

families with additional assistance to purchase health care and allows unspent funds to be allocated to a Health Savings Account (HSA).

Mr. Speaker, the FAST Act reforms the tax code to provide permanent tax relief and clarity for American families and businesses, while encouraging innovation and entrepreneurship vital to our economic recovery. I encourage all my colleagues to join me in this pro-growth economic policy.

HONORING SEBASTICOOK VALLEY HOSPITAL

HON. MICHAEL H. MICHAUD

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 5, 2011

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the accomplishments of Sebasticook Valley Hospital in Pittsfield, Maine.

Founded in 1963, the Sebasticook Valley Hospital was started by local citizens who were concerned about the health and well-being of their families, neighbors and employees of the region. The hospital continues to honor that legacy and commitment by being accountable at all levels of the organization in meeting the changing health care needs of the local communities. Sebasticook Valley continues to strive for improvement in services and to ensure that their patients receive the best possible service for their health care needs.

Sebasticook Valley Hospital has been recently recognized as one of the nation's top rural hospitals by the Washington, DC-based Leapfrog Group. The Leapfrog Survey, which launched in 2001, focuses on four critical areas of patient safety: the use of computer physician order entry to prevent medication errors, standards for doing high-risk procedures, protocols and policies to reduce medical errors and other safe practices recommended by the National Quality Forum and adequate nurse and physician staffing. In addition, hospitals are measured on their progress in preventing infections and other hospital-acquired conditions and adopting policies on the handling of serious medical errors, among other things.

Sebasticook Valley Hospital has displayed a tremendous commitment to providing the best quality health care for their patients. I am proud to congratulate the employees, providers, board members and volunteers for their dedication to providing the best care to our rural communities. Their skills, compassion and dedication make this hospital a well-deserved award recipient.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in recognizing Sebasticook Valley Hospital for their devotion to ensuring that patients and families receive the best possible health care.

INTRODUCING THE IDENTITY THEFT PREVENTION ACT

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 5, 2011

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, today I introduce the Identity Theft Prevention Act. This act pro-

tections the American people from government-mandated uniform identifiers that facilitate private crime as well as the abuse of liberty. The major provision of the Identity Theft Prevention Act halts the practice of using the Social Security number as an identifier by requiring the Social Security Administration to issue all Americans new Social Security numbers within five years after the enactment of the bill. These new numbers will be the sole legal property of the recipient, and the Social Security administration shall be forbidden to divulge the numbers for any purposes not related to Social Security administration. Social Security numbers issued before implementation of this bill shall no longer be considered valid federal identifiers. Of course, the Social Security Administration shall be able to use an individual's original Social Security number to ensure efficient administration of the Social Security system.

Mr. Speaker, Congress has a moral responsibility to address this problem because it was Congress that transformed the Social Security number into a national identifier. Thanks to Congress, today no American can get a job, open a bank account, get a professional license, or even get a driver's license without presenting his Social Security number. So widespread has the use of the Social Security number become that a member of my staff had to produce a Social Security number in order to get a fishing license!

One of the most disturbing abuses of the Social Security number is the congressionally authorized rule forcing parents to get a Social Security number for their newborn children in order to claim the children as dependents. Forcing parents to register their children with the state is more like something out of the nightmares of George Orwell than the dreams of a free republic that inspired this nation's founders.

Congressionally mandated use of the Social Security number as an identifier facilitates the horrendous crime of identity theft. Thanks to Congress, an unscrupulous person may simply obtain someone's Social Security number in order to access that person's bank accounts, credit cards, and other financial assets. Many Americans have lost their life savings and had their credit destroyed as a result of identity theft. Yet the federal government continues to encourage such crimes by mandating use of the Social Security number as a uniform ID!

The Identity Theft Prevention Act also prevents the federal government from establishing any form of national ID. In 2005, Congress attempted to turn state driver's licensing into a national ID, however, resistance to this unconstitutional and costly mandate on the states has been so intense that today, for all intents and purposes, the Real ID mandate has been nullified. The Identity Theft Prevention Act simply puts the nail in the coffin of the Real ID and similar schemes, thus protecting Americans from having their liberty, property, and privacy violated by private and public sector criminals.

Some members of Congress will claim that the federal government needs the power to monitor Americans in order to allow the government to operate more efficiently. I would remind my colleagues that, in a constitutional republic, the people are never asked to sacrifice their liberties to make the jobs of government officials easier. We are here to protect

the freedom of the American people, not to make privacy invasion more efficient.

Mr. Speaker, while I do not question the sincerity of those members who suggest that Congress can ensure that citizens' rights are protected through legislation restricting access to personal information, the only effective privacy protection is to forbid the federal government from mandating national identifiers. Legislative "privacy protections" are inadequate to protect the liberty of Americans for a couple of reasons.

First, it is simply common sense that repealing those federal laws that promote identity theft is more effective in protecting the public than expanding the power of the federal police force. Federal punishment of identity thieves provides cold comfort to those who have suffered financial losses and the destruction of their good reputations as a result of identity theft.

Federal laws are not only ineffective in stopping private criminals, but these laws have not even stopped unscrupulous government officials from accessing personal information. After all, laws purporting to restrict the use of personal information did not stop the well-publicized violations of privacy by IRS officials or the FBI abuses of the Clinton and Nixon administrations.

In one of the most infamous cases of identity theft, thousands of active-duty soldiers and veterans had their personal information stolen, putting them at risk of identity theft. Imagine the dangers if thieves are able to obtain the universal identifier, and other personal information, of millions of Americans simply by breaking, or hacking, into one government facility or one government database?

Second, the federal government has been creating proprietary interests in private information for certain state-favored special interests. Perhaps the most outrageous example of phony privacy protection is the "medical privacy" regulation, that allows medical researchers, certain business interests, and law enforcement officials access to health care information, in complete disregard of the Fifth Amendment and the wishes of individual patients! Obviously, "privacy protection" laws have proven greatly inadequate to protect personal information when the government is the one seeking the information.

Any action short of repealing laws authorizing privacy violations is insufficient primarily because the federal government lacks constitutional authority to force citizens to adopt a universal identifier for health care, employment, or any other reason. Any federal action that oversteps constitutional limitations violates liberty because it ratifies the principle that the federal government, not the Constitution, is the ultimate judge of its own jurisdiction over the people. The only effective protection of the rights of citizens is for Congress to follow Thomas Jefferson's advice and "bind (the federal government) down with the chains of the Constitution."

Mr. Speaker, those members who are not persuaded by the moral and constitutional reasons for embracing the Identity Theft Prevention Act should consider the American people's opposition to national identifiers. The numerous complaints over the ever-growing uses of the Social Security number show that Americans want Congress to stop invading their privacy. Furthermore, according to a survey by

the Gallup company, 91 percent of the American people oppose forcing Americans to obtain a universal health ID.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I once again call on my colleagues to join me in putting an end to the federal government's unconstitutional use of national identifiers to monitor the actions of private citizens. National identifiers threaten all Americans by exposing them to the threat of identity theft by private criminals and abuse of their liberties by public criminals, while diverting valuable law enforcement resources away from addressing real threats to public safety. In addition, national identifiers are incompatible with a limited, constitutional government. I, therefore, hope my colleagues will join my efforts to protect the freedom of their constituents by supporting the Identity Theft Prevention Act.

INTRODUCTION STATEMENT: H.R.
40 THE COMMISSION TO STUDY
REPARATION PROPOSALS FOR
AFRICAN-AMERICANS ACT

HON. JOHN CONYERS, Jr.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 5, 2011

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to re-introduce H.R. 40, the Commission to Study Reparations Proposals for African-Americans Act. Since I first introduced H.R. 40 in 1989, we have made substantial progress in elevating this issue in the national consciousness. Through legislation, state and local resolutions and litigation, we are moving closer to a full dialogue on the role of slavery in building this country.

At this time, however, I must acknowledge the passing of a major voice in the reparations debate, Dr. Ronald Walters. From his position in the academy—Professor at the University of Maryland and head of its African American Leadership Institute—Dr. Walters led the debate on reparation that touched both the grassroots and scholarly communities. His wisdom and clarity will be missed, but never forgotten.

As evidenced by recent events, the sin of slavery is one that continues to weigh heavily upon us. Following the lead of other churches, the Episcopal Church formally apologized for its role in slavery on October 4, 2008. Florida became the sixth state to apologize for slavery on March 26, 2008, following Virginia, Maryland, North Carolina, Alabama and New Jersey. During the internationally renowned Sundance Film Festival, *Traces of the Trade*, a documentary in which descendants of the largest U.S. slave trading family confront this painful history, screened in January of 2008.

In the 110th Congress, the House passed a slavery apology bill on July 29, 2008, in which the House issued a formal apology for slavery. The Senate followed on July 18, 2009, with the passage of S. Con. Res. 26 which was sponsored by Tom Harkin of Iowa. Moreover, in recognition of the 200th anniversary of the abolition of the transatlantic slave trade on January 1, 1808, both the House and Senate passed legislation creating a commemoration commission, which was signed into law on February 5, 2008, and is currently awaiting funding. I believe that such Federal efforts are significant steps toward proper acknowledg-

ment and understanding of slavery and its implications, but our responsibilities on this matter are even greater.

The establishment of a commission to study the institution of slavery in the United States, as well as its consequences that reach into modern day society, is our responsibility. This concept of a commission to address historical wrongs is not unprecedented. In fact, in recent Congresses, commission bills have been put forward.

In 1983, a Presidential Commission determined that the internment of Japanese Americans during World War II was racist and inhumane, and as a result, the 1988 Civil Liberties Act provided redress for those injured by the internment. However, the internment of Japanese Latin Americans in the United States during World War II was not examined by the Commission, resulting in legislation calling for a commission to examine this oversight. Legislation establishing a commission to review the injustices suffered by European Americans, European Latin Americans, and Jewish refugees during World War II has also been proposed.

H.R. 40 is no different than these other commission bills. H.R. 40 establishes a commission to examine the institution of slavery and its legacy, like racial disparities in education, housing, and healthcare. Following this examination, the commission would recommend appropriate remedies to Congress, and as I have indicated before, remedies does not equate to monetary compensation.

In the 110th Congress, I convened the first Congressional hearing on H.R. 40. With witnesses that included Professor Charles Ogletree, Episcopal Bishop M. Thomas Shaw, and Detroit City Councilwoman JoAnn Watson, we began a formal dialogue on the legacy of the transatlantic slave trade. This Congress, I look forward to continuing this conversation so that our Nation can better understand this part of our history.

Attempts to eradicate today's racial discrimination and disparities will be successful when we understand the past's racial injustices and inequities. A commission can take us into this dark past and bring us into a brighter future. As in years past, I welcome open and constructive discourse on H.R. 40 and the creation of this commission in the 112th Congress.

INTRODUCTION OF A 3-PART BALANCED BUDGET CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

HON. BOB GOODLATTE

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 5, 2011

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to re-introduce legislation that will amend the United States Constitution to force Congress to rein in spending by balancing the federal budget.

We have a spending addiction in Washington, D.C., and it has proven to be an addiction that Congress cannot control on its own and which is bringing dire consequences. We have gone in a few short years from a deficit of billions of dollars to a deficit of trillions of dollars. We are printing money at an unprecedented pace, which presents serious risks of massive inflation. Our national debt recently

surpassed an astonishing \$14 trillion and continues to rapidly increase, along with the waste associated with paying the interest on that debt.

Our first Secretary of State, Thomas Jefferson, warned of the consequences of out-of-control debt when he wrote: "To preserve [the] independence [of the people,] we must not let our rulers load us with perpetual debt. We must make our election between economy and liberty, or profusion and servitude." Unfortunately, it increasingly appears that Congress has chosen the latter path.

Our current Secretary of State, Hillary Clinton, issued a similar warning when she recently declared: "I think that our rising debt levels [sic] poses a national security threat, and it poses a national security threat in two ways. It undermines our capacity to act in our own interest, and it does constrain us where constraint may be undesirable. And it also sends a message of weakness internationally." Despite these warnings, Congress has refused to address this crisis.

Congress' spending addiction is not a partisan one. It reaches across the aisle and afflicts both parties, which is why neither party has been able to master it. We need outside help. We need pressure from outside Congress to force us to rein in this out-of-control behavior. We need a balanced budget amendment to our Constitution.

That is why I am introducing this legislation, which is a common sense, 3-part balanced budget Constitutional amendment. This bill would (1) amend the Constitution to require that total spending for any fiscal year not exceed total receipts; (2) require that bills to raise revenues pass each House of Congress by a 3/5 majority; and (3) establish an annual spending cap such that total federal spending could not exceed 1/5 of the economic output of the United States.

The bill would also require a 3/5 majority vote for any increases in the debt limit.

The legislation provides an exception in times of war and during military conflicts that pose imminent and serious military threats to national security.

Our federal government must be lean, efficient and responsible with the dollars that our nation's citizens worked so hard to earn. We must work to both eliminate every cent of waste and squeeze every cent of value out of each dollar our citizens entrust to us. Families all across our nation understand what it means to make tough decisions each day about what they can and cannot afford and government officials should be required to exercise similar restraint when spending the hard-earned dollars of our nation's citizens.

By amending the Constitution to require a balanced budget, establish measurable spending limits, and make it harder to raise taxes, we can force the Congress to control spending, paving the way for a return to surpluses and ultimately paying down the national debt, rather than allow big spenders to lead us further down the road of chronic deficits and in doing so leave our children and grandchildren saddled with debt that is not their own.

49 out of 50 states have a balanced budget requirement, and it is time that the federal government had one too.

Our nation faces many difficult decisions in the coming years, and Congress will face great pressure to spend beyond its means rather than to make the difficult decisions