

flashy about any of this and avoided the spotlight. The love that they shared was palpable, the kind that we all dream of finding. I remembered her unbridled excitement about their wedding and her dreams of starting her own family.

Ashley truly enjoyed the simpler things in life, family and close friends. She cherished spending time with Dan and their three children, Shaw, Lane and Mason Grace. Neighbors have often recalled seeing her and Dan wheeling the kids around the neighborhood. Her children were her joy, the light of her life. She wanted nothing more than the very best for them, a childhood filled with love, encouragement, and support. It is difficult to imagine that they will grow up not knowing her as well as we did.

I, like so many others, have not yet come to terms with the reality that Ashley is lost to us. The idea that I will not get a call or email or text from her, just a couple of lines to say hello, is inconceivable to me. I simply cannot imagine my life without her in it.

Ashley was an exceptional young woman whose kind heart, quick wit, unwavering loyalty, and unparalleled professionalism touched the lives and hearts of all those fortunate enough to have known her. And so it is with the heaviest of hearts that I rise today to extend my deepest sympathies to her husband, Dan; her parents, Jim and Diane Westbrook; her brother, Blair; Dan's parents, Tom and Cathy; and Ashley's children, Shaw, Lane and Mason Grace. Ashley's absence has left a hole in all of our hearts that will never be filled.

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

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

#### THE PASSING OF SARGENT SHRIVER

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, America lost one of her greatest public servants this week. Sargent Shriver dedicated his life to others. He was the driving force behind the creation of Head Start and Upward Bound, opening the door to education for countless children. He was passionate about service, and through his stewardship of the Peace Corps and VISTA, gave millions of others the opportunity to serve. Sarge and his wife, Eunice, were visionary advocates for people with disabilities, and today the Special Olympics empowers young people with intellectual disabilities around the world.

Sargent Shriver's courage under fire earned him a Purple Heart for his serv-

ice in the Navy during World War II. After directing the Peace Corps and the Kennedy administration and helping launch the War on Poverty in the Johnson administration, Sargent Shriver applied his formidable talents to our Foreign Service as ambassador to France from 1968 to 1970. In 1994, President Clinton awarded Sargent Shriver the Presidential Medal of Freedom, our Nation's highest civilian honor.

Despite all these accolades and well-deserved recognition, those who knew Sargent Shriver knew that he considered his work its own reward. His life was a tireless crusade for peace and justice, willing to lend a hand wherever one was needed and building institutions that could carry his work into the future.

"When our deeds match our ideals," Sargent Shriver would say, "we will be living life as it ought to be lived." Sargent Shriver lived life as it ought to be lived.

I extend my deepest sympathies to his five children, Mark, Robert, Maria, Timothy and Anthony, and to their families. I hope they are comforted by the thoughts and prayers of all those who knew, admired, or were helped by Sargent Shriver. His legacy—the children given a head start, the volunteers whose lives were changed and who changed lives in their service around the globe, and the individuals with disabilities now treated with dignity and respect that they deserve—that legacy is with us today and will continue for years and decades and more to come.

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

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

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

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

#### HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. HURT. Mr. Speaker, the repeal of the health care law and beginning the process of replacing it with market-oriented solutions that reduce health care costs are important steps in the right direction for the people of the Fifth District of Virginia and for our Nation as a whole.

Having heard from so many of my constituents on this issue, I believe that it is essential that we repeal the government takeover of health care that raises costs, increases taxes, im-

poses burdensome mandates on small businesses, and jeopardizes quality medical care for our people.

I rise today to share an example of the real-life implications that the new health care law has had on one doctor in the Fifth District of Virginia.

□ 1210

His story is not unique. No doubt there are many others in central and Southside Virginia, as well as across the Nation, who are dealing with similar, negative ramifications of this law. His story is an important one to tell. It's a story of the hardships this legislation has caused to the people who have dedicated their lives to serving others.

In 1999, this doctor took a huge risk when he decided to sell his home and move to Charlottesville to buy and operate an Urgent Care Center. The challenges he faced in starting up his own practice did not come without sacrifice. It was over a year before he took home his first paycheck. He and his wife lived on savings and retirement money and did not know if their business would make it until 2004, 5 years later. His sacrifice and hard work proved to be a model for success. Now he has over 40,000 charts and 30 employees, and he provides high quality care to more than 16,000 patients. The average charge per patient visit remains low, while the services rendered provide good quality care, proving that health care at the primary level does not have to come with an overly expensive pricetag.

However, this doctor has made it clear in no uncertain terms that the fear and uncertainty regarding the new health care law threatens both the present and future success of his practice. Due to the tax hikes, added regulations and bureaucracy, and overall government intrusion, the doctor is no longer sure he can afford to stay in business, which means over 16,000 patients in the area served by his practice may lose access to this reliable and affordable care.

What a crushing blow to the innovators that are seeking new ways to provide quality medical care to their fellow man. What a crushing blow to the entrepreneurial spirit for those who are seeking to succeed. And what a crushing blow to the very spirit upon which our Nation was founded. This is just one example of why it is critical and necessary to repeal the government takeover of health care.

To ensure that doctors in the Fifth District can keep their doors open and that the people of the Fifth District of Virginia can continue to afford quality health care, it is critical that we find replacement measures that seek to truly keep costs low while removing the government from the patient-doctor relationship.

We have a great deal of work ahead, Mr. Speaker, but I'm committed to continuing to find the health care solutions that are in the best interest of all central and Southside Virginians.

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

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

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

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

#### GOVERNMENT OVERSPENDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. AKIN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. AKIN. Mr. Speaker, it is a treat to be able to join you and my colleagues today, and at the beginning of a new year, take on a subject that we have been aware of and increasingly conscious of, the problems relative to our economy, to jobs, but particularly to the Federal Government and its voracious appetite to overspend.

I'm joined by a number of distinguished colleagues today. I think it should be an interesting discussion. We're going to try to keep it simple and look at the big picture and look at the choices that America faces.

Along those lines, here is a sort of a by-the-numbers projection for this year, 2011. And you see sort of a bar graph, these tubes here. This top one is \$3.834 trillion, that's \$3.8 trillion, and that's what it's expected that the Federal Government is going to spend, \$3.8 trillion. The problem here is this other little thing here. This is the income projection. And that's \$2.6, if you round a trillion. So 2.6 versus 3.8, which, you can tell by the length of them that we are spending more money than we are taking in. People that have tried to run a budget at home understand that's a very easy thing to have happen, to spend more money than what you have coming in. And the Federal Government has that problem, and it has it big-time. In this case, the difference between the two is more than \$1 trillion.

And so that's what we're going to take a look at. And what can we do about it isn't so much a matter if you are a liberal or a conservative really, the fact is it's mathematics. We're spending a whole lot more than we're taking in. And so that is the problem we're going to take a look at. When you do that year after year, spend more than you take in, you start to develop a debt. In our case, we've got a \$14 trillion debt. So you have a deficit of \$1.6 trillion, but you keep adding these things every year, and pretty soon you build this debt up. And the

problem with the debt is that you have to pay interest on the money that you borrowed. And so that also makes things worse. And so now you take a look at the fact that not only are we spending about one-third more than what we have, but we've been doing a bad job of controlling our spending.

In the past, we have also cranked up this debt. The effect of that is that one of the things that comes as far as spending is your cost of the debt service, so the more that you borrow, the more you have to pay interest on your debt, and therefore it just compounds the situation, making it worse. So that's the lineup.

So let's take a look at, well, where are we spending all this money? And one of the things that people that are looking at numbers take a look at is three fairly big what are called entitlements. Entitlements mean that somewhere along the line, the Congress passed a law, and the law works like a little machine. It just spits money out. And anybody who meets certain parameters, the machine will just give them some money. And that's called an entitlement. And so depending on what the entitlement is, it just spends money. And Congress doesn't have to do anything. The money just gets spent. And it is called an entitlement.

The three big ones, of course, are Medicaid, Medicare, and Social Security. And if you project over time how much money those entitlements are going to spend, you find that they are growing. They are growing because of people such as myself, a baby boomer. The baby boomers are getting older, and there's a whole lot of them, and there are not as many people working to pay into the system. And so the cost of these entitlements go up.

And as you see in this chart right here, this is the typical revenue that we get from taxes coming in. It is running at 18 percent. You can see it goes up and down as we have more or less taxes depending on who is in charge of the White House and the Congress. But it averages now, over since 1965, it's averaging about 18 percent. And you see this point out here at 2052 where these three entitlements are going to use up the entire budget. There won't be any money for anything else other than just these three things.

Unfortunately, this chart is optimistic because this is only including these three entitlements. We have other entitlements also. And in fact, at this point we have come really pretty close to it even today.

So our entitlement spending, when you look at the big bar chart up here, pretty much, of our income—about \$2.5 trillion, pretty much that income is spent today on various entitlements. It's not just Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security. But there are two other categories, miscellaneous entitlements, that would be things like food stamps and public housing, stuff like that, but also debt service, because you have to keep paying the interest

on debt. You put that all together, and that's just about what we've got for income. So we've got ourselves some challenges.

And I'm glad that I don't have to solve all this problem, but we have got some very smart people that are going to join and talk a little bit about this, what are our alternatives and what should we be doing.

The first is a freshman who is already distinguishing himself in the Congress, BILL JOHNSON. He is from Ohio. We are thankful that Ohio sent one of their great sons here, somebody who first of all has a background as a chief information officer in a global manufacturing company. "Information officer" means people that deal with the transfer of data and information, but also the data processing side of a company, which is really the communications and lifeblood of a company. He is also somebody who served our country faithfully as an officer in the United States Air Force.

BILL JOHNSON, it's a treat to have you on the floor. We're glad you got elected. You've heard the opening here. We've got a bit of a problem. In fact, we've got a problem that's so big that a lot of people are kind of—in Missouri we have an expression, hunker down like a toad in a hailstorm. A lot of people look at this and they go, oh, my goodness, what are we going to do?

So let's talk about that for a minute.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Well, Mr. Speaker, and to my distinguished colleague from Missouri, thank you so very much for the opportunity to be here. You're exactly right, and you've pointed it out so well. We have a disease here in Washington, and that disease is called "overspending." And it is, by and large, what has brought us economically to where we are today. And the debt that we see is the symptom of that disease.

It's amazing to me how many in D.C., how many in the administration and in the previous Congress, really believe that we can borrow, tax, and spend our way back to prosperity. As a businessman, as a graduate from a business school—I have a minor in business administration—I don't think that there is a business theory in place that says that you can prosper that way.

□ 1220

Mr. AKIN. Let me just stop you. I want to cut in on you.

What you are saying is most businessmen, if you tell them we are having trouble with overspending so what we are going to do is spend some more, they are going to laugh you out of the shop; is that basically what it boils down to?

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. That's right. You know, that kind of thinking has never been good for families. It has never been good for businesses, and it certainly is not good for America. We see where that has left us. Your charts point out that we are on the path to a train wreck here. Yet we see policies