

did in the health care bill here in the House, and not intrude into so many areas, including the requirement, a shall, one of the many shalls it required was a study by the Secretary of Health and Human Services with the Secretary of Labor shall conduct a study of businesses.

And it goes through a list of different things they are supposed to look for, the kind of benefits the employees get. And one of them is whether or not particular companies are making decisions that will allow them to remain solvent. It is government at an intrusion like never seen before in this country.

Mr. CARTER. Thank you, Mr. GOHMERT. Reclaiming my time, Mr. KING, I think we have about 3 minutes. Do you want to be heard very briefly?

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the judge from Texas, and I appreciate the chance to address you, Mr. Speaker, here on the floor of the House.

I tell you, I am full of amazement that the President of the United States can make a proposal that he wants to come out here and negotiate on health care, and yet he doesn't want to negotiate on health care. He insists on bringing forward one or another of the bills that passed the House or the Senate, but he apparently doesn't have a bill yet. Bill Clinton had a bill. Hillary Clinton actually had a bill. This President actually doesn't have a bill. He has a position.

We asked him if he was going to keep his word and present his legislation at least 72 hours before it would be voted on. It is quite interesting that the platitudes that the President has released in bullet points this morning at 10 o'clock happens to be 72 hours precisely until such time as the meeting starts at the Blair House on Thursday at 10 o'clock in the morning. So there is 72 hours to digest some platitudes, but all the while that is going on, and you have spoken of it very well, then the secret meetings have been taking place in the White House and wherever. This is something that is clearly being done behind closed doors, in formerly smoke-filled rooms, with guards on the outside, albeit there for the security of the people inside the room. We don't know what went on in there.

But the President is not coming to the table looking to negotiate. The President is coming to the table looking to put the reconciliation gun to our head, cock the hammer and say, you can say "yes" on Thursday or we are going to pull the trigger on reconciliation. That is the nuclear option. That is the thing that was intolerable when Republicans discussed it, and I would like to think it is going to end up being intolerable to the American people. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CARTER. That is a great summary. And that is exactly what the American people need to be looking for. They need to be looking for those words, reconciliation, because the truth is the real loaded gun that is

going to be held to the heads of those who go to negotiate is reconciliation, which will mean we are not interested in Republican input, and we are going to bypass it.

RESTORE FISCAL DISCIPLINE

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

They say that talk is cheap, but for hardworking Americans, the President's talk is very expensive. President Obama has spent the past year making speech after speech about the need for Washington to restore fiscal discipline. But what he says isn't what he does.

During the campaign, Obama promised he would go through the budget line by line to reduce spending. But it seems as though a few lines is all that he has cut. The President began his campaign last spring when he rushed to the microphone to announce his order to his cabinet to reduce spending by \$100 million. Then he went to the podium to tout more fiscal restraint by announcing a spending freeze. But we quickly learned that it affects less than 20 percent of the budget.

Recent press reports reveal he cut \$1 million in funding for an Olympic scholarship program, and another \$2 million subsidy for cotton and peanuts. If the President is serious about fiscal discipline, he is going to have to remove more than a couple of peanuts from his Federal budget. These meager cuts are just another example of the administration's arrogance, ignorance, and incompetence.

The President has proposed a \$3.8 trillion budget for 2011, boosting the deficit to a record high of \$1.6 trillion, a record he broke last year when he introduced a budget with a \$1.4 trillion deficit. Let me put that into perspective. The average deficit when Republicans were in power was \$104 billion. The average deficit now that Democrats are in control is \$1.1 trillion. What that means is each man, woman, and child owes \$46,000 apiece.

As hardworking Americans are struggling to balance their checkbooks, they are frustrated that Congress can't do the same. They aren't just frustrated, they are angry. I share the concerns of the American people. That is why I have introduced H.J. Resolution 75, which is a balanced budget amendment to the U.S. Constitution, aimed at reining in the chronic deficits in spending.

We absolutely must stop the outrageous spending by Congress. Our children and grandchildren's future depend upon our doing so. My amendment would make sure that government does not spend more than it takes in. My amendment would also make sure that any extra revenue would be returned to the taxpayers at the end of the year.

After decades of deficit spending it is time to make balancing our budgets the rule, not the exception. For too long Congress has acted as if it has a credit card with no limit and a bill that our children and grandchildren will be forced to pay. Individuals cannot spend more money than they earn, and neither should Washington. The fact is if the family budget cannot afford to go into debt, neither should the Federal budget.

The only way we are ever going to get our economy back on track is by leaving dollars in the hands of individuals, and particularly leaving dollars in the hands of small businesses so that they can buy inventory and can hire permanent employees. Small business is the economic engine that pulls along the train of prosperity in America. We need to stimulate small business, not bigger government.

Congress must now make tough decisions, slow down the rapid growth of government, and get back to the fiscally responsible government that the American people expect and demand. I am committed to doing just that. I urge my colleagues to join in this effort, and I urge the American people to demand a balanced budget from this Congress.

DEFENDING THE CONSTITUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I appreciate being recognized to address you here on the floor of the House of Representatives. I appreciate my colleagues that have spoken in the hour previous and those that will perhaps join me in the hour that ensues at this point.

As one can tell from listening to that dialogue, we can clearly see that there is a high degree of concern about the direction America is going. I would like to get into that pretty deeply, but I also recognize that my friend from Georgia has something left unsaid, and so I would be very happy to yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN).

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Thank you, Mr. KING. I appreciate you yielding.

You have a document there that I know you are going to explain it, but I want to say before I have to leave that my name is on that document. It is the Declaration of Health Care Independence. In fact, I recently signed a copy of the Declaration of Independence. I was honored to do so, as I was honored to sign the Declaration of Health Care Independence.

But what I want to say is the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States cannot be separated. And in fact, the Declaration of Independence in itself, the original declaration penned by Thomas Jefferson, set out the philosophies of

government. The Constitution took those philosophies and embodied it into a foundational principle that this government should be run upon. We have left that idea.

We hear people talking all the time about a Constitution that is flexible and that is changeable and that it is a flowing document. Well, it can be amended. The Founding Fathers set in place the process for amending the Constitution. There have been just a few, over 20 amendments to the Constitution.

It shows the beauty of the Constitution of the United States. I carry a copy in my pocket all the time. I believe in this document as our Founding Fathers meant it, one of very few Members of Congress that believe in the original intent and vote that way here on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are suffering. They are suffering, and frankly they are scared, they are angry. They are scared and angry because they see their freedom being taken away from them. And this health care bill that we have been discussing for the last several weeks is something that is bringing that to the head. Because what I see is an American sleeping giant is arising, a sleeping giant that has had some nightmares, nightmares about Obamacare, nightmares about an energy tax that is going to destroy our economy and kill millions of jobs in this country, a nightmare of overgovernance from the Federal, state, as well as local level.

□ 2115

They are angry, they are scared, and they are sleeping giants waking up. And I'm excited about that because, frankly, Mr. Speaker, I think the best days of America are still ahead, but they're not going to be ahead for our children and grandchildren if we continue down this road where government is going to control our health care, what cars we drive, what we eat, how we live our lives. And the American people understand that very firmly; they understand that government is trying to rule them instead of them taking care of their own family's situation.

Most people in America just want to go to work, come home, live a great life for their families and take care of all their family business without all the government intrusion. That is what you are fighting for, Mr. KING. That is what I'm fighting for here. That is what the declaration of health care independence is all about. We must return back to the foundational principles.

In Hosea 4:6, God says, "My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge." And I am encouraging people to get a copy of the Constitution of the United States. We give out hundreds, maybe thousands, of copies out of our offices in Georgia as well as our congressional office here in Washington. But I en-

courage people to get a copy of the Constitution. Read it; it's readable. It wasn't written by a bunch of lawyers. And that is all there is to it. In fact, the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and every single amendment that has ever been passed, in this little booklet. "My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge." America is going to be destroyed for a lack of knowledge if we don't become knowledgeable about limited government and start demanding something else.

Mr. KING, you have been very vigilant in coming to the floor over and over again fighting for what you and I believe in, and that is fair and limited government, personal responsibility and accountability. I applaud the efforts that you have made, and I feel very honored to serve with you. I feel very honored to come to Special Orders and speak with you, and I thank you. I just want to thank you from the bottom of my heart for being engaged in the fight. I'm a marine. You're not a marine, but you're a fighter, and I appreciate that. I thank you and yield back.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, I very much thank my good friend from Georgia, who is always there when I need him, and he shows up sometimes before I realize I need him. This may well be one of those times.

Mr. Speaker, there are certain bonds that get built here in the House of Representatives. There are people here working late at night and they're up early in the morning and they are pushing an agenda, those that carry a Constitution in their pocket and those that believe it. There are some that carry a Constitution in their pocket that believe that it is a living and breathing document. That way of thinking that began to erode our liberties over 110 or 120 years ago is the way of thinking that says that there is no guarantee whatsoever, that the Constitution is not only a protection of the rights of the majority, it is the protection of the rights of the minority, whichever side of that equation you happen to be on.

This liberty that we have is not just in the document, but it is something that we have to preserve and protect. Those that set about with the argument that it is a living and breathing document are actually undermining our liberty and turning it over to people in black robes who then can decide in their fashion what they believe the Constitution is supposed to say. So I pose the question, Mr. Speaker—and I posed this question to Chief Justice Rehnquist when he was alive and sitting on the Supreme Court—and that is, if the Constitution doesn't mean what it says, if it doesn't mean what it was understood to mean at the time of its ratification, then what has it become? Has it become just an artifact of history, or is it a shield that liberal judicial activists can hold up to protect themselves from the criticism of the

public that they would like to convince that they don't have the capability of reading a very simple document, that clear, plain, precise language of our Constitution?

I yield again to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Thank you, Mr. KING.

In Psalm 11, God asks a question. He says, "If the foundations be destroyed, what are the righteous to do?" Well, the Constitution of the United States was obviously the foundation of this country. But if you think about it, if it is a living and breathing document, then that means it can be applied by anyone in any manner. What does that have a potential of leading to is nothing but tyranny. Tyranny. And that philosophy is a tyrannous philosophy.

Mr. KING of Iowa. The tyranny of the majority, as our Founding Fathers defined it.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. It is the tyranny of the majority. And it's tyranny that destroys freedom and liberty in this country. And I say liberty and freedom. Let me define liberty for you, Mr. Speaker, because I see them differently.

Liberty is freedom bridled by morality. A wild dog is free. True freedom for everybody is anarchy. But we have liberty in this country. Liberty is where my freedom ends, where yours begins, where you and I can come together in a society and we can work for a common good. That is what our Founding Fathers very firmly believed. That is what I believe. We need to work together for our common good.

We are supposed to be, under the Constitution, a government of the people, by the people, and for the people, not a government over the people. That is what many in this House, many in the Senate, and many Presidents, even Republicans and Democrats have—

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, if I can just make this point that however long we might talk to the people on that side of the aisle, they're not going to change their mind. They are the wrong people. I can tell you that I stood here for 7 years and made some powerful arguments, and I can't think of a single time when one of them stood up and said, Oh, my, I didn't realize that. I didn't think about it that way. I'm going to change my mind. It doesn't happen in the real world.

I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Well, you are right. They are absolutely entrenched in the philosophy that they know best: The government needs to control everything. Well, there is a word for that. It's called socialism, central planning. That is exactly what many people on the other side hold very dear to is they think we are too ignorant to control our own lives, to make our own decisions, so they have to control our health care. They have to control what light bulbs we screw into the lamps in our home. They have to control what

kind of toilet we can have in our bathrooms and what kind of showerhead, what kind of cars we can drive. That is socialism, that is central planning, and that is the road we are going down.

We are on a road towards people losing their freedom, where they cannot make decisions for themselves. This health care bill, proposal—it's actually not a bill; it's a proposal that the President put forth this morning. I went on the Web site and looked at all the things. There is no bill. The proposal is nothing but the first step in taking over the whole health care system and making it government control so that government bureaucrats control that part of it. We have got to stop it, and it is up to the American people.

Mr. KING, you are exactly right. Mr. Speaker, Mr. KING is exactly right that there are folks that don't pull out the Constitution. They talk about the Constitution, but they have no clue what limited government is supposed to be under the Constitution. They fight for bigger government, bigger government control, socialism, central planning so that it takes everything away from individuals. And the American people are going to have to stop it by standing up and saying no to ObamaCare, no to an energy tax, the tax-and-trade, or cap-and-trade as they call it, no to forced unionization, no to the illegal aliens in this country—they need to go home; they're criminals. They need to say no to all those things. The American people need to say no to those. We are accused of being the party of "no," but we are the party of "k-n-o-w," because we know how to solve these problems over here on the Republican side if we can just have our voices heard. The American people need to demand that also; that is absolutely critical.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Georgia, and I appreciate him sticking around for a few extra kind words. The gentleman, the doctor, the marine from Georgia, thank you very much, Dr. BROWN.

I want to move along into a component of this that is at the front of my mind. The first part of this is so that you, Mr. Speaker, and the people on the other side of the aisle—and I know your constitutional position from a formal standpoint, nonpartisan position from a formal and constitutional standpoint, that would be one of the points we would disagree on, but how did we get here is the question. Why is it that America is watching as the White House has rolled out, what is it, 14 pages of platitudes, no legislative language, that is supposed to be a bipartisan negotiating standard? Why is it that the President of the United States has refused to give up on ObamaCare—which some could call ReidCare, others would call PelosiCare, some of that is ObamaCare, and I call it TroikaCare. It is a health care policy that is put together by those three rulers and leaders that are untested in a single party government, and this is what you get. You get something, Mr.

Speaker, that is put together behind closed doors in those formerly smoke-filled rooms with guards outside the doors, and they are trying to put together some kind of package that can garner now 51 votes in the United States Senate and 218 votes in the House of Representatives. Meanwhile, the President is chastising Republicans for not wanting to work in a bipartisan fashion.

So what has happened? I will make the point, Mr. Speaker, that the President of the United States has simply lost his mojo. He doesn't have it anymore. He had the most juice of any President I can think of when he was inaugurated on January 20, 2009. This was a Nation that was on the verge of euphoria because they elected the first black President of the United States, because it was a new way forward, because it was all about hope and change. And this hope and change was defined differently to people depending on what they heard from the ambiguities of the President of the United States. One side, the extreme liberals, believed that the President of the United States was going to jerk the troops out of Iraq come whatever calamity. They believed that he would never engage in a foreign conflict and he would sell off our tanks and airplanes and spend the money on social programs. The other side believed that the President might be somewhat stable with national defense and maybe wouldn't spend so much money. And everybody certainly believed that the President would work in a bipartisan fashion, but it didn't happen.

When the President of the United States, today's President of the United States, Mr. Speaker, was working in a complicit fashion with George W. Bush when TARP unfolded 1 year and several months ago, it turned out to be first \$350 billion, and then another \$350 billion. We see it as one package. Well, it was not. Under the 110th Congress, and it would be in the last months of the Bush administration, \$350 billion was approved for TARP—Troubled Asset Relief Program. Henry Paulson came to this Capitol on September 19, 2008, before the presidential election and did what I call his "Chicken Little routine." He said, The sky is falling, the sky is falling and it is a financial calamity, and the only way we can prop the sky back up is you give me \$700 billion and do so right now. And maybe, just maybe I will be smart enough and wise enough to do this, but if you tie my hands and you put any strings on this money, if you try to alter or amend the latitude that I demand, then the whole sky is going to come crashing down. The economic world will collapse. Because he had been thinking about it for 13 months, he presumed we had only thought about it for 24 hours, and we had to bite the bullet and take the bait so that they could set the hook and reel us in on TARP.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that was one of the things that happened. It wasn't ac-

tually the first. But through the course of this, President Obama, then-Senator Obama, was right along the way supporting for, voting for every irresponsible spending that took place as a United States Senator, and then as a President-elect United States Senator, then as President of the United States newly inaugurated. That is when he really turned up the heat. That is when he really opened the floodgates, and that's when the spending really moved on and that is when we really saw the nationalization of these eight huge entities. That would be three large investment banks, Mr. Speaker. It would be AIG, the insurance company. It would be Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac.

□ 2130

Now, that's six of the eight. The American people are watching this, and they're thinking we have a constitutional republic. We elect our representatives. Their job is to use their best judgment and their best resources to come to the best conclusions possible and to make decisions for the American people because, first of all, the American people can't all be investment bankers. They can't all know what's going on on the inside of Wall Street. They can't all know what the United States Treasurer is doing, and they can't understand necessarily all of the advice that's going into the White House or into the offices of the Members of Congress.

They can provide their input, and we need to listen, but they also trusted the judgment. That's how our Founding Fathers set this up. That's why this is a constitutional republic, because every one of us has his own unique franchise. Every one of the 435 Members of the House and of the 100 Members of the Senate has a unique franchise.

We owe the American people this, Mr. Speaker: first, our best effort; second, our best judgment.

Our best effort is clear, which is to work as hard, as diligently and as efficiently as you can. Our best judgment includes input from the American people, and it includes input that comes from the experts and the data and the analyses and the studies and the testimony and the hearings that come before these committees so that we can come to a good conclusion.

The American people, to some degree, trusted those conclusions, but they saw TARP come down the pike. Then they saw the takeover of some of the large investment banks and the investment brokers like Bear Stearns, Bank of America, Citigroup, AIG—bing, bing, bing, one after another—Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac taken over by the Federal Government. They are getting more and more uneasy as this unfolds.

Then, Mr. Speaker, as the American people had this knot in their guts, along came the nationalization of General Motors and Chrysler. That's when the credibility of the White House

tanked, because, even though the American people don't necessarily understand Wall Street, they understand cars. Most of us own one or more of them. We know pickups, too, and people who know pickups certainly know cars. I'm not sure it's the other way around, Mr. Speaker. We know cars. We make cars. We market them. We sell them. We fix them. We race them. We buy them, sell them, trade them. We collect them. Americans have a love affair with cars, especially with their American cars.

The President of the United States nationalized two huge, important American automakers. He took them over. He dictated the terms to the bankruptcy court, and the hearings that were held before bankruptcy changed not one single dot or cross on a "t" from the proposal that was dictated by the White House going into the bankruptcy court, according to testimony in the Judiciary Committee on just this.

So the President dictated the terms, or his people dictated the terms, and the President appointed a car czar, a 31-year-old car czar who had never made a car or sold a car. We don't think he has ever fixed a car. We don't even know if he owned a car at the time, but if he did, we ought to take a look and see if it was an American car or if it was a foreign-made car. We began to lose faith quickly when we saw the White House take over our automobile business.

The Speaker of the House, Mr. Speaker, made the point that she would not give the automakers bargaining control over the unions, over the United Auto Workers union. When she said that and when that term stuck and when the President of the United States and others leveraged the bondholders out—the secured creditors who had hard collateral invested in these companies—and when they had secured collateral that they could foreclose on, they were aced out. One of the reasons they were is that those secured entities that held those were some of the investment banks that were bailed out by TARP. So they had leverage that said, Give up your positions because we've got the money, and we can control your boards of directors.

So the White House dictated then the terms of these bankruptcies to the automakers. They took the secured credit away from the investors, and they handed it over to the labor unions. Additionally to that, the President of the United States fired the CEO of General Motors, and replaced the board of directors of General Motors down to the last two. All but two were directed by the President of the United States, and the American people were repulsed by the very idea that the President of the United States would be engaged in nationalizing companies.

As I look at this, I just have a little piece of document that I've printed off of the socialist Web site, the Democratic Socialists of America. Mr.

Speaker, I would encourage you and the others who are interested in this to go to the Web site dsausa.org. There you will find some of the text of the strategy that appears to be the strategy of the White House.

"Social redistribution," it reads. Social redistribution is one of the goals. "The shift of wealth and resources from the rich to the rest of society will require"—this is the Democratic Socialists' Web site—"the shift of wealth and resources from the rich to the rest of society will require, No. 1, massive redistribution of income from corporations and the wealthy to wage earners and the poor and the public sector in order to provide the main source of new funds for social programs, income maintenance, and infrastructure rehabilitation."

A massive shift of income from corporations and the wealthy. In other words, share the wealth, Mr. Speaker. This is right off the socialists' Web site.

Item No. 2 reads, "A massive shift of public resources from the military to civilian uses." We've seen that, too.

Furthermore, on the socialists' Web site, it talks of the nationalization of major corporations. It says they don't have to do it all at once. They can do it gradually. They want to nationalize the oil refinery business. They want to nationalize the energy industry in America. All of that is on the socialists' Web site, Mr. Speaker. All of that looks stunningly like what we've seen happen over the last year and a half.

The American people have had enough. Eight large entities. The last two were the automakers, and the automakers were the ones that gave the American people the insight into what the rest of those decisions were.

Right after that came the stimulus plan—\$787 billion poured into the economy for a purpose that only 6 percent of the people think it produced. Only 6 percent think that the stimulus plan worked.

Right behind that came cap-and-trade, cap-and-tax. This was another plan to punish American business and to punish everybody in America who uses energy under the extremely myopic and ill-informed idea that anybody is "trying to save the planet, trying to save the planet." I don't want to sound like a broken record. I'm actually quoting a high-profile person in the House of Representatives, Mr. Speaker.

Well, you're not going to save the planet if you're going to use false data—data that has been either jiggered or data that has been sorted and selected to produce the results that they want. It looks like the data that produced the hockey stick graph was selected data, and the language that came out of some of the leaked emails said we have to hide the decline. Michael Mann wants to hide the decline. Phil Jones wants to hide the decline.

Well, the American people understand now that it wasn't just some-

thing that they didn't understand. Cap-and-trade, the science behind that—if you call it science—is another one of those things the American people thought they didn't understand, but surely, the experts did, just like they didn't understand Wall Street, but surely, the experts did. Now they're finding out the American people knew more about Wall Street than the people of Wall Street did, because they want fiscal responsibility. They aren't skimming the cream out every quarter and, come what may, letting the economy become unstable and, perhaps, crash. It's the same with cap-and-trade, cap-and-tax, and the pseudoscience behind that. They understand now that the results have been rigged to some degree—they don't quite know what.

Right behind that came comprehensive health care reform—socialized medicine, Mr. Speaker. The American people rose up again, and they filled the town hall meetings in August, and they kept them full into September, and we came back here and argued and fought this legislation. As that unfolded, finally, on the 7th of November, a version from the House passed here on the floor. In the following month, on Christmas Eve, a version in the Senate, a significantly different version, passed there with a 60-vote super majority. On Christmas Eve, the elves were just putting away the last gift that they had put together, the last toy for the kids, and they were going to go to bed to sleep while Santa delivered, but HARRY REID had to have a vote over in the United States Senate. So the Christmas Eve gift to the American people was socialized medicine, Senate style.

Now we have a House version and we have a Senate version, and the American people rose up. Not a single pundit on Christmas Eve, on the day that that bill passed, had said that there was a chance for SCOTT BROWN to win the United States Senate race in the special election in Massachusetts, which was scheduled for and did take place on January 19 of this year. Not a single pundit predicted it on that date. No one saw it coming. Some poll showed SCOTT BROWN down 30 percent. Others showed him down 21 percent on that day. His opponent went dark, and they stopped the campaign. People thought that everybody would be distracted over Christmas, and so there wasn't any point in doing politics during that period of time from Christmas Eve on through New Year's Eve and on into the new year, when you finally get back into the rhythm of things.

Yet the thing that didn't get anticipated was that, oh, we talked politics all right when we got together for the holidays. We do several King Christmases to get it all taken care of in the right way. We talk about politics. We talk about religion. We talk about the weather. So do all kinds of Americans, and so do people in Massachusetts. So, when they came through the other side of that and with the intervention that

we had, SCOTT BROWN obviously won the election in Massachusetts in the "Scott Heard Round the World." That was the death knell for socialized medicine in America. The President of the United States immediately refused to receive the message from the people in Massachusetts, and he insists on pushing ObamaCare back at us over and over and over again.

While that was going on—excuse me, Mr. Speaker. I think I need to make this point—from the 19th of January, there were a lot of other maneuverings that went on. Senator TOM HARKIN said that they had already negotiated a settlement between Democrats so that they could figure out how to pass a bill before SCOTT BROWN won the election. That strategy, I presume, was predicated upon an assumption that they would have 60 votes in the Senate. In any case, they contemplated the idea that they might have to try to move something through on reconciliation—the tactic that they use in the Senate on rare occasions which Democrats call the "nuclear option," but it's not too handy to call it a "nuclear option" today.

Mr. Speaker, even though the blizzard shut this town down for a week and it was hard to get some business done, they have been meeting behind closed doors again. Even though the American people are revolted at the idea of cooking up this toxic stew called ObamaCare—"TroikaCare" I called it earlier—this toxic stew that started with socialized medicine, single-payer government runs it all, this big, old, dated, 15-year-old, tainted soup bone called HillaryCare, they dropped it into a pot to cook up this health care bill. Then they saw that nobody wanted it. Nobody wanted the plain old, straight, single-payer that President Obama, as candidate Obama, had promised that he was for to the American people.

So they started throwing in some other kinds of vegetables and things to change the flavor of it or the looks of it a little bit. So they gave some options about it the other way, but it still turned out to be the same soup bone in there, that same tainted meat that cooked up this toxic stew. This toxic stew, called ObamaCare, is something the American people don't want. They don't want the taste of any toxic stew, and once it is, no matter what you add to it it's still toxic. It's still tainted. The American people don't want a potful, and they don't want a bowlful, and they don't want a cupful, and they don't want a spoonful. Mr. Speaker, they want no measure of this national health care plan that has been cooked up. It's tainted. It needs to be thrown over the side, thrown out, and we need to start over. That's what 47 percent of the people say—they want to start over. Another quarter of them says to just throw it out and do nothing. There is maybe a quarter of them who think—I think the number was actually 23 percent—that ObamaCare

should be passed, and that's a pretty low percentage.

Thomas Jefferson said a large initiative should not be passed on slender majorities. Well, now they're trying to push a large initiative through without a majority. I say that because, Mr. Speaker, the American people have spoken. The American people realize now what they have produced in the past election. They know they have got a new election coming up here in November of this year. The political center of America has moved, and the elections haven't caught up to reflect the movement of the political center, but no one doubts it will happen. They are just as confident that there are going to be significant seats that are going to be picked up here in the House of Representatives.

So I'm going to make this point, Mr. Speaker, which is that nothing good can come from the President's insisting on pushing ObamaCare back out onto the table on Thursday. Nothing good can come from closed-door, secret meetings, planning a strategy called "reconciliation-nuclear option," which is the equivalent of holding a gun to the heads of Republicans, figuratively speaking, and then saying, Listen, I have all the cylinders full; the hammer is cocked. This is reconciliation-nuclear option. Now you can either accept this that we offer to you, ObamaCare through this version, or, if you don't, we're just going to pull the trigger, drop the hammer and run that reconciliation package through the Senate and over here to the House where the House would be sitting with two Senate versions passed.

Then they would pass the reconciliation, which are the changes that the House insists on in the Senate bill—not the House—excuse me—the Speaker and the House Democrats insist on in the Senate bill. If they pass that, they would then hold it and not message it to the President. They would wait, and then they would pass the Senate version of the bill, message that to the President, ask him to sign the Senate version. Then the reconciliation-nuclear option package would go to the President of the United States, and he would sign that right afterwards, probably in the same bill-signing ceremony, and the second bill amends the first bill.

That, Mr. Speaker, is how honest this is, and I'm not suggesting that it is. That should give the American people an idea of what's going on here, and it is something that repulses them and me.

□ 2145

The job of the Speaker is to bring out the will of the group, not to bring out the will of the Speaker.

We have some negotiations to take place. Before we go to those, I want to make a point that is very useful to me, and it is something that was originated within the mind and the thought process of my friend from Minnesota. This

is the Declaration of Health Care Independence. I could read this whole thing down here, but it recognizes six points above of what went wrong. Those six points are that everything that's going on right now, except for what Republicans have done, has denied our American liberty. It increases our taxes. It cripples the economy. It creates a new tax. It creates a bureaucracy that will devise ways to increase the spending. It empowers bureaucrats to do what they will to us. And it costs us quality and choice. Those are the negatives.

Mr. Speaker, the positives are these in this Declaration of Health Care Independence: These are the things that we say are the new rules for the road going forward. We're going to consider working with people who believe in these principles. These principles are, number one, we're going to protect the doctor-patient relationship. Number two, we're not going to add to the debt. Number three, we're going to improve, not diminish, the quality of care. What we do is going to be transparent in its negotiations and in its meaning with no favoritism to anyone from any State, equal protection under the law. We're going to treat people the same whether they're Members of Congress or whether they are your regular citizens that don't have the privileges that we have here. We are not going to fund abortion. We are not going to fund illegals. There will be no new mandates on the States, individuals, businesses, or employers. I said equal protection. And we're going to utilize the marketplace of ideas and choice with competition.

That, Mr. Speaker, is what this Declaration of Health Care Independence does. It currently has at least the signatures of 96 Members of Congress. Somebody printed that there was a small number of people that have supported this. That's only 2 days of trying. Ninety-six Republicans have signed this. Not a single Democrat has come forward and been willing to sign it at this point. And we need to send a strong message to the leadership, going cheek to cheek with the President of the United States and dancing a tango and acting like we want to do business and we don't have any rules for the road. These are the rules of the road. And I will, Mr. Speaker, make the announcement here that I will not vote for a bill that doesn't honor and respect these parameters. And I want to start with single standalone pieces of legislation, and I want to start with tort reform.

I need to recognize the gentlewoman from Minnesota because she was here first for so much time as she may consume until such time as Mr. GOHMERT gets nervous about it.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I thank the gentleman from Iowa for yielding.

I'm so thankful that you're bringing up the Declaration of Health Care Independence. I believe that viewers may be able to see that on your Web site at king.house.gov. Also it would be available at my Web site as well, which is

bachmann.house.gov. We encourage viewers to go and view this document and take a look for themselves. As I understand, we have about a hundred Members of Congress that have already signed this. I understand that anyone can go ahead and take a copy of this bill and post it on their Web site. They can download it. They can do whatever they would like. They can take it to their Member of Congress, their Senator. Whatever they want to do they can do with this. I understand that some people have taken this and posted it on Web sites and have gotten at least 10,000 signatures of the American people. So it's interesting how this has captivated the imagination of the American people because going forward with this health care summit on Thursday, we need to have a roadmap. The President has indicated what his roadmap is, and many of us—I know that Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. KING, myself, other Members of Congress spent hours working on this Declaration of Health Care Independence. We labored over this, particularly Mr. GOHMERT, particularly Mr. KING, wordsmithing every word to make sure this was exactly right. That's why we're very proud to have the American people see this as a roadmap going forward on health care, unlike what we believe will be seen this coming Thursday. I just want to let the American people know ahead of time. It's now Monday; so we're within the 72-hour window of when this health care "summit" will occur. I say it's summit in name only because I say we prepared, America, Mr. Speaker. I say we prepared, because we probably had more substance come out of the beer summit that was at the White House than we will in all likelihood see come out of 6 hours of TV cameras on Thursday coming up.

Why do I say that? I say that because this dog and pony show that is planned for this upcoming Thursday needs to be about what the American people want it to be about, and the President is demonstrating, in essence, a very deaf ear to what the American people have asked for.

The American people overwhelmingly have repudiated the Democrat job-killing government takeover of health care. Again, as Mr. KING has said, this is the government's taking over one-sixth of the American company, or 18 percent of the private sector. Just like that, in one fell swoop, taking it over so that rather than the American people having the say over their health care decisions, now the say goes to the Federal Government so the Federal Government gets to decide. So egregious is this bill, in fact, it's not even a bill. It's an 11- or 12-page proposal that the White House just put up online today. It says in essence the Federal Government would be able to price-fix on health insurance policies. We've been down this road before. This is an old movie. It's a B movie at that. It's been repeated over and over. Any time government gets the wise idea of

putting its hand in on price fixing any commodity, any service, any wage in the United States, inevitably the result, and it's always been this way, is scarcity.

So now think of that in terms of health insurance. The Federal Government says how much a policy can be in the United States. Inevitably there will be less of that product. Why? Why would a private organization decide to put a product out and can only spend so much on that product? The only option this organization would have would be to offer less of it. Fewer options, less care. In other words, the Federal Government is going to mess up health care even more than they already have done. We know this because the President has decided he's going to begin on Thursday with a plan that already the American people have repudiated. The American people have said clearly what they want in all of this is lower costs and more competition. That isn't done at all. As a matter of fact, the President's own economic adviser, Christina Romer, has already said if the President's plan goes through, it's 5½ million jobs lost.

Now, things haven't gone real well already by the estimates from the President's advisers. They said if we passed the stimulus plan when we had 7.6 percent unemployment that we wouldn't rise above 8 percent. They said if we do nothing, it will go up to 9 percent unemployment. Well, we're now millions of jobs lost later and we're still hovering at 10 percent unemployment. And the President's own economic adviser says if we put his plan in place, we'll lose another 5½ million? I think that alone is reason enough to reject his plan.

But that isn't enough. This plan also we know is massive tax increases in violation of what the President promised the American people. It's also massive job killing, as the President's own economic adviser said. And it cuts half a trillion dollars out of Medicare. That's right, Mr. Speaker. While we will be adding in about 47 million more people into receiving services, we're going to cut \$500 billion out of Medicare. Who's going to be hurt by all of this? Senior citizens.

Senior citizens are so smart. They have been on to this from the beginning, and that's why overwhelmingly senior citizens have said, Mr. President, don't do this thing. I'm the one that's going to pay the price.

That's right. Only every American will pay the price because all of us will see tax increases. All of us will suffer from these job-killing actions. This will force Americans again to pay for other people's abortions, and it will force Americans to pay for people's health care that aren't in this country legally.

Every word in the health care bill was negotiated by Democrats behind closed doors. In fact, they said today that if the Republicans won't go along with their bill, they're going to go for-

ward with it anyway. Well, then what in the world are we going to this summit in name only for? If the Democrats have already said we've figured out our legislative trick, according to the chief negotiator for Speaker PELOSI, we've got our trick, we know how we're going to trick the American people and pass through a bill that two-thirds of the American people said they don't want. Well, if that's the case, what's this about?

Well, we know what this is about. Today the White House Communications Director gave a quote, and he said that they want the American people to see the negotiations played out on TV among Democrats and Republicans. And why do they want that to happen? Well, Mr. Pfeiffer said, "The fact that the summit," and I quote, "will be on TV and that the legislation is posted online will help take away a little of the concern of this being something hatched behind closed doors."

Well, I hate to break it to you, but this has already been done behind closed doors. As Mr. KING said, while the snow shut down Washington, D.C., that didn't shut down the Democrats, who control every lever of power in Washington, from staying behind closed doors.

Remember, every minute of this health care bill, every minute, has been negotiated behind closed doors with all the special interest groups who don't want to get whacked by the President. Except for the American people. They did not get access behind those closed doors. It's been negotiated behind closed doors. It's going to result in tax increases. It's going to result in less health care. And it's going to hurt senior citizens the most.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Exclusively with Democrats.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Exclusively by Democrats. They have been the only ones behind closed doors with these negotiations. So don't for a moment suffer the delusion to think that what's going to happen this Thursday in a 6-hour time period—remember, the President on Saturday in his weekly radio address said that when we have these negotiations, he doesn't want to see any political theater. Oh, really? He also said that he wants to go through section by section a 2,700-page bill. In a 6-hour period, Mr. President, you're going to go through section by section a 2,700-page bill, which, by the way, none of us have seen yet?

Mr. GOHMERT, have you seen this bill? Mr. KING, have you seen the bill?

Mr. KING of Iowa. I have not seen the bill.

Mrs. BACHMANN. That's because no one has seen this bill. It's not online. How do we know that? Today the Director of the Congressional Budget Office, Mr. Douglas Elmendorf, said, We can't score how much this bill is going to cost. Why? We don't have the legislation. In fact, he said, We don't even have enough details out of this, quote, little 11-page proposal to even say how much the thing is going to cost.

So we don't know exactly who the players are that are going to go to this summit in name only on Thursday. We don't have a bill yet that we can negotiate. Yet this is going to impact every American, raise taxes, kill jobs. We don't even know what the bill is. We don't even know who the players are that are going to be in the room. And somehow this is a negotiation when the President has already said through his mouthpiece, his spokesmen, they have already said, well, it doesn't matter if the GOP turns it down, we're going to go our own way anyway. So agree with us. That's your option, Republicans. Agree with us or take a hike. Doesn't that make the American people feel good?

I thought the Declaration of Independence said that we rule by the consent of the governed; that we pass laws with what our constituents want. I spoke to STEVE KING earlier; I spoke to LOUIE GOHMERT earlier. They were both home over these last 2 weeks in their respective districts. Their constituents told them, We don't want this job-killing government takeover of health care. That's what my constituents told me. I was just this weekend in St. Cloud, St. Martin, in Stillwater, in Woodbury. I was up in Anoka County. Everywhere I went people said, Michele, please, you don't think they're going to pass this health care, do you? Well, President Obama plans to. He must have his fingers in his ears or something must be happening, with all due respect, because that's not what my people are telling me in my district. All I can say is, Mr. President—Mr. Speaker, I am speaking through you. Mr. President, I beg you, listen to the heart cry of the American people. They don't want this clunker, for cash or otherwise. They don't want this thing. Let's start over and have a true legitimate negotiation. Let's not insult the intelligence of the American people. That's all this summit in name only is. There is more respect for the beer summit than there is for this so-called "summit" in name only on Thursday. It's a travesty.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, I very much thank the gentlewoman from Minnesota.

In transition to the gentleman from Texas, I will just say I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, who will not be at the summit, who will not have a forum, who will not have a microphone, and that will be there will be no outspoken conservatives allowed to address that issue on Thursday at the Blair House. That's a given. I make that prediction for the American people, Mr. Speaker.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas who has so patiently waited and has so much to say. And I thank the gentlewoman from Minnesota for joining us.

Mr. GOHMERT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

It's a pleasure to wait. It's not patiently. I'm just sitting and taking in everything that has been said and benefiting from that.

My friends here, the gentlewoman from Minnesota, the gentleman from Iowa, and others, have worked very hard on the Declaration of Health Care Independence.

□ 2200

But it must be noted that these last 10 things that are pledges are things the President has already promised. You know, and it is important that people in Washington keep their word. You give your word and say, this is what we're going to do, we will not do that, then it's important that we keep our word.

So we were hoping that the President—and there's still time, and we would ask, Mr. Speaker, that the President go ahead and note these 10 things, all of which he has promised, and say, you know what? Even though our leaders didn't make these preconditions, they're not really preconditions. They're just saying, will you live up to what you've promised before? Please, Mr. President, live up to what you promised before. That's all this is asking. That's all it's stating. That's what the pledge is.

Number 1, protect as inviolate the vital doctor-patient relationship. That's been promised by the President. We're going to protect the doctor-patient relationship. So that shouldn't be a tough one to agree to.

Number 2, reject any addition to the crushing national debt heaped upon all Americans. The President promised when he was running for the Presidency and after he's elected to the Presidency, we're not going to heap on any debt. And, in fact, I've enjoyed his speeches recently where he has chastised Congress for spending too much money, and that he's having to do by Executive order what didn't pass in Congress.

And I'm sorry. I haven't heard anybody point out the irony of saying, you know what? I am going to appoint an executive committee, people that I choose, and heck, I'll let you throw some people in there, but I'm going to sign an order to create a panel to save money. Now, this panel is going to cost millions and millions of dollars. But we're going to have a panel that will cost us millions and millions of dollars, but we're hoping somehow in the end we'll finally get this Democratic majority to do what they haven't done before, and that is rein in spending.

You know, Republicans lost the majority in 2006 because they had not reined in spending. Yeah, it was the Republican Congress in 1995 through 2000 that did as they said, they reined in spending. This President has said that.

And I don't know what happened to the Vice President. I do know the President said, you know, he's going to put him in charge and people would be afraid to mess with the Vice President.

But what happened to scrubbing the budget line by line? We just shot up \$3.8 trillion, never a budget that high

in the history of the country ever. And yet, just crushing national debt will be heaped upon all Americans.

So, the ask here, Mr. Speaker, is that the President go back and listen to some of his own speeches recently where he has said we have got to stop this runaway spending. So if he'll listen to what he said himself there, then we'll be able to get him to agree to Number 2 because he said it himself.

Number 3, improve rather than diminish the quality of care that Americans enjoy. Now, it's one thing to come before the American public and say nobody's going to be denied any type of coverage. Yet, you talk to people in England, you talk to people in Canada, they're not denied coverage.

So we're not going to say you can't have that surgery. You can't have that radiation. We're going to put you on a list and one in five of you, like for with localized breast cancer tumor, one in five of you here in England are going to die waiting on a list; whereas, if you were in America, you would get that treatment anyway. So let's improve, rather than diminish the quality of care. That ought to be the goal.

Number 4, negotiate it publicly, transparently, with genuine accountability and oversight, and be free from political favoritism. I know eight times the President promised on television that he—it's on video eight different times that the negotiations would be done on C-SPAN.

Well, that doesn't mean when you're going to come bring a bunch of people in and talk for 6 hours when the negotiation already occurred, because we've already heard from AARP and union reps, those folks that have said, oh, yeah, we've already negotiated this deal. We've come up with a compromise between the House and the Senate bill. That's not transparent.

He promised everybody would get to see who was siding with the pharmaceutical companies—I've heard the President say this stuff—and who's siding with the union, who's siding with the AARP and who's siding with people. And when I say "AARP," I mean that entity. I don't mean retired people, because all of us, I think, in this Chamber right now side with the retired people whether we do with AARP or not.

Number 5, treat private citizens at least as well as political officials. What that means is, particularly, the little phrase that was added to the House bill when people had an outcry from around the country that we expect Members of Congress to have to live with whatever they do to us, there was that line inserted into the House bill that just said Members of Congress may participate in this program.

Well, I haven't found anybody in America, when you read that line to them, that doesn't immediately pick up on the word "may."

Now, this pledge that we're asking of the President, that so many people across America have already signed on

to, just says, you know, treat private citizens at least as well as the public officials.

We're called public servants for a reason. We're the servants. We're not supposed to be the masters.

Number 6, protect taxpayers from compulsory funding of abortion. Well, the President said right in here in September, there are those who claim that our reform efforts—well, let's see. Under our plan, no Federal dollars will be used to fund abortions. He said that.

Well, the truth is, we had to have the Bart Stupak amendment to prevent what the President said from being false. And if the Stupak amendment hadn't passed here in the House, then what the President said would not have been true. In fact, at the time he said it, it wasn't true. I'm sure he didn't realize that he was stating something false, but it wasn't true. That's why the Stupak amendment was necessary. And the Stupak amendment was not used in the Senate version.

Number 7, reject all new mandates on patients, employers, individuals, or States.

Well, originally, that's what was promised by the President, so hopefully he'd be willing to go back and live up to that.

Prohibit expansion of taxpayer funded health care to those unlawfully present in the United States. The President said in September, those who claim that our reform efforts would insure illegal immigrants, this too is false. The reforms I'm proposing would not apply to those who are here illegally.

Unless you require identification, it's not going to happen. We want the President to live up to his promise, and we'd ask that that pledge be made.

Number 9, guarantee equal protection under the law and the Constitution. That means it applies across the board to everyone, every State.

Number 10, empower, rather than limit, an open and accessible marketplace of health care choice and opportunity.

I've heard people say I want the same health care coverage you have. Well, you don't want what I had last year. I didn't want it. I got rid of that at the end of last year, and I went through that big publication we had that every Federal employee has, and I chose a different insurance for this year. I hope it works out.

You don't want my insurance I had last year. You want my choices, and that's what Number 10 is talking about. American people ought to have a choice.

And with those 10 things being covered, I sure hope the President will be willing to live up to those things he's promised over the last year and half.

And I yield back to my friend, Mr. KING.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank my friend the judge and Congressman from Texas for joining us here this evening. And to bring this together and bring it to a

close, Mr. Speaker, I'd just say this, that there will not be outspoken conservatives that will be part of this discussion. There may be outspoken liberals; that would be if the President speaks up. That would confirm that, in my view, Mr. Speaker.

But the American people have rejected the very idea that the Federal Government would do what it would do, take over 100 percent of the health care in America and all of the health insurance policies that are in America, and, by the way, if they say that they won't, but they'd actually regulate every single one, it's true.

□ 2210

I talked a moment earlier, some minutes earlier, about the nationalization of these eight huge entities and what that means to free enterprise, but the real utter irony that we have, Mr. Speaker, is that not since 1973, since Roe v. Wade, have there been thousands and thousands of people who have stood up and said the government has no business telling a woman what she should do with her body. That is a sacrosanct decision made by the woman and her doctor and her pastor or her priest. I've heard the argument over and over and over again. And it is made by men and women. It's been made for two generations. And now the very same people that are arguing that you can't tell a woman what to do with her body, are now advocating that the Federal Government should take over the management of everybody's body.

The utter nationalization of the most private thing we have, our health care. Take away our choices, take it over and manage it, give us whatever insurance policy the Federal Government will approve, tell us what we have to pay for it, tell us what mandates will be included in it. And if we can't afford it, they will give us a refundable tax credit, and if we can't afford it and don't buy it, they're going to fine us, and they're going to fine the employer that doesn't produce it.

This is a mandate for the first time in the history of America that the Federal Government would mandate that a person has to buy something that is imposed on us by the Federal Government, and I say "no" to it all.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CUELLAR (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of death in the family.

Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of inclement weather and travel delays.

Ms. MCCOLLUM (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of business in the district.

Mr. CULBERSON (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of personal business.

Mr. DREIER (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of events in the district.

Mr. POE of Texas (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of other district-related business.

Mr. REICHERT (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today and the balance of the week on account of supporting his family after the sudden and unexpected death of his 16-year-old niece.

Mr. SESSIONS (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of official business in the district, scheduled before the majority leader's announcement that votes would be held today.

Mr. DENT (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of a death in the family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. FUDGE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, February 23, 24, and 25.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today, February 23, 24, 25, and 26.

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, February 23, 24, 25, and 26.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, February 23, 24, 25, and 26.

Mr. INGLIS, for 5 minutes, February 23, 24, and 25.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PAUL, for 5 minutes, today, February 23, 24, and 25.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, for 5 minutes, February 23, 24, and 25.

Mr. SHIMKUS, for 5 minutes, February 23.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced her signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2950. A act to extend the pilot program for volunteer groups to obtain criminal history background checks.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.), under its previous order and pursuant to House Resolution 1084, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 23, 2010, at 10:30 a.m., for morning-hour debate, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late Honorable John P. Murtha.