

geothermal to help run the campus activities.

All of this has immense potential, immeasurable at times, and all we have to do is unleash the talent. A leading Nation such as ours cannot, again, be complacent. And we need to continually energize our thinking and our behavior. No lead nation can allow itself to slip backward. Unless we encourage our workforce and our students out there, our youth, to desire, to invent, and discover and explore, we will not maintain a leadership status.

So I agree with you, for those who are agents of no, for those who wanted to settle for the status quo, those who are perhaps using partisan approaches to deny progress with this administration, need not put the burdens and the hurdles before us.

□ 1730

We need to march forward in progress, sharing a boldness of vision, created by a situation here that has really triggered the need for the American ingenuity, the American intellect, and the American resolve to move us forward.

Representative LUJÁN, it's great to have you here this evening.

Mr. LUJÁN. Well, it's great to be with you, Mr. TONKO. I'm not sure if there is anything to add after that.

When you talk about the piece of legislation that you brought to the floor and we were able to get passed that would make new investments in wind energy, back home in a little community by the name of Tucumcari, New Mexico, we have the North American Wind Research and Training Center at Mesalands Community College where they're training young people how to maintain these wind turbines across New Mexico, across Texas, up to Colorado, and across the country. I will tell you, job creation, investments in new energy, investments in clean energy, they're all connected. That's one example of a piece of legislation that's allowing us to achieve this and make it happen.

It's just great to be on the floor with you this evening, Mr. TONKO, as we're able to talk to the American people and those that want to see this happen, those that are hungry for this investment, those that are hungry to see their kids have these opportunities for years to come, that they want more generations behind them to have as well. I'll tell you, we're almost there, Mr. TONKO, and we're going to make this happen, and it's going to be the American people to help push us over the top.

Mr. TONKO. Well, I agree. And thank you for leadership like that that you have provided, because it's that advocacy, that voice of can-do that will make the difference. I think of the opportunity that we have to make solar a legacy piece.

Representative GIFFORDS introduced her solar efficiency roadmap legislation, and allowing for us to look again

at the efficiencies that we can drive into the solar discussion, the solar outcome, we should create a legacy piece of that. We need to look at thin film and R&D that can put us into a situation where we discover the materials that can shave the priciness of some of these renewable opportunities that then make them all the more competitive, make them all the more connected to consumer behavior out there.

You know, if we can utilize the sun, and if we can utilize water, and if we can utilize the wind, and if we can utilize the soil to provide for our needs in a benign way, then what a tremendous legacy, what a tremendous bit of progress to leave that next generation as they will continue to grow upon our success stories. But what a tragedy if we're to look back and say that we thought status quo was fine, that 40 years ago we won a space race and we were content to sit still. Nothing could be more un-American than that thinking.

So in this House, in this loftiness, we require lofty thinking, and that's what it's about. I'm so proud of this majority in that they do speak in lofty terms, Madam Speaker. I think this is the way we get things done, and I am just impressed with what I see here being brought forward not only in resolve for an energy problem or problems or with environmental concerns, but in job creation, where we're allowing as a down payment a half million jobs with the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, but then looking at the millions of jobs that come forward through a program like ACES, the American Clean Energy and Security Act, that allows us to, again, think outside that barrel and say, That's not good enough for us.

Fossil-based fuels, you know, the dependency to send hundreds of billions of dollars to foreign economies where there are unfriendly governments that are utilizing those monies in their Treasury that are poured in from the American pockets and then fight us as terrorist regimes or what have you, we have got to step back and say, There is a better way. And there is a better way, and we're promoting it. We're advancing it here, and it's all in the name of job creation, job retention, which I believe is a benefit that is immeasurable in its kind.

Madam Speaker, we thank you for the opportunity this evening to share sentiments on behalf of Democrats in the House who are advancing the notion of progressive energy policy, of resources that will enable us to think in new capacity as we speak to the energy needs of this Nation all while advancing the notion of jobs. We thank you for that opportunity.

Representative LUJÁN, any closing comments?

Mr. LUJÁN. Madam Speaker, we just appreciate the time this evening to remind the American people what we can do, the jobs that can be created when we can come together and make invest-

ments in this great Nation of ours. Investing in energy and being smart about the way we do things, it's all part of the mix. It's just great to know that this Congress and this President are serious about getting something done to be able to put the American people first.

GROWING THE GOVERNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. KOSMAS). 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. Thank you, Madam Chair.

It's a pleasure to join you this evening and to join my friends as we take a look once more at a debate which has stirred the imaginations and minds of Americans and has perhaps even tried the patience of many Americans now for many months, but something that is not complete, it's not done, and that is the question of health care.

One of the things that I want to do is to recognize the speakers from the previous hour, as they were talking in glowing terms about free enterprise and about the possibilities of what America can do in the future and about setting bold new objectives and all. All of that sounded pretty good. I agreed with all of it. Except the only trouble is what we've really been doing for the last 10 months, which is the government's taking everything over. So it's a vision, but it's not a bold vision.

I don't know of any nation that really set any great records or achievements in a positive sense by the government taking over more and more things. In fact, most nations, when the government takes over more and more things, they do more and more mischief and damage. Indeed, we have many nations that are government-run that have given us the worst tyrannies in history. For instance, the history of communism, a phenomenon of the last century. The communist nations of the world killed more of their own populations than all of the wars in history. So the idea of expanding government at a rapid and radical pace and sort of saying that this is free enterprise is amusing.

There was also a comment made that all of this unemployment was, implied that that happened a long time ago. It was somebody else's fault. The only thing I remember was that just a few months ago we had a stimulus bill. It was a guarantee. They said we're supposed to pass the stimulus bill. I called it the porkulus bill. If we didn't pass the stimulus bill, by golly, unemployment could get all the way to 8 percent. So you have got to jump on and spend \$787 billion by expanding Medicare and giving money to community organizing organizations like ACORN because this is really important stimulus money. So we passed, not with my vote and not with one Republican vote,

the stimulus bill. That was to make sure that we didn't have this problem of unemployment. Well, now it's 10.2, and that stimulus bill doesn't seem to have worked.

Now, you don't have to be a rocket scientist to know it wouldn't work. All you had to do was look back at the Great Depression. Look at Henry Morgenthau. He was a guy that marched right along with Little Lord Keynes, saying, Hey, if we're going to stimulate the government, we're going to stimulate the economy by having the government spend tons of money. Well, Henry Morgenthau comes to the Congress, to the Ways and Means Committee in 1939, and he said, Well, we tried the stimulus idea. Friends, it didn't work. We have got unemployment as bad as ever, and we're in a tremendous amount of debt to boot. Now, we aren't going to learn from that. We're going to march on with this bold new vision of the government spending money like mad, and they justify it in the name of free enterprise. I find that amazing.

We have another example of this bold new spending initiative, and that is what happens in the area of health care when the government tries to take over one-sixth of our economy.

I am joined by my very good friend, Congresswoman FOXX, who has agreed to come here in spite of an extremely busy schedule this evening, a young lady that adds tremendous vigor to the Republican Caucus. And anybody gets out of line, you've got the grandmother to deal with. So everybody knows you've got to line up.

Congresswoman FOXX, we've just heard a vision of tremendous free enterprise, new materials, all sorts of things, and we're marching boldly because we don't want to stay in the staid ways of the past. But the solution seems to be more government spending, more government takeover of things. Can you think of any civilization that you can think of that became great because the government grew and took over everything?

Ms. FOXX. No, I can't. And I want to thank the gentleman from Missouri for taking on this Special Order tonight and for bringing up issues that are very, very important to the American people and doing it on such a consistent basis. You've done a terrific job.

I think, as I heard today in a meeting—I'm not sure if you were in that meeting when somebody pointed out—when the Communist Chinese start lecturing us on having too large a deficit, something is out of kilter in the world. And we know that in the last few days the President's been in China, and they have been lecturing us about this issue.

Mr. AKIN. Just reclaiming my time, there is something that's almost funny about that. It shouldn't be funny. It should be sad, I suppose, that the Communist Chinese are lecturing us about the government spending too much money and taking too many things

over. It's, of course, because they own a whole lot of American treasuries, and they don't want to see us mess the whole system up. So here we have the Communist Chinese talking to us about excessive big government. I mean, this has been a year of amazing things, hasn't it?

We saw the government fire the president of General Motors. Just on the face of it, that's kind of a weird thing to see. We've got czars now in charge of all kinds of areas of government, people that have never been approved by the Senate. They're unconstitutional, and they're setting the prices of American executives, how much they're paid. So we've got the government doing that. Now they want to take over a sixth of the economy in this health care situation, and they're not thinking of this as any kind of problem at all.

But Congresswoman FOXX, you know, when the government does too much, we see these kinds of typical symptoms: bureaucratic rationing, inferior quality, inefficient allocation, excessive expense. We've seen that in department after department of Federal Government when they grow and try to do too much. It has led to the quip, "If you think health care is expensive now, just wait until it's free."

Ms. FOXX. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. AKIN. I do yield.

Ms. FOXX. You mentioned a minute ago about the fact that this has been a year of very unusual things to have happen. I learned just recently that there is a poll that was done, and we know people are polling in this country all the time. But a poll was done that said that two-thirds of Americans believe it is more likely that we'll discover life in outer space than that the Democrats' health plan will be deficit-neutral.

Now, I think that's a good sign for our country. It's a good sign that people are paying attention to what is happening in this country and what is happening in this House and in the Senate, the fact that two-thirds of our citizens don't believe the line that's being fed to them that this health care bill is deficit-neutral.

That deficit, as you say, is causing tremendous harm, not just because the Chinese are nervous about it, but from the money it's taking out of the private sector and the problems it's causing small businesses. I know you want to talk a little bit about that tonight, and I hope that you will. I'm not going to be able to stay with you for the whole hour because I have the great pleasure of going over to be with Senator Jesse Helms' family who are in town for the unveiling of his portrait tonight, but I want to stay with you for a few minutes. I can just imagine Senator Helms watching us from heaven thinking, "Oh, I wish I were there to be in this fight." The Senate right now is behind closed doors, behind closed doors despite all the promises of trans-

parency, working on a bill that's going to create havoc. But the American public has awakened, and it knows this is not right.

Mr. AKIN. You just tickled my imagination. So we're saying that two-thirds of Americans in this poll said that they think there is more chance to discover life in outer space than there is that this health care bill is going to be budget-neutral. That gets to the very top excessive expense.

Let's just talk about the big picture of what's going on. You remember just a year or so ago, we heard that President Bush spent too much money. Do you remember hearing that? The Democrats said it all the time, and some Republicans said it a fair amount, too. So let's take a look at President Bush's worst year in deficit spending.

□ 1745

His worst year was 2008—and the Democrats controlled Congress—and his worst spending was about \$450 billion, which was too much deficit spending but was 450.

Now this year, the bold new vision says we are going to do things differently. And so what is our deficit spending now? Well, it's \$1.4 trillion. So we've tripled the deficit this year, and we are kind of wondering, Gosh, gee, I wonder why we have got problems with unemployment.

You know, one of the things that the Democrats, at a minimum, should do is they ought to learn from other Democrats even if they won't listen to Republicans. I can understand they don't want to listen to Republicans because we say things that are uncomfortable truths that they want to ignore such as laws of supply and demand and gravity and other miscellaneous things.

But they could listen to JFK. He was met with a recession, and what he figured out was he wanted more jobs. He thought, Gosh, gee, where did the jobs come from? Oh, small businesses, where most of the jobs are. If you look at America, 80 percent of the jobs are in small businesses, that is 500 or fewer employees.

So he says, How are we going to get these small businesses to hire people? Well, maybe let's back off on taxes, give them some more room, some money to work with. Then they will add wings on the buildings, new machines, new ideas, innovation. We have heard a lot about innovation. Innovation doesn't come from the Federal Government, taking everybody's money. JFK understood that. So he backed off on taxes, and the small businesses started producing jobs, and we pulled out of the recession.

Now, Ronald Reagan understood that. He did the same thing, and we pulled out of a recession because we allowed small businesses to create jobs. And Bush, II, did that with dividends, capital gains, death tax. He allowed the small businessman—instead of taxing him into the dirt, he gets them going.

What we're seeing under the Pelosi plan, this is a repeat of FDR. We're going to turn a recession into a depression because they haven't learned even from the Democrats, which is such as Henry Morgenthau or JFK.

Ms. FOXX. Will the gentleman yield?
Mr. AKIN. I yield.

Ms. FOXX. I have quoted Morgenthau many, many times saying we've spent, we've spent, we've spent, and we can't do anything about the unemployment rate. And I think we need to keep repeating that quote. And I know you have it, and it's a little more eloquent than what I have summarized here.

But I wanted to go back for a moment when you started out talking about our colleagues who were here earlier on the floor talking small businesses and about small government. You know, we hear that talk from our colleagues across the aisle all the time; and it reminds me of the North Carolina motto, which I've occasionally used on the floor when I have heard those kinds of speeches being made. The North Carolina motto is "To be, rather than to seem."

Unfortunately, our colleagues talk a good line, but when it comes down to doing what needs to be done, they want to seem rather than to be. So they try to tell their folks at home—they act like they're conservatives. They act like they're going to be good people with the purse, that they're protecting people. Then they come up here and they vote to spend money. Day after day after day we see all of these bills coming up authorizing expenditures, spending money. And as you said, we have the largest deficit right now that we have had, than we had with our first 43 Presidents. And it is really dragging down our economy.

You know, my daughter runs our nursery and landscaping business, a business my husband and I started a long time ago; and I can remember going to my husband at times and saying, You know, I'd like to do this in the garden shop and spiff it up a little bit. And he would say to me, Well, how much is that going to help our bottom line? Is it going to bring in more money? And I would sometimes say, No, it will just make things look better. He would say, If it isn't going to bring in more money, then we shouldn't be doing it.

That is the decision small business people have to make every day of their lives. Some of them lay awake at night worrying how am I going to pay my bills, how am I going to make my payroll. They personally sacrifice to take care of their employees. I know. We've been there. And yet we have people up here who've never worked a day in their life, a real job. They have been in Congress for 50, 40, 30 years, and they have no concept of how hard it is to run a business and how dedicated small business people are.

Mr. AKIN. They seem to understand one thing, which is what Ronald Reagan always said: taxing and spending.

Let's take a look at what we've got here. We're talking about just this year. Here's \$350 billion for the Wall Street bailout. Here's another \$787 billion. That's the one that's supposed to make sure we don't have unemployment, right?

Ms. FOXX. Will the gentleman yield?
Mr. AKIN. I yield.

Ms. FOXX. If I remember right, the promise was if that passes, unemployment will not go above 8 percent; is that correct?

Mr. AKIN. Yeah.

Ms. FOXX. What is our unemployment right now?

Mr. AKIN. Last time I checked it was 10.2, and you know those were conservative numbers because it doesn't include somebody being unemployed more than a year. They take their name off the list. It doesn't mean they got the job.

Ms. FOXX. I have heard from many economists that the actual unemployment rate is probably 17 to 20 percent because of the folks you mentioned, those who've given up looking for jobs, those who have gone to work part time. So it was not supposed to go above 8 percent.

This really has damaged the credibility, I think, of both this Congress and this administration because all these promises have been made and none of them have been kept.

Mr. AKIN. The implication is that the unemployment that we're having trouble with was really Bush's fault. Everything that doesn't work right, well, it was Bush's fault. Bush, when he came in—I was here; I came in the same year he did—and we had a problem with a sagging economy. We were going into a recession, and he dealt with it the same way that JFK had done it and Ronald Reagan had done it, and that is he got off the back of the small businessman because he knew he had to let that guy have some breathing room to get those jobs going. We're doing the exact opposite, which is what Henry Morgenthau did, and we're going to turn a recession into a depression if we're not careful.

And when this thing passed, this stimulus bill, we stood here on the floor—and I think you were with me, young lady—and we said it's not going to work. I don't mean to be an "I told you so." You don't have to be an "I told you so." All of history is screaming that this is not the way to solve this problem.

And now we hear, well, because we have unemployment, it must be the Republicans' fault somehow when we're 40 seats in the minority.

Ms. FOXX. Will the gentleman yield?
Mr. AKIN. Yeah.

Ms. FOXX. My recollection is every single Republican voted against the stimulus package in the House.

Mr. AKIN. That's correct.

We've been joined, as you know, by my very good friend, Congressman BISHOP from Utah, a gentleman that is so commonsense and so straight-

forward in explaining himself. He has already made a great reputation here, and I would like to yield time to my good friend.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. You're very kind, Mr. AKIN. I wish I believed what you said about me.

You know, I was intrigued by the original chart that you had up there when government does too much. Sometimes we tend to overlook that.

I have always contended that the issue of health care we saw was foretold by our Founding Fathers over 200 years ago when they instituted a system of federalism, because they knew back in that time even though there were only 13 States in the original country—actually 11 when we started, eventually 13—that the Federal Government would always be too big to take—to do anything other than a one-size-fits-all approach. And that if indeed you wanted to have justice, take in the circumstances, creativity or perhaps a program if it failed, it didn't destroy an entire country. You had to have it done by State and local government. That is the value of it.

Mr. AKIN. It's called federalism, as I recall.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. You know, they didn't limit the power of the Federal Government just for the fun of it. There was a reason and a purpose to it.

One of our great Justices on the Supreme Court once said, The Constitution protects us from our own best intentions. It divides power precisely so that we will resist the temptation to concentrate power in one location as an expedient solution to the crisis of the day.

Now, he was not writing, obviously, about the health care bill that passed this House, but it applies. And what we did was simply lose sight of the structure the Founding Fathers put in place to create balance and creativity and empowerment of individuals.

I'd like to talk simply about one of the things the States are doing, specifically in my State, because my State recognizes we have a unique demographic.

Mr. AKIN. What you were talking about I think at one point it was viewed that States were, in a way, kind of a laboratory of creativity. So you have got now with 50 different States, if some State wants to get a little bit out in the land of fruits and nuts, and California wants to spend a whole lot of money and do things one way, there is some flexibility to do that. But that doesn't mean that Missouri or Utah has to do it the same way.

And certainly in the area of health care we've seen that. We've seen a couple of States try some innovative ideas in health care. One was Massachusetts, and one was Tennessee. And both fell flat on their faces because they did the same thing that is being done here.

I don't want to get ahead of you.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. That is part of the issue.

Massachusetts has a program that is expensive. They appear to like it, but

it's very expensive. It would not work in Utah. Our program would not fly back in Boston.

Utah has unique demographics. We're a very young State. We have a lot of kids, whereas most small businesses, 42 percent of the Nation, provide insurance. In Utah it's only 32 percent. That's a unique demographic challenge that we have to face.

What would happen, though, if we simply go along with the PelosiCare that we passed is that every one of the small businesses in Utah rather than getting help to solve the problem would be hit with a 5 percent tax that would attack 5,500 small businesses already nickled and dimed. What they really want is for us to get off their backs with mandates and out of their pockets with taxes so they can solve problems.

So what the State legislature in Utah provided is a way of solving those problems by recognizing that small business has a great concern once they get into health care because they don't know what their costs will be over the period of time, and it's very marginal.

So what they have tried to do is come up with a concept which empowers individuals to choose. Small businesses now can give a pot of money they would be giving to an employee as a defined contribution, they could then go and buy the health care service that they want.

Mr. AKIN. That idea sounds like freedom. I am really liking this already.

Go ahead.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. It's dangerous, isn't it? It's almost scary as we think about it.

But the goal is to have a clear, transparent index in which all of the options that are legal in the State of Utah—and right now there are 66 options from which people can choose. They are easily adaptable, easily accessible, easily understandable. If you change jobs, you're still in the insurance. So there's a portability.

Mr. AKIN. So you have portability?

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Costs are stabilized for the business; employers now have options from which to choose. And this is only in the first year. It has had a phenomenal response, and we are just beginning.

If the Federal Government were then to try and help that out by doing simple things like allowing—removing barriers for cross-state purchases, doing tort reforms which would bring down the costs, the number of people who are truly uninsurable because of pre-existing conditions can be shrunk to an area that is possible for States to easily handle and maybe even the Federal Government could give grants to that.

Mr. AKIN. Can I ask you about what you've got, because that's really an exciting concept.

First of all, what you're saying is that a small business has some employees, they want to treat their employees right but they also have to make the small business make money so they

can say, Look, we're going to put aside this amount of money for each of our employees to help them with health care, but we're going to allow those employees to have some choices as to what they buy.

So, for instance, let's just say that I am a husband. I've got a job in small business. I have a wife. And it turns out we know that we're never going to have any children. So I don't really need to get the coverage for childbirth or something that maybe somebody else does. So I could find a policy that would suit, that would be more tailor-made to our family and therefore could get better coverage in some other areas possibly.

So you have a way to fine-tune something that meets your particular situation.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. And by controlling your own money with your own choices.

When I go into a grocery store to pick up cereal, there's an entire wall of choices. I pick the kind I like. You would go in with me and you'd go over and pick another one. Why isn't the role of government to allow people to have choices?

I have one of my fellow teachers who was upset because in his plan the district only allowed him two options. If you actually go to a single-payer system by the Federal Government, you get one.

The State of Utah is saying there are 66 options, which is a comparative advantage of that. It also means one of the situations that we have in large business provides insurance for its workers. The owner or the manager picks what company it is and everybody has to follow along. In this program, the large business already providing insurance could do the same thing by providing the amount of money to an individual who could then go on the State index and pick what he or she wants to do.

□ 1800

Here is the kicker: this is a great idea.

Mr. AKIN. Of course this Pelosi bill is going to absolutely torpedo everything that you are talking about, isn't it?

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. You just took the words out of my mouth because that is the kicker. States have the ability of becoming creative. They are, as you were earlier quoting Louis Brandeis, becoming laboratories of democracy. They have the idea of making a system that meets the demographic needs of that particular State. What we should be doing is encouraging that kind of creativity, encouraging those kinds of options. But you are exactly right, with the bill that we passed the other week, that stops that concept dead in its tracks.

Mr. AKIN. First of all, the Pelosi bill has all of these mandates in it, and let's just talk about this mandate. This one here is the mandate for, let me get

it on the chart, this is the mandate for employers. First of all, employers have to offer a qualified health care plan to all full and part-time employees. What do you think that "qualified health care plan" means?

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. We may be comfortable today with what is defined as qualified. Unfortunately, and this is what the Supreme Court Justice was saying, the Constitution protects us from our own instincts of doing this, that by creating a commission that in the future will tell what the private sector will do when it is in competition with the Federal Government. What may be qualified in the future is not necessarily what is qualified today.

As you stated very convincingly earlier, if you have a specific need, what is your need may not be what some distant bureaucrat in Washington determines to be qualified. And, in fact, one of the biggest problems we have when people talk about health care, no one has ever really defined what health care actually is. Is cosmetic surgery part of it? Is mental health part of it? Nursing homes, are they part of it? What is the goal or purpose of it? We have yet to do that. See, that is what we are allowing a bureaucrat in the future to do as opposed to what some of the States wish to do in allowing citizens, employees, to have options and choices so they have control over their own lives.

Mr. AKIN. There will be a number of our colleagues who may be watching, and other Americans who are hearing this discussion. Which would you prefer to have? The option that you are offering, which is what Utah is doing—your employer gives you some money, you can go out and use that money to buy something. You can buy one of, what was it, 66 different policies, and try and find something that really fits the need of you and your family. That is one alternative.

This is the old Henry Ford alternative: you can have any color car you want as long as it is black. This is the government plan: employers must offer a qualified plan. Who says what qualified is? The Federal Government says what qualified is.

How does it work? First of all, the employer has to pay somewhere between 65 and 72 percent of the cost of the plan. Now we have already defined this because the government knows what the employer should provide. It shouldn't be 50, it shouldn't be 80; it has got to be this.

Or if you don't do that, you have to pay a tax of 8 percent of the payroll costs. Here is how this works. You have 20 employees. One employee decides he wants something else. That means just one out of 20 doesn't take your plan that the business offered, and now the business gets hit with 8 percent, regardless if the other 19 employees were happy with it. So now they are going to get whacked with this 8 percent tax off of payroll, so you are hammering small business, which makes it less efficient

and forces everybody into, guess what, Henry Ford's one color, black. You've got a qualified health care plan. Which qualified health care plan? The one by the Federal Government.

You have a choice of one, one, or one. The insurance companies, what are they going to write? The qualified plan. Because if you don't write the qualified plan, what happens is, you get fined by the Federal Government, because you had a nice health plan that fits some people's needs that you thought was a good deal, and you are going to get fined instead. That is mandate. That is not freedom.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. If I can add one thing here, because I notice that we have been joined by two other colleagues who have given their entire professional career in this area. They know what they are talking about. I would add our Founding Fathers, sitting over there with their knee britches and their powdered wigs, knew exactly what we needed today because their highest goal was to provide individual liberty for the citizens so that people could make choices for themselves. They realized it is not the role of government to tell people what is best for them. That is a risk-averse system of nanny government where we tell people what to do because we know what is best, and it is cheaper as we see it.

Our goal should be to provide people with choices and options that ennoble their souls and allow them to control their own destinies. The only way of doing that is allowing States to move forward on their own, as Utah is trying to do, and not be stopped by this Pelosi care bill which will stop the States' progress and all of the innovations that are taking place out there.

Some time we have to realize that you don't solve problems by putting a lot of experts in a room in Washington, D.C. There is a font of knowledge out there that is waiting to blossom and provide new solutions. Our salvation as a Nation is to go back to the Constitution and believe in federalism. That is how we move forward.

Mr. AKIN. Well, I very much appreciate the gentleman from Utah. Congressman BISHOP, you are just an inspiration, and that really is a breath of fresh air flowing through this Chamber, the idea of freedom and the idea of limited government and the idea that we will allow States to solve their own problems instead of the Federal Government, the one-size-fits-all Pelosi plan. And it also takes the pressure off of intense levels of Federal spending that are bankrupting our Nation. We talked about earlier—can you believe that the communist Chinese were telling us that our government is spending too much money and getting too big? That is a wrong day in American history. It is something else.

I am joined by Dr. GINGREY from Georgia, who has some great charts. They look more interesting than mine, so I yield to Dr. GINGREY.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Thank you, Mr. AKIN. Referring to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP), the historian, what he was talking about, I carry this with me in my pocket all the time, and I am sure many of my colleagues do, a pocket Constitution. This is the inconvenient truth, and this is exactly what my colleague was just talking about.

You go in the back and look up in the glossary or the index and try to find anything about health care, it is not in there. It is not in there. My colleague, Mr. Speaker, referred to some of the posters that I have with me. I do want to point those out to Members on both sides of the aisle, because I think in many instances a picture is worth a thousand words. In this instance these posters are worth a thousand words.

Focusing in on the first one, Mr. Speaker, it shows the ship of state and the captain of the ship. That would be the administration, that would be the President of the United States, and that ship is the economy. Down here at the bottom of the poster it shows a trailer as we see on television news a lot of times: Alert, bulletin: 10.2 percent unemployment, and then the caption, "Good news, I'm almost done reorganizing the medicine cabinet" as the ship of state is sinking.

Mr. Speaker, it is a point that I have made over and over and over again. When the President sat right where you are, or stood right in front of where you are and spoke to the Nation before a Joint Session of Congress and said our number one priority is to reform our health care system. One-fifth of our economy, colleagues, I believe we are talking about, and yet we have spent \$787 billion on an economic bailout when our unemployment rate was 8 percent, now 10.2 percent, and I think we have lost, and correct me if I'm wrong, Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, the loss of jobs since February of 2009 when we passed this so-called economic stimulus, which was supposed to stem the unemployment at 8 percent, it is now 10.2, and we have 16 million people out of work, an additional 3.5 million since February of this year. Why is that not our number one priority instead of reorganizing the medicine cabinet?

I have some other posters that I want to refer to as well, but I want to yield back to the gentleman controlling the time because there are other Members who would like to speak. Hopefully you will have an opportunity to come back to me.

Mr. AKIN. I appreciate that, and I look forward to doing that. I thought you were going to bring some sort of gory medical pictures here.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. If the gentleman would yield, I definitely do have some of those that I will bring up.

Mr. AKIN. We also have my good friend, G.T., joining us. I think it is good to have different people from different States to have a part in this discussion. We haven't had too much of a

part because all of the doors have been closed and we have been on the outside, but we have a few ideas.

One thing we know how to do is to reduce the cost of health care; and we also know that one size fits all doesn't sound like freedom. Mr. THOMPSON, I would like to yield to you at this time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. I thank my good friend from Missouri.

I came here in January, and I came here knowing that I had a pretty good handle on health care. I worked in health care for almost 30 years. I actually think we have a pretty good health care system, but it can be improved. And much of the improvements that I saw was getting government out of the way. The frustrations I had as a health care professional, as a health care manager, as a therapist, as a nursing home administrator, is when the government was creating problems, preventing access to cost-effective care, increasing costs because of these arbitrary ways that it gets involved.

To me, I think, as my good friend Mr. BISHOP talked about, it is about the wisdom that our Founders had, and it is about free market.

You look at all the Republican proposals we have; they are free market proposals. It is not about inserting more government; it is getting government out of the way. And it is about the arbitrary rules that we have on where we can buy our health insurance from. The government tells us we can only buy within the confines of our own State, and it is about the government telling us we can't group together and form association health plans, that we have to endure medical liability. That becomes legislated and codified into our lives and adds just hundreds of billions of dollars of waste onto the health care system.

I am just so proud of the proposals that Republicans have put forward. I don't know how many in total we have, but between 35 and 40, I believe.

Mr. AKIN. I heard there are over 50 different bills at this point. Some are a combination of different ideas and put together in different ways.

You know, you used to be an administrator and you had to deal with red tape and bureaucracy. What we have just done is we have got a 1,990 page bill. It passed with less than 72 hours for the public to review it. It creates 118 new boards, bureaucracies, commissions and programs, and it is full of new mandates. And it contains the word "shall" 3,425 times. This is what it looks like. And that doesn't even have all of those 118 new boards on it. This is just a simplified version of it. Now, does that look like something to you that gives you much choices? And second of all, talk about overhead, talk about redtape.

You know, we were thinking about, and I see my colleague has come out here with some great sort of cartoons and things, and we were thinking about turning this into a cartoon. We were going to put patients over here and

doctors over here, and turn it into a place mat, and we are going to have lines like a maze, and the trick is, before your dinner is cold, to try to get the patient to the doctor. We were going to set the maze up so there wasn't any way to get there, because that is really what this tells you.

If you really want good, efficient health care, this thing here is in your way. That's the reason why a great majority of Americans don't believe that the Federal Government can take this thing over and manage it efficiently and effectively without the costs going through the roof and also without degrading health care, because the trouble is no other country has ever been able to do this.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Let me reflect on my experiences as someone who was a manager of health care services in a rural hospital, skilled nursing, rehabilitation service—across the board, on what this means. Because you talked about increased costs to the taxpayers of this country.

I have to tell you, what I see there is a nightmare in terms of costs for hospitals and for providers. Hospitals alone, when you look at over 1,990 pages of new text, and that is just the bill. The regulations to be promulgated as a result of over 2,000 pages of law will be—it will just take a forest to be able to print those regulations. Those regulations all need to be administered.

Here is my prediction: For those hospitals that are not bankrupt in the near future, they are going to have to add tremendous employees to deal with that bureaucracy. Those employees' only job will be to interact with all those agencies, not health care, not people providing direct care. They will have to lay off people who provide direct care to be able to afford what will be required to administer those regulations, to make those regulations work within a hospital. That is not good health care.

□ 1815

Mr. AKIN. That's overhead.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. That's overhead. That's the complete opposite of access to quality care. That's preventing access.

Mr. AKIN. I would like to go to my friend Dr. GINGREY. He's got another very heavy medical concept for us. I can tell. He's got it all cued up here.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for yielding back to me. In fact, I would ask him to put the previous poster back up, the one that showed all those additional bureaucracies that are created by H.R. 3962. In fact, that poster was created when it was H.R. 3200 and, as the gentleman from Missouri said, a thousand pages, now 2,000 pages. But he said something about, Madam Speaker, putting that in cartoon form. Well, I've got the cartoon for my colleagues, and here it is.

When you put a gown on that chart, this is what it looks like: a bloated, bloated patient called the House health bill. And this is a cartoon actually from the San Diego Union Tribune a few days ago. And, my colleagues, look at the poor patient, and, of course, I don't know if you can see up at the top corner, "nip/tuck." And these two Senators are standing over here. I guess that may be the majority leader of the Senate, HARRY REID, and possibly the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee or the chairman of the Senate Health Committee standing next to Majority Leader REID, and the caption is, "Hey, this might take a while" to nip/tuck this bloated 2,000-page bureaucracy that's depicted by my colleague Representative AKIN.

It just shows you in a cartoon form, but unfortunately it's not funny, is it? It's not funny, my colleagues and Madam Speaker. This is serious business. And I hope and pray that the Senate will be the saucer that cools the drink of the hot cup that has come over from the House, because Lord help this country if we don't do a whole lot of nipping and tucking if not downright eliminating this bill, H.R. 3962.

Mr. AKIN. I appreciate your keeping it in a sort of a big picture form as to what we're talking about on cost.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. No pun intended, of course, about the cartoon.

Mr. AKIN. But the cost supposedly by the Congressional Budget Office was that this was going to cost a trillion dollars, so your figure over there was overweight in costing a trillion dollars. The trouble with this estimate is it's wrong because the Congressional Budget Office took some assumptions when they built it because they were told we've got to keep this thing under a trillion dollars.

The problem is, first of all, the Democrat Governor of the State of Tennessee, who has already tried this lovely idea, has taken a look at this and called it the "monster of unfunded mandates." What that means is that that trillion dollars was trimmed one way, was to dump a bunch of the costs down to the various States, aside from the fact that it destroys everything that the State of Utah has set up, which is actually kind of an innovative idea. It destroys that because it says every single health insurance plan has to follow what the Federal Government says. So now they're going to define what health insurance is and that's all there is, one definition. And anybody else that doesn't follow that definition, you know what the bill says. You're going to get fined if you're offered health insurance that doesn't fit with what the government guidelines say. So this trillion dollars is wrong.

The other thing they did was they took the trillion dollars and they took the time to calculate this in such a way that the revenue was coming in but the real expenses of the program hadn't hit their peak yet. So they cheated on the two different time

scales as to when the money was coming in versus when the costs were going to come. So, in fact, the trillion as the Senate has calculated it is closer to \$2 trillion, which is \$2 trillion we don't have.

I think the gentlewoman Congresswoman FOXX said that there was a survey done that said that Americans believe there is more probability that we're going to discover aliens in outer space than the fact that this thing is ever going to be anything other than a big budget-busting deficit, driving deficit spending. And, you know, there is a pretty good reason why Americans have that common sense, because we've tried these things before. The Federal Government has tried Medicare and Medicaid, and we see their costs are going out of control, and we're told, Trust us. Medicare and Medicaid are going out of control, so we're going to take the whole system over and run it by the government and it's not going to go out of control.

I yield to my good friend from Pennsylvania.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. I appreciate that, Mr. AKIN.

To that point on Medicare, because of the baby boomer generation, utilization is going up. Those costs are climbing. But just this past week we heard from the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services. They released their 31-page actuarial report on the Pelosi health care plan on what would this do to Medicare. You know what? You're going to have to make that poster a little larger because what the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services—which is the Medicare agency, and they're nonpartisan. That's not a partisan report. It comes from the people who actually run the Medicare and Medicaid systems in the country. As they looked at this bill when they scored it, they said that this would increase costs to the Medicare program over the next 10 years by \$289 billion. So I'm afraid we're going to have to budget for a little larger poster, because with the Pelosi health care bill, it's going to take quite a steep climb beyond where Medicare is already on—

Mr. AKIN. So you're saying that the cost of Medicare is going to go up with this program.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Absolutely, \$289 billion is what the Medicare agency—

Mr. AKIN. Now, wait a minute. My understanding was that what we were cutting was 400 or \$500 billion out of Medicare in order to pay for that trillion. How then is the cost of Medicare going to go up if we're cutting \$500 billion? How do the mathematics work?

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. You know what? I have asked that question many times since I came here in January, how does the math work in this Chamber, because it doesn't add up.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. If the gentleman from Missouri would yield.

Mr. AKIN. I yield to my good friend Dr. GINGREY.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. On this issue, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania just said, the actuaries of CMS, Medicare and Medicaid Services, just said exactly what he said, that over a 10-year period of time, the amount of Medicare expenditures are going to go up by something like \$289 billion.

Look, colleagues, Madam Speaker, we are going to face something on this floor tomorrow, something called “doc fix.” I think the bill number is H.R. 3961. And I want to use my reference to my last chart to bring this home to our colleagues that this is nothing but a Trojan horse. Here’s the Trojan horse with this 3961. I know, my colleagues and Madam Speaker, it’s hard to see this, but it says “Democrat doc fix,” but what’s inside that Trojan horse, of course, is the \$500 billion cut to the Medicare program that the gentleman from Pennsylvania was just talking about. And also it says H.R. 3200. We now know with the Pelosi health reform act, as H.R. 3962, the poor horse is back because it’s gone from a thousand pages to 2,000 pages. But that’s what’s inside this Trojan horse.

Make no mistake about it, my colleagues. Members back home and, yes, your physician constituents, your physician constituents are going to recognize this Trojan horse because they were promised in this massive bill, H.R. 3962, that there would be this permanent “doc fix” in there. But the leadership and the President got together and said, oh, no, that’s going to make the cost go over \$900 billion, and I promised not one dime more than \$900 billion. So let’s pull the doctor fix out and then we’ll bring it forward as a stand-alone bill. But guess what, colleagues? It’s not paid for. And the gentleman from Pennsylvania, I know that he knows this. That adds another \$250 billion to the deficit.

Don’t vote for this Trojan horse tomorrow, 3961.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time, you were speaking clearly except there was one word I didn’t quite catch. I thought you said, was it “doc fix” or was it “doc tricks”?

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. I said “doc fix,” Madam Speaker. But I probably misspoke. I think the gentleman from Missouri is absolutely on target. Doc trick. Amen.

Mr. AKIN. So it’s a trick to make it seem like everything is going to go right with Medicare, but, in fact, it’s not. In other words, the idea was it was going to fix the formula in Medicare so that the doctors wouldn’t keep having their salaries cut a certain—what was it, 5 percent a year or something like that?

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. If my colleague would yield, and I’ll yield right back to him because I know we’ve got another Member that wants to speak.

Mr. AKIN. I yield.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. It is a doc trick. And what it does is it does not

solve the problem. It just substitutes one bad formula for another. And I think, unfortunately, our doctors, if this thing passes, are going to wake up and find out that they are now working for the Federal Government and they’re making far less on Medicare reimbursement than they are today.

Mr. AKIN. My friend is a medical doctor, and you’re planning to vote “no” on the bill.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. In fact, the gentleman is right. I wish there was a “heck no” button, but I don’t think there is. But I will be a definite “no.”

Mr. AKIN. Thank you very much, Dr. GINGREY. Thank you for joining us, and I appreciate your at least trying to put somewhat of a humorous face on a very, very serious situation.

We’re joined by a very good friend of mine from Louisiana. I hope you would join us here on our discussion we’ve got going here tonight.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SCALISE. I thank the gentleman from Missouri.

You’re talking about these tricks, and, of course, the American people are saying Halloween’s over, we’re tired of all these tricks. In fact, for most American people right now, the only treat they get is when Congress adjourns and during those times when Congress isn’t trying to pass all of these policies that literally are adding millions and billions of new taxes on the backs of American families, adding billions of debt onto the backs of our children and grandchildren, and running millions of jobs out of our country. All of this happening under Speaker PELOSI’s leadership. The public’s had enough of the tricks, and like I said, that’s the only treat they want.

But one trick that they just found out about the other day, this goes back to the stimulus bill, something that we talked about a long time ago. We opposed that pork-laden bill, that bill that massively grows the size of government, over \$787 billion of money we don’t have. But the White House promised the American people there would be a full accounting of the money. And now we find out, in fact, that people just in the last few days went to the White House’s own Web site that was set up to track the spending in the supposed job creation, which they initially said it was going to create all these jobs and then they changed the wording and said there will be jobs created or saved, and there’s no definition of a job saved. I guess every job that’s out there they can try to claim they’ve saved. But then what we’ve seen is we’ve only had millions more jobs lost since that massive spending bill that grew the size of government.

But now talk about another trick on the American people, just Monday night when they would go to the Web site that the White House had set up, and maybe this was good news for States like yours, mine. In Louisiana, we found out, according to the White House’s Web site, we had 15 congressional districts.

Mr. AKIN. How many was that, gentleman?

Mr. SCALISE. Fifteen, according to the White House. In fact, Louisiana’s Eighth Congressional District, according to the White House’s own Web site, created more jobs than the First Congressional District that I represent. That all sounds really good until you realize Louisiana doesn’t have 15 congressional districts. Louisiana only has seven congressional districts.

So we did a little bit of research, and some people did some calling around on their own and they actually called the White House. And they said, Can you explain to us, you said there would be all this transparency. You said there would be accountability. How is it, how is it that somebody can go to the White House Web site and pull up in Louisiana Congressional District 26 or Congressional District 45? And the response from the White House was, “Who knows, man, who really knows.”

That was Ed Pound, who is the spokesperson for the White House’s recovery.gov Web site. The best he could come up with was “who knows.” And then he further went on to say, “We’re not certifying the accuracy of the information.” That’s the White House’s spokesperson on the stimulus bill actually saying that they’re not going to certify the information after they said they would be so transparent.

So when the American people say what happened to \$787 billion of money that was borrowed from our children and grandchildren, money we don’t have, money that surely hasn’t done anything to create jobs because it was going to cap unemployment at 8 percent and now we’ve got unemployment at 10.2 percent, and then you go to the White House, what about that accounting that the American people deserve to know where their money is being spent, and the best the White House can say is, “Who knows, man, who really knows,” well, the American people have had enough.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time, I would like to take a look at your chart here. You were boggling on my poor brain here. You’re the Congressman from District One, and they’re saying there are 40 some congressional districts in Louisiana, which is real news to me. I suppose that was news to you, too. And you finally get ahold of the White House, and they spent millions of dollars to create this Web site to track down where we spent the \$787 billion, which was guaranteed or supposed to keep us under 8 percent unemployment, and we get some guy that says, “Who knows, man, who really knows.” It’s like Woodstock lives on.

□ 1830

And we’ve spent billions of dollars to get that kind of answer?

Mr. SCALISE. Right.

And what the American people are really asking is, where are the jobs and where is the accountability? And when the White House actually goes out and

made these statements back months ago and they told the American people that that stimulus bill needed to be passed, we said back then it was a mistake, we shouldn't do it because it wouldn't create jobs. We proposed alternatives.

Mr. AKIN. Gentleman, you were here on the floor when we talked about this. We said, Look, all of the mathematics, all the common sense says this is wasting a lot of money that we don't have. We said, It's not going to create jobs. It didn't for Henry Morgenthau when he turned the recession into the Great Depression. We said, The reason it's not is because jobs come from businesses, particularly small businesses. You're hammering the small businesses. At least learn from the Democrats, learn from FDR, learn from Henry Morgenthau.

Instead, we've got this half-baked Web site telling us that there's 40 some congressional districts. I mean, you'd think they would at least check how many congressional districts there are in a State.

Mr. SCALISE. If this was just a mistake limited to Louisiana, maybe you could understand their excuses. But, of course, this was all across the country. I talked to a colleague of mine from Arizona where they claim there was a 99th District from Arizona.

But one final word on that. President Obama himself just yesterday said, and I'll quote another quote from the President: "If we keep on adding to the debt, people could lose confidence in the U.S. economy in a way that could actually lead to a double dip recession."

Now, of course, those words ring true to us. They would really ring true to the American people if it weren't for the fact that this is the same President that passed a budget just a few months ago out of Congress that doubles the national debt in the next 5 years. And yet here he is quoted just yesterday saying, If we keep on adding to the debt, people could lose confidence in the U.S. economy in a way that could actually lead to a double dip recession.

Now, I would agree with that. The only problem is, the President needs to start living up to the comments that he's actually making and pull back his bill that doubles the national debt and actually work with us to balance the budget, which is what we've said from the beginning needs to happen, not only to create stability in our economy, but actually to go out and start creating jobs as opposed to his policies that are running millions of jobs out of our country.

Mr. AKIN. Do you really think that we're going to balance the budget with a socialized medicine bill that they've said is going to be a trillion? Do you know what the budget estimate on Medicare was when it was passed? The Congressional Budget Office, they tried to estimate it. They were off by a factor of seven times. This thing is clearly over 2 trillion when you do honest math with it. If that's off by a factor of

seven, that's \$14 trillion. No wonder the Chinese were giving us a lecture telling us we've got the government spending too much money. They've got some American Treasury bills. It's not like they don't mind big government, but they just don't want to see us ruin their treasuries.

I've got my good friend from New Jersey here, Congressman GARRETT. Please join us.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. I appreciate the opportunity to join you, and I commend the gentleman for leading tonight and also for those very interesting quotes from the White House with regard to the Web sites that are out there.

I think the American public are asking some very basic questions—Where is the transparency? Where is the accountability? Where are the jobs?—on all this legislation that's coming through. And when they see this, when they see Web sites that you just pointed out talking about congressional Web sites that don't even exist, when they see about job creation that doesn't even exist.

You probably recall that the majority leader was on this floor back in the early part of this year when he was exclaiming that we had to vote for a seven or \$800 billion stimulus bill and you had to vote for it today. Why? Because it would make or create 3 million new jobs, not next year but this year. And, of course, we now know what the facts are. What are the facts? Instead of making or saving 3 million new jobs—and I never did quite get an explanation of what is saving a job—but making or saving 3 million jobs, we, of course, have lost upwards of 3 or 4 million jobs, just the inverse of that, just the opposite of that.

So the people are asking, where is the honesty in that aspect of things? Where is the accountability with the job creation? They're also asking about, and you're talking about all the money that we're spending, the trillion dollars with regard to the health care legislation and the like. Actually, I think the number was a little bit larger than what you were saying as far as the discrepancy with the projections with regard to Medicare which was created back in the mid sixties. They said by 1990, that program would cost around 10 or \$11 billion. It actually cost \$112 billion, so it was off by a factor of 10.

Mr. AKIN. So seven—I was being too generous.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. You were being too generous.

Mr. AKIN. So if you take the 10 factor, how much congressional budget—I mean, they're making assumptions trying to guess what something is going to be years into the future. But if you take that 10, if you put the unfunded mandates from the States and you put in the fact that they skewed the time schedule to try to keep it under a trillion, say, they're over 2 trillion, that's \$20 trillion?

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Those numbers are just so mind boggling you can't get your arms around it. But you know what you can get your mind around is something that's happening to everybody right now, and that is, I'm getting phone calls to my office with regard to the swine flu situation that's going across this country, and they're saying, We can't get the swine flu vaccine. This is something that's supposed to be administered by this administration, that they promised would be out there for everybody who needed it, and in my counties, my district, you can't go to a doctor or a county clinic or to a county hospital and get that. But you know who is getting it? People who work at the Federal Reserve in New York, people who work for some of the largest financial institutions in this country. And the people who absolutely need it are not getting it. The people who are in jail down at Guantanamo are getting it as well. I just use that as a real life example of the administration running a program for health care and not getting the job done.

I yield back to the gentleman as the time comes to an end.

Mr. AKIN. Looks like we're just starting to have fun and the clock has already run out. I just want to thank all of my gentleman friends here. Congressman GARRETT, thank you so much for joining us. Hearing from the east coast, that's very refreshing. From down in the South, from Louisiana, Congressman SCALISE. And also G.T., all that health care experience that you bring here to the floor managing, we appreciate that.

Thank you. Have a great evening.

COMMUNICATION FROM CHAIR OF COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. TITUS) laid before the House the following communication from the Chair of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure; which was read and, without objection, referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE,

Washington, DC, November 18, 2009.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: On November 5, 2009, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure met in open session to consider 20 resolutions to authorize appropriations for the General Services Administration's (GSA) FY 2010 Capital Investment and Leasing Program, including five construction resolutions (authorizing \$221.4 million) and 15 lease resolutions (authorizing \$121.4 million). The Committee adopted the resolutions by voice vote with a quorum present.

Enclosed are copies of the resolutions adopted by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure on November 5, 2009.

Sincerely,

JAMES L. OBERSTAR, M.C.,

Chairman.

Enclosures.