

how we might enforce those through the courts and so forth, there's another competition going on, and it's the competition that goes on in the media and in the public dialogue. And here is where there is an inherent advantage for the executive branch. And I think part of the reason why, over the last few decades, the executive branch has been able to accumulate far more power than the Constitution and the Founding Fathers envisioned was because it is much easier for the President of the United States to use the bully pulpit, as we call it, and dominate time and the news media and the television, and it's much harder for the Congress to do that since we are a body comprising 535 men and women.

□ 1915

But what's interesting about it is that when you use the bully pulpit and when the President uses the bully pulpit, you hope that he uses it in an honest way, and, in fact, in this debate what we have seen is a performance that has actually been very insulting to the concept of a pulpit, I think, because what this President has done is used his bully pulpit, his media access, to deceive the American people about what we are doing and what he intends to do.

For instance, he is constantly saying that the proposal, the legislation that we passed would enable families making \$83,000 a year to access the SCHIP program. No families making \$83,000 were authorized to make it or, in fact, ever found access to the SCHIP program. The only way that a family making more than double the poverty level can get entrance and access to the SCHIP program is if the executive branch gives them a waiver. In fact, the State of New York asked the President for a waiver. He declined it. So for him to then say under this program people making \$83,000 would be eligible for SCHIP is not only not true, it is deceitfully dishonest. And, actually, if you talk about what he has done, he has the power, which we delegated to him, he has the power through the executive branch to waive some of these requirements.

And that goes back to the interesting thing about this entire debate. In 2004 during the Presidential campaign, President Bush actually campaigned for an expansion of the SCHIP program. He loved the SCHIP program. He applauded it when he was Governor of Texas and he wanted to expand it. Now what does he do? Because it's not a Congress dominated by his party, he wants to change his perspective. He's changed his perspective as to whether the States should have waiving powers, which he wanted the States to have when the Congress was run by the Republicans. Now that Democrats control the Congress, he wants there to be Federal standards which he controls.

So this is not just a battle of power internally in the Congress and through the courts but also one that we have to

fight in the media. We are at a disadvantage, but I hope it is discussions like this and people who are not afraid to be outspoken and point out dishonesty and deceit when they see it that will help us even the playing field in terms of convincing the American people that not only does this Congress have the power, by virtue of article I, to make all legislative decisions, but it also has the moral foundation and the integrity to do what's right for the American people.

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. I thank the gentleman.

We are down to our last couple of minutes, so I'm going to turn it over to Mr. HODES and then Mr. COHEN if you want to wrap it up.

Mr. HODES. Thank you, Mr. KLEIN.

What we are talking about here really is the moral compass of our Nation. We have a stark choice before us. There is a huge difference between what the President values and what the American people value.

To the President and his allies, \$190 billion for a failed war is a necessity, but \$35 billion to give our kids access to doctors is some kind of extravagance. And that really talks about the values that are at play here. Are we going to value and speak up for the people of this country, or are we going to let the President assert values that we in this country don't agree with because we value kids?

Now, there is a President, a former President who really said it best because we here in Congress are no longer simply going to enable this President to take power which should not be his. We are going to reassert, in these conversations and in our conduct, the power that rightfully belongs to the Congress and to the people. Because as Abraham Lincoln said, when we were engaged in the midst of a great civil war that was to determine the fate of this country, he talked about government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

That's why we are here tonight. That is why we were sent to Congress. To reassert that this government is a government of the people, by the people, for the people. And while we are on this watch, it shall not perish, and we are going to stand up to this President and we are going to have some checks and balances in the United States of America.

Mr. COHEN. Thank you, Mr. KLEIN.

I think when I first addressed this group and, Mr. Speaker, I mentioned how proud I was to be a Member of this body and this class, and I think the people who have listened to this discussion realize why I'm so proud to be a member of the class. The talent is here, as some people have State legislative experience, some come straight from the private sector, and each brings a different perspective but a concern for the people and a concern for change and direction of this country and for the middle class.

Mr. HODES talked about Ms. Miers and Mr. Rove not obeying the subpoena

that was issued for them to come to testify before the Congress. This Congress is looking at having a contempt charge brought against them, which I think we should have done earlier. We need to have a contempt charge brought, and we need to have them be punished for their contempt of this Congress, which, in essence, is a contempt of the American people and a contempt of the Constitution and of all things good that the American people stand for.

I am proud to be a member of this class, to support SCHIP, for health care for children and for all Americans.

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. I thank my colleagues for being here this evening.

We do this once a week. We're looking forward to seeing you all next week and having this continuation of discussion. And, of course, we look forward to working with everyone in this country to make sure that we resolve and come to some successful conclusions on some of these issues that are so important to our country.

THE OFFICIAL TRUTH SQUAD

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ELLISON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a great privilege and honor to come back to the floor of the House and present some alternative views, some views that I hope are more grounded in truth as this is another edition of the Official Truth Squad. We've heard some interesting comments over the last hour and over the last few days and weeks and months. So, Mr. Speaker, it is indeed an honor to be designated by our leadership to come and share some words with this Chamber.

I would first comment about the relative tone and the divisiveness of the language that we have just heard. It just astounds me that people think who come to Washington that our constituents want us to be divisive. When I go home, what I hear from folks is that they want us to work together, that they want us to work together positively for solutions. So the class warfare debate that we have just experienced over the last hour is truly remarkable, as one Member talked about the spirit of Lincoln, a proud Republican, and what he brought to our Nation. A government of the people, by the people, and for the people is what he championed. He also championed an end to class warfare. So I would encourage my colleagues to read further in history and to expand their vision of what it is that their constituents truly want. And as I mentioned, Mr. Speaker, my constituents, our constituents, I think, want us to work together.

This is the Official Truth Squad. This is a group of folks who come to the floor and have an opportunity to address our colleagues and hopefully

bring, over the course of an hour, a little brighter perspective, a little more upbeat perspective, a little more optimistic perspective, and, hopefully, a little more truthful perspective because so often what happens on the floor of this House during the course of our debates is that the truth tends to be swept away. And, again, that frustrates our constituents. It frustrates my constituents, I know, when they ask why we can't stick to the facts, stick to reason as we try to solve the significant challenges that confront us as a Nation.

I have a number of favorite quotes. One of them is this one from the late United States Senator from New York, Daniel Patrick Moynihan. He said, famously, "Everyone is entitled to their own opinion, but they are not entitled to their own facts." Another one of my favorite quotes is "Imitation is the most sincere form of flattery." So I was so pleased when I heard either the Speaker or the majority leader say just this in a debate recently, and I would ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to heed this. Everyone's entitled to their own opinion, and you ought to state so, and that's appropriate. But you're not entitled to your own facts.

So tonight, Mr. Speaker, we're going to share a few facts with our colleagues, and I am going to start by bringing a couple of quotes from a true American institution. Certainly the "Tonight Show" is an American institution. The current host of the "Tonight Show," Jay Leno, oftentimes crystallizes in just a very humorous way what the American people are thinking. So I thought it would be appropriate to share with our colleagues, Mr. Speaker, what Jay Leno has said over the past couple of days. This is about the state of Congress right now. As you know, Mr. Speaker, the numbers for Congress aren't great right now. I would again encourage my colleagues to try to use the sense of what the American people are saying as a positive impetus to have us move forward together in a commonsense, positive, upbeat, principled way that reflects the will of our Nation.

But Jay Leno said the other day, "And our new Democratic Congress, remember, they promised longer workweeks. Well, now they announced they're going to a 4-day workweek. I guess they realized they don't need a full 5 days to do nothing." It was alluding to the fact that really not much has gotten done in these first 10 months of this 110th Congress under the new leadership. And it hasn't for a variety of reasons. We will talk a little bit about that tonight. But I would suggest most clearly, Mr. Speaker, that it hasn't because this new majority seems to be unwilling to work together on behalf of the American people. SCHIP is a classic example, and our colleagues mentioned that, and we will talk a little bit about that tonight.

Jay Leno also said just 2 days ago, "The Democrats in Congress have an-

nounced they will now be taking Fridays off. Apparently they were getting worried their approval rating was getting too high." As I mentioned, Mr. Speaker, the approval rating for Congress is not great.

And that troubles me. It should trouble all of us. It troubles me because I think that what the American people are seeing when they look here to Washington, when they look to the Speaker and to the leaders that are running this Congress, they see an institution and they see a group of leaders who are not willing to work with each other. And for those of us who are less than senior Members, certainly in the minority party at this time, it is very distressing because we came here, all of us came here, to solve problems. I oftentimes encourage my colleagues to go back and read their first piece of campaign literature in their first campaign because I think, Mr. Speaker, that speaks to the goals and the vision and the dreams that we all had when we came to Congress.

But as you know, Mr. Speaker, a recent Zogby poll found that for the second month in a row, this Democrat-led Congress's approval rating was 11 percent. Now, why is that? Well, I think if you look at the bills that have been passed through this Congress and signed into law, there have been 107 of them so far, Mr. Speaker, 107 bills. Now, you might think that that would be a grand accomplishment, and I suspect that it is on one measure. This new majority touted the fact that they have had over a thousand votes. What they didn't say is that the vast majority of those were procedural votes. They were determining how the bills ought to move forward, oftentimes in significantly noninclusive ways. But 107 bills have gone through the House and the Senate and signed into law by the President. So I thought it would be helpful to kind of break down those 107 bills. What were they? Were they wonderful solutions, as have been proposed, to children's health insurance? Were they wonderful solutions to health system reform? As a physician myself, I believe so strongly that we need significant, positive, patient-centered health system reform.

□ 1930

Was that one of the bills that was signed? Was controlling the crisis that we have in the area of illegal immigration, was that one of the bills? Well, regretfully, Mr. Speaker, as you well know, it wasn't.

In fact, of 107 bills signed into law, 47 of those bills named post offices, courthouses or roads. Now, those are important things to do, and certainly when we name and honor individuals with the naming of a post office or a courthouse or a road, that's an important thing to do, but it ought not be something that the majority party brings forward and champions as a grand accomplishment. I haven't looked at what the votes were on those 47 bills,

but I suspect that, by and large, they were unanimous. I will just take a wild guess, Mr. Speaker; I suspect that the vast majority of those were unanimous.

So, 47 of the 107 bills signed into law were naming post offices or roads or courthouses. Forty-four of the bills were noncontroversial measures that were either sponsored by Republicans or they passed overwhelmingly. And those are the kind of routine things that you've just got to do to keep the trains running on time here.

So, 47 naming post offices or other buildings; 44 were noncontroversial. Fourteen of the remaining 16 were to extend preexisting laws or laws that had been passed during the Republican-led Congress. Now, that means that there were only two left out of that whole 107 bills that were signed into law. In fact, I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that these were the two most important bills. One of them was the extension of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, and we'll talk a little bit about that. But to keep our Nation safe, one of them was that bill. That passed. But as I note, Mr. Speaker, that passed over the objection of the leadership of the Democrat Party.

So, one of the most important things we've done, in fact, probably one of the two most important things that we've done, passed over the objection of the leadership of the Democrat Party, the majority party. The other bill that passed was the supplemental to provide appropriate resources for our troops.

So, Mr. Speaker, not an opinion, but a fact is that we have, yes, we have, indeed, had over 1,000 votes. And the majority party is very proud of that, and maybe they should be. But when you look at the number of bills that have passed Congress, 107, 47 of those were to name post offices or buildings, 44 were noncontroversial, 14 were to continue previous law, and two, the two most important, the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act and the appropriate resources for our troops in Iraq and Afghanistan, passed over the objection and the vote of the majority leadership, the majority of the majority leadership.

So, Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure that's something to champion, but I will tell you that I believe that's part of the reason that the American people say, "What's going on? What's going on up there in Washington? Can you all please work together on behalf of the American people?" which is what I believe and my colleagues, I know, believe we ought to do. In fact, many of those things would be very, very humorous if they weren't so doggone serious. We are in challenging times, Mr. Speaker, and I would suggest and encourage my colleagues, frankly, on both sides of the aisle to put positive issues out there and work together as we move forward.

One of the bills that we heard from our good friends on was the SCHIP bill, the State Children's Health Insurance

Program, and I will be joined by a number of colleagues tonight to talk about that. I would just like to say that as a physician who practiced in the northern side of Atlanta for over 20 years taking care of kids, I take personal offense to anybody who says that those of us who have not supported so far the State Children's Health Insurance reauthorization bill don't care about kids. Clearly, we care about kids. I spent my entire professional life caring for kids.

The other side says, well, 81 percent of the American people want SCHIP. Well, they do when you ask them the question, do you support the State Children's Health Insurance Program? And I ask that of my folks when I go home and have meetings and talk to Rotary Clubs and other kinds of groups. And I have asked them over the past 2 or 3 months, do you support renewing the State Children's Health Insurance Program? And sure enough, the vast majority of the people raise their hand, and as well they should. And I ask them to keep their hand up. And then I said, now, would you support that bill if you knew that poor kids were not going to be taken care of before kids in wealthier families? Put your hand down if you wouldn't support that bill if you knew that kids from higher income families would get insurance paid for by the taxpayer before lower income kids. And about one-third or so of the hands come down; still a number of hands up there. And I say that because that's what is in the bill that the majority party passed and that was vetoed by the President, and then we sustained that veto.

And then I say, well, now, would you support that State Children's Health Insurance Program if you knew that it also covered childless adults? And a number of other hands come down. And I don't make that up. I ask that question because that's in the bill. Now we've got about one-half or maybe one-third of the folks still raising their hand saying they would support the bill. I say, now, would you support the bill if you knew that 2 million kids would be forced from private personal health insurance onto public, State-run, government-run bureaucratic medicine? And you get almost all of them coming down at that point. They've kind of gotten the clue that in the fine print in the bill, it's not what they've been led to believe.

And then I ask them, well, would you support the bill if you knew that in order to make the funding work, you would have to have 22 million new smokers in America because it's paid for by tobacco tax, would you support it now?

Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't have to tell you the results of this unscientific poll. But the fact of the matter is, not an opinion, but the fact of the matter is when I get through outlining what was in the bill, there isn't a hand left. There isn't a hand still raised that said they would support that bill.

And so, Mr. Speaker, that's why the numbers have come down. In the length of time that the majority party has been demagoguing this issue and trumpeting out their radio ads and their television ads across this Nation, what has happened is that the American people have recognized that the story that they were being told by this majority party, the Democrat leadership, was, in fact, not the truth. It may have been an opinion; it certainly wasn't the truth.

And so now what we see is 55, 60, 60-plus percent of the American people saying yes, we want to help poor kids, absolutely, that's appropriate. And we'll talk tonight about how we should do that, a positive message, an upbeat message, an optimistic message, a message that says, yes, Americans are generous, we know that, and they believe that, in fact, there is a better way, there is a better way to do business here in Washington, hopefully to raise those numbers. There is also a better way to fashion a bill that would provide health insurance for low-income kids.

So I am pleased to be joined tonight by a couple of colleagues, my good friend from New Jersey, who certainly knows fiscal issues as well as the issue of State Children's Health Insurance Program. I look forward to your comments this evening and yield to my good friend Mr. GARRETT.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. I thank the gentleman from Georgia for heading this program tonight to bring about the Truth Squad, which when I'm not here on the floor, I'm in my office turning on C-SPAN to make sure that I can find out the latest of what the actual facts are, because we can't always be assured that we hear them correctly from the other side of the aisle.

Actually, that's where I want to begin on this one. I was tuning in as I was doing some work at my desk for the last 10 or so minutes of the other side of the aisle, and I was a little bit amused by their closing comment. They seem to be chagrined by the fact that they don't have the opportunity to get the message out, if you were listening to them, that the President seems to be able to have the bully pulpit and be able to get the record straight out to the American public, and they don't. I had to scratch my head at that time because I thought, well, gee, doesn't the Democrat Party now control both this House, isn't NANCY PELOSI now the Speaker of this House? Isn't HARRY REID now the lead in the Senate as well? I thought the Democrat Party was the majority party.

And I know that every time that I leave this Chamber during the day there are microphones out there waiting for speakers to speak. And they're not coming to me to ask for comments; they are looking to the Democrat majority. So I think they were a little bit flippant or disingenuous, if you will,

when they're saying that they're not able to get the message out. I think what they are really saying, though, is the message that is getting out is not a truthful message, and some of the points that you've already made.

And if I may just touch upon a point or two here. If you go back in time a little bit to when President Clinton was in office, he laid out the groundwork of what his vision was for health care in this country. He told us where he would like to take this country and maybe where his wife would also like to take this country when it comes to health care. And he said that he wanted government-run healthcare. He wanted universal, socialized, Washington-controlled health care. And how would you get there, he said? Well, he laid it out in plans; he put it out in a book, almost, for us. He said, you get there not overnight, although I guess HILLARY CLINTON tried to do that, but he said, no, you get there incrementally. First what you do is you insure the indigent children, then you will insure all the children, and eventually you will insure all the adults as well. And what does that bring you to? Well, that's socialized, government-run and controlled health care. Now, that may be something that he would like and maybe a small segment of this country would like, but when I go back to my constituents, they remind me that Washington government may not be the most effective and efficient entity in the entire world of delivering services. They remind me of what happened back when Katrina occurred and we had FEMA step in to try to deliver services, and it was abysmal. They remind me continuously, regardless of which party is in control, earmarks, and we can talk about that ad nauseum later on probably, about the waste, fraud and abuse when it comes to spending their hard-earned dollars on earmarks.

They remind me, also, some of them who were trying to leave this country during this past summer for a summertime vacation and they found out that they needed to get a visa in order to do so. And they could not get their visa even though they put in their request one, week, two weeks, three weeks, eight weeks, nine weeks in advance. A very basic function of the U.S. government to supply visas to people, and they couldn't get them on time. They remind me that the government couldn't even do one of their basic functions.

They remind me, finally, when it comes to what is one of the most seminal issues when it comes to any government, and that is to protect your borders, and they say, you know, Congress, here under this majority, can't even get that issue resolved and done. We can't get the money to the border security guards. We can't get that fence built along there. If the government can't do those functions, they ask me, why in the world do we want to turn over our control, life-and-death

situations, really, and you're a physician, you know this, to an entity that can't run the functions that they're doing right now.

They tell me, the American public, my constituents tell me that they want to make sure that health care remains in their hands, that health care remains as a private matter in the sense of a doctor-patient relationship. Maybe you want to comment on that at some point, where they're in control of the delivery, of the questions and the asking and what have you and the needs for the services, and the doctor is in control of the services that are being provided. They don't want big brother, if you will, stepping in and saying, well, no, we're going to exclude you, include you and what have you. So they are very hesitant to go down the direction that Bill Clinton wanted this country to go down and now this Democrat majority wants us to go down as well.

And if the gentleman would continue to yield.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. The very definition of a middle-class entitlement, which, as Bill Clinton would say, is the next step to go to socialized, government-run health care, well, the very definition of a middle-class entitlement can be seen in what the Democrats are trying to do right now with SCHIP. Look at the numbers. And I know I don't have a chart behind me like you do to have these numbers right next to me, but let's think of these basic numbers.

Right now the SCHIP program, as originally intended, was to fund indigent care for children, at what level? Two hundred percent of poverty. Ballpark figure, that's around \$42,000 for a family of four; that's what is defined as poverty for that family. The medium income, that's the middle income in this country, for a family of four all across this country on average is about \$48,000. So, \$48,000 is the middle range. Any time you're going to start spending more, providing a government-run program for somebody making more than the middle by definition now becomes a middle-class entitlement, and that leads us to government-controlled health care.

So, when they're talking about providing services above 200, 250, 300, well, 300 percent of poverty, that would put you at approximately \$62,000 for a family of four. In New Jersey, we're at 350 percent of poverty; that puts you around \$72,000 for a family of four. So, by definition, they're telling us that they are not trying to create a program for the indigent and the poor in this country. By the very definition of the words they're using and the facts that are out there, they are trying to create an entitlement program for the middle class. And then of course the question is, who is going to pay for that?

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. I will yield.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I appreciate your perspective on it and your comments because they ring true. Those are the absolute facts, Mr. Speaker.

And to put a few more numbers on that, at 300 percent of the poverty level, which is about \$62,000, \$63,000 of income for a family of four, 79 percent of those families already have health insurance. The children have health insurance. And this bill that the President vetoed and the veto that we sustained, this bill would have made it so that those children would have been essentially forced, because the employers would say, well, why should I insure these kids if the government is going to do it, those kids would be forced into government-run medicine.

□ 1945

At 300 percent of the poverty level, at 62, \$63,000, folks who live in families with incomes at that level or below comprise 53 percent of the kids in this Nation, 53 percent of the kids, which means that over half of the kids would be eligible for State-run, government-run bureaucratic health care. And as a physician, I know that whenever the government got involved in the decisions I was trying to make on behalf of my patients, it was even more difficult.

I am pleased to welcome my good friend and physician colleague from Georgia, who understands those issues as well with governmental intervention into the practice of medicine. I appreciate you joining us tonight and look forward to your comments.

Mr. GINGREY. I thank my colleague from Georgia, Dr. PRICE. Certainly the posters that he has got up there, Mr. Speaker, that I call our colleagues' attention to, I might just touch on that issue in regard to the tax on tobacco product, particularly cigarettes, that increase in that tax, just 61 cents a pack, I believe that would bring the Federal tax on cigarettes to a dollar a pack. But the Heritage Foundation and others have looked at that and said, well, how many new smokers would you need to have to raise the \$70 billion that would actually not completely pay for this massive expansion of SCHIP that Democrats have recommended? And the number, Mr. Speaker, is 22 million, as Dr. PRICE's poster so vividly points out.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I try to bring posters, because when I look at something like this it really drives the issue home and brings it much more clear to me. But this is what you have mentioned that is so true, and the bill that was passed, as you said, would require 22 million new smokers, new smokers, that means from 2010 to 2017, 22 new Americans would have to start smoking. This is the number of folks that would have to begin smoking just in order to pay for the program.

Mr. GINGREY. That's right. And that means the ones that are already addicted, the poor grandparents and

parents of these children that can't break that habit, and some of them, Mr. Speaker, and I know my colleagues appreciate this, are the poor members of society, for some reason that have developed that smoking habit. And we are going to put the burden on them, plus 22 million. And some of those 22 million, this is the irony of this pay-for that the Democrats have come up with, some of these very children, maybe some of the 5,000 that I delivered who are old enough to go buy cigarettes, they will have to be addicted to help pay for this massive expansion so that their younger brothers and sisters can get health insurance funded by the Federal Government. It makes absolutely no sense. I really appreciate Dr. PRICE bringing this leadership hour to us as part of the Truth Squad, the ongoing Truth Squad, because the truth just needs to be told. And I think the important thing for our colleagues to understand and anybody within shouting distance to know that Republican Members of this body, and our President, George W. Bush, is all for children and providing health care for children. If he wasn't, would we be spending \$35 billion a year on the Medicaid program for children's health insurance? Absolutely we would not. The President even has recommended that because it is estimated that 750,000 children, we cover 6,750,000 in that income bracket that my colleague from New Jersey was talking about, the 100 to 200 percent of the Federal poverty level have fallen through the cracks, so the President said, look, let's increase this spending \$25 billion over 5 years, let's increase it 20 percent and a little bit more money in there for inflation. But, instead, the Democrats come with a bill to increase the spending by 140 percent to \$60 billion. In fact, in their original bill, the CHAMP Act, they wanted to increase it to \$90 billion.

As Dr. PRICE points out, in this new bill the \$60 billion version, that is covering 53 percent of all children in this country either on the Medicaid or the SCHIP program. Well, there is something wrong with that. There is no question about it. We don't need to be paying the health insurance for children from families who are making \$62,000 a year. In some instances in the State of New York, it may be up to \$83,000 a year. That's what we're railing against, this unnecessary, massive expansion. We Republicans and the President want to renew this program. It's a good program. We need to increase the funding. The President possibly would be willing to even go a little more than a 20 percent increase. But the only justification the Democrat majority can have for this type of increase is just what was already alluded to, a march toward a single-payer national health insurance program. In some of their rhetoric in regard to Medicare and wanting to start covering people at age 55, you see where the gap gets smaller and smaller, and then all of a sudden you're covering from cradle to grave

everybody in this country run by the government.

So I thank the gentleman from Georgia, my colleague from Georgia, my colleague from Cobb County, for leading this time. I know there are a number of other speakers that are here that want to weigh in on this. We just need to keep fighting. We will get this bill right. But we need to do it in a bipartisan way.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Thank you so much. I appreciate my physician colleague pointing out again the number of new smokers needed to pay for it. And the last time I remember, it has been a while since I have been in medical practice, but we used to try to get folks to quit smoking, that is what we tried to get them to do, instead of beginning to smoke to pay for it.

This chart really describes it very, very well, talking about the bait and switch of the funding. In addition to having a tobacco tax pay for it, which is really counterproductive because we want folks to quit smoking, not start smoking, but in addition to that, what happens at 5 years, this is 2008 program, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, when you get out to this fifth year, what happens in the majority party's bill, the Democrats' bill? The funding drops way off, which means that they weren't sincere about this in the very beginning.

It really isn't about cost. It is about control, about who is going to control health care. Is it going to be patients, individuals, families and doctors? Or is it going to be government? It really is about something as basic as that, a basic question.

I'm so pleased to be joined tonight by my good friend from Florida who has a district that is probably as sensitive to health care as any in this Nation, GINNY BROWN-WAITE. I appreciate so much your joining us and I look forward to your comments.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I was sitting in my office calling back some constituents. It was 7:30, and first of all, they were surprised to hear from any Member of Congress calling them back at 7:30, but I am sure everyone here in this chamber does exactly that. And I saw you coming here to inform the American public about the truth. It is long overdue.

Many of us in this Chamber had ads run against us. It was during that 2-week period after the President vetoed the bill. Now, we could have been working on a compromise, but no, there had to be time out there for the operatives to run nasty ads against people who voted to not override the President.

The President was right. This bill, the spending in the bill is out of control. It is out of control, and the American public started to catch on. Because when they started to attack me, you know, I have been called the mother of this bill. I wasn't in Congress at the time. But it was because I was willing to take that very difficult vote to

allow for third-party reimbursement to come from the tobacco companies for health care costs that the money came from.

So, Dr. PRICE, your chart there on where the money is coming from is very, very interesting because, as you say, in 2013, if I am reading the chart correctly, that is where the funding drops off. Twenty-two million smokers would be needed to fund this program, which is far, far different from that originally envisioned and that which both sides of the aisle, the Democrats and the Republicans, worked on in 1997 to come up with the SCHIP bill.

So what exactly do we have in the bill that many of us voted against, many of us who fought long and hard for State children's health programs? What is in it? Well, it continues to allow adults to receive health care under various State SCHIP programs. It is interesting that it also will allow more illegals to participate in health care through the SCHIP program. That is not what our constituents wanted.

The Senate received a loud-and-clear message when America finally did wake up to what they were doing on the issue of illegal aliens. They virtually inundated the switchboard of the Senate. People do not want more magnets to attract illegal aliens here. But most of the State health plans, part of the pool of money that the various States got after going after the third-party reimbursement, part of that money was also for education and trying to get people to stop smoking. So isn't it interesting that with this hand we fund programs that are trying to get people to stop smoking, and yet we have a bill here that says, oh, come on, we need some more smokers to pay for this program.

One of the fallacies that people have finally in America begun to realize is that the program, the SCHIP program, was a great program. It should be renewed. It shouldn't be expanded. It should be renewed. And we need to reach out to those that the program hasn't already touched, those low-income children out there. It shouldn't have been, and it was never intended originally to be for adults. But, quite honestly, States gamed the system. And why did they do it? Because they could get 15 percent more funding from the Federal Government than they could with the traditional Medicaid program that adults go into.

In Florida alone, we have right now 62,000 children who should be eligible for KidCare, which is the State program, but they have not signed up for it. So before we go expanding it to middle-income kids, let's capture those children in Florida, and every other State, Dr. PRICE, every other State that has children who still are not covered by the program, the very, very good program. Many of us actually are on the bill that would be a simple extension. And many of us are cosponsors of that which allows the program to continue for 18 months.

I hope that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle realize what America really wants. They want this great program to continue for low-income children.

Dr. PRICE, I appreciate your being here tonight as part of the Truth Squad to bring this information to the American public.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Thank you so much, Congresswoman GINNY BROWN-WAITE. We appreciate your perspective. What a moving story about the beginning of the program where you were on the front lines at the beginning. I know of nobody in this Congress who has greater compassion for kids than you. I sincerely appreciate your coming down, sharing that story and trying to bring some truth. That is what we are trying to do, trying to bring some truth and some light to this issue.

When folks at home ask me what the alternative is, because there are alternatives, there are wonderful, positive alternatives, a number of other Members of Congress have introduced bills. I, along with over 60 folks in Congress, have introduced a bill that we call More Children More Choices Act. It would be a bill that would in fact reauthorize SCHIP, State Children's Health Insurance Program, up to 200 percent of the poverty level, that is \$42,000 for a family of four. For those kids between \$42,000 and \$62,000 and their family, we would provide premium assistance, premium support, make it so that all kids can, indeed, get health insurance. But most of those kids would then be able to have health insurance provided in a personal and private way so that their doctors and their families were making health care decisions, not the government.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Many of the State programs actually had that language in there so that we wouldn't crowd out those who already had insurance and encourage them to get into the program. Many of the States had subsidies, premium subsidies so that people could stay in a family program so you didn't have to have one doctor for perhaps your 12-year-old and another doctor for the mom and dad so that there could be a family, a true family doctor there because they all were covered by the same insurance company. The problem was over time many of the States stopped promoting that. So it was just easier to enroll the children in the State children's health program, and in Florida we call it KidCare. That is an excellent point you bring up.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Thank you so much. I appreciate your joining us and providing that perspective.

Again, Mr. Speaker, there are all sorts of alternatives. The alternative we put forward was H.R. 3888. I encourage my colleagues to look at it.

□ 2000

It's a bill that would reauthorize SCHIP. It would make certain that we had premium assistance or support for

those folks in low to middle-income families so that they could make certain that they could own their own personal private health insurance and be able to make health care decisions, with families and doctors being the ones in charge, not State or Federal Government. It would allow States greater flexibility to provide health insurance for their uninsured population.

So I would encourage my colleagues to look at that. I think it is the kind of bill that folks across this Nation I think are clamoring for because it allows us to work together in a positive way and do something that benefits our constituents, does something that benefits the vast majority of Americans. One of the things that benefits the vast majority of Americans is not to have the Federal Government reach into their pockets and destroy their economic well-being.

This Federal Government, under the new leadership here, has shown a penchant for increasing the desire to have this government involved in all sorts of personal decisions, and probably the most personal of decisions is what to do with one's money. When you think about it, tax issues, taxes are, in actuality, the government, either the local or the State or the Federal Government coming into peoples' lives and saying, We know how to spend your money better than you do. We know so well how to spend your money better than you do that we are going to take it from you, because you certainly don't know exactly what you ought to be doing with your money.

This new majority, this new majority has passed all sorts of tax bills, almost at every turn. As we have talked about, Mr. Speaker, they have passed a \$392.5 billion tax increase in their budget; \$50 billion in new energy taxes; \$35 billion in new tobacco taxes; \$7.5 billion in new taxes on a farm bill. Hold on to your wallet when you go to the gas tank; a 55 cents per gallon increase in gas taxes for infrastructure and global warming studies; new taxes on homeowners by ending mortgage deductions.

Mr. Speaker, that isn't all, because Congressman RANGEL, chairman of the Ways and Means, you have got to honor him for his candor, because what he says is he is coming with the mother of all tax hikes, the mother of all tax increases, and, Mr. Speaker, this is a \$3.5 trillion proposal for a tax increase over the next 10 years, the largest individual tax increase in American history, \$3.5 trillion. Mr. Speaker, that is with a T. Only in Washington can we talk in those kind of numbers.

It is very concerting to me, I know to my constituents, and it's concerting to my colleagues who have joined me tonight to talk about the issue of taxes, the issue of money and Washington's appetite for money.

I am pleased to welcome my good friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY).

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it's quite ironic, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. PRICE has this hour tonight. Tonight is Halloween. I will tell you, when I look back at home in California, my kids will be getting ready to go out with their friends. Some of them are going to dress up, some will try to scare one another. But tonight, Mr. Speaker, this is the scariest moment of all. This largest tax increase in American history is going to scare every American there is.

I will tell you that as you study history and study economics, you will see in the last cycle when taxes were lower, we set a record April 15. April 15 was the day people were paying their taxes. With taxes lower, more revenue came into American coffers, government, than ever before in the history of collecting taxes. Why? Because you let people keep more of what they earn. They went out and took their money and invested into capital, invested into businesses. What does this plan do that the Democrats put forward in the Democrat's largest tax increase? It taxes small business, small business at the highest rate. How do you create a big business? I guess you can't under the Democratic plan.

For those that are sitting at home, Mr. Speaker, I want them to think for one moment when you think about taxes, because you always don't realize how much taxes you pay in a day. On an average day, you wake up, you take a shower; do you realize you pay a tax on that water? You go maybe over to Starbucks to get a cup of coffee, you pay a tax on that coffee. You stop off and fill your car up with gas; you pay a gasoline tax. You go into work, and for the first three hours you're just paying taxes before you make any money. You go home, turn on the TV, hopefully you will see yourself on television, you pay cable tax if you're watching this show tonight.

You go out tomorrow, a lot of us are going to fly home, and when we buy that airplane ticket, we're going to pay an airport tax. You rent a car, you pay a rental tax. Somebody stays in a hotel, they pay an occupancy tax. God forbid, you save enough money and unfortunately die, you're going to pay an inheritance tax. On the Democratic plan, it goes to 55 percent.

They think they know what to do with your money. I believe the Republicans know what to do with your money. You keep your money and invest it and build America. The plan has shown that if government continues to grow, they are going to raise your taxes further.

Mr. Speaker, this plan and the appropriations that have gone through on this floor have continued to make government grow, continued to increase. How do they want to feed it? By taking more of what you have.

I want to yield to my good friend from Georgia and thank him for the time that he has put into this, because it is a Truth Squad. It's rather ironic that tonight you're talking about how

the Democrats have scared the rest of America. It is scary because they plan to move forward with their plan.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I thank my friend from California for outlining what truly is a frightening issue for many Americans. Many folks, especially in the middle class, there has been talk about a war on the middle class. I tell you, Mr. Speaker, the war on the middle class is being fully engaged by this majority party when you think about a \$3.5 trillion tax increase.

Congressman RANGEL, again, you have to honor him and commend him for his candor and his honesty. He says, well, look, 90 million Americans will have a tax decrease with his proposal. What that means, Mr. Speaker, is that over 200 million Americans will have their taxes increased. That is where this \$3.5 trillion comes from. It comes from anybody who is paying taxes currently to any degree will have their taxes increased. My friend from California outlined so many different ways that we are taxed and taxed and taxed by folks who think they know how to spend our money better. I believe I know that most folks on our side of the aisle believe that individuals know how to spend that money better. I recognize my good friend from Ohio, who believes that sincerely and has great knowledge and acumen about the issue of taxes and financial issues, my good friend, Mr. JORDAN from Ohio.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for putting this hour together. I thank my friend from California too for his focus on keeping taxes low, which the gentleman from Georgia made the right point: Whose money is it? Does it belong to the families of this country or does it belong to government?

The families of America know that they can spend their money better than government. They can invest it in their kids, their grandkids, their goals, their dreams, their ideas, their principles. They can do it better than government can. American families know that taxes are too high. Think about the typical family, the typical family in this country. When you factor in local, State and Federal taxes, all those taxes that my friend from California went through that you pay in just a typical day, when you factor that in, the typical American family spends 50 percent of their income, 50 percent of what they make, what they bring in, that they can invest in their kids, their grandkids, their future, they have to give to some level of government.

As the gentleman from Georgia pointed out, when you think about what has happened this year in this Congress, we had a budget bill passed that doesn't extend the 2001 and 2003 tax cuts that have helped our economy, that have helped families have a growing economy, the tax increases in there that result in huge, huge taxes in the future on American families. We had an energy bill that raises taxes on domestic energy companies. We had a

farm bill, a farm bill, one of the most bipartisan pieces of legislation that typically moves through the Congress, had a tax increase in it.

We had the SCHIP bill that the gentleman spoke on earlier in this hour which had a tax increase in it. And just this day on the floor we had a Trade Adjustment Assistance Act that also had a tax increase in it. And, as my good friend from Georgia pointed out, we now have what is appropriately called the mother of all tax increases coming, which will raise \$3.5 trillion, \$3.5 trillion on American families across this country.

It begs the question: Why do politicians want to raise taxes? It is real simple. Because politicians like to spend money. You always hear "tax-and-spend politicians." It is actually the opposite. It is spend-and-tax. Spending always drives the equation.

That is why this summer my good friend and I and several other members of the Republican Party offered a series of amendments which said let's hold the line on spending. Let's do what families have had to do from time to time, what business owners, as my friend from California pointed out, have to do from time to time, what individual taxpayers have to do from time to time. Let's just spend what we spent last year.

After all, if you ask the typical American, do you think government spends a lot of money? Do you think maybe there is just a little bit of waste in the Federal Government? And everyone knows instinctively, of course there is. So we said, let's just spend what we spent last year.

You know what? Right now we are operating in a continuing resolution, which is a fancy way of saying we are living on last year's budget, even though the Congress was supposed to have budgets in place by September 30 and start a new budget. So we are living on last year's spending.

When we argued these amendments this fall, that is what we wanted to do, the other side told us, oh, the sky is going to fall, the world is going to end, all kinds of things are going to happen. You know what? For 4 weeks now we have been doing just what we offered in those amendments, living on last year's budget. And, guess what? Kids are going to school. The government is still running. Nothing terrible has really happened. If we can do it for 4 weeks, we can do it for 4 months, we can do it for the next year.

Here is why this is critical. If we don't begin to get a handle on spending, it hurts us in our economic position around the world. And right now Americans understand this as well. The market is so competitive, we have got to keep taxes low, keep spending under control so our economy can grow.

There was a point in the past, there was a point in the past coming out of World War II where America was uniquely situated; it didn't really matter if elected officials, if politicians did

some dumb things. But now it matters. Now the competition is so stiff we have got to get public policy right.

Just think of some of the numbers we have to deal with today. We have 300 million people in this country. We are competing with the Chinese, who have 1.3 billion. It is critical that we do things right so we can remain the economic superpower, because here is the way the world works.

The economic superpower is also the military and diplomatic superpower. Right now there is one country that fits that definition, that is the United States of America, and that is a good thing. The American people recognize instinctively that the world is safer and better when America leads. If in the future that is some other country, that is a scary thought. We want America to lead.

I kind of joke when I say I think the only folks who don't get that concept is the editorial page of the New York Times. But Americans understand that the world is better. I love what Cal Thomas said. He was talking one time about how sometimes the national media doesn't see things the same way that a typical American family does. He had a line when he was talking about the New York Times. He said, "I get up every morning and I read my Bible and the New York Times so I can see what each side is up to." There is certainly some truth in that statement.

It is important for America to lead. The way America can lead economically is to keep taxes low, keep spending under control, and, if we do that, American families, American business owners can create those jobs and make our economy grow so that we have a prosperous future, just like America has always had, and that will allow America to continue to be the greatest country in the world.

So I thank the gentleman for his time tonight and for his focus. He is so right on target. And my good friend from California as well.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Thanks so very much for joining us tonight, and for really shedding the truth on issues as they relate to taxes. You are so right about the spending.

That is what we have seen in this Congress, Mr. Speaker, is bill after bill after bill with more spending and more spending and more spending. And it will drive, it has to drive, increased taxes. So what we have seen is a proposal from not just a back-bencher, not just somebody who took some wild hair and decided that they were going to propose a tax increase; the proposal comes from the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, the tax writing committee. And in fact the Speaker in her first comments about it said she supported it.

Mr. Speaker, on Halloween, you talk about something that is frightening. As my friend from California said, that is frightening, to have the Speaker and the chairman of the Ways and Means

Committee supporting a \$3.5 trillion tax increase, the largest tax increase in the history of our Nation, on individuals.

My good friend from California, I am pleased to yield.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. My good friend from Georgia, I appreciate your yielding. You are talking about spending and you are talking about how much it has increased.

The American public would say before you raise my taxes, have you cut the waste, the fraud and abuse? You just talked about the chairman of Ways and Means. You look at the tax increase he proposed and you wonder why does he want to increase taxes so much?

I look back and I remember on this floor when we were bringing up the Health and Human Services bill. In there, you thought you were going to talk about the needs and the other things.

There was an amendment in there. I remember the debate on the Republican side, Mr. Speaker, because in there, there was put in what is called an earmark for \$2 million for a library which the college didn't ask for to be named after the chairman of Ways and Means. It was interesting to me, I call it "the monument to me," because that is exactly what it is. The American people need their taxes raised so somebody on this floor can name a library after themselves for \$2 million? And if you look at the brochure, it says it will be just as nice as President Clinton or President Carter, which I will tell the American people, Mr. Speaker, were paid for by private funds.

When it was challenged on the side of the Republicans to say maybe that earmark is not right because it didn't go through the process, the chairman of Ways and Means came to the floor and defended it and said he deserved it. When someone said, Well, maybe you shouldn't name it after yourself, he talked about it and said, No, I have been able to raise \$25 million from corporations to go through it. Then when he sat there and talked and they said, Well, maybe we should name one after ourselves, he said, No, no, you don't deserve it.

But that is the hypocrisy that goes on on this floor of the Congress. When you continue to spend, when you continue to move earmarks and you think you can just tax the American public more and more, they are going to wake up. That is why I appreciate the time you have taken, the Truth Squad, to let people know what goes on on this floor.

□ 2015

Mr. Speaker, I apologize to the American people for scaring them too much, but this is the truth, and I yield back to my good friend from Georgia.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for those comments, but the truth sometimes is painful. And it is important as leaders in this Nation

that we bring the truth to our constituents. And the truth of the tax bill that has been proposed is on this chart right here, Mr. Speaker. This describes the time from 2007 through 2050 and the amount of money that would be raised, the amount of taxes that would be raised by the Democrats is this orange line right here, this top line, and it continues to go up and up and up.

And the reason it is important to appreciate it going up is this ordinate here, the Y axis, has the percent of GDP. That is the entire economy of the United States. And once you get above about 18, 19, 20 at the outside, the economy tends to plummet. You can't run the economy in an aggressive and appropriate way to provide jobs for people when you get above 20 percent.

And the majority's party plan, the plan proposed by the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee and supported by the Speaker of the House in her first comments, what that plan does is move us upwards of 24 percent of gross domestic product. Mr. Speaker, that is a frightening prospect. That is not the kind of leadership, I believe, that the American people bargained for last November. The kind of leadership that they wanted, that they desired, were individuals to work together for solutions.

And the yellow line down here, Mr. Speaker, is a solution. It is called the Taxpayer Choice Act. It is uplifting, optimistic, enthusiastic support of the American people. It says, Mr. and Mrs. American, you know what to do with your money more than we do; and we believe that so strongly, we are not going to increase taxes on you. If you work harder, you will be able to keep more money. You will be able to appreciate the fruits of your labor. Isn't that what America is all about, Mr. Speaker? To be able to reward hard work and reward success and reward entrepreneurship and reward vision? That is what America is all about. That is what my constituents tell me when I go home.

So my constituents are concerned, which is why the numbers for Congress are so very, very low. An 11 percent approval rate of the United States Congress by the American people. Again, that troubles me. This is a wonderful, fine institution. It works best when people work together positively for their constituents.

So I challenge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, I challenge them to embrace them in the SCHIP arena, embrace a positive bill which provides reauthorization for the bill but ensures that moms and dads and families and kids can be able to make health care decisions with their doctor without the intervention of the Federal or State government.

As a physician, I know oh so well how the intervention of the State and Federal Government into the practice of medicine destroys the ability to take care of people. It makes it so you can't provide quality health care for children and moms and dads.

There are alternatives to that. H.R. 3888, the More Children More Choices Act. More kids being insured, the same number of kids proposed by the other side, but more choices. More personal ownership and more ability to control one's future.

In the area of taxes, Mr. Speaker, the alternative is clear. It is allowing Americans to keep more of their hard-earned money. It is what we have done for the last 6 years. It has resulted in the largest economic boom we have seen in a number of decades. In fact, it has resulted in the largest economic boom that we have seen since taxes were decreased before in the sixties and the eighties under President Kennedy and President Reagan. And what we saw under them was increasing revenues to the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, it is an incredible privilege to come to this floor and present ideas and speak on behalf on our constituents in a positive and optimistic and enthusiastic way. I encourage my colleagues to embrace the kind of optimism and enthusiasm we have for America. And if this majority party would do just that, I promise you that the ratings for this Congress would increase. I look forward to joining my colleagues in that positive and upbeat way.

VACATING 5-MINUTE SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ARCURI). Without objection, the 5-minute Special Order in favor of the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) is vacated.

There was no objection.

30-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP

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

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. I thank the Speaker and I thank the Speaker of the House, NANCY PELOSI, for once again allowing the 30-Something Working Group to come to the floor tonight and share with the American people and share with you, Mr. Speaker, some of the most important and pressing issues that are before this Congress right now, and to do that in part from a perspective of some of the hardworking individuals across this country who are looking for help from this Congress, who are looking for a Congress for the first time in a long time to start standing up for average, hardworking, everyday men and women who have been getting the short shrift from this government for a very long time.

I am soon to be joined by some of my colleagues, potentially Mr. RYAN and Mr. MEEK and Mr. ALTMIRE to discuss some of the issues confronting us today.

We will try, on behalf of Mr. ALTMIRE and Mr. MEEK, and certainly Mr. RYAN,

to make as few Halloween analogies as potentially positive. We have exhausted that already this evening, and we are guilty on both sides of the aisle, so we won't talk about things being frightening or scary, at least until Mr. RYAN gets here. He may not be able to resist.

It always amuses me when we are down here for one of these 30-Something Working Group hours, and a lot of times we are preceded by The Truth Squad or some of our friends on the Republican side of the aisle. Often their mantra is to preach to the Democratic side of the aisle and preach to the American people the values of fiscal responsibility.

Tonight we heard a little bit about it from our friends from the other side of the aisle chastising Chairman RANGEL and his new very progressive tax cut which will bring tax relief to millions of working-class families. We heard them talk about how it is time this Congress got spending under control as well.

Mr. Speaker, there are short memories on the other side of the aisle, short memories which seems to only go back 10 months. They do not go back 3, or 6 or 12 years ago when Republicans took control of this Congress. If they did, they may have some recollection of the fact that they had 12 years of control. The Republicans had 12 years of responsibility over the Federal budget to get some fiscal sense and some fiscal discipline in the Federal budget.

I stand here as a representative from a pretty fiscally conservative district. I represent northwestern Connecticut which is filled with Democrats and Republicans and Independents alike who care about the management of their Federal budget. They care about what this government does with their Federal dollars.

They may be sort of a more socially liberal or moderate district, but when it comes to dollars and cents, people in my district care about fiscal responsibility. So I think one of the reasons I replaced a 24-year incumbent is because after a while, people in my little corner of Connecticut and from across this country woke up to the fact that while on the floor of the House of Representatives or back in their districts or on the talk shows or the cable news networks, the Republicans said over and over again that they valued fiscal responsibility, but when they had a chance to pass budgets to back up that talk, when they had a chance to get the deficit under control, not only did they not do it, they made it worse.

This President with a Republican-controlled Congress in the House and the Senate, with a Republican-controlled administration inherited a budget surplus and turned that in just a few years into a record budget deficit. A chart that Mr. MEEK and Mr. RYAN have shown on this House floor year after year after year says it pretty well. President Bush during the time he has been in office, all of that,