

So, when you go home, listen to your seniors because they're going to know what's in this bill, and I don't want you guys to lose. I really don't.

DOING NOTHING IS NOT AN OPTION

(Ms. CHU asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, not in six decades have we been this close to achieving the most crucial task of reforming our health care system. Let me be clear: we would be derelict in our duty to the American people if we let this opportunity go to waste.

Now, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle claim that this legislation amounts to the government takeover of health care and that Americans will be stripped of their choices of doctors and plans, but the reality is that everybody in this country will lose if they don't have health care reform.

People like Mary Smith, a 45-year-old with diabetes who just lost her job, she will no longer have to worry about whether she can get insurance again. Certainly, in my district, everybody will benefit, the 155,000 who lack health care coverage but, also, the majority of my constituents who are insured. They will have stability, security and peace of mind in having health care that they can count on no matter what happens. You will always have options for coverage even if you change or lose your job. You will never be denied coverage if you get sick.

Doing nothing is not an option.

BETTER ALTERNATIVE FOR HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. FLEMING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Speaker, as a doctor, one of the main reasons I came to Congress was to push for health care reform, that is, commonsense reform, not nonsense reform as proposed by our Democrat colleagues. That's why I'm proud to be an original cosponsor of the Empowering Patients First Act, a Republican bill for reform.

This bill contains all of the essential elements of good health care reform, including expanding private insurance to all Americans who want it, removing preexisting illnesses, improving portability, subsidies to the working poor, access to excellent primary and specialty care and, of course, instituting lawsuit reform. All of this is accomplished without a government takeover, without gutting Medicare, without long lines or bureaucrats interfering in the sacred doctor-patient relationship; and it is budget neutral.

It is obvious that private insurance, no matter who pays for it, is the gold standard. As we return to our districts and debate this important issue, I believe we will find that Americans truly want private insurance options, not the

government takeover of health care with the Soviet-style central planning of our economy.

THE RECOVERY ACT IS CREATING JOBS

(Mr. SCHRADER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SCHRADER. Mr. Speaker, I've come to the floor this week to dispel the assertion by Republican colleagues that the Recovery Act is not creating jobs. It's simply not accurate. I would like to talk to you about the first four construction transportation projects under way in my district.

Oregon 22, one of the few roads that connects the Willamette Valley to the Oregon coast, is getting two overlay construction projects, employing 44 and 80 workers respectively. These projects make sure that freight and tourists can keep our economy going.

Twenty workers are being put to work replacing the concrete barriers on Interstate 5, a major valley thoroughfare. This makes our highways safe. There are 120 workers who are being put to work paving and rebuilding sections of Highway 101, the only north-south road that connects the small Oregon coastal communities.

Mr. Speaker, those are 261 jobs under way in my district alone at this early stage of the recovery, and there are more in the works.

BRING FISCAL DISCIPLINE BACK TO WASHINGTON

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, in December 2007, our economy slipped into a recession, and since then, the recession has only gotten worse. The American people are hurting.

President Obama and Democrats in Congress promised that their stimulus plan would bring "immediate" relief. Unfortunately for the American people, the results are rolling in. Two million American jobs have been lost since the stimulus was signed into law. More than 400,000 jobs were lost in the month of June alone.

Just when you thought it was clear that we can't spend, borrow and tax our way to a growing economy, Democrats propose a government takeover of health care that will lead to higher taxes, to more government spending, and to even further job losses.

The American people deserve a real plan for real recovery, not another excuse to increase spending, to raise taxes, and to grow government. The Republican economic recovery plan brings fiscal discipline back to Washington, and it puts money back into the hands of the American people.

JOBS AND STIMULUS

(Mrs. MALONEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, President Obama inherited a labor market in free fall. When President Bush left office in January, job losses peaked as employers slashed a stunning 741,000 jobs.

Congress worked quickly with the new administration to restore financial stability and to pass a recovery package that is beginning to take hold. The pace of job losses has eased from its decline at the end of the Bush administration. Last week, Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke testified that the unemployment rate would be higher right now without the legislation Congress enacted.

By restoring financial stability and by implementing stimulus measures and a responsible budget, we will make the investments necessary to lay the foundation for economic recovery that will put Americans back to work now and that will create the jobs of the future.

HEALTH CARE

(Mr. REICHERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, when the House Ways and Means Committee recently considered the health care overhaul proposal, I supported an amendment that said if our constituents must join the government-run public plan, so should Members of Congress. Unfortunately, the Democrats rejected this amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I ask today: If the government-run plan is great enough for the American people, why isn't it good enough for the Members of Congress?

Americans deserve the freedom to choose their health care. This plan doesn't give them that choice. It will force Americans into a plan that supporters of the bill simply don't want.

We need to work together to protect and to strengthen the health care of every American, not take away choice and drive up costs. I urge my colleagues to reject this bill, to work together on a plan that will lower costs, while maintaining the freedoms of Americans to choose their health care.

And that is just some straight shooting from the sheriff.

IT IS TIME TO ENACT REAL HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, it is time to speak a little truth to power, to the powerful special interests and to the insurance companies that are willing to deep-six health care reform for millions of Americans by spreading misinformation and by scaring people. All the while, these big insurance companies raise deductibles, premiums, and copays. They drop people with preexisting conditions. They

limit coverage, and they reap billions in excessive salaries, profits, and bonuses.

Look at the facts: United Health earned \$2.9 billion last year. WellPoint reported profits of \$2.5 billion. For CEO pay, United Health Group's Stephen Hemsley made \$3.2 million. WellPoint's Angela Braly made \$9.8 million. It doesn't stop there. Former United Health Group's CEO, Bill McGuire, left his job in 2006 and still took home \$1.1 billion. That's a lot of zeros.

Who are we kidding, Mr. Speaker? This is all about money—campaign contributions, CEO salaries, millions in advertising to kill reform, and billions in profits. That's what's at stake here.

It's time to stop this nonsense and enact real reform that includes a public insurance option based on Medicare rates and with a network of providers to lower costs and to provide quality care.

THE SEVEN DIRTY WORDS WE CAN'T USE

(Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, this year, we lost a comedian of some note named George Carlin. One of the marks of his career was when he challenged the FCC with the seven dirty words. We're now engaged in a debate on health care, and we've been told that there are a number of phrases that we can't use because we're attempting to speak truth to power, power being the Democratic leadership here in the House.

What are these dirty words or phrases we can't use to describe the leading Democratic health care proposal?

We can't call it "government-run" even though that's what it's going to be inevitably. We can't call it "single-payer" even though that's where they're going. We can't call it "socialized medicine." I don't know why not, but we can't. We can't call it "ObamaCare." We can't call it "rationed care" even though rationing is an absolutely essential element to their plan. We can't call it the "government mandate care" even though it's full of mandates. The word "shall" appears, I believe, 100 times in the bill. "Shall" means "must," which means a mandate. You can't call it "keep your change care" because, frankly, there won't be any change for you to keep.

The seven dirty words we can't use.

THE URGENCY OF HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. CARSON of Indiana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak to the urgency of health care reform. I want to share the story of Holly, an Indian-

apolis woman who has courageously fought and won two bouts with breast cancer. Thankfully, Holly's medical costs were largely covered by insurance. While she praises the care and treatment she received, Holly is rightly worried about the future.

Due to her history of recurring cancer, Holly will be uninsurable if she ever loses her job and, with it, her employer-based health insurance plan. Holly and thousands of people across my district know that the status quo will leave millions more uninsured, in some cases even fighting for their lives.

We must push forward with overhauling our health care system, not only for the 47 million who are uninsured but for the millions more who will be added to these rolls unless we act. Now is not the time for fear-mongering. Now is not the time for political posturing or for narcissistic behavior. We must be Representatives in the true sense of the word and act on behalf of the American people.

HONORING ST. ANN'S 150TH ANNIVERSARY

(Mr. LANCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LANCE. Madam Speaker, I rise this morning in honor of the 150th anniversary of St. Ann's Roman Catholic Church in Hampton, Hunterdon County, New Jersey.

St. Ann's was officially established in 1859, and Father Claude Rolland of France was named its first resident pastor.

Throughout its history, St. Ann's has faithfully fulfilled its mission while, at the same time, helping to establish eight other Catholic churches in Hunterdon and Warren Counties. Due to its contribution to the history of our State in 2003, the church was designated by New Jersey as a Site of Historical Note. Today, St. Ann's Parish is enjoying a period of significant growth under the leadership of its current pastor, Father Michael Saharic.

I congratulate St. Ann's Church for its 150 years of service to the communities of Hampton, Glen Gardner and surrounding areas and as a pillar of faith.

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO OFFER RESOLUTION RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Speaker, pursuant to clause 2(a)(1) of the IX, I hereby notify the House of my intention to offer a resolution as a question of the privileges of the House.

The form of my resolution is as follows:

Whereas the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. Broun submitted an amendment to the Committee on Rules to H.R. 3326, Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2010;

Whereas that gentleman's amendment would have required that none of the funds

made available in this Act be used to standardize the design of future ground combat uniforms across the military branches;

Whereas defense appropriations have typically been used to provide funding for various types of equipment such as uniforms;

Whereas the gentleman's amendment complied with all applicable Rules of the House for amendments to appropriations measures and would have been in order under an open amendment process, but regrettably the House Democratic leadership has dramatically and historically reduced the opportunity for open debate on this Floor; and

Whereas the Speaker, Ms. Pelosi, the Democratic leadership, and the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, Mr. Obey, prevented the House from voting on the amendment by excluding it from the list of amendments made in order under the rule for the bill: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That H. Res. 685, the rule to accompany H.R. 3326, be amended to allow the gentleman from Georgia's amendment to be considered and voted on in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland). Under rule IX, a resolution offered from the floor by a Member other than the majority leader or the minority leader, as a question of the privileges of the House, has immediate precedence only at a time designated by the Chair within 2 legislative days after the resolution is properly noticed.

Pending that designation, the form of the resolution noticed by the gentleman from Georgia will appear in the RECORD at this point.

The Chair will not at this point determine whether the resolution constitutes a question of privilege. That determination will be made at the time designated for consideration of the resolution.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2010

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 685 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 3326.

□ 1031

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3326) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes, with Mr. BLUMENAUER (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the committee of the whole rose on Wednesday, July 29, 2009, all time for general debate had expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read for amendment under the 5-minute rule and the bill shall be considered read through page 147, line 4.

The text of that portion of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3326

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in