

in the individual market by \$2,100 per family. The increase is because people will be forced to buy richer coverage, which will encourage them to consume even more health care.

So, you see, Mr. Speaker, the President, when he was a candidate, promised that the cost of premiums would go down by \$2,500 per year per family. It has already gone up that much, so that's a spread of about \$5,000 per year, and it's expected to go up even another \$2,100 as ObamaCare fully kicks in.

Mr. Speaker, these are the main six points that I wanted to bring out today. In closing, I would just like to say that we'll be posting, Mr. Speaker, on our Web site these promises and the others that have been broken. And I pledge, with many of my colleagues here in the House, that we will, hopefully, the beginning of next year fully repeal ObamaCare and replace it with something that's common sense, that's market-driven, that re-establishes the doctor-patient relationship and puts the choice back into the hands of the American citizen.

#### PRESERVING OUR RIGHTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, a couple of issues I want to address. I appreciate so much my friend, Dr. FLEMING, who has the adjoining district to mine, across the Sabine River over in Louisiana. He makes great points. We need to get the Federal Government out of the business of controlling people's health care. We need to get them back in the business of being a referee, making sure insurance companies and health care providers do the right thing, butt out of the business of dictating and controlling health care.

Very clear from ObamaCare, the IPAB, we got a board of 15 people going to dictate people's medical decisions for them, and, of course, all of the pandering back during the debate on ObamaCare how you can, as my friend Dr. FLEMING pointed out, the President, all those who mirror his comments, all those that read from the same teleprompter and say, oh no, you like your health care, you can keep it. You like your doctor, you can keep it. Well, we knew they were wrong. They were wrong.

So most people have already lost their health care exactly as they had it before if they liked it, and if they haven't yet, they will. That's why it was a good idea, not only to repeal the provision on that board that will dictate people's lives, what health care they can have, what they can't have. That was a good idea.

We need to repeal the whole bill. It is unconstitutional, and of course the President did us a wonderful favor by showing what many of us knew, that if ObamaCare is considered constitu-

tional—it's not, but if the courts considered it that way—then it is very clear, the President believes, and I think, under the bill, he has the authority to step on, suppress, override people's individual liberties and freedoms.

We were assured by our Founders that we were endowed by our Creator with certain unalienable rights, among those, life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Well, ObamaCare modifies that to the extent that you can have life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness only if it meets with the approval of the administration in power and the people they've put on IPAB, and what they have to say about whether you're too old to have a treatment, whether, or, like the President said in one of his town halls to a lady that said, will you at least consider the quality of life on people like my mother and whether she could get a pacemaker since she'd lived for 10 years with the pacemaker. And he said, ultimately, you know, maybe we're just better off telling your mother just take a pain pill. The part that he didn't say is take the pain pill and die. Don't live 10 years, because that's what ObamaCare will do for us.

So, hopefully, the Supreme Court Justices that will take this up and consider it will also realize that since ObamaCare gives the President the power to override the Constitution and prohibit the free exercise of religion—I'm Baptist, but, obviously, it does clearly restrict the free exercise of individual Catholics, of Catholic institutions, and that's because the President says so, because ObamaCare gives him the power to do that.

I hope that the Supreme Court Justices will take note of that. They could take judicial notice of what has been publicly done and by order, and take note of the fact that since our freedom of religion is clearly expressed in the first part of the First Amendment, and it's there in black and white, the government's not to prohibit the free exercise of religion.

And since the "privacy rights," as the Supreme Court has come to call them, are not written in the Constitution, they were somehow found in the shadow of a penumbra somewhere and, gee, if ObamaCare gives the President the power to override people's constitutional rights, for rights that are put in stated words in the Constitution, then it's certainly going to give some redneck President down the road the right to just say, you know what, the privacy rights aren't even there, and so we're setting those aside too. Just like I set aside Catholics and other religious beliefs, now we have the power to set aside a right that's not even mentioned in the Constitution.

And it ought to scare every thinking liberal—we won't get the ones that don't think—but every thinking liberal ought to have that go to their core and give them goose bumps.

Oh, my goodness. I didn't think about some redneck person possibly getting—

becoming—President because at some point the American people are going to get so fed up with having Washington dictate all of their individual decisions that they may just elect the biggest redneck they can get.

And because the Supreme Court, if it were to do the unthinkable and rule ObamaCare as constitutional, then the administration will have not only a right, they will have a duty to dictate to people how they can live, because if the Federal Government has the right, under the Constitution, to control all our health care, putting some providers out of business, picking winners and losers, telling who gets a pain pill, who gets a pacemaker, if they have the right to do that, the government has a duty to tell every person how they can live.

We're told that the Federal Government, if it wanted to, could look at every debit purchase, every credit card purchase. I mean, I got in this discussion with some government attorneys back before I ever got to Congress; and they were saying, look, if banks have the right to review all of your banking records, why shouldn't the government? I explained because the government can put us in jail and a bank can't. That's why there are protections against the government.

But ObamaCare will give the government control of our health care; and, therefore, at some point it will only make sense that they live up to their duty to say, you know what? Of course, under ObamaCare the Federal Government will have every person's health care records. It becomes the repository for everyone's most private information about their lives.

□ 1550

There's nothing in mine I'm worried about, but it is quite bothersome to think that there is nothing that can be private from the Federal Government once they have all of everybody's health care records.

Well, if they've got everybody's health care records, wouldn't it make sense at some point down the road to say: You know what? You're costing us too much money. You're not living properly. And we noted that in your health care records, you've got a 280 cholesterol level, and then we noticed you went to the grocery store and bought a pound of bacon this weekend, so we're going to have to change your health care, change the charges.

Folks, that is a reasonable conclusion of where ObamaCare has to take us if it's ruled constitutional. It's got to stop.

One other thing I want to mention, Mr. Speaker. It's been reported today in a couple of places, one in my friend Breitbart's online news blurb from A.W.R. Hawkins; another is from The Washington Post. Two different ends of the spectrum, perhaps. They're both reporting the same thing: that this administration, through Secretary Hillary Clinton, is going to announce that

it could care less what Congress has ordered about helping the enemies of Israel, about helping those who are terrorizing and persecuting Christians in Egypt and destroying churches and eliminating freedom of religion, and are saying they want to rethink their peace accord with Israel and setting themselves up to be the enemy of Israel. And now this administration, knowing that Congress passed a law that says you can't give people money in Egypt unless you can certify to certain facts—and they cannot, not honestly. If they do so now with what we know publicly, we know they will not be honest in doing so, and they're going to give \$1.5 billion, not in humanitarian aid, according to this story, not food—military aid.

So forget all of those speeches that this President gave at AIPAC: Oh, gosh. We're Israel's best friend. We're going to help them. Because, oh, no, we're going to give people who have the power to destroy Israel, on the border with Israel, military aid, as they are planning—many there make it clear they hate Israel, they hate us, and I've said over and over: We don't have to pay people to hate us. They'll do it for free.

We have to quit funding the enemy of us and the enemy of our friends. This is insane. And I hope somewhere in this administration is a cooler head that will say, Mr. President, Madam Secretary, Israel is our friend. Remember the speeches you've both given about what a friend they are? And it's time that we do not provide military aid, abetting, and assistance to people that want to destroy Christians, that want to destroy Israelis, and that want to put the world in turmoil and have everyone living exactly as they dictate. We want to keep some freedoms here and in Israel, and the way to do that is not to fund and provide military assistance to anyone unless we know they are our friend, they're Israel's friend, they're the friends of our friends.

To do otherwise will bring calamity on this country like they will not realize until it's too late.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of travel delays.

Mr. MARCHANT (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of the death of his father.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 886. An act to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemora-

tion of the 225th anniversary of the establishment of the Nation's first Federal law enforcement agency, the United States Marshals Service.

#### BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House reported that on March 08, 2012, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill.

H.R. 4105. To apply the countervailing duty provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930 to non-market economy countries, and for other purposes.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 26, 2012, at noon for morning-hour debate.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

5367. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Pyrooxasulfone; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2009-0717; FRL-9334-2] received February 13, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5368. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility [Docket ID: FEMA-2012-0003] [Internal Agency Docket No. FEMA-8219] received February 29, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

5369. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule — Removal of the Indian HOME Investment Partnerships Program Regulation [Doc. No.: FR-5568-F-01] (RIN: 2577-AC87) received February 29, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

5370. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Priority; Safe and Healthy Students Discretionary Grant Programs received February 12, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

5371. A letter from the Deputy Director for Policy, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Paying Benefits received March 1, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

5372. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Weatherization Assistance for Low-Income Persons: Maintaining the Privacy of Appli-

cants for and Recipients of Services [Docket No.: EEWAP0130] (RIN: 1904-AC16) received February 29, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5373. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Application, Review, and Reporting Process for Waivers for State Innovation [CMS-9987-F] (RIN: 0938-AQ75) received February 17, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5374. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medicaid Program; Review and Approval Process for Section 1115 Demonstrations [CMS-2325-F] (RIN: 0938-AQ46) received February 17, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5375. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medical Devices; Cardiovascular Devices; Classification of the Endovascular Suturing System [Docket No.: FDA-2012-N-0091] received February 12, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5376. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; District of Columbia, Maryland, and Virginia; Determinations of Attainment of the 1997 8-Hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard for the Washington, DC-MD-VA 8-Hour Ozone Moderate Nonattainment Area [EPA-R03-OAR-2010-0986; FRL-9634-6] received February 13, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5377. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Arkansas; Regional Haze State Implementation Plan; Interstate Transport State Implementation Plan to Address Pollution Affecting Visibility and Regional Haze [EPA-R06-OAR-2008-0727; FRL-9637-4] received February 13, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5378. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; New York; Motor Vehicle Enhanced Inspection and Maintenance Program [Docket No.: EPA-R02-OAR-2011-0687, FRL-9635-4] received February 13, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5379. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Missouri [EPA-R07-OAR-2011-0995; FRL-9634-8] received February 13, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5380. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Tennessee; Prevention of Significant Deterioration; Greenhouse Gas Tailoring Rule Revision [EPA-R04-OAR-2010-0696-201202; FRL-9635-6] received February 13, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.