

jobs out of any Member in this body, and that is because you have more soldiers in your district than any other, and you are the one who has to comfort them, as we all do, but you, many more times than any other Member, have to comfort the loved ones whose son or daughter has been killed in a time of war. I know you personally have comforted the families of the victims here and Fort Hood, and the biggest tragedy is that it could have been prevented.

With that, I yield back.

Mr. CARTER. We are about to run out of time for this evening. Once again, we are talking about the rules we make for ourselves and how we should apply them. I think it is honestly said here that let's don't be so politically correct that we oversee ills that may fall upon our society. That is why we make rules. That is why we have laws and order in our society, so we can protect our citizens, whether they be civilian or in the military.

It has been a great evening, and I thank my friends Mr. MCCAUL and Mr. KING for being here to join me in this conversation. I am going to thank the House for allowing me to continue to talk about issues that relate to rules or to the law.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate notifies the House that the Senate shall convene as a Court of Impeachment at 2:00 p.m., on Wednesday, March 17, 2010, for the purpose of receiving the Managers on the part of the House in the matter of the Impeachment proceedings against G. Thomas Porteous, Jr., Judge of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

The message also announced that pursuant to Executive Order 12131, as amended and extended, the Chair reappoints and appoints the following Members to the President's Export Council:

Reappointment:

The Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW).

The Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN).

Appointment:

The Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) vice the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. DORGAN).

MORE GOVERNMENT WON'T WORK

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HIMES). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, today I had the great pleasure of holding a town hall meeting in one of the towns in the Fifth District in North Carolina, Statesville, North Carolina.

I didn't count the number of folks there, and I haven't had a chance to

ask my staff exactly how many were there, but I think probably about 175 people were there.

We let these folks put in questions or their names into a box, and we pull their names out randomly and let them speak about the health care bill. This was a health care town hall. And to a person who spoke, and there were probably about a dozen who had a chance to speak for about 2 minutes, and I answered their questions, they all are very upset about what is going on here in Congress. They are upset about many, many things, but they are particularly upset about this government takeover of our health care system, and they just don't understand why the folks in the majority continue to push this issue knowing that the majority of the people in this country are very much opposed to it.

They very much are concerned about what they have heard and read about the way this is going to be pushed through this week. They hate it when bills are put together that aren't germane to each other or that aren't related. They heard about the education bill being put on the health care bill, and they are very concerned about that. They just don't like that.

They said over and over again they know that the government does not do things more efficiently and effectively than the private sector. One businessman talked about how he has been struggling for the last year. He has used up all his savings, all his equity in the last year to keep his business going because the economy is so bad, and he wants to know, where is that stimulus that he thought that we were getting?

So it was a great town hall, because they talked about what was on their mind and got a chance to ask me questions.

When I told them about the plan to do this reconciliation bill, where the folks on the majority side are going to go from passing bills without reading them to passing bills without voting for them, they understood what a threat that is to our entire way of life. They understand that that is a threat to the rule of law, and they are very much concerned about that.

I told them of the President meeting with us at our retreat and saying, You know, I was wrong when I said over and over again that you can keep your health insurance if you like it. But, he said, I made a mistake by saying that, because some cats and dogs got into that Senate bill that we weren't planning to get into that bill. But we are going to take care of that.

But guess what. That is not going to get taken care of. And the President, I understand, made that comment again this week, saying out on the stump, If you like your plan you can keep it—when he told the Republicans at our retreat that that is absolutely not true.

We have a major problem, Mr. Speaker, in this country. We have people trying to establish a takeover of our lives from birth to death. They want the

government to run our lives and to make all of our decisions for us.

I have an article, Mr. Speaker, from The Washington Times, Wednesday, January 20, 2010, that says "More Government Won't Work."

[From the Washington Times, Jan. 20, 2010]

EDITORIAL: MORE GOVERNMENT WON'T WORK

Government is bigger than ever and controls more aspects of American life than at any time in U.S. history. Last year, the federal government ate \$3.52 trillion out of a \$13.2 trillion economy. With the current trajectory of big government under the Democrats, the federal bureaucracy will devour as much as 50 percent of this nation's economic activity by midcentury. To illustrate how wasteful that is, take a look at the empty space above this editorial. That's what government creates—nothing.

A basic problem with a future dominated by ever-expanding government is that bureaucracies are hobbled by waste, fraud and abuse. Government simply does not work well. Freedom works, but the more government that exists, the less freedom we have. Under President Obama and the Democratic Congress, the United States is heading in the wrong direction. The big spenders are on a joy ride, and we're stuck in the back seat on the road to dramatically less freedom.

The main battleground of the war between freedom and government is the marketplace. Markets work for a simple reason: They give people choice. Consumers know what they want, and businesses try to figure out how to produce and deliver the goods and services the best way, considering price, quality and service. Only the best firms survive.

Today is the first anniversary of the start of Mr. Obama's term in the Oval Office. For the past year, Americans have been told that government is smarter than private industry and that more government intervention is needed to fix problems in the market. Central to this agenda is the canard that private for-profit companies have to charge higher prices than nonprofits to recoup enough to earn profits, thus making for-profit firms less competitive. This explanation is wrong-headed because it ignores that profits give an incentive to lower costs and improve quality. The greater the incentive to reduce costs, the less waste there is. That is why, despite all the tax advantages given to nonprofits, the economy is dominated by for-profit firms.

Politicians and bureaucrats in Washington don't know what individual consumers want and certainly shouldn't be the ones to decide what individuals need. If the government decides everything, elections will determine what businesses can produce and what options consumers will have. In a healthy market system, consumers wouldn't have to persuade their neighbors to use the ballot box to determine what type of toys, computers, books, houses or cars they can buy. Those products will be produced as long as the value consumers get is greater than the costs of producing them. The government should stay out of the way of these inherently private everyday decisions.

A common justification for government intervention is based on the notion that individuals and firms don't bear the full costs and benefits of their actions and that taxes and regulations are needed to correct the imbalance. The debate over global warming is an example of this idea. Climate-change activists argue that markets don't take into account damage purportedly caused by carbon dioxide. Yet even if they were right that carbon emissions cause global warming (which is unlikely), there are many stumbling blocks that prevent effective government intervention. First, there is the pure

numbers-crunching aspect: Government must figure out how much to tax carbon emissions to alter behavior, which is a difficult and error-plagued challenge. Other than taking wealth out of private hands, all the negative impact of higher taxation is rarely clear, and it's a fair question whether the outcome is likely to cause more damage than the original problem.

Second, politics is a dirty business. Special interests twist programs into dole-outs for favored groups. Political machinations are behind every dollar of federal spending, and the interest of the taxpayer usually doesn't have a seat at the table when the spoils are divided up. Consider all the special favors to unions and particular constituencies in everything from last year's \$787 billion stimulus package to the Democrats' government health care bills. So much of federal spending amounts to nothing more than a big slush fund.

Regulations are the second edge on the knife government uses to cut the heart out of private initiative. Bureaucratic red tape ties up markets with little consideration about its impact. Take the health care debate. Amidst government's attempt to take over health care, politicians are telling American families that the suits in Washington know how to run health care at a lower cost and with better quality than what is currently being produced. If that were true, government wouldn't need to pass a regulation. If Democratic ideas had any merit, companies would pay Mr. Obama, House Speaker Nancy Pelosi and Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid for advice to help provide customers a better product at a lower price. Democrats wouldn't have to scheme behind closed doors to figure out how to ram through legislation to force Americans to accept a system they don't want.

This gets to the heart of the matter. Markets are fundamentally different from government programs in that market transactions are voluntary. Government's main tool is coercion. Consumers don't buy a product unless they think it makes them better off. Firms don't sell a product unless they think they can make profits. Telling people what to do doesn't make them want to do it or like doing it. There's no question which way works best. Countries with the most market-based economies have enjoyed the largest growth in wealth. The innovations generated in these places benefit the entire world. Messing with the market-based model slows the pace of progress for our children and grandchildren.

The massive "tea party" protests all across the land reveal how outraged Americans are by the direction of government. President Obama and Democrats in Congress are making government bigger than ever because they think bureaucracies make smarter decisions than individuals and the government is better than private business. But taxpayers aren't hitting the streets for so-called smarter or better government—they want less government. A lot less. A new Congress will be seated a year from now. Hopefully that will bring real change to the nation's capital.

The Senate bill that the House is about to pass this week under a very, very, shaky rule is going to let people vote on the rule and then say the bill is passed. It has major problems with it. It is not addressing the cost of insurance and health care. It has a tax on hiring low-income workers. It funds abortions. It has the Cornhusker kickback, the Louisiana purchase, the Gatorade. It has a new Federal mandate to buy insurance. There is a pen-

alty enforced by the IRS that is going to require an additional 40,000 IRS agents if we don't buy insurance. And there will be a job-killing 8 percent tax on employers who don't offer government-approved health insurance. This is wrong, Mr. Speaker.

The people in my district want jobs. They want to be able to work. And they want to see our country continue to operate the way it always has, under the rule of law, not with the majority abusing the rules. They want us to do the right kind of thing here.

What do Republicans support? We want legislation that will reduce the cost of health care. We want to force insurance companies to compete with each other across State lines and let people buy insurance across State lines if they choose. We want to cover pre-existing conditions. We want medical liability reform, which would save tens of billions of dollars each year. And we want to expand health savings accounts, which put Americans in charge of their health care and their health dollars. We can do that, Mr. Speaker.

We passed a bill the other day in a bipartisan fashion, a 1½ page bill taking away the antitrust exemption for insurance companies. Folks on the other side said we couldn't do it, but we can.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back.

□ 2115

JOB CREATION IN THE AFRICAN AMERICAN COMMUNITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert materials related to the topic of this Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Ms. FUDGE. Thank you. The Congressional Black Caucus is proud to anchor this hour on job creation in the African American community. Currently, the CBC is chaired by the Honorable BARBARA LEE from the Ninth Congressional District of California. My name is Congresswoman MARCIA FUDGE, representing the 11th Congressional District of Ohio, and I anchor this hour.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to yield to our chairwoman, the Honorable BARBARA LEE.

Ms. LEE of California. First, let me take this moment to thank Congresswoman FUDGE again for the Special Order tonight, for your leadership, and for bringing to the Congress, really, the understanding of what unemployment is, given the unemployment rates

in your district, given what has taken place in Ohio in terms of the recession. Your leadership and your commitment to turn the economy around is remarkable. We can learn a lot by what you have done in Ohio. So thank you again.

As Chair of the Congressional Black Caucus, I rise this evening to continuing to sound the alarm about the need to create jobs in America, particularly for the chronically unemployed who are disproportionately suffering the brunt of this economic crisis and, who, as a result, are in desperate need of targeted, concrete, and meaningful relief.

Last week, members of the Congressional Black Caucus met with President Obama at the White House to discuss our job creation agenda. It was a candid, constructive, and substantive conversation which the CBC had with the President. We reviewed our priorities to create jobs, especially for the chronically unemployed.

We understand very well that President Obama inherited an economy on the brink of collapse and all that he and his administration have done in working with Congress to hold it together. It has certainly been remarkable, and we commend the administration for their efforts. The recovery, however, from this economic crisis has been uneven, at best, and there is a long way to go to put people back to work.

The impact of unemployment foreclosures and the housing crisis are particularly extreme among African Americans and Latinos. People are desperate, as Congresswoman FUDGE knows in Ohio. As we try to create jobs, States are laying off people in order to balance their budgets. California has cut \$20 billion out of our budget. Virginia will pass a State budget with \$4 billion in cuts. If you extrapolate this nationally, we are talking about \$200 billion State budget cuts nationwide, after about \$350 billion last year. So we need the \$200 billion this year just to break even.

Our Congressional Black Caucus member, Congressman BOBBY SCOTT, who's on the Budget Committee, continues to remind us of these very glaring numbers and how we need a major jobs initiative just to break even. That's why the CBC has been and remains laser focused on helping people who are chronically unemployed and on direct job creation.

On Wednesday morning, the CBC will host a hearing focused on job creation. The event is called: "Out of Work but Not Out of Hope: Addressing the Crisis of the Chronically Unemployed." This will be held on March 17 from 9 to 11 in room 2237 of the Rayburn House Office Building on Capitol Hill. The hearing will focus on data that suggests the chronically unemployed include African Americans and other communities of color with unemployment rates significantly higher than the national average. Youth and adult workers also are in need of enhanced education and