

The Colorado GEAR UP model focuses on college and career exploration, exposure, and experience. Students participate in monthly college knowledge workshops. They visit college campuses. They learn about different kinds of degrees and different kinds of financial aid that might be available to them. Juniors and seniors use the GEAR UP online college portfolio as a navigation tool to help them with their college selection process, the admissions process, and financial aid. In 2008 and 2009, more than 80 percent of Colorado GEAR UP students understood the financial aid options, compared to 30 percent of their peers.

Colorado GEAR UP has partnered with community colleges and 4-year institutions to offer concurrent enrollment courses as early as the second semester of their sophomore year in high school. This allows students to take courses for actual college credit while they're still in high school. Not only are Colorado GEAR UP students taking advantage of college coursework, they're succeeding. This past fall, 80 percent in the GEAR UP junior cohort completed at least one college course, and 77 percent received at least a C or better in a college course while they were in high school.

As a result of their participation, Colorado GEAR UP students will enter college with a significant amount of college credit, and some may even earn an associate's degree. As students go onto college campuses, GEAR UP partners with the institutions to continue to track progress and make sure that the students have the support services they need to succeed at college.

I want to share with you what some students say about Colorado GEAR UP. "GEAR UP is an opportunity to achieve an education. It just makes a person realize about the real world. GEAR UP is there to make it a little easier," said a tenth-grader from Pueblo East High School. A tenth-grader from North Ridge High School said, "GEAR UP means opportunity to me. It means a chance to go to college and succeed in my life."

Moving forward, Colorado GEAR UP plans to expand to serve even more students across Colorado. This program's performance clearly demonstrates that students can be successful in early college initiatives, can succeed at a 4-year university, given the proper guidance and support and opportunities. Early college experience can even save money by preventing students from dropping out of high school. That's why I applaud Colorado GEAR UP as a national model for innovation and effectiveness in expanding college access for low-income students and first-generation college goers, and I strongly support its continued expansion and success.

CONGRATULATING EVAN LYSACEK

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

woman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Evan Lysacek, the 2009 Men's World Figure Skating Champion and the 2010 Olympic gold medalist. What a feat. Evan started figure skating as a young boy in Naperville, Illinois, a town located in my district. He attended Neuqua Valley High School, where he was on the honor roll and earned many other academic achievement awards while still maintaining a very intense training schedule for figure skating. His discipline and focus certainly paid off. Evan won several titles and championships at the junior level before making his senior international debut at the age of 19. Evan has competed and medaled in several United States Figure Skating Championships, World Figure Skating Championships, and the 2006 Winter Olympics before his thrilling gold medal win at the 2010 Winter Olympics in Vancouver. But he is more than an accomplished figure skater. Word has it that Evan finds time in his grueling schedule to support a variety of charities, including the Ronald McDonald House Charities, the Make-a-Wish Foundation, and the Special Olympics.

I am proud to say that Evan Lysacek and his family call the 13th District of Illinois their home, and I would like to extend to him my congratulations and wish him the best as he takes on his next challenge—"Dancing with the Stars"—which premiered this week.

RESPECT THE INSTITUTION

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE from Texas. It's always a historic pleasure to be able to sign legislation that can change millions of lives. It is a rare opportunity for Members of Congress, no matter how long they may serve, to be able to serve the people and then to be able to grant the people privileges that they would not have had but for the acts of this Congress. So I stand here today very proud of the fact that just a few hours ago, the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Democratic leadership and Members, signed legislation that would provide opportunities for 32 million Americans. Polling over the last 24 hours have characterized Americans as enthusiastic, uplifted, and happy. Quite contrary to some of the unfortunate drama that played out over the last 3 or 4 days as we were debating on the floor of the House.

Today, in Roll Call, a local Hill paper, the headline reads, "House decorum is fraying." It cites a comment about House Democratic leaders may have lost control of this body. I beg to differ with them. They are wrong. This institution is sacred and the House Democratic leadership maintains that

sacredness. But, tragically, those who differed with us took to tactics that I believe calls for an apology by the Republican leadership—the actions of Members on the balcony that were beyond the pale; holding up posters that denigrated House leadership on the balcony of the United States House of Representatives; signs that were inappropriate.

Certainly, I have no control, and welcome the First Amendment rights of anybody, including the protestors. Interestingly enough, more than a hundred thousand had gathered on Sunday for immigration reform. Polite, orderly, respectful, and getting their point across. But lo and behold, there were some who decided to disrespect this institution. And I'm offended. Yes, there can be cheers. There can be boos. We do that. It is the order of the day. But to call out words that are offensive to our fellow Members is unacceptable.

I rise today calling on our leadership to ask for an apology from the minority and to have a review and an investigation—that's a too harsh word—but a review of the actions of those who decided to hold signs and I believe disrespect the institution.

So we're not losing control of this body. Individuals may have acted inappropriately. But I will assure you that the debate that was carried on by Democrats were on the issues, albeit you may have agreed or disagreed. It was respectful. And we won the vote. Thank God, we won it on behalf of the American people. But they are my friends on both sides of the aisle. I claim them. But the point is that this kind of behavior is unacceptable and offensive. We must learn that there are some things more important than our individual opportunity to express ourselves as Members of Congress outside of this body. It is the institution and the respect that it's held over the years for the institution that is known as the most powerful lawmaking body in the world. We are owed, then, the duty and responsibility of acting like we have the respect for this body. If no one else does, we need to have it.

Madam Speaker, the behavior was unacceptable. The behavior was without description and without comparison. And I'm offended by the insults to the Democratic leadership. They've got tough skins. But it's not Democratic leadership. It is the Speaker, the Majority Leader. It is the majority whip, the majority chairperson of the Democratic Caucus. It is the vice chairperson and a variety of leaders. Not one did I see on a balcony holding up any untoward message that would have offended the minority.

The time comes now when we'll take back this House in a way that all of us can respect this institution. I'm grateful that we had the courage to do what was right for the American people.

DEMOCRAT SPENDING SINCE TARP

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Well, you know, Madam Speaker, I was watching television today and I saw that the President was down at the White House signing the new health bill, and he was getting all kind of applause and everybody was just having a big time. Something like 61 or 62 percent of the American people are wondering why, because what they passed was something that the vast majority of Americans don't want.

So, tonight, I thought I'd come down here. I don't want to rain on the President's parade but I would like to talk just a little bit about what they're doing to America, because I think it's really important.

□ 1730

I know, Madam Speaker, I can't talk directly to the American people. But if they were listening, I would like to just tell them a few things about what's been going on since this guy took office—oh, excuse me—since the President took office.

In January of '09, they spent \$73.3 billion on the State Children's Health Insurance Reauthorization. A lot of people said that was necessary, but it was still \$73 billion. February 9, a month later, they passed the stimulus bill that was going to create jobs and keep unemployment below 8 percent. That was \$1.16 trillion with interest, and that was not successful in keeping the unemployment down. In fact, it went way above 8 percent, over 10 percent. It's now down a little below 10 percent, but nevertheless, it's still up there much higher. But we spent \$1.16 trillion on that. Now I can't tell you how many zeros are involved in that, but you'll figure it out, America—if America were allowed to listen to me, Madam Speaker. They'll figure it out when they start seeing all this extra cash flowing around that's going to depreciate the value of their money. Then on February 9 also, they passed the omnibus bill, the same day that they passed the stimulus bill. But that wasn't much. It was only \$625 billion, a little over half a trillion. And then in June, they passed the defense supplemental, which was necessary. That was \$106 billion, but they had scads of pork barrel projects in there that the President said he would not tolerate. Then in December the President passed the omnibus bill, the consolidated appropriations omnibus bill, and it was only \$3.554 trillion.

We don't have this money. We just don't have it. We're digging a hole that you just won't believe how hard it's going to be to get out of it. Nevertheless, the spending goes on, and on, and on, and on, and I'm hoping that America wakes up and realizes what's going on before it gets so bad that we have hyperinflation and interest rates that

go out of sight because they'll try to control inflation that way, like they did in the early 1980s, and we see taxes going through the roof. And in addition to that, the things I just mentioned, they passed cap-and-trade through this body, which was \$846 billion—almost another trillion—but it's still languishing in the Senate. But after the President's victory and the signing of the health care bill today, I'm sure he's going to try to ram that dude through too.

And the health care program that they passed today that they said was going to end up saving us money—I mean, listen to this: They say we're going to have 32 million more people that are going to be insured, and it's going to cost less. I want everybody to figure that one out. How can you insure 32 million more people and spend less money? If you can figure that out, I'm going to get you a job as Houdini's assistant. It just isn't going to happen.

As a matter of fact, the cost of the health care bill is going to run at least—at least \$1.5 trillion to \$3 trillion. The gimmick they're using to try to make it look good is they're going to start taxing us for right now for 10 years, but the health coverage—most of it doesn't start until 2014. So you're paying 10 years of taxes for 6 years of coverage, and that makes it look like they're staying below \$1 trillion. But when you put the pencil to 10 years of taxes and 10 years expenditures, you're looking at something like close to \$2 trillion. And I believe it's going to end up costing a lot more than that. All these government programs they talk about that are going to cost so little always end up costing more, always create more bureaucracy and always ends up hurting this country and the future generations.

So I would just like to say, Madam Speaker, if I were talking to America tonight, remember what happened today, remember what our colleagues on the other side cheered about 2 days ago, remember what it's going to do to you and your kids and your grandkids because there's an election coming up in 2010 in November. And the people need to be aware of what's happened and what's happening. We are moving toward a socialistic approach in government—not free enterprise that made this country great—but socialism. And America needs to be aware of it.

To: Congressman Dan Burton
From: Legislative Staff
Date: January 12, 2010
Subject: Democrat Spending Since TARP
Enacted into Law:
Oct 08—Emergency Economic Stabilization Act (TARP Bailout)—\$700 billion
\$296.4 billion—Federal spending from the financial crisis bailout fund before Jan. 20, 2009.
\$173 billion—Federal spending from the financial crisis bailout fund after Jan. 20, 2009.
\$165 billion—Amount of bailout funds repaid by banks and automakers.
Jan 09—State Children's Health Insurance Reauthorization—\$73.3 billion
Feb 09—American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (Stimulus)—\$820 billion + \$348 billion (Interest) = \$1.16 trillion

Feb 09—Consolidated Appropriations for FY 09 (Omnibus)—\$410 billion + \$215 billion (Interest) = \$625 billion

June 2009—FY 2009 Defense Supplemental—\$105.9 billion (Exceeded the President's original request by \$20.9 billion or 24.6%)

Dec. 09—Consolidated Appropriations for FY 10 (mini-Omnibus) = \$3.554 trillion

Passed by the House but not enacted:
June 2009—Cap and Trade—\$846 billion in new taxes

Nov. 2009—Proposed Government-run health care program—estimates range from \$1 trillion to \$3 trillion

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

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

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

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

FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

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

Mr. LANCE. Madam Speaker, I rise to discuss the health care legislation that has just been signed into law and to discuss the state of the American economy and, in particular, the state of Federal spending and Federal debt. Regarding the health care legislation that the President signed into law today, it was unanimously opposed on our side of the aisle; and in my case, it was opposed principally as a result of what I believe is a fiscally irresponsible approach. Certainly we need to reform health care in this country, and I was supportive of a proposal that permitted the purchase of policies across State lines, major medical malpractice insurance reform, making sure that young people have the opportunity to stay on their parents' policies until their mid-twenties, and the pooling of small businesses together. I think that this would have been an approach that would have received wide bipartisan support.

However, the bill that became law today is not balanced over the next 10 years. The Congressional Budget Office reported over the next 10 years that this does not include spending for the so-called doctors' fix that is roughly \$200 billion, and there is no one on either side of the aisle who believes that we will not engage in that appropriate expenditure. In other words, if that were included in the cost over the next 10 years, the bill is not revenue-neutral. It is in the red.

There was an interesting op-ed piece in The New York Times on March 21 by Douglas Holtz-Eakin, formerly the director of the Congressional Budget Office. Mr. HOLTZ-EAKIN is widely respected on both sides of the aisle. The