

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.)