

SEC. 8. The Secretary shall notify the House of Representatives and counsel for Judge G. Thomas Porteous, Jr. of this resolution.

The message also announced that pursuant to Senate Resolution 458, 111th Congress, on the appointment of an impeachment trial committee and Impeachment Rule XI, the Chair, upon the recommendation of the majority leader and the minority leader, appointed the following Senators as members of the committee to receive and report evidence in the impeachment of Judge G. Thomas Porteous, Jr.:

The Senator from Missouri (Mrs. McCASKILL) (Chairman).

The Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR).

The Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE).

The Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL).

The Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN).

The Senator from Delaware (Mr. KAUFMAN).

The Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) (Vice Chairman).

The Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO).

The Senator from South Carolina (Mr. DEMINT).

The Senator from Nebraska (Mr. JOHANNS).

The Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH).

The Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER).

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PERRIELLO). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

FREE SPEECH IS NO LONGER RECOGNIZED IN THE NETHERLANDS

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the God-given right of free speech to all people in all nations is no longer recognized in the Netherlands. The Dutch Government is intolerant of intolerance for terrorists. Thou shalt not criticize, says their commandment.

Dutch lawmaker Geert Wilders made a documentary movie about real terrorist acts and real radical Islamic clerics encouraging violence in the name of hate. Wilders now is on trial for insulting Islam. He's charged with discrimination and incitement to hatred.

In Amsterdam, it's illegal for a Christian or a Buddhist or an atheist or anyone else to criticize Islam because radical Islamic clerics will incite their followers to murder people. So the Dutch are no longer allowed to talk about terrorism.

The Dutch Ministry of Justice says—get this—it doesn't matter if Wilders was telling the truth. The Dutch court says it's irrelevant whether Wilders might prove his observations to be correct. What's relevant is his observations are illegal.

□ 1715

Geert Wilders now lives under threat of a 5-year jail sentence from his own government for a violation of free speech. His trial is set to resume in July, the trial where the Dutch court said truth doesn't matter; it only matters if Wilders' words hurt somebody's feelings.

And Wilders lives in fear under the threat of death for speaking his mind about radical Islam. So-called religious leaders believe their radical religion says they can kill those who don't agree with them. Dutch filmmaker Theo Van Gogh, great-grand nephew of the famous painter Vincent Van Gogh, was a big believer in freedom of speech too. He and his partner, Hirsi Ali, made a documentary movie about women and Islam called "Submission." The radical clerics didn't like that one either, so they had Van Gogh murdered. Six terrorists were later arrested. One of the terrorists shot and then repeatedly stabbed Van Gogh as he rode his bicycle to work. He slit Van Gogh's throat and then stabbed him again, pinning a five-page radical rant to his body.

The rant listed all of the things they thought Hirsi Ali, his female partner in the film, had done to violate the Koran. And they threatened her with death. At the time, she was a sitting member of the Dutch Parliament.

Hirsi Ali was born in Somalia, and her family escaped when she was a child. She was raised a Muslim and subjected to the custom of female mutilation against her will. After surviving refugee camps in Africa, then a stay in Saudi Arabia, her family finally went to Canada. She was promised in marriage to a distant cousin she had never met. She refused that marriage and soon fled as a refugee to Holland. She became a warrior for women's rights, becoming an elected member of the Dutch Parliament. But after Theo Van Gogh's murder, she was run out of the country by her own government, the Dutch Government. They would not protect her. She was simply just too controversial. She resigned her seat in Parliament and she fled to the United States. She lives in this area around D.C.

Kurt Westergaard is one of the 12 artists who drew cartoons of the prophet Mohammed. Radical clerics then incited their followers to murder people in the streets. They rioted and they burned down embassies. Most of them, by their own admission, had never even seen these cartoons, and Westergaard had to flee for his life. He too lives in the United States under armed guard.

Threatening people and killing people for speaking their mind is just an-

other form of terrorism. Van Gogh, Ali, Westergaard, and now Geert Wilders, have never used or advocated violence. They simply exercised their God-given right of free speech. So now in Amsterdam, truthful insult speech is a crime. What kind of free society says truthful speech can be illegal? The most controversial speech is political, religious, and even truthful speech. That is why it's protected. Freedom of speech is a fundamental principle, a God-given human right to all people in all nations. It has been said, I may not agree with what you say, but I will fight to the death for your right to say it. But not in the Netherlands.

Geert Wilders should be able to speak his mind without becoming an enemy of his own country. The enemy of free speech is the court of the Netherlands and radical Islamic clerics who preach violence in the name of hate.

And, Mr. Speaker, that's just the way it is.

STORIES FROM NORTH CAROLINA

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

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to discuss reforming the health care insurance market in this country. It is really time to put health insurance back on the side of the people back home. To me this issue has never been about politics; it's about people. It's about North Carolina families and small businesses. I have heard from thousands of North Carolinians from all perspectives. And I want to share some of their stories because my phones are still ringing. These are the stories of real people on North Carolina's Main Streets and country roads.

I talked the other day to a farmer in Johnston County in North Carolina, the county where I grew up in a family of tenant farmers. This farmer has health insurance that costs him over \$20,000 a year. He told me, We've got to fix this broken system that leaves too many families out in the cold.

A woman from Raleigh, North Carolina, our State's capital city, fears she will suffer the same fate as her sister who died from asthma because she could not get coverage. There's a lot of fear out there right now. Her fear is real. It is the fear of the consequences of a health care system that's not working for everyone.

She wrote me and said, Like many Americans, I take health care reform very seriously, and I feel that this is no time to bow to petty bickering or false arguments. This issue is also very personal to me. You see, my 33-year-old sister died just last December of asthma, a perfectly livable condition if only she had the right treatment. She didn't. She simply couldn't afford her medication, even with family help.

I also suffer from the same condition as my sister, and I have to say, it scares me to think that if it weren't for

my husband's job, I could end up like my sister. He's been at his company for less than a year now, and I pray he doesn't lose his job or his coverage. So as you see, Congressman ETHERIDGE, health care reform is a deeply personal issue for me, and it is one that I hope will finally be resolved this year. It's too late for my sister, but I'm hoping this gets done soon, especially before her daughter gets out on her own. I don't want her ever to have to deal with what her mother and I are dealing with under this ghastly system.

And a nurse from Sanford, North Carolina, recently wrote me in favor of health reform, and she said, Insurance premiums are too high. How can we wrestle the high cost of health insurance from the companies? When they tell a physician how much he can charge for a procedure or what medications he can prescribe, we are allowing untrained, uneducated individuals to dictate health care to our system in this country.

And a woman in Louisburg, North Carolina, says, Please vote "yes" on health care reform. I have a very successful new business that my son would like to join me in, but he can't afford to leave his current employer's health plan because he has a child with autism. No private plan will provide coverage for him, even though he has never filed a claim for his treatment of autism. We are not looking for a handout, just a fair playing field. Everyone should be able to get insurance.

And a young man from Raleigh wrote and said, I want to thank you very much for the work you have been doing in my district and urge you to vote for the health care reform bill. Despite the misinformation and outright lies that are being spread about the bill, I hope the House acts to pass comprehensive reform to our broken system.

My girlfriend, whom I love very much, has a disease which prevents her from getting coverage. In fact, the insurance company dropped her when they found out she had it. This disease will very possibly lead to her death. While it is too late for this bill to help her, I do not want any other American to have to worry about how they will get treatment for any disease that they may have. I urge you to vote for the bill.

Another woman from Clayton, North Carolina, tells me she has a brain tumor, and as of December of this past year, the insurance company dropped her coverage. She is talking now to an attorney and plans to file bankruptcy. And this is a tragedy. These are examples of why we need reform.

Mr. Speaker, I'm listening to North Carolinians from all perspectives and a wide range of points of view about this system. We need reform that cuts costs, assures quality of care, patient choice and prohibits denials for pre-existing conditions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. In order to achieve real health care reform, the kind of change that would relieve Kansas families and business owners from facing drastic increases in their health insurance premium costs, we must do something to reduce health care costs. If we fail to affect cost, then reform efforts, whatever they may be, will fail because costs simply get shifted and always roll downhill to the patient. This is one of the many reasons I'm so adamantly opposed to the Democrat health care plan.

You may hear that the health care legislation we apparently are going to vote on this week will reduce costs. But the accounting data shows just the opposite. The facts are the facts. Democrats count billions in tax revenues to pay for their plan's new programs, but then they assign those same revenues to preserve Medicare and Social Security. They are double counting. When all the budgetary gimmicks are removed, we see this bill for what it is, a trillion dollar budget breaker that we cannot afford and that won't improve everyday Americans' access to affordable health care. It's the worst of both worlds: Breaking the bank, breaking the Treasury and not controlling health care costs.

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

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

HEALTH CARE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of America's women to urge passage of health care reform to benefit our mothers, our sisters, our daughters, our families, and our friends. And, of course, when we pass health care reform, we will improve health care for all Americans.

But today I would like to concentrate on why women stand to gain the most. Right now, being a woman is reason enough for insurance companies to discriminate against us. Today, women are being charged higher insurance premiums than men simply for being a woman.

Our legislation will put an end to this practice by prohibiting a practice

known as gender rating whereby women are automatically charged higher rates. Right now, there are women who have been victims of domestic violence who are denied health insurance coverage because insurance companies have said that domestic violence is a preexisting condition. Our legislation will put an end to this practice and expressly prohibit insurance companies from considering domestic violence a preexisting condition.

Right now, many women can only obtain an insurance policy that excludes maternity coverage. Our legislation will put an end to this practice by requiring coverage for maternity care. These three provisions alone will help millions of women in this country.

Mr. Speaker, as a public health nurse, I'm particularly enthusiastic about provisions in the bill to eliminate cost sharing for some of the most important preventive services that women should be accessing. And, of course, this provision is important for men as well. But many of us, especially Members of Congress who already have comprehensive health insurance, take it for granted that we are going to get routine checkups. There are, however, too many women who forgo screenings for conditions like cervical cancer or heart disease because they can't afford these screenings, either because they are uninsured or their insurance company requires prohibitive copays for routine screening.

The legislation we will soon pass will ensure that there is no cost for patients to be accessing the most important screenings which are recommended by medical experts. Those of us in the public health community have long been advocating this because costs should never stand in the way of lifesaving screening procedures.

In addition to the ways our legislation will benefit individual women, it's important to keep in mind that women are often the health care decision-makers for their households. And that's why we all have reason to be so hopeful about how our bill will improve health care for families as a whole. Insurance premiums for families have risen at alarming rates over the past decade and will continue to rise if we don't enact health reform now.

Middle class families especially have shouldered this burden as the rise in premiums has far outpaced any rise in wages. The announcement, for example, by Anthem in California that it will raise premiums by up to 40 percent is just one of the latest outrages. When premiums become too expensive to pay, families are forced to drop coverage. And then what happens when someone in the family gets sick? They are forced to spend down all their assets until eventually bankruptcy may become their only option.

Mr. Speaker, over half of all bankruptcies in the United States today are caused by medical debt. And in 2008, over 900 families in my congressional district alone were forced into bankruptcy because of medical debt. And