

certain that we have an energy policy that works for this country.

I flew wounded and fallen soldiers out of Baghdad. And it is very clear that we have two fronts over in the Middle East, in Afghanistan and Iraq and a much broader region because of the oil that that area produces. This is about making our Nation stronger. We have to do this now. The Department of Defense realizes this, and that is why they are testing alternative fuels. We can make that innovation. We believe in the American people. That is what this bill is about.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I just want to add, the answer that our friends on the other side have given when we said, increase the Pell Grant, no; increase minimum wage, no; change the energy policy, no; change health care policy, no; add a stimulus bill that is going to keep people working, no.

That is not leadership, and this is bold stuff that we are trying to do. We are trying to lead the country. At the end of the day, that is going to pay off for everyone. I yield back.

Mr. BOCCIERI. You're exactly right, Congressman RYAN. We are going to be judged by two measures in this Congress, two measures, by action or inaction. And I am so happy that we had this opportunity to speak tonight on clean energy and our national security.

SETTING THE RECORD STRAIGHT

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the privilege to be recognized here on the floor of the House. I would remark that the common courtesy here is to yield. And I'm happy to yield to the gentlemen who are here if we could carry on this dialogue with or without that particular yielding. I know it is only four to one, so it would be an interesting engagement that could take place.

I have to correct a few things on the RECORD. One of them is, as the gentleman from Ohio challenged the mendacity of the Republicans, who had said that there is a \$4,000 increase on a payroll, that is exactly the number you get if the payroll is \$50,000 and you tax it at 8 percent. That is in the bill, Mr. Speaker, and that is a precise number, and that is what I sought to offer that could have been injected in for an open dialogue.

But we do deal with the facts. It is hard to get those facts when you have a bill that is drafted and a bill that has to be drafted to match a CBO number. The Congressional Budget Office came out with an estimate of a \$1 trillion health care plan, and we found out that the Congressional Budget Office came out with that number without having read the bill, Mr. Speaker.

So we are poised to go down a path by tying a blindfold around our eyes and charging off into the abyss of so-

cialized medicine with a \$1 trillion price tag, a little less than that, that is slapped upon a bill that nobody has yet, well, I suppose some now have completely read, but the Congressional Budget Office did an estimate on the cost of this socialized medicine policy over the telephone with the staff of the committee of the Democrats, not even a bipartisan staff.

And that is how we make policy in the United States of America? And it is adequate to stand here on the floor and utter platitudes about what your political philosophy might be?

I think it is interesting that I get to hear the quotes from Republicans, JOHN MCCAIN, on cap-and-trade. Well, I can think of the time pretty recently that would have been after this particular quote that we saw a few moments ago, the time I most emphatically agreed with JOHN MCCAIN, and that is when he said that President Obama has more czars than the Romans. That was something that I think illustrated part of the big picture that we should be talking about.

This is a government that is out of control. It is overreaching. It is creating the nationalization of industry after industry in this country. It is breathtaking, the scope of the reach of this White House that is supported by the Democrats in the House and in the Senate. And who would have thought—let's just say if we just roll back in our memory and our mind's eye back to election day in November of 2008, what if somebody would have said, now you're ready to go to the polls, think about what you're going to do. Because if you elect President Obama, he is going to go in and nationalize three huge investment banks, the large insurance company, AIG, Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, General Motors and Chrysler. All of these huge eight entities all wrapped up together will all be controlled, if not controlling interest, in the hands of and in control of the White House.

Then he is going to manage those by appointing 32 czars, and this will be hundreds of billions of dollars. And the idea will be that the economic stimulus plan is going to be FDR's New Deal on steroids.

□ 2300

And now, never mind that if one goes back and reads the data from the 1930s from that Great Depression—there was nothing great about what people had to go through during that decade of the 1930s. But if one goes back and reads the data and tries to index it back to the actions of the New Deal and this Keynesian economics of borrowing money and trying to actually replace private sector jobs with government jobs is what was going on in the New Deal—the CCC camps, the WPA, and the list of these acronyms went on. But what it did was it created a lot of debt, and it delayed the recovery that would have come from the private sector of the economy. It competed directly with the private sector.

One of those examples would be the Tennessee Valley Association where there was private-sector investment that was prepared to go in and develop just what the TVA turned out to be. And FDR went in and stomped on the private sector and grew a government instead.

This is what was the model for President Obama.

So he set forth—and he told us on a day on or about February 10, 2009, he said that FDR didn't go far enough, that he lost his nerve. He got worried about spending too much money. If he hadn't gotten worried about spending too much money, the economy would have recovered. But he didn't spend enough money and, therefore, along came World War II first and became the largest stimulus plan ever.

I don't take issue with the last part of that statement. I just take issue with the prediction that the New Deal would have worked if FDR would have spent a lot more money.

This President hasn't lost his nerve. He is spending a lot more money. And if there is any doubt in anybody's mind about whether Keynesian economics and spending borrowed money to dump it in and grow government at a time of economic crisis actually heals up the economy—there isn't any doubt in my mind because I've read the data. In fact, I went through every newspaper from the crash of the stock market in 1929 until the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, reading for the economic news so I could understand what people were living through during those days of the stock market crash and the deep, long trough of the Great Depression and then the shock of the attack on Pearl Harbor that launched us into a world war.

I wanted to understand what that was like for the people that lived during that period of time. But I couldn't find evidence that the New Deal was a good deal on any kind of a broad scale, small little place as it was. It bought some friends, sure, but I couldn't find evidence that the New Deal worked. And economists that have gone back and studied that era can't show you the data that indicates the New Deal worked.

But if anybody wonders, they can study this era 25 years from now when it will be clear—there won't be any question about, no more arguments can be brought up. No future President will be able to say of President Obama, Well, his stimulus plan would have worked but he just lost his nerve and didn't spend enough money.

This President has not lost his nerve. He has spent way too much money, and he has nationalized eight huge entities. He's landed blow after blow against the private sector, the free-market economy that is the engine that drives this economy, and it sets the economy for the world, blow after blow.

And they'll look back at this and they will say, \$700 billion in TARP, \$787 billion in the stimulus plan, untold

hundreds of billions of dollars shoveled out the door of the U.S. Treasury to prop up businesses that don't necessarily go through the appropriations process here in Congress, the blank check of Tim Geithner is being spent. And all of that going on, and this President has the audacity—remember, he wrote a book with “audacity” in the title. This is a President with a lot of audacity. And the audacity now to float the trial balloon to call for another economic stimulus plan when this one is only partly spent and less than half of it—and we don't really know what those numbers are. It's being trickled out and it doesn't impact on our economy, and sometimes strung out over a number of years.

But yet it was an act of desperation to get it before this Congress and pass it quickly because they had to have it to save us from a financial meltdown. But they didn't really use the bill in the fashion they said. Neither did they use the TARP bill in the fashion that they said.

And so this urgency to prevent a meltdown was more what I see in the pattern of legislation brought through this Congress. It's the urgency of bringing this thing through this Congress before the American people figure out what's going on, pass it quickly and get it out of the way so it comes out of the public eye. And while that's going on, load up another one, put another round in the chamber and fire another one down through the floor of the House of Representatives and on over to the Senate, another destructive missile that brings down the economy in this country, the culture in this country, the spirit of the people in this country. This has been an all-out assault on Americanism that I have seen in the months that we have had here.

The statements made on this floor that need to be corrected, other than the erroneous statement that a Republican had made a—just implied at least a willful misstatement. This President's plan and the health care, health insurance plan that's being debated in this Congress today and tomorrow, has in it an 8 percent tax on payroll, on the employer, on the employer's payroll, if he doesn't provide health insurance for his employees.

So, an 8 percent tax. When you just think about how that works, let's just say there is an employee that's making \$50,000 a year and there is not a health insurance policy. You can talk about the question of whether that's right or wrong. But in any case, there is not a health insurance policy.

Under the Obama plan, there would be an 8 percent tax on that payroll, 8 percent of \$50,000 is \$4,000, precisely the number that the gentleman from Ohio objected to applies perfectly to a \$50,000 payroll, which is not that unusual in the United States, and it's becoming far and far more common.

So to take issue with a statement that's clearly factual I believe is misinformation itself.

And the argument that we are sending—the other gentleman from Ohio, Mr. RYAN, said that \$700 billion is going to those other countries. And the real number—and he's referring to the importing of petroleum products from foreign countries. And there were statements made last year that we were sending \$700 billion to foreign countries to buy their petroleum.

Well, those statements that were going out over the media caused me to be curious enough that I actually ran the numbers to find out, and the real number is this: that over that period of time, over—this was the middle of last summer in about July, and in fact July 11 would be the date that this statement was initially made. The actual moneys expended to purchase imported petroleum, that's natural gas and oil and other products that come from oil wells, in their entirety, the actual money that we sent overseas during that period of time from July 11 of 2009 to a year prior to that, that 12-month period of time, was \$332 billion, Mr. Speaker. Not \$700 billion. \$332 billion.

But we know July 11 was also the peak day for the highest price for oil and gas. That's when our gas hit the highest price at the pumps, and that's about the same time that crude oil by the barrel hit the highest price.

So one could then, last July 11, a year ago July 11, extrapolate what we would import if we imported the same number of gallons: \$700 billion. If you work it out and take the gallons and multiply it times the highest prices we had, which was on July 11 of 2008, and carry that forward, you come with a number projected of \$726 billion. But we never imported \$726 billion because the oil prices plummeted some weeks after that and we saw our gas prices go from \$4 and change a gallon and they dropped to nearly \$2 a gallon in a short period of time. That was moving up to the election in November.

So at this point, if you look at the most recent data, the number hasn't quite reached \$400 billion in the amount of imported petroleum that we have paid for.

It's still too much, Mr. Speaker, and we can be independent with our energy. And we should work in that direction and build the infrastructure that allows us to be independent. But we should also do it on real data and real facts.

And as the other gentleman spoke about two wars going on—this is pretty interesting to me—the lament is still there that we're engaged in two wars. These are conflicts that were—let me say this: Afghanistan was certainly thrust upon us. And the Iraq situation is this: President Obama was elected—at least in part—because he aggressively criticized President Bush for going into Iraq and for not having an exit strategy.

Well, Mr. Speaker, this House needs to know and the American people need to know that Bush had an exit strategy. It was a strategy that said we're

going to provide victory and we're going to establish a stable government in Iraq that reflects the will of the Iraqi people. That's what's been achieved there. It really can't be argued today, Mr. Speaker, as to whether who won the war in Iraq. Al Qaeda is defeated in Iraq. They can't mount a military operation that's there.

□ 2310

American deaths in Iraq, as sad as they are, and every one of them is an individual tragedy and every one of them is an honorable patriot, and we need to keep them all in our prayers, as well as their families. It's been a high sacrifice, but it's also been a noble endeavor, and those that we have lost in Iraq in the last year through accidents have been almost exactly equal in number to those that we have lost to combat, which says that a soldier, sailor, airman, marine that's serving in Iraq today has roughly an equal risk of being injured or killed in the rollover of a Humvee on one of the Iraqi roads as they do at the hands of the enemy. And those numbers are getting—it's looking better and better each week that goes by, more stability in Iraq.

And the exit strategy that President Bush devised in Iraq was what I said: win the war; establish a stable, moderate government in Iraq that reflects the will of the people. And so when we listened to the criticism that came from the other side of the aisle here and when Speaker PELOSI first was sworn in and received the gavel as Speaker of the House of Representatives, that was the 110th Congress. We're in the 111th now. That took place in January of 2007.

From that moment on, there commenced a series of votes here on the floor of the House that were designed to unfund, underfund or undermine our troops in Iraq. They, had they passed, and some of them singularly, but many of them in their aggregate portion would have brought about a defeat in Iraq as opposed to the victory that's been achieved.

That's what's taken place in this Congress, efforts that undermine our troops. Still, our troops prevailed and still President Bush had the will to order the surge, and still after the surge was executed to the fashion that it brought about the result we see today. President Bush negotiated this so that we could not be giving up a victory that has been so costly and so nobly earned.

And I did look him in the eye on this subject matter, and I know that he was preparing this country to sustain the victory that was being achieved at the time. And President Bush negotiated the SOFA agreement, the status of forces agreement, and it was signed last fall. The Bush status of forces agreement was signed last fall, and we find ourselves in the ironic situation today, Mr. Speaker, of having a President of the United States who was elected, at least in part, for criticizing

his predecessor for not having an exit strategy in Iraq.

But President Bush had an exit strategy, and it's on paper and the irony is President Obama is executing President Bush's exit strategy to the letter of the SOFA agreement. It's on paper. It's there. It's a matter of fact and a matter of action, and it can't be argued. It's just simply ignored because these are the people over here that wouldn't acknowledge that President Bush could do good unless they could put a quote up there that they might think would support their cause.

So the quotes from JOHN MCCAIN come up in the same way. They criticized JOHN MCCAIN all last fall. Now they put his quote up here on the floor and they argue, why don't Republicans listen to JOHN MCCAIN. Well, Democrats wouldn't listen to JOHN MCCAIN. If they had, they would have voted for him and we'd have a different situation in the world today.

Let's see, the Tehran situation and the nuclear endeavor of the Iranians is another thing that just befuddles me. As I listened to the debate in the previous hour, how it is that they're arguing that we have, let me see, we're on the cusp, as the gentleman from Virginia said, we're on the cusp of a great economic revolution. This economic revolution, the green revolution, I guess, all of these green jobs that are going to be created because they passed cap-and-tax on the American people out of the House of Representatives.

And we think they're going to get their jobs back after the next election. The American people know better than this. They understand that when you call it cap-and-trade that it is truly cap-and-tax. What they do is cap the amount of energy that you're able to access in the United States and identify which forms you can and can't have, and they tax the living daylight out of what you do get.

All energy in America will be more costly because of cap-and-tax that passed out of this House, and how anybody can think that we're on the cusp of a great economic revolution because we're taxing energy is way beyond me.

The basic principles of business are things that I had to learn when I started a business, Mr. Speaker. And so just think of this as a legal pad, and you sit down with a little calculator and you draw a line through the middle of the paper, top to bottom. On one side, you list all of your expenses. On the other side, you list your income. You add up your expenses and you add up your income. You take the total income and you subtract the total expenses, and that's your profit. Probably never heard that described here on the floor of the House before, that simple accounting principle of total income minus total expenses is profit. On some of your expenses, of course, are taxes and the overhead and the things that people don't think about that people in business have to do.

So if any business that you have, if you're running a flower shop, a barber-

shop, an ethanol plant, if you're manufacturing wind generators, if you're running a gas station, if you have an operation with a dozen carpenters working out of there with hammers and wheelbarrows, all of these things going on, this energy tax is going to make your business—it's going to cost you more.

So over on that column on the pad that you write down on your business expenses, when you see that they have passed cap-and-tax on you and you look at the cost of your electricity and your heating gas—and let's see, the natural gas you might use in your manufacturing and your diesel fuel you put into your trucks and your heavy equipment and the fuel oil that you might heat with and the cost of the coal that might be generating the electricity, all of those things add up, and they're all part of the expenses of a business. And so if energy gets more expensive, so does the cost of running your business get more expensive; and the more energy intensive it is, the higher the increase as a percentage of your overall expenses and the harder it is to find some profit on the other side.

And we are on the cusp of a great economic revolution because this Congress can increase the cost of our energy? It takes energy to do anything that we want to do. It takes energy to heat a cup of coffee. I go over to my office and push the button and make a pot of coffee, they're burning natural gas to generate some electricity to create enough heat that I can have a cup of coffee. It was coal, but Speaker PELOSI switched that around in our power plant here, and because there was a real concern that the coal that was burning was putting carbon dioxide up into the atmosphere and contributing to global warming and she became Speaker, she concluded that we would get away from that and we were going to be a carbon neutral Capitol complex.

So Speaker PELOSI ordered that the power plant be converted over from coal to natural gas, and so that was done. And some reports show that it doubled the cost of our energy, and I haven't actually analyzed the numbers. I have to take that at face value. It's a summary report. It may or may not have been doubled. It could have been more or less. But the cost of our energy went up, we do know that; and still the calculation was that we were putting too many tons of CO₂ in the air annually.

So the Speaker, being true to her commitment to saving the planet, true to her commitment, she then went on the board of trade to purchase some carbon credits. These would be like, well, selling intentions I guess, or indulgences is a better word for it. So you could go on the board and buy carbon credits and they're indulgences for the carbon CO₂ you put into the atmosphere, and it's supposed to be offset by somebody else's behavior because you've reached your limit of being able

to limit the CO₂ emissions you have here.

So I tracked that; \$89,000 spent on the board of trade to pay indulgences for the CO₂ emissions that take care of this Capitol Building, and somebody had to go sequester some carbon that they weren't sequestering before, change their behavior to help the planet. This is the equation. Some of the money went to no-till farmers in North Dakota, farmers union farmers. In fact, I think that was the exchange that was used. Now, we don't have any evidence that these farmers just started a no-till because they got a check that was a contribution to encourage them to do that.

□ 2320

It's more likely they were with no-till farmers and they were just simply rewarded for something they were doing anyway. So we can't determine that there was any carbon that was sequestered out of that behavior.

And then the balance of the money went to a coal-fired generating plant in Chillicothe, Iowa. Now that's a curious thing, Mr. Speaker. Think about how this works, that the Speaker of the House concludes that there is too much CO₂ emitting in the atmosphere because of the coal-fired power plant that feeds this Capitol complex, and so she switches it over to natural gas because there's less emissions from natural gas.

At the time, she said that because natural gas is not a hydrocarbon. Well, that didn't last but a day or so, and she finally discovered it was.

So I'm not quibbling with her lack of technical understanding of how this works. Her conviction is clear; her understanding is not. The power plant was converted from coal to gas, and then still the emissions of CO₂ continued, and we had to get to this zero emissions because we were going to be a model for the country.

So that money went to Chicago, \$89,000, and they brokered it through the exchange and paid some no-till farmers in North Dakota and the balance of the money went to Chillicothe, where we're really interested to find out what happens at a coal-fired generating plant that you can pay them to sequester some carbon, or let's say diminish the effect of carbon in the atmosphere.

So I went to visit that plant. It's a well-run plant run by good people. It's an outstanding company. I've met with their CEO and had engaging conversations. When I visited that day, I stood in the shed that had big bails of switchgrass in it. And there was expensive equipment that was in there that was designed to pick up and put these big round bales—these are 1,500-pound bales—so that high in diameter, 7 feet or so in diameter.

And there was designed—I didn't see this actually happen: Put them on a conveyer belt, run them through a hammer mill, blow them out through a tube, and blend this ground-up

switchgrass in with the coal that they were using to generate electricity.

That was the plan. And what I saw was—well, switchgrass hay that had sat there for 2 years—and nobody had burned any switchgrass in 2 years. They had tried it, experimented with it. They didn't have any data on what they'd learned from burning the switchgrass. But, in any case, they stopped doing it so it must not have been a particularly lucrative endeavor.

But they got a check cut by the taxpayers and signed by Speaker PELOSI—this is figuratively, we understand—because they had diminished the CO₂ in the atmosphere sometime a couple years earlier.

That's what cap-and-trade is. That's brokering these imaginary credits that don't create anything exception imaginary sequestration of carbon, which in somebody's imagination turns a thermostat down on planet Earth.

And of the people that advocate this, the aggressive, vocal proponents of cap-and-tax that think the Earth is going to be destroyed if we don't go through with their legislation, not one of them can explain the science. Not one of them can debate the science on the floor of the House. I'd be happy to do that. I have offered that many times. If somebody is convicted on the science and they want to come down, I'd be happy to yield. Schedule some Special Orders from now until the cows come home so we can talk about this science. But it is an embarrassment, the science that's underneath this.

I don't take so much issue with the science as I do with the economics. They're wrong on the science. They're completely wrong on the economics. And people that can get it that wrong, it should be no surprise they could get it so wrong when it comes to a health care plan.

But here's a couple of things I want to run through as I observe the gentleman from Texas has arrived to lend a hand with this endeavor.

What do I have that's entertaining here? Let me just pull this one out. There's so much material in this Congress, it's amazing that one can get this done in a few short hours of Special Orders.

This mouse has been kind of hard to hold down. He stands on his head once in a while.

This is, Mr. Speaker, the saltwater marsh harvest mouse. He has been decreed to be a species that needs special help from the taxpayers of America. We need to have a stimulus plan that's going to jump us out of the deep hole we're in. So, of all the places that we could put money to grow this economy, where could it do the most good?

I allege, and others alleged back during this process of the stimulus plan, that Speaker PELOSI had set up an earmark in there of \$32 million. Well, the allegations came back. No, that's not true. That can't be. There isn't any earmark there. The Speaker wouldn't do that. There's a statement that was

put out by the Speaker's Office that said no.

So what we really end up with now is, we find out yes, it is in there; it's just not \$32 million. It's \$16.1 million. The saltwater marsh harvest mouse.

This little pet project right here, this cute little guy, has finally arrived to get his particularly special earmark.

And if we look at what Speaker PELOSI said, she said, I don't want to have legislation that is used as an engine for people to put on things that are not going to do what we are setting out to do, which is to turn this economy around.

I don't think I want to read the rest of that.

You're going to turn the economy around by dumping \$16.1 million into the salt water marsh harvest mouse, this pet project that everybody promised that I made this up. It wasn't in the bill. Now it's there and no one can refute it, this cute little earmark.

So think of this little guy here. The least they could do is just notch his ear a little and put an earmark in that little pet project, that salt water marsh harvest mouse. It's going to get \$16.1 million taxpayer dollars.

That's not as wise an investment as the \$89 million that was wasted buying the carbon credits to be the little microcosm model of what they're doing with the cap-and-tax bill on us. We've got a great big model on what they're going to do to us, all Americans, on this socialized medicine plan that looks to me like it took HillaryCare and wrote in large, in Technicolor, and in 3D.

So, as I take a deep breath, I'd be very happy to yield to my good friend, the judge from Texas, Judge GOHMERT, so much time as he may consume. I know he will use it wisely.

Mr. GOHMERT. Well, in this body, wise is such a relative term. I appreciate my friend yielding. But wisdom seems to be in short supply. I may not have it, but I know it when I see it. I'm not seeing it being utilized in this House, in this Congress these days—not with the salt water harvest mouse.

And I come bearing news. Of course, my friend from Iowa knows, Mr. Speaker knows, there are 14.7 million jobless Americans right now. If it weren't for the suffering that's going on right now in America, some of the things we were doing would just be comical.

But we just had a job fair. I had a couple in my district. On the one hand, when you have a function and lots of people come, you're really excited people turn out. This is great. But when you realize each one of these represents somebody who has lost a job and they're hurting and their family is hurting, it breaks your heart.

Then, when I saw cars line up for blocks, people coming to a job fair, looking for jobs, from people who do manual labor to airline pilots to engineers, I mean just the full spectrum looking for jobs, it breaks your heart because you know they're hurting, you know they're suffering.

There are 14.7 million jobless Americans right now. The unemployment rate now climbing up over 9½ percent. We have got a trillion-dollar deficit, we find out this week. And there are some indications that we haven't gotten a report recently as we should have from the OMB because maybe somebody is trying to stifle it because it may be that we're way over a trillion-dollar deficit.

We already set the record this year under this President and this Speaker with the kind of deficit that's been run. We know that there's been 2 million jobs lost since President Obama's stimulus package.

I know people here will recall we weren't given a chance to read the stimulus bill because we were told that if we waited another day, more people would lose their jobs. So you guys can't read the stimulus bill. Some of us wanted to.

Some of us, like me, read the bailout bill. And that's why we knew this was not something, no matter what kind of pressure was brought to bear, not something we could vote for. But we couldn't read the stimulus bill because everyday people were losing their jobs.

□ 2330

So you can't read it. Just pass it because we were told that this will start working immediately. So it was rushed through, passed through this House without our doing any kind of diligence, much less due diligence. Then the President sat on it for 4 days until he went to Colorado to have a photo-op to sign it.

What happened to all of those people who would have lost their jobs every day if we had taken the time to read the stimulus bill?

Now we hear much later, well, nobody expected it to work immediately. Well, that's what you said. You said it was going to work immediately. In fact, the President said, not only was it going to go to work immediately, but we've heard just in recent days that it has done its job. Now we find out it hasn't done its job. People are still losing their jobs every day. So 2 million jobs have been lost since that stimulus was passed, the stimulus that we were not allowed a chance to read or to amend. It was not done properly.

Mr. KING of Iowa. If the gentleman will briefly yield.

Mr. GOHMERT. Certainly.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, there is also a number out there of about 6.8 million people who no longer qualify for unemployment who are still looking for jobs. So, of that 14.7 million, we can add another 6.8 million to that. The number is well over 20 million people who are looking for work in the United States of America. The direction is going the wrong way.

I'd again yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GOHMERT. I appreciate the gentleman's comment and for yielding back, but I come bearing news.

I believe my friend from Iowa, Mr. Speaker, has seen the schedule for tomorrow. We got that tonight. Well, the schedule has a bill on it that is going to be taken up. Let's see. I'm looking for the formal name of the bill, but basically, it's welfare for wild horses. We're going to vote on that tomorrow.

We've got people who are losing their jobs every day—devastating households, devastating people—and the bill coming to the floor tomorrow is welfare for wild horses. That's why I say, if it weren't for how serious this is in knowing that real Americans are out there hurting and are having problems with their own habitat, this would be comical. You're going to spend \$700 million on welfare for wild horses. In fairness, there's an even late-breaking report that says, well, actually, we're thinking, by the time the smoke clears and by the time all is said and done, it may only be as much as \$2 million in welfare for wild horses. This is what's in the bill.

We will conduct a wild horse census every 2 years. Yes, the Constitution requires that we have a census for people every 10 years, but in the wisdom of this body or lack thereof, depending on your perspective, we've decided we need a 2-year census to deal with the wild horses.

This bill will also provide enhanced contraception. Now there will be a fun job. We were told by this administration that there were going to be green jobs. I don't know if that will be a green job or just what color it will be, but we're going to provide enhanced contraception. That's in the bill, enhanced contraception, and there will be birth control for the wild horses.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, I just can't go on further with this thought process until you can go into a little more detail on what that means. I am totally confused on that legal language in the bill.

I would yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GOHMERT. Well, "enhanced contraception" means we're going to help the horses control the process by which little horses are created. I know it's late, you know, 11:35 here on the east coast, but there could be little children watching out in California, and I'd rather not get more descriptive on the process of how those wild horses are created and on how this enhanced contraception will keep them from creating little wild horses.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, would there be a reason why just regular contraception wouldn't be adequate?

I would yield.

Mr. GOHMERT. As my friend from Iowa knows, we don't do things halfway in this Congress. If we're going to provide contraception for wild horses, it will be enhanced. That's what we want to do.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Being from Texas, the gentleman has "enhanced everything" in Texas. Do they have enhanced contraception in Texas?

Mr. GOHMERT. I was not aware of us in Texas having enhanced contraception, certainly not for wild horses.

It doesn't stop there. It will be interesting to find out from the studies how many green-, brown-, whatever colored jobs these will be that will be created to help the horses with their little contraception issues.

In addition, we are going to provide an additional 19 million acres of public and private land for wild horses, and we're going to have \$5 million within the bill for repairing horse damage to the land. So that will be interesting.

Then also, before any Americans can adopt these wild horses, there are millions in this bill to allow for the home inspections of potential homes that may wish to adopt these wild horses. If you want a wild horse, we're not going to trust you to have a wild horse until we do a home inspection to allow us to check on you. You have to let Big Brother come into your home to see if yours is a fit place for these wild horses.

Now, the thing that really gets me here—again, if it weren't so serious and if people weren't losing their jobs as we speak and if there weren't people hurting, this would be comical. I do know I'll get some nasty letters from people: How could you seem so insensitive about the wild horses and about their needs for enhanced contraception?

The fact is that this is going to be voted on tomorrow. It will be debated on the floor. We haven't been allowed to read, to amend or to deal with some of the most pressing issues in this country with habitats for Americans. Americans are losing their habitats right and left in this country as they lose their jobs, and we're worried about the wild horses.

The thing that came to my mind for people, Mr. Speaker, who may be listening is: when you get on an airplane, one of the first things they do is walk you through the safety instructions. One of the things they tell you is, in the event of an emergency and in the event of a loss of cabin pressure, an oxygen mask will drop down for each passenger. Then they tell you to put your own mask on first. You may have a small child, and you may want to first put it on your child, but unless you put your own mask on first, you may not be able to help the child. Put your own mask on first. Save yourself, and then you'll be able to save others around you.

□ 2340

So I thought about that example with application to what's been going on in Congress. You know, if we do not save Americans, save their jobs, save their habitats, then how in the world will there be an American government left to help the wild horses? You want to help the environment, you want to help wild horses? Save the country first. Once the country is saved, then we can get around to saving the wild horses and helping them with enhanced

contraception. But until we save this country from bankruptcy and people from losing their homes, we are not going to be able to help anybody, not the wild horses and not their enhanced contraception needs. Those wild horses will be devastated when this country goes bankrupt, and we can't help anybody, much less a wild horse.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, and I'm adding to the cause here. There are some things that need to be known about the wild horses before we have the great wild horse debate here in Congress tomorrow. One is, I feel like it may not be a good idea to read these bills if it brings out this kind of thing, but we have to talk about it, and there is some data that we need to think about. That is, there's been a concerted effort to determine in a way that we couldn't sell any horses any longer in the United States of America that might end up on the dinner plate of somebody in Belgium or France. So what that does is, it took the price out of horses; and it took them from \$500, \$600 a head on down to them being essentially worthless. So the people that have horses that I know say, If you have three horses in your pasture, you'd better lock your gate because if you don't, you might have five in there tomorrow morning. People are dumping horses, turning them loose on the range. The population of horses are going up because there is not a market to cull those horses out of the herd to manage them. So you end up with hungry, starved horses wandering around; and it takes an act of Congress to deal with the horses because they wouldn't allow the horse owners to manage them. They took the asset value out of horses in a very large way. I did the math on this. I can't go back and memorize the whole formula; but I can tell you the conclusion of it, which would be extra horses are in this country because they have been barred from being sold and sent off for human use. Those numbers of horses, if you figure the half-life of a horse at about 10 years, it accumulates an extra million horses in America, a million horses running around here; and we're going to count them every 2 years, which seems really ridiculous to me. But if you calculate what a horse will eat and how many acres it takes to feed a horse—not everybody can have a horse. They don't have enough acres in order to do that—but it works out to be those extra million horses eat enough feed to consume what can be grown on enough acres that we could, instead, produce a billion gallons of ethanol on the acres that those million horses would be chewing the grass down to the nubbins on.

So it is going to be an interesting debate tomorrow. I think I had better go back and read the bill tonight myself. I find it an incredible piece of language that has been brought up. I've got myself vetted on—we've done horses. We've done the salt water marsh harvest mouse here, the \$16.1

million earmark for the Speaker to take care of her neighbors by San Francisco with these little earmark pet projects.

There is another project here that is a huge project, and that is this new health care plan that has emerged. I came prepared to talk about it a little bit. This big, huge health care plan that—it was too expensive when the first estimates came out, and so the Speaker was critical of the Congressional Budget Office's estimates, and those estimates miraculously were reduced somewhat, we think, because some language got changed in the bill. This \$1.5 trillion or so CBO estimate went down to just a little under \$1 trillion. Well, now we can afford this. You know, I always thought too, if I want to buy something, if I can get it down below \$1 trillion, it's not so bad. It is like buying a loaf of bread. If it's \$900-and-some billion, it isn't nearly as bad as \$1-plus trillion. So I find out that that CBO estimate, made by the Congressional Budget Office, these professionals that calculate the costs of the legislation, they usually either do it for committee Chairs first and somebody else over months and months, if you can get it done. But the Congressional Budget Office had not read the bill either. We have a score on this massive growth of bureaucracy that takes over one-sixth or one-seventh of our economy, and the costs that are projected from it that come from the nonpartisan, highly professional Congressional Budget Office come out of there not with them reading the bill and analyzing it and a putting formulas in place that can be tracked back, but by being on the telephone with the Democrat committee staff to negotiate down to a number that would be low enough that they think they could fund the bill and sell it. We think that this bill is going to cost two or three or more times higher than the estimate that's there. But the part that hits me the hardest and the most is this piece down here.

Now when you look at this flow chart, all of these that are white are existing bureaucracies. The colored ones are newly created by the bill that are linked in with existing bureaucracies. There is much to be said about each one of these because they are huge and intimidating. But this one here is the one I would ask, Mr. Speaker, that the American people focus on. These are the traditional health insurance plans. They exist. And there's some number I saw the other day, it was around 1,300 different companies selling health insurance in America. That's a lot of competition. Those that survive the insurance czar—I don't know if he actually exists today, but there are 32 of them, and it doesn't take long to create another one—these existing insurance companies that have 70 percent of the people pleased with the health care plan that they have, these qualified health benefit plans would be the plans that are approved

by Obama's insurance czar. So we wouldn't have the same competition that we have today, not the same policies we have today. We would only have the policies that are permitted under the bill, policies that would require that they fund abortion, policies that would require mental health, policies that would require little or no deductible and little or no copayment plan because they have to be written in such a way that the newly created government plan, this public health plan over here in the second purple circle, that the government could compete. So what we would have would be all of these private plans here that exist today. When President Obama says, "If you like your current plan, don't worry. You get to keep it," well, you get to keep it for a little while; but if it doesn't exist any longer or if it changes because the government has said that these insurance companies can't write their preferred policy in the way they want, but they have to write it the way the insurance czar says it would be written, or if we subsidize this insurance plan over here, the newly created public health plan, if the government subsidizes that, the premiums will be lower than they will be in the private sector. The premiums won't reflect the risk, but it will push out and crowd out and kill the private insurance market. It's just a fact that that's what happens, Mr. Speaker. I can give the clearest example of how this will and can work. There was a time when people bought flood insurance in this country from a private provider, insurance companies created, in part, for the purposes of that property and casualty insurance. So if your home was flooded, you could be compensated, and you would pay the premium according to the risk. The government decided to get into the flood insurance business. Now they're in the flood insurance business. They sell flood insurance. They actually require you to buy flood insurance in some cases before you can get a mortgage on a property. The flood insurance program that exists now has a couple of unique things about it. First, it has crowded out all of the private sector. As near as I can determine, there is not a single company in America that's selling flood insurance. I asked the question today at a conference, What if I want to start out a company and sell flood insurance to the people that are out there in the lowlands that need that coverage? I asked the question rhetorically; and I got the answer, There is no prohibition towards starting a flood insurance company or an existing company from expanding their services into flood insurance. The prohibition is, the Federal Government is in the business. They have cornered 100 percent of the market. There isn't anybody competing against them, and we know that government can't do anything as efficiently as the private sector can—or hardly anything. So the circumstances are this: The flood in-

surance account is \$18 billion in the red. That's a deficit that comes out of the taxpayers, and that represents how much below the cost of doing business the flood insurance is. That's what government does. So if we can have a viable and relatively healthy flood insurance program in the private sector that existed years ago and the Federal Government comes in and competes directly, like it did with crop insurance too, by the way, they crowd out the private providers, and they put in the government program, and pretty soon there's nobody there but government.

□ 2350

That is what will happen here. And if anybody thinks that the President's promise that if they like their insurance plan, their health care plan, they get to keep it, they just don't lose it the day the bill is signed. And they won't get to make that decision because the insurance company may have to fold up and sack up their bats that day or a month or a year later.

Even those private providers that will last for a while will still have to adjust their premiums accordingly. And when they do that, they won't be able to compete with the federally subsidized plan, and you will see employers that will drop the private carrier here and adopt the public plan here because it will be cheaper.

We saw Walmart take a position this past weekend that they supported an employer-mandated health insurance plan. Now, it doesn't necessarily mean they support this monstrosity here. But is President Obama going to tell Walmart thanks for the support of the concept that he is promoting, but you can't sign up on the public plan because some of your employees might want to keep the policy they have?

The President can't make that promise, and we ought to know it, just like he couldn't promise that he was going to create or save X million jobs. The language about "saving" always was the word that let him slip away. You can never prove that somebody saved 3.5 million new jobs unless you get down below 3.5 million existing jobs, then he didn't save the 3.5 million anymore. This is a big crux in this problem.

Also there is a tax that goes on the payroll of 8 percent. I spoke about that earlier. We need to understand what is in here and what this does. It tears asunder the private sector and replaces it with a public sector. It is socialized medicine. It is HillaryCare writ large.

I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas if he is in a position to vent himself a little further in the next 5 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Absolutely, and I do appreciate my friend for yielding.

The takeover of health care by the government will be not just figuratively, but literally, a death knell for so many in America, because the only way socialized medicine has been able to work ever is by putting people on

lists, rationing health care, having more general practitioners, getting rid of so many specialists that have made such great strides forward, and then people dying on the list waiting to get health care.

That is where we are headed. And it breaks my heart to know so clearly where this goes and what will happen.

The way that some of this is being pushed is with class envy and creating this friction among Americans that used to be so much the antithesis of what being an American was. But that has been fracturing America. We are Americans. We need to get rid of being hyphenated Americans and go back to being Americans.

Mark Levin was here on the Hill earlier today, and in his great book, "Liberty and Tyranny," he has a quote from Ronald Reagan. And it has so much application today. He said, and this was a quote from Reagan, "How can limited government and fiscal restraint be equated with lack of compassion for the poor? How can a tax break that puts a little more money in the weekly paychecks of working people be seen as an attack on the needy? Since when do we in America believe that our society is made up of two diametrically opposed classes—one rich, one poor—both in a permanent state of conflict and neither able to get ahead except at the expense of the other? Since when do we in America accept this alien and discredited theory of social and class warfare? Since when do we in America endorse the politics of envy and division?"

That is what is being driven here. And as my friend knows, some months back I said instead of throwing money at Goldman Sachs, AIG and that kind of thing, how about letting people keep a little of their own money in their own paychecks, let them have their own withholding back for even a couple of months, and you'll see stimulus that was never seen. That wasn't listened to by this administration or this House majority. And we are paying a severe price. And I yield back.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Texas, and I thank the Speaker for his indulgence this evening and for recognizing us. I just point out that we disagree with the philosophy that is being driven by the White House. We are free-market people that believe in constitutional rights and the spirit of the American people. We will emerge triumphant, however long it takes.

I thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. BORDALLO (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today until July 22 at 2 p.m. on account of official business in district.

Mr. PENCE (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of the funeral of a close personal friend.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today until 3 p.m. on account of a family medical emergency.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SESTAK) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SESTAK, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFazio, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. POE of Texas) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, July 23.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, July 23.

Mr. MCCOTTER, for 5 minutes, July 17.

Mr. BOOZMAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PAULSEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, for 5 minutes, July 17.

Mr. SCALISE, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at her request) to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WATSON, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 509. An act to authorize a major medical facility project at the Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center, Walla Walla, Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, July 17, 2009, at 9 a.m.

OATH OF OFFICE MEMBERS, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER, AND DELEGATES

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members, Resident Commissioner, and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in 5 U.S.C. 3331:

"I, AB, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign

and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Member of the 111th Congress, pursuant to the provisions of 2 U.S.C. 25:

JUDY CHU, California, Thirty-Second.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

2674. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting a legislative proposal to be a part of the National Defense Authorization Bill for Fiscal Year 2010 entitled, "Authority to Extend Eligibility for Enrollment in Department of Defense Elementary and Secondary Schools to Certain Additional Categories of Dependents"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2675. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting a legislative proposal to be a part of the National Defense Authorization Bill for Fiscal Year 2010 entitled, "Air Force Academy Athletic Association"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2676. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting a legislative proposal to be a part of the National Defense Authorization Bill for Fiscal Year 2010 entitled, "Authority to Order Army Reserve, Navy Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, and Air Force Reserve to Active Duty to Provide Assistance in Response to a Major Disaster or Emergency"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2677. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting a legislative proposal to be a part of the National Defense Authorization Bill for Fiscal Year 2010 entitled, "Authority to Order Army Reserve, Navy Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, and Air Force Reserve to Active Duty to Provide Assistance in Response to a Major Disaster or Emergency"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2678. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a quarterly report on withdrawals or diversions of equipment from Reserve component units for the period of January 1, 2009 through March 31, 2009, pursuant to Public Law 109-364, section 349; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2679. A letter from the Deputy Chief of Staff, Department of the Army, transmitting the Department's annual report on recruiting incentives for fiscal year 2008, pursuant to Public Law 109-163, section 681; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2680. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting the annual report on the Emergency Steel Loan Guarantee Program for fiscal year 2008, as required by Section 101(i) of Chapter 1 of Pub. L. 106-51; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2681. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's fourth annual Homeless Assessment