement with Colombia, U.S. GDP would increase by roughly \$2.5 billion and exports by over \$1 billion, creating thousands of jobs in the United States. The Colombia Free Trade Agreement is also a positive foreign policy gesture to one of our most reliable allies in the region and the oldest continuously functioning democracy in all of South America.

Madam Speaker, it's time to stand with one of our best allies in Latin America and create thousands of jobs here at home with passage of a Colombia Free Trade Agreement.

NO HEALTH CARE REPEAL

(Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am wondering whether many people understand what we did today. Frankly, we gave permission for more Americans to die from a lack of good health care. In fact, as I presented my amendments to the Rules Committee last evening, I was reminded, if you will, of those who really suffer because of a lack of access to good health care. I offered an amendment to ensure that H.R. 2, to repeal this good health care bill, would not eliminate what we call community health clinics and deny rural and urban areas of good doctors and nurses who treat the children and seniors. And then I asked that we protect the middle class and not have the insurance rates go up. And finally, an amendment to make sure that we don't have Medicaid and Medicare fraud and abuse and to protect those who need Medicaid, as my State of Texas is going to eliminate it. So people will die as we proceed in this untimely and ludicrous process.

But I'm glad that Pastor D.Z. Cofield in my district will ascend to the presidency of the NAACP in our local community. I believe with all of these good thinking people, we will be able to rise up and save the lives and oppose any repeal of this good affordable care bill.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FLEISCHMANN). 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.

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

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

THE WOLF IN SHEEP'S CLOTHING FOLLIES ACT OF 2011

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, those who are watching this today may wonder what just happened in the House of Representatives. And I want to talk a little bit about it so they understand what goes on next week on the floor of this House. Today we set the stage for the passage of the Republican health care plan. It won't be a repeal of what the Democratic Congress did before. It will be returning us to the status quo where the health care insurance industry in this country is totally in control of the private insurance industry.

Now, yesterday I was on a conference call with groups that represent 18,000 physicians who want us not to act and repeal the Affordable Health Care Act next week. They have taken resolutions in every district around this country among physicians. They have delivered them to the Speaker's Office, Mr. BOEHNER in Cincinnati. They have taken them to Mr. CANTOR's office in Virginia. Because doctors know what this act really does.

I listened to a couple of my colleagues who are physicians, and I heard them say they wanted to repeal it all. But the 18,000 physicians who I was talking to, or their representatives, on the phone yesterday were talking about what the real experience is out in the doctors' offices, not on the floor of the House or not in some political arena where we are making points, but when you are actually dealing with patients.

I am a physician. I have been there. I have done it also. I have had phone calls from Omaha, Nebraska, about whether I could continue to see a patient. And every doctor who has practiced in this country in the last 30 years knows that is what goes on. They know that patients don't have health insurance because they have a pre-existing condition. They know that people who thought they had insurance suddenly get an illness and then find out their insurance company won't cover them because of some technicality or whatever they find. They worry about their own children who finish college at age 21 or 22 and can no longer be covered on their insurance policy. But with the bill that we passed last year, those young people can be covered from age 22 to 26 until they get a job where they have health care benefits. Those are the reasons why doctors want to see this bill stay in place and be enacted.

Now, what we're going to see out here next week is political theater. I call it the Wolf in Sheep's Clothing Follies Act of 2011. We have a piece of legislation which we weren't told about today. It is exactly one page long and repeals everything that happened. It

repeals the prohibition against pre-existing condition exclusions. It allows insurers to no longer cover children over the age of 22. It sets lifetime limits again on people's insurance policies. All of that occurs here in one single piece of paper, with no debate, no committee hearings, no effort to find out what's going on out there in the community. It's a political document for a political purpose for a part of the Republican Party. It is not what the American people are actually feeling.

Now, what you will hear next week is even more interesting because we are going to get a fraudulent piece of legislative hot air. They will say, Well, yes, we are repealing ObamaCare. You know, it's strange. They never call Medicare "Johnson Medicare." It passed under President Johnson. I wonder why not. Because it was for all Americans. It's not the President. It's the body that sits here that passes the legislation that covers all Americans. And yet we are now, next week, going to be offered this piece of fraudulent hot air. It's House Resolution 9. They will say, Yes, we're repealing that, but we have this.

□ 1210

And when you read H. Res. 9, it's one page of nothing. Read it. You've got the weekend.

THE U.S. FOREST SERVICE

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, much of my district comprises forests managed by the U.S. Forest Service. Over the last 2 years, I have received a growing volume of complaints protesting the increasingly exclusionary and elitist policies of this agency. These complaints charge the Forest Service, among other things, with imposing inflated fees that are forcing the abandonment of family cabins held for generations, charging exorbitant new fees that are closing down long-established community events upon which many small and struggling mountain towns depend for tourism, expelling longstanding grazing operations on specious grounds, causing damage both to the local economy and to the Federal Government's revenues, and obstructing the sound management of our forests through a policy that can only be described as benign neglect, creating both severe fire dangers and massive unemployment.

Practiced in the marketplace, we would renounce these taxes as predatory and abusive. In the public sector, they are intolerable.

Combined, these actions evince an ideologically driven hostility to the public's enjoyment of the public's land and a clear intention to deny the public the responsible and sustainable use of that land.

Most recently, the Forest Service has placed severe restrictions on vehicle access to the Plumas National Forest, despite volumes of public protests. Supervisor Bill Connelly, chairman of the Butte County Board of Supervisors writes that “the restriction applies to such activities as collecting firewood, retrieving game, loading or unloading horses or other livestock and camping.”

He goes on to write: “The national forests are part of the local fabric. The roads within the national forests are used by thousands of residents and visitors for transportation and recreation. These activities generate revenue for our rural communities which is critical for their survival.”

Mr. Speaker, this is not a small matter. The Forest Service now controls 193 million acres within our Nation, a land area equivalent to the size of Texas.

During the despotic eras of Norman and Plantagenet England, the Crown declared one-third of the land area of southern England to be the royal forest, the exclusive preserve of the monarch, his forestry officials and favored aristocrats. The people of Britain were forbidden access to and enjoyment of these forests under harsh penalties. This exclusionary system became so despised by the British people that in 1215 no less than five clauses of the Magna Carta were devoted to redress of grievances that are hauntingly similar to those that are now flooding my office.

Mr. Speaker, the attitude that now permeates the U.S. Forest Service from top to bottom is becoming far more reminiscent of the management of the royal forests during the autocracy of King John than of an agency that is supposed to encourage, welcome, facilitate and maximize the public’s use of the public’s land in a Nation of free men and free women.

After all, that was the vision of the Forest Service set forth by its legendary founder, Gifford Pinchot, in 1905: “To provide the greatest amount of good for the greatest amount of people in the long run.”

In May of 2009 and April of 2010, some of my California colleagues and I sent letters to the Forest Service expressing these concerns. I’ve also personally met with senior officials of that agency on several occasions in which I have referenced more than 500 specific complaints of Forest Service abuses received by my office.

All that I have received to date from these officials are smarmy assurances that they will address these concerns, assurances that their own actions have belied at every turn.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for Congress to conduct a top-to-bottom review of the abuses by this increasingly unaccountable and elitist agency to demand accountability for the damage it has done and is doing to our forests’ health, to the public’s trust, to the government’s revenues and to the Na-

tion’s economy, and to take whatever actions are necessary to restore an attitude of consumer-friendly public service, which was Gifford Pinchot’s original vision, and for which the U.S. Forest Service was once renowned and respected.

HEALTH CARE ACT—SIGNED WITH BLOOD, SWEAT AND TEARS

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

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I was there when the President of the United States of America signed into law the health care act that is sought to be repealed. I was within 20 feet or so of the President; and at the time he signed it, there was a feeling of great jubilation, but also there was a feeling of great consternation because, as he signed it, in ink, I knew that it was written in tears, written in the tears of the many parents who saw their children with preexisting conditions and could not get insurance for the illness that their children had; signed in ink, written in tears, but it was also written in sweat, the sweat of the many persons who toiled for more than 50 years to get health care for all Americans; signed in ink, written in sweat, tears and in blood, written in the blood of the millions of people who suffered because they couldn’t get health care, and also of the many who died because they could not get the insurance that would afford them health care.

I was there. I knew what the circumstances were. At the time the bill was signed, we were spending \$2.5 trillion per year on health care; \$2.5 trillion is \$79,000 a second on health care. That was approximately 17.6 percent of our GDP. And by 2018 it would have become \$4.4 trillion per year, which would have been more than 20 percent of GDP and \$139,000 a second. Signed in ink, written in blood, sweat and tears.

I knew where we were at the time it was signed. In my State, we had 6 million uninsured, 1.1 million in Harris County, and 20 percent of the children in Texas uninsured when that bill was signed. Still in America we have millions that are not getting the proper attention that they need, but there is the potential to get it because of this bill.

At the time it was signed, we had more than 40 million people uninsured. The bill covered some 30-plus million people. We had 21 million people who were working full-time and did not have insurance; 45,000 people per year were dying because they didn’t have insurance. That’s one person every 12 minutes. Twenty-one million people were working full-time and did not have insurance. That bill brought people under the umbrella of health care and health insurance.

The greatness of America is not going to be measured by how many

great buildings we build and how many people we can cut out of health care. It’s not going to be measured by the people that we can put in the streets of life. The greatness of America will be measured by how we treat people in the streets of life. This bill addresses people in the streets of life, real people who can die because they don’t get the health care that the richest country in the world can provide.

□ 1220

I respect those who vote however they choose. But as for me, I am going to stand with those people who need health care and who are going to get it under this bill because preexisting conditions no longer exist.

And for edification purposes, for those who do not know, pregnancy was a preexisting condition at the time the bill was signed. For those who do not know, children under the age of 26, many of them required to get health care because they couldn’t stay on their parents’ policies, they can now stay with their parents. The doughnut hole for seniors is being closed with this bill. The doughnut hole, for edification purposes, is that point in time when a senior has to pay for all of the pharmaceuticals that a senior might receive and need. And these pharmaceuticals are expensive. This bill addresses these things.

This bill is a lifeline for many persons in this country. I will support it and I will say more about it in the future. I stand with the American people who need health care.

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.)

REINTRODUCTION OF TITLE X ABORTION PROVIDER PROHIBITION ACT

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

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, the largest abortion provider in America should not also be the largest recipient of Federal funding under title X.

Today, with the support of more than 120 of my colleagues, I introduced the Title X Abortion Provider Prohibition Act. I am grateful for the support of my colleagues within this House and the support of millions of Americans who long to see this Congress take this decisive action on behalf of our values.

The Title X Abortion Provider Prohibition Act would deny any family planning funds under title X from going to Planned Parenthood or other organizations that perform abortions. It would

ensure that abortion providers are not subsidized with Federal tax dollars.

Now, let me say, to be very clear, Mr. Speaker, this legislation does not cut one penny from title X family planning funding. I applaud much of the important work that is done at title X clinics across this country: breast cancer screening, HIV protection, education, counseling, pregnancy diagnosis. This legislation simply prevents family planning funding from aiding organizations that profit from the abortion industry.

Federal funding should reflect the priorities and the values of a majority of the American people. Whatever people think about abortion across this country since *Roe v. Wade*, survey after survey has shown that an overwhelming majority of Americans oppose the use of taxpayer dollars to support, subsidize, or promote abortion at home or abroad. It is for that reason that I would assume that most Americans would be surprised, if not shocked, to learn that the largest abortion provider in America is also the largest recipient of Federal funding under title X. But that is most certainly the case.

According to their own annual report, Planned Parenthood received more than \$363 million in government funding in 2009 alone. During that time, they performed an unprecedented 324,008 abortions, a heartbreaking statistic. Planned Parenthood of America continues to receive a greater amount of Federal funding each year while simultaneously taking over an increasing share of the devastating abortion market in this country.

Now, look, Planned Parenthood and its defenders will claim that the money they have received from the government has not been used to fund abortions, but that is only technically true. Current law prohibits the use of title X family planning funds "in programs where abortion is a method of family planning." Therein lies the loophole.

While title X money cannot directly be used to fund abortions, common sense says there is no question that taxpayer dollars received by Planned Parenthood are used to cover allowed expenses, like overhead, operational costs, thus freeing up other money for the clinics that do provide abortion. And in many of our largest cities, title X clinics run by Planned Parenthood are literally just steps away from abortion clinics operated by Planned Parenthood, many times in the same building.

This legislation would close that loophole that has forced millions of pro-life Americans to subsidize the Nation's leading abortion provider sustaining and underwriting this nefarious trade.

I urge my colleagues to support the Title X Abortion Provider Prohibition Act. I urge our new majority to bring this legislation forward with all deliberative speed.

Let me say again. The largest abortion provider in America should not

also be the largest recipient of Federal funding under title X.

For the sake of American taxpayers, for the sake of the important work being done at title X clinics across this country, and, most importantly, for the sake of the defenseless unborn and vulnerable young women who find themselves in a crisis pregnancy, we must enact the Title X Abortion Provider Prohibition Act and end the day of taxpayer support for these organizations.

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

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

CAMPAIGN FUNDRAISING AND SPENDING IS OUT OF CONTROL

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, campaign fundraising and spending is way out of control. We need a constitutional amendment to fix it. The American people have to help this Congress, because it will not do it by itself.

Many years ago, Will Rogers, whose statue sits just outside the doors to this Chamber, joked, "We have the best Congress money can buy." Unfortunately, that joke has not grown old.

After witnessing this past election cycle, the campaign money expended to elect this Congress, both Chambers, is way out of bounds. The Center for Responsive Politics estimates that a record-breaking \$4 billion was spent in the 2010 midterm elections.

Now, \$4 billion equals 4,000 millions. So 4,000 millions was spent to elect the current sitting Congress. The number of Members being elected didn't change. The amount of money being raised changed. It skyrocketed. The opportunity for people of ordinary means with great talent to gain election to office in our country is disappearing election after election. It's very hard for talented people of ordinary means to raise 4,000 millions.

To put that number in perspective, 4 billion, or 4,000 millions, divides up to about \$8.5 million spent on each of the 435 seats in this Chamber and those who are up for election in the other; \$8,500,000 having to be raised every 2 years. Yes, an average of \$8.5 million per Member was expended in each of the races. That is 50 times more than the amount of money the job pays. We would be better off to say to the American people, "We're going to get rid of all of this campaign donation stuff and just beg our salaries from the public." It would be a lot cheaper, and we wouldn't have to spend it on all those ridiculous ads. Imagine the outrageous amount of fundraising that sits on the

head of every single Member in this Chamber.

This past congressional election, in fact, was more expensive than even the last Presidential cycle in which \$2 billion was spent. And they said that that was the most expensive race in U.S. history, and Wall Street financiers were the major contributor in that Presidential race.

How is it that as our country is fighting to recover from near economic collapse and the average American is struggling to make ends meet, with national unemployment still at 9.4 percent, somehow billions and billions of dollars were able to be thrown by big interests to affect the election? It is because, unlike the average American, big financial players, big business, multinational corporations, all kinds of well-funded ideological groups have deep pockets, and they do try to buy access and influence what happens. And this situation makes it much more difficult for ordinary Americans to have their voices heard here.

□ 1230

The American people know this. They are frustrated. These big interests should not outweigh the American people's voice nor vote. The American people should have the primary access and influence here, not deep-pocketed interests. Truly the American campaign finance system is out of control. We all know it, and we all know it needs to be fixed, and that ought to be a priority of this new Congress.

Real campaign finance reform thus far has been unattainable because neither party wants to stop the money chase because they both think that next time out they might be the ones to really grab all those gold rings. Too much of that money is playing insider politics, and that is why the American people feel that they are being forced to the sidelines rather than the front lines in our elections. They feel like they are pushing a big boulder up the hill, and every time they cast their vote, that somehow that boulder comes right back down on them.

Reform is being thwarted again and again by outside interest groups and deep-pocket interests. The Congress is unwilling and seemingly unable to act on its own, along with Supreme Court rulings like *Citizens United v. FEC* and *Buckley v. Valeo*.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H.R. 8, a new constitutional amendment that I put in every session to bring this system under control. There could be no more important priority to our country than giving our politics back to the American people again.

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

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

MARINE FIGHTS FOR OLD GLORY

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. Mr. Speaker, history, heritage and symbols of the United States are constantly under criticism in this country. Even yesterday when we read the Constitution of the United States on the House floor, the first time it has ever been done in 200 years, there were some who complained that it is irrelevant. It is kind of like folks in church that cover their ears when certain sections of the Bible are read. They don't want to hear it because it may apply to them.

People go to court nowadays to try to remove our national motto, In God We Trust. It is above the flag, Mr. Speaker, although television very seldom shows our national motto.

Then there are those who are offended by the American flag, Old Glory. It is not even displayed in parts of the United States because it offends some people. Some people that are included in the group are foreigners who are offended by the American flag.

Now we get to today, a report by the Houston Chronicle about Marine Michael Merola, a 60-year-old vet from the United States Marine Corps, and he flies, here he is, he still looks like a Marine, this is a photograph from the Chronicle that shows Old Glory and, of course, the Marine flag, flying in his backyard on a 20-foot flagpole.

No one has complained. His neighbors like it. Kids walk by and actually compliment him on flying Old Glory and the Marine flag. But the neighborhood association has complained and sued.

Now, who is this guy? Well, he served in the United States Marines from 1969 to 1977. He trained with the United States Navy SEALs. After he left the Marine Corps, he was responsible as sergeant of the guard for raising the flag at NSA right down the road. He is from New York, but he got to Texas as fast as he could, and he has no intention of taking down this flag or flagpole. He is a passionate American. He is a marine.

But the association doesn't like it, and here is what they have said in their lawsuit: the flagpole is a detriment to the association. It causes imminent harm and irreparable injury to the association. The problem with the flagpole of that height and that significance is it flaps in the wind and causes noise to other homeowners. That is their problem. So they sued him.

Now, first of all, we have an issue of freedom of speech. The Supreme Court has said it is a right to fly the flag. Speech includes the flying of the American flag. It is the symbol of everything that is good and right about America. That is why it is behind you, Mr. Speaker, when we go into session every day.

Marines and sailors and soldiers and members of the Coast Guard have fought under that flag all over the

world and have died for that flag so the association can exist down there in northwest Houston. Right now we are engaged in two wars, in Afghanistan and Iraq, and members of our military are fighting under that flag. But it is flying in the breeze and offends the association because the flapping causes irreparable injury.

Well, flapping in the breeze has brought safety to the United States. The flag flying throughout the world and the noise, if we can use that word, the sound of freedom, is the sound of that flag flying in the United States and throughout the world. It is freedom of speech, and it trumps the elitist concept that the flag and the flagpole are offensive to the association.

You know, Mr. Merola is a marine. Once a marine, always a marine. And we are proud of our marines in the United States. They are a unique bunch. That was best said by an Army general about the Marines, "There are only two groups that understand the marines—the marines, and the enemy." And that is correct.

So good for you, Mike Merola. Keep your flagpole up. Fly Old Glory. Fly the marine flag. We are proud of you. Keep fighting for the flag, because freedom of flying the flag trumps the concept that it is offensive to some people.

God bless our marines, God bless you, Mike Merola, and semper fi.

And that's just the way it is.

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.)

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.)

HEALTH CARE AND OTHER ISSUES

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I very much appreciate the privilege to address you here on the floor of the House in this leadership hour designated by the majority leader.

There are a number of subjects I wanted to take up this afternoon, but I am first inspired by the statement made by the gentleman from Texas, Judge, Congressman, Mr. POE, about Marine Mike Merola.

This is one of these recurring stories that we hear across the country. Somebody that is an ACLU individual, some-

body that thinks somehow they get indignant because there is something somewhere that would allow them to vent some of their prepackaged hyperventilation against patriotism or the truth or life or the Constitution or the Declaration of Independence or American values or the values of Western Civilization or Judeo-Christianity, all those people out there are full of indignities.

So an American flag and a marine flag offends somebody? I say tough. I am glad you are there. Fly that flag. Fly it proud and fly it long.

I especially appreciate the statement made by Mr. POE about the sound of that flag. My flag is on a flagpole about that same height, 20 foot. I step out my door in the morning, I check the wind and the weather and I look at that flag, and I listen to that sound. And there is times I am sitting there in the dark at night on my deck and I am hearing that flag from the light that shines on it around the corner just a little bit, and I hear that ripple of Old Glory. It gives me comfort and it gives me pride, and it reminds me of the privilege of serving here, anywhere you can serve Americans anywhere on this globe.

I think of a time also on March 18, 2003, where I went out here to Pershing Park, this side of the White House, when there was an antiwar demonstration that took place. I actually walked around through the Mall, around the Washington Monument as they prepared their demonstration. I remember former chairman of the Judiciary Committee, John Conyers, standing on a little stage there with great big speakers calling for the impeachment of President Bush because it looked like there was an impending liberation of Iraq. And I saw a man there.

Every kind of discontented, counter-cultural, anti-American group was represented in those thousands of people that came here that day. I saw the Japanese communist flag. I saw Vegetarians for Peace. I saw every counter-culturalist group you can imagine. And I saw a man there, an aging hippie. He had on a jacket. He was a photographer, you could tell, and he was taking pictures with great pride of this anti-Americanism.

He reached in his pocket of his jacket, a worn leather jacket, and pulled out of his pocket a flag, an American flag, a silk American flag, a small flag, and he used it to wipe the lens of his camera. That is an image I will never forget.

But no one stepped up to say he couldn't do that. Where were they then? Where were the critics of Mr. Merola then? When flags are used as grease rags to scrub the lens of a camera that is taking pictures of anti-Americans joined together to protest the saving of our freedom that Marine Merola has stepped up to defend.

Those actions against him are offensive to me, and I say guard the flag, defend the flag, and I will stand with you, and I know Judge POE will too. Thanks

for bringing this up. I appreciate it, Judge.

□ 1240

I came here to talk about a number of things tonight. One of them is the repeal of ObamaCare. Freedom-loving Americans fought this for a long time. It began to roll out at us in the summer of—I've got to roll my years back now—in the summer of 2008, when President Obama was elected. I should actually take you back through a little bit of this history, Mr. Speaker, because there's some of these components that the American people forget about.

There was a relatively unknown State senator from Illinois named Barack Obama, and he gave a speech before a national convention of the Democratic Party. That elevated him into some level of national prominence. There were those that decided they wanted to move him forward to become President of the United States. Hillary Clinton also decided she wanted to be President of the United States. And these two found themselves—actually, after John Edwards, anyway—locking horns, the two of them, for the nomination of the Presidency of the United States under the Democrat Party. I know a little bit about this. Barack Obama's movement began in Iowa. He brought his people over from Chicago and they started a movement and they did battle with Hillary Clinton in Iowa. John Edwards was there, of course. That went on for 4 years.

But we have to remember that here, in 1993 and 1994, when Bill Clinton was elected President, remember, he said you get at twofold—you get Hillary and you get Bill. Well, I wasn't all that happy getting Bill, let alone Hillary. But he assigned Hillary the job of writing a national health care act. And this was a complete takeover of our health care in the United States. Socialized medicine in an even purer form than ObamaCare is today.

We watched as this unfolded and she set up closed-door meetings and they cooked up this bill. And I recall the flow chart of the HillaryCare bill. I had a laminated copy of it in my office, my construction office in Odebolt, Iowa. And it gives me chills to think yet about the expansion of government that emerged from the HillaryCare proposal.

But we need to remember, Mr. Speaker, the relevant component of that is yes, a government takeover of health care that had been advanced and advocated in this country for quite a few years. But America's rejection of HillaryCare was resounding. And if Bill Clinton were going to maintain his capital as a President, they had to pull that bill down. The American people were against HillaryCare. I was against it. It actually animated me into getting engaged in politics. I do not think I would be here today if it weren't for Bill Clinton and Hillary Clinton deciding they were going to step in and take our liberty.

But, in any case, Hillary Clinton's credentials, now Secretary of State—and with all due respect, and I mean that honestly—her credentials on health care were greater than those of Barack Obama. He had to build himself foreign policy credentials and he had to build himself health care credentials. And so they turned the Presidential nomination debate into a health care debate, a health insurance debate. And as they battled their ideas out, they had to find ways that they could separate themselves from each other and still remain Democrats.

And so we heard all kind of statements out of Barack Obama as he competed for credibility on the policy of health care. And in the process of doing that, they convinced the American people that they were in a health care crisis in America. They intentionally and willfully, and I'm talking about Democrats in general, conflated two terms. They ended up duping the American people. They conflated the term health care and the term health insurance, to the point now where, when we hear someone say health care, we don't know whether they're saying health insurance or whether it's actually taking care of someone's health.

I recall then the newly elected Governor of Iowa, Chet Culver, now just voted out of office, came out here to the Capitol to sit down with the congressional delegation meeting, the Iowa congressional delegation. We sat in a conference room over in the Senate. And he said, There are 40,000 kids in Iowa that don't have health care. We've got to get them health care. And I looked at him and I said, Governor, I don't think that's true. I don't think there are any kids in Iowa that don't have health care. Could you give me an example of a child in Iowa that doesn't have health care. Well, no, he couldn't do that. Neither could he actually even tell me that he really meant health insurance. I had to feed that line to him so he could understand the difference. It was so embedded in his head that health care and health insurance, the conflated terms, could be used interchangeably.

Mr. Speaker, if people are having trouble understanding this, I'd use another example of conflated terms—the difference between immigrant and illegal immigrant. I was asked earlier today what do I have to say about people that accuse me of being anti-immigrant. I said, That's offensive. There isn't anybody in this entire Congress that's anti-immigrant. And the reporter stopped. Well, what kind of a statement is that? Surely there are. I said, No, there isn't anybody in this entire United States Congress that's anti-legal immigrant. Everybody I know in here—and there's a new class I don't know that, but I suspect they'd fit the same mold—everybody I know in here is supportive of legal immigrants. We cheer them. We're proud of them. When they take the oath of naturalization, I often go and give a little speech and

welcome them to being citizens of the United States of America. It is a proud time. I present them Constitution, and I sign. I want them to revere it the way I do, the way many of us do.

But they have conflated the term “immigrant” with “illegal immigrant” and then they have the audacity to accuse people of being anti-immigrant, when everybody I know is pro-immigrant—pro-legal immigrant. And everybody in here ought to be anti-illegal immigrant. But that's how they use the language to distort the argument and get people confused on where they stand on the issue.

So they did that with health care and health insurance. And when Barack Obama was establishing his credentials on health care, they began to convince the American people that we had 47 million people in this country that are uninsured. Well, that actually may be true. It may have been true. And you can start down through the list of 47 million and start to subtract from that the numbers that are here that are here illegally. That's at least 12 million, 12.1 million. I believe it's more than 20 million, but I'll take the 12 million. And I have to guess at the totals here because it's been a little while since I've run through these.

But, generally speaking, you take 47 million that are listed as uninsured by the Democrats and you subtract from that those that are here illegally, those that qualify for Medicaid but don't bother to sign up, those that make over \$75,000 a year and presumably could provide their own health insurance, those that qualify under their employer but have turned down that opportunity for that health insurance. And when you get done subtracting those that do have options, including affordable options, and you narrow the 47 million down to those who do not have their own health insurance policy and do not have affordable options, that's 12 million. That's actually the 12.1 million number I reached to remember.

That's less than 4 percent of the United States population without their own health insurance policy and without an affordable option. Less than 4 percent. What percent of the health care industry did they want to take over in order to address that less than 4 percent, those 12.1 million? A hundred percent. Barack Obama proposed to take over 100 percent of our health care industry in America in order to get at those less than 4 percent that are uninsured, without an affordable option.

He told us—remember these things—We're in an economic crisis. We're in an economic crisis, and we can't fix this economic crisis—Barack Obama—unless we first fix health care. And how do we do that? Well, the argument against it by him, and Hillary Clinton as well: We spend too much money on health care. What's their solution? Spend a lot more. Throw a trillion dollars at health care. He also argued that if you like your policy, you can keep it.

If you like your doctor, can you keep him. And when he said it, he knew that that commitment could not be kept. You can't keep your health insurance policy if the policy doesn't exist any longer. You can't keep your health insurance policy if the company doesn't exist any longer.

The President said we needed to have more competition in the health insurance industry. The demagoguery's been going on here for the last couple of days about not turning over this country to the health insurance companies, again who get accused of being vipers. Well, they're in a free market system. They need to be able to compete against each other. The President wants to have—and was not successful in this component—wants to have a Federal health insurance policy, a program, to compete against the health insurance companies. He argued that there needed to be more competition in the health insurance industry.

And so, what does he do? He wants to have the Federal Government do that. Does the President even know how many health insurance companies we have or had at the passage of ObamaCare? Probably not. He's probably not watching C-SPAN right now, Mr. Speaker, but if any of his staff are out there, I can tell you what that number was: 1,300 health insurance companies in America. 1,300 companies competing against each other. Not all of them against each other, not one competing against all the other 1,299, because there's a McCarran-Ferguson Act that allows the States to protect the insurance companies within their States and set up monopolies or quasi-monopolies within the States.

□ 1250

I think we should repeal that.

If we repeal that, we will allow then people to buy insurance across State lines, and we would instantly put those 1,300 health insurance companies in competition with each other. That would achieve the goal to lower the costs and increase the options and provide for people to have more choices themselves, and it would help sustain the doctor-patient relationship at the same time.

Mr. Speaker, of the 1,300 health insurance companies, how many policy varieties existed a year ago? 100,000 health insurance policy varieties existed a year ago. That's not enough competition—1,300 companies and 100,000 policies? The President wanted a new Federal company to compete against them. Now, that's because he understands this pattern.

We've seen this pattern happen several times in the past. It happened most recently with the Student Loan Program. The Federal Government took it all over. They started out with the argument that they needed to have another option—a public option—for school loans, student loans, so that they could provide a little more honest competition with the free market.

What do we get out of GEORGE MILLER, NANCY PELOSI, Barack Obama, and HARRY REID?

We get the complete takeover of the Student Loan Program over a little period of time. A great, giant leap came down this hallway in a reconciliation package from the Senate, actually threaded right into this ObamaCare bill.

What's another pattern?

There was a time—let's just say, oh, at about the time of the Bay of Pigs—when the Federal Government wasn't engaged in flood insurance. All of the property and casualty flood insurance in America was privately provided in the marketplace. We know what free enterprise does. If there is a demand, somebody will come up with a business idea to supply that demand. That was going on in the early part of the 1960s until the Federal Government decided that, really, they needed to get in and compete with that a little bit, so they set up the Federal Flood Insurance Program.

So what did they do? They drove out all of the private sector competition.

Today, if you're worried about your house being flooded or your factory being flooded, you have to buy flood insurance from the Federal Government. In order for them to compete with the private market, they passed legislation that, if there were a real estate loan from a Federal bank, they were compelled to buy flood insurance. So they wired in a customer base; they set the premium rates, and they drove everybody out of the flood insurance industry.

While all that's going on, what do we get out of that? We get a Federal Flood Insurance Program that's \$19.2 billion in the red and no private sector competition whatsoever and no way to judge, actually, the risk because the industry hasn't developed.

You know what government does: it atrophies. Anybody who doesn't have competition atrophies. They don't develop the technology. They don't develop the new approaches and the innovative ways to market, and they don't streamline. They don't have to find savings. They just raise fees or borrow money from a general fund. That's where the \$19.2 billion came from. Then, of course, that's the American people going into debt for \$19.2 billion.

Why? Because the Federal Government decided they wanted to go in and provide a little competition so that they could keep the private sector flood insurance industry honest because the people who passed that are not free market personnel. They are anti-capitalists. They are not capitalists. They are not free enterprise people.

So we have some of the pattern that's there. We've got the flood insurance pattern. We've got the pattern of the student loan program. Then we have the pattern of the President wanting to step in and drive out the competition in the health insurance industry.

The American people have watched that component. They've watched the statements about: you can keep your health insurance policy. If you like your policy, you can keep it. Yet the Federal Government under ObamaCare regulates every single health insurance policy, and they will decide which policies you can keep and which policies are banned by regulations to be written later by a gentleman by the name of Berwick, who believes that we should ration health care and not spend money on the lives of people who may be at the end of their lives.

Now, Sarah Palin called that "death panels." If you have to put something down in a Twitter that explains it all, I think she did that.

We've seen the manifestation of that out of the Obama administration—with his appointments, with the actions, with their taking the initiative to want to pay doctors to counsel people to accept death when there is medicine there that may save them or extend their lives. I don't think that's the business of the Federal Government to pay people to counsel others to die quicker. That's what turns out of that policy, and I'm glad that they rescinded it. I am hopeful that it isn't something that creeps back again, but if you've got a Dr. Donald Berwick there, it is going to creep back on us. That's his philosophy. He is there for a reason.

ObamaCare cannot be allowed to stay in this code. It must go. It has got to be repealed, and we are about to do that.

The first legislative steps on this took place yesterday with the rules debate upstairs—hours of debate on the rule, on how this debate would go on. We debated the rule here on the floor today, and it passed. The chairman of the Rules Committee, Mr. DREIER, did an outstanding job of ushering this all through; and he has been useful, I think, in also negotiating the types of language that allow for a legitimate debate on the floor of the House—far more legitimate than the debate that actually crammed ObamaCare down the throats of the American people.

So, Mr. Speaker, I come here to celebrate the opportunity to begin taking back a significant measure of American liberty, that is, the repeal of ObamaCare—pulling it out by the roots lock, stock and barrel. We must pull it all out, and we can't leave one visage of it in.

This ObamaCare the American people understand. They diagnosed it. They looked at it. They felt it and they ran the tests on it. They began to find out what was in it. Remember Speaker PELOSI saying we have to pass this bill in order to find out what's in it? Well, there is actually some truth in that because no matter how brilliant people are, no matter what their experience, there is not one person alive who could have shut themselves up in a room for I don't care how long they would want—a week, a month, a day, or a

year—and read through those 2,500 pages of ObamaCare and actually understand each component of it and do an analysis and be able to comprehend the implications of that monstrosity that has now become the albatross around the neck of the President and the Democrat Party in the United States of America.

No, no one could understand it. It is that complicated; but over time, we began to see the implications. Republicans predicted many of the implications that were in the bill. We pointed to a lot of the parts of it that were bad; but there wasn't time, and there weren't enough people and enough voices to raise all of the issues that are bad about something of this nature.

When you take away people's liberty, that is a big deal, Mr. Speaker—when you take away the right of people to buy a health insurance policy of their choice. No matter what money they have, no matter what their health, you have to buy a health insurance policy that is approved by Uncle Sam.

Now, I kind of like Uncle Sam. I like his image. I like his colors—red, white and blue—but I don't like the tarnished image that he was given by ObamaCare. I don't like the idea of besmirching the memory of Madison and Washington and Franklin and Jefferson. I don't like the idea that these God-given rights that we have, that clearly our Founding Fathers defined with precision that do come from God, can be besmirched and can take away the freedom of a freedom-loving people.

But the American people don't like it either. The American people rose up, Mr. Speaker.

Those who argued that they wanted to offer a whole series of amendments on the repeal of ObamaCare said it's not an open rule; it's not an open process, that they want to come down here and be able to offer amendment after amendment under an open rule. Then they think that somehow, by doing so, they can perfect a bad piece of legislation. Well, in their piece of legislation, even they can only name four things that they are willing to defend in 2,500 pages. Of course, they'll demagogue us on every single one of those.

The four things that they defend are: Preexisting conditions language. Republicans will address preexisting conditions, not with socialized medicine, but with a practical, constitutional, free market approach. That's fine. We need to have that debate and advance that kind of policy, and that has been part of our agenda all along, for several years now. That's the first one.

The second one is they claim they closed the doughnut hole. Well, I thought the doughnut hole was a bad idea in 2003. It was there because of the constraint in the funding that was available; but they closed the doughnut hole by increasing fees and taxing others, and low-income people are already exempt from it.

□ 1300

So it isn't of significance from a policy standpoint. It is philosophically

and politically, and so they make their second argument, doughnut hole.

Third one is they think that something that we just couldn't do without, that should take us all down because we're willing to repeal the idea that insurance policies must all have a Federal mandate in them that your children shall stay on there until they're 26 years old. Now, I'm astonished by this. I'm astonished that Republicans would think that's a good idea. I can actually name you two Republicans that were elected to Congress at age 25. Now, I don't know what kind of pride they would have in their newfound adulthood to walk down the aisle, like they did here a couple of days ago to swear into the new 112th Congress, and up until the moment they take the oath of office, they're still on Mommy and Daddy's health insurance.

Now, that's how bad this idea is that we would raise kids up and give them the keys to the car at age 16, and give them the right to vote and choose the next leader in the free world at age 18, and give them the right to drink at age 21, and keep them on Mom and Daddy's insurance until they're 26. Why?

I wanted my kids to grow up. I announced to them when they were 18 that I'm now legally off the hook, guys. We nurtured you as long as we can. We're still doing that. We don't have to anymore. I'm so proud of what they've accomplished and what they've promised to accomplish, but I wanted my kids to grow up, and that should be our goal when we're raising them, not to keep them children forever, keep them on our insurance until age 26. To what purpose? Can't they defend themselves and find a way?

And by the way, insurance companies, if there's a market for this, isn't there going to be a policy out there that you can buy, at your own choice, that will allow you to keep insurance on until your kids are 26? If there's a market for it, keep them on there until they're eligible for Medicare. It's all right if it's driven by the free market. It's actually constitutional if the States want to impose such a ridiculous mandate, but it's not constitutional and it's not all right if the Federal Government imposes such a thing because it raises the cost of everybody's premium, and it limits our choices and it taxes people that don't have any kids, people that are on individual policies.

So there's three things in ObamaCare that they are proud of, and I'm not particularly proud of any of those three. Actually, the fourth one may come to me and I'll bring it up in a moment, Mr. Speaker, but here's another rub.

ObamaCare wipes out more than half of the health savings accounts opportunity that's there. We established health savings accounts in part D in 2003. A young couple could start in today with \$5,150 in their health savings account, and let's just say they got married—fell in love, got married, age 20. I can do the math, which is why

I use the age 20, Mr. Speaker. And they maxed out on their health savings account at \$5,150 that first year. It's adjusted for COLA, and so we go up, that amount would go up each year as they went through their happy married bliss for the next 45 years until they qualified for Medicare.

Now, I'd like to see that expanded, but here's how this works. If you look historically back over the last 30 or 40 years, you will see that that type of an investment like an HSA would accrue at a 4 percent compounded interest rate, not over the last 2 or 3 but over the last 30 or 40. That's a reasonable number to predict. And so your couple that started with an HSA with \$5,150 and deposited the max in it every year and spent \$2,000 a year out for normal medical expenses would arrive at Medicare eligibility age with about \$950,000 in their health savings account. Boy, what a glorious opportunity that is.

The Federal Government's interested in that \$950,000 because they want to tax it. They want to tax it as ordinary income when it's taken out of the health savings account if it's not used for health along the way.

I suggest this. Why wouldn't we say to that couple, take the money that's in your health savings account, buy a Medicare replacement policy, a paid-up-for-life Medicare replacement policy—be worth about \$72,000 per person at this point, so \$144,000 out of this \$950,000, and so you get what, \$806,000 left over. That's the change.

I would say to Americans who had that kind of responsibility and prudence, Keep the change. Take yourself off the Medicare entitlement rolls when you're eligible by buying a paid-up replacement policy, annuitized policy. Keep the change tax free. Travel the world. Will it to your kids. Do what you want to do.

And if we do that, we turn health savings accounts into life management accounts, Mr. Speaker, these kind of accounts that young people would savor the day that they could start their account in their health savings account, and they would nurture it and protect it and want it built up to the point where it's 20, 30, 40, \$50,000, \$100,000. They would be there in this private market of insurance that we must preserve and protect—actually got to go back and restore it by repealing ObamaCare.

They would be in that marketplace saying, I want a \$10,000 deductible policy. I want a major medical deductible policy. I can have a higher copayment policy. I need lower premiums. I have the prospect of good health. I exercise. I watch my diet. I watch my weight. I get regular checkups, and so I'm willing to—and, in fact, it'd be prudent to have catastrophic policies with high deductibles and potentially a higher copayment for people who have the funds in their health savings accounts so that they are protected by insurance for its proper form.

Insurance should not be for hangnails. It should not be for the little

things. Insurance should be for the things that we can't fund ourselves. That's why it's there. It's protection so that you don't go broke when something catastrophic happens.

We would have people not only managing their health; they'd be managing their health insurance premiums. They'd be advocating for lower premiums. They'd be saving more money in their health savings account, managing their health for a lifetime while their health savings account transitions into a pension plan.

This is a full lifetime management account, and why can't we do that in the United States of America? These free people that we are, why can't we do that in the United States of America?

Well, ObamaCare goes in and cuts out more than half of the amount that they can contribute into their health savings account because ObamaCare is about, yes, a Federal takeover of our health care, and a health insurance industry eventually, but it's about also expanding the dependency class in America. It's about causing people to give up on trying and taking care of themselves and just finally sighing and get in the herd with the rest of the sheep and go submit to the government-run health care plan. And when they tell you you can't have a test, then you don't go for a second opinion; you've already been trained to accept the rule of the State. So they either test you or they don't; they give you treatment or they don't.

You can look up to Canada to see the waiting list times for hip replacements, knee replacements. One of those, I believe it's the knee replacement, is 194 days that you wait. The hip replacement then is three-hundred-and-some days. It's possible it's the other way around, but we're dealing with half a year or more, almost a year in waiting time.

I remember a presentation that was given downstairs in HC-9 a year or so ago. A doctor from northern Michigan, Dr. Jansma as I recall, has written a book on this, but he went up across the border to work within the emergency room in a hospital in Canada, and he had done a lot of orthopaedic surgery. And there was an individual that tore up a leg playing ball, came in. He looked at it, diagnosed it. He needed to have surgery. He said, I can schedule you for surgery in the morning. We should move on this quickly.

Well, the surgery couldn't be scheduled. He didn't know it at the time, but he didn't meet the government regulations. They had to go through and get another bureaucrat to approve it, and they had to wait to get it approved, and then they had to wait to schedule the surgery. This young man, in the prime of health, had a job, couldn't do it with his leg torn up. It took 6 months to schedule this young man to go before the specialist to do the secondary diagnosis to approve the need for the surgery so that they could ra-

tionalize spending taxpayer dollars to fix his leg. So it's going to be free health care up there, but you don't get it unless the right doctor, the one who's appointed by the State, approves the surgery.

So from the day of the time his knee was torn up and they took him into the emergency room, they had to patch him up, put him on crutches, and he had to gimp around for 6 months with a torn-up knee to go in and have the government doctor look at his knee and approve that he needed surgery.

Well, then you would think that that surgery might happen, oh, the next day like it would in America. But it didn't happen until another 6 months. Mr. Speaker, 6 months to wait for government approval for surgery that would have happened the next day in the United States of America with this doctor, another 6 months just to approve, then another 6 months to get the schedule to work through to get the knee surgery. And how much rehab does it take to put somebody back in shape after their leg is atrophied for a year and they have drug it around on crutches?

□ 1310

So he's out of work for a year and a half. His productivity has been stopped. And additionally, his development professionally has been diminished substantially. This is the kind of thing that happens when government gets involved setting up formulas. It's what the people on that side of the aisle want to do. And that's why the roof caved in, and there was a cataclysmic electoral change that took place on November 2, the election when the American people said, Enough, enough to the ruling troika, the Obama, Pelosi, and Reid ruling troika. Enough to the liberty-stealing legislation that was coming out of this Congress one after another after another, with cap-and-trade and government takeover of businesses, and the government takeover of the health care industry, including their massive regulation of the health insurance industry.

The American people rejected ObamaCare. The American people came to this city by the tens of thousands to protest against ObamaCare. The American people, for the first time, I believe, in the history of this country, came to this Capitol in such massive numbers that they not only crowded out here on the west lawn by the tens of thousands, there were so many people, they surrounded the Capitol. They formed a human chain to surround the Capitol and say, Keep your hands off of our health care. And it wasn't just a stretched human chain where people were barely hanging onto each other by their fingertips. They were six- and eight-deep all the way around the Capitol building saying, Keep your hands off our health care. They were shoulder-to-shoulder, and they were six and eight deep, a full doughnut.

Talk about the doughnut hole. The Capitol of the United States of Amer-

ica was in the doughnut hole of the freedom-loving, constitutional, and conservative people who came here to reject ObamaCare, to petition the government peacefully for redress of grievances. That's what happened. And still, their hearts were hardened. Still, the regal Speaker PELOSI marched through the throngs with her magnum gavel in her "let them eat cake" moment, and still they don't get the message.

We swore in 87 new freshmen Republicans here, nine freshman Democrats. The majority changes, every gavel changes hands in the entire Capitol. It's amazing. It's amazing that it's so hard for them to hear the message from the American people. Do they still have the level of arrogance? Is it still an intellectual elitism of liberalism, the leftists that think that they have apparently some kind of gift of intelligence that supersedes the common sense and the wisdom of the American people? I reject that. The American people rejected that. And we have 87 new faces over here that I believe are God's gift to America, Mr. Speaker.

And I so look forward to the impact. We have already seen the impact. We have seen the impact in the rules package vote. We have seen the impact in the rules vote here today. And we'll see the impact on the repeal of ObamaCare on Wednesday after this rule that provides for—I guess I didn't keep it with me—but this rule that provides for I believe 7 hours of debate, 7 hours. NANCY PELOSI would give us an hour split, 30 minutes on each side, no amendments. Seven hours of debate, a debate on the rule, full debate up in the Rules Committee. And we are going to start this process of repealing ObamaCare. It began with the rules votes here yesterday in the Rules Committee and here on the floor today. We have begun the long, hard slog of the repeal of ObamaCare, Mr. Speaker.

It is, I believe, a new precedent to see the American people rise up this instantaneously to reject a piece of legislation that was passed. I recall when it was passed here November 7 out of the House, it went back to be worked through the—let me say worked through the procedures. I withdrew that "shenanigan" word and replaced it with the "procedures" in the United States Senate.

But in an unprecedented fashion, they put that legislation together in the Senate. And on Christmas Eve morning, they circumvented the filibuster, and they pushed through on a reconciliation package, they called it, a piece of legislation that had to come through to marry up with the House legislation in order to, some say in the press, "buy the votes" to get barely enough to pass ObamaCare here in the House. Well, that legislation, their version of ObamaCare, passed in the Senate on Christmas Eve morning. Around 9 o'clock was when they opened the vote. They had a chance procedurally—the Republicans did—to delay

that vote until 9 o'clock Christmas Eve. I argued vociferously that they should use every procedural tool at their disposal to delay that vote to the maximum amount, and perhaps something would happen. Like what if a blizzard would have come along and shut this Capitol down, and they wouldn't have been able to put the votes together? Look how close that came, if you look back upon it.

But in any case, when ObamaCare passed the Senate, I asked a question to one of the senior Senators over there who opposed ObamaCare, and did so well: What do we do now? What's our next step? We had 9 more hours we could have fought, or 12 more hours we could have fought. We didn't fight all 12 of those hours. What do we do next? His answer was, Well, we pray, and we pray for a victory in the special election in the Senate race in Massachusetts.

Well, at that time, a lot of people in America didn't know the name SCOTT BROWN, and I thought that that was a pretty big reach, to think we were going to put our stakes in saving America's liberty in a special election U.S. Senate race in Massachusetts. Massachusetts had a full, at the time, 100 percent congressional delegation of all Democrats, the strongest Democrat State in the Nation that I know of. So I thought it was a bit of a presumptuous thing to talk about asking the Lord to intervene in Massachusetts, which was the message that I got. But I took a look and I decided, that's our best chance. I ended up going to Massachusetts, and I spent 3 days there.

On January 19, SCOTT BROWN was elected to fill what's commonly known as "the Kennedy seat" in the United States Senate, from Massachusetts. He had pledged to vote "no" and kill ObamaCare. That made it the veto-proof Republican minority in the Senate. Most people thought on that night that ObamaCare was dead, and that was January 19 last year.

Well, subsequent to that, the President held a health care summit at the Blair House February 25. That's where he identified his health care plan as "ObamaCare." And in that health care summit, there were certain selected Republicans who were invited to sit with the Democrats around this big table. And there were rules. Of course the rules applied to people differently. The President interrupted Republicans 72 times. Somehow he got his mojo back. Somehow they put together this legal maneuvering to be able to bring legislation here and say they got it—and actually, they got it passed. I'm not taking that issue.

The then-chair of the Rules Committee wanted to just deem ObamaCare passed because they didn't want to take a vote on it. They couldn't get the votes out of their own conference because there were 12 anonymous individuals in a list called the Stupak Dozen that would not vote for a bill that would use Federal funding for abortion.

So they sat with their coalition. The President of the United States promised to sign an Executive order that they seemed to think would amend legislation after it passed the House. And even that wasn't enough. They had to have their reconciliation package out of the Senate that would be married up with and effectively amend some of the ObamaCare legislation itself.

So, Mr. Speaker, the convolution of all of this, it was a legislative circus of every legislative shenanigan that I can think of to put this together in such a way that they finally got stuff to the President's desk signed in the proper sequence and order so that the attorneys and the constitutional scholars could look at that and say, Well, actually there is a piece of legislation that somebody's going to have to follow the direction of.

So we had a Presidential Executive order that was designed to amend legislation passed by the people's House and the United States Senate that was promised before the legislation was presented to the floor as a condition of its passage here so they could get the votes from the Stupak Dozen and others. And there was a reconciliation package from the Senate that amended the legislation. They passed it out of the Senate before the legislation was brought before the House. When do you ever bring legislation that is designed to amend legislation that's not yet passed? You only do that if you don't have the support of the majority of the people in either body.

And I will tell you this, Mr. Speaker: On the day ObamaCare passed, as stand-alone legislation, that big 2,500-page package, if there are no extraneous issues, like promises of Executive orders from the President or a reconciliation package in the Senate that amends it, if it was ObamaCare stand-alone, 2,500 pages dropped here in the House of Representatives for an up-or-down vote, anybody that was here, any student of what was here knows, Mr. Speaker, they did not have the majority votes to pass ObamaCare.

□ 1320

It was done on the condition that the President would sign an executive order and the Senate reconciliation package would be brought in the form that they demanded it.

So, we watch all this process and we think it's making sausage. You don't want to eat the sausage when you watch them make it. I'm happy to eat the sausage when they make it. I really don't want to eat this one. The American people didn't want to eat this one either. The American people rejected it. The American people brought their voice and their effort.

And I went home that night, the last one to leave this Capitol. And I told myself I will lay down, and I'm going to sleep until I'm completely rested up, and I'll wake up fresh in the morning, and I'll retool, and I'll start a new plan and see what I can do to save America,

see what I can do to save what's left of America, because our liberty had been ripped out. Our Constitution had been violated. And I knew the bill was going to be signed eagerly by President Obama, which he did on March 30.

So I laid down and slept for about 2½ hours, and it was the sleep of the exhausted. And I woke up. I sat down at my computer and I wrote up a request for a bill to repeal ObamaCare. That bill draft request went in at the opening of business that following morning. It was waiting for them to unlock the doors, my staff was. And that request turned into a draft within a couple of hours, and got back into my hand, 40 words, 40 words. And those 40 words are included in this repeal that is coming, that is now before this House that will be debated on Wednesday of next week.

I introduced those 40 words into the legislation and ironically, coincidentally and perhaps providentially, MICHELLE BACHMANN of Minnesota was doing the same thing at perhaps the same time and put in a bill draft request almost simultaneously, and our bills came down within 3 minutes of each other, exactly the same 40 words that said the same thing: pull ObamaCare out by its roots. That's not the quote; that's the summary, Mr. Speaker. And, actually, I'm not going to summarize the bill this time. We don't have 2,500 pages in this repeal, but I would just say a few more words about that.

We started then the repeal process within hours of the passage of ObamaCare and it being messaged to the President within hours. And people said, well, that's just throwing a tantrum. You're just frustrated. You've lost. Why can't you just pack up your things and move on? We've got to move on. Put that behind us. That debate's over with.

Well, the debate's not over with when a Congress defies the will of the American people. And this Congress, the 111th Congress, the one just passed, defied the will of the American people. And the result was 87 new freshmen Republicans courageous, bold, principled, constitutional conservatives, young, vigorous, with ideology, driven people, statesmen and women in the group that will emerge as national leaders.

I believe there's a Speaker in that class. I know there are committee chairs in that class. I believe there's a reasonable chance that there's a President of the United States in this class that was elected in 2010. There may be more than one. We have leaders there. They came to this Congress to repeal ObamaCare. And the filing of the repeal of ObamaCare on that late March day, that early morning of the late March day, started the process. The start of that process began within hours of the passage of ObamaCare and well before its actual signing into law, it was introduced before the President actually signed it into law to repeal it.

And MICHELLE BACHMANN and I and CONNIE MACK and, let me see, Parker

Griffith, they come to mind as people that have introduced legislation to repeal, and we worked that together with many others. There wasn't hesitation. Republicans wanted to sign on to the repeal, and they did so quickly. And over a period of time, the numbers of signatures accumulated to about 86, and 86 were ready to sign for repeal.

Then we decided, let's turn this into a discharge petition. NANCY PELOSI won't let this come forward until it does. So we did that. And I filed a discharge petition here on the floor, Mr. Speaker, and Members began to go down and sign the discharge petition. And the numbers of signatures went up on the discharge petition, when they said it was impossible to repeal ObamaCare, all the way up to 173; and it became bipartisan with the signature of Gene Taylor, whom, I believe, would have been re-elected to this Congress had he not voted for NANCY PELOSI. He did lose his election. And he served well here in this Congress.

But the result of this is that the existence of the bill to repeal ObamaCare in the last Congress was inspiring to new candidates that ran for office. It was inspiring to their supporters. It was inspiring to their constituents and their voters. And the discharge petition, with 173 signatures said, Republicans have the resolve to repeal ObamaCare. Republicans have the resolve.

And so the inspiration and the resolve, along with a fairly long list of anti-free market, anti-freedom things that took place out of the Pelosi Congress and the Obama administration, all contributed to give us the inertia to get to this point to where we are today.

But the legislation that I introduced then, actually amended at the end of the last Congress because it needed to consider the reconciliation package that came from the Senate after the bill was passed. It wasn't possible for me to introduce legislation to repeal that because it hadn't passed. So packaged it up together and put that in as a squared away, on point, full 100 percent repeal of ObamaCare legislation that I introduced, again with MICHELLE BACHMANN on the last day of the last Congress, and on the first day of this Congress. And that's the legislation, that's the language that is considered before this Congress and will be voted on Wednesday of next week and will result in the House repealing ObamaCare, Mr. Speaker.

And so it's a 2,500-page bill. I wouldn't presume to come to the floor and read a 2,500-page bill, Mr. Speaker. But I would do this: I think it's a delightful experience to read a bill that's short and to the point. And this is H.R. 2; H.R. 2, the repeal of ObamaCare. And I'm going to just read this into the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, aside from the titles, just down to the meat of the bill. And it won't take very long. It's actually, altogether now, 131 words.

But it reads this way: "Effective as of the enactment of Public Law 111-148,

such act is repealed, and the provisions of law amended or repealed by such act are restored or revived as if such act had not been enacted."

Boy, that sounds pretty good, doesn't it? Now, that's just the first part.

And it repealed, effective as of the enactment of the law, ObamaCare, such act is repealed, and the provisions of law amended are repealed by such act are restored or revived as if such act had not been enacted. It doesn't take a lot of complicated language to say pull it all out by the roots as if it had never been there. That's what we get with the repeal that's before us now that will be debated on and voted on Wednesday of next week.

This is the language that I introduced long back when people said it's just a frustrating, political exercise. You will never repeal ObamaCare. You can't get a vote on ObamaCare, so why are you going through the motions? It's just a legislative tantrum. No, it's not. It's tangible. It's not a tantrum. It's tangible. It's here. It's here before us now.

Here's the second component of it. This is the reconciliation package that couldn't be addressed on the day it passed but can now. It says this: "Effective as of the enactment of the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010," the Senate Reconciliation Act, "Public Law 111-152, title I and subtitle B of title II of such act are repealed, and the provisions of law amended or repealed by such title or subtitle, respectively, are restored or revived as if such title and subtitle had not been enacted."

Once again, the repetition of that language, for the two major components of ObamaCare now, they are repealed, and the provisions of law amended or restored by such title or subtitle, respectively, are restored or revived as if such title or subtitle had not been enacted.

□ 1330

Well, isn't that refreshing, Mr. Speaker, that we have a piece of legislation here that's not 2,500 pages. It's not so long and complicated that we can't read it here on the floor. It's not so complicated that anybody that might be sitting in the gallery or watching on C-SPAN or might be reading through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD can understand what is going on here. This is in the full light of day with the support of the American people.

Sixty percent of the American people, according to a Rasmussen poll here sometime back, support the repeal of ObamaCare, as do I. And, Mr. Speaker, I look forward to the debate on Wednesday. I look forward to the vote going up on the board on Wednesday. I look forward to the beginning of the repeal of ObamaCare.

The press asked me a question on that earlier today: If you pass the repeal of ObamaCare—we will pass the repeal of ObamaCare—is that the end?

No. To reflect back on Winston Churchill, it's not the end. It's not even the beginning of the end of ObamaCare, but it is perhaps the end of the beginning of the end of ObamaCare. That's what I believe is coming.

I heard the gentleman from Texas bring up Churchill when he said, "sweat, blood, and tears." There are some people out there that bring some quotes to mind that stand out for me, and one of them is the Congressman from Indiana, MIKE PENCE. His statement on our persistence and due diligence in bringing about ObamaCare is this—and I wrote it down because it impressed me, not the words but the manner in which he says it. It is always superior to my delivery. But it is this, Mr. Speaker. Congressman PENCE of Indiana said, if House Republicans got the message from the American people last November, "we won't just vote once to repeal ObamaCare; we will vote to repeal ObamaCare again and again until we consign their government takeover of health care to the ash heap of history—where it belongs."

Nice quote, MIKE PENCE. It sounds like Ronald Reagan to me. "We will vote . . . again and again until we consign their government takeover of health care to the ash heap of history—where it belongs."

I intend to stay with this with an even heightened level of persistence, Mr. Speaker, to bring about the final and complete repeal of ObamaCare, Mr. Speaker, to be able to one day watch as the President of the United States, the next President probably, puts an end to ObamaCare. It will take persistence on our part. It will take determination. We will pass this out of the House. We can pass it again and again, send it over to the Senate where HARRY REID gets a hot potato on his lap that gets hotter and bigger each time.

We have appropriations bills coming through here. We have a CR that ends March 4th, and everything that funds our government, we should put into that language that prohibits any of the dollars from being used to implement or enforce ObamaCare. We can shut off all of the implementation of ObamaCare. If this House stands resolute and determined, there is not a dime that can be spent by the Federal Government without our approval. So we can shut off the funding that implements or enforces ObamaCare, and we must. And we must stick with it.

We must stick with it with the determination that comes from people like MIKE PENCE, with the tone that comes from Ronald Reagan that comes from his mouth, and I think the determination that comes from Winston Churchill. We will fight on this. We will fight until the end. We have the majority to start with now in the House. We shall not flag or fail. We shall go on to the end. We shall fight with growing confidence and growing strength, whatever the cost may be. We shall never surrender. We will carry on this struggle until, in God's good time, with all His

power and might, He steps forth to the rescue and liberation of our God-given American liberty. That's what will happen in this Congress.

The day will come, Mr. Speaker, that the next President of the United States, I pray, stands on the west portico of the Capitol here in this building down that hallway and off to the left to take the oath of office. And when the Chief Justice steps forward and he takes his oath on the Bible, I want to see that next President of the United States take that oath with pen in hand, Mr. Speaker, and I want him to take the oath, "preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States, so help me God." And before he even shakes the hand of the Chief Justice to be congratulated as the next President of the United States, I want that pen in that hand to come down on the podium and sign into law the final repeal of ObamaCare as the first act of office of the next President of the United States, and I will support the man or woman that's willing to do that.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your attention and the honor to address you.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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 1 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1342

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FLEISCHMANN) at 1 o'clock and 42 minutes p.m.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. JONES (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of personal reasons.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of attending his grandmother's funeral.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. KAPTUR) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BLUMENAUER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFazio, 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. FRANKS of Arizona, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PENCE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BARTLETT, for 5 minutes, January 11 and 12.

Mr. PAUL, for 5 minutes, January 11 and 12.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 43 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Tuesday, January 11, 2011, at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

44. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Review Group, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Tobacco Transition Payment Program; Tobacco Transition Assessments (RIN: 0560-AH30) received January 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

45. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations Division, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule — Conforming Changes to Applicant Submission Requirements; Implementing Federal Financial Report and Central Contractor Registration Requirements [Docket No.: FR-5350-F-02] (RIN: 2501-AD50) received January 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

46. A letter from the General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Corporate Credit Unions, Technical Corrections (RIN: 3133-AD58) received January 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

47. A letter from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Temporary Rule Regarding Principal Trades with Certain Advisory Clients (RIN: 3235-AJ96) received December 29, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

48. A letter from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendments to Form ADV; Extension of Compliance Date (RIN: 3235-A117) received December 29, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

49. A letter from the Deputy Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendments to General Regulations of the Food and Drug Administration [Docket No.: FDA-2010-N-0560] (RIN: 0910-AG55) received January 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.

801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

50. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Multispecies Fishery; Emergency Rule Extension, Pollock Catch Limit Revisions [Docket No.: 100427197-0207-01] (RIN: 0648-AW86) received January 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

51. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Regulations Governing Book-Entry Treasury Bonds, Notes and Bills Held in Legacy Treasury Direct and Regulations Governing Securities Held in Treasury Direct received January 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

52. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Nuclear Decommissioning Funds [TD 9512] (RIN: 1545-BF08) received December 23, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

53. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulations, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Amendments to Regulations Regarding Withdrawal of Applications and Voluntary Suspension of Benefits [Docket No.: SSA 2009-0073] (RIN: 0960-AH07) received January 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. BROWN of Georgia (for himself, Mr. AKIN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. CARTER, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. COLE, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. FORBES, Ms. FOXX, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. JONES, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. KLINE, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. LATTA, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. OLSON, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. TERRY, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HERGER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. LONG, Mr. PEARCE, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. ROKITA, and Mr. WITTMAN):

H.R. 212. A bill to provide that human life shall be deemed to begin with fertilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska (for himself, Mrs. MYRICK, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana):

H.R. 213. A bill to establish a moratorium on regulatory rulemaking actions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 214. A bill to establish a Congressional Office of Regulatory Analysis, to require the periodic review and automatic termination of Federal regulations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 215. A bill to repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and title I of the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 while preserving the reauthorization of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, Ways and Means, House Administration, Rules, the Judiciary, and Appropriations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California:

H.R. 216. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to issue a rule with respect to border security searches of electronic devices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. PENCE (for himself, Mrs.

BACHMANN, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. OLSON, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. JONES, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. AKIN, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. TURNER, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. PAUL, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. PITTS, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. TERRY, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. FLAKE, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. HERGER, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. CANSECO, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. COLE, Mr. LATTA, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. CRAVAACK, Mr. WALSH of Illinois, Mr. REED, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. LONG, Mr. KLINE, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Ms. BUERKLE, Mr. HALL, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. WEST, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. HUNTER, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. FORBES, Mr. QUAYLE, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. POSEY, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. HARPER, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr.

WALBERG, Mr. MICA, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. CARTER, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. PLATTS, and Mr. LANKFORD):

H.R. 217. A bill to amend title X of the Public Health Service Act to prohibit family planning grants from being awarded to any entity that performs abortions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BACA:

H.R. 218. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for naturalization for certain high school graduates; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 219. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to ensure the integrity of the Social Security trust funds by requiring the Managing Trustee to invest the annual surplus of such trust funds in marketable interest-bearing obligations of the United States and certificates of deposit in depository institutions insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and to protect such trust funds from the public debt limit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 220. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to protect the integrity and confidentiality of Social Security account numbers issued under such title, to prohibit the establishment in the Federal Government of any uniform national identifying number, and to prohibit Federal agencies from imposing standards for identification of individuals on other agencies or persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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 Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas:

H.R. 221. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide penalties for displaying nooses in public with intent to harass or intimidate a person because of that person's race, color, religion, or national origin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas:

H.R. 222. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require hospitals reimbursed under the Medicare system to establish and implement security procedures to reduce the likelihood of infant patient abduction and baby switching, including procedures for identifying all infant patients in the hospital in a manner that ensures that it will be evident if infants are missing from the hospital; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas:

H.R. 223. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide an alternate release date for certain nonviolent offenders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas:

H.R. 224. A bill to enhance Federal enforcement of hate crimes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas:

H.R. 225. A bill to provide that no Federal funds may be used by the Secretary of Homeland Security to approve a site security plan for a chemical facility, unless the facility meets or exceeds security standards and requirements to protect the facility against acts of terrorism established for such a facility by the State or local government for the

area where the facility is located, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, 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. JACKSON LEE of Texas:

H.R. 226. A bill to strengthen the Notification and Retaliation Act of 2002, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas:

H.R. 227. A bill to prevent children's access to firearms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas:

H.R. 228. A bill to provide for the collection of data on traffic stops, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas:

H.R. 229. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to establish national standards for State safety inspections of motor vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas:

H.R. 230. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Energy to make loan guarantees for cellulosic ethanol production technology development; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, 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. JACKSON LEE of Texas:

H.R. 231. A bill to increase the evidentiary standard required to convict a person for a drug offense, to require screening of law enforcement officers or others acting under color of law participating in drug task forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas:

H.R. 232. A bill to recognize the extraordinary performance of the Armed Forces in achieving the military objectives of the United States in Iraq, to terminate the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 (Public Law 107-243), to require congressional reauthorization to continue deployment of the Armed Forces to Iraq, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, 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. JACKSON LEE of Texas:

H.R. 233. A bill to reform the provisions requiring "one-strike" eviction from public and federally assisted housing; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself, Mr. AKIN, Mr. CARTER, and Mr. MANZULLO):

H.R. 234. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to establish a Social Security Surplus Protection Account in the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund to hold the Social Security surplus, to provide for suspension of investment of amounts held in the Account until enactment of legislation providing for investment of the Trust Fund in investment vehicles other than obligations of the United States, and to establish a Social Security Investment Commission to make recommendations

for alternative forms of investment of the Social Security surplus in the Trust Fund; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas:

H.R. 235. A bill to reduce unsustainable spending; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, Financial Services, Natural Resources, Oversight and Government Reform, House Administration, Education and the Workforce, Ways and Means, Transportation and Infrastructure, Science, Space, and Technology, Armed Services, Agriculture, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H.R. 236. A bill to provide that rates of pay for Members of Congress shall not be adjusted under section 601(a)(2) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 in the year following any fiscal year in which outlays of the United States exceeded receipts of the United States; 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. CONNOLLY of Virginia:

H.R. 237. A bill to amend the Homeowners Assistance Program of the Department of Defense to give the Secretary of Defense flexibility regarding setting the commencement date for homeowner assistance for members of the Armed Forces permanently reassigned during the mortgage crisis; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. EMERSON:

H.R. 238. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a refundable credit to military retirees for premiums paid for coverage under Medicare Part B; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. EMERSON:

H.R. 239. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for an improved benefit computation formula for workers affected by the changes in benefit computation rules enacted in the Social Security Amendments of 1977 who attain age 65 during the 10-year period after 1981 and before 1992 (and related beneficiaries) and to provide prospectively for increases in their benefits accordingly; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 240. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to promote jobs for veterans through the use of sole source contracts by Department of Veterans Affairs for purposes of meeting the contracting goals and preferences of the Department of Veterans Affairs for small business concerns owned and controlled by veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GALLEGLY:

H.R. 241. A bill to authorize the conveyance of certain National Forest System lands in the Los Padres National Forest in California; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HERGER (for himself, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, and Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California):

H.R. 242. A bill to clarify the implementation and enforcement of Subpart B of the Travel Management Rule (36 C.F.R. 212), relating to the designation of roads, trails, and areas for motor vehicle use, in administra-

tive units of the National Forest System in California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 243. A bill to amend title 35, United States Code, to modify the penalty for false marking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LATTA (for himself, Ms. JENKINS, and Mr. TURNER):

H.R. 244. A bill to prohibit the use of certain stimulus and disaster relief funds for business relocation incentives; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, and Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PENCE:

H.R. 245. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act to remove the mandate on the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal Open Market Committee to focus on maximum employment; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. PLATTS:

H.R. 246. A bill to repeal the provision of law that provides for automatic pay adjustments 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. RYAN of Ohio (for himself and Ms. SUTTON):

H.R. 247. A bill to provide for the retention of the name of Mount McKinley; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 248. A bill to provide for identification of members of the Armed Forces exposed during military service to depleted uranium, to provide for health testing of such members, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 249. A bill to permit Members of Congress to administer the oath of allegiance to applicants for naturalization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 250. A bill to provide discretionary authority to an immigration judge to determine that an alien parent of a United States citizen child should not be ordered removed, deported, or excluded from the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 251. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of designating Oak Point and North Brother Island in the Bronx in the State of New York as a unit of the National Park System; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 252. A bill to require an annual report on Federal funds distributed by Federal agencies through grant programs, formula programs, or otherwise, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 253. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a business credit relating to the use of clean-fuel and fuel efficient vehicles by businesses within areas designated as nonattainment areas under the Clean Air Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 254. A bill to amend the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and the egg, meat, and

poultry inspection laws to ensure that consumers receive notification regarding food products produced from crops, livestock, or poultry raised on land on which sewage sludge was applied; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, 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. SERRANO:

H.R. 255. A bill to lift the trade embargo on Cuba, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Energy and Commerce, Financial Services, the Judiciary, Oversight and Government Reform, and Agriculture, 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. SERRANO:

H.R. 256. A bill to waive certain prohibitions with respect to nationals of Cuba coming to the United States to play organized professional baseball; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 257. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow taxpayers to designate income tax overpayments as contributions to the United States Library Trust Fund; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WITTMAN:

H.R. 258. A bill to require the Office of Management and Budget to prepare a cross-cut budget for restoration activities in the Chesapeake Bay watershed, to require the Environmental Protection Agency to develop and implement an adaptive management plan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BROWN of Georgia (for himself, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. JONES, Mr. PITTS, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. LONG, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. WEST, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, and Mr. BASS of New Hampshire):

H.J. Res. 11. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to balance the Federal budget; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas:

H.J. Res. 12. A joint resolution denouncing the practices of female genital mutilation, domestic violence, "honor" killings, acid burnings, dowry deaths, and other gender-based persecutions, expressing the sense of Congress that participation, protection, recognition, and equality of women is crucial to achieving a just, moral and peaceful society, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. EMERSON:

H.J. Res. 13. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States giving Congress power to prohibit the physical desecration of the flag of

the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. EMERSON:

H.J. Res. 14. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide for a balanced budget for the United States Government and for greater accountability in the enactment of tax legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PLATTS:

H.J. Res. 15. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to authorize the line item veto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of Iowa (for himself and Mr. WOODALL):

H.J. Res. 16. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to repeal the sixteenth article of amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.J. Res. 17. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to repeal the twenty-second article of amendment, thereby removing the limitation on the number of terms an individual may serve as President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TERRY:

H.J. Res. 18. A joint resolution proposing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. EMERSON:

H. Con. Res. 7. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding the need to prevent the closure or consolidation of post offices; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. SERRANO:

H. Con. Res. 8. Concurrent resolution entitled the "English Plus Resolution"; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. DREIER:

H. Res. 27. A resolution Relating to the status of certain actions taken by Members-elect; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas:

H. Res. 28. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Transportation Security Administration should, in accordance with existing law, enhance security against terrorist attack and other security threats to our Nation's rail and mass transit systems and other modes of surface transportation; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California (for herself, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, and Mr. ROYCE):

H. Res. 29. A resolution calling for Internet freedom in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DEUTCH:

H. Res. 30. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to require that plain English section by section analyses be posted on the Internet for bills and joint resolutions reported by committees; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. KING of New York introduced a bill (H.R. 259) for the relief of Alemseghed Mussie Tesfamical; 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 Representa-

tives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. BROUN of Georgia:

H.R. 212.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section five of the 14th article of Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which states "The Congress shall have power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article." Section two of this article states ". . . nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law . . ."

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 213.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 214.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 215.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution.

By Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California:

H.R. 216.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 1 of Amendment Number 4 of the Constitution.

By Mr. PENCE:

H.R. 217.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BACA:

H.R. 218.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 219.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority for the Social Security Preservation Act is Article 1, Section 9, Clause 7 giving Congress the authority to control the expenditures of the federal government.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 220.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Identity Theft Prevention Act is constitutional because it protects the American people's rights to be free from federal violations of their privacy as protected by the fourth and ninth amendments to the United States Constitution.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas:

H.R. 221.

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, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas:

H.R. 222.

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, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas:

H.R. 223.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill in enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas:

H.R. 224.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill in enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas:

H.R. 225.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill in enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas:

H.R. 226.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill in enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas:

H.R. 227.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill in enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas:

H.R. 228.

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, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas:

H.R. 229.

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, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas:

H.R. 230.

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, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas:

H.R. 231.

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, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas:

H.R. 232.

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, Clause 12.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas:

H.R. 233.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill in enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 234.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1; Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3; and Article 1, Section 8, Clause 14.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas:

H.R. 235.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H.R. 236.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this joint resolution rests is the power of Congress as enumerated in Article I, Section 9 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia:

H.R. 237.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests in at least two clauses enumerated in Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

Clause 14 grants the power of Congress "to make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces."

Clause 18 grants the power of Congress "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," as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

Specifically, this bill amends the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 to expand access to Department of Defense (DOD) homeowners assistance for qualified members of the Armed Forces permanently reassigned during a designated mortgage crisis to allow the Secretary of Defense greater flexibility regarding the dates of the availability of such assistance.

By Mrs. EMERSON:

H.R. 238.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to raise and maintain armed forces, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clauses 12, 13, and 14 of the United States Constitution, as well as the power to lay and collect taxes, provide for the common defense and general welfare, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1.

By Mrs. EMERSON:

H.R. 239.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to provide for the general welfare, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 240.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. GALLEGLY:

H.R. 241.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution, relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress. Also this legislation can be enacted under the authority granted in Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2, relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States.

By Mr. HERGER:

H.R. 242.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 7 of Section 9 of Article I of the Constitution, and Clause 2 of Section 3 of Article IV of the Constitution.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 243.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article I, Section 8, Clause 8 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have the power to enact this legislation 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.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 244.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have power to enact this legislation to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

By Mr. PENCE:

H.R. 245.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 5 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PLATTS:

H.R. 246.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, 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.

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.

And Amendment XXVII—Originally proposed Sept. 25, 1789. Ratified May 7, 1992.

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio:

H.R. 247.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 248.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 14, which gives Congress the power "To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces," and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, which gives Congress the power "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers."

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 249.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4, which gives Congress the power "To establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization," and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, which gives Congress the power "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers."

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 250.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4, which gives Congress the power "To establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization," and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, which gives Congress the power "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers."

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 251.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 2 of Section 3 of Article IV of the Constitution:

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.

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 252.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This legislation is introduced pursuant to Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the United States Constitution, which states that "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 . . ." In addition, this legislation is introduced pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, which states that Congress shall have the power "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."

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 253.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This legislation is introduced pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution, which states that "The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises . . ." In addition, this legislation is introduced pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution, which states that Congress shall have the power "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."

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 254.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution—

The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

In addition, Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution—

The Congress shall have Power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 255.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, which gives Congress the power "To regulate Commerce

with foreign Nations," and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, which gives Congress the power "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers."

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 256.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, which gives Congress the power "To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations," Article I, Section 8, Clause 4, which gives Congress the power "To establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization," and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, which gives Congress the power "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers."

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 257.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

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. (Article I, Section 8, Clause 1)

The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof. (Article I, Section 8, Clause 18)

By Mr. WITTMAN:

H.R. 258.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the authority to enact this bill.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 259.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4—The Congress shall have Power to establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization, and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States.

By Mr. BROUN of Georgia:

H.J. Res. 11.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article Five of the Constitution of the United States, which states "The Congress, whenever two thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose Amendments to this Constitution . . ."

By Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas:

H.J. Res. 12.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill in enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. EMERSON:

H.J. Res. 13.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to establish Post Offices and post roads, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 7 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. EMERSON:

H.J. Res. 14.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to propose Amendments to the Constitution, as enumerated in Article V of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PLATTS:

H.J. Res. 15.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

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, 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.

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.J. Res. 16.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This joint resolution is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress to propose amendments to the Constitution under Article V of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.J. Res. 17.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This proposed constitutional amendment is introduced pursuant to Article V of the Constitution. In *Whitehill v. Elkins* (1967), the Supreme Court's majority opinion stated that "there is no restraint on the kind of amendment that may be offered," under Article V of the Constitution. In addition, this proposed constitutional amendment is introduced in relation to the 22nd Amendment to the Constitution, which this joint resolution seeks to repeal.

By Mr. TERRY:

H.J. Res. 18.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article Five of the Constitution—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. 21: Mr. SCHOCK, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. WALBERG, and Mr. RENACCI.

H.R. 23: Ms. BORDALLO and Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 27: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. CARNAHAN.

H.R. 38: Mr. HUNTER and Mr. RENACCI.

H.R. 44: Ms. LEE of California, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

H.R. 53: Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 54: Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 61: Mr. WITTMAN, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. LATTA, Mr. COLE, Mr. KLINE, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, and Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 96: Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mrs. ELLMERS.

H.R. 97: Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. MACK, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. LAMBORN, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. FLORES, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Mr. SULLIVAN.

H.R. 103: Mr. ROHRBACHER.

H.R. 104: Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 111: Ms. BORDALLO and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 120: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, and Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 121: Mr. LANKFORD.

H.R. 140: Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. WEST, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. HUNTER, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. HALL, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. JONES, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. POSEY, Mr. AKIN, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CARTER, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. WESTMORELAND, and Mr. CRAWFORD.

H.R. 143: Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. RIBBLE, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mrs. SCHMIDT, and Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 144: Mr. KING of New York, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Ms. GRANGER, and Ms. BERKLEY.

H.R. 168: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 178: Mr. JONES.

H.R. 192: Ms. LEE of California, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. STARK, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. HINCHAY, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. FARR, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. HONDA, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, and Mrs. CAPPS.

H.J. Res. 3: Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. KING of Iowa, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H.J. Res. 9: Mr. BURTON of Indiana and Mr. POE of Texas.

H. Con. Res. 3: Mr. HALL, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. SCHOCK.

H. Res. 19: Ms. LEE of California, Mr. RUSH, and Ms. MOORE.

H. Res. 20: Mr. BERMAN, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H. Res. 21: Mr. CONYERS and Mr. STARK.

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. CAMP

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Ways and Means 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 of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF KENTUCKY

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Appropriations 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. UPTON

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Energy and Commerce 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.