

knows, Medicare's chief actuary says that the ObamaCare bill represents a maze of mandates, tax hikes, and subsidies that will push costs up. The bottom line, Madam Speaker, is we need to stop arguing about "inside baseball" budget gimmicks.

□ 1150

There's no question that a new, open-ended entitlement program will grow unsustainably fast, will drive costs up, and could potentially bankrupt this Federal Government, as well as our States.

Mr. HOYER. I want to say to my friend, the continuing rhetoric is Washington doesn't have a revenue problem, it has a spending problem. Americans in every family that I know understand that their revenues directly impact on their spending and vice versa, and if they don't, they have a real problem. If they don't have enough revenue to meet their expenditures, they've got a problem, and if their spending exceeds their revenue, they have a problem.

I tell my friend, I understand what you're saying, and I've heard this rhetoric all of my career here in the Congress. When President Reagan was President, we never overrode a Presidential veto of an appropriation bill because it spent too much. If he vetoed it, it spent too much, he never had a veto overridden. Nevertheless, we incurred an additional \$1.5 trillion in deficits. Under President George H.W. Bush, we didn't override any veto of his, and we incurred an additional \$1 trillion. That was \$2.5 trillion plus.

Under the Clinton administration, of course, in the economic program as you and I both know that your party universally opposed, we had a surplus, the only President in your lifetime and I think in mine, which is substantially longer, that's had 4 years of surplus. Now, I know you say, the response that Mr. DREIER gave to me, is that, well, yes, we took over the Congress in 1995. That's correct. And of course not only did you take over the Congress in 1995, but in 2000, you took over the Presidency as well and controlled the House and the Senate and the Presidency.

And during that period of time, we didn't pass any appropriation bills on our side. You were in full charge during the Bush administration's first six years, and \$3.5 trillion of deficit spending was incurred, making a total of over \$5 trillion of deficit spending during the time that your party took the position that we didn't have a revenue problem, we had a spending problem.

Well, it ended up being a \$5 trillion deficit problem, adding to the deficit for our children and for my grandchildren and for my great-granddaughter, and I'm concerned about that. And that is why I'm so concerned about statutory PAYGO, sticking with CBO scores, and accommodating our spending and revenue. They are both related, obviously, and to ignore that eliminating revenue without eliminating spending does cause deficits I think is to ignore reality.

So I would hope my friend would talk to Mr. RYAN of the Budget Committee and bring us legislation which would, in fact, do what you and I want to do; that is, eliminate the deficit. If we've got two messages during this past election, in my view, it was, A, focus on creating jobs. We've got to get to work. Americans are hurting. We had some good job numbers this month. We've created over 1.3 million jobs this past year as opposed to losing almost 4 million jobs in the last year of the Bush administration. That's progress. But as I've said so often, it's not success. Success will be when every American who wants a job, willing to work, can find a job, and they can support him or her and their families.

But we need to not pretend that revenues and spending are not inextricably related, and that if we give up revenues before we do the difficult thing, the tough thing, the adult thing, as Mr. BOEHNER said, and cut the spending, then cut the revenues if Americans are buying it, then we ought to be paying for it and not passing along the bill to our grandchildren, and I would hope the gentleman would pursue that.

If the gentleman wants to respond to that, I want to say something about health care briefly.

Mr. CANTOR. You know, Madam Speaker, the gentleman and I have gone through these discussions for the last 2 years, and when we get into discussing the past, I normally posit a quote from Winston Churchill when he said, If we open a quarrel between the past and the present, we shall find we have lost the future.

And what my response is, Madam Speaker, we are looking to see that we do take the tough steps and cut spending. So I'm hopeful with all the renewed enthusiasm that all of us have gained after the election towards fiscal sanity that the gentleman and his caucus can join us and vote with us in terms of the spending cuts that we'll be bringing to the floor every week.

The gentleman speaks about revenues, and absolutely, as an ongoing concern, this government has to be concerned with that. But we first and foremost must understand—and I think both of us realize, Madam Speaker, that in order to have revenues, we've got to have a growing economy—and so there is balance, and that is where perhaps our two visions diverge, but it is my hope that we can work together by putting priorities in place, cutting spending, growing the economy. And that's the formula by which we will be operating, and I'm hopeful we can operate in that formula together.

Mr. HOYER. I appreciate the gentleman's comment, and briefly in closing, Madam Speaker, let me say this. I hope we can cooperate, but we do have a divergence, as my friend pointed out, and that's of course the nature of what the House of Representatives does, debates different points of view. Frankly, my experience, as I have said, is that when we diverged in a point of view in 1993,

when my Republican friends took the position that accommodating revenues to spending would, in fact, from their perspective, be a job killer—they talk a lot about job-killing legislation. They all voted against that legislation in 1993, and in fact, some of my colleagues on my side of the aisle lost their election because of voting for that piece of legislation. In fact, however, it helped create the most robust economy anybody in this Chamber has experienced in their lifetime. It created over 22 million jobs, as opposed to losing 8 million jobs in the last administration under President Bush, so that there was a substantial difference which you can see, touch, and feel and read about and know about.

So I tell my friend, yes, there's a difference of opinion, but there's no difference of opinion on what happened, and when Winston Churchill, who you quoted before and of whom I'm a great fan, one of the things that Winston Churchill was most known for was trying to remind his British friends: don't forget what dictators and despots do—and I make no aspersions, I want to make that clear. I'm simply saying he believed strongly in learning from the past and not continuing to make mistakes and not continue to do what failed in years before.

So I agree with the gentleman in looking at the past for instruction on how to make the future better and to create those jobs that both he and I want to create and that America certainly is looking for us to create.

I thank the gentleman for this colloquy.

—

HOURLY MEETING

Mr. CANTOR. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at noon on Tuesday next for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

□ 1200

COLOMBIA FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

(Mr. RIVERA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RIVERA. Madam Speaker, I rise today for the first time to address the House and express my strong support for passage of a free trade agreement with Colombia. Colombia is America's fourth-largest trading partner in Latin America, and the U.S. Department of Commerce estimates that 9,000 American companies trade with Colombia, most of which are small businesses and many of which operate in my district in south Florida.

While 90 percent of Colombian goods enter the U.S. duty free, American

companies still pay tariffs for U.S. goods to enter Colombia. The Colombia Free Trade Agreement would eliminate obstacles and immediately boost U.S. exports to Colombia. By passing a free trade agreement with Colombia, U.S. GDP would increase by roughly \$2.5 billion and exports by over \$1 billion, creating thousands of jobs in the United States. The Colombia Free Trade Agreement is also a positive foreign policy gesture to one of our most reliable allies in the region and the oldest continuously functioning democracy in all of South America.

Madam Speaker, it's time to stand with one of our best allies in Latin America and create thousands of jobs here at home with passage of a Colombia Free Trade Agreement.

NO HEALTH CARE REPEAL

(Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am wondering whether many people understand what we did today. Frankly, we gave permission for more Americans to die from a lack of good health care. In fact, as I presented my amendments to the Rules Committee last evening, I was reminded, if you will, of those who really suffer because of a lack of access to good health care. I offered an amendment to ensure that H.R. 2, to repeal this good health care bill, would not eliminate what we call community health clinics and deny rural and urban areas of good doctors and nurses who treat the children and seniors. And then I asked that we protect the middle class and not have the insurance rates go up. And finally, an amendment to make sure that we don't have Medicaid and Medicare fraud and abuse and to protect those who need Medicaid, as my State of Texas is going to eliminate it. So people will die as we proceed in this untimely and ludicrous process.

But I'm glad that Pastor D.Z. Cofield in my district will ascend to the presidency of the NAACP in our local community. I believe with all of these good thinking people, we will be able to rise up and save the lives and oppose any repeal of this good affordable care bill.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FLEISCHMANN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

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

THE WOLF IN SHEEP'S CLOTHING FOLLIES ACT OF 2011

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, those who are watching this today may wonder what just happened in the House of Representatives. And I want to talk a little bit about it so they understand what goes on next week on the floor of this House. Today we set the stage for the passage of the Republican health care plan. It won't be a repeal of what the Democratic Congress did before. It will be returning us to the status quo where the health care insurance industry in this country is totally in control of the private insurance industry.

Now, yesterday I was on a conference call with groups that represent 18,000 physicians who want us not to act and repeal the Affordable Health Care Act next week. They have taken resolutions in every district around this country among physicians. They have delivered them to the Speaker's Office, Mr. BOEHNER in Cincinnati. They have taken them to Mr. CANTOR's office in Virginia. Because doctors know what this act really does.

I listened to a couple of my colleagues who are physicians, and I heard them say they wanted to repeal it all. But the 18,000 physicians who I was talking to, or their representatives, on the phone yesterday were talking about what the real experience is out in the doctors' offices, not on the floor of the House or not in some political arena where we are making points, but when you are actually dealing with patients.

I am a physician. I have been there. I have done it also. I have had phone calls from Omaha, Nebraska, about whether I could continue to see a patient. And every doctor who has practiced in this country in the last 30 years knows that is what goes on. They know that patients don't have health insurance because they have a pre-existing condition. They know that people who thought they had insurance suddenly get an illness and then find out their insurance company won't cover them because of some technicality or whatever they find. They worry about their own children who finish college at age 21 or 22 and can no longer be covered on their insurance policy. But with the bill that we passed last year, those young people can be covered from age 22 to 26 until they get a job where they have health care benefits. Those are the reasons why doctors want to see this bill stay in place and be enacted.

Now, what we're going to see out here next week is political theater. I call it the Wolf in Sheep's Clothing Follies Act of 2011. We have a piece of legislation which we weren't told about today. It is exactly one page long and repeals everything that happened. It

repeals the prohibition against pre-existing condition exclusions. It allows insurers to no longer cover children over the age of 22. It sets lifetime limits again on people's insurance policies. All of that occurs here in one single piece of paper, with no debate, no committee hearings, no effort to find out what's going on out there in the community. It's a political document for a political purpose for a part of the Republican Party. It is not what the American people are actually feeling.

Now, what you will hear next week is even more interesting because we are going to get a fraudulent piece of legislative hot air. They will say, Well, yes, we are repealing ObamaCare. You know, it's strange. They never call Medicare "Johnson Medicare." It passed under President Johnson. I wonder why not. Because it was for all Americans. It's not the President. It's the body that sits here that passes the legislation that covers all Americans. And yet we are now, next week, going to be offered this piece of fraudulent hot air. It's House Resolution 9. They will say, Yes, we're repealing that, but we have this.

□ 1210

And when you read H. Res. 9, it's one page of nothing. Read it. You've got the weekend.

THE U.S. FOREST SERVICE

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, much of my district comprises forests managed by the U.S. Forest Service. Over the last 2 years, I have received a growing volume of complaints protesting the increasingly exclusionary and elitist policies of this agency. These complaints charge the Forest Service, among other things, with imposing inflated fees that are forcing the abandonment of family cabins held for generations, charging exorbitant new fees that are closing down long-established community events upon which many small and struggling mountain towns depend for tourism, expelling longstanding grazing operations on specious grounds, causing damage both to the local economy and to the Federal Government's revenues, and obstructing the sound management of our forests through a policy that can only be described as benign neglect, creating both severe fire dangers and massive unemployment.

Practiced in the marketplace, we would renounce these taxes as predatory and abusive. In the public sector, they are intolerable.

Combined, these actions evince an ideologically driven hostility to the public's enjoyment of the public's land and a clear intention to deny the public the responsible and sustainable use of that land.