

IED? Was it trip wire? Was it pressure activated?

He knew everything about the experience of these soldiers. And he wasn't sentimental. He was direct. He was blunt. And in that strength he was warm and encouraging and respectful to the service of those soldiers. It is something only a person with Jack's strength of character could do.

We all know that Jack was endlessly challenged by the press for the so-called earmarks. I remember that he took the criticism as though it was a grain of salt, and when asked, he would hold up a document saying, this is my power. It is in the Constitution, and I take care of my people.

We lost a great man.

IN TRIBUTE TO REPRESENTATIVE JOHN P. MURTHA OF PENNSYLVANIA

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

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, many speakers have preceded me today in speaking about Mr. Murtha—and I will always call him Mr. Murtha because that's how I referred to him here in the House and that's how I will refer to him in memory.

I only had the opportunity to serve with him for 3 years, and I feel certainly inadequate in being the last person to speak, but this man was my friend. He was like a father figure to me.

When I was thinking about running for Congress, I came up here to view Congress and think about it. I wasn't sure if I was going to run or not. I went up in that gallery and I sat on this left side of the aisle, Madam Speaker. I looked at the floor and all the people down here and I thought about whether or not I wanted to run. But coming up here, I was in Rayburn, and I walked up by the train that comes from Rayburn to the Capitol. And this man came up to me, this gentleman—I didn't know him—and he put his arm around me and we talked on the way up and walked all the way down the path. And he said, Young man, this is going to be like 1974. It's going to be a great year for Democrats.

We got up the elevator—and I was so proud to be in this building—and we got to the top and he went to the left where you enter the Speaker's lobby and come onto this floor and I went around the way to this gallery where visitors go. He said, Next time you come up here, I hope you can come in here with me. And it was the next time I got to come in here with him.

I was so proud every time I got to go over—I read about "Murtha's Corner" in The New York Times, and then I find myself over there with mostly folks from Pennsylvania, but also the different people that were fond of Mr. Murtha. I was standing there and I thought, I remember reading about

Murtha's Corner, now I'm in Murtha's Corner. And I was in his corner and he was in mine. When I needed help for my community and learning about appropriations, defense appropriations and how they could benefit this country and my community and my universities, he helped me. He always helped me. And I helped him when he was in need in his last election.

I made the trip to Johnstown for his funeral, and I am so happy I did and I am happy to be here. I could not let this opportunity pass to speak about this great American. It has been talked about he was a marine and he was the first from Vietnam to be elected—he was part of that class—and he stood up and received the John F. Kennedy Profiles in Courage Award. All is true. But the bottom line is he was a good human being.

"Avuncular" is a word I learned when I was in high school, uncle-like figure, and I guess he was an uncle-like figure. He was just a grand, good human being. I will miss him. This House will miss him. And I am just fortunate that I passed this way at the same time he did and got to change time with him in life.

Thank you, Jack Murtha.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 3961. An act to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to reform the Medicare SGR payment system for physicians and to reinstitute and update the Pay-As-You-Go requirement of budget neutrality on new tax and mandatory spending legislation, enforced by the threat of annual, automatic sequestration.

IN HONOR OF SERGEANT JEREMIAH WITTMAN

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

Mr. INGLIS. Madam Speaker, I am here to honor one of America's heroes. U.S. Army Sergeant Jeremiah Wittman, age 26, was killed in Afghanistan on Saturday, February 13, 2010. Sergeant Wittman was from Montana. His wife, Karyn, is from the Chesnee/Boiling Springs area of Spartanburg County, South Carolina.

Sergeant Wittman and Karyn have a beautiful 3-year-old daughter named Miah. I got to play in Miah's doll house when I visited her grandparents' home recently. More on that in a minute.

Sergeant Wittman was doing what Americans best do—he was protecting freedom, protecting us, when an improvised explosive device was detonated near him as he was on foot patrol in Zhari province in Afghanistan.

I wonder what it means to a 3-year-old, Madam Speaker, to hear that her daddy is one of our heroes. I said that to Miah the other night at her house. I know she heard it from others because we are very patriotic people in the upstate of South Carolina, Madam Speaker. Still, I wonder what it means to a 3-year-old.

Miah's mom, Karyn, knows what it means. She knew what it meant when representatives of the U.S. Army showed up at her parents' front door dressed in "Class A's." She knows that this Saturday an Army officer will kneel beside her and say that the President of the United States and a grateful Nation stand in appreciation of the honorable and faithful service of her husband, Jeremy.

Devoted spouses like Karyn and self-sacrificing parents like Sergeant Wittman's know that service means the possibility of not coming home safe and sound, the possibility that the last full measure of devotion will be given on a battlefield far from home.

The people of the upstate of South Carolina and Montana know what it means. It means that we must live our lives in gratitude to America's best; the ones who come home unscathed, the ones who come home with scars, and the ones who come home in solemn honor.

But what does it mean to Miah? Well, Madam Speaker, if you will indulge me, I will try to say what it means in a letter to Miah.

Dear Miah, that's an awesome dollhouse you have in the living room at your grandma and grandpa's house. Thank you for letting me see the cool things you've got in there. I like the computer a lot, and the lights over the door to your doll tent are awesome. Thank you for showing me the pictures of you and your daddy.

I guess you've noticed by now that grown-ups like us cry sometimes when we hear you say that your daddy is in heaven. It's not that we're not happy for him. You know better than us grown-ups that your daddy can trust God to dry every tear. It's just that we're overwhelmed by the gift you've given. You and your mom and your grandparents have given the rest of us the gift of your dad's life.

He was in Afghanistan protecting you and your mom mostly, but he was also there protecting me and my family and all American families. So if you see a lot of people crying, it's the only way we know to show how much we care, how much your dad's sacrifice, how much your sacrifice means to us.

A sergeant like your dad told me recently, "When I see good things at risk, I'm inclined to fight for it. I guess that's why I'm in the Army." That's Sergeant Mennell from Texas. I don't know if Sergeant Mennell knew your dad, but I bet that's what your dad thought too. Your dad saw your future at risk, Miah, so he went to fight for you and for me and for all of us.

When I was leaving your house the other night, there was a beautiful

moon hanging low in the west over the mountains you can see from the top of your driveway. It was glowing orange and looked like a bowl that could hold something. I thought of those pictures of you and your dad. I thought of God holding the moon up there, holding your dad, holding you and your mom, holding this whole big world. It seemed like the moon was doing something else, Miah. It seemed that it was holding the hope of a lot of tomorrows. You see, as the moon falls, the sun rises on a new day. When your dad fell, it was so that you could have many more tomorrows in peace and freedom.

When I see a waxing moon glowing orange and hanging low in the west, stretching its light from South Carolina to that farm your dad loved in Montana, I'll think of you, Miah, and I'll think of your dad, and I'll pray for many tomorrows for you and for the country your dad loved.

Thank you, Miah.

Your friend, Bob.

P.S. Keep an eye on those dinosaurs in your doll tent. You know they scare me.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2701, INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010, WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. ARCURI, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 111-419) on the resolution (H. Res. 1105) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2701) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2010 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes, waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules, and providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

POLITICAL DRAMA AT THE WHITE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. AKIN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. AKIN. Madam Speaker, this evening we stand just before a day—tomorrow—of great political drama.

I am trained as an engineer, and not much of an expert on drama or plays, but I have at least one theory about acting in plays and drama, and that is, usually it's very good or very bad.

□ 1945

As we take a look at the drama that faces people who will be watching tomorrow, the question tonight is: What drama are they liable to watch? Are they going to watch the Olympics, the last part of the Olympics, which will be very exciting, or the political drama of 6 hours of discussions or debate? I think there will be more drama that will take place tomorrow on the health care bill.

Now, we have been talking about this health care bill for more than a year, and the subject has had a tendency to get a little bit stale, but tomorrow is an attempt to revive that discussion. One of the things that is required in good drama is the theme, or the major topic, and the different parts of that drama have to be believable. I think that's one of the things that may make the drama tomorrow more difficult in terms of its success. Let's just talk about what really is believable.

The President claimed about a year or so ago—I guess it was in a State of the Union message—that this new health care was going to save money and that it wouldn't cost us a dime. Well, I guess that's true. It's going to cost more like \$1 trillion. Is that believable?

The President repeatedly said that Republicans had no ideas. Yet, in Baltimore, just a month or two ago, he said, not that the Republicans had no ideas, but that he'd read a good number of the bills that had been introduced by the Republicans. Is that believable?

The President also pledged transparency and openness in the whole process of developing a health care bill. What we have seen has been that bills are developed behind closed doors, and for tomorrow, the bill that has been created behind closed doors is going to be revealed only for 24 hours. So is the transparency-openness pledge believable?

In Baltimore, the President talked about the fact that he has a lot of economic experts scoring the bill and taking a look at whether it works financially or not, whether or not the different component parts come together and whether or not it achieves the economic results that he wants. Yet, when the Congressional Budget Office, which is supposedly and to a large degree politically neutral, scored the bill, they said that the Republican bill actually reduces premiums by 10 percent while the Democrat bill makes them more expensive.

Then there is a question about whether or not the meeting tomorrow, which is attempting to be billed as bipartisan and bipartisanship—does that really make sense? Because, if you write a bill behind closed doors, unveiling it at the last minute, within 24 hours, and then demand that the Republicans agree to it, is that really bipartisanship? I wonder if that is believable.

The President promised us that the bill that he was going to present when

he was in Baltimore would include tort reform. Yet the bill that we have seen did the exact opposite. The States that had already enacted tort reform were forbidden from using those tort reform laws. So, in effect, it would reverse tort reform and would go in the exact opposite direction. Is that believable?

We were told that the special deals have been taken out. Yet, in a few minutes, we will take a look at those special deals which remain in the bill.

Then last of all—and it is the one that I find most amazing—the Republicans are obstructionists. I find that hard to believe how anybody could even repeat that, let alone believe it. I wish it were true. I sorely wish it were true. The Republicans here in this Chamber, my Republican colleagues, are 40 votes short of a majority. There is nothing that we could obstruct if our lives depended on it. The Democrats could lose 20 voters and still pass anything that they choose to pass. So how we could be, as Republicans, obstructionists, again, seems very hard to pass the old sniff test.

Now, it seems that the President, in setting up this great drama of 6 hours of televised discussion on health care, has made a major assumption, which is, if people just knew what was in his bill, they would really like it. Probably the opposite is true. What we have seen is our constituents, my constituents, have called in, and they have read portions of these bills. They know what is in the bill. Guess what? They don't like it. In fact, this bill that is being proposed is ugly. It's so ugly it has to sneak up on a glass of water just to get a drink. Well, let's take a look specifically at why it is that we are going to have this great health care political drama tomorrow, and yet we are not really passing the believable test. Let's just take a look to see if anything has really changed at all.

First of all, this bill imposes \$500 billion in Medicare cuts. That's a whole lot of money. Five hundred billion dollars is going to be taken out of Medicare. The old Democrat bill took \$500 billion out of Medicare. The President's new bill takes \$500 billion out of Medicare. The Republican alternative takes nothing out of Medicare. Well, nothing seems to have changed here.

This bill enacts job-killing tax hikes and government regulations, costing hundreds of billions of dollars. In the old Democrat bill, yes, that was true for it. The President's new plan, which is online, likewise enacts a lot of job-killing tax hikes and government regulations that cost billions of dollars. Yet the Republican alternative does not.

It spends \$1 trillion on a government takeover of the health care system. This is something that people are really conscious of. This is a government takeover of an entire sector of the U.S. economy—\$1 trillion. I think that number is short because it's not counting the unfunded mandates to States. The old Democrat bill does that. The President's new bill does it. The Republican