

or at least scaling them down, will not move unless the Speaker, Speaker PELOSI, says that is a good idea and she will post the bill.

The legislation that you spoke about at the top of hour regarding the discharge petition that the Republican leader has that would expand earmark information to not just appropriation bills but also to authorizing legislation, to clean up some of the areas that have given them the latitude to actually continue to hide this information from the American public. That piece of legislation will not move unless the Democrat Party and Speaker PELOSI finally hear from the American public and realize this is what the American public wants us to do and wants us to move that legislation.

It is still early in the evening. It is only a quarter of 9. I am sure Speaker PELOSI is in her office or somewhere in the Capitol as we speak. I would invite her to come to the floor right now and join us with either one of those pieces of legislation. Maybe you could recite the words right back to her that she said some time ago, and remind her of what she said when it comes to the issue of giving transparency and openness. I would invite her to come to the floor and join us in this debate this evening, to say she will move these, will move these things in the next days, weeks. Just before the winter holiday so when we leave here in the next several weeks or months, they, we can say in the first session of the 110th Congress we finally gave the American public what they were promised when the Democrat majority came into Congress. I will eagerly await her arrival here.

Mr. GINGREY. The gentleman is exactly right. The Speaker could say forget about Minority Leader BOEHNER's discharge petition, we are going to bring it up under regular order. We are going to do the right thing. We are going to do what I, Madam Speaker, said she would do in September of 2006.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to be here tonight and I thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) for taking this hour and to say to colleagues on both sides of the aisle, I think most of my colleagues would agree, even though I had to rebut the four outstanding freshmen Democrats that had the previous hour regarding the SCHIP program.

I think most of my colleagues would agree that I am not a real partisan Member, and I enjoy comity. That is the way I think it should be. But we have a problem here in River City, whether it is Republican leadership or Democratic leaders.

Mr. Speaker, I truly believe that the party, if it becomes partisan, the party that will take hold of this idea and pledge to the American people that we are going to do something about it once and for all, and as Mr. FLAKE has said to me often, it is one thing to air out our laundry, but we need to clean it. We don't need to just air it, we need

to clean it up. I agree with him completely. Again, I think the party that will adopt that or fight for it is the party that either deserves to keep their majority or regain their majority.

### 30-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SPACE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to address the House. My good friend, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY), we have traveled together and served together. I want that chart that he has. I keep asking him for it. About how when Democrats take control, pork barrel spending is cut in half. I appreciate it. I am glad for his accuracy.

It is so good to serve with my colleagues up here in Washington, D.C. I am here with my good friend, Congresswoman WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Our districts neighbor each other in south Florida. We have been good friends for a long time. We are here tonight part of the 30-Something Working Group.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, we come to the floor once, twice, and when we can three times a week to share with Members issues we are working on here.

We want to make sure that all of the Members are fully aware of what is happening in Iraq. As of today, October 17, 10 a.m. report, there have been 3,824 deaths in Iraq. The total number wounded in action and returned to duty is 15,604. The total number of wounded in action not returning to duty is 12,674.

We want to make sure that is not only a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but that every Member of Congress understands the sacrifice those who are in harm's way are making. And those of us who are policymakers, that we make sure that we take the appropriate steps to do away with that number continually going up on a daily basis.

Mr. Speaker, I want to turn it over to my colleagues that are here, but tonight I just want to take a point because the President today had a press conference. We did some good things. We gave out a Congressional Gold Medal today, and the President decided to release a press release driving over to the Capitol here.

It was very interesting. In his statements he said that the 110th Congress, Democratic-controlled Congress, whether it be House or Senate, they need to go to work. That is interesting because I have record-breaking information here. We have taken more roll-call votes than any other Congress in the history of the United States of America. We are working 5 days a week in many cases. We have deaths or what have you. We have to pause for that. And national holidays and religious holidays that need to be recognized because there is sensitivity towards that.

But I can't understand, we start talking about going to work. Let me read down the list of things we have done. The 9/11 Commission recommendations, all of them, to protect America from terrorism, passed. And the President said he wasn't going to sign it, but the American people pushed him and said they wanted to be safe, and he finally signed it.

The largest college aid expansion since 1944, the GI bill, saving the average American \$4,400. The President said he would never sign that bill. Because of the hard work of Members that voted for that bill, and these are bipartisan votes. I want to make sure that those who are paying attention to what we are saying here on the floor, those Members and Americans, that they understand this is not a Democratic message, this is a bipartisan message on behalf of the people of this country.

The minimum-wage increase which raised the minimum wage for some 13 million Americans, passed and signed into law. The President said he wasn't going to sign that, but it was such a good piece of legislation. People wanted it to happen for many, many years. We said we will not allow the Members of Congress to receive a pay raise until we give the American people a pay raise.

Innovation agenda to promote 21st century jobs, passed and signed into law. All of this was signed into law at like 7:30 on a Friday evening as the President is leaving to go to Camp David.

Again, tough lobbying and ethics reforms that many of the independent reform groups are so happy that finally passed off this floor, through the Senate, and signed into law.

Reconstruction assistance for the gulf coast disaster hurricanes, never would have happened, Mr. Speaker, if it wasn't for the push of this Democratic Congress. Actually, I remember when they had two amendments that came to the floor, one to give assistance to the victims of Hurricane Katrina and Hurricane Rita, and one to continue the funding for the war for 3 months, they came in two amendments, never would have happened if it wasn't for a Democratic-controlled Congress pushing it through.

Expansion of life-saving medical research stem cells, passed on a bipartisan vote, vetoed by the President. Okay.

Again, health care for 10 million children and working families, passed by a bipartisan vote. A bipartisan vote which tomorrow, and we are going to talk about that here tonight, the Senate has the votes to override the President and there are some Republicans that are saying that they are going to take that vote. We have a problem here in the House because we don't have some of our friends, and I do mean some of our friends because some of our friends on the Republican side of the aisle are going to be voting with Democrats. Not with Democrats, but just to

vote on behalf of children in the United States of America. We are falling eight or 10 short of those votes. I want the Members to be aware of that.

The largest veterans increase in the 77-year history of the VA passed this House and we are still waiting on it to make it through the process and hopefully the President won't veto that.

Landmark energy independence and global warming initiative, that is something that is very, very important. Also, we have other pieces of legislation that are out there.

Actually since the partisan politics started, not partisan, but some of the folks being partisan on this, 45 that we had last time of Republicans that joined Democrats on that bipartisan vote, so that's not 10, that's not 15, that's not 20, that is 45 of our Republican colleagues that, because of the Democratic leadership bringing it to the floor, knew it was a good idea and voted on behalf of their districts.

With that, I want to make sure, just in case someone gets confused about that issue, because we are going to talk about SCHIP. We are going to do a hard push on SCHIP because this is about children's health care, and it is very, very important.

I yield to Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Thank you. It is wonderful to be here with my good and long-time friend, Mr. MEEK of Florida, and our relatively new friend, Mr. ALTMIRE from Pennsylvania. I have to tell you, Mr. ALTMIRE, it has been such a pleasure to have the 41 new freshmen Members of our Democratic Caucus join us in being able to move this country in a new direction. It has really injected a vibrancy, a new vibrancy, an energized vibrancy, into our caucus. You guys are fresh from the campaign trail, as Speaker PELOSI always talks about. You came with stories from the grass roots and talking about things that people in America care about.

Oftentimes what happens in this institution here, we get a little stale and crusty. When we are all making, many of us, policy thousands of miles away from our constituents. Myself and Mr. MEEK, we are a thousand miles from our constituents. You are a good 2 or 3-hour drive from yours. Mr. MURPHY is a little further than that. It becomes easy to be desensitized to what the real needs and concerns are. We get wrapped up in how important Congress supposedly is, and that is when it gets dangerous.

That is what happened to our friends on the other side of the aisle when they were in charge over the last 2 years. They were engulfed by a culture of corruption. They really engaged in the priorities of K Street and the priorities of the wealthiest people in America instead of the priorities of the average working family, and that is what SCHIP is all about. That is what the Children's Health Insurance Program is all about. It is about getting basic health care, not to people who make a

lot of money, not to people who have private health insurance as the President has said who would supposedly drop it if they were suddenly eligible for SCHIP, but for people who are the working poor, the people who fall in the huge gap that exists between not qualifying for Medicaid and not being able to afford to buy either the insurance that your employer provides you or buying it on your own.

So what that means is that if you don't have a children's health insurance program that your child is eligible for and that your child has access to, then you are using the emergency room as your primary means of health care. So I am so glad we had the infusion of energy from your class, Mr. ALTMIRE and Mr. MURPHY, so we could make sure we could pass bipartisan legislation like the Children's Health Insurance Program.

Mr. MEEK referred to the President's comments about how Congress needs to get to work. Again, it is funny. It is humorous. It is actually sad. I joined Congress in the 109th Congress, the term before Mr. MURPHY and Mr. ALTMIRE, and a couple of terms after Mr. MEEK. We were in session in the 109th Congress a total of 89 days.

□ 2100

Now how many days are there in a year?

Mr. ALTMIRE. 365.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Okay. And I actually don't know how many of those 365 days are weekends. So, you know, if you discount those, I can't really calculate the math that quickly, but just a couple hundred, right, couple hundred days, and we were in session for 89. It was a record low for the history of the Congresses. We were known as the do nothingest of do nothing Congresses.

So I think the President needs to take a look at history, maybe open a history book, maybe open a book, and take a look at what actually goes on here in the 110th since Democrats took control versus what was going on for the last 12 years.

We're about making sure that we get the America people's priorities in focus: children's health insurance; making sure that we can focus on alternative energy sources; making sure we can expand health care for more individuals; truly end America's addiction to foreign oil; recognize that global warming is a problem and not just say that it is and do nothing. We want to make sure that the future is really bright for the American people.

Mr. ALTMIRE. I wanted to talk a little bit about what the President said today as well, and he focused his remarks in large part on the SCHIP vote that we're going to take tomorrow in this House. This, as we speak, is the day before we're going to take a vote on whether or not to override the veto that the President put forward on a plan that passed with overwhelming bipartisan support from both Houses.

Sixty-seven Members of the United States Senate and 265 Members of the House voted for the SCHIP bill, bipartisan.

And one of the things the President put forward today and has said in the past as well, we need to compromise; we need to come together. Well, I would say to the President, Mr. Speaker, that we have, in fact, made substantial compromise. We have come together as Republicans and Democrats. We put forward a bill in the House. The Senate put forward a bill. We conferenced a bill. We came to an agreement that passed with overwhelming support among both parties. We sent it to the White House, and the President, as he certainly is able to do under the Constitution and is his right to do so, he vetoed the bill, and we're going to have a vote tomorrow on whether or not to override the veto.

But don't pretend that this was not a compromise piece of legislation that took weeks and months to hammer out the details and to work together with Republicans and Democrats alike, voting to support this piece of legislation that enjoys 70 to 80 percent approval in the country according to recent polls.

I wanted to talk a little bit about what the President said were his problems with the SCHIP bill, and one of the things that he continues to throw out there as well: this is socialized medicine; this is a big Federal Government program that's a movement towards Big Government health care. And that just could not be further from the truth.

Let's take a look at what the SCHIP program is. This is a capped block grant. The money is capped from the Federal level. It's sent to the States and the States carry out the program. It's a State-administered program, and almost every State in the country contracts out their SCHIP program in the private health insurance market, in the private market. So this could not be further from the big Federal Government takeover of socialized medicine scheme. It's administered in the private market.

We could spend our entire hour here tonight listening to groups that have endorsed this bill, but for the purposes of refuting what the President says, I would point to the health insurance industry in this country, which is certainly never going to support anything that's remotely close or a movement towards federalized health care, socialized medicine. They support this legislation, as does, as Speaker PELOSI often says, everyone alphabetically from the AARP to the YWCA. This has overwhelming support around the country, overwhelming support among Republicans and overwhelming support among Democrats.

So, again, the President's welcome to veto this bill. He's able to do so, and he exercised that right, but let's be truthful about what's really in this piece of legislation.

He talks about how it affects families making up to \$83,000. Well, what are

the facts behind that claim? Where did that number come from? That comes from the fact, as I said, this is administered by the States, and I would welcome my friend from Ohio, Mr. RYAN, as well, who has taken a break from watching the Cleveland Indians to-night.

We have \$83,000 as 400 percent of poverty. There was one State in the country, New York State, applied for a waiver. Four hundred percent of poverty they wanted to cover. That waiver was denied. It did not take effect. No other State in the country does it.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. I would like you to just yield for a minute because, as you know, in the 30-something Working Group we always enjoy seeing our friends come by, and the majority whip came to the floor, heard we were talking about children's health care, and thought he would just stop by and share something with the Members, and I yield to him.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the 30-somethings for allowing me to intrude on their discussion here this evening.

I think that tomorrow when we come before the American people to take a vote on whether or not we ought to override the President's veto, it's a very important program. I think it's important for the American people to think about a couple of mischaracterizations that have gone on concerning this program.

First of all, we are hearing our friends on the other side call this Children's Health Insurance Program some kind of step towards socialized medicine. I find that very strange that when the President came before the American people, asking for a second term, at his convention, when he accepted the nomination, he called for an expansion of the Children's Health Insurance Program, and I think we ought to ask ourselves how can a program be socialized medicine for 10 million children but it's not socialized medicine for 6 million children. I think that it says something about the commitment that the President made to the American people and to his own party at his last nominating convention.

Second mischaracterization I think that the American people ought to really think about, and that is the accusation that this Congress, our party, the Democratic Party is ignoring poor children by pushing this program. The fact of the matter is lower-income children will have an opportunity through Medicaid. That's there now. It's been there for a long time.

SCHIP was not designed for that purpose. This program was designed as middle-income relief, relief for middle-income families, for families whose children are in need of health care, but their incomes are a little bit too high for them to qualify for Medicaid but not high enough for them to be able to afford the health care that they need in the private market.

So I think that tomorrow, as we get ready to say to the American people

exactly what our values are, I think that the people who are planning to vote to sustain this veto ought to ask themselves what is it that I'm doing, and I think that what they will be doing would be denying health care, denying to children, they will be denying relief to the middle-income families who work every day trying to make ends meet, but while they're trying to feed their families, to provide for their educations, to shelter them, they do not have enough left to afford the kind of health care that they need.

So I want to thank you all for highlighting this program this evening, and I know that for the 30-somethings it may not be all that important now but for us 60-somethings, this is a mighty important program for our grandchildren, and thank you so much for allowing me to intrude this evening.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Thank you for joining us.

Mr. ALTMIRE. It was great to hear from one of the true giants of this House, the distinguished whip from South Carolina, Mr. CLYBURN. Thank you for joining us tonight.

I was talking about this \$83,000 income level that the President continues to throw out there, and it's factually inaccurate. It's just completely false.

As I was saying, the history of it is New York State, one State in this country, applied for a waiver, attempting to reach the 400 percent of poverty level. That waiver was denied, never took effect. Those families were not covered, but the President uses that as his example of what could happen if we put this legislation forward.

Well, the reality is, as under current law, it doesn't change in our bill; it would have to be approved. Any change in income up to that level would have to be approved by the administration. So if the President did not want to see any State move forward, he would say that that is denied, as it was denied when New York State tried to put that forward.

So to say that the \$83,000 figure is the reason for his veto is just factually inaccurate, at least using it as an example.

Importantly, the bill that we passed limits the Federal matching percentage and gives States a strong disincentive for going above 300 percent of poverty which would be about \$62,000. So the States have a strong incentive to not even attempt to go above 300 percent of poverty; and as I said, it's inaccurate for the President to say that that's the reason for his veto.

So I'll continue a little bit later on that, but we're joined by Mr. MURPHY from Connecticut, and I mentioned earlier that Mr. RYAN from Ohio has been watching the baseball playoffs. Well, unfortunately, Mr. MURPHY from Connecticut is on the other end of that.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. We needed an off night tonight. We got an off night from the playoffs. So those of us that wallowed in the Boston defeat

are glad to have a little separation to let our team regroup and rethink how they're going to approach this.

It's rare that we have five members of the 30-somethings here. As the two new Members here, I want to make sure we understand our place. So I'm going to be very, very brief and just say this: To add on to all the great reasons why we should do this, this is reaching out to families that have done everything that we've asked them to do; they're playing by the rules. They simply can't afford insurance in a market in which in a State like Connecticut you're going to pay \$8,000 or \$9,000 out of pocket before an insurance company picks up dollar one for the average family plan that you look at on a lot of these insurance programs.

It's the right thing to do because it saves money in the long run because you're getting preventative care to the kids that are going to end up sick and in the hospital later on and end up costing the system way more money because you didn't invest in prevention and end up paying for crisis care.

I think it's also important to note that this bill is paid for. This bill is part of an effort here in this Congress to advance some of the most important programs in the middle class. We're talking about health care programs, student loan programs, minimum wage and do it in a way that doesn't add to this enormous, unfathomable deficit that the Republican Congress put us under.

Let's just talk about the facts, because Mr. RYAN and Mr. MEEK especially talked about this over and over and over again on the floor here.

When the Republicans took control, they had a \$5.6 trillion surplus that President Clinton left them with. They have now turned it into, along with this President, a \$2 trillion 10-year deficit. The debt which started at the beginning of the President's administration at \$5.7 trillion has ballooned to \$9 trillion.

So our biggest task here is to make sure that we don't add to that just unbelievable amount of money that this country and every single citizen here owes, and guess what, we are able to do that, to pass a 5-year budget that's going to be balanced after 5 years, to pass a rule that mandates that we don't spend a dime of new money without accounting for how we pay for it. We're able to run the most fiscally responsible Congress that this country has seen in a very long time, while maintaining our commitment to expand programs that help the middle class.

That's what we have to remember when we talk about this SCHIP bill, the children's health bill, is that this isn't more deficit spending. This is targeted spending on people who need it, the middle class. It's paid for.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Remember the beginning of this Congress that we gave an opportunity for every Member of this House to vote against paying the

oil companies about \$14 billion in oil subsidies, and a lot of our friends, who are now voting against the SCHIP for fiscal responsibility reasons, voted to make sure that we could not take that basically corporate welfare that we were giving to the oil companies. They voted to sustain basically that corporate welfare that was going to the oil companies.

But it's important for us to recognize that Members of the Republican Party, the same Members who were voting against SCHIP, voted against the Democrats pulling the money from the oil companies and putting it back into alternative energy, to health care, to education, all these. You had this opportunity to do this, and they refused to do it.

□ 2115

And to say now that you are going to draw the line in the sand, Mr. ALTMIRE, you are going to draw the line in the sand on children's health care after raising the debt limit, as the gentleman from Connecticut just mentioned, five times they have asked to borrow more money from China, from Japan, from OPEC countries. Now you are going to draw the line in the sand on children's health care?

Now, people are sitting at home saying, I don't know a whole lot about politics, Mr. Speaker, but my goodness gracious, you are picking this battle now on the backs of children. And I don't know, I didn't get to hear your whole argument on socialism. But my question is this. If everyone is saying that this is socialism, that this is somehow a socialistic step towards national socialized medicine, why are you negotiating it in the first place?

Mr. MEEK of Florida. And the good thing about the 30-Something, we really get into a conversation about this. And behind you, you can see, I will let you explain that chart there. But I want Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and I just to share a little bit. You say that everyone is saying that it is socialized medicine. That is not the case. Do you know who is saying that? The Bush administration. Do you know who else is saying that? Our friends on the Republican side that are not even thinking about health care. They are thinking about how I need to protect the GOP philosophy on Capitol Hill. Not in America.

Let me just read this here. CBS News poll that was taken says, and here the headline goes and you can go on, it says CBSnews.com. Don't believe me. You can go on there if you don't believe what I am telling you. This came right off of this sheet here: Do you favor or oppose expanding the children's health care plan? Eighty-one percent said I am in favor of it. I am in favor of the Democratic plan. And the headline goes: Most backed Democrats and kids health care fight. It says, those that oppose, 15 percent.

So, Mr. RYAN, when we look at that, we have to look at it for what it is

worth. And I know Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ has something from the USA Today. And I will yield back, but I want to share that with you, Mr. RYAN.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I just want to say, the argument that you are going to hear over the next day is socialism. As the gentleman from Florida just said, it is like, what are you talking about? Go in to private hospitals, private doctors, there is no question that this is privately administered. But here is the question. If we peel it back \$1 billion or \$5 billion, is that all of a sudden not socialism anymore? I mean, at what number do we get to where it stops becoming socialism and it starts becoming a private, some kind of health care system?

The arguments, the strawmen, the red herrings that have been put up on this debate are absolutely ridiculous. And I can't believe the President would draw the line in the sand and just have no arguments to back it up.

Mr. ALTMIRE. Let me add one quote to build on that, Mr. RYAN. This is from one of our Republican colleagues who seems to get this. DAVID HOBSON, a Republican, pretty reasonable.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. From Ohio. A good guy.

Mr. ALTMIRE. Talking about the President, he said, "I don't know who is advising him up there, but the President is really out of touch. It is too little, too late for him to be a fiscal conservative. He should have vetoed the farm bill. Now, he is against the SCHIP bill, and he wants \$190 billion more for the war."

So there are Republicans who get this. The President and a lot of these so-called fiscally conservative Republicans are Johnny-come-latelies on this issue. All of a sudden, after ballooning deficits and skyrocketing spending, now, when it comes to kids' health they are going to all of a sudden be fiscal conservatives. So it is nice; we are talking about this year's Democrats, but there are some Republicans who get that as well.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. MURPHY, Mr. RYAN, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. MEEK, we in the 30-Something Working Group generally try to make sure that the people that are able to listen to us, our colleagues, the Speaker, and anyone else within the sound of our voice, when we do these round robin conversations on the House floor we ask people not to take our word for it. We ask people to look at the third-party validators that we present on the floor and judge for themselves. We are presenting the facts here, not just making stuff up and talking in flowery sound bites.

Let's look at today's editorial in USA Today. What they said today about the President's veto and what action Congress should take tomorrow is our view on the children's health program. Bush Gives Bogus Answers to the \$83,000 Question. That is the headline on the editorial. In summary, the main quote which summarizes the body

of their editorial is that, "Bush's claim is misleading at best, simply wrong at worst. The House would do well to look past the President's deceptive rhetoric and override his veto." That is USA Today's editorial from today.

We are going to cast this vote tomorrow, my friends, and people have a choice. When they swore to uphold the Constitution, at the same time we know that they made a commitment to their constituents to stand up for them; and that when you represent your constituents in government, you are supposed to do that and be there for people who don't have a voice. That is what this vote is about. It is who is for kids, and who stands with the President. It is very stark, very black and white.

Mr. ALTMIRE. I want to talk about that very point. The editorial that you held up hits the nail precisely on the head. If you are the President of the United States and you want to veto this bill, at least be factually accurate and honest about why you are vetoing the bill.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. ALTMIRE, I mean, factually, you said factually accurate? This whole administration is about misperception. It is about look right, we are going left. I mean, it is not about that. The good thing about it, Mr. ALTMIRE, is that you were elected and your colleagues were elected in this last Congress that brought about that paradigm shift. And that wasn't because it was something great that an individual did; that was the fact that the American people wanted to move in a new direction. Now we are moving in that new direction. We have the same game, but the Congress is changing, and we are not going to allow that to happen. And I am glad that the Speaker is saying, listen, we are going to insure 10 million children, period, dot, and we are going to stand there.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. The only thing I want to jump in on, Mr. ALTMIRE, is that the bottom line is that the track record of this administration is that generally the facts are not on the side of their argument, so they have to make it up. I mean, that has been their M.O. the entire, we are on 7 years now, their entire administration. When the facts aren't on your side, make it up. And just like Mr. MEEK has said repeatedly on this floor during our working group sessions, make it up and repeat it over and over and over again, and hopefully people will believe it is true. Only the people are on to them now.

Mr. ALTMIRE. We have had many 30-Something sessions on that very topic and a variety of issues. My point on the SCHIP bill and the veto override vote we are taking tomorrow is, if you are going to threaten to veto or you are going to veto the bill and justify the veto, be honest about why you are doing it. Just say, "Look, I don't agree with expanding the program. I don't think this is a good program. I don't want to do it." That is his prerogative

to make that case. Don't say it is too expensive when it doesn't cost one additional penny, it doesn't add one additional penny to the Federal deficit. This bill is paid for. It doesn't add one penny. Don't say it is too expensive.

We talked about the \$83,000 in your chart and the USA Today, and everybody who has looked at this knows that is a false statement, to say that this allows you to go up to \$83,000 unchecked, and the socialized medicine that we talked about. Don't throw those out there, because they are not only not true, they are blatantly false. So don't say that is why you are vetoing the bill. Just say, "I don't like this program. I don't want to expand it. I don't want to give health care to 10 million children." That is his prerogative to say that. That would be a more accurate statement than the reasons he is giving us to veto this bill.

We have four people who want to speak.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. RYAN wants to say something, but I want Mr. MURPHY to say something because he stood up and he likely had something he wanted to share. Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and I are always willing to share, because we have a whole notebook full of stuff that we are just ready to take off on.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. I don't have notebooks; I just have loose scraps of paper. I haven't reached that level of organization of veteran Members like yourselves.

Let me talk about one more myth. There is not a bill that comes before this House, and you and I, Mr. ALTMIRE, are new here, so we are figuring this out as we go along. But there is not a bill that comes before this House that somebody on the other side doesn't scream "illegal immigrants" over. Right? That is just sort of the buzz word that accompanies every bill here.

We had a Native American housing bill before this House a couple of weeks back, and somebody on the other side filed an amendment to make sure that no Native American housing benefits went to illegal immigrants. Now, I know that we run our programs pretty inefficiently in this country, but you have to really mismanage the Native American housing program in order to give some of the housing to illegal immigrants.

So what they are saying on the other side is that this children's health care bill is going to go to illegal immigrants. Not true. Find me anywhere in that bill that allows for that. In fact, Mr. ALTMIRE, it doesn't even allow for those health care benefits as part of the SCHIP program to go to legal immigrants, people who have their papers, did everything right, are waiting to become citizens of this country. They can't get the children's health care program under this bill.

Mr. ALTMIRE. It is expressly prohibited under the bill.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. It lays it out, black and white. So yet another

example of if you say it over and over again and you hope that people believe it. As we have said over and over, the agenda here is pretty clear. Republicans and the President simply do not want this Congress to extend basic foundational health care rights to middle-class, to kids, and they are coming up with all sorts of crazy arguments that don't have truth, a strain of truth in them to try to stop them.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I just hope our friends who are opposing this bill to cover children's health care because of the cost of it, which we are paying for, will scrutinize the Iraq spending as it starts to come up over the next few weeks and few months. As we went over already, one day in Iraq, \$330 million would cover 270,000 kids for a year for this program. That is one day. And if you go through 1 week, \$2.3 billion would cover 1.8 million kids. And less than 40 days in Iraq would cover all of these kids that we want to cover, 10 million kids, for 1 year. Forty days in Iraq. And all we are saying is our priority is this.

Now, I just want to take a minute here to just go over what has happened over the past 8 or 9 or 10 months here in Congress, what we have done, how we have shifted the priorities. We have the same Members who are voting against this bill who voted against the minimum wage increase. We have the same Members who are going to vote against the children's health care bill are the same members who voted against us increasing the Pell Grant and cutting the interest rates for college loans in half, the same group of folks.

When we wanted to invest all this money in alternative energy research, we took it from the oil companies, corporate welfare, put it into alternative energy research. The same group of folks that voted against this SCHIP bill, children's health care bill, voted against that, too. And all of these issues come up. The only thing we can get them to agree on is probably the veterans spending, which was the largest increase in the history of the VA.

So what we are saying is there is a pattern, Mr. Speaker, there is a pattern of behavior of a certain fringe group of people who are here that even very conservative people have agreed with us on this issue, and we can't get enough to override the veto.

I don't know about you guys, but I have got a little restaurant I go to back home called Vernon's Restaurant, Vernon's Cafe, great Italian. But when you are sitting there and you are eating and you are talking to your friends who go through everyday life, they are talking about their student loans, they are talking about health care, they are talking about what are we going to do to stimulate the economy? Why are we so dependent on foreign oil? And we all have our own little Vernon's in all of our communities. We are trying to address these bread and butter economic issues, and I think we have in this Con-

gress. And the one that lays before us here is children's health care. For God's sake, Mr. Speaker, God help us if we can't pass children's health care.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. RYAN, it is good that all of us agree here that is on the floor here tonight, along with hundreds of other Members of Congress. But it only takes a very small percentage of numbers to say "no."

And what is interesting, Mr. RYAN, when we start talking about fact versus fiction; be accurate if you are going to share something. Accuracy is not necessarily a value here in Washington, D.C. We pride ourselves, Mr. Speaker, here on the 30-Something Working Group, we go through a lot of pain and suffering and research and all of that to make sure that what we are sharing with the American people is actually fact and not fiction. If we had more fact, we would have better policymaking here in Washington, D.C.

The fact that the President would say, oh, well, you know, the Democratic Congress needs to go to work, when we broke records in the history of the Republic of 980 rollcall votes. And that is not just post offices. That is major policy that has passed off this floor.

Still saying that, what Mr. RYAN is saying, the bottom line is as we go into the last closing minutes of our time here on the floor, the bottom line is we are going to see a separation from those that are willing to lead and those that are willing to follow tomorrow.

□ 2130

There's going to be a supermajority vote to vote for children's health care to override the President of the United States. The only time he ever vetoed a piece of legislation last Congress was dealing with the stem cell research bill, and he did that. Okay. But now, every week he's threatening a veto. He's threatening a veto.

Mr. RYAN, over there, has a chart that shows how record oil prices under the Bush administration are continuing to climb to today's oil prices rate that is at the top, that's record-breaking at the top.

Meanwhile, we're around here trying to provide health care for children. We have a war that's going on that the President is willing, you know, to say, oh, well, it's okay for us to borrow from foreign nations to continue a war in Iraq, but we're not willing to provide health care for our own children.

And the sad part, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ said funny and then we agreed on sad, the sad part is the fact that these are American children. I mean, I've been to Iraq. Mr. ALTMIRE and I have been to Iraq recently, and some of the Members here, we've been. And the real issue is this, is the fact that we went into a health care facility. Iraqi children there are getting health care. I mean, you have U.S. troops that are in neighborhoods that are giving shots and evaluations. I don't have anyone in my neighborhood

giving shots and evaluations to all the children and not asking for any documentation if you have health care or not. It's almost universal.

And so we're sitting here, and the President's going to stand on a small ant hill saying, well, you know, I think it's just too much that we're investing, and using some sort of, you know, hocus pocus talking about social medicine.

Meanwhile, children are going to the CVS, Rite-Aid or whatever the case may be, families trying to cure themselves. So I just want to make sure, I want to put the pressure on my colleagues to make sure that they override. And in closing, I'm going to send it over to Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

Y'all know this chart. This is the first action, one of the first actions that we took as relates to the Iraq war. It had all of the requirements in there to bring our men and women home, put the pressure on the Iraqis to stand up. And the Republicans went down there and stood with the President and said we stand with the President so that the Congress will never override the President. And they may not have one of these because if they do I'm going to have my staff down there with a camera to take a picture to make sure that we have the second picture.

But those that stand with the President tomorrow in not allowing us to override when we have a bipartisan vote out of this House, and we have Senators that are standing up here like ORRIN HATCH, GRASSLEY, a number of other Republicans that are saying, hey, you know, Mr. President, you're wrong. But we have some House Members here that are saying, well, we're with the President. You continue to stand with the President. I would appreciate some sort of public kind of standing out with the President because the bottom line is, I believe those Members, Mr. Speaker, all due respect, they will be at home reading this process in the paper and paying attention to C-SPAN and seeing what's going on because their constituents will not allow a Member to vote against their own children and then say, I want to go back to Congress and represent you.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, I'm sorry I went past 30 seconds when you asked me to yield.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. That's okay because we are all pretty worked up about this. This is really important when it comes down to making sure. I have kids too. And Mr. ALTMIRE has kids. One day Mr. MURPHY and Mr. RYAN are going to have kids. It really matters to all of us.

But one of the important points that we have not made is how effective this program is. The SCHIP program, the Children's Health Insurance Program provides health care to kids who need it and who wouldn't have it if there wasn't an SCHIP program, and there won't be an SCHIP program if we don't make sure we override the President's veto or pass a bill and make sure we

keep putting it on his desk until he signs it.

I think it's interesting, the President likes to call himself The Decider. So it's time for him to decide which of the families he thinks shouldn't get coverage, don't deserve health insurance.

How about this family? The Wilkerson family in St. Petersburg, Florida. This is personal, this is the Mom speaking. This is personal not only to us, but for millions of parents across the United States, said Bethany's mother, Dara, in a telephone call Monday with reporters about why she and her husband, Bo, are allowing such a focus on their daughter. Dara Wilkerson said Bethany had to have heart surgery in 2005 when she was 6 months old after doctors told them she had been born with two holes in her heart and a valve that didn't close as it should.

The Wilkersons said their annual household income is about \$34,000 from their jobs, and they cannot afford private insurance. But even if they could, Bethany's pre-existing condition, the heart problem she was born with, made enrollment in a private plan impossible, her mother said. Thanks to Florida's version of SCHIP, the State KidCare program, she said Bethany gets the care she needs to recover from her lifesaving surgery.

Those are the kinds of kids that get coverage that wouldn't get it if not for the SCHIP program. Those are the kinds of kids that our colleagues who choose not to vote to override the President's veto tomorrow are going to deny.

And that's the last thing I wanted to say as we wrap up since we've got five of us here tonight, and I don't know who to throw it to.

Mr. ALTMIRE. I just have one more myth that I wanted to throw out there that none of us touched on, before our time runs out, and that's this idea of this bill promoting adults being in the SCHIP program. And the President used that as one of his examples. He talked about it today and has talked about it in the past.

Well, what are the facts of adults being in the SCHIP program? It is true that under the current SCHIP program, the plan that is current law and has been for the past 10 years, some States have made the determination to cover the parents of children, thinking that that will entice them to take their entire family to the doctor. And that's debatable. It's something that's certainly under a policy discussion we could have that debate.

But what does our bill do about that? Our bill's a reauthorization of the program. And the President says we're going to encourage adults to get into the program. Well, you know what our bill does? Our bill phases out adults being eligible for the program over a 2-year period. And after that 2-year period, the only adults that would be allowed into the SCHIP program are pregnant women, if it's determined by

the State, again, it's a State option that they should be covered, and there's no guarantee that any State in the country would do that. But we phase out the current part of the SCHIP bill that allows adults into the program.

So for the President of the United States to stand up before a camera and say, I'm going to veto this bill because it allows adults to get coverage under SCHIP, is again just factually inaccurate.

So with that, if Mr. MURPHY is ready. I will yield some time to him.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. I just think in the end this is about choices, Mr. ALTMIRE. Mr. RYAN was talking about it before. This is about whether you want to continue to throw billions upon billions of dollars into a war in Iraq that, frankly, is probably making this country less safe rather than more safe as it breeds terrorism and Islamic jihadists within the boundaries of Iraq.

It's about whether you want to continue to give away \$12 to \$18 billion of tax breaks to the oil companies that the oil companies themselves say they don't need to continue putting products into the American market. Do you want to continue to subsidize the drug industry, which is making out like bandits off of a prescription drug program that pads their pockets and their profits, as we just found out from a new report from the Government Oversight Committee that tells us that we're wasting \$15 billion a year on the Medicare prescription drug program.

You want to help drug companies or poor kids? Do you want to help oil companies or poor kids? Do you want to throw more money in a religious civil war, or do you want to help poor kids? I mean, the reason why these polls, one after another, come out pleading with Congress to get its act together and pass children's health care is because everybody out there in the community, at the social halls, at the union halls, at the churches, at the synagogues, at the pasta suppers and the pancake breakfasts, the PTA, they've all figured out that we're making the wrong choice; that in the end the choice is easy. You help middle-class families afford college. You help them get health care. You boost their wages up to a livable wage, and you can do that without spending another dime in taxpayer money in the end. I mean, that's the great thing. You don't want to have to raise anybody's taxes to do it. You just make different choices. Iraq, oil companies, drug companies, instead, minimum wage, health care, kids going to college. I mean, that seems like common sense, Mr. RYAN.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Well, the one thing that is important too, I mean, a lot of people would say that, you know, well, my kid has insurance and we're fine and everything else. You know, but if your kid's sitting in a classroom with a kid who is sick that does not have health care because they don't



qualify for Medicaid, they're going to get your kid sick. And I think this kind of ties the whole argument together that we are in this together. You know, we have to make very sound, prudent, targeted investments in certain areas that are going to yield a lot of benefits.

These are the same kids we're asking to go off to college and get a degree in math and science. But if at a young age these kids don't have health care, where they can, if they get sick, have something, and I find it completely outrageous that in 2007 we would have a President of the United States say, go to the emergency room, or these kids can go to the emergency room. I mean, that's just ridiculous. That's just ridiculous. You don't have to be a Philadelphia lawyer to figure out that it's going to cost everyone a lot more money if this kid that has a cold ends up two weeks later in the emergency room with pneumonia or something worse and spends two weeks in the hospital.

I mean, that costs us hundreds of thousands of dollars, as opposed to a prescription that would cost 20 or 30 bucks. I mean, this is some pretty basic stuff here. And the fact that the President has drawn the line in the sand on this doesn't make a whole lot of sense.

So in closing, I want to thank everybody, Mr. Speaker, for being here and for participating in the 30-somethings. But I also want to say that it's been a very enjoyable week for those of us who are baseball fans in northeast Ohio. Those folks who may happen to be in, say, Pittsburgh or like Florida, or like New England for example, who, baseball season ended a long time ago for some of you, and others who are not faring as well, our sympathies go out to you. But in Cleveland, northeast Ohio, Youngstown, Akron, it's been a great week, followed up by a great week we had a few weeks ago. And many of you may not know, Mr. Speaker, that the new WBO/WBC middleweight champion of the world, Kelly Pavlick, is from Youngstown, Ohio, too.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. RYAN, I'll just remind you that our weather is still always better than yours.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. And also, Mr. RYAN, you shared that with us last week; you shared that with us the day before that. We're happy that the welterweight and middleweight champion is from Ohio.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I'm not getting the kind of happy vibe from my friends.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. RYAN, we were very mild. Those of us from Florida were very mild when the University of Florida, and I'll take this from Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ because if she says it she may not be as mild as I am when a certain team in Ohio, not only in football, but basketball, found themselves, no I will not yield. So what I'm

saying, this whole dancing in the end zone experience that you're having now about going on and on and on, Florida, I mean, the Marlins are nowhere in this thing, and we had nothing, we're just sitting here quiet, doing an hour with you and we're not, we're not talking sports, we're all friends. We're talking about children's health care.

But we understand that those victories, the people of Youngstown, Ohio, being in Niles, Ohio, and other cities around it are very represented here under your leadership, sir, and I respect that. And I'm saying there is a limit.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I appreciate that. But I think, I want to, for the record, I want to clear this up. He says that the Florida folks weren't dancing in the end zone when University of Florida won the national title. I remember Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ showing up here in like royal blue and orange wardrobe with a purse that had a gator on it. I remember that. So that was a little bit of dancing in the end zone. I am being polite. I didn't even mention the fact that the Ohio State Buckeyes football team was number one in the Nation. I'm trying to be polite here. So if you'd show me a little respect.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Mr. RYAN, let me ask you a question: When was the last year that your team, the Indians, won the World Series? When was that? It was a long time ago. It was a long time ago. It's just something you might want to remember, that there might be a reason why it's taking so long to get over that hump. There is still a game left, Mr. RYAN.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Actually, Mr. RYAN, I think the last time they were in the World Series they lost to the Marlins, come to think of it.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Can we live in the present? The Dalai Lama was here today, Mr. Speaker, and he's pretty much focused on how we should live in the present moment, and I think it would behoove all of you to take the Dalai Lama's advice on that.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. But we digress.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. RYAN, we just could not sit here and not give the representation that we were sent up here to carry out.

But, Mr. RYAN, you know, in all seriousness to all the Members, I mean, the good thing about the 30-something Working Group, we work so hard we have to add some humor in every now and then, especially when we work a full day and it's a quarter to 10 and we're still here on the floor.

The bottom line is one of the real historic votes of the 110th Congress will take place tomorrow.

□ 2145

And I'm asking the Members, those that are not willing to override the President's veto of children's health care in the United States of America, and we don't have to worry about any Democrats, but need it be Republicans,

I implore you to please reconsider on behalf of the children of the United States of America.

This is not about our children. My kids, they have health care. I am a Member of Congress, but I wasn't elected for my children to have health care. I didn't go out and give the speech, Mr. Speaker, and say "I want you to vote for me because my children need health care and I need health care. Send me to Washington. And I am not going to vote for you to have health care, but I want my kids to have health care."

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. It's important to point out that you pay for your children's health care.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Absolutely. Absolutely. But the real issue is this: At least I have a plan that I can afford, and the average American doesn't have that. And especially for these poor families, they need it.

So I don't think that anyone who votes against this went to their constituents and gave the brimstone speech or whatever you want to call it saying, "I'm going to Washington, and when we have an opportunity to insure 10 million American children that need health care, I am going to vote against it. Vote for me on Tuesday" and walk away. That did not happen. I guarantee you it did not happen.

And I want those Members to pay very close attention to when they put their card in the voting machine tomorrow and they vote that they look at that red light, if they press red, and correct their vote immediately on behalf of the children who don't have health care.

We are given this card here. This card is to help children, to be able to help Americans have a better life, and if you vote against it, it is really going to be a sad situation for our poorer families that are here in the United States of America and those families that are financially challenged.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. We joke around about baseball and Cleveland, Mr. Speaker. The Cleveland Indians are doing great, but Cleveland is the poorest city in the entire country. There are a lot of kids in that city who would, hopefully, be eligible for this program and be able to take advantage of it. The same in Pittsburgh and Miami and cities in Florida and certainly Boston. So this is important stuff that we need to deal with and, hopefully, we have been able to persuade a few votes.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Why don't you give out the Web site.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the Web site is [www.speaker.gov/30something](http://www.speaker.gov/30something). But I hope this has been persuasive to folks who are on the borderline here deciding on what to do.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Thank you. We pray and hope that they join us.

And I just want to thank Mr. ALTMIRE and, you, Mr. RYAN, and Mr. MURPHY and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ for being here with us.

We will vote tomorrow. We will be on the floor continuing in the debate.

Mr. ALTMIRE, I want to thank you for being very factual on the bill and sharing with the Members what is actually in the bill. A lot of folks don't take the time to find out what's actually in the bill; so I am glad you brought that perspective to the floor tonight.

With that, Mr. Speaker, it was an honor addressing the House.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SPACE). All Members are reminded that assertions that the President has been deceptive constitute an indecorous descent to personalities and are thus a violation of House rules.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state her inquiry.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, my understanding of the rule that you just cited is that Members need to refrain from making direct accusations of the President's being deceptive or referring to the President as a prevaricator or any other word that might apply.

What I did on the House floor this evening was read from a newspaper editorial's opinion. I did not directly make any reference. So I wanted to make sure that we clarify that that was not a violation of the rules.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is incorrect. The House rules do not permit a Member to make an improper statement under the guise that it is a quote from another.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I will take that under advisement, Mr. Speaker, but that is something that I would like to look into on my own and would be happy to follow up with the Parliamentarian. Thank you.

#### THE STATE CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Once again, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the privilege of being recognized to address you here on the floor of the United States Congress.

And as I have listened to some of the dialogue that has been rolled out here before me, I think it's imperative that someone come to the floor to bring another voice and another opinion and another viewpoint to this subject matter, particularly of SCHIP.

The first point that I would make, Mr. Speaker, is that the SCHIP issue that has been kicked around this Congress now into its third week that per-

haps comes before the floor tomorrow in an effort to override the President's very prudent and well-reasoned veto has been turned into a political issue rather than a policy issue.

SCHIP, State Children's Health Insurance Program, now, one could read that acronym and perhaps get a little better idea of what it stands for by reading the poster, Mr. Speaker. And I have heard presenter after presenter here this evening over on the other side of the aisle address this issue as children's health care and the allegation that the people that are guarding the taxpayers' dollars and seeking to get the resources that are here for the SCHIP program into the benefit of children, those who want a responsible program, those that don't want to chase people off of their own private health insurance but those that want to encourage parents, responsible parents, those who can afford it, to provide the health insurance for their children, those who want to encourage employers to provide health insurance as part of the employment package and keep in that package the insurance of the children, those of us who don't want to grow government, that want more personal responsibility, those of us who respect and appreciate the best health care system in the world, those of us who recognize that if there is a private sector investment, if people are responsible for their own health care, if parents take responsibility for their children's health insurance that this invisible hand that Adam Smith wrote about, this consumer's guide to how the health care in America will be developed, how it will evolve, how the research will be done, how the development will be done, how we will be marketing health insurance and how we will be providing services, this best system we have in the world is something we want to preserve.

And I can't think of a single thing we could do to destroy the best health care system in the world rather than to institutionalize it and federalize it and make it a socialized medicine program. Now, how do you do that?

Well, here on the floor, Mr. Speaker, of the United States Congress, September 22, 1993, President Clinton asked for a joint session of Congress. It's unusual for a President to ask to come speak to the House and the Senate in a joint session aside from the State of the Union address, but he did that on September 22, 1993, I think because Hillary actually advised him to, myself. And I have read the speech, and it is about a dozen pages long. And in that speech is component after component of a nationalized, socialized medicine program that was rolled out by the new Clinton administration in the fall of 1993.

And America looked at that. And, Mr. Speaker, I still have that poster, and I have it in the collection of my archives that shows "Hillary Care." It shows a laminated poster about that wide and about that high, and if you

look at it in its fine print, it's the flow chart for all the government agencies and all of the price limiting and price control and all the eventual, one can only conclude, health care rationing as well.

That whole flow chart is there on that laminated chart. That laminated chart is something that was put up before Americans in magazine after magazine, newspaper after newspaper, and published by good organizations so we could understand what it was that the Clinton administration wanted to impose upon Americans in September of 1993.

And as he laid out this case here from just in front of where you are, Mr. Speaker, he began to make a compelling case because he's a good salesman. But the American people sat and watched their television, and they reached down and pinched themselves: Do I really believe what I hear? What is coming out of the mouth of this President that sounds so good? Well, on that night the American people thought it sounded all right. They heard the message that you don't have to be responsible for the bills and you don't have to make any more health care decisions. The government will do that for you. The government will take the money out of the pockets of the people that are more wealthy than you are and put it into the pockets of the people that are of your income and less and take over some of that responsibility that you have, and somehow the world will be a better place.

Well, that was the marketing technique of that dozen-page speech September 22, 1993, Mr. Speaker. But when the sun came up on the morning of September 23, 1993, the Americans that had pinched themselves when they listened to the speech had slept upon the policy, and they began to take it apart piece by piece, one component of the flow chart, another component of the flow chart; and we ended up with an educated American populace that, after having listened to some people like "Harry and Louise," after having listened to Senator Phil Gramm over in the Senate say "We are going to have national health care in America over my cold, dead political body," which was a statement that Phil Gramm of Texas made on the floor of the United States Senate back during those years more than a decade ago, Mr. Speaker, the American people one at a time, sometimes by the dozens, sometimes by the hundreds, and, in fact, by the thousands rose up and said, no, we don't want national health care. We don't want that.

But a component that we did support, a component that was brought forth from this Congress in about 1997, by my recollection, and I could be off a year or so, Mr. Speaker, so I qualify that, was this component that we call SCHIP, State Children's Health Insurance Program. SCHIP was something that came out of this Republican Congress that was designed to subsidize