

Jones on his election as Imperial Potentate and recognize the contributions that Shriners worldwide make to the betterment of our world.

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

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

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

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

UNEMPLOYMENT, CAP-AND-TAX, AND AFFORDABLE HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Madam Speaker, after losing an additional 467,000 jobs last month, our Nation's unemployment rate reached a 25-year high of 9.5 percent. It is time for the administration and the Democratic majority to admit what the American people know all too well: the vaunted Democratic stimulus bill has failed to stimulate anything other than a few Federal bureaucrats and the Chinese, who are loaning us, with hefty interest, I might add, those stimulus dollars.

When President Obama and the Democratic leadership rammed the 1,073-page stimulus bill through Congress without giving Representatives on either side of the aisle, much less voters back home, a chance to actually read it, they promised that the \$1 trillion price tag would go to "saving or creating 3.5 million jobs." Well, Madam Speaker, I must ask the question, Where are the jobs?

To make matters worse, the House passed the "Pelosi Global Warming Tax" 2 weeks ago that will only make it harder for businesses and families to survive by piling an additional \$3,000 on to every household's energy bill. This cap-and-tax policy, they call it cap-and-trade, but it is a cap-and-tax policy, would further impose artificial emissions standards on American companies and energy producers, increasing the cost of doing business and forcing them to cede market share to overseas competitors who will not be subject to these limits on carbon dioxide emissions. I repeat: they will not be subject to these limits, and I'm talking, of course, about China and India.

And now the same people who turned General Motors into "Government Motors" have set their sights on a government-controlled health care system that gives power to bureaucrats rather than doctors, like myself, to make decisions about your care. As we have

seen in Great Britain and Canada, the end result would be the virtual elimination of private health insurance and the creation of a one-size-fits-all government health plan that would ration care by limiting the types of treatments patients can receive.

Madam Speaker, instead of another government takeover, we need real solutions which will make health care more affordable and more accessible while leaving critical choices and decisions about their health where they belong, in the hands of patients and their physicians.

REVISIONS TO THE 302(a) ALLOCATIONS FOR THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS ESTABLISHED BY THE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEARS 2009 AND 2010

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

Mr. SPRATT. Madam Speaker, under section 422(a)(2) of S. Con. Res. 13, the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010, I hereby submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD revised 302(a) allocations for the Committee on Appropriations for fiscal years 2009 and 2010. Section 422(a)(2) of S. Con. Res. 13 directs the chairman of the Committee on the Budget to adjust discretionary spending limits for certain program integrity initiatives when these initiatives are included in an appropriations bill. The bill H.R. 3170 (Making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes) includes an appropriation for such an initiative in accordance with S. Con. Res. 13. A corresponding table is attached.

This adjustment is filed for the purposes of section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended. For the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended, this adjusted allocation is to be considered as an allocation included in the budget resolution, pursuant to section 427(b) of S. Con. Res. 13.

Any questions may be directed to Ellen Balis or Gail Millar.

DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS—APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE 302 ALLOCATION
(In millions of dollars)

| | BA | OT |
|---|-----------|-----------|
| Current allocation: | | |
| Fiscal Year 2009 | 1,482,201 | 1,247,872 |
| Fiscal Year 2010 | 1,088,059 | 1,306,759 |
| Change for program integrity initiatives: H.R. 3170 (Appropriations for Financial Services and General Government): | | |
| Fiscal Year 2009 | 0 | 0 |
| Fiscal Year 2010 | 600 | 564 |
| Revised allocation: | | |
| Fiscal Year 2009 | 1,482,201 | 1,247,872 |
| Fiscal Year 2010 | 1,088,659 | 1,307,323 |

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.)

THANKS AND FAREWELL TO LIZ BIRNBAUM

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

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

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, in the frenetic pace we maintain in Washington, we too seldom acknowledge the invaluable role played by our staffs. As chairman of the Committee on House Administration, on this occasion I wish to note the recent departure of my invaluable committee staff director, S. Elizabeth Birnbaum.

Since her arrival in 2007, Liz has served the committee, the House and the country with distinction, providing me and my colleagues with wise counsel honed during her years of service with the Department of the Interior; with the House Interior and Natural Resources Committee, as it was then known; as a tireless advocate for the health of our nation's waterways at the environmental organization American Rivers, and elsewhere. In addition to her policy advice, Liz also proved a strong, effective, compassionate leader for the committee staff from whom her colleagues could and should have learned much during her tenure.

Madam Speaker, the House Administration Committee may be the most important committee that many Americans have never heard of. We don't write tax or spending bills, we simply run this place. I can assure the House that the committee could not have run this place for the past two years without Liz Birnbaum. We grapple with dozens of administrative matters every day, large and small, each crucial to someone. Although I cannot be certain, because she has so many from which to choose, I suspect Liz might consider her greatest accomplishment to be her legislative and oversight roles in the December 2008 opening of the Capitol Visitor Center, already toured by nearly 1.5 million people.

Liz will be greatly missed, but we can all take comfort that she will not be far away. The President lured Liz back downtown to the Interior Department, where she will direct the Minerals Management Service implementing the Administration's policies concerning resources on federal lands. While the committee's loss is definitely the President's gain, as Liz herself knows, Capitol Hill never lets go of alumni completely. So, on behalf of my committee, the House, and the country, I thank Liz Birnbaum for her dedicated service, wish her well in her next assignment, and fondly look forward to seeing her again soon.

GENOCIDAL HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Madam Speaker, recently the Secretary of State appeared before the House Foreign Affairs Committee and confirmed that it is the administration's goal to include abortion as an integral element of "reproductive health care" provided by

the United States overseas. This hearing came on the heels of the Secretary's words of praise for Margaret Sanger as a personal heroine. Margaret Sanger was a notorious American eugenicist who advocated tirelessly for policies to eliminate persons she deemed inferior and unworthy to live, namely the poor, the immigrant, and the black child.

While the Secretary at the hearing did rightfully deplore the racist comments attributed to Margaret Sanger, the administration's policies regrettably continue to champion abortion both here and abroad. This continues despite the fact that more and more Americans oppose the practice, let alone using taxpayer dollars to fund it, or imposing it on persons across the world who may be weaker and more vulnerable.

Margaret Sanger's world view should shock the conscience and evoke equal condemnation from thoughtful persons on both sides of the aisle.

Madam Speaker, for this reason, I was stunned to learn that in a July 12 interview with the New York Times, Supreme Court Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg echoed the sentiments of Sanger. While explaining the outcome of *Harris v. McRae*, a 1980 Supreme Court ruling that upheld the Hyde amendment, which disallows Medicaid funding for abortions, Justice Ginsburg said this, "frankly I had thought that at the time Roe was decided, there was concern about population growth and particularly growth in populations that we don't want to have too many of."

Madam Speaker, did you hear those words? Justice Ginsburg, I repeat, actually said this, "There was concern about population growth and particularly growth in populations that we don't want to have too many of."

Madam Speaker, to whom was Justice Ginsburg referring? Who would Justice Ginsburg prefer to not have live? It is unfathomable that in this day and age, a Justice of the United States Supreme Court would articulate such a patently genocidal sentiment.

This is more of the same discredited, amoral philosophy of social engineering that offers no comfort, no vision of the common bond of all humanity, particularly for those who are weak and vulnerable among us.

Madam Speaker, it is with a very heavy heart that I have to say such things. I know we have come much further than this in our society. Millions of Americans believe that we are big enough and loving enough as a Nation to embrace the mother and her unborn child and truly care for life. We can do better. We must do better. Women deserve better than abortion, and America deserves better from its leaders.

"GOVERNMENT MOTORS"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Madam Speaker, 2 days after Independence Day, the remaining GM dealers in the United States received a letter from the General Motors National Dealer Council letting the dealers know that the National Dealer Council strongly opposes the Automobile Dealer Economic Rights Restoration Act of 2009. It is also called H.R. 2743. The letter urged all remaining GM dealers to sign the letter immediately, by no later than 5 p.m. on Tuesday, July 7. They urged the dealers to fax it back to the National Dealer Council urging that they do not support passage of the restoration of economic rights.

I have nothing personally against GM or Chrysler, Madam Speaker. These are great American companies. But what I do object to is the Federal Government effectively taking over these once great companies.

Last Friday, GM emerged from bankruptcy, Madam Speaker, but do the American people even realize that they own a majority share in this company, effectively 61 percent, which is why many people now call it "Government Motors"? Do they know that 3,400 privately owned dealerships were given pink slips essentially by the Federal Government? 3,400 dealerships were closed down all across the America, not because these dealers were failing? Hardly. In my district dealers were experiencing some of their best months ever for sales, high customer satisfaction and terrific service.

Perplexed and bewildered, 3,400 automobile dealers across the United States were given pink slips essentially by the Obama Auto Task Force; 150,000 jobs are estimated to be at risk of vanishing by this move. And with these jobs goes a part of the American Dream for private property owners and business in our country. The remaining GM dealers carved up the spoils.

Now let me be perfectly clear. I fault none of these existing remaining GM dealers. These actions weren't their fault. Our fear with government owning these car companies is that politics will control GM's remaining decisions, not business. And now with this letter, it seems that politics is prevailing. Existing dealers are urged by GM to work against restoring economic rights to the dealers who saw their businesses' value drained from them overnight.

How can current GM dealers possibly stand up against GM when GM is the Federal Government? Again, dealers are urged to sign a letter that will disadvantage their disenfranchised former competitors. This is a bad business, Madam Speaker. And it perfectly illustrates why we don't want government to own, operate, or control private businesses.

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 NATIONAL ENERGY TAX

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the time to come down to the floor and talk about the bill which recently passed the House, the cap-and-trade, cap-and-tax national energy tax bill, which has a basic premise. The basic premise says that there is too much carbon dioxide in the atmosphere. The solution is to make sure that the emission of carbon dioxide is charged more, and that charge will decrease our reliance on that by forcing people not to use fossil fuels.

It sounds simple. It is not that simple. Fossil fuels is the basic foundational fuel for a thriving economy. And in this economy that we have today, the last thing we want to do is slow that engine by raising costs.

Energy is a component in the cost of everything we do. Here in this Chamber, we appreciate the lights being on. That currently is possible by fossil fuels. Whether that is coal or natural gas, fossil fuels help create that electricity. As we drive back and forth to our districts, the gasoline is a fossil fuel. If we are flying back to our districts, the jet fuel is a fossil fuel. If we add a cost on the use of fossil fuels, the cost for everything increases from the clothes that you wear to the food that you consume and to the houses that you build.

The last time we went through environmental legislation that dealt with the Clean Air Act, there was great devastation of jobs throughout the Midwest. An example is this poster that I bring to the floor numerous times of United Mine Worker members from Peabody No. 10 in Kincaid, Illinois. When the last Clean Air Act amendments were adopted, 1,200 mine workers in this mine alone lost their jobs. There is an effect by the legislation that we pass here on the floor of this House.

□ 1800

And not only did it affect these individual miners, but it affected all the communities from which they have come from because that was the major job creator in this county was those who operated this mine. They not only lost their jobs, but in southern Illinois, 14,000 other mine workers lost their jobs. This is very similar to what happened throughout the rest of the Midwestern States.

The one that really is poignant because the head of the Ohio Coal Association, the Ohio Mining Association came before our committee and said, after the 1990 Clean Air Act amendments, 35,000 coal mine workers lost their jobs. And so that's why those of us from coal-producing areas and those of us who want low-cost fuel have come to the floor and we fought so diligently in opposition to the national energy tax.