

protection under the law for being who they are. Yesterday Republicans tried to block an important provision to protect gays, lesbians, transgenders, and bisexuals from being targeted, harassed, injured, or even killed due to acts of bias and hatred. The Matthew Shepherd Hate Crimes Prevention Act would give the LGBT community the same protections already provided to other groups that have been discriminated against in our Nation's history.

Many are familiar with the hatred and bigotry perpetrated against people of different races and religions. Take the case of Kenny Chiu, a 17-year-old Asian American from Orange County, California, who was simply standing in the driveway of his own home when he was grabbed and brutally stabbed 26 times. In the last hour of his life, he was able to identify his killer. It was his 20-year-old next-door neighbor, who was a Neo-Nazi sympathizer and was looking for a minority to kill.

But members of the LGBT community face the same harassment every day just for being who they are. Larry King was a gay eighth-grader from Ventura, California, who used to come to school dressed differently. He was the subject of great harassment. Other boys made fun of him, called him names, and threw wet paper towels at him in the boys' restroom. Then one morning behind the computer lab at his junior high school, a fellow classmate shot him twice in the head. In contrast to the case of Kenny Chiu, Larry King's murder is not covered by our Federal hate crimes law. This must change.

When asked by my constituents why I support this bill, I describe my experience as Chair of the California State Assembly's Select Committee on Hate Crimes, where I held hearings on hate crimes across all the communities of the State. After hearing these horrific stories and listening to their heart-broken families, I know I cannot fight for the civil rights of one group without fighting for the civil rights of the other. Things will not change until people stand up and say we will not tolerate making anybody in America a second-class citizen. As long as intolerance exists, as long as there are people out there that turn a blind eye to hate and bigotry, then we as a human race are doomed to repeat the horrors of the past.

In California what happened to Larry King is considered a hate crime. It is one of only five States in the Nation that include sexual orientation and gender identity in the definition of a hate crime. But in the Nation many are left without such protection because Federal law leaves many States without the resources or expertise to effectively investigate and prosecute bias-motivated violent crimes in the LGBT community. That is why tomorrow we must pass the Matthew Shepherd Hate Crimes Prevention Act so that every teenager who goes to school can be who they are knowing they are

protected by the United States of America.

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

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

SAVING A MILLION JOBS AT \$787,000 PER JOB

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

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, in a column last month for RealClearMarkets, businessman Bill Frezza took on the idea that the stimulus package had somehow "saved" jobs in America. He writes:

"The White House Council of Economic Advisers said Thursday the \$787 billion stimulus plan kept 1 million people working who would otherwise not have had jobs.

"You wouldn't let me stand up and make the simplistic claim that these million jobs were saved at a cost of \$787,000 per job without challenging the details of my accounting, would you? Surely reality is more complex.

"But when the White House Council of Economic Advisers calculated the number of jobs saved by our government's massive stimulus spending, how is it that they entirely neglected to account for the impact on employment of removing \$787 billion from the balance sheet of the private economy?"

He continues by discussing those from the White House Council of Economic Advisers who make these dubious claims about the so-called "saved" jobs:

"They never had to meet a payroll," Mr. Frezza writes. "They never had to raise money to fund their businesses from skeptical investors. They never bet their life savings on their own business judgment. They never had to scramble to pay off a banker who called in a loan. They never had to decide whether to take a calculated risk to expand their workforce, hoping to take market share from a fierce competitor. They never had to make a judgment call on whether or not to launch an unproven new product. They never had to manage a new reduction in force, explaining to employees that their jobs have been eliminated because the tax and regulatory burdens imposed by some new law forced them to cut costs.

"They never lost business to a government-subsidized competitor whose cost of capital was vastly lower than theirs. They never had to grease the palms of politicians offering constituent services to resolve a bureaucratic hangup caused by the labyrinthine government approvals these self-same politicians inflict on many businesses.

"They never had to deal with a missed sales forecast caused by an economy so roiled by capricious and uncertain fiscal policy that frightened customers were holding back orders. They never had to deal with a key supplier that unexpectedly went bankrupt because their source of credit dried up as dollars got sucked out of the commercial economy into government debt. They never had to negotiate with angry landlords after being forced to shut down a business destroyed by spurious mass-manufactured class-action suits. They never had to stand up in front of disappointed investors to explain why they lost money that had been entrusted to them.

"And you can be sure that none of them ever fell on their face and had to pick themselves up, dust themselves off, and decide whether it was worth going through all the joys described above to take another shot at building a business from scratch."

Then he launches into his final broadside against the assumption of the council's economists:

"All three have Ph.D.s from fancy universities," he writes. "They are prize-winning experts in macroeconomics. To have come this far, you can bet they are ambitious, articulate, well connected, and brilliant. Yet when the Council of Economic Advisers did its calculations to determine the numbers of jobs saved by the stimulus, they shamelessly counted assets and totally ignored liabilities.

"People this smart cannot be easily fooled. People so visibly in the public eye cannot remain willfully blind.

"No, these people and those who appointed them are cunningly smart. It's we who are the fools for listening to them. Long after these experts return to their sinecures in academia to train another generation of economists on the wisdom of central planning and Keynesian pump priming, it's we and our children and our grandchildren who will be paying the price."

□ 1915

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

(Mr. GRAYSON 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 South Carolina (Mr. INGLIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

THE MACKAY FAMILY

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Yesterday I came on the floor, and I introduced this body to the Mackay family, a doctor of 30 years, a certified orthopedic surgeon in our community. Dr. Mackay, as has been alleged by the Drug Enforcement Administration, has been giving improper prescriptions to patients in a way that has caused addiction within our community.

Now, the investigation had taken apparently about a year, starting in 2007; but I wanted to pick up the story of this family on June 6 of 2008.

It was on that day that a hard knock came on the door of Dr. Mackay's home. He said it was so loud he thought that had he not answered the door quickly they would have broken the door in, but he did answer the door.

In a rush, 20 agents in full riot gear and armed, they handcuffed Dr. Mackay, took him to the front room, sat him on a chair, and then stuck a gun in his stomach. His wife was also escorted into the front room and held at gunpoint for 4 hours. DEA did not have a search warrant at this time. They said one was coming as they were going through his office at the same time. And sure enough, after the 4-hour ransacking of his home, they finally did show Dr. Mackay and his wife the one-page search warrant.

I suppose he could have objected earlier to that, but usually when a gun is pointed at your stomach, you have a tendency not to be too talkative in those situations.

What they did in his office is take almost two-thirds of his files, hundreds of patients' files. In his personal home, they confiscated all of his personal records, his tax records, his children's personal records. They downloaded his computer, his cell phones; they took his textbooks and medical journals. They also confiscated his savings and checking account and put a hold on his retirement fund. They also took both his car and his truck.

They did not at any of this time charge him with any crime. They didn't arrest him for anything. In fact, if the issue is prescribing improperly prescription drugs, they did not take away his license to be a doctor. He could still function as a doctor, I suppose, if he could walk to work. And he did. The State of Utah never did go after his particular license.

However, with all of his money confiscated, he is relegated to a position of no money for food, which is okay because he has no vehicles to drive to the store if he needed to. For several months his family survived on the food storage that they had put away as a family for an emergency situation. And during this time, once again, there have been no charges, no arrests; but his property has been confiscated.

He was finally able to get enough money together to hire an attorney; and in November of 2008, 5 months after the initial raid, he went to court. And the courts did demand that some of his property be returned to him. He was

given his pension fund back. He was allowed his car but not his truck, nor was he allowed access to his personal savings account or to his personal checking account. Nor was he allowed access to his files or to his textbooks. I have a hard time wondering why DEA, the Drug Enforcement Administration, wants his textbooks and his truck; but they kept them.

Everything he has done up until this time is in trying to meagerly pay off defense bills that he is now accumulating to try and clear his name.

Now, I don't want to give an opinion as to the element of what may or may not have been the legal situation here. I can say from my understanding of this family and the situation that is involved that I do not find Dr. Mackay or his family to be a threat to our community. In fact, if one looks at the sworn statements from almost all of the physicians in our area, they do not find Dr. Mackay a threat to our community. If I read the letters to the editor in our local paper, the constituents' mail that I have read, no one still considers his family a threat to the community.

Nevertheless, this family, since June of 2008, has been terrorized, a profession has been destroyed, a reputation has been besmirched, property has been confiscated; and still there are no charges, there are no arrests.

Justice, as I always understood it, is supposed to work in a way in which the bad guys are accused and charged and then go before a judge and a jury of their peers. That has not been the situation.

And with that, Madam Speaker, I appreciate the time here. And what I would like to do is once again come in for installment number three, because this story of the Mackay story is not over, and tell you what has still continued to happen to this family in contradiction of what could be or should be the rule of law.

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

(Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey 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 Georgia (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BROWN of Georgia 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 Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GOHMERT 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 North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

HEALTH CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. AKIN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. AKIN. Madam Speaker, thank you for this opportunity to once again take a look at some of the very significant questions that face our country this evening in this 1-hour. We're going to be taking a look at the subject of health care in America, something that has absorbed the attention of citizens and political leaders now for a number of months. Something that is, of course, important to every single one of us.

We each have to live inside the bodies that we have, and how health care is run in this country is not only very important from a financial and economic and policy point of view; it's very personal because it's our bodies, after all.

So what we're going to take a look at this evening once again is the question as to what are the reforms that should be made in American health care.

Now, sometimes people when we deal with this want to say that everything is wrong; we need to just burn the entire barn down and start completely over. But of course people from foreign countries that have millions and millions of dollars come to America all the time as their choice for the best health care that they can buy anywhere in this planet.

So, certainly, there are many good aspects to our health system even though it may need some reforms in some areas.

What is being proposed here is not minor. In fact, that's one of the problems with the fact that legislation has not moved in months on the health care subject and that's because what was being attempted is to do a great, great deal. What's being attempted is the government, essentially over time, is going to take over 18 percent of the entire U.S. economy, that is, the government is going to run the health care system.

Now, this is a rather bold proposal. When Lyndon Johnson discovered hunger as an issue, he didn't propose that the government was going to take over all of the grocery stores and farms and all of the trucking in between, but rather that he would propose food stamps. This, instead, is the idea the government is going to take over everything in medicine over a period of time.

So the question is, is this a good thing. Does it really meet the problems, and what are the potential dangers of it.