

this administration, this government can't deliver. He is worried about the fact that we can't fund health care under this bill.

And I think what frustrates people is we already have a Medicare program that is going bankrupt. We have Social Security not far behind. We don't fully fund veterans for military care, yet we are going to add this new entitlement. Americans, I don't think, are very easily fooled. They know the Democrats in Washington aren't really blameless when it comes to who is responsible for driving health care through the roof. Fueled by labor and lawyer contributions, millions and millions of dollars from them in their pockets, Democrats have for decades successfully killed lawsuit reform and efforts to allow small businesses to join together to buy health care at the same discount the big companies get. As champions of government mandates have driven up health care premiums and union contracts have demanded unsustainable health benefits, Democrats have fought voraciously against reasonable efforts to keep health care costs down. Yet today Democrats in Washington wield this sword of a massive government takeover in order to slay the health care beast that they have been feeding for decades and decades.

So tomorrow, even if the powerful combination of threats, union paybacks, and backroom deals ultimately produce 216 votes, the fight isn't over, and nor are the consequences. The images of Democrats in Washington running from town halls, hiding from C-SPAN cameras, slipping in sweetheart deals and arrogantly ignoring the voices of constituents is also indelibly etched in the public's mind. It is a disturbing picture the American people won't easily forget.

I object to that bill. I will fight it with all my might. It is not the right solution for America.

□ 1815

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Madam Speaker, I would inquire as to the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Guam has 3 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Colorado has 1½ minutes.

Mr. LAMBORN. Madam Speaker, let me point out that there is a big flaw in the process that we have been following here recently. We have these massive groups of bills that we are supposed to absorb in a 72-hour period which finishes tomorrow, and then we culminate potentially with a vote on a massive piece of legislation reforming one-sixth of our Nation's economy.

And if you look at this bill right here, this is the reconciliation bill, H.R. 4872, the bill reported from the House Budget Committee, 2,310 pages; the two plain-language reports from the Budget Committee totaling about 1,300 pages; and, the amendment in the

nature of a substitute of 150 pages. You add all that together, that is 3,800 pages that we have been given in the last 3 days. I dare say there is not a single Member of this House that has read these 3,800 pages, and that is on top of the original bill of a couple thousand pages.

So we have a process here where we are not really given enough time to absorb and go through these bills, and the American people really deserve better than that. This system has not been followed like we should be doing, and I just regret that. I think that is a flaw in this process.

I yield back the balance of my time.
Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 925, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

COLD WAR VETERANS RECOGNITION DAY

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 900) supporting the goals and ideals of a Cold War Veterans Recognition Day to honor the sacrifices and contributions made by members of the Armed Forces during the Cold War and encouraging the people of the United States to participate in local and national activities honoring the sacrifices and contributions of those individuals, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 900

Whereas the Cold War involved hundreds of military exercises and operations that occurred between September 2, 1945, and December 26, 1991;

Whereas millions of Americans valiantly stood watch as members of the Armed Forces during the Cold War; and

Whereas many Americans sacrificed their lives during the Cold War in the cause of defeating communism and promoting world peace and stability; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) honors the sacrifices and contributions made by members of the Armed Forces during the Cold War; and

(2) encourages the people of the United States to participate in local and national activities honoring the sacrifices and contributions of those individuals.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from

Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) and the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Guam.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Guam?

There was no objection.

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of House Resolution 900, honoring the sacrifices and contributions made by members of the Armed Forces during the Cold War. I would like to thank my friend from New York, Mr. STEVE ISRAEL, for bringing this resolution to the House floor.

In an age where fear dictated the world's stage, the Armed Forces of the United States of America bravely stood guard to ensure that communism, one of democracy's greatest adversaries, would not prevail. The Cold War Certificate Program recognizes the service of veterans during the period of the Cold War from September 2, 1945 to December 26, 1991 in promoting peace and stability for America.

For nearly five decades the United States stood the test of time and proved its powerful convictions in defending itself and the ideals of freedom from the threat of communism.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to help the achievements and sacrifice of the Armed Forces during the Cold War be recognized by passing a resolution that encourages the people of our Nation to participate in local and national activities honoring our veterans. I am proud to stand here today to honor the men and the women who stood on the brink of devastating global war in order to bring peace and stability to the world, and I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of House Resolution 900.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Madam Speaker, I rise also in support of House Resolution 900, as amended, supporting the goals and ideals of a Cold War Veterans Recognition Day, and encouraging the people of the United States to participate in activities honoring the sacrifices and contributions of Cold War veterans.

The Cold War was a war between the freedoms of democracy and the totalitarian ideology of communism. It was fought around the world, often in places that were on the brink of slipping into the harsh realities of communism. It was fought by millions of Americans who, as members of the Armed Forces, were at the point of the spear defending democracy whenever it was in peril. Many Americans sacrificed their lives in the long struggle against communism.

For that reason, Madam Speaker, it is right to recognize the veterans of the Cold War and thank them for their dedication and efforts toward defeating communism.

I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL) for introducing this bill. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to my friend and colleague, the sponsor of this resolution, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL).

Mr. ISRAEL. I thank the gentlewoman and the gentleman, as well, for the bipartisan cooperation that has been demonstrated with respect to this bill.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution, supporting a day of recognition for Cold War Veterans. I am very proud to have authored it and sponsored it. It recognizes American heroes who protected our Nation during one of the most perilous times in our history.

Madam Speaker, the Cold War began on September 2, 1945, and ended on December 26, 1991, and the years in between were fraught with peril. I, along with many of my colleagues, grew up in the Cold War. I remember going to elementary school and hearing the air raid drill, going out into a hall, bracing myself against a wall covering my head with my arms. There were millions of American children who went through those exercises.

Tens of thousands of nuclear warheads were aimed between the United States and the Soviet Union. The world was on hair trigger. And while wars were fought and combat raged in places like Korea and Vietnam, those nuclear missiles never fired. The nuclear conflagration between the United States and the Soviet Union never occurred. It never occurred because of those heroes of the Cold War.

They answered President Kennedy's call as we embarked on a path full of hazards. They maintained and defended missile silos and checkpoints. They served on remote B-52 bomber bases and storm-tossed Navy ships. And when they returned, there were no parades; there were no public thanks. They went quietly to their jobs.

Until today. Today, they receive that thanks. Today we acknowledge their courage, their valor, and their patriotism. Today we say thank you to those who kept the world safe, who kept the peace, who saved the world from that unimaginable nuclear catastrophe.

My bill honors their service, Madam Speaker, and asks that Americans fly their flags high in thanks, that we dedicate 1 day each year to thank them for 50 years of security.

Those young children in those elementary schools had to feel great fear during those air raid drills. They may have felt unsafe at the time, but those in dangerous places kept them safe for a generation and more. We thank them for that service.

I thank both sides of the aisle for their bipartisan demonstration of support for this bill, and I urge its passage.

Mr. LAMBORN. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia, Representative GOODLATTE.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Colorado and the gentlewoman from Guam for bringing forward this bipartisan resolution honoring Cold War veterans.

I too also commend the importance of understanding the history of the Cold War and of what President Kennedy did with the airlift into Berlin to protect the people of that city; what happened during the 1980s when President Reagan called the Soviet Union exactly what it was, the Evil Empire, and later went to the Berlin Wall and called upon Mr. Gorbachev to "tear down that wall." It was the brave men and women who served in our Armed Forces who made that possible in our history to see the ability of our President to stand up to the Soviet Union, and, indeed, to see that wall torn down not that many years ago.

I will tell you also, however, Madam Speaker, that we have before us in this Congress today and tomorrow health care legislation, a massive bill. When you take all of the pages of all the bills that are being considered here, the House bill, the Senate bill, the reconciliation bill, you are talking about thousands and thousands of pages. And tomorrow—tomorrow, we will have a couple of hours for 435 Members to talk about what is in those bills.

So I have no doubt that the millions of American veterans who served their country, and many of whom are baby boomers and will be facing \$520 billion in cuts in the Medicare program to pay for a new government program at a time when our Nation is broke, that they are going to be as concerned as all of us are here today about this health care legislation, this monstrosity that is going to include \$569 billion in tax increases that will cost millions of American jobs.

They will be concerned to hear from the 130 economists from across the country who sent President Obama a letter explaining how this legislation is a job-killer. They will be concerned about their children and grandchildren who will inherit the enormous debt that is a product of this legislation. Because, unlike the specious claim that this will indeed result in deficit reductions, they know that when you have a side deal of over \$200 billion to take care of physicians under the Medicare bill, when you have a bill that provides 6 years of coverage with 10 years of tax increases and Medicare cuts, that does not balance out.

In fact, this legislation is hundreds and hundreds of billions, some say more than \$1 trillion, greater in costs than will be taken in in revenue and Medicare cuts. The result of this is going to be devastating for our country, and I urge my colleagues to reject this monstrosity.

□ 1830

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

(Mr. ANDREWS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDREWS. I rise in very strong support of this bill. I commend Members on both sides for supporting it. I regret that the Member who just spoke has chosen to use this debate about honoring veterans of the Cold War era by mischaracterizing the bill before us tomorrow. I'd like to take a few minutes and specify those mischaracterizations.

The gentleman said there will be Medicare cuts. There will be no cuts to benefits for any Medicare recipient. Yes, there'll be cuts from fraud, waste, and abuse under Medicare. Senator COBURN of the other body says a third of Medicare spending is fraud, waste, and abuse. The Heritage Foundation says at least 10 percent. This bill takes between 5 and 6 percent of that fraud, waste, and abuse.

For the record, the gentleman made reference to veterans and TRICARE. Veterans Administration care, which this Congress under this majority has increased to the highest level of the history of the country, will not be affected in any way. I will challenge anyone on the minority side to show me one word in these bills that justifies a different conclusion, one. TRICARE will not be affected in any way, and I would offer a similar challenge.

The gentleman said there will be massive tax increases. What he did not say is that tax increases to help pay for this bill are on families with an income of more than a quarter of a million dollars a year, the top 3 or 4 percent in the country.

He said it will cost American jobs and be a job killer. This is echoes of the words we heard in this Chamber in 1993, when Members of the other side said the Clinton economic plan would be a job killer. The former chairman of the House Budget Committee, our friend from Ohio, Mr. Kasich, said at that time that if the plan worked, he would become a Democrat. Well, he didn't become a Democrat, but the plan worked. It created 23 million new jobs after it was passed.

He said there was a specious claim of deficit reduction. I'll say this to you. The gentleman said that some say the deficit will go up as a result of this. Well, around here, we don't rely upon hearsay from unsubstantiated sources. We rely upon the Congressional Budget Office, and here's what they say. They said the deficit will go down by \$138 billion in the first 10 years, and over \$1.2 trillion in the next 10.

With all due respect, the men and women who served this country in the Cold War served honestly and always gave a fair accounting of what they do. When we hear these remarks on the

floor, they are not an accurate representation of facts and they, frankly, do dishonor to this bill and this debate.

Mr. LAMBORN. Madam Speaker, at this time I would like to yield 4 minutes to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER).

Mr. SOUDER. I thank my colleague from Colorado.

Apparently, our ground rules here are: We praise the vets on Saturday and punish them on Sunday. To my friend from New Jersey, this afternoon we did a supposed fix for TRICARE, because the Senate bill, basically, unless you're 65 and over, triples TRICARE. We did this Band-Aid thing—

Mr. ANDREWS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOUDER. I have 4 minutes, so let me do mine.

We did a Band-Aid this afternoon. Now, the challenge is that as we debate tomorrow, apparently we're going to have separate votes on the Senate bill. And the Senate bill is the problem here because it could become law. So it doesn't really matter what we're doing in the House right now. The question is: Are our veterans covered in the Senate bill, and is TRICARE going to be gutted in the Senate bill? And the veterans who took this risk during the Cold War would rather—as much as they appreciate a flag being raised, they'd rather have their TRICARE. So the fundamental question, if any Member votes for the Senate bill tomorrow in the rule, if we're not going to do this deeming bill and instead do a separate vote on the Senate bill, this is really going to be the vote for veterans.

A second category. When it says there's no harm for veterans, or no job killing, I happen to represent the orthopedic capital of the world in Warsaw, Indiana. It has DePuy, Biomet, and Zimmer. They are getting a tax clobbering in this bill, particularly in the Senate bill, and that tax clobbering equals half of their R&D.

Now, who uses hip replacements and elbows and shoulders more than anybody? Our vets. Because, particularly as we've developed body armor, they're getting hit in those places where they used to die, they're now alive, and a big percentage of them are doing hip replacements.

Now, R&D is critical, particularly as they're 18- to 22-year-olds, those who are retired vets from the Cold War era are looking at trying to get quality hip and joint replacements. One of the questions is is that if you reduce half the R&D, only one of two things can happen: either future vets are not going to have as good quality and advances like we've been having or the jobs will go offshore to reduce the costs so they can do the R&D. There's really not a way that this isn't going to affect vets. It's indirect.

Then, as we all know, veterans health care in general, just like Medicare and Medicaid, pays for variable costs and a little bit of mixed costs. The way the government runs through

buildings is that, if we run through those in one year, we don't do amortization and depreciation; therefore, in health care costs, private pay funds most R&D and innovations. So if you're going to keep the quality of care that you're going to have in veterans, you may have your veterans hospital, but the new drugs that are being invented, the new hips that are being invented, the new things that were there that were funded by private pay are going to be squeezed out of the market and, therefore, veterans will be indirectly hurt by that.

A third category this bill hurts in veterans and these Cold War people that we're paying tribute to is, as it goes through and addresses—even in second home sales, by the way. I have a hundred lakes in Steuben County, a hundred lakes in Kosciusko County. These aren't big, fancy kind of western lakes. These are often where retired vets have a mobile home—it's their second residence—that we've now airdropped in a tax on the second residences. It's going to punish many of them who are banking on this either to cash it out for the retirement or to maybe retire there. They're going to get taxed. They didn't have the margin for their homes. We have whole lakes that are around different veterans groups and age groups and people were police and firemen. They aren't all million-dollar homes. Many of them are \$20,000 and \$30,000 homes that now are suddenly valued at \$100,000, \$200,000, and they're going to get hammered.

The fourth category where they're going to get hit, and they're very used to in the veterans systems, and it may not directly affect them, but they're going to watch with everybody.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LAMBORN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to Representative SOUDER from Indiana.

Mr. SOUDER. Veterans get ping-ponged back and forth. Right now in Indiana, we're online in this budget to get a new hospital in Fort Wayne. We haven't had investment since before World War II. But they get ping-ponged down to Indianapolis because of utilization. You know what this bill says? In the Medicare reduction it says: Higher utilization of equipment. Higher utilization of equipment is being interpreted and they're now going to cardiologists, oncologists, and others in my district, saying, 80 percent utilization.

That does great for the Federal savings in Medicare, but what it means is everybody's going to get ping-ponged like the veterans are getting ping-ponged, because only Indianapolis in the State of Indiana can reach 80 percent utilization.

So they're telling Fort Wayne, South Bend, other parts of the State that they aren't going to have oncology equipment, heart equipment. And just like the veterans who see their records are often lost; when their appointments are canceled, they have to get a

motel. They have to pay for their own gas. This is a nightmare for the rest of the citizens.

So, once again, I would say, We praise them on Saturday. We're punishing them on Sunday.

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my friend and colleague, who is also a member of the Armed Services Committee, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

My friend from Indiana, the previous speaker, is a very thoughtful and substantive Member and I appreciate the good work he does, so I want to ask him a couple of questions about the assertions he just made. One is that the Senate bill, the base text, hurts TRICARE. I wonder if he could explain to us exactly how that is, and I would be happy to yield to him if he could explain to us.

Can anyone explain how the Senate bill hurts TRICARE? I'm just simply asking for an explanation of the statement.

Mr. SOUDER. I'm sorry. I don't have the details in front of me. I have it down. You know the details of the bill far better than I do.

Mr. ANDREWS. Let's talk about one of the details that is more obvious. I thank you.

The gentleman talked about a couple that would buy a home for \$30,000 and sell it for \$200,000, having a \$170,000 gain. Under the proposal that the House will consider tomorrow, does the gentleman know what tax that couple would pay on that gain if they had a \$170,000 gain?

Mr. SOUDER. It's based off the capital gains. Right now—I had one person with a \$40,000 house, and the capital gains on that made the difference of his retirement on an annual basis. The question is they have planned nothing—

Mr. ANDREWS. Reclaiming my time, the example the gentleman used was a couple that bought a \$30,000 house, sold it for \$200,000, which means it's a \$170,000 gain. The tax would be zero because the tax doesn't kick in until \$250,000.

Every Member is entitled to his own opinion but not his own set of facts. These assertions are false.

Mr. LAMBORN. Let me say in response to the gentleman from New Jersey that it was a good step we took with the IKE SKELTON bill today. It solved half the problem. We still have a remaining problem, and that is that it's not clear, like it should be, who has jurisdiction over defining beyond whether it's a minimum standard that TRICARE will satisfy, whether there will be additional impositions and regulations put on by the health czar. I think a health czar should have no impact, no say whatsoever on TRICARE.

Mr. ANDREWS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBORN. In just a moment.

And we should have gone farther. We did not do that. We only went halfway. So it's still undefined who has final control over imposing all the regulations. And I have veterans in my district, a hundred thousand of them, who feel that they have earned a right to have health care, and they don't want to have to be told that they need a second policy, that somehow that's not good enough. That's what the danger is, because it hasn't been defined like it should be.

Mr. ANDREWS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBORN. You'll have a chance shortly, I'm sure.

I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding, Madam Speaker, and I rise in support of this resolution to honor our veterans who did so much to preserve our freedom during the Cold War. It is unfortunate that we may be about to pass a massive health care bill that will take away an important part of that freedom that those veterans worked so hard to preserve.

Madam Speaker, Robert Samuelson, a very middle-of-the-road economics columnist for the Washington Post, wrote a column this week entitled, *A Cost-Control Mirage*. Mr. Samuelson wrote that the health care plan we will vote on tomorrow "evades health care's major problems and would worsen the budget outlook." He added that "It's a big new spending program when government hasn't paid for the spending programs it already has."

Every government health care program has far exceeded all cost expectations and has cost many times more than what is predicted. Medicare cost just \$3 billion a year after it was created and \$453 billion last year. Its unfunded future liabilities are estimated at a whopping \$38 trillion.

Medicaid is also out of control at both Federal and State levels. Last week, the Governor of Arizona estimated that this new health care bill would cost her State alone \$4 billion that they do not have, when Arizonans are facing their biggest deficit ever—over \$3 billion.

Most States are in their worst shape ever, financially, and yet according to the Census Bureau, 10 States would have to expand Medicaid coverage by more than 50 percent, and 33 States would have to expand by more than 30 percent. The States simply cannot afford all the megabillions this bill would order them to spend.

Our senior Senator from Tennessee, Senator ALEXANDER, said Congress "set out to reduce health care costs," but that this bill "will do the exact opposite." He said this bill "will increase health insurance premiums, raise taxes, cut Medicare, and dump millions into Medicaid."

Of course, the bill is so long, so complicated, so confusing, that the Speaker of the House was quoted as saying we would have to pass it to find out

what is in it, and one of the Senate Democrat leaders said on the floor of the Senate even he did not know all that was in it.

□ 1845

Now the Congressional Budget Office has apparently cooked the books and filed a very misleading report, attempting to show a cost of less than \$1 trillion. To do this among other budget gimmicks and manipulations, the CBO was told to count phony savings, such as over \$400 billion from cutting doctors' payments by over 20 percent and never raising them back up again. This will never happen.

Another huge phony savings comes from cutting Medicare. Dr. David Gratzner wrote in a column in the New York Daily News last December, "It's that time of year again: Washington is talking about cuts to Medicare. President Obama's health care reforms depend on them—up to \$400 billion over 10 years. As a psychiatrist, I'll break the news gently: Medicare cuts are like Santa Claus and his flying reindeer—often talked about, never actually seen."

The Weekly Standard magazine published an analysis of this bill 2 days ago, estimating the bill's real cost during its first decade at \$2.5 trillion to \$3 trillion, more than double or triple the CBO estimate. Then there are the tax increases on everything from medical equipment producers to tanning bed operators to \$210 billion in new Medicare taxes. Then there are the fines of \$695 for individuals or up to 2.5 percent of household income against people who do not buy insurance and the employer mandate of \$2,000 per employee if they do not provide insurance. The bill starts the tax increases immediately, but 98 percent of the benefits do not take effect until 2014. Two lawyers from one of the Nation's most prominent law firms wrote a column for the Washington Post entitled, "Illegal Health Reform." David Rivkin and Lee Casey wrote that this bill is, without question, unconstitutional.

In the early 1990s, Madam Speaker, I went to a reception, and the doctor who delivered me came and brought my records. I asked him how much he charged back then, and he said \$60 for 9 months of care and the delivery, if they could afford it. Medical care was cheap and affordable for almost everyone until the mid sixties. Then we took what was a very minor problem for a very few people and turned it into a massive, major problem for everyone.

Anything the Federal Government subsidizes, the costs just explode. There are many things we can do to bring down the cost of health care, but this bill would cause costs to go up even more, and getting the Federal Government into health care in an even bigger way will eventually lead to shortages, waiting periods, and declining quality of care, all at greater cost. This bill in the long run will end up hurting most poor, lower-income, and

even middle-income people. It should be defeated.

The problem is, as Jeffrey Toobin, the CNN legal analyst who is liberal himself, said in a speech at the Free Library of Philadelphia last September 27: "The risk of a liberal Supreme Court is that the Constitution becomes a meaningless document that means anything you want it to." Apparently, a majority in Congress feel the Constitution is meaningless, too.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Guam has 11 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Colorado has 5 minutes remaining.

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my friend and colleague, Mr. ANDREWS from New Jersey.

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. We've just heard another series of misrepresentations. We just heard the CBO, the Congressional Budget Office "cooked the books." I, frankly, think that does a great disservice to the men and women on a nonpartisan basis who work for that budget office and give us their honest judgment. Apparently the minority doesn't like their honest judgment—that the bill reduces the deficit. So rather than argue the facts, they attack the men and women, nonpartisan people, who wrote the report. I think that's just not fair.

Cuts to Medicare: No Medicare beneficiary gets any cut. There's an increase in prescription drug coverage. There's an increase in preventive care where there's no copay. Having said that, I think there is fraud, waste, and abuse in Medicare. Senator COBURN thinks that. The Heritage Foundation thinks that. The gentleman on the other side must think that because last spring when the Republicans put their alternative budget on the floor, it cut Medicare outlays by \$100 billion more than this bill does. It was in excess of \$600 billion. And I, frankly, think that that targeted some fraud, waste, and abuse, so to argue somehow that these are cuts is disingenuous and inaccurate.

Then we come back to TRICARE. There are two issues with respect to TRICARE. The first is, which office or department regulates. It's very clear it is the Department of Defense, and it should be the Department of Defense, not any other department. Mr. SKELTON's bill very wisely affirmed that. But I'm still waiting for someone on the other side to tell me what the other problem was of trying to fix TRICARE. I just don't know what it was. There's an assertion made that the bill hurts people on TRICARE, and I'm still waiting to hear what that was.

Mr. TIAHRT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. TIAHRT. The concern was for veterans that were under the age of 65 and have 20 years of service or more, that the health care bill statutes that were determining what was acceptable as the stand-alone insurance committee—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Ms. BORDALLO. I yield the gentleman an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TIAHRT. I thank the gentleman.

It was that the folks who were on TRICARE under the age of 65 and retired would get moved out of TRICARE into the government-determined plan.

Mr. ANDREWS. Reclaiming my time, show me in the bill where it says there's any possibility of that happening. The bill says exactly the opposite. It says that under the terms of the individual mandate, someone who's covered by TRICARE satisfies the individual mandate. The bill also says expressly, No one can be forced to join the exchange, no one can be forced to buy a particular insurance policy from anyone. So not only does the bill lack the accusation that the minority makes, it expressly disclaims it.

I think the public has a right to see where we stand on this, and tomorrow it will. But I think that right would be in the expectation of people who have actually read the bill and have an understanding of what's in it. I don't think the minority has.

Mr. LAMBORN. Madam Speaker, at this time I yield 3 minutes to my friend and colleague from Kansas, Representative TIAHRT.

Mr. TIAHRT. I thank the gentleman from Colorado.

Madam Speaker, I was just on the steps of the Capitol speaking to a Cold War veteran who served this country admirably and then went to serve the Fire Department in the State of Mississippi. He has driven all the way from Mississippi to Washington, D.C., because he is concerned that the health care bill that's going to be passed is going to increase the debt for his grandchildren and his children. He had other lists of concerns that he had, but primarily he was concerned about the debt.

We know for a fact that since October 1, the beginning of this fiscal year, we have overspent by \$655 billion. This is money we do not have that we've gone ahead and spent. We've borrowed this money and applied it to programs that I don't believe we needed. So he's concerned that, looking at this health care bill and the current projections, the total cost outlays over the next 10 years is \$1.2 trillion, money, again, that we don't have, and so we're going to have to borrow from somewhere. And that takes into consideration that there's only 6 years of health care benefits that are going to be applied in the first 10 years and 10 years of higher taxes. So he's very concerned about the direction. If you go on to the next 10 years, it's going to be over \$1.5 trillion that we will have to borrow for the health care bill that we are about to vote on tomorrow. He's concerned about that as well. Where's the money going to come from?

The gentleman from New Jersey was very concerned about us overlooking something that may have been or may not have been in the bill. The concern that the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee had is that under the way the bill is currently written, that people who are on TRICARE would be forced into the government exchange, and so he corrected that earlier today. Now it wasn't me that came up with that solution. I was aware of the problem, but even the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, the Democrat Chairman IKE SKELTON from Missouri, was concerned, so we had the legislative change. What else is hidden in this bill?

Now we have the bill, and yet we're not going to know the entire contents as far as what the American public is concerned about or what they will know. So if you look at the Senate bill that's going to be passed, fortunately, it's not going to be deemed to be passed with a rule. And I think that's a tremendous victory for the American people.

Yesterday the American people were very upset that we were going to deem the Senate bill passed. Today 50,000 people showed up to protest it. Calls came in. You couldn't even call into our switchboard, 202-224-3121 was blocked because of all the calls coming in, and their voices were heard. So tomorrow we're going to get a separate vote on the Senate bill. The people of America spoke out. They didn't want it to be deemed to be law. They wanted a separate vote. Now they want us to vote against it.

There is a whole bunch of people standing out here on the east side of the Capitol near the steps. They are protesting the health care bill. What they're saying is, Kill the bill. They're chanting it over and over and over again. Are we going to listen to their voices? Are we going to listen to what they're saying? What they know of what's in the Senate bill and the reconciliation bill they don't like. So tomorrow we hope that we can explain to them what's in the bill. Then they'll make an informed decision, and hopefully they will encourage their Members of Congress to vote against the bill.

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, I would inquire of the minority if they have any additional speakers.

Mr. LAMBORN. There will be one more speaker.

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, I will continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. I yield the balance of my time to Representative CASSIDY from Louisiana.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. CASSIDY. My colleague from New Jersey made a point earlier that he wasn't sure that many people on this side have read the bill. I have read the bill, and some things are quite apparent to me. One, there is a loss of

freedom. Thou shalt buy insurance or else thou shalt pay a penalty. You shall provide insurance to your employees or thou shalt pay a penalty. But I think the point that Mr. TIAHRT made is the, if you will, the ultimate sacrifice of freedom.

As one said, The power to tax is the power to destroy. Well, clearly as we expand Medicaid, we are going to ultimately shift taxes both to the Federal taxpayer and to the State taxpayer. Now this plan will increase Medicaid to 133 percent of the Federal poverty level. That has tremendous implications. One implication, for example, is that the physicians will be paid extremely poorly, so poorly that they won't be able to see the patients. I looked up in New Jersey, for example, Medicaid only pays 37 percent of Medicare rates to physicians to see the patient. They only pay 37 percent. Now as it turns out, that's below a physician's cost. Physicians would like to see the patients. It's too low of a reimbursement.

There was just an article in the New York Times, and the New York Times held up an example of a woman from Michigan on Medicaid who could not get treatment for her cancer because the Medicaid reimbursement was so low that she was unable to find a physician who could afford to treat her. I've read the bill. If we think this bill is a way to provide insurance for the uninsured, I would like to invite you to come to the public hospital where I've worked for 20 years, where many of the patients that I see are on Medicaid, and they come to the public hospital because, despite Medicaid, they still cannot go to a private facility.

In fact, I'm struck. For 20 years, I have been seeing politicians in Washington saying that we've now fixed health care. Consistently they have overpromised and underfunded. Now I think what's coming down is, this bill is a question of whether this time, this time indeed is different. Whether or not we were not overpromising, even though we're promising greatly, and we're adequately funding. The reality, I am afraid, is going to be the same as it has been in the past.

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, I wish to ask my colleagues to support House Resolution 900, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 900, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

URGING A MOMENT OF SILENCE
FOR MILITARY PERSONNEL

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1119) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that all people in the United States should participate in a moment of silence to reflect upon the service and sacrifice of members of the United States Armed Forces both at home and abroad, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1119

Whereas it was through the brave and noble efforts of the Nation's forefathers that the United States first gained freedom and became a sovereign nation;

Whereas there are more than 1,471,000 active component and more than 1,111,200 reserve component members of the Armed Forces serving the Nation in support and defense of the freedom that all Americans cherish;

Whereas the members of the Armed Forces deserve the utmost respect and admiration of their fellow Americans for putting their lives in danger for the sake of the freedoms enjoyed by all Americans;

Whereas the families of members of the Armed Forces make sacrifices commensurate with the men and women of the Armed Forces;

Whereas members of the Armed Forces are defending freedom and democracy around the globe and are playing a vital role in protecting the safety and security of all Americans;

Whereas the Nation officially celebrates and honors the accomplishments and sacrifices of veterans, patriots, and leaders who fought for freedom, this resolution pays tribute to those who currently serve in the Armed Forces;

Whereas all Americans should participate in a moment of silence to support our troops and their families; and

Whereas March 26, 2010, is designated as "National Support Our Troops Day": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that all Americans should participate in a moment of silence to reflect upon the service and sacrifice of members of the United States Armed Forces both at home and abroad, and their families.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) and the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Guam.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Guam?

There was no objection.

Ms. BORDALLO. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 1119, which honors the service and the sacrifice of

the members of the United States Armed Forces both at home and abroad. I would like to thank my colleague from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) for authoring this thoughtful measure.

The men and women of the United States Army, Navy, Air Force, Marines, and Coast Guard are true patriots, not only because they have heard but because they answered the call of duty, the duty to defend our great Nation from threats both foreign and domestic, the duty to protect our immutable freedoms, and the duty to uphold the values that make the United States both a guardian and a herald of peace and justice.

□ 1900

They come from all around us: from big cities and small towns; from the heartland to the coasts; from jobs in farming, industry and technology; from high schools and colleges and universities; and from Wall Street and Main Street. They come from all different backgrounds, from all classes, races, and denominations. They are diverse, yet they share the same sense of duty and purpose. They possess the same courage and fortitude to go and do what others cannot.

They courageously grasp the mantle passed on by those before them, those who gave their lives so others may live free. They understand the consequences and the risks, yet they keep their heads held high in honor and in pride, knowing that the rewards are great, but so are the costs.

They are often asked to sacrifice that which many of us take for granted: a home-cooked meal; a comfortable bed; the embrace of a friend or a relative; and most importantly, safety. They leave behind spouses, children, and other family members, the people that they love the most, so that other Americans, complete strangers, can enjoy the same freedom.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1119 also acknowledges the critical sacrifice families of servicemembers make: the uncertainties and the inconveniences incurred from permanent changes of station, the anxiety and the stress induced by a deployed servicemember, the grief experienced by families and loved members of those servicemembers wounded or killed in action. These families and loved ones also deserve our most sincere thanks.

The moment of silence that will take place on March 26, 2010, on National Support Our Troops Day to honor the men and women in uniform is an undemanding effort, but their service and sacrifice demand our contemplation and our gratitude. So I implore that everyone use the time to recall the sacrifice that they make each and every day.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 1119.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 1119, as amended, which asks that all people in

the United States participate in a moment of silence to reflect upon the service and sacrifice of members of the Armed Forces who are currently serving both at home and abroad.

Service in the Armed Forces during peacetime is a difficult enough proposition; but during an extended period of war, like we have had since 9/11, the courage and sacrifices required of our all-volunteer military are especially challenging. These men and women are working for us all over the globe: on land; on and under the sea; and in the skies above. They are on duty around the clock, every day, 7 days a week, in every month of every year, in all seasons and climates.

This Nation owes the members of the Armed Forces and their families the respect and thanks for their willingness to serve and sacrifice. This resolution asks us to do that by taking a moment out of our own busy lives to pause and in a moment of silence honor our soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines who are currently serving. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. PETERS), my friend and colleague and the sponsor of this resolution.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

I rise today in support of House Resolution 1119 calling for a moment of silence in support of our troops and designation of March 26, 2010, as the National Support Our Troops Day.

As a Nation, we celebrate and honor our veterans and patriots, yet we don't have an official day celebrating our servicemen and -women who are currently protecting our country at home and overseas.

As the son of a World War II veteran and as a former officer in the U.S. Navy Reserve, I have the utmost respect for the sacrifices made by our active duty soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines.

Recently, I had the honor of visiting our troops in Afghanistan where I was able to observe first hand the dedication with which they are serving our Nation. I was truly humbled by the sacrifices they are making each and every day.

This resolution honors those troops, and I am proud to have introduced it, continuing a bipartisan tradition in the 9th Congressional District in Michigan. One of my constituents, Alexandra McGregor, contacted my predecessor, Congressman Joe Knollenberg, with her idea of a day to honor our heroes currently fighting on the front lines. Alexandra was a student at Waterford Kettering High School in Waterford, Michigan. She, along with her fellow students, as well as the faculty of Waterford Kettering High School, have observed a moment of silence for the last several years on March 26 in support of our troops.