

Griffith
Guthrie
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Inglis
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBlando
Loebbeck
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Mack
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo

Marchant
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Matheson
Matsui
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McMahon
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Obey
Olson
Oliver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Rahall
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce

Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schradler
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shea-Porter
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Souder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Taylor
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wamp
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—1

Johnson (IL)

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3

Marshall Oberstar Welch

NOT VOTING—53

Ackerman
Arcuri
Blumenauer
Boren
Boyd
Buyer
Camp
Campbell

Chaffetz
Cleaver
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Fallin
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
Diaz-Balart, L.
Doggett

Doyle
Edwards (TX)
Eshoo
Fallin
Farr
Garamendi
Grijalva
Gutierrez

Hastings (WA)
Hill
Hoekstra
Holden
Jordan (OH)
Lee (NY)
Linder
Massa
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)

McKeon
Meeks (NY)
Miller, George
Murphy (NY)
Nadler (NY)
Pascarell
Pitts
Quigley
Radanovich
Rangel

Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Sanchez, Loretta
Sherman
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiahrt
Velázquez

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KRATOVIL) (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in the vote.

□ 1539

Mr. WELCH changed his vote from "yea" to "present."

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRIVILEGED REPORT ON RESOLUTION IMPEACHING JUDGE G. THOMAS PORTEOUS, JR.

Mr. SCHIFF, from the Committee on the Judiciary, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 111-427) on the resolution (H. Res. 1031) impeaching G. Thomas Porteous, Jr., judge of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana, for high crimes and misdemeanors, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland, the majority leader, for the purpose of announcing next week's schedule.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the Republican whip for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday the House is not in session. On Tuesday, the House will meet at 12:30 p.m. for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business, with votes postponed until 6:30 p.m. On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for legislative business. And on Friday, if needed, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. We will consider several bills under suspension of the rules. A complete list of suspension bills will be announced by close of business tomorrow, as is the custom.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, we will consider H. Con. Res. 248, the Afghanistan war powers resolution introduced by Mr. KUCINICH, and we will also consider H. Res. 1031, impeaching G. Thomas Porteous, Jr., judge of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana, for high crimes and misdemeanors. It is also possible there will be further action on the jobs agenda, which depends on what the Senate or the House has coming out of committee or out of the Senate.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I want to ask the gentleman if he can give us some better indication of what he means by the jobs agenda.

Mr. HOYER. We believe that the number one priority for us is to continue to grow the economy so that we will create jobs in this economy. As the gentleman knows, my perception is we have gone from losing an average of 726,000 jobs in the last 3 months of the Bush administration, to the last 3 months of losing, on average, 35,000 jobs. That is 95 percent in the right direction, but we need to continue to create jobs.

As you know in the bill that was just passed, which was passed in a bipartisan fashion in the Senate and to some degree here, we are trying to encourage the hiring of those who are unemployed through giving tax credits, and also tried to spur investment by giving businesses the right to write off items. We also ensure the continuation of the Highway Act; and in addition to that, as you know, we provided for a less expensive way for communities to expand public works and hire people to do that, public buildings and construction of public facilities.

So when I say the agenda, that was obviously a part of the agenda. We still are very concerned about lending, capital being available to small, particularly, but medium-sized businesses as well. The Senate is considering a jobs bill now, as you know, with a number of component parts. So when I talk about the jobs agenda, I am talking about ways and means and efforts to grow the economy and create jobs.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

The gentleman refers to some areas that I hope he and the majority would work with the minority on in trying to do exactly as he stated, which is to create an environment for small businesses to create jobs. As the gentleman just saw in the vote taking place on the floor today, there were 35 members of his caucus who voted against the so-called jobs bill that was on the floor today, perhaps indicating that the gentleman may want to work with us as we have been continuing to propose tax cuts for small businesses, not necessarily connected with what kind of hires that the businesses should do, and not necessarily connected with some type of targeted credit that may or may not fit with the business model of any particular small business, but in general, I think the gentleman would agree, making it easier for small businesses to keep the lights on right now so they can return to a mode in which they could increase payroll.

□ 1545

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman if he could speak to his mention of the resolution dealing with the Afghanistan war powers. As the gentleman knows, the Republicans view a withdrawal from Afghanistan within 30 days as incredibly irresponsible.

Mr. HOYER. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANTOR. I yield.

Mr. HOYER. Just for accuracy, it's my understanding that the resolution that the gentleman from Ohio has introduced is by December 31, I believe, not 30 days. And I yield back.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman for that.

Still I would say that the Republican view is we have consistently supported this President in his efforts in Afghanistan as he has listened to the commanders on the ground to determine the focus and future of our presence there in terms of protecting our troops and the U.S. interests there. So I imagine my friend from Maryland, knowing his position on these things, agrees with that.

I would like to know, Mr. Speaker, whether there will be an all-out push to make this some type of partisan issue. Perhaps the gentleman could shed some light on his position on this bill that is being brought forward next week. And I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As the gentleman knows, I've expressed support for the policy being pursued by President Obama, and I certainly intend to continue to support that policy. The resolution is not consistent with that. So I think the gentleman is not going to be surprised at my expectation that this will be a bipartisan vote—perhaps on both sides of the proposition, yea and nay, but I certainly think it's going to be a bipartisan vote.

I believe the President's policy that he has articulated is a thoughtful, measured policy. And very frankly, I think he has done what perhaps we should have been doing for some period of time, focused on where terrorism was organized against the United States to ensure that we eliminate al Qaeda and prevent the Taliban from resurgence and reestablishing a base wherefrom terrorists might attack us. I think that is an appropriate policy that the President is pursuing, and I would hope that the House would support that policy on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I look forward to joining him in opposition to the resolution he is bringing to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, if I could ask the gentleman to give us, in the House, an update on when he expects the budget resolution to come to the floor. And I yield.

Mr. HOYER. We hope that the budget resolution will come to the floor—and we're working on that—by the end of the month before we leave for the Easter break.

As you can well imagine, given the fiscal situation that confronts us, that's a very difficult document to put together. But Mr. SPRATT is working very hard at that with the committee. I know Mr. RYAN, I'm sure, the ranking

member, is also working hard on that. I am hopeful that we will be in a position to bring that to the floor before the Easter break.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman for that.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman, in view of the short period of time until Easter break, is it his expectation that the House will take up health care legislation within that time period? And I yield.

Mr. HOYER. It is the President's hope and our hope that that will be the case. As you know, the President has expressed that objective, and we have said that would be our objective as well.

As you know, we have been working on this issue for well over a year. We passed a bill many months ago; the Senate passed a bill over 2 months ago. Many of us have been working on that bill. As you know, we had a very substantial—historic, really, in many respects—discussion with the President at Blair House last week. I understand the President has incorporated a number of ideas that he felt were good ideas that Republicans put on the table at that meeting.

My expectation is we will be moving on this bill in the near future. And what I mean by that is, again, hopefully, that we would be able to consider this prior to the April break, the Easter break.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, the President has asked Congress—in fact yesterday—that the majority here consider using the reconciliation process to pass this health care bill. I would like to ask the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, is it his intention and the Speaker's intention to adhere to the President's request and actually use the reconciliation process? And I yield.

Mr. HOYER. Well, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As the gentleman knows, we provided for reconciliation in the budget resolution that was adopted last year, so that is available to us. That has been used 22 times, as the gentleman knows, since 1980; 16 of those times it was used when your party was in the majority. You utilized that to do what the American people think is usually the case: we pass things by majority vote, up or down, and the majority rules. Now, here, of course, when the majority rules, it really does represent a majority of the country. In the Senate, of course, even when a majority votes, it doesn't necessarily represent a majority of the people of the country because obviously every State, no matter how large or small, is represented.

But having said that, we believe that the Republicans, when you used it for a tax bill or welfare or other very important pieces of legislation—the tax bill obviously having trillions of dollars of economic impact on the economy—you felt that that process of passing it by a majority vote in the United States Senate made sense. We share your view.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that and would say that nothing compares to the use of or suggested use of reconciliation then as to now with this bill. I would say that there was, in the main, bipartisan support and, frankly, support on the part of the people of this country for what was being done through reconciliation in those instances.

I would like to turn the gentleman's attention, Mr. Speaker, to a question that I have regarding statements that were made as late as September of 2007 when then-Candidate Obama said, "This is an area where we're going to have to have a 60 percent majority in the Senate and in the House in order to actually get a bill to my desk. We're going to have to have a majority to get a bill to my desk that is not just a 50-plus-1 majority" said then-Senator Obama. "You've got to break out of what I call the sort of 50-plus-1 pattern of Presidential politics. Maybe you eke out a victory with 50 plus 1, but you can't govern. You know, you get Air Force One and a lot of nice perks as President, but you can't, you can't deliver on health. We're not going to pass universal health care with a 50-plus-1 strategy." That later quote, again, was the next month in October.

So I'm having difficulty understanding, Mr. Speaker, why now the President and the majority seem to have done a 180 when it comes to using reconciliation with a \$1 trillion bill that could very well alter one-sixth of our economy. And I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Let me repeat, his 180 was incorporated as a way to go forward last year when we adopted the budget almost 1 year ago. So this is nothing new for the gentleman.

I told the gentleman his party has used this procedure 16 times out of 22 times that it has been used, which means your party has used it two-thirds of the time—over two-thirds of the time—that it's been employed. As a matter of fact, JUDD GREGG, a Member of your party, a leader of the Budget Committee on your side, was chairman of the Budget Committee, now ranking member, when an objection was raised on that—we're using quotes—when an objection was raised to that said, as he turned to the Democratic side, "What's wrong with a majority vote? I thought a majority vote was what should prevail." That was JUDD GREGG of your party. I think it's ironic when we're saying, okay, you think a majority vote is good, we'll take a majority vote.

Now, the President's quote is a demonstration that we all say things that, unfortunately, then don't become reality. Well, I will tell you the reason they don't become reality is because, as JIM DEMINT said, I think many of your party hope this is President Obama's Waterloo. That's a direct quote—you used quotes—from Mr. DEMINT.

Your belief is, in my view—I do not attribute it to you—but my belief is, as Mr. Gingrich pointed out over and over again, if we fail, you win. The problem is if we fail, we believe the American people lose, and we think that is not fair.

I want to use one more quote and then I will cease and yield back to you. October of 2008, Presidential campaign debate, national television, JOHN MCCAIN, your candidate, said, “I want to see a plan that gives all Americans, all families availability of affordable health care.” That was a quote that Senator MCCAIN, your candidate for President, made just a few months ago. It was almost exactly what Mr. Obama said. So, from my perception, there was a consensus with respect to where we needed to go.

As a matter of fact, I think almost every Member on this floor believes that we need to reform the health care system. We’ve had a very vigorous debate, a very open debate, a very transparent debate over 1 year now on how this ought to be done. We have disagreement, and that is the nature of democracy. But if a majority of the representatives in this body and the majority of the representatives in the other body believe a policy ought to be adopted, then, frankly, that is the way our system should work.

There is nothing in the Constitution, as the gentleman well knows, about having—except for some rare instances—a supermajority, and certainly none on policy. There are on confirmations and overriding a President’s veto, but other than that, the perception is the majority vote rules.

So it’s a procedure that you used, and it’s a procedure that we anticipated last March. We hoped that wouldn’t be the case. Very frankly, we would hope that we could work in a bipartisan way to effect this end that at this point hasn’t been possible, and Senator MCCONNELL has made it pretty clear that he has no intention of participating in that kind of effort.

I yield back to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

I don’t know if the gentleman is saying, Mr. Speaker, that maybe the President was wrong when he spoke about not using this process; but I do know, Mr. Speaker, that 70-something percent of the American people don’t like this health care bill.

I think the gentleman is correct, Mr. Speaker, that all of us care about doing something positive for health care. Republicans care about health care. We went to that forum with our ideas. The public began to see for 7 hours that there were very different approaches to how we are going to deal with health care. We said if we can stop the overhaul, stop the \$1 trillion attempt to lead us to a path from government getting in the way of decision-making between patients and their doctors, if we can set that aside, there could be some things that we could work on much more modest and focused in terms of

cost control. Once we reduce cost, people can have access. More people can have insurance. We could also do some things together to address the problems of preexisting condition exceptions in coverage. All of us want to do something about that.

So I would say to the gentleman, I am disappointed—as I know he knows that we are—that his side has decided to defy the protests that came from the President and others on his side of the aisle about the use of reconciliation for health care. But I would ask the gentleman, will the House move next on health care or will it be the Senate? And I yield.

Mr. HOYER. Well, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

We are still discussing exactly what procedure will be employed to effect a majority vote in both Houses and send something to the President in the same form, so I can’t specifically answer that question at this particular time.

But let me say to the gentleman, he mentioned the forum we went to, and Republicans did put ideas on the table. We thought they were constructive. As a matter of fact, as you may recall, I responded to Senator COBURN, who is also a medical doctor, when we mentioned about fraud, waste and abuse. As you know, there is substantial investment in both the House bill and the Senate bill to eliminating fraud, waste and abuse. Senator COBURN observed he thought there was a lot of money that could be saved there. We think that is the case as well, so we have provided to go after that.

We also, I think, agree that reform ought to be based on a private, market-based system. As the gentleman knows, the exchanges that are set up both in the House bill and the Senate bill, they differ; but they are both based on private sector competition by private insurance companies.

□ 1600

We talked about wellness programs. Dr. COBURN also talked about that as did others. I think Dr. BOUSTANY, Congressman BOUSTANY, also talked about that.

We have a very substantial investment in wellness and, as Dr. COBURN pointed out, in practices that give cooperative care and are not reimbursed piecemeal but are reimbursed by the quality of care that is given, by the outcomes that are given as opposed to simply being process-oriented.

We also agree, I think, Mr. CANTOR, on mechanisms to have competition across State lines. We believe the exchanges do that, but we also believe there is room for discussion in looking at how we might do that in other ways as well. So we think that that’s an idea, and the pooling with respect to small businesses so they can create large groups so that they can have better competitive advantages. We believe that, when we put small businesses into the exchange, that’s exactly what we give them.

For instance, in a large group, as all of us know and as we have in the Federal Employee Health Benefit Plan, we don’t have preexisting conditions, because we are a large group. Most large groups don’t. In the legislation you offered as a substitute to ours, of course, you did not cover preexisting conditions. Your legislation provided for about 3 million people having greater access to the system; ours for about 30 million. So, while we agree that we ought to have people have access, frankly, we believe that what we have proposed provides greater access.

Insurance pooling to acquire health insurance at lower prices, it seems to me we agreed on that as an objective. You disagree with the way we have done it in terms of our exchanges, which is, of course, what the Federal Employee Health Benefit Plan is that you and I participate in. It’s a large exchange with many different insurers. In our area, we have about 25 or 26 different options that we can choose from. For the most part, they’re private sector. As a matter of fact, for all parts, they’re private sector to choose from.

So, yes, we have differences, but as I’ve told you before, I’m still prepared to discuss with you and to work with you on suggestions you have that get us to an objective that we think is appropriate.

Let me just lastly, in closing, say a recent polling shows a majority wants to keep working. You indicate, as you do on a regular basis, that there are polls that show people are against this bill. My view is what they are really against is this confrontation and contention regarding these bills, which is, of course, why the President said he thought having 60 percent would give a greater level of confidence. I agree with that. I would hope that we would have created that kind of consensus.

I want to read to you: 63 percent in a Washington poll said that we ought to pass comprehensive health reform; 57 percent in a Kaiser Family Foundation poll. February 22, 2010, Kaiser poll also finds overwhelming support for key elements of the reforms in our bill; 76 percent support reforming the way health insurance works in our bill; 71 percent support creating a health insurance exchange, which is in our bill; and 70 percent support expanding high-risk insurance pools.

So, when you go to the individual elements of our bill, we find very significant support for those individual elements, I tell my friend. I continue to look forward to working with my friend to reach common ground.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, from the summation of his remarks, I gather that there has been no willingness to listen to the American people on the part of the majority here in the House.

The gentleman does know that all polls indicate that the American people want us to set the bill aside, to stop this construct that Washington is going to tell everyone how to design

health care, and to really start over. In a CNN poll last week, 73 percent of the public said, Shelve the bill. Start over.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's time, and I look forward to working together with him in whatever way we can, frankly, focusing on the issue of getting America back to work.

I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY,
MARCH 5, 2010, TO TUESDAY,
MARCH 9, 2010

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Friday, March 5, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday next for morning-hour debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEETERS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on the Budget:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 3, 2010.

Hon. Speaker PELOSI,
United States Capitol,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI, Given the increased commitments I have made to my state, I resign, effective immediately, from the Committee on the Budget. It has truly been a pleasure to work with Chairman Spratt and the many dedicated members that care passionately about getting our nation's fiscal house in order. Fighting for fiscal responsibility as a member of the Blue Dog Coalition for the past five years and pushing for a responsible budget has been an immense honor. I look forward to continuing to work hard for the people of Louisiana and our great nation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

CHARLIE MELANCON,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

JOBS FOR URBAN SUSTAINABILITY ACT

(Mr. COHEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, today, Congress passed a jobs bill. It was a small jobs bill, but it was a start.

This country needs to work on jobs. This week, I introduced an Urban Sustainability Act to direct \$10 billion of TARP money into cities with populations of 600,000 or more and with unemployment rates of 10 percent or more to put in public works projects and job training.

It is important that we realize that urban America is suffering and suf-

fering in a disproportionate way, and it is important that they get paid particular emphasis. I encourage other cosponsors—we have 9 or 10 already—to join with me, and I encourage the administration and the leadership to look at urban cities and the need for job training programs and public works programs.

Last week, Senator BERNIE SANDERS and I introduced a bill on solar for 10 billion solar photovoltaic panels on roofs and 10 billion gallons of solar water. We need to invest in solar to protect our country, our mother Earth and our resources so that we don't have as many soldiers protecting lines of transportation that are there to bring in oil from the Middle East.

I urge the strong consideration and adoption of that bill. Solar is the future, and it can protect our Nation and our mother Earth.

UNEMPLOYMENT

(Mr. GINGREY of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in January, Georgia's unemployment rate hit a record-high level of 10.4 percent. There could be no clearer proof that the Democrat majority should have long ago shifted this body's focus to the economy and to jobs.

Back in Georgia, Democratic Labor Commissioner Michael Thurmond said yesterday, "I'm concerned that thousands of pending government layoffs will further cripple Georgia's struggling private job market. Our elected leadership must come together to develop a bipartisan plan that will balance the State budget and jump-start private sector hiring."

Mr. Speaker, listen to our State leaders. Unlike the current health care bill, which the Democrats are going to attempt to ram down the American people's throats without any bipartisan input, please do not bring any more legislation to the floor that will raise taxes and kill jobs. Listen to Commissioner Thurmond and work with us. Let's get our economy back on track.

A QUESTION OF JOBS

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this is a question of jobs, and I don't want tomorrow's numbers, if they happen to be showing that we have not reached the goals that we want to reach, to in any way distract from the work the Democrats are doing and that we should be doing together.

I have concerns about what we just passed as it relates to jobs, although I support the infrastructure part of the bill. I think that, if we focus on jobs, we've got to save NASA, and we've got

to ensure that we continue human spaceflight.

Then we've got to go into neighborhoods and areas where there are the chronically unemployed. We have to put up recruitment offices so that we can provide real opportunities for jobs to build America's infrastructure. We have to go to the public housing projects and make sure that those who live there can work on the rehabilitation of those projects.

Those who are chronically unemployed need to have a job in hand. They need to be able to be trained and then work. Those who are unemployed need to be able to be trained for new jobs and not lose their unemployment. We've got to put a job in the hand of the chronically unemployed. That's what I will continue to fight for. That's the legislation that I will support.

A GOVERNMENT TAKEOVER OF HEALTH CARE

(Mr. PENCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, from the town halls in August of last year to the voting booths of Massachusetts, the American people have spoken. The American people don't want a government takeover of health care. Despite the President's latest polished pitch, ObamaCare 2.0 is still a government takeover of one-sixth of the American economy, and the American people know it.

The latest version of ObamaCare is a government takeover because it will mandate private citizens' purchases of health care whether they need it or want it or not. It will cause millions of employers to cancel the health insurance they currently offer employees, and it will force tens of millions of Americans into government-run exchanges. It will create a health care czar to impose price controls on private health insurance, which will lead to shortages and which will force even more people into government-run insurance.

Mr. President, government mandates, government-run insurance and more government control is a government takeover of health care.

HOUSTON CITIZENS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE NASA RESOLUTION

(Mr. OLSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share a letter that I received from my friends at the Houston Citizens Chamber of Commerce. The Houston Citizens Chamber of Commerce is the oldest and largest African American Chamber of Commerce in Houston. They are strongly in support of efforts to preserve NASA's Constellation human spaceflight program.