

than that. And I think there's a better way.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I really get a kick out of the Speaker. She thinks the American people don't get what's going on, but they do. The overwhelming majority of Americans don't want this, and they know that she's playing around with the rules here in the House.

And so I just want to make one little statement to the Speaker if she is paying attention. Abraham Lincoln, who was a Member of this body a long time ago, said, You can fool all of the people some of the time, and some of the people all of the time, but you can't fool all of the people all of the time.

And if those people on that side of the aisle vote for this turkey, they're going to pay in November.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Mr. FLAKE. Madam Speaker, one of my favorite things to do is go to a local high school and talk to government classes. For the past 10 years that I've been doing this, I have always told them, there are certain things that are done in the House that are there to protect the minority. One is during appropriation bills: any Member can bring any amendment to the floor on anything they want to that is germane to the bill, and the leadership can't stop them, even their own party or the other party.

This past year, I wasn't able to say that anymore because for the first time in the history of this institution, every appropriation bill that came to the floor was brought under a closed rule so only the amendments that the majority wanted to be offered could be offered.

Something similar is happening here. All of us have told classes that we have taught that your history books are right, if a bill passes the House and a different bill passes the Senate, the House will have to vote on it again. But here we're being told, no, you don't have to do that anymore. You can deem it passed. It just magically appears back in the Senate without having a vote here in the House.

Our institution, this institution, the people's institution, deserves better than that.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Mr. GRAVES. Madam Speaker, I rise today to voice my opposition to this

piece of legislation. This is a government takeover of health care. Over the last few months, the American people have voiced their opposition to this bill loud and clear. They know that this bill is being pushed with false promises and backroom deals, and they have had enough. This bill will put the American Government between patients and their doctors. It's going to raise taxes and increase regulations. It will hurt small business owners, the very people who create 7 out of every 10 jobs in this country, by hitting them with impossible mandates.

Make no mistake: this bill will destroy jobs in this country and freeze our economic recovery.

Madam Speaker, Americans know that the answer to the problems in our health care system is not bigger government and more bureaucrats. The answer is more competition and better choices. My colleagues and I have introduced several commonsense reform pieces, but they have been ignored by the majority. It's not too late to start over on legislation that will increase access for all Americans and help control costs. However, this bill is not the answer. I urge my colleagues to vote against it.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Madam Speaker, just last week I was listening to the Speaker talk about health care. She said—and I had to actually look it up in the transcripts because I couldn't believe what I heard—Madam Speaker, Speaker PELOSI said, "We have to pass it so you can see what's in it." Well, she was wrong then, and she is wrong now. The Democratic majority in this people's House is not listening to the people. Americans do not want this bill.

How do we know this? Well, because in my own town halls last summer, which I had in Bakersfield, California, and Paso Robles, more than 5,000 constituents turned out just to say that. And it is not just because they don't know what's in the bill. They get it. They don't like it. They don't like the political payoffs, the job-killing tax hikes, the huge cuts in Medicare; and most of all, they don't like Washington running their health care.

Maybe that's why this House Democratic majority is poised to use the parliamentary procedure to pass this bill without an actual vote. By doing this, the House majority will prove, once again, they are not listening. It's time for a new direction. Scrap the bill and start over.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, here are 10 reasons why the administration's health bill makes no sense according to Investor's Business Daily. Number one, the people don't want it. In fact, the majority of Americans are opposed to it. Two, doctors don't want it. Three, people are happy with the health care they have. Four, it doesn't cover the people they set out to cover. Five, costs will go up, not down. Six, real cost controls are nowhere to be found. Seven, insurance premiums will rise, not fall. Eight, Medicare is already bankrupting us. Nine, medical care will also deteriorate. And, ten, rationing of care is inevitable.

Madam Speaker, the conclusion is clear: Congress should start over and get it right.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Madam Speaker, if the Democrats are so proud of the health care bill, why the subterfuge? Speaker PELOSI said, If we can't cross the fence, we will pole vault over it. We will tunnel under it, we will break through it. In other words, they are going to subvert the legislative process.

If they are so proud of the health care bill, why the Cornhusker kickback? Why the Louisiana purchase? Why the Gator aid? Why the hospital for the folks in Connecticut? Why all the other special interest bills? And if they are so proud, why not post it on the Web page? But, in fact, here is what the Speaker said. These are NANCY PELOSI's words: "We have to pass the bill so that you can find out what's in it." In other words, the height of D.C. arrogance and Beltway we-know-best.

I call on fair-minded Democrats to join me in denouncing this process and standing up for transparent, fair, and open government. Let's have a bill that comes to the floor in which amendments are allowed and one that has come through the committee process.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, the American people have spoken loud and clear on this issue as recently as the Massachusetts election. They want health care reform, but they reject this bill. This administration and the Democrat majority have been tone deaf to this message. Speaker PELOSI just said, "We need to pass this bill to see what's in it."

I don't quite understand what that really means. But I will tell you what's in this bill: there's over \$500 billion in tax increases, a cut to Medicare by \$500 billion, a new form of government-run

health care insurance by the Office of Personnel Management, a cut to Social Security by \$4.2 billion, and sweetheart deals, basically legalized bribery, to buy off votes of the Senate by the Louisiana purchase, the Cornhusker kick-back and the Gator aid.

To those Blue Dog Democrats, 40 sitting in conservative districts, do the right thing. Don't walk the plank on this bill. This is still the United States of America, and we're going to take this country back.

□ 1545

UNACCEPTABLE GROWTH OF GOVERNMENT

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

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. Madam Speaker, we have been talking all day about this bill that is that 2,700-page Senate bill, this bill that increases bureaucracies and bureaucrats and gives more government power and more government control. We know the American people don't like it, and we are speaking against it.

But that is not bad enough. At the same time, using this convoluted parliamentary procedure, our Democratic colleagues want to have the government take over the student lending business, build up bigger bureaucracy, wipe out 30,000 private sector jobs, make the Department of Education one of the largest banks in the country lending \$100 billion a year of money that we don't have, money that we have to borrow from China before we can lend it to students.

So whether it is health care or it is student lending, we are watching a massive growth of government power, size, and spending, and I deem that unacceptable.

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

Mr. FLAKE. Madam Speaker, pursuant to clause 2 of rule IX, I hereby give notice of my intent to offer a resolution raising a question of the privileges of the House.

The form of the resolution is as follows:

Whereas, the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct initiated an investigation into allegations related to earmarks and campaign contributions in the Spring of 2009.

Whereas, on December 2, 2009, reports and findings in seven separate matters involving the alleged connection between earmarks and campaign contributions were forwarded by the Office of Congressional Ethics to the Standards Committee.

Whereas, on February 26, 2010, the Standards Committee made public its report on the matter wherein the Committee found, though a widespread perception exists among corporations and lobbyists that campaign contributions provide a greater chance of obtaining earmarks, there was no evidence

that Members or their staff considered contributions when requesting earmarks.

Whereas, the Committee indicated that, with respect to the matters forwarded by the Office of Congressional Ethics, neither the evidence cited in the OCE's findings nor the evidence in the record before the Standards Committee provided a substantial reason to believe that violations of applicable standards of conduct occurred.

Whereas, the Office of Congressional Ethics is prohibited from reviewing activities taking place prior to March of 2008 and lacks the authority to subpoena witnesses and documents.

Whereas, for example, the Office of Congressional Ethics noted that in some instances documents were redacted or specific information was not provided and that, in at least one instance, they had reason to believe a witness withheld information requested and did not identify what was being withheld.

Whereas, the Office of Congressional Ethics also noted that they were able to interview only six former employees of the PMA Group, with many former employees refusing to consent to interviews and the OCE unable to obtain evidence within PMA's possession.

Whereas, Roll Call noted that "the committee report was five pages long and included no documentation of any evidence collected or any interviews conducted by the committee, beyond a statement that the investigation 'included extensive document reviews and interviews with numerous witnesses.'" (Roll Call, March 8, 2010)

Whereas, it is unclear whether the Standards Committee included in their investigation any activities that occurred prior to 2008.

Whereas, it is unclear whether the Standards Committee interviewed any Members in the course of their investigation.

Whereas, it is unclear whether the Standards Committee, in the course of their investigation, initiated their own subpoenas or followed the Office of Congressional Ethics recommendations to issue subpoenas. Therefore, be it

Resolved, That not later than seven days after the adoption of this resolution, the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct shall report to the House of Representatives, with respect to the activities addressed in its report of February 26, 2010, (1) how many witnesses were interviewed, (2) how many, if any, subpoenas were issued in the course of their investigation, and (3) what documents were reviewed and their availability for public review.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 Arizona 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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair

will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

SUPPORTING GOALS AND IDEALS OF RED CROSS MONTH

Ms. WATSON. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 311) expressing the support of the House of Representatives for the goals and ideals of Red Cross Month.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 311

Whereas the American National Red Cross, one of the most well-known humanitarian organizations in the world, was founded by Clara Barton in Washington, DC, on May 21, 1881;

Whereas the American National Red Cross received a congressional charter in 1905 setting forth the purposes of the organization, which include giving relief to and serving as a medium of communication between members of the Armed Forces of the United States and their families, and providing national and international disaster relief and mitigation;

Whereas the American National Red Cross depends on the support of the people of the United States to accomplish the mission of the organization;

Whereas the American National Red Cross has been at the forefront of helping individuals and families prevent, prepare for, and respond to disasters for more than 127 years, including more than 70,000 disasters annually, ranging from apartment and single-family home fires, the most common type of disaster, to hurricanes, floods, earthquakes, wildfires, tornadoes, hazardous materials spills, transportation accidents, explosions, and other natural and human-caused disasters;

Whereas, when a disaster strikes or is imminent, communities throughout the United States depend on the American National Red Cross to help meet the basic and urgent needs of affected individuals, including shelter, food, healthcare, and mental health services;

Whereas the "Be Red Cross Ready" safety program encourages the people of the United States to take the 3 actions that will help them "Be Red Cross Ready" for a disaster: "Get a Kit, Make a Plan, Be Informed";

Whereas the "Be Red Cross Ready" safety program represents a major effort by the American National Red Cross to encourage the people of the United States to be more prepared for a disaster or other emergency;

Whereas, since 1943, every President of the United States has proclaimed March to be "Red Cross Month"; and

Whereas the American National Red Cross uses Red Cross Month as an opportunity to promote the services and programs the organization provides to the people of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of Red Cross Month;

(2) recognizes the contributions of American National Red Cross volunteers in times