

spending and the government is spending. That is ruinous for this Nation. That course cannot stand.

So I hope that as we debate this over the coming weeks and coming months that we can have some coming together here, we can agree on the bottom lines of health care reform, get coverage to people who don't have it, and lower costs to everybody. And we will shut out the people who scream government takeovers and death panels and all of the rest. All of the people either inside this building or outside this building whose agenda is to either stop health care from happening or to score political points shouldn't have a place at the table. But anyone who wants to have an honest debate about how we make the system work better for people we represent I think should be there. I think that's something we can all come together on.

I thank my colleagues for joining us this evening. We will be back as much as we can.

ACORN

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

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, for about the last 3 to 5 months I have been down here pretty regularly talking about maintaining and restoring the rule of law to certain areas of our activities as a government. And I think this is important. I've stated it over and over and over. We created a Republic by creating a Constitution that set up that form of government.

But our Founding Fathers knew that the moral underpinnings of a Republic were required for that Republic to succeed. And they knew that there had to be implanted and instilled in the hearts and minds of Americans who would be—would maintain this Republic, a certain inbred understanding that there were rules that governed our society and our behavior and that there were morals and ethics which should be applied to what we do as we operate this Republic.

You will recall that when Benjamin Franklin was asked, when he walked outside of the Constitutional Congress, and they said, "Mr. FRANKLIN, what kind of government have you given us?" He said, "We have given you a Republic."

Now, God help us that we can keep it. And the whole purpose of that statement is to point out that he was fairly confident, as was every one of our Founding Fathers, that at that point in time in the United States of America there was a moral and ethical underpinning of society, and that if we would maintain that moral and ethical underpinning of society, we would be able to keep our Republic.

But I don't think any Founding Father envisioned a society in which indi-

viduals thought they would make the choices as to which rules applied to them and what rules did not apply to them, and they would not abide by the rules that society had set but rather the rules that they had chosen to govern their own lives. Because that's not a Republic; that's anarchy.

Now, we've been talking about some things that are going on in our society and in this Congress that have to concern everybody. And they have to concern them in a big way because they affect the attitudes of those who govern here in the Congress and those who are involved in this governmental process.

I've tried to raise and point out some things that I think are of dire concern, and I will continue to do this because I spent most of my entire adult life basically following as best I could and trying to enforce those rules that this society has established for itself to operate in.

And when I came to this Congress as a new Member of Congress almost 8 years ago now, I was told there were rules that govern this body—all of the people who serve in the United States Congress—and I very quickly tried to do my best—as I am sure every Member here has—to learn what those rules were. And they were not only just parliamentary rules, but they were fundraising rules, they were political rules, they were reporting rules, they were tax-paying rules. There's lots of rules that govern the activities in this body.

I had started talking about this because I see a trend, and I see things that are happening that make me concerned that there are those who don't think certain rules apply to them.

I am going to point out what the President of the United States said as he started out his term: "I campaigned on changing Washington and bottom-up politics. I don't want to send a message to the American people that there are two sets of standards: one for the powerful people and one for the ordinary folks who are working every day and paying their taxes." This was stated by Barack Obama to CNN February 3, 2009. And it's a noble statement by the President.

That's sort of what I am trying to talk about right now.

And I've got a laundry list that I went over last week, and this list is pretty much the same list but with some exceptions. I've added some things and taken up another subject.

But I want to start with something that's made the headlines here very recently, and that's this organization known as ACORN, which we discovered by watching television and seeing events on television, that people who were established to do certain things under the rules in fact forgot those rules and did others. And this House voted 345-75 for an amendment to bar the Federal funding to ACORN after these undercover investigators uncovered four ACORN offices engaged in blatant mortgage loan fraud and aiding and abetting prostitution.

In my opinion, that was the right vote. I am proud of my colleagues who voted for it, and I think we need a stand-alone bill—not a bill that's an amendment to another bill—that would restate the very obvious: That no Federal moneys should be distributed to those who would blatantly commit mortgage fraud and aiding and abetting prostitution. And many of us saw that, saw it live and in color on television.

But in addition to those videos, we have had our bodies here in this Congress out doing some investigations of ACORN, and they have found a lot to be concerned about.

They found a nationwide history of crime—most of it relating to the last election, but not all of it; some of it relating to mortgages and other things that they were supposedly there to advise the uneducated and the uninformed as to what was available for them, especially the poor and the underprivileged, so that they might attempt to prosper in our society. They sounded like a good cause.

But if you will examine with me this list for just a moment, these are things that our Oversight Committee has found and brought forward. There are things that have been brought forward by the press, and there are things that have been brought forward by court records.

In Colorado we had allegations of voter fraud with multiple counts with convictions. So people were convicted of that crime. In Florida, voter fraud with cases pending in the courts; in Michigan, vote fraud with multiple counts with convictions in the State of Michigan; Minnesota, vote fraud with multiple counts with convictions in Minnesota; Missouri, mail fraud and identity theft, multiple counts with convictions in Missouri; Nevada, vote fraud, multiple counts pending; Ohio, vote fraud, multiple counts with convictions; Pennsylvania, vote fraud, multiple counts with convictions; Washington State, vote fraud, multiple counts with convictions.

Notice how many times the words "with convictions"—which means—I think everybody knows what that means. It means a finder of fact and a ruler of law made a judgment that these people had violated the law, and they convicted them of breaking that law, and I assume they assessed some form of punishment against them.

So this is a case, I would argue, of just what I was talking about when I started talking today, that someone—and I would argue a whole group of someones—have made a decision that certain laws don't apply to them and therefore, they blatantly—across the United States in a very short period of time, basically the last election cycle—they went out and violated these laws and these rules because they made their personal judgment that the law that we as a society established didn't apply to them.

This is moral relativism run amok, and it's done with \$55-plus million of

United States money because that's how much money we have heard that we have allocated and given to ACORN to do their business.

And by the way, we have bills that have passed this House that the Democrat majority have put in other funding mechanisms to the tune of \$8 billion, and that's why when we address this very issue that we would no longer fund ACORN, we need to make sure that that includes those things already approved for sources of revenue for ACORN. Because if you're not going to follow the rules of law, there needs to be consequences in our society.

So we start off with this supposedly great helping organization called ACORN.

□ 2115

The next thing I want to address here tonight, and I see that I'm joined by one of my good colleagues, and if he would like to have some of the time, I would be sure glad to give him some, is the fact that Dr. RON PAUL has raised an issue before this body that I think we ought to be concerned about and that we ought to think about, and that issue that he has raised is that we have turned over an awful lot of money to the Federal Reserve, and the Federal Reserve has independently of this body issued an awful lot of additional indebtedness and printed an awful lot of additional money, and we would like an accounting of what is going on.

I think it's kind of important, and I would venture to say that if anybody walks up to anybody who serves in this House of Representatives and says, Where is the money we put in the TARP bill? Can you account to me where that TARP money is? Can you tell me where the stimulus money is and what has happened to it? I have been asked the question all the time. How much have we spent? Well, what we know is that the press says we've spent this or the press says we've spent that, but we should know that. I mean, we are the people that were sent here by the American folks to take care of their business.

The Federal Reserve has been designed because it has an effect on our economy. The theory is you've got to keep their activities sort of off in a dark mist so nobody really knows what is happening so you don't cause a run on one part or the other of the economy. And I don't have a problem with that.

But it comes down to the fact that this Congress has turned over \$1 trillion worth of American indebtedness, basically money we don't have, money we are borrowing from other nations like China and others that are buying our paper so that we can issue these huge amounts of money. And if you take the TARP and the stimulus bill, it's \$1 trillion, well, you've got to ask—and there's more than that, you've got more than that—but we ought to know.

So Congressman PAUL has introduced H.R. 1207, and he is asking that we look

into what's going on with our money. He says that we've given the Fed \$700 billion in Bush TARP funds, and the Congress has given \$787 billion in Obama stimulus funds, so that's \$1.4 trillion and some change that we've given to the Fed, and yet the taxpayers and the Members of Congress have no way to independently verify what in the world the Fed has done with this money or where it is or who it went to or anything.

Now, we read about it in the newspapers. I used to tell juries when they would come before me, I would say, now we've got a case on trial here today that may be in the newspapers or on television or on radio, or there may be something out there in the news about this case. But I don't want you to listen to any radio broadcast, view any television programs or read anything in print about this case because, believe it or not, they don't always get it right. And we want you to only base your opinion on the evidence you hear in this courtroom under the rules of evidence. I'm sure my friend, Mr. GOHMERT, Judge GOHMERT, has done exactly the same instruction. And the reason is, you don't really know if the newspapers know what they're talking about. I like to hear what they have to say, but you don't know.

So why should the people that sit in these chairs around this whole big room, why should those people not have an answer to that question, Where is my money? Who is spending it? Where is it going to? How much is left? I think the guy that owns the garage on the corner down the street from me, he pays his taxes, he is entitled to know. His children, grandchildren, and great grandchildren are inheriting the debt we have created for them. They ought to be able to know what we are doing with it today.

And do you know what? That kind of number is a potential for disaster if somebody is crooked. Because it's such a big number, how are you going to know? There can be people stealing billions of dollars, and we don't know. So we ought to know.

I think Dr. PAUL has a good bill here. Let me ask my friend, LOUIE GOHMERT from east Texas and a fellow judge, I will yield such time as he may wish to spend on this subject of the Federal Reserve and the fact that we probably ought to have an audit that is reported back to this Congress.

Mr. GOHMERT. I appreciate my friend yielding.

This is a very important issue, and actually if you go back to the original bailout bill a year ago, as I read through it, and I did, I didn't read the extra pages that were added for pork at the end, but one of the things that caught my eye was here was a bill for \$700 billion for bailout, basically a slush fund for the Treasury Secretary; but in the bill it raised the debt ceiling \$1.3 trillion. Now that caught my eyes, because I know \$700 billion is less than \$1.3 trillion. So I went back through

reading again for any loopholes that might allow for the expenditure of more than \$700 billion.

Well, we know that before the bill finally passed, there was about \$100 billion in pork added in order to get enough votes so that it would pass. That still leaves half a trillion dollars between what the debt ceiling was raised and how much was appropriated in that bill. So I went back through, and one of the things that intrigued me was a provision that allowed the Secretary of the Treasury to hire, utilize whatever personnel was necessary in order to carry out the intentions of the bill.

Well, I was impressed and went to one of the Treasury people privately and asked, what does that mean? Are we going to have a new department of asset management? Are we going to set up a whole new bureaucracy here in Washington? Is there going to be \$500 billion spent setting up this kind of extra bureaucracy? And the answer I got was basically, and it was unofficial and informal, but was basically, look, we will hire some people, but ultimately this is going to be so much work we'll have to outsource it.

Well, I don't know if my friend from Texas noticed, but it turns out that the favorite firm of the former Secretary Paulson and the current Secretary Geithner had its biggest profit in the history of Goldman Sachs in the second quarter of this year.

So when my friend talks about transparency, wouldn't it be nice to know how much of that \$3.44 billion in clear profit that Goldman Sachs made came from taxpayers, came from the United States Government? But do you know what? There is only one way we really get to know exactly where all that money came from and how much went from the Federal Government. Sure, Goldman Sachs will have to file reports and whatnot, but it would really be nice to see from the government's own reports just how much Federal money is going Goldman Sachs' way, and how much money is being funneled from here in Washington to Wall Street. That would be important to know.

I think one of the things that we have seen, especially in the last several months, is that just because it's good for a Wall Street firm doesn't mean it's good for the stock market and it doesn't mean it's good for rank-and-file Americans who are paying their taxes to keep this government running who also were called upon as they saved and scrimped and tried to meet the demands of the day to be called on to bail out the Wall Street firms. And so it would be nice if maybe they would share a little more than what we are able to see.

I also want to point out the subject of transparency is so important. There is not much that is more cleansing than sunshine. Sunshine, you get enough of it, the mold and mildew just dries up and dies. You get enough sunshine, and things clean up, you get rid

of all the mold and nastiness. And yet what we get around here is people are left in the dark and fed lots of manure. Well, that will grow plenty of mushrooms, but that is not what we are supposed to be about here in Congress.

So the rules of the House, the rules of the Federal Reserve it seems like right now, they are just being played fast and loose, which parenthetically that gives rise to a situation we have right here tonight this week where we played fast and loose with the rules so you have a Defense appropriation, a defense authorization bill where you bring in a hate crimes bill, and I know there's a lot of agreement over what its effect will be; but clearly, one of the effects will be that it will make homosexuality and transgender a protected class.

The elderly were rejected. We weren't going to give them any added protection. Of course, some of us fought for the elderly. If you're going to give anybody protection, how about the elderly? They are commonly sought out. But, no, they weren't protected. And they certainly hadn't been protected in this administration's proposals for Medicare cuts, half a billion—I'm sorry—half a trillion basically in Medicare cuts. So I guess the thinking is we're not going to protect the elderly as much as homosexuals, transgender or even pedophiles. We tried to have an amendment that would exclude pedophiles from a protected class under the hate crimes bill, and that was rejected along party lines basically. So anyway we are not going to protect elderly as much as these sexuality lifestyle groups.

And then we turn around and we tack that hate crimes bill on to the military or Defense appropriation or Defense authorization. We've got soldiers out in the field needing this bill, and we're going to play fast and loose with the rules. We will not be allowed to amend this on the floor; we will not be allowed to change anything about this. It's take it or leave it. And I just think it is so outrageous while we have soldiers in the field to use this Defense authorization bill that's going to help our soldiers protect us, it's going to protect them while they protect us, and you tack on a hate crimes bill to the Defense authorization? Just how much disrespect can somebody have for the rules of this body and for procedure to do that kind of thing? It is just outrageous.

But then as you see these kinds of things coming into play, you see the lack of what really is strong morality in our financial laws, in our transparency. And it was Chuck I heard earlier this year was pointing out that when you lose morality, you're going to have economic chaos; you're going to have economic instability. And when you lose economic stability, people—and this is so tragic—but people throughout history, when they have economic chaos are always willing to give up liberties to gain economic sta-

bility. You lose morality in the Federal Reserve, in the Treasury of the United States, and in ACORN and all the voting laws and the procedure of this body. You lose what is just right. You lose that, and it contributes to economic instability, and then that gives rise to economic chaos. And people always give up their liberties trying to get economic stability.

So I think we get back to that sense of morality when you start having transparency, when you're able to see what's going on, when it's not behind closed doors, when it's not some private group with an agenda out there drafting the Employment Non-Discrimination Act who has their own lifestyle agenda, when it's not some group behind closed doors saying let's push through this stimulus bill, it may not stimulate America, it won't spend money, most of it for 2 years, it really won't do what we are saying is stimulus, but, boy, will it enrich our friends.

□ 2130

We have to get away from that or we are going to lose this country. We cannot continue down this road with a lack of candor, with a lack of openness and honesty. We have got to return to transparency. That will help address the issues of this country. Sunlight always has a way of doing that.

Mr. CARTER. I thank my colleague for his passion. You know, it is very simple: We expect the Fed to look at our banks back home and make sure that they are handling our money right. I don't think anybody I know has close to a billion dollars in the bank, and yet we expect the people that we put in charge of our money to have somebody looking over their shoulder to make sure that they are doing the right thing.

This is the largest chunk of money on the face of the Earth right here, and I don't think it is too much to ask somebody to look over their shoulder and decide what is going on.

Mr. GOHMERT. If my friend would yield, this is such an important point.

Through the economic downturn over the last year or so, a lot of people across America have confused community banks and investment banks. They have just lumped them all in together, and there is a major difference. You have community banks who have to have complete transparency. They have Federal regulators who come in and check every dot and tittle. They have to make sure that everything is just the way the Federal regulators want it. Some of us have been concerned that over-aggressiveness by Federal regulators in the most stable of our financial institutions, the community banks, has helped dry up a great deal of the credit.

So imagine the hypocrisy to have Federal regulators just swarm in like locusts to community banks which are the most stable and have been the most careful in Federal banking, and they

are being regulated by people who will not open their books to this Congress. That in itself is such an outrage that it alone ought to be a basis for getting RON PAUL's bill here to the floor, get it passed, and let's open them up. I love what Newt Gingrich said: If transparency is good enough for the CIA, it really ought to be good enough for the Federal Reserve.

Mr. CARTER. That is very good.

I am going to change gears here because I have serious business on the floor of this House tomorrow. For every week of this year, just about, I have come before this body and I have discussed with them the fact that we have serious allegations that have been made against the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. RANGEL. I have asked repeatedly that Mr. RANGEL do the right thing and resign his position as the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee until such time as these allegations have been dealt with by the appropriate authorities. A lot of this is supposed to have been dealt with and we have been promised would be dealt with by Speaker PELOSI. She told us, by the end of 2008, the Ethics Committee would have resolved Mr. RANGEL's issues.

So I am going to just go briefly over a few.

Mr. RANGEL admits to underreporting income and assets for 2007 by more than half, including failure to report income from his Caribbean resort property again. By the way, I say "again" because that's the allegation that started all of this information about Mr. RANGEL.

Mr. RANGEL's aides have now also filed amended disclosure forms revealing similar underreporting by them.

The Committee on Standards is still investigating Mr. RANGEL's lease of multi rent-controlled apartments in Harlem; his use of the House parking spot for long-term storage for his antique Mercedes; his failure to report and pay taxes on rental income on his resort villa in the Dominican Republic; an alleged quid pro quo trading legislative actions in exchange for donations to a center named for Mr. RANGEL at City College of New York; a gift rule violation on trips to the Caribbean sponsored by the Carib News Foundation in 2007 and 2008; and now Mr. RANGEL has the audacity to push through a bill in this body today increasing tax penalties on his fellow taxpayers on the heels of Secretary Geithner's crackdown on UBS depositors for failure to pay taxes.

So, you know, tomorrow I will be offering to this body a very important piece of legislation, a document called a privileged resolution, asking this body to consider what Mr. RANGEL refuses to do, and that is the right thing.

We cannot have the chief taxing authority of this body with the allegations, and there are many more than these, these are just a few. There is another full page just like this of different allegations. We cannot have the

chief of values over the IRS, the man who writes the tax laws for this House of Representatives, as the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. It is a travesty of justice for him to serve as the chairman of that committee when the American citizens back home, they realize that he has been getting special treatment on his tax problems and those problems he has not faced, the onerous issues that they have to face when they have the IRS finding that they haven't paid their taxes, and he is doing, we are seeing just what President Obama said he didn't want to see, and that is people of power being treated differently than the ordinary American citizen. That is why I have raised this issue.

When I read what the President said, that gave me the incentive to do this. It does not please me at all to raise issues against any Member in this body, but I am telling you, this gives an appearance of wrongdoing and an appearance of impropriety at the least on behalf of Mr. RANGEL, and good governance tell us he should not be in this position of power until the issues are resolved.

I will be the first to say if they are all resolved and concluded to be irrelevant and not any kind of wrongdoing or breaking of the rules, I will be the first to say Mr. RANGEL ought to be the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. He ought to be put back in there. But it is not right for him to be there.

So tomorrow, I will ask this body to remove him from that position.

Does the gentleman wish to comment on the issues with Mr. RANGEL?

Mr. GOHMERT. It goes back to the issue of transparency. Everybody needs to be accountable under the same rules no matter who it is. And actually, this weekend, I had a number of people commenting on how unfair it was of Congress to be judged by one standard, and specifically mentioning the chairman of the Ways and Means, and the rest of America to be judged by another standard. It is difficult for the American people to understand.

If that were me, I couldn't do this. I would have had to pay the penalty and interest. I mentioned to my friend previously about my constituent, Mr. de le Torre, and he was very proud of his Hispanic descent. He said de le Torre meant "of the tower." Apparently he had some royalty back in Spain some centuries ago.

But here he had four permanent employees, four part-time employees, and he had a sheet metal business, and he had no problem with me mentioning his name and his own situation. And with the downturn in the economy, he wanted to protect his employees. He did not want to let them go. He knew they were struggling, and he certainly was struggling. And, of course, he is the last one to get paid. He didn't have any money. And yet the quarterly payment had to be made for the portions of Social Security and the Federal tax

on that payroll, and he did not have the money. And because of the additional pressures being brought to bear by the Federal Reserve, who will not be transparent against community banks, which are doing everything they can and have been transparent, he wasn't able to get a loan. He could not get a loan or a line of credit to make his payment, his quarterly payment to the government.

So he notified them, filed how much he owed, but said, I don't have any cash. I don't want to fire any of my employees, and I can't get a loan or a line of credit to make my quarterly payment.

They let him know you owe penalty and interest. We are coming after you. He was telling me that he has since been notified that they are going to start seizing his accounts and his assets, sell them off if necessary, but seize his assets if he does not make his penalty and interest payment.

So it is kind of hard for a guy like that who is being loyal to these people, the eight people who work with him and for him, how a guy that is chairman of the committee that writes the tax laws can do far worse and not be open, not just be completely transparent in what has happened.

The chairman of the committee doesn't have to pay penalty or interest, and yet this poor man does. It is hard for him to understand, and it is hard for rank-and-file Americans to understand. It is not the standard that this Congress should be establishing. I so hope that we can get back to being a Congress that leads by example.

You know, I think about the words of George Washington. He was a man who had incredible bravery. We would not have the Nation as we know it if it were not for his humility, his willingness to resign and go home after winning a revolution. His words, his exact words were, "A people unused to restraint must be led; they will not be drove." And that was okay English back in those days.

I look at what we are doing now. We are dealing with a country that is not used to restraint, and yet the financial taxation laws are restraining Americans like never before, not so much because of the percentage but because of the actual effect on Americans. And we are not leading as Washington implored. We are trying to drive Americans to do what this Congress has not done and should be doing, and that is lead by example.

And we were promised by the Speaker that this would be the most transparent and open and accountable Congress. That simply has not happened. In fact, to the contrary. I don't know that there has ever been one that has been more closed and protective of its own, and that really has to change.

I yield back to my friend.

Mr. CARTER. I agree. There will be more about Mr. RANGEL tomorrow.

I want to bring up something else. We have had a lot of issues to do with

automobiles in this country, and now we have somebody at least that is trying to say, you know, the United States Constitution, section 10, says no State shall pass any ex post facto law or law impairing the obligation of contracts or grant any title of nobility.

This is the Auto Dealers Economic Rights Restoration Act, and this bill prohibits automakers in which the Federal Government has ownership interest or which receives loans from the Federal Government from depriving an auto dealer of its economic rights.

What they are talking about is it seems that these automobile dealerships when they were in the bailout position with the Federal Government—and, quite frankly, General Motors stands for "Government Motors," as far as I am concerned, and Chrysler is sort of in the same boat. I understand Fiat was buying some of that. I am not sure that they made the purchase.

These people went out and made choices to break contracts with one auto dealer and award his customers to another auto dealer. There have been allegations made that these were political decisions. I have no evidence of that. But it is, you know, a right of contract, and they had a contract with these dealers, and because they were pressured, I would argue that they breached contracts with one group of dealers to put their sales into the hands of another dealer. For what reason is beyond my understanding.

□ 2145

But I think this is a good law because it says, this is a violation of the Constitution. This is not the way we do business in the United States. And you know what? We did the Cash For Clunkers, and oh, boy, the government was involved and the money was flowing and all's right with the world, although the government hasn't even started to pay for the clunkers yet. They're still out there processing the deals. And, you know, I think that's a great example, Cash For Clunkers is the perfect example. Do you really want the government running your health care if they can't even pay for junk cars on time? My Lord. I mean, but anyway, that's all part of another tangent.

Mr. GOHMERT. If the gentleman might yield on that point.

Mr. CARTER. I will yield to my friend.

Mr. GOHMERT. On the Cash For Clunkers program we know that there are many foreign vehicles that are manufactured here in the United States, and the American workers do a fantastic job. But it is worth noting that in this program that was rushed through so quickly without going through the proper order, without getting the proper scrutiny through committees and through proper chance for amendment here on the floor, where you can take a law that may have some problems and make it better, we're not allowed any of that opportunity.

And so what we got was a Cash For Clunkers program in which four of the five top vehicles that were purchased were foreign vehicles. Now, some of those were made in America, but most of them were made in foreign countries. In other words, the Cash For Clunkers vehicles helped foreign governments and foreign companies more than it helped American companies. And they want to run my health care. My goodness. Is that sad? If it weren't so tragic, how much we help foreign companies over our own U.S. companies, it would be a comedy. It's just outrageous.

Mr. CARTER. Reclaiming my time for just a moment. I will also point out that, to date, according to my auto dealers, they still haven't paid all the dealers for all the clunkers that they bought. So you know, that program has closed out, finished out, done, and there are some dealers with millions of dollars owed to them and the government hasn't processed those dollars in that thing. The important part of this bill is—

Mr. GOHMERT. If I might, on one other point. Unforeseen consequences too. Because we didn't have a chance to go through the proper channels and really look at this legislation, the Cash For Clunkers bill, one of the effects has been that the working poor in America have been the hardest-hit, because they were not able to come in and buy a brand new car with this attractive program because they didn't have the money to make the payments after that.

So it really didn't help the working poor in the United States. And, in fact, it hurt them because what happened under this Cash For Clunkers program is thousands of vehicles, used vehicles that would be sold cheaply to the working poor in America, cars they could afford, were just fixed to where they could not be run, could not be operated, could not be sold. That drives up the price of the used vehicles that the working poor in America really need to get to and from their jobs. So it hurt those who needed help in America the most and helped foreign companies over domestic companies. Now that's a government program that we're going to use, I'm sure, to model health care after.

Mr. CARTER. And you know, reclaiming my time, the reports this week have been that the sales from our two bailed-out automobile firms that are now part of Government Motors, are tragically low, and there's a lot of talk that they don't know if General Motors can even pull this out. So it's important. Mr. GOHMERT has hit upon something that's very important. It's important that we follow procedures and follow the rules. That's what we're talking about, the rule of law, follow the rules. We need to follow the rules of this House so we give a proper examination of every bill and every idea that passes through these halls.

And that's why we've got a bill by GREG WALDEN and JOHN CULBERSON and

BRIAN BAIRD that says how about us following the rules that are written into our book that was written by the Honorable Thomas Jefferson in the rules of this very House of Representatives, that says we're supposed to get three days to read a bill? And as Mr. GOHMERT pointed out, just the Cash For Clunkers bill didn't go through any committees, rushed in here. We saw it when we were voting on it and, bam, it was out there. And has it done any good for the automobile industry?

Maybe there was an idea sitting in one of these chairs that would have been a little bit better than the idea that came from who knows where, because it didn't go through a committee system to get through floor, and none of us had time to read it or come up with an idea or amend it, because the rules didn't allow us to amend it.

And that's what's happened on every bill that's been offered this year of any importance. It is brought to us, crammed down our throat, and we're not given the chance to even read it. The American people have made an outcry, and they're making an outcry about bills that are hard to read. I'll admit they're hard to read. But they're saying, why don't you read the bill that's going to change health care in America permanently? And so many of us struggled through it and did. But we're not enforcing a rule that says we should have 3 days to read this bill. We should.

If Americans send us to Washington to be their voice and cast their vote in Washington, D.C., and we are handed a document that may be 2,000 pages long and spend \$700 billion, and it gets to us at midnight and we're expected to vote on it at 10:00 the next morning and they drop in amendments after that, how in the world can we do the job the American people sent us to do here?

So this bill right here, the 3-day reading rule, is just ordinary good courtesy and common sense in a place where we spent, in the last year, in the last 6 months we've spent more than we spent in the history of the Republic. So maybe we should slow down. Maybe we should follow the rules and give us 3 days to read these bills. Sorry, but that's kind of a passion, I think, Mr. GOHMERT. I'll yield.

Mr. GOHMERT. Thank you. And the point about having time to read the bill could not be illustrated more clearly than on the stimulus bill that was basically crammed down this body's throat. We were promised by the President back when he was running for office that he was going to have, what is it, 4 or 5 days it would be up on the Internet, where all America could read these bills for days before we voted on them. But it gets a little hard to take the administration, the President, leaders of this body seriously when they all parroted that stuff and how they were going to do that.

And then on the stimulus bill we were told over and over, we didn't have time to read the bill. We just didn't. It

was filed, I think, after midnight. We're voting on it, over 1,000 pages. There was no time for anybody to read it. We were told that there were thousands of people losing their jobs every day. It had to become law immediately. There's no time to read it; just do it. Just do it. Just vote on it. Well, some of us still wanted to see what was in it. We voted against it, and yet it passed on that Friday, and so because it was such an emergency, they said, and we didn't have time to read the bill, we passed it on Friday, and then Saturday came and went, and Sunday came and went, and Monday came and went, and Tuesday, when the photo op was set up in Colorado for the President to sign the bill, he finally got around to signing the bill.

Why couldn't we have had those 3 days and voted on it on Monday if it was such an important bill and if the President had been serious and the leadership of this House had been serious about the importance of reading bills? Why couldn't we have had Friday, Saturday, Sunday, and then debated on Monday? But we were denied that, even though the President never had any intention of signing that bill for 4 days after it was signed. So it gets a little hard to take some of the acrimony on the floor seriously, as in that case, when we were just ridiculed for not being willing to sign it immediately and for wanting to read it when there just was no time to waste. Four days later, the President signed it.

Mr. CARTER. Reclaiming my time, I call that the Chicken Little syndrome. The sky is falling. We've had the sky falling in this Chamber on more than one piece of legislation. Oh, my God, the sky is falling; the banks are dropping off a cliff, the economy's going to hell in a handbasket, and you've got to vote now. Don't bother to read it. Don't ask any questions. Give us the money. Trust us. Sign the check.

Well, and I'm telling you this, the same thing happened in the last waning months of the Bush administration, and I didn't support that then, and I won't support it now, because the sky's not falling. We're sent here to do a job, and we ought to be given the chance to read these bills. And I think this is a good bill. And I hope our leadership will let us bring this up. I'm coming down to the last thing I want to talk about tonight, and that is, we are setting history, because we now have more czars by twofold than the Romanovs in all the history of Russia, Imperial Russia.

And so we have a couple of bills, both of them dealing with czars, which say that they want to—Mrs. BLACKBURN wants to deal with the czars. And we'll start with Mr. SCALISE. Mr. SCALISE defines czars. We have now, and I may be corrected by my friend, Judge GOHMERT, but I believe we're at 34 czars, or maybe 36 czars have been created by this administration, which is like head and shoulders above any bunch of czars we've ever had. We've got czars for everything in the world.

In fact, the compensation czar today announced some compensation rules which were kind of interesting, and I think there's going to be some contract law matters that will probably come up on that. But we have a compensation czar. We have a czar probably, you know, furniture polish czar, for all I know. But sunset the czars. In other words, let's look at them, see what they're doing. If they're not doing anything worth having or they're duplicating efforts that are done by the people who've gone through the Senate appointment process and been vetted by the Senate, the secretaries of the various departments of this government, maybe we ought to just eliminate the czars.

Then our friend, MARSHA BLACKBURN, has a bill that the President is to report the responsibilities and qualifications that authorize the special assistance of czars. The President will certify that the czars will not assert powers beyond those granted by the law to a commissioned officer on the President's staff, and Congress will hold hearings on the President's report and certification within 30 days.

In other words, Mr. President, tell us what those folks are going to do, how qualified they are to do the job. We're going to pay them somewhere between \$175,000 and \$200,000 a year to do the job. And the Congress ought to be able to see that report and have the ability to deal with it. Both of these are good laws, and both of these have to do with czars. My friend, LOUIE GOHMERT, has been here with me for almost the full hour. We're about 5 minutes from conclusion, so I'll yield a couple of minutes to my friend, LOUIE GOHMERT.

Mr. GOHMERT. With regard to the czars, we've seen over and over examples of people who have been placed in these positions, and it doesn't do me any good or anybody in America any good to say, well, you know, prior presidents have used czars. Not to this extent. Not ever, and I never really cared for them, no matter who the President was. I didn't like the bailout last year. I thought, until this administration, it was possibly the worst domestic action that's been taken in the last 50 or 60 years. That is, until this administration just left \$700 billion in the sand as it blew through more and more money. But then, to have this massive spending spree that's, while we've got people appointed by the White House, not properly vetted, and the more we find out about these people, the more we're concerned they should never have been in those positions in the first place.

And as we know, we've already had one recently step down, he should have never been there in the first place, whereas, if you went through regular order there and had advice and consent of the Senate, it doesn't mean they're going to be perfect. Nobody is. No process is. But there was real ingenuity in the process that was set up by the Founders, and the advice and consent

is an important issue. But the whole reason our Founders set up a President outside the main stream of Congress, unlike the parliament that elects a prime minister from this body, it was going to be from outside this body so that there would be more checks and balances, and the czars have done nothing but create Scars upon Thars—with all deference to Dr. Seuss—scars across America, as they have been unaccountable to the Congress, to the courts, to America. And that really has to be changed.

□ 2200

We need the sunlight. We need transparency. We don't need czars.

Mr. CARTER. Reclaiming my time, I agree with my friend and fellow judge from Texas. We don't need czars that don't answer to the people. We intentionally designed the executive department to stand with checks and balances over it, just like the legislative department is designed that way. We intended it. This is not the way our Founding Fathers intended this country to be run.

We've been talking tonight about the rule of law. It's about the rule of law. It's about following the rules. You know, if we don't hold each other to the standards that are required by this body, if we don't hold our colleagues to the standards that are required by this body, then why would we expect the American people to trust us? I will tell you, all of us need to be worried about the issue of trust. So I will continue to raise these issues, and I will be glad to be joined by anyone in this discussion to discuss following the rules and obeying the law.

MODIFICATION IN APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2647, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NYE). Without objection and pursuant to clause 11 of rule I, the Chair removes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES) as a conferee from the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence on H.R. 2647 and appoints the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) to fill the vacancy.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will notify the Senate of the change in conferees.

REPEAL THE DON'T ASK, DON'T TELL POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY) is recognized for 60 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and ex-

tend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, tonight, October 6, at 10:03 p.m., we have a very special night. My colleagues and I stand here tonight to champion the repeal of the Don't Ask, Don't Tell policy. Repealing Don't Ask, Don't Tell is important. It's important for three reasons.

Number one, it is vital to our national security that we repeal Don't Ask, Don't Tell. We have kicked out over 13,000 troops since we enacted this law 16 years ago. We have kicked out over 400 troops just this year, in 2009. When our commanders on the ground are desperate for troops in Iraq and Afghanistan, now is not the time to throw them out—not for any type of sexual misconduct, but just because they're gay.

Number two, do we need to repeal Don't Ask, Don't Tell because it is doing right by our taxpayers? It is costing the American taxpayer \$1.3 billion to throw these young American heroes out of our military just because of their sexual orientation. It costs the American taxpayer \$60,000 to recruit these young heroes to come in, to train them up, to make them warriors, and then we just disregard them just because of their sexual orientation.

And, lastly, the Don't Ask, Don't Tell policy goes against the very fabric of what makes our country the greatest country on Earth, the fact that we're all created equal.

Mr. Speaker, we have colleagues, Members of this great House here tonight to argue about the repeal of Don't Ask, Don't Tell. There are 176 cosponsors to repeal this act, but one of these Members is the highest-ranking enlisted soldier ever to serve the United States Congress. He was a command sergeant major. That is the highest rank you can become in the United States Army in the enlisted ranks. He is a sophomore Congressman from Minnesota. His name is TIM WALZ. He is an American patriot and a hero, and I'd like to turn it over to my colleague and my friend, TIM WALZ from the great State of Minnesota.

Mr. WALZ. Thank you to my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania. Thank you for your service in the military. Thank you for your leadership in this Congress and, especially, thank you for standing forward on this important issue. The colleagues who have joined us here tonight understand this issue is one of civil liberties, of basic human dignity and of national security.

As my colleague said, I had the privilege and the honor to serve this Nation for 24 years in uniform. I can tell you, there is no greater privilege than putting on the uniform of the United States Army and trying to do the best