

a horrific notion to our Nation's doctors, but it is a horrific notion to each American because doctors believe, as Americans believe, that social justice is given out one patient at a time.

But the President's adviser, Dr. Emanuel, believes communitarianism should guide decisions on who gets care. He says medical care should be reserved for the nondisabled. So watch out if you're disabled. Care should be reserved for the nondisabled, not given to those who are "irreversibly" prevented from becoming participating citizens. "An obvious example," he said, "is not guaranteeing health services to patients with dementia."

We just lost my father-in-law to dementia 2 months ago. I thank God that the doctors were able to alleviate my poor father-in-law's symptoms at the end of his life at age 85.

□ 1945

Apparently, under the Democrats' health care plan, my father-in-law would not have received the high quality of care that he received in his last 2 months of life. Or if you're a grandmother with Parkinson's or a child with cerebral palsy, watch out.

In fact, the President's adviser defends discrimination against older patients. He writes: "Unlike allocation by sex or race, allocation by age is not invidious discrimination. Every person lives through different stages of life rather than being a single age. Even if a 25-year-old receives priority over 65-year-olds, everyone who is 65 now was previously 25."

These bills that are being rushed through Congress right now, maybe even this week, are going to cut over \$500 billion out of Medicare in the next 10 years, putting it on the backs of our State legislature to fill the gaps. Knowing how unpopular these cuts are, the President's Budget Director, Peter Orszag, has urged Congress to delete their own authority over Medicare to a new Presidentially appointed bureaucracy that will not be accountable to the public.

Here is the President's next adviser, Dr. David Blumenthal. He recommends that we slow medical innovation in order to control health spending. You heard me right. He said let's slow medical innovation to control health

spending. He has long advocated government health spending controls, although he concedes they are associated with longer waits and reduced availability of new and expensive treatment and devices, but he calls it debatable whether the timely care Americans get is worth the cost.

Mr. Speaker, Americans need to wake up and read what the President and his advisers are saying. It may scare them to go to the phones and call their Members.

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

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE RISING COSTS OF HEALTH CARE AND THE NEED FOR A PUBLIC OPTION

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

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, at a time when families throughout my district and throughout our Nation are struggling with the rising costs of health care, a robust public option will expand choice and increase competition, driving down costs and making affordable health care a reality.

We need a strong public option for the single mother in my district who changed jobs and lost her insurance, who deserves the chance to get the coverage she needs for herself and for her kids.

We need health care reform for the self-employed businessperson who will finally have a chance to get affordable, comprehensive health care without worrying about constraints on his business.

There should be no question that our current health care system is broken. We have an opportunity to work with one another to truly look after the American people and make a difference in their lives. We need a strong public option because our constituents, our constituents, deserve affordable, accessible health care.

Mr. Speaker, we have come to work. We have come to look after the general

welfare of the American people. Year after year we have had an opportunity, and we have squandered it, to be able to address the problems that are afflicting the American people, people struggling today. And we have an opportunity to either work to come up with some solutions or not present any ideas.

Mr. Speaker, we have some great ideas here, and it is about time that we take some action.

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

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

REVISIONS TO THE 302(a) ALLOCATIONS AND BUDGETARY AGGREGATES ESTABLISHED BY THE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 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. Mr. Speaker, under section 423(a)(1) of S. Con. Res. 13, the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010, I hereby submit an adjustment to the budget aggregates and the 302(a) allocation for the Committee on Appropriations for fiscal year 2010. Section 423(a)(1) of S. Con. Res. 13 permits the chairman of the Committee on the Budget to adjust discretionary spending limits for overseas deployments and other activities when these activities are so designated. Such a designation is included in the bill H.R. 3326 (Making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes). Corresponding tables are attached.

This adjustment is filed for the purposes of sections 302 and 311 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.

BUDGET AGGREGATES

[On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars]

	Fiscal year 2009	Fiscal year 2010	Fiscal years 2010–2014
Current Aggregates:¹			
Budget Authority	3,668,788	2,882,117	n.a.
Outlays	3,357,366	2,999,049	n.a.
Revenues	1,532,579	1,653,728	10,500,149
Change for Appropriations adjustments to date:			
Budget Authority	0	0	n.a.
Outlays	0	3,514	n.a.
Revenues	0	0	0
Revised Aggregates:			
Budget Authority	3,668,788	2,882,117	n.a.
Outlays	3,357,366	3,002,563	n.a.
Revenues	1,532,579	1,653,728	10,500,149

¹ Current aggregates do not include the disaster allowance assumed in the budget resolution, which if needed will be excluded from current level with an emergency designation (section 423(b)).
n.a. = Not applicable because annual appropriations Acts for fiscal years 2011 through 2014 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS—APPROPRIATIONS
COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATION

(In millions of dollars)

	BA	OT
Current allocation:		
Fiscal Year 2009	1,482,201	1,247,872
Fiscal Year 2010	1,091,405	1,309,520
Changes for overseas deployment and other activities designations:		
H.R. 3326 (Department of Defense Appropriations):		
Fiscal Year 2009	0	0
Fiscal Year 2010	128,247	68,091
Revised allocation:		
Fiscal Year 2009	1,482,201	1,247,872
Fiscal Year 2010	1,219,652	1,377,611

OZARK-JETA PROJECT

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

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I join those Members of Congress who are concerned about the rapid growth of deficit spending by the Federal Government, lots of spending with little job growth. For that reason I rise today to express my concern that the administration budget attempts to cancel a project that will literally cost the taxpayers more to cancel than it will to complete.

On July 7 the New York Times reported on the Ozark Powerhouse Rehabilitation project. According to the Times: "Shutting down the Ozark-Jeta project won't save taxpayers a dime since the government would pay a \$12 million cancellation fee and reimburse utility ratepayers for their \$20 million share. Bottom line: Federal Taxpayers would spend \$32 million to kill the project, \$4 million more than it would cost to complete it."

I think it is important for the record to contain some background information on the Ozark Powerhouse Rehabilitation project. So let's take a moment to do that.

The Corps of Engineers is in the middle of a major rehabilitation of the Ozark-Jeta Taylor Powerhouse on the Arkansas River. Construction is under way. This project involves turbine redesign and replacement that will improve and allow the continued operation of this 100-megawatt hydropower facility. The electricity produced at the Ozark Powerhouse is sold to customers in Arkansas, Kansas, Louisiana, Missouri, Oklahoma, and Texas. As the Times article noted, electricity customers have already invested \$20 million through their utilities in this project. Neither the President's fiscal year 2010 budget request nor the initial announcements of stimulus money for the Corps contain any funding for this project.

My hope is that the administration will now work with the Congress to do the right thing and ensure that funding is provided to complete this project. If the project is not funded in 2010, work would be closed out on the project as fiscal year 2009 funds are exhausted.

If that happens, what will we have? We will have one turbine unit dis-

assembled and inoperative. We will have another inoperative unit due to a cracked shaft. We will have three units that are available only on a day-to-day basis due to frequent outages caused by problems with old turbine runners. We will have five new units that have already been purchased and may be left sitting uninstalled and onsite with no place to store them. Most regrettably, the taxpayers will have an additional \$32 million bill on top of the money they have already spent on an incomplete project.

If this project is cut, how can we say we want to reduce our dependence on fossil fuels and cut emissions? If this project is cut, how can we say we want to encourage renewable energy? If this project is cut, how can we say we will avoid wasting the taxpayers' money?

In fact, because the electricity produced by this Federal project will be sold, once the rehabilitation is complete, every taxpayer's invested dollar will be returned to the Treasury plus interest. At this point how could we even consider not completing the work?

I encourage the President to make an honest effort to reduce Federal spending, and we can start by completing this project rather than canceling it. During the Presidential campaign, then-Senator Obama talked about the importance of using a scalpel, not a hatchet, when cutting spending. A quick look at the facts shows that this project was thoughtlessly cut, the kind of cut that is made with a hatchet.

We have all seen crazy decisions made by both Republicans and Democrats in the White House; so I'm not trying to be partisan expressing my concern about the way this project is being handled. Instead, I believe this cut illustrates that the government too often makes poor decisions and mishandles taxpayers' dollars. It just doesn't make any sense to cancel a project in the middle of construction when it will cost more to cancel the project than it would to finish it.

Again, my hope is that the administration now will work with Congress to do the right thing and ensure that funding is provided to complete this project.

INTRODUCING H. RES. 680, REQUESTING THE PRESIDENT TO RETRACT AND APOLOGIZE FOR REMARKS CRITICIZING OFFICER CROWLEY; AND H.R. 3347, THE FREEDOM TRADE ACT

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

Mr. McCOTTER. Mr. Speaker, tonight I have introduced H. Res. 680, calling upon President Obama to retract and apologize for his remarks regarding the conduct of Cambridge, Massachusetts, police officer James M. Crowley, Jr. Mr. Speaker, I view this as a Presidential issue.

After admitting his bias and inadequate grasp of the facts, the President nevertheless stated Sergeant Crowley had "acted stupidly" when carrying out his duties as a law enforcement officer. Subsequently, in a public remark, the President said that Sergeant Crowley had "overreacted."

On his part, Sergeant Crowley has steadfastly denied any inappropriate conduct.

Mr. Speaker, this is the crux of the problem, and it is a situation patently unfair to Sergeant Crowley and his standing regarding potential legal and professional consequences. Therefore, I ask the President to retract his premature judgment, apologize for it, and allow the appropriate authorities to resolve this issue through due process.

With my view, Kenneth E. Grabowski, legislative director of the Police Officers Association of Michigan agrees. I quote Mr. Grabowski: "After admitting a bias against the police officer and an ignorance of the facts, the President used his bully pulpit to help a well-connected friend by unfairly accusing an officer of misconduct in the performance of his duties. It must not stand. If it does, what officer will be next?"

And I would add, what citizen will be next?

Mr. Speaker, tonight I have also introduced H.R. 3347, the Freedom Trade Act, which applies human rights as a criterion of trade with the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I believe H.R. 3347 is most timely, for today, in the Ronald Reagan Building, President Obama stated how "the relationship between the United States and China will shape the 21st century, which makes it as important as any bilateral relationship in the world."

On my part, I believe it is therefore imperative that this relationship be built upon a common and unbreakable commitment to every human being's God-given rights to liberty, including the rights of the free exercise of religion and speech and to the ability to form free and independent labor unions.

That is why this bill is necessary. It will show all our potential partners throughout the world that the United States remains a beacon of freedom that will never forget Natan Sharansky's warning that "how a government treats its own people cannot be separated from how that government could be expected to treat other countries."

Mr. Speaker, with this I wholeheartedly concur.

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

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