

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.

Now, if we want to move on the national energy tax and if we want to limit the amount of carbon dioxide because the atmosphere has too much, wouldn't it be important to ensure that the rest of the countries that are developing would also comply? But the bill that passed the House had no provision, had no trigger to ensure that the number one emitter of carbon dioxide would have to comply in a regime, and that's China. Another major emitter of carbon dioxide is India. They're not involved and responsible for moving to limit their emissions. So, for the United States to go into and disarm ourselves by raising our energy costs against countries that compete with us because they can pay their employees more, they don't comply with environmental standards, now we are going to allow them to have cheaper energy, it is just a foolish proposition.

So what have Republicans done? We've come to the floor to talk about what really are the energy demands that we have in this country. We need to decrease our reliance on imported crude oil. The cap-and-tax bill does nothing to decrease our reliance on imported crude oil.

What we have proposed is making sure that we take access of the Outer Continental Shelf, the oil and gas reserves there. The royalties then are used not to continue to bring additional taxes on the American people. The royalties are used to expand wind and solar power that is now developing throughout this country, which we support because we want a diversified energy portfolio. We want to make sure we use our most efficient, cheapest source that we have, which is coal. We want to use it for electricity generation, driving down electricity prices. We also want to use that to produce liquid fuel, so we have a competitor. That is where we decrease our reliance on imported crude oil.

#### GOVERNMENT REGULATION OF THE FINANCIAL SERVICES SECTOR

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

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, I rise to address the House this afternoon because, like so many Members of this body, I am engaged in a terribly important exercise of working to think through the next generation of regulation that will oversee the stability and health of our financial services sector. This is a terribly important and challenging thing that we do. We need to make sure that we do what is necessary to have a vibrant, innovative, thriving financial services sector that employs the people of Connecticut and the people of this Nation, that pays taxes in Connecticut and to this Nation, but that we toe the line in such a way that we never find ourselves in the position that we are in today of tens and hundreds of billions

of taxpayer dollars being brought to the table to bail out a private industry that took too many risks.

And I rise this evening because I am concerned by the conclusion being drawn by some of the Members of this House, because our regulatory apparatus which, let's face it, was crafted in the 1930s, failed in many respects. And, boy, did it fail in some spectacular aspects. The conclusion seems to be drawn that government cannot regulate, that we should get out of the business, that we should leave the financial services sector entirely to its own devices, that somehow individual responsibility alone will create a stable and vibrant financial services sector.

And so I want to hearken back to the history of this body and this government crafting smart regulation. Think back 110, 120 years ago. American families ate rotten food. They bought snake oil in the guise of pharmaceuticals. They worked in factories that burned down and killed hundreds. They lived in cities that were unsanitary.

And over 120 years, 110 years, maybe starting with the fine Republican, Teddy Roosevelt, this Nation said we can do better. We can put in place smart regulation that protects our citizens and that adds to the quality of life of every American family. And, in fact, that is what happened, and we haven't gotten it quite right. There have been spectacular failures. But over that 120 years, the efforts of this government to craft smart, efficient regulation hasn't destroyed the economy.

The economic growth in this country over that period of time has been nothing short of spectacular. But it has protected American families. Very few families anymore buy snake oil, buy securities that would put Madoff's securities to shame, find themselves working in factories that burn down and nobody gets out because the doors are locked. 110 years, 120 years of success, not unadulterated success. There have been failures. But over time, the efforts of this country to put in place smart and efficient regulation have helped this economy and have helped the quality of life of American families.

And that is what we must do. We must not shrink from the task just because the SEC blew it on the Madoff case or because other regulators weren't watching new and dangerous markets closely enough. We must not shrink from the task of thinking through what new round of financial regulation allows that industry to thrive, allows that industry to provide credit to American families, to small businesses, to allow our economy to grow, but which never, ever puts us in the kind of risky position that we're working so hard to dig ourselves out of right now.

We can do this. There's a century-long tradition of our working constructively in that direction. So I know we can do this. The answer is smart, efficient, modern regulation for the ben-

efit of everyone and the benefit of this economy.

#### THE MAJORITY MAKERS AND HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, it's a great honor for me to be here tonight to lead a discussion about the most pressing and the most significant problem to most Americans, and that is the question of health care. I'm here with Members of the class of 2006. We call ourselves the Majority Makers, and from time to time we are here to address matters of great national import with you. But this is a very special topic for the class of 2006.

I remember very well when I began my campaign for Congress back then, in 2006, when many of the headlines of our Nation's newspapers and our television news operations were all about the Iraq war, and people would say to me, Well, I guess everyone's talking about the Iraq war to you. And I said, No, nobody's talking about the Iraq war. It's health care, health care, health care. Everywhere I went, neighborhood picnics, Catholic picnics on Friday night, festivals, businesses, schools, wherever I went, I heard story after story about how Americans were fed up with the health care system that was not serving them. In fact, it was, in many cases, killing them.

Well, here we are, 3 years later, and while health care may not have been on the front pages of the newspapers up till now because we have a severe economic decline and many challenges we're dealing with, this Congress is ready to put health care back on the front pages. And President Obama has already indicated that this is his top priority in his first time in office, and the reasons that that is so are not hard to determine.

It's pretty easy to look around us, look at the numbers and see why we have to take significant, decisive action to improve, to change our health care system. Just a few weeks ago, Dr. Christine Rohmer, who heads the White House's economic team, testified before the House Budget Committee that if we don't make significant steps to reform health care, to get a handle on cost, to bring prices down, that health care, which now comprises 17 percent of our economy, by 2040, would make up 35 percent of our economy.

Well, you don't have to be an economist or a health care expert to know that if health care takes up 35 percent of our economy, it's going to squeeze out most of everything else. In short, it is an unsustainable number. And we can go on and talk about the dramatic impact of Medicare and those types of expenses on the Federal budget as well as on the general economy.