

which would have the rules rigged in its favor. And if you, as an individual, did not do that, you'd have to pay a 2½ percent surcharge. And if you, in a small business, did not offer insurance to your employees you'd have to pay 8 percent.

Is that the best way to get things done? A huge, \$1.2 trillion expense on top of the TARP bill, on top of the stimulus bill, on top of the war in Iraq, on top of all the other problems that we have, we're now going to go out and spend \$1.2 trillion and tax virtually everybody in America to do it. We can also look at the Canadian or the German or the British system and see the rationing that it leads to. And we know, if you live around a border State near Canada, that when they need to see a doctor, they come to the United States of America.

And we have also seen in States like Massachusetts, where they have a government option, that it takes twice as long to see a doctor as it does in Los Angeles. We also know that this plan will do away with Medicare Advantage. I don't know if the AARP realized that when they endorsed the bill, but this not only does away with Medicare Advantage, but it cuts Medicare itself. And then, between you and the doctor comes the bureaucrat, because you don't get a second opinion under the government-run health care system. What the doctor tells you, that sticks. You can't go to three or four doctors because the bureaucrats in Washington who make the rules don't allow it.

These are things that concern me. They concern Democrats and Republicans alike, seniors and young people entering into the workforce. That's why I think we should slow this system down. And when you hear somebody say this does not require a senior citizen to have a consultant with their doctor and the government bureaucrat every 5 years, on their end-of-life plan, they're wrong because that is in the bill. Every 5 years senior citizens are supposed to report to some bureaucrat and say, here's my 5-year end-of-life plan, and as President Obama said himself, and we are going to strongly encourage hospice.

Well, you know, I'd rather have my mom make that decision as my dad, who is now dead. I'd like to have her make that decision just as he did, with his doctor, not bringing in a government bureaucrat, and not having to have some sign-off by some government bureaucrat. That should scare anybody who's parents are alive or any senior citizens.

Indeed, there are better ways to do this thing: association health plans that would allow small businesses to band together and get the economies of scale that the big purchasers of insurance can get; medical savings accounts, which would allow you to have deductibles; many other options. We can look at them. We need the time. Let's make the time count. Let's pull Democrats and Republicans together for the best product for America.

□ 1530

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

(Mr. SALAZAR 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 Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

#### SENIORS MUST CONTROL THEIR OWN HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, this body passed a cap-and-trade bill, and we had people coming down, friends across the other side of the aisle, saying this isn't going to cost jobs, that it's going to create jobs. Well, they telegraphed, every time that was said, that they'd not read the bill. They assured America that this was going to create green jobs and that it wasn't going to cost jobs.

If they'd bothered to read the bill, they would have seen that, before the 300 pages were added and, unaffected by the 300 pages, there was a fund created to pay an allowance to people who'd lost their jobs because of the bill. It also created a fund that could help them with relocation after they lost their jobs because of the bill. They just hadn't read the bill, so they were able to come down and, with righteous indignation, say it wasn't going to cost jobs. I knew they were being honest. They were just ignorant about what the bill said, but it will cost jobs, and now we're told that some of us don't care about seniors.

Mr. Speaker, I'm here because I care about seniors, and I know what that health care bill is going to do to them. It is going to put seniors on lists to get treatment. The lists will be for those who are not considered too old to be put on lists.

If you'd followed the President's own presentation in that townhall, Ms. Pam Stern pointed out her mother was nearly 100, and she needed a pacemaker. Her doctor said, because of the joy and quality of her life, she should have one, but the arrhythmia specialist said, no, not somebody her age until he met her. Then he said, Well, of course, she needs to have one. So they did and she's now 105.

So Ms. Stern asked the President, Is there any consideration to be given for a certain spirit, joy of living, quality of life, or is it just a medical cutoff?

He went into a long explanation, and ended by saying, You know what? We at least can let your mom know that,

you know what, maybe this isn't going to help, maybe you're better off not having the surgery but taking a painkiller. Taking a painkiller, when we've already seen that she had another 5 years, and the President wants to say, Well, maybe we'll just give you a painkiller and let you die?

This is going to allow seniors to die who could have a much more ongoing, productive life. There is no reason to do this.

Now, when I and my staff looked at this, the latest numbers we were able to get were from 2007 of, roughly, 112 million households in America. If you divide that into the amount of money paid into Medicare and Medicaid, it's \$9,200 per household for every household in America.

Well, once I saw that, I realized, boy, there is a way for the first time in 40-something years to give seniors control over their own health care and over their own lives. You give them \$3,500 in their own health savings accounts that they control. You give them a debit card. They have exclusive control. No insurance company can tell them what to do with it. Then you buy them private insurance, and they won't have to do like my mother-in-law did and buy supplemental insurance on top of that. You buy them good insurance. They don't need to do that. On top of that, you save the country hundreds of billions of dollars a year. Now, that puts control in seniors' hands, and it saves the country money.

This isn't about that. It is about control. This health care bill is about control. It's about taking charge of people's lives.

We had the EPA already say, since carbon dioxide is a pollutant, this body has the right to control any entity that puts out carbon dioxide. Well, maybe there are people here in the majority who can pick out individuals and say, You know what? I'm tired of them putting out carbon dioxide. It's time for them to stop. I mean that's how ludicrous it gets, except that, once you can control whether people put out carbon dioxide, you can control whether they live or not. Once you can control their health care, you can have the right to say, You know what? I noticed on your credit card purchase you bought some Twinkies last month, and therefore, we're not going to provide health care unless you quit buying those. I mean this is going to get so intrusive.

The one thing that's clear is that Orwell was 25 years early, because this is going to be so Orwellian with Big Brother looking into everyone's lives and having the right to do so once they pay for your health care. This will allow seniors to die, waiting in line for lists. Do you think that's over the top? I had a Canadian man tell me that just a few weeks ago.

His dad got put on a list for bypass surgery, and he had to wait 2 years. I said, Why did it take so long? He said, Well, the bureaucrats kept moving him back.

Let's don't kill our seniors. Let's give them control. That's what Americans should do.

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

(Ms. KAPTUR 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 North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES 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 Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO 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 Kansas (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

#### MARKING ANNIVERSARIES

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, anniversaries, marking anniversaries, is a very important thing to do, and we do that on a regular basis.

In fact, just this past week, a great deal of attention was focused on that marvelous achievement when we saw Neil Armstrong 40 years ago take that first step on the Moon. We in just a few months are going to be marking the 20th anniversary of that amazing achievement, which many of us throughout our lifetimes thought would never happen, and that was the crumbling of the Berlin Wall, and there are countless other events that take place that are regularly remembered.

The importance of remembering events that have taken place, Mr. Speaker, is that we want to do everything that we possibly can to learn from those very tragic experiences and also from the good experiences so that we can ensure that the world is a better place.

Eleven years ago at this very moment, there was a tragic occurrence here in our Nation's Capitol, and I remember it just as if it were yesterday. It was when we saw a madman come into the Capitol, what is now referred to as Memorial Door. At that door, he

brutally murdered Officer Jacob J. Chestnut and Detective John Gibson of the U.S. Capitol Police.

Mr. Speaker, in just one moment, colleagues of ours and Members of the U.S. Capitol Police are going to be, for 1 minute, taking a moment of silence to remember the lives of those heroes who were here, defending the U.S. Capitol. Earlier today, here in the House Chamber, we all know that, in remembering that occurrence of 11 years ago, we did have a moment of silence in remembrance of those great men.

At this moment, since it is now 3:40, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask that we have 1 minute of silence to remember the lives of Officer Chestnut and Detective Gibson.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I would like to continue the train of marking anniversaries.

Today, I rise to mark the occasion of the 220th anniversary of the First Congress and what is, perhaps, the most important milestone that was achieved in that first session of Congress, that being, of course, the passage of the Bill of Rights.

Two hundred twenty years ago, James Madison, a Congressman from Virginia and the Father of our Constitution, introduced a package of constitutional amendments, sparking a great, historic debate in the House of Representatives and in the Senate. This came about despite the fact that Madison had opposed the inclusion of a Bill of Rights when drafting the Constitution.

It came about because his constituents demanded it. Lives, fortunes and sacred honor had been sacrificed in the war that followed the signing of our Declaration of Independence, and many believed fervently that it would all have been in vain were it not for putting in place a Bill of Rights. The States, Mr. Speaker, went on to ratify 10 of the 12 amendments that Congress passed, the very first 10 amendments to our Constitution, which collectively are known around the world as the most enduring and comprehensive guarantor of rights in the modern world.

I believe there is great value in remembering our history as a nation and as an institution, and in examining the lessons that can be applied to our own era today. As we deal with the many challenges today—the worst recession in recent memory, two ongoing wars and a worldwide struggle that is going on against violent extremism—there is much to be gleaned from the great debates of our past, and the more we know about where we have been, the better we can understand where we are now and where we as a nation are headed.

On May 4 of 1789, James Madison announced his intention to introduce a series of amendments that would constitute the Bill of Rights that many opponents of the Constitution had sought. Though 11 of the 13 States had ratified the Constitution, there re-

mained those who opposed the Constitution and the system of federalism it established. Chief among the complaints by those who had not supported the Constitution was, as I said, the absence of a clear Bill of Rights.

As I've said, Madison, himself, had originally opposed the issue when he crafted and then, under the nom de plume Publius, joined Alexander Hamilton and John Jay and penned the Federalist Papers with the goal of defending the U.S. Constitution. But he came to see the value not only in explicitly delineating the rights of the citizens of the United States, but more importantly, he came to see the value in bringing unity to the Nation and in consolidating support for our Constitution.

On June 8 of 1789, he introduced his proposal in the House of Representatives. Two hundred twenty years ago this very week, on July 21, 1789, the matter was referred to the Rules Committee on which Madison served. After reviewing the proposal, the committee moved the amendment package to the House floor on August 14, marking the start of a very vigorous debate right in the House of Representatives where we are privileged to serve, Mr. Speaker.

□ 1545

That debate carried on for 10 days, 10 days as Members passionately argued for and against the individual amendments, passing some, amending some, and rejecting others. On August 24, the House took its final vote and passed 17 amendments sending them over to the other body, to the Senate, for consideration.

220 years ago this summer, the Senate began its debate on August 25. The debate carried on throughout the month of September and additional changes were made. Ultimately, a conference committee was convened and both the House and the Senate passed the final version on September 24 of 1789, having whittled the package down to 12 proposed constitutional amendments. As we all know, the States went on to ratify 10 of those, and Mr. Madison's Bill of Rights was incorporated into our Constitution.

Now, throughout that summer and early fall 220 years ago, many passionate arguments were made for and against the proposed constitutional amendments, but I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the most instructive debate came on June 8 when Madison first introduced his proposal in the House of Representatives. He argued vigorously for the need to pass a Bill of Rights, but he also presented a fair representation of the arguments against a Bill of Rights. He welcomed a fair, open, and spirited debate, and he wanted it to take place on the floor of the House of Representatives where it could be conducted in the light of day and within plain view of the American people.

Though Madison had previously opposed the idea, he became increasingly ambivalent, and then ultimately, as we