

willing to run for Congress, and I can tell you this from some personal experience, doctors actually enjoy a fairly high approval rating. It's in the high seventies. You come to Congress, it goes into the low teens.

It is a significant step to run for Congress for physicians. And yet doctors across the country are willing to give up their peace of mind and their livelihood to come to the aid of their country in its hour of need.

BIG GOVERNMENT AND THE WILL OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DRIEHAUS). 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 being recognized to address you here on the floor of the House. And I remind you, Mr. Speaker, that these deliberations here represent the most deliberative body in the world. And that's the argument that we've made for years. And even though it's not as deliberative as it was before Speaker PELOSI took the gavel, we still have some discussion time down here. We still have Special Orders. We still have 60 minutes and alternating hours between Democrats and Republicans when both sides do show up for those alternating hours.

But tonight that's not the case. This is the wrap-up and the finish of the week, Mr. Speaker. And many have gone to the airport and caught a plane and gone home to their district or wherever they might go.

But I don't think enough has been said yet this week. It's been a relatively short week, and not a particularly trying or testing week with anything that stands out here as significant accomplishment.

But I'm watching still as policy moves in America. And the policy that has been shoehorned through this House of Representatives and become the law of the land has caused the American people to fill up my town hall meetings.

We were not here on Monday. We didn't gavel in until, well, we gaveled in on Tuesday, and the first votes were sometime about 6:30 on Tuesday evening, so the work week is Tuesday evening for two or three votes. We call it naming post offices. That was the level of the significant suspension calendar. And then we had some debate on Wednesday and some committee activity. And today is Thursday. It's been low key. Last votes took place maybe 2 hours ago, something like that. So our work week is all day Wednesday, finishing the night on Tuesday and the early part of the day on Thursday and then going, a lot of people going home, Mr. Speaker.

That's okay with me because I don't support the agenda that's being driven here out of the Speaker's Office. I don't support the process that has been developed.

I do support the Constitution, liberty, freedom, fiscal responsibility, limited government, and I support the people that have been coming here to petition the government for redress of grievances. That's a constitutional right that we all have. And I've seen tens of thousands come here to say, don't take away my freedom, don't take away my liberty. Let me have the right to manage the health care of my own body, for example.

And the people across this country that have said over and over again that the fiscal irresponsibility with the profligate spending that's been going on for the last 3 years-plus in this Congress is more than they can abide.

And my town hall meetings on Tuesday, or excuse me, on Monday of this week, one in Council Bluffs and one in Sioux City, we're not jam-packed to the walls with people standing outside looking in the doorway, as they were during August of last year, when people believed that they had a chance to put the brakes on what we now know and the President refers himself to as ObamaCare. That packed our town hall meetings in my district, all over my district, all over the State of Iowa, all over the United States of America, hundreds and hundreds of town hall meetings with hundreds of thousands of Americans that came in to express that they did not want the government to take over the management of our health care.

And I have never seen an issue that brought this much intensity and this many people out. And still the leadership in this Congress was determined to shoehorn a bill through here. And that happened maybe 3 weeks ago or a little more, early in the wee hours of a Monday morning, just a little after midnight, as I recall. The final vote was on a Sunday night.

The Speaker could not have allowed the Members of Congress to go home, let alone for an Easter break period of time, because she knew that if the Democrats in this Congress went home to listen to their constituents, that their congressional offices would be jammed full of people that said they were there to petition their Members of Congress for redress of the grievance of a government takeover of health care. And they would have filled the streets by the tens and hundreds of thousands. They would have demonstrated at congressional offices. They would have filled any town hall meetings. There would have been an outpouring of rejection of that policy like this country has never seen.

And so the Speaker kept her own Democrat Members here on the Hill and insulated from their own constituents, even to the extent that, as the phone lines either jammed or they were shut down, I don't know which, but the last 3 days I couldn't call my own office. And I know that there weren't that many people calling my office. They were busy calling the offices of Democrats who were determined to vote for ObamaCare.

But I couldn't get through because the switchboard was jammed, at least the last 3 days here in the House. While you had Members that couldn't even be heard, their constituents could not call them. They couldn't get through to send them a fax. Yes, they could send an email, presumably. And we don't know whether those emails went on an automatic dump or whether there was an answer. Only their constituents can know that.

We know that there was a difficulty verifying if the Senate, during their period of time that this was an important issue, up till Christmas Eve, if in the Senate actually Members were answering their telephones.

□ 1515

But here they couldn't get through to call my office. I couldn't call my own office from my cell phone. And my own staff that I had to communicate with around the Hill, we had to call on our own cell lines to each other's cell phones.

That's not such a particularly great handicap, but on top of that, Mr. Speaker, the cell phones were jammed. The signal was so jammed with so many calls that we couldn't connect either by cell phone sometimes for hours.

Now, that's an awful lot of rejection focusing itself on an issue here that America had had the opportunity to debate since last July all the way into nearly—well, nearly into April. That's what's happened with ObamaCare.

And now, after the bill has passed—and I would remind you, Mr. Speaker, that if we would have had the bill go to the Senate for a vote and then to the House for a vote in order to qualify it to go to the President's desk for signature that turns it into the law of the land, ObamaCare could not have passed this Congress on the day that it was messaged to the President because the votes didn't exist in the United States Senate to support the bill. That was voted by other people.

And the ones that the folks voted to represent themselves, Massachusetts in particular, SCOTT BROWN was elected by generally the liberal people in Massachusetts to block ObamaCare. And there he was following through on his word to do that, except it was circumvented. And they used a rescissions policy that had never been used in a piece of policy like this before to enable that to happen. And on top of that, a promise from the President of the United States that he would sign an executive order that he would have liked to have had the pro-life people in America believe that the President of the United States can sign an executive order that would amend a bill that the Congress had just passed. That's the executive order that deals with the Stupak amendment, which was designed to shut off Federal funding for abortion that might be enabled by ObamaCare.

Now, think about what this means. Here we have a Constitution that sets

up the structure. Article I, section 1 says all legislative powers will be vested in a Congress of the United States comprised of a House of Representatives and a United States Senate. It even prescribes that all spending will start in the House, not in the Senate. But this is an authorization bill, not an appropriations bill. So ObamaCare could have started in the Senate or in the House.

Well, we got a Senate version that was taken up by the House. But the Constitution establishes that all legislative powers are vested here in the House or in the Senate, but House and Senate collectively. We are the legislative branch of government. And the President of the United States, who wrote the book "The Audacity of Hope" had the audacity to offer to BART STUPAK that he would sign an executive order that would effectively amend BART STUPAK's pro-life language into the legislation that was here on the floor of the House at the time mesaged from the Senate.

Now imagine, a man that taught constitutional law as an adjunct professor at the University of Chicago would believe as President of the United States that his executive order can effectively amend legislation that is presumably the majority opinion of the elected Members of the United States Congress.

If the President can amend legislation by executive order, then can't the President also just write the legislation by executive order and do what he will without having to consult Congress? That would be a two branches of government instead of a three branches of government. Maybe the President would argue that there is something that Congress can do that he can't, like appropriate money, for example. Well, that would be a very narrow role, and that would be turning his back on the constitutional responsibility that is vested in the United States Congress. And we should always reject the idea that a President can sign an executive order that has an effect on changing the legislation that the Congress has passed.

In fact, I may be the number one most authoritative voice in the United States Congress on this subject matter because, I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that on a State level when I was in the State legislature as a State senator, we had then our Governor, Tom Vilsack, filed an executive order. He was a fresh governor of maybe a little bit fresher than the President has been during this period of time. I think it was in the first couple, 3 months of his office, Governor Vilsack signed an executive order known as executive order number seven. I looked at it and concluded that he had violated the separation of powers and legislated by executive order. And when I raised an objection, of course it was refused and denied. The executive office didn't want to respond to a legislative office.

And so I went to court, and we filed the case of *King v. Vilsack*. Now, this

is now our Secretary of Agriculture, Tom Vilsack, whom we had a good exchange in the Ag Committee. I think it was just yesterday. But in this issue we disagreed. He believed that he could amend the code of Iowa by executive order and sought to do so with that executive order. I believed that the legislative powers are vested within the legislative branch of government. And most of our State Constitutions, including Iowa's, are modeled off of our United States Constitution.

And so our State legislators across the land will take an oath to uphold the Constitution of the United States and the Constitution of the State of, fill-in-the-blank. For me it's Iowa. That oath is an oath that you can only take to uphold the Constitution as it reads, as you understand it, as it was understood to mean at the time of the ratification of the Constitution itself, or the subsequent amendments. There isn't any other alternative.

None of us can take an oath to uphold a Constitution as it might be amended by, what, the President's executive order? Or even a decision of the United States Supreme Court? Now, I put that list at 10 now, as the 10 last people that should be allowed to amend the Constitution of the United States. That should be the nine Supreme Court Justices and the President of the United States. Those 10 are the last people on the planet that should be engaged in seeking to amend the Constitution.

The Constitution sets up a framework for us to amend it when we don't like the results. We are required to adhere to it and live by it. And for a President of the United States to sign an executive order that's got companies that deal, that supposedly buys a dozen votes to support ObamaCare here and the President would exchange an executive order that was designed to assure those Stupak dozen that there wouldn't be Federal funding of abortion because his executive order would alter the language and the meaning of the bill. The smallest and tiniest of fig leaves was offered to Congressman STUPAK. That executive order no one takes seriously today. It was simply a tool of utility to put the votes together to force this ObamaCare off the floor of the House and send it to the President for his signature, which he did. And now ObamaCare is the law of the land.

I was, I believe, Mr. Speaker, the last Member of Congress to leave the House of Representatives and leave the Capitol that night. It took me perhaps an hour to wind myself down and come to a point where I thought I could leave this place where such a cataclysmic offense to our Constitution, our budget, our freedom, and our liberty had taken place in such a shameful fashion. The shameful fashion includes the antics in the United States Senate, where they cut deal after deal after deal, including the Cornhusker kickback. Yes, and I know there was a successful effort made to peel the Cornhusker kickback

out of there. It leaves in the Louisiana purchase, it leaves in the Florida gator aid, it leaves in seven or eight other special deals that were cooked up in the Senate so that they could produce enough votes temporarily to push that bill through on Christmas Eve. And then of course we had the Massachusetts election, which changed the dynamics over there.

Here deal after deal was made. And one day I hope to hold hearings in the United States Congress to find out what actually went on behind those closed doors. And I believe the American people have a right to learn what went on behind those closed doors. I want to hold hearings and investigations and bring people under oath and stand them up and let them take that oath and then testify before a congressional hearing. What were you offered by Rahm Emanuel? What were you offered by the President of the United States?

If you're AARP and your job is to represent the senior citizens that are your members, I want those representatives of AARP to come in and tell us, was the offer that you can sell insurance to the AARP members so good and so high that you decided to sell out your own members? What was it that the SEIU got? What was it that Big Pharma got? What happened to the \$165 million that they promised that they would commit in an ad campaign in order to sell ObamaCare to America so that Big Pharma could have a larger market that was mandated by the Federal Government? What were the deals that were made? We need to know that.

If we can drag CEOs of private American corporations before the United States Congress, and if HENRY WAXMAN can threaten to—actually, yesterday was the day he was going to do that and he cancelled it. I think he thought better of it. But if HENRY WAXMAN, the chair of Energy and Commerce, can bring CEOs before the United States Congress and allege that they're making too much money, or he wants to see into their books and their records, or if ED MARKEY, the subcommittee chairman, can hand a letter to David Sokol that is an intimidating letter because the president of Mid-American Energy, who testified against cap-and-tax, can be intimidated with the threat of the chairman of an important Energy and Commerce subcommittee at the request of that chairman to investigate the company that he represents. Witness intimidation, plain and simple, straight up front. It's documented. It's in public documents now. Along with the other activities that have to do with the President of the United States now nearly a year ago firing the CEO of General Motors.

Just simply summarily fired the CEO of General Motors. Didn't try to take his fingerprints off. Didn't imply that it was a decision that came about some other way. Didn't try to hide it. He proudly accepted, some will call it credit, I will call it blame for reaching

across the line between the public and the private sector and firing the CEO of General Motors and deciding who would be the new CEO of General Motors. He sent his car czar to make some of those deals. The President of the United States replaced and named all but two of the board members of General Motors. And he wasn't quite as engaged in Chrysler, but those same activities took place.

And the White House, and when it's the White House it's the President of the United States, Mr. Speaker, dictated to the bankruptcy court exactly the terms that emerged from the bankruptcy court, General Motors and Chrysler. That situation is appalling and breathtaking when you think of the nationalization that has taken place.

And Mr. Speaker, when you look at the beginning of this is at the end of the Bush administration, Henry Paulson, Secretary of the Treasury, came here to the Capitol, September 19, 2008, and asked for \$700 billion in bailout money that he would deal out the way he saw fit in an attempt to stop what he believed was a potential or maybe even an impending meltdown of the world's credit. He thought it could have all come crashing down. He couldn't guarantee there would be a fix, but he said if you try to give me any new ideas they won't be as good as his own.

So he ended up with \$350 billion in the beginning of this, in about October of 2008, and then another \$350 billion that was approved by a Congress that was elected later and by a President who was elected later. And that was President Barack Obama, who supported and approved all of the TARP funding, all of the nationalization beginnings. And he followed through on the balance of that and the takeovers of three large investment banks: AIG, the large insurance company to the tune of around \$180 billion, Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac, culminated by executive order right before Christmas of last year that hardly made the news.

You know, if we just went in and looked what happened on late Friday night after the news cycle and the press goes off to their golf game or home to their family, we would find all kinds of, I mentioned earlier, cataclysmic things that have happened in the United States on late Friday night.

I would like to go back and just amend something here to the power in Congress. Give me the right to veto and put back in place anything that happened after, say, 2 o'clock on a Friday before the press comes to work at around 9 o'clock on a Monday morning. Let me go back and fix those things that happened. We would have a lot better country today that wouldn't have reverted. But Friday night, this is when the President pulls those moves because that is when there is the lowest news cycle. So that's what happens.

Three large investment banks taken over by the Federal Government with

the approval or the active involvement of President Barack Obama. AIG the insurance company taken over and bailed out, \$180 billion. President Obama approved or enacted that. The takeover of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac that the chairman of the Financial Services Committee pledged he would never vote to support or bail out. And I remember the date that I heard that the first time and the most clearly was October 26, 2005, right over there from that microphone, when BARNEY FRANK said, "I won't vote to bail out Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. And if you think so and you're investing in them, don't count on me doing that."

Well, we might not have had the starkest and clearest and cleanest of votes, but we have had a persistent and a relentless defense of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac's irresponsible financial practices going through many years prior to 2005. But I stood here on this floor and engaged in that process. And the amendments that came to put capital requirements and regulatory requirements on Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac were shot down and voted down and fought against. The most aggressive opposition came directly from the Democrats, who were in the minority at the time. But Fannie and Freddie had worked the lobby and had a broader bipartisan support than they might have otherwise had.

So three large investment banks nationalized, AIG nationalized, Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac nationalized. And now, Mr. Speaker, I say you and the American people share the liability of \$5.5 trillion in contingent liability of Fannie and Freddie. And before I go to the car companies' nationalization, I would remind you and all who may be overhearing this dialogue that of all of the financial reform that has Wall Street under the focus and under the spotlight and under the magnifying glass, of all of the tactics that have been used, and the President going back up to Wall Street to give his speech today, of all of that, the President didn't mention Fannie Mae or Freddie Mac. There is nothing in the financial reform bill that reforms Fannie Mae or Freddie Mac.

□ 1530

What's in the financial reform bill is a \$50 billion slush fund to let the administration decide which businesses are too big to be allowed to fail and to go in and implement a government takeover of the private sector. And what are the criteria? The judgment of the executive branch. Yes, there are some guidelines, but not many constraints. And it gives the Federal Government the power and the authority to look over every credit transaction in America. Every credit transaction in America.

And so presumably that means that if you're in a small, little rural area, it used to work this way: you go in and maybe pick up some grocery items or

buy some gas, they'd put it on your tab. You'd come around and pay the bill at a later date. They'd want to look that one over.

If you go in—and someone mentioned this, and I thought it was a pretty descriptive way. If you go into a furniture store and they have a special on mattresses and so you can buy the mattress and come pay for it 30 days later, nothing down, that's a credit transaction the Federal Government would look in on and have to approve.

It would give them the ability to look in on your credit card, Mr. Speaker. Not necessarily take it out of your pocket, but electronically look in on those credit records. And that would give the Federal Government the authority to examine everybody's transactions. All of your credit card transactions, all of your debit card transactions. Presumably, if you have credit involved with your bank accounts, to look at those loans in the bank accounts. Maybe technically not your checking account because that's not a credit account.

But a Federal Government going that far and that deep and having that kind of authority, let alone looking into all of the Wall Street transactions that take place—the investment banking transactions, the derivatives, the credit default swaps—all of the components that come along that have to do with higher finance, the mortgage transactions that take place and to track them all the way through. And some of this is good. Looking at high finance and being able to track that and being able to identify is primarily a good thing as long as that oppressive thumb of the Federal Government doesn't go in the middle of our back down to individuals in this fashion, and as long as we don't leave it to the discretionary judgment of the Federal Government on which businesses are too big to be allowed to fail.

If the Federal Government can come in and take over three large investment banks and AIG and Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, and if we have a President of the United States who seems to be following through on the playbook that is on the Web site of the Democratic Socialists of America—DSAUSA.org, Mr. Speaker. I hope everybody is paying attention to it, or you can Google "Democratic Socialists of America" and hit the button and there will be a Web site. And that Web site changes a little bit each time that I speak about the DSAUSA.org.

But on the Web site—I saved all of those pages so you can run but you can't hide. Things never die in cyberspace, Mr. Speaker. But on their Web site is now or has been the language that starts out with this. It says, We are socialists. We are not communists—which doesn't give me a lot of comfort. There's a marginal difference, and they tell you what the difference is.

Communists want to nationalize everything. They want to own all real

property. They want to take over everybody's house, all real estate, and they want to tell everybody where they have to work, what they will pay for goods, and what they'll be paid for the work that they are told to do. That is more the pure form of communism. From each according to his ability, to each according to his need.

Well, that also seems to fit the socialists, doesn't it, because they want to do the wealth transfer. They want to share the wealth. That's what the President told Joe the Plumber. Funny. That's what is also the mission statement of ACORN: Share the wealth. The exact language comes right out of the mission statement of ACORN. And the SEIU linked in so closely to ACORN that it's just the funding streams are a little bit different but they are commingled, and often they are trading shirts with each other. Whether it's a purple SEIU shirt or a red ACORN shirt, there are a few more wearing the purple SEIU shirts today than there are ACORN.

By the way, at the risk of digressing, Mr. Speaker, I would point out that even though ACORN announced that on April Fools' Day they would be shutting down ACORN National, I carry this acorn around in my pocket every day to remind me that they have not gone away. It actually may have been an April Fools joke on us that ACORN was going to shut down ACORN National. They could have done that.

But now it's the same people, the same faces, the same boards of directors, a little mixing and matching, changing the names, changing the titles. Funding streams have been shrunk significantly, thanks to Hannah and James and the work that went on behind that. But the same structure is in place. It's the same people, the same problems.

In fact, it reminds me of what happened after the wall went down on November 9 of 1989, and it appeared to be the end of the cold war. The Soviet Union thereafter imploded. A little more than a year after that, the Soviet Union was wound down, and there were those who got together to celebrate the end of the cold war. It was worthy of celebration. A 45-year cold war had looked like it had come to an end, but it didn't convince the communists that they had lost it philosophically.

They didn't believe that our free enterprise capitalism and the vigor that comes from being an American was what had defeated them. They thought they just maybe needed better managers that were more pure in their ideology. And so even though they had to scatter from the light, they went back and reformed new alliances and new allegiances, and they come back at us again and again and again, even more insidious and even harder to find and harder to identify. But philosophical enemies of the liberty and freedom of the United States and western civilization, they remained.

ACORN remains an entity out there that has spent millions of dollars un-

dermining the integrity of the legitimate ballot system here in the United States of America. They produced and admitted to over 400,000 false or fraudulent voter registration forms, and they argue that it didn't result in a single fraudulent vote—which is completely, I think, a specious argument. Why would you spend millions to produce false or fraudulent voter registrations if you didn't think that was going to result in some kind of favorable result for you in the ballot box?

And I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that even though there were major problems with ACORN in Ohio, if that election would have been closer and we would have scrutinized it more closely, we would have found out more about what could have been happening in the ballot box in places like Ohio and Minnesota. When we go to court, who wins in the end in the close elections?

And what if all of those false or fraudulent voter registrations had been kicked out at the beginning and no one had walked in? And that doesn't mean that the ones that were discovered were all of those that actually happened. I have to believe that the voter registration list was significantly corrupted in all of the States where ACORN was carrying out this practice and has significantly corrupted voter registration lists, and opens things up for more and more corruption.

And this United States of America, built upon the foundation of our Constitution itself, that Constitution, one might think, is the framework for law, and it's what we have to preserve if we're going to be a healthy and a viable country. And I agree.

But the very foundation underneath the Constitution itself is legitimate elections. And when elections are delegitimized by organizations like ACORN, and if the American people lose the confidence that we have legitimate elections, there the Constitution falls because the foundation for the Constitution itself is legitimate elections and the people's confidence in those legitimate elections as well.

So ACORN went right at the very component of America that is essential. And that is not that we just have clean, legitimate elections. We must do that if we're going to uphold our Constitution; but we also have to have the American people that believe that we've conducted ourselves in a legitimate fashion, that their vote was not undermined by an illegitimate vote.

That's the ACORN side of this.

ACORN, by the way, another place that I want to do investigations—the other side of the great election divide—and hold hearings in this Congress and subpoena witnesses and go in and drill down and investigate them completely. And I believe that many of those investigative lines, when we follow the money, will lead to the White House itself, Mr. Speaker.

So we have financial reform that's up in front of us. We have ACORN that has dispersed itself to some degree but are

reforming under the same managers, same faces, and some of the same funding streams.

I have raised the issue of how ObamaCare was pushed through this Congress and how it takes over another chunk of our private sector. I will summarize and add up: The three large investment banks that were taken over by the Federal Government; AIG, the insurance company, taken over by the Federal Government; Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, taken over by the Federal Government; and now we have General Motors and Chrysler taken over by the Federal Government; \$700 billion in TARP spending at the beginning of that; \$787 billion in the stimulus package at the tail end of that. And we have all of 6 percent of the American population that believes that the stimulus package actually worked and stimulated jobs.

Well, the data shows the exact opposite. Unemployment went up, not down, while that was going on. The promise was we wouldn't see unemployment go over 8 percent under the stimulus package, but what really happened is unemployment went to 10 percent. And it's hanging in that zone, 9.7 percent in unemployment.

The vision of borrowing money from the Chinese and the Saudis and pouring it in to projects here in America, extending jobs for the public sector, creating government jobs—and calling creation of government jobs economic development, I don't think we've ever had a President that believed that in the history of America until we get to here, this point in our history.

I don't even believe Franklin Delano Roosevelt, the great Keynesian economist that he was, and he embraced John Maynard Keynes' philosophy—not quite to the extent that Keynes would have liked to have had him do, but in a substantial way—didn't believe that government jobs were a replacement for private sector jobs even though he created a lot of them. And we did a lot of make-work projects across the country, and the evidence of that is still out there.

But our President has said to us a little more than a year ago that he believed that Franklin Delano Roosevelt lost his nerve and that he should have spent a lot more money in the thirties, and if he had done so, that would have brought about a recovery instead of waiting for World War II to come along to become and I quote—well, I better not quote that—but the general language is that World War II came along; it was the greatest economic stimulus plan ever. That's close to a quote. I know I've got the philosophy exactly right. And I don't actually disagree with that statement about the stimulus plan with what the Second World War happened to be.

But I would argue that we didn't recover from the Great Depression in the Second World War even. When the stock market crashed in October of 1929, and as it spiraled downwards and

it hiccuped its way up and down and we went through that vast spending era of the Great Depression, and we saw unemployment go up and then come back down and go up again, and when we got to World War II, December 7, 1941, we were still in the Depression. And unemployment was a number that was approaching 20 percent for part of that time, and we had 25 percent unemployment, I think, at the peak.

And we got into the Second World War and we began to manufacture everything as fast as we could. A lot of the women that had not worked before went to work. Rosy the Riveters. And my mother among them who tied parachute knots in Omaha is what she did every day. Tied knots in parachutes. That was part of her war efforts. And, God bless her, she turned 90 years old yesterday. And I honor my mother with all of the love that I have. She did her part of the war effort, as my father did his 2½ years in the South Pacific.

But the economy didn't recover in the Second World War back to where it was. It wasn't the Second World War that was the complete recovery package that one would think the President, according to his words, would be the recovery.

I would just look at what are the indexes. Some of the indexes would be what did the stock market look like and when did it get back to where it was in October of 1929. One might think that Franklin Delano Roosevelt's New Deal and his Keynesian spending was what brought us out of that. That's what my history people taught me. My teachers taught me that.

□ 1545

I went back and looked at the records and found out that wasn't the case. We still had high unemployment, and we still had low and stagnant growth and some reduction of growth in the thirties.

What we saw during World War II was that unemployment rates went way down because we needed everybody to do the work. We saw unemployment rates go to the lowest they've been in history, 1.2 percent. Now that's almost unheard of today, but unemployment was 1.2 percent. It was 25 percent as a high ratcheted down to 15, 10, on down to 1.2 percent near the end of World War II. Still, still we did not recover from the Great Depression from the 1929 stock market crash. It wasn't World War II. It wasn't even the Korean War. In fact, Franklin Delano Roosevelt had been dead for 9 years before the stock market, the Dow Jones Industrial Average, came back to where it was in October of 1929. That happened in 1954, Mr. Speaker.

So one can't, I don't think, legitimately argue that the World War II stimulus plan even brought us out of it. We increased our production and stabilized our economy and put people to work. The unemployment component of this got a lot better, but the growth and equities that had to do at

least at a minimum with the Dow Jones Industrial Average didn't get back to where it was until 1954, from October of 1929. Franklin Delano Roosevelt had been dead for 9 years before the stock market got back to where it was when it crashed in 1929. This was a long, long, long painful recovery that America went through, and we went through not just the Great Depression of the thirties looking for a recovery, but we went through the Second World War looking for a recovery, we went through the Korean War looking for a recovery, and finally limped our way back.

I will submit, Mr. Speaker, that a big reason for that is, when you over leverage a country or a company, you have to pay and service the debt. That means that you have to pay the interest on the borrowed money. And by the way, that borrowed money came from Americans back then instead of the Chinese and the Saudis now. But you have to service the interest on the debt. The war bonds had to be paid off as well. So that has to come out of the tax revenue that's coming in. The tax revenue that comes in comes from—not government—it comes from the private sector. The private sector has to be viable. It has to be vigorous. There has to be profitability there in order to attract more capital investment. Capital investment necessarily increases—wise capital investment necessarily increases our productivity. Increased productivity increases our gross domestic product, which allows us to buy, sell, trade, make, gain, produce more goods, sell more goods, cash in at the cash register more, whether it's the factory or the retail. And when that happens, this private sector economic growth then pays its share of taxes. And in the end, it's the people in America that pay the taxes, not the corporations, not the businesses, and it certainly isn't the government.

So what we have going on here now is, the government is swallowed up with those eight huge entities that I talked about. Three large investment banks, AIG, Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac, General Motors and Chrysler, those eight entities that are swallowed up by the Federal Government represent, according to an economics professor at the University of Arizona as far back as last August, one-third of the private sector activity in the United States swallowed up by those eight huge entities nationalized and taken over by the Federal Government. And behind that came what? ObamaCare swallowing up another 18 percent of our economy.

Now if you want to add 18 percent to—one-third is 33 percent, correct, Mr. Speaker? Yes, I know. You're nodding, and I appreciate your math is correct—that's 51 percent. So 33 percent and 18 percent adds up to 51 percent of our private sector economy. This now taken over and managed or dictated the terms of its business contracts, every bit of health care in America will be, according to this term of

ObamaCare, signed into law a couple weeks ago or three, will be directed by the Federal Government.

And some people—let me say some people without the largest of minds—are arguing that because we still have a surviving private sector health insurance industry, that the health care in America hasn't been nationalized. I would challenge them, Mr. Speaker, point to me—point for me to a sector or a component or an activity within health care in America that is not slated to be changed, altered or directed by ObamaCare. There isn't a single health insurance policy in America that the President can tell anyone, You get to keep that policy, that it isn't going to increase the premiums dramatically or perhaps reduce them marginally. That's going to happen. The premiums change for everybody in America unless there's somebody who happens to sit exactly on the dividing line. Young people will pay a lot more in premiums because they're a lower risk. We went from a 7-1 community rating that's out there now, which means that the most extreme cases—the lowest premium compared to the highest premium—are 7-1, which means that if we have a young healthy person paying \$100 a month on a similar policy, an older person that may not be completely healthy could be paying \$700 a month on a similar policy or even an identical policy. Now this has been pulled back to a 3-1 community rating which means that now that—just say we've got two people. They're both insured. The youth at \$100 a month. The older person, say my age, who is a greater risk, at \$700 a month. That's \$800 between the two of us. Now when you go to a 3-1 community rating, that means that there can't be that much disparity. So you dial that thing back down. And you charge the young person then \$200 a month and the older person \$600 a month. Now we're dealing with \$800 again. But the \$800 comes \$200 from the young person at doubling their premium and a reduction in the older person at \$700 down to \$600. Now you've got the \$800 that comes together for that monthly premium of the two insured. That's how that works.

So health insurance premiums change because they changed the rules for everybody, and they'll have to be approved by the Health Choices Administration czar or whomever that happens to be who has that title, and what was the Senate version of the bill. That part I didn't commit to memory, Mr. Speaker. Everybody's health insurance changes in America, and this government effectively cancels every policy subject to the approval of the new rules that will be written that aren't written yet. Nobody knows where they are. The health insurance underwriters are pulling their hair out, trying to figure out what happens and how do they do business. The Federal Government's dictating completely every health insurance policy in America. Can we find a health care provider that doesn't have

their way of doing business altered by this bill? Certainly the funding stream that comes in is altered. There's \$500 billion cut in Medicare for our senior citizens, \$523.5 billion—over \$500 billion cut out of Medicare reimbursement rates.

I represent the most senior congressional district in America. Iowa has the highest percentage of its population over the age of 85 of any of the States. We're the oldest two or three over the age of 65. There is good longevity there, I like that, and healthy practices, presumably. But the district I represent, out of the 99 counties in Iowa, 10 of the 12 most senior counties in Iowa. And I hear the President say there's waste, fraud and abuse in Medicare so we're going to slash \$500 billion out of there to pay for ObamaCare. And has the President pointed his finger to a single bit of waste, fraud and abuse that is in Medicare that he would fix? The promise is that's what he will do. But if he can't identify it or won't identify it, or if he's holding the access to that information hostage to the passage of his ObamaCare bill—he's got the bill. He signed it. It's now the law of the land.

Now it's time for the President of the United States to turn over all of those magic cards to show us, where is the waste, fraud and abuse in Medicare? I don't say it doesn't happen. I hear those cases, too. But what's the solution to fix it? And do we really have to pass a bill in order to have legitimate clean government? If there's corruption, let's go find it. Let's go root it out, root and branch, pull it out, and let's legitimize all of Medicare in the country. But we don't need to be going in there and arguing that—if there's \$500 billion worth of waste, fraud and abuse, how do you arrive at that number if you haven't found the waste, fraud and abuse yet?

So now I'm going to tell you, seniors will be penalized or they won't keep their word, and we'll be borrowing more from the Chinese to fund ObamaCare because—I'm going on record here in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on this day, April 22, 2010, to say that we will not see \$500 billion in cuts in Medicare. They were never sincere about that. That's only a number that they needed to reach so they could argue that ObamaCare doesn't cost over \$1 trillion over 10 years. Remember the argument now became, CBO scored this at \$132 billion in savings over 10 years. That's \$13.2 billion per year, the 10-year budget window that we're talking about. That is not loose change to American taxpayers. But to the overall budget, it's very marginal as to whether it's a savings or whether it's an increase in spending. But that includes and is predicated upon the cut to the spending which is a punishment to our seniors of \$523.5 billion. It's also predicated upon a tax increase of \$569.2 billion, and it was predicated upon the avoidance of the doctors' fix which is in the change of \$360 billion. All of that

distorts this to the tune of about \$1.4 trillion that with an honest accounting would get added back into this ObamaCare bill.

So you take \$1.4 trillion in costs that are distorted, and you would subtract \$132 billion from that, and you're down in the neighborhood of—let me get that number here right—subtract \$132 billion from the \$1.4 trillion. Now you are down about \$1.27 trillion in increased costs. Now remember what the President said. I have to refresh you, Mr. Speaker, because I'm wondering if any Democrats would actually be able to pass this test.

A couple little questions about history: Why did we go into ObamaCare in the first place? What was the argument from the beginning? What happened during the campaign that presumably gave the President of the United States a mandate to impose ObamaCare on America? And I remember this discussion, but I suspect that Madam Speaker PELOSI does not choose to remember this. Barack Obama—then Senator and candidate Obama said, We are spending too much money on health care. We've got to solve the problem of spending too much money on health care. And so he argued that the solution for that apparently is to spend a lot more on health care.

Now that doesn't pass the first little bit of third grade logic test. I could go to my little granddaughter, who is now 5, had her first little loose tooth here over the weekend, and say to her, If we're spending too much money, does it solve the problem if we spend more money? And she would give me that quizzical look like, How could you say something so irrational, Grampa? It's not rational to argue that spending too much money is solved by spending more money. But that's the argument that came. It's a matter of fact in public record. We're spending too much money. We have to solve that problem. And lo and behold, ObamaCare spends a lot more money, and somehow they still argue that they're solving the problem of spending too much money.

The second thing is that we have not enough competition in the insurance companies, not enough choices. We have 1,300 health insurance companies in America—or we did until a month ago when ObamaCare was signed into the law of the land. We have 1,300 health insurance companies, 100,000 possible policy varieties, and the President wants another one to compete with. Now he didn't get that. But he got the exchange, and the exchange will decide who are the winners and who are the losers, and they will write the mandates for every single policy in America. And let's just say, if you don't cover contraception, then there is going to be a requirement to cover contraception; if you don't cover Viagra, there's going to be a requirement to cover Viagra; if your policy doesn't cover mental health, there will be requirements to cover mental health.

Mandate after mandate after mandate, when we only have a couple—three of those in law prior to ObamaCare—will come raining down out of the Federal Government. And whenever there is a mandate, it makes an argument for four or five or six more health care mandates, and every mandate increases the costs over the premium and takes away our liberty and takes away our freedom.

□ 1600

All of these things that I have talked about pale in comparison to the part that knots up my innards more than any other, and that is this: since 1973, the people generally on the left side of the aisle in America have made the argument with regard to *Roe v. Wade*, *Doe v. Bolton*, and abortion in America, the people on the other side of the aisle have argued long and hard that the Federal Government has no business telling a person what they can or can't do with their body. That's the argument. So they argue that the Federal Government can't regulate nor diminish nor make it more restrictive for a woman who seeks an abortion to get that abortion because it's not our business what a woman does with her body. That is their argument. Men and women made that argument.

Over here on this side of the aisle, over and over and over again they made that argument. Now the same people, Mr. Speaker, are making the argument—and have made the argument and the President has signed it into the law of the land—that the Federal Government has no business telling a woman what she can or can't do with her body, but instead, now the same people are arguing that the Federal Government has every right to tell everybody in America what they can or can't do with their body.

The President of the United States, with the iron fist of the leadership within the House and the Senate and the complicity of a bare majority of the Members of the House, has imposed and nationalized our very bodies. The most sovereign thing that we have is our own personal self, our skin and what is inside our skin; the management of same has been taken over by the Federal Government. Now they tell all of us, you shall buy a health insurance policy; and if you can't afford it, we're going to tax somebody else and send you a refundable tax credit and you, by golly, are going to pay for that policy.

And if you are working and making enough money and you don't have a policy, if you happen to be working for a business that has less than 50 employees, then we are going to fine you a percentage of your income. The IRS is going to come in and do the audits, first electronically and then personally, to impose that health insurance policy on you. And it won't be the one that you could buy last month. It will be the one that you can buy next year or the year after, after they write the

new rules. The Federal Government's nationalization of our bodies.

So they have nationalized eight huge entities, a third of the private sector activity, and another 18 percent of our economy, health care, and nationalized and taken over the most sovereign thing we have, our skin and what is inside our skin, and taken away our ability, as individual free people that exercise the rights that come from God, clearly identified by the Founding Fathers and delineated in the Declaration of Independence, which is the foundation for the Constitution, the sovereignty of man, the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

By the way, Mr. Speaker, I would point out that you and everyone in this Congress and those who aspire to come to this Congress should know that the Founding Fathers understood that those rights are prioritized rights—life, liberty, the pursuit of happiness—not just a grab bag of rights that they pulled out of the sky or randomly put into a package, but set there in an order of priority, a priority that the thing most paramount is our lives, the management of our lives as well; and that liberty, as a secondary right, is subordinate to the right to life.

The pursuit of happiness was not the pursuit of happiness as it is envisioned in the minds of a lot of people today. Pursuit of happiness, by the way, is subordinated to liberty and to life so that no one in their pursuit of happiness—and by the way, pursuit of happiness meant to our Founding Fathers more the Greek understanding, the word “*eudaimonia*,” which means pursuit of truth, pursuit of knowledge, pursuit of perfection in both body and mind. That is what pursuit of happiness was understood to mean when the Declaration of Independence was signed and they pledged their lives, their fortune, and their sacred honor.

The pursuit of happiness was the pursuit of truth and purity. That pursuit of happiness, though, is still subordinate and cannot—in anyone's pursuit of happiness can they infringe upon the liberty of another because our liberties are established in the Bill of Rights, for example, now—we understand them more clearly.

And they are also enshrined in title VII of the Civil Rights Act: You shall not discriminate against people based upon race, creed, color, ethnicity, now and a lot of times it's age and disability. Those are real rights. They are the rights that are protected. And the rights to freedom of speech, religion, the press, the right to keep and bear arms, the rights to property that come in the Fifth Amendment, the right to be protected against double jeopardy, to be judged by a jury of our peers, all of them, those are all rights. These rights are our liberties.

Our liberties that are guaranteed to us cannot be taken over by someone else in their pursuit of their happiness. They have to honor and respect that as our liberties are always subordinated

to the right to life being the most paramount right. These things are all taken away by ObamaCare: right to life itself, because it puts people in line to take the health care that the Federal Government prescribes and it's unconstitutional in a lot of ways, at least four ways.

First, there is nothing there in the enumerated powers that grants this Congress or the President of the United States to join together and impose a product on us that is neither produced nor approved by the Federal Government. Never in the history of this country has that ever happened. That is a constitutional violation. There is nothing in the commerce clause that allows such a broad definition that people that would not engage in commerce whatsoever would have to buy a product produced or approved by the Federal Government. It is a violation of the equal protection clause for the reasons that I have said, the Louisiana Purchase, Florida Gator Aid, and the list goes on.

Some Americans are treated different than others in the bill. It is a violation of the Ninth and 10th Amendments, the States' rights component of this as well. I encourage the 20 States attorneys general to go forward with their lawsuits. I am working for a repeal of 100 percent of ObamaCare. Pull it out root and branch; I don't want one DNA vestige left behind. Let's get it out. Let's pull it out all the way, Mr. Speaker, so there is none of it left. And then we can start putting components in place as individual stand-alone bills so the American people can clearly see that their voice is being heard in this United States Congress. And we can do it, we must do it, and we can do it in a reasonable time frame. We can put a discharge petition down here on the floor now for signatures of these Members of Congress.

The second thing we can do is seek to get that vote on the floor. The Senate is doing the same thing. And when we have the other side of the election, we can shut off funding for the implementation of ObamaCare. We can do that. In 2011 and 2012 we can elect a new President who will sign the repeal on his first order of business January 20, 2013. And then we start the reform process.

That is where we need to go, Mr. Speaker. And for those who think that it can't be done, it can't be accomplished, I have a survey on my Web site that asks the question: Do you believe that it's more likely that ObamaCare will be repealed than the Cubs will win the World Series this year? And the last number I saw, 58 percent believed it is more likely we will repeal ObamaCare and 42 percent thought it was more likely the Cubs would win the World Series. They went to spring training; they're playing ball. We are going to play ball all the way to 2013 and beyond. We are going to get this job done, Mr. Speaker. One hundred percent repeal of ObamaCare it must be

to preserve the liberty that Americans had last month that they deserve every month in the lives of our children and grandchildren.

So with that, Mr. Speaker, I would express my gratitude for your indulgence and your attention, and especially that little nod of the head, and I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. MCCOLLUM (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today until noon on account of official business.

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. DAVIS of Tennessee) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ALTMIRE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SABLAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, 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. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, April 29.

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, April 29.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, April 29.

Mr. PAUL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, April 26, 27, 28, and 29.

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. 3244. An act to provide that Members of Congress shall not receive a cost of living adjustment in pay during fiscal year 2011; to the Committee on House Administration; in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, April 26, 2010, at 12:30 p.m., for morning-hour debate.