

These are things that we have historically punted, and we did when our side was in control as well. There was a real opportunity to fix this in this bill, and for whatever reason, for whatever reason, the Democratic leadership and indeed the American Medical Association decided to take a pass on that.

There is a lot more that is contained in this bill. I will be back to the floor from time to time to talk about it over the coming year or two or three or four or five, however long it takes.

Again, remember, the principle behind this is to kill this bill, root it out, rip it out, repeal the bill, and then get on to fixing the things we should have fixed in the first place.

IMPORTANT ISSUES FACING ALL AMERICANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. HALVORSON). 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. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the privilege to be recognized to address you here on the floor, and I appreciate the gentleman from Texas' previous hour and his discussion on health care.

By the way, the gentleman from Texas, Congressman/Dr. BURGESS' contribution on this health care debate that has gone on now for months and months and months, his intensity doesn't let up. He understands the issue. He is here on a cause, and this cause is to do what we can to salvage the system that America has had and improve that system and not capitulate to this system of ObamaCare.

Madam Speaker, I will take us to that, and I will cross a number of lines into different subjects here this evening. But with regard to the ObamaCare that we have heard about for the last hour and for the last 9 or so months, we have seen a Congress that has passed legislation that on the day it passed the House, it couldn't have passed the Senate. On the day it passed the House, we don't know what kind of bargains came in that brought about just barely the votes to get it passed, but we knew the President would sign it. He wanted anything that he could put his name on.

By the way, the President of the United States is the one who gave the moniker to this legislation, "ObamaCare." He called it ObamaCare February 25 at the Blair House at that conference on health care that seemed to have given the ObamaCare its legs.

I am for 100 percent repeal of ObamaCare. There isn't any part of that that I want to keep, that I want to hold, that I want to sustain or expand or continue into the next year or generation.

Most of it is not enacted until the year 2014. There are some small pieces that are enacted right away, and then slowly over time. The tax increases, by the way, are enacted pretty soon so

they can collect this money for the first 4 or more years and then charge only 6 years of expenses against 10 years of revenue and argue that it saves \$132 billion.

Now we find out that high-ranking people within the administration and possibly the President himself understood that the numbers that came in were not accurate, that ObamaCare is going to cost a lot more than they represented it to cost on the day that the legislation was passed.

Now, I don't think that is the reason to repeal ObamaCare. I have always thought it was going to cost a lot more than they said it would. The reasons to repeal ObamaCare are great in number and more varied than that.

□ 2140

But we're not going to get down to a financial calculation. In the end, there are enough people in America that think somehow they're going to get a free lunch, that they're not going to support the repeal of ObamaCare for that. But they understand this. They understand when the government runs things, there are lines. There are lines at TSA to get into the airport. There are lines to get your driver's license. There are lines outside of Federal buildings. There are lines outside the Cannon, the Longworth, and the Rayburn Building of just citizens that want to come in and watch their government function.

Free people don't stand in line. Free people, Madam Speaker, will go to the next place of business. If the line is too long at McDonald's, they will go to Burger King. But when they're dealing with government, it's a monopoly. That's why the line is there. The government doesn't have any incentive to expedite the passage of people through that service, except to turn down the noise of the squeaky wheel, because government doesn't have to compete for its customers. The government has a monopoly. So free people, they don't stand in line. They go someplace else. But our freedom is diminished every time the government takes up a task that the private sector can do, and health care is certainly one of those.

So, Madam Speaker, here's what I'm watching happen. This has taken place over the last year and a half. A little bit of it began under the Bush administration. But I'd start with this: \$700 billion in TARP spending, half of that approved under the Bush administration, essentially down the lame duck era of his term. The other half of it—that was right before the election, if I remember right. The other half of it was approved by a Congress that was elected in November of 2008 and signed in by a President who was elected in November of 2008. That was President Obama. At the direction of Speaker PELOSI and the majority leader in the Senate, HARRY REID, \$700 billion in TARP spending, most of it, in my view, wasted.

And while this is going on, we had three large investment banks that were

nationalized, taken over by the Federal Government. That means Federal ownership or control, management influence and control, three large investments banks. AIG, to the tune of about \$180 billion. Then we watched Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac swallow up billions of taxpayer dollars to recapitalize them for their losses. Then we saw, right before Christmas, the President issue an Executive order that takes on all the contingent liabilities of Fannie and Freddie and completely nationalizes Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, all of the markets that are the secondary loan market of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac taken over by the Federal Government.

Then we saw General Motors and Chrysler taken over by the Federal Government. At General Motors, the Federal Government stepping in with 61 percent of the shares, bought up the share value of 61 percent; the Canadian Government, 12.5 percent; and the unions got handed 17.5 percent, even though the secured bondholders got iced out. They had the secured collateral and they still were iced out in the leveraged negotiations that took place.

And so we've seen one-third of the private sector activity taken over by the Federal Government, and along came a \$787 billion economic stimulus plan, and then a along came the resurrection of the dead ObamaCare. The dead ObamaCare was brought to life, barely squeezed out of it, on life support, limped out of this Congress, put on the President's desk in a fashion that it could not have passed this Congress on the day because the Senate would not have approved it, Madam Speaker.

And so we saw one-third of the private sector profits swallowed up in the banks, the AIG, Fannie, Freddie, General Motors, and Chrysler, and another sixth of the economy swallowed up in ObamaCare, where the most sovereign and private thing that we have, which is our own bodies, our skin and everything inside it, taken over by the Federal Government, called ObamaCare. Our skin and everything inside it, the most sovereign thing that we have. We manage our lives, we manage our bodies, and now the Federal Government tells us what we can and can't have for tests, what we can and can't have for insurance policies, what insurance policies will be approved and what insurance policies are not approved.

Every single insurance policy in America under ObamaCare will be cancelled by 2014. Yes, many will be reissued. Some will be similar to the ones they have. But there isn't a single policy that the President of the United States can point to and say, This one will be a live, viable policy in 2015, and it won't have to change. Every one gets cancelled.

They've nationalized our bodies. And they've done so, the very people that stood here and—before 1973, but at least 1973—said that, because of *Roe v. Wade*, they said that government has

no business telling a woman what she can or can't do with her body. Remember when you said that? Remember that debate? Remember those arguments? You'll make them again. You'll make them again to the end of the Earth because that's the bumper sticker discussion. But it's not rational thought. It doesn't substitute for thinking people. A woman should have an unlimited right to elective abortion because government has no business telling her what she can or can't do with her body, while at the same time, now the very same people, men and women who have argued since 1973 that the government has no business telling a woman what she can or can't do with her body, now are arguing that the Federal Government has every business and every right to tell everyone in America what we can and can't do with our bodies and have taken over and nationalized the most sovereign thing that we have—our own personhood.

Our skin and everything inside it managed now by the Federal Government, by the people who said that government had no business telling a woman what she can or can't do with her body. The men and women, most of you sitting on this side of the aisle, have made the argument, and you don't have a rebuttal for this argument. Not one of you has risen to rebut this argument that I've made. I've put up the contradictions here. I pointed out the hypocrisy. I made it clear on the dichotomy. If you've got an argument to rebut the one that I've made, please stand up. I'll recognize you. I'll yield time to you. But you don't. You will sit there and you won't respond because you know you're wrong.

It reminds me of the statement made by Art Laffer on economics when he said, They are rebutting arguments that they know to be wrong in order to curry favor with their political benefactors. Well, Madam Speaker, that's what's going on. You have people here that realize where their power base is in order to curry favor with their political benefactors. They're making arguments that are completely irrational. And when they're caught in those irrational arguments, they slink away out of the Chamber with their hands in their pockets, afraid to face the rationality of it, afraid to face the debate, knowing all the while I'm happy to yield to, but no, you're gone. You won't stick around this Chamber. You won't come to a microphone because you're rebutting arguments that you know to be wrong, because that's what gravitates towards your political power base, and it's disingenuous to make those illegitimate arguments in that fashion.

So here we are now. We have come all through this continuum jump of the nationalization of one-third of the private sector activities and you add about 17 or 18 percent of health care on top of that. Now we've gone over 50 percent of our private sector economy taken over by the Federal Government,

including 100 percent of the student loans. And where are we next? Well, the financial services industry. Why didn't I see that coming?

If someone had given me the job to, in an Orwellian way, write the screenplay to a movie of how America could be taken over by a socialist agenda, I could not have imagined some of the things that have happened so far. I might have gotten half of these things. I don't think I could have gotten the scenario down. I might have been able to envision that the banks could be taken over. That was kind of an obvious one. I'd have been able to envision the takeover of the car companies because that's actually on the socialist Web site. It's actually supported by the Progressives, 77 of whom serve in the United States Congress. They are the arm and the voice of the socialists in America.

If you just Google Socialists in America, you will go to the Web site called DSAUSA.org, the Democratic Socialists of America, Madam Speaker. They're proud to be Socialists. They start out and they say, We're not Communists. There's a difference. Well, to start out with your advertisement that you're not a Communist, and there's a difference—Socialists aren't as bad as Communists is what they're saying. So they'll argue they don't want to nationalize all the real estate, all the real property in America. They don't really even have to nationalize real estate in America. They just want to take over the Fortune 500 companies. That's on the Web site. It's not a manufactured thing. It's there. It's on the Web site. Then they say, We don't have to do this all at once. We can do it incrementally. We can take over the Fortune 500 companies and these other companies that are profitable. We can take them over incrementally. We don't have to do it all at once.

Well, look what's happened. Bank of America, Citigroup. All together, three large investments banks—AIG, Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac, General Motors, Chrysler. All of them at one time were all private sector entities, all now swallowed up and managed by the Federal Government. Fannie and Freddie, \$5.5 trillion in contingent liability. Swallow all that up.

□ 2150

Well, they can control them, a large sector of the economy. And I wondered, why would you want to take over Fortune 500 companies and manage them for the benefit of the people affected by them? What would be the motive to do that? What would this be? Well, it's power for one thing, and it creates a dependency class for another, and it expands the dependency class. The Democrats in this Congress believe that if they expand the dependency class, they will also at the same time be expanding the constituent base that will get them reelected over and over and over again. Never mind that it's a direct assault on our Constitution, a direct assault on

our liberty, but it diminishes the vitality of Americans, it saps us as a people and makes us more dependent, European socialism, something worse than that.

The argument that comes from the progressives in this Congress that want to nationalize the oil refinery industry in America—MAURICE HINCHEY—who wants to nationalize the petroleum industry in America—MAXINE WATERS—75 other progressives, the socialists and their website say, we don't run people on the socialist ticket; we don't have socialist candidates on the ballot, we have Democrats on the ballot who are progressives. They are our legislative arm, Madam Speaker.

So I continue to read through the socialist Web site, the Progressive Web site. And we will see the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) come to this floor pretty regularly—maybe not every week, at least every other week—and he puts up a blue poster that says “Progressives”—grijalva.com, or whatever that particular Web site might be—and he's proud of the progressive agenda. But the progressive agenda, if you go read it, you find it on the socialist Web site; they're proud of it, too. And they're proud of the progressives claiming the agenda that the socialists drive. Those are facts. They're not refutable. And I can flip the pages out here and put them on posters on the floor of the House without too much difficulty.

Now, BERNIE SANDERS, who served in this House, a self-evolved socialist, argued many times at these microphones—and I debated with him occasionally, although it was nothing particularly memorable that I can think of—was elected to the United States Senate a few years ago and became the first socialist in the United States Senate. BERNIE SANDERS, progressive. He's the only progressive in the United States Senate—that's listed at least on the Progressive's Web site. He's proud of that. He's proud of being a socialist.

And the argument about where the President stands is not an argument about whether the President is a socialist because the President voted to the left of BERNIE SANDERS, the self-avowed socialist. The argument, if it was going to be made, should have been made by the President. He should have made the argument that BERNIE SANDERS isn't a socialist; he's just masquerading as a socialist.

Maybe a true socialist does something different. Maybe a true socialist nationalizes even fewer businesses. When I see the President do his glad-handed, double-armed handshake with Hugo Chavez, and I see that that same week Hugo Chavez had nationalized a rice processing plant that belonged to Cargill, a proud Minnesota company that was taken over by Hugo Chavez, while that was going on, General Motors and Chrysler were being taken over by President Obama. And I thought, when I saw those two together with the big grins on their face, that

Hugo Chavez is a piker when it comes to the nationalization of business. And the question isn't, is the President a socialist? The question is, he votes to the left of BERNIE SANDERS, so what's a better description than the one that some are using? What's a better description than the one that BERNIE SANDERS, the one he uses on himself, the socialist?

The President votes to the left of a self-evolved socialist in the United States Senate; I think that's a matter worth note. It's a matter of fact; it's not a matter for debate. It is a matter for consideration, Madam Speaker. And I think it tells us something about America and about where America is being dragged and about where America will go if we don't turn back around and take this country up to the heights that are destined for us, that are based upon individual liberties, rights that come from God—free enterprise capitalism, the religious foundation and our religious faith—not just the freedom to worship freely, but the core of our faith that gives us the moral values that diminish the need for law enforcement to be looking over our shoulder and sapping our energy.

I have seen a lot of energy sapped out of this country in the last year and a half of this Obama Presidency, Madam Speaker, and I don't know how much more this country can sustain. But I do believe that we have a chance, and we're going to step forward on that chance to turn this around and take this country back to the heights where she was intended to be. That's going to mean an election result in November that's entirely different than the one we had the last couple of Novembers. And it's going to mean that this Republican party in this Congress, by golly, better get the planks down on where we want to go. We had better be unified behind them. And we better step this Nation forward so that when the election comes people will know what they're voting for, and they will be able to get behind those things that we say we're going to do.

I will submit, Madam Speaker, the number one plank in the Republican agenda has got to be 100 percent repeal of ObamaCare, not 99.9 percent or 99.8 or 98 percent; 100 percent repeal of ObamaCare. And if there are Republicans that equivocate on that, if they're afraid that they don't want to take on the debate, that they don't want to put a Federal mandate in to provide for and require all insurance to be extended to age 26 for college kids, for example—I want my kids to grow up; I don't want to keep them dependent. I don't want to make their bed when they're 26. I want them on their own well before they're 26.

The law has dealt with it this way: That you are responsible for a child until they're 18 years old unless you've been divorced, in which case you might be responsible for that child until they graduate from college. I think that's a bit of an inequity. But to go to age 26

and put a Federal mandate in, I'd turn this question back the other way: Where in the Constitution does it grant the authority for the Federal Government to establish a mandate that would require that insurance companies offer health insurance to age 26 as part of every policy, which certainly raises the premium and means that health insurance is less affordable rather than more affordable?

Many of these things will take place and unfold in the upcoming next 2 to 3 years, but here's the timing in the sequence in the repeal of ObamaCare. First, a maximum number of co-signatures on my legislation, on that of MICHELE BACHMANN's, and others. We are somewhere around 63 or 64 cosponsors, Madam Speaker. And there isn't a good reason why anybody that voted "no" on ObamaCare can't step up and cosponsor legislation for repeal of ObamaCare. When we net enough signatures on that, we'll put a discharge petition down here at the well. A discharge petition with 218 signatures on it requires a bill to come to the floor for debate and vote without amendments. If we could do that, we could pass out of the House, and if the Senate could do that we could pass out of the Senate a repeal of ObamaCare that could then go to the President's desk. And President Obama would certainly—well, almost certainly—veto the bill.

Some will argue it's an exercise in futility, but I put on my Web site—the kingforcongress.com Web site—a polling question that asks this question: Do you believe that 100 percent of ObamaCare is more likely to be repealed, or do you think that the Cubs are more likely to win the World Series? And do you know, we were 2-1, 2-1 of people answering the poll for predicting that it was more likely that ObamaCare would be repealed than the Cubs would win the World Series.

Now, I'd be happy to see the Cubs win the World Series. I'm not coming here, Madam Speaker, to stir up any Cubs fans. I'm just pointing out that the Cubs went to spring training this year. They're playing ball. They're throwing, catching, hitting, running; they're practicing, they're in shape, they're getting their pitching up. They're focused. And why? Because they believe that they're positioned to win the World Series this year. They didn't go out with their dobber down. They didn't think it didn't pay to practice. They didn't skip spring training; they went to the field. Even though now they know that most Americans think it's more likely we will repeal ObamaCare than the Cubs will win the World Series, they're still playing ball. And they're not out of this at all. It's early. They're not even out of it when it's late. Until it's mathematically impossible, the Cubs are always in it. But it tells you the degree of difficulty here. If the Cubs are only one out of three likely to win the World Series, we can do this, it's not that hard. It's

not as hard as winning the World Series. We can accomplish this. We can repeal ObamaCare.

By the way, if the President vetoes a discharge petition or we come back after the elections and Republicans have the majority, we can perhaps then pass a repeal of ObamaCare, and maybe the Senate will get that done too—and Senator DEMINT is working on this mission over on the Senate side. And so we set it on the President's desk, and he vetoes it, and we wouldn't likely have the votes to override a presidential veto. Fair enough, that's reality. But here's how the function of this goes: All spending bills start in the House. A Republican majority in the House with a deep conviction to repeal ObamaCare in its entirety can shut off all funding to ObamaCare so that it cannot be implemented.

□ 2200

No part of it could be implemented or enforced if we say so in appropriations bills here in the House. And if we do that in 2011 and 2012, we will elect a President in 2012 whose number one plank in the platform needs to be that the first bill he will sign as President is full repeal of ObamaCare.

So I just envision this: the inauguration of the President of the United States out here on the west portico of the Capitol building, standing there taking the oath of office. And once he is sworn in as President of the United States by the Chief Justice John Roberts, he can take his hand down. And the first act as President of the United States, he can get out his pen, because we will gavel in January 3 of 2013, we can pass the repeal in the House and the Senate. We can set it up not on the President's desk, let's put it on the podium on the west portico so when he swears in he can have the pen in his hand for all of me, put it down, sign the repeal of ObamaCare, and it's gone from history. Pulled out root and branch, lock, stock and barrel, with no vestige, not one particle of DNA of ObamaCare left behind. Because that toxic stew has now become a malignant tumor, and we need to pull it out by the roots before it metastasizes.

That's our duty to the American people and one of the things that I came here to do and one of the things that I will work on. And I will challenge anybody that can make a cogent argument that we have got to repeal ObamaCare before we can move forward because it is an agenda that you can find at dsausa.org. That is Democratic Socialists of America. You can also find that agenda at the progressive Web site that is advertised so many times by those 77 that are the ones that are run on the ticket that the Socialists say they support.

That's what's up, Madam Speaker. I wanted to get that out and lay it out and get it off my chest before I asked my friend, the judge from Texas, if he had anything on his mind. And if he does, and he has never been without

anything on his mind, he was born with things on his mind, but I am very happy to yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas, Judge LOUIE GOHMERT.

Mr. GOHMERT. I thank my friend for yielding. Steve Forbes was up here on the Hill a couple of weeks ago. One of his comments was that we could do a complete repeal, and at the same time we could put some fixes in there that Republicans had been proposing, that we have had out there as alternatives at the same time, just one fell swoop, so that people would realize that we have not been the Party of No, we have some fantastic ideas that would have revolutionized health care and gotten it back to where it had transparency, where it was affordable, and gotten insurance companies out of the health care management business and into the health care insurance business, where you insure against an unforeseeable illness or catastrophe down the road and put patients back in charge of their health care.

I certainly had a proposal along that line that we never could get CBO to score nearly a year later, I guess about 9 months to be fair, that they have sat on that to try to help kill—help work for the Democrats to help make sure that any of the good alternative plans could not get scored so that we couldn't come in and say here is the plan that saves money, gives more freedom, and does all these things. Anyway, it's been a bit of a tough year.

But the problems didn't just start with this President. My friend from Iowa knows as well. We have been heading in the wrong path for some time. Of course Republicans lost the majority, rightfully, in November 2006 because Republicans had gotten giddy after 2001 and had started spending too much money. And voters held them accountable. And we hope they will continue that trend this November.

But I recall my favorite President, from Texas that is, George W. Bush, I think the world of him, he is smarter than most people give him credit for, but he got sold a bill of goods by a bad Secretary of the Treasury, and he was told a good way to stimulate the economy in January 2008 was to have a stimulus bill and have \$160 billion, \$40 billion of which would just be given to people as a rebate who didn't pay income tax. They would get an income tax rebate even though they didn't pay income tax.

And my friend from Iowa may remember as President Bush came down the aisle here he shook hands with everybody, and made his speech, and then on the way back up I didn't realize there was a mic open that picked me up asking him, "Mr. President, I wanted to ask you how do you give a rebate to people that didn't put any bate in?" And that's still a problem.

And then you come up, and bless his heart, Hank Paulson saved his firm Goldman Sachs, saved the people that he had worked with and chaired over

and had great personal interest in. He was able to save them at great cost to the American way of life, to the free market system. Just created a real disaster. You can't set aside free market principles to save the free market.

But it all led up to desensitizing people to just how much \$700 or \$787 billion is. It is an enormous amount of money. And so here we came into January of 2009, and right off the bat have a \$787 billion stimulus, most of which has not been spent. Even though we were told that people didn't have time to read it, you got to just pass it, \$787 billion dollars will be thrown out there and we will get the economy going. Had to be passed so fast, before people could read it.

And then yet the President took several days, kind of like he has getting fired up to do anything about the gulf coast. So he takes his time, waits for a photo op to sign the stimulus bill into effect. But the problem is you can't raise taxes the way this health care bill did and think you are going to help the economy in the long run. It's not going to happen.

And then we find out we have moved from the overly high 39 percent of Americans not paying Federal income tax to now the projection that 53 percent of American adults will be paying all of the income tax. I think historians all pretty well acknowledge that in a democracy, including this republican form of government where people can vote for candidates based upon what they promise to give them in the way of benefits, once you get past one more than 50 percent of those who are voting receive benefits and not pay income tax, or not pay the Federal taxes, you've lost it. You head to the dustbin of history. You're done. There is no recovery from that, absent a miracle from God.

And of course some of the people that are creating the problem don't believe in God, so they are really in trouble because they can't even expect a miracle from God like some of us could.

But 53 percent of Americans to pay all of the income tax. And then I have heard great disparagement, as my friend from Iowa has, as we have been to the tea parties and been asked to speak at various tea parties, including the one down Pennsylvania Avenue a few weeks ago, the one at the Washington Monument, and you see all these wonderful, peaceful, law-abiding people, and you talk to them and you find out these are people paying income tax.

And we also have seen the latest survey that indicated that 28 percent of Americans, up from 20 percent, 28 percent of Americans identify with the tea party. Well, what that means is since those 28 percent pay income tax, it means that over half of the 53 percent projected to pay all the income tax this year, those that are really carrying the load for the country, pulling the wagon for everybody else, over half of them are tea party members, identify with the tea party.

□ 2210

Quite interesting. It's not the marginal group that some would have Americans believe. We are talking about rank-and-file Americans who are pulling the weight with income tax.

Now, one of the things that would help a lot is if all of the President's promises about jobs were to come true. Then we would have more people able to pay income taxes. I know an awful lot of folks who would welcome the chance to get back to paying income taxes, but they can't find jobs. This health care bill is a real jobs killer.

I have had, as I'm sure my friend from Iowa has had as well, people who've come up and who've said, I lost my job. My sister lost her job. These folks lost their jobs. After the health care bill passed, they had to be let go. Others are saying, We've had our salaries cut. We've been told it's coming.

These are economy killers, and these things in the health care bill are robbing America of people who would be able to help with that income tax burden. So it has been tragic, and it just breaks my heart to hear from these people who have lost their jobs because they had to ram through this health care reform bill instead of doing what was really right for America. We didn't have to have people lose their jobs just to pass a health care bill, but they didn't care about what America thought.

I want to mention one other thing about the Tea Party folks before I yield back to my friend from Iowa.

We've heard that people were rowdy at the Tea Party on that weekend that health care got rammed down America's throat. Some of us went out and walked and saw the folks. We walked down the street. People were lining the sidewalks pretty thick. They were yelling and cheering when some of us came out because they were so vocally opposed to health care.

On that weekend, as I was going back to my office from a vote over here and as people had crowded onto the sidewalks and as most of my friends in Congress were walking through the streets, I decided to get up on the sidewalk and walk through the middle of the crowd and thank them. This was not a group for which the SEIU, ACORN, or the Federal Government paid their way. These were people who had come on their own money—nobody else's. They'd had to come up with their own money. Some of them had taken time off from work and from family. They'd made sacrifices to get here in order to let their voices be heard. So I wanted to personally make sure I went through the crowd. I shook as many hands as I could, and I thanked as many people as I could.

As I was going down the sidewalk, people were patting me on the back and were speaking encouragement to me. I was just saying, Thank you for coming. Thank you for letting your voice be heard.

About 10 people into the sidewalk, I started to reach for this lady's hand.

She probably was 40 to 50 years old. She was pleasant-looking enough.

She said, I'm for health care.

I thought I misunderstood, so I said, Well, I am, too—just not for this disaster.

But she said, No. I support this bill. She wouldn't shake my hand, and I thought, well, that's kind of strange. That's kind of a party killer person right here in the middle of the crowd; but, oh, well. That's fine. That's America. So I moved on.

I was shaking hands and was thanking people. They were so wonderful and encouraging. They were saying "thank you" for my thanking them. It was really very moving at times. Those were some of the expressions we got.

About 15 feet down the sidewalk, I met a guy who said, I'm not shaking your hand.

I realized this was another one like the lady. Every 10 to 15 people, as I shook hands with people on both sides, I ran into people who wouldn't shake my hand because they were for the health care bill.

When I got to Independence, I had a guy yell, Are you LOUIE GOHMERT?

I said, Yes.

He wanted to know why I hated homosexuals, and I explained I don't. You know, as a Christian, I am supposed to love everyone, and I try very much to do that, but it doesn't mean I have to embrace lifestyles that the Bible says are inappropriate.

Anyway, he used the "S" word and some things that I won't use. I mean I know it's appropriate for Senators like Senator LEVIN, but I'm not going to use those words down here. I don't think they're appropriate here, but I had them used on me out there on the sidewalk. He was, obviously, also not a supporter of the Tea Party, of me, or of those who were walking through.

After I got back to my office, I realized, you know, those people were placed about every 10 or 15 feet in the middle of the crowd. I don't know what they did after they refused to shake my hand, but there were certainly people placed regularly throughout the crowd who were just that—they were placements. They were people who were put in there. They were observers. Hopefully, they weren't the people who yelled epithets or things to try to make their conservative folks around them look bad; but I can verify and I can testify that those people were out there and that they were amidst the Tea Party folks. Most assuredly, they were not Tea Party people.

Mr. KING of Iowa. If I could temporarily reclaim my time, I would just appreciate an opportunity to comment on what you said, Mr. GOHMERT. This phrase comes to mind: Birds of a feather flock together.

That's why it's unusual to see some of those birds that are not of a feather there in the flock of the Tea Party faithful. Why would that be?

I think we've seen it here, occasionally, on the floor of the House of Rep-

resentatives when we generally sit in a segregated fashion—Democrats on one side and Republicans on the other side. Yes, we walk through and we talk to each other and we do business; but generally speaking, it's Democrats there and Republicans here. Yet on occasion—and especially on the occasions of the State of the Union addresses and of addresses of the joint sessions of Congress by President Obama—we have Democrats who will come over to this side of the aisle and who will sit in a scattered fashion throughout over here so that, when the standing ovations begin or when they don't happen, they're blended and integrated in a different way.

That's by order of the Speaker of the House. It isn't infiltration—it's public—but it is clearly by order of the Speaker of the House. They didn't just spontaneously decide to come over and sit here and try to start standing ovations and, more or less, change the image of the State of the Union address.

Also, we know that the left has infiltrated or has at least announced that they were seeking to infiltrate the Tea Party groups. Some of those subversive tactics come to mind especially in the times that we've had these rallies—they're really press conferences—over on the West Lawn of the Capitol. We went out and took pictures of the lawn. I know on one occasion I asked people to be careful and to pick up their litter, but I don't know of anybody else who has ever made that request. I'm thinking of three occasions when the lawn was spotless. We took pictures. We were trying to find some litter. We were trying to find a cigarette butt—anything out there on the grass. It was all picked up and carried away.

The cleanest group of people is the Tea Party group that comes here. They have the Constitution in their shirt pockets or on their hearts. They love this country, and they wouldn't desecrate any of the symbols of our liberty or any of the symbols of our freedom.

Though, if you looked at the other folks, at the people on the other side of the aisle, at the people who make common cause with the folks who generally sit over here, on the same day of that major gathering of opponents to ObamaCare, there was a pro-amnesty rally. The differences were they were wearing the same T-shirts; they were carrying signs that came off the printing press one after another, and they left litter all over this city.

While the Tea Party groups and the anti-ObamaCare groups were here, they had homegrown signs. They didn't have any commonality of dress. They wore what they had of their own. There was some red, white, and blue out there and plenty of yellow hats and flags, but they were not at all an army that was uniformed, coached, or bussed in. They came in by their own transportation. They made their own signs. They wore a whole variety of different clothes. They made up chants on the way, and

they were making signs on the fly. When it was all over, it was as clean as a whistle. It was as if it were a park that they owned because they believed—and they do—that they owned that park.

I am proud of the peaceful people who came here. I don't have respect for the folks who tried to infiltrate that and who caused trouble. When I saw the rallies against the Arizona immigration law, when I saw the bottle bouncing off the head of a police officer, when I heard the stories about refried beans being smeared on the State buildings in Arizona, and when I heard about a swastika that was, perhaps, painted there, those are the kinds of activities you would never see happen on the other side with the Tea Party groups. There is no violence there. The violence is perpetrated by people on the other side.

The allegation that the "N" word, that the "F" word, or that spitting took place could not be substantiated, and I am coming close to the conclusion that it was fabricated, not substantiated.

As I feel a little better having vented myself on that subject, I would yield back now to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GOHMERT. Well, thank you.

One of the other things that comes to mind is we talk about our freedoms—about the ability to assemble and about the freedom of speech, which is the ability to say what is in your heart.

□ 2220

We come to what happened last week in England, where a man who was not intentionally out being a nuisance, but he was asked by an officer, according to the article I read, who looks for violations of this type of law, ethics type of law—and this person apparently was homosexual in practice, and he asked the individual about the Bible, about sin. He mentioned drunkenness and a number of things that would be sins as addressed in the Bible and was asked about homosexuality, and he said, yes, under the Bible it's a sin. It's hard to look at Romans 1 and think otherwise. But anyway, this man was arrested. He was put in jail and now is out awaiting trial on his charges. And it was one of the things that concerned us greatly about the Hate Crimes Act because we knew that bill was based on two lies. And there were publications like Texas Monthly that didn't bother to look into the facts, many publications around the country that just ran off and jumped on the train of those who refused to read it, laws to read the facts, to look at facts that were being cited as basis and find that they were lies. But the two things on which that bill were based were both lies. Number one, that there was an epidemic of hate crimes in America. Number two, that it would somehow have changed for the better the outcome in the James Byrd case in Texas, the Matthew Shepard case. And the fact is that those are lies.

The James Byrd case had two of the three—the two most culpable defendants got the death penalty. The only effect the hate crimes bill would have had if it had been in place back then would be that those guys that got the death penalty would have gotten life in prison instead of death. I felt like from the evidence that I read and heard about that they deserved the death penalty. And in the Matthew Shepard case, they got multiple life sentences; so it wouldn't have affected those cases.

The FBI statistics show there has been no surge, uptick in hate crimes, alleged hate crimes, and those include willing of things inappropriate.

I don't think my friend from Iowa or any of our friends, and those that I met at TEA parties would condone nasty name calling. None of the people I met. But we get into a very dangerous area. There were Founders that fought and died for this country and for that thing that would later become the First Amendment. It didn't exist during the Revolution, but they believed the concept of freedom of speech. And they often cited Voltaire as the source. Some disagree, but Voltaire is usually given as the source for the saying "I disagree with what you say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it." That helped form a basis for this country. Yet now we have evolved in this country to where the thought police have a slogan that is more apt to be, I disagree with what you say, and I'm going to destroy your life because of it. I'm going to see you're fired. I'm going to see that you lose as much of your assets, hopefully all of them, as I can. I am going to destroy your life.

So we have come a long way from those days when the Founders were willing to fight and die so people could say things they thought reprehensible but at least they had the liberty to say them.

One of the things that gets very dangerous is when you start putting a lid on people's freedom of speech, as the PC police around here, as the thought police have begun to do. When you prevent people from being able to say what's in their heart and vent a bit, then you build up steam. If you don't allow people to vent, they build up steam, and then you have an explosion. So I know there are those that say, well, talk radio is hateful and whatnot. And actually talk radio, most of it, is not hateful at all.

But you go back to the President's own statement that we're not a Christian Nation. Well, I am not going to debate that. I know that we were founded by people who professed to be, although history is often rewritten nowadays, including in the early 1800s an early biography of Washington that was a complete fraud.

But if my gentleman friend from Iowa would allow me, this has just been on my heart because I go up from time to time to the Lincoln Memorial, and I stand there and read those pro-

found words from that selfless man. And on the north inside wall is his second inaugural speech. And it brings me to tears every time I read it because this is a man who is wrestling with how a just God could allow the pain and suffering to go on that he did. And it is a beautiful theological discussion. If it would be all right with the gentleman from Iowa, these are Abraham Lincoln's words in his second inaugural. It's there carved into the marble, and he was talking about the North and the South, trying to make sense of how you could have friends and family fighting on two sides of an issue. He said:

"Both read the same Bible and pray to the same God, and each invokes His aid against the other. It may seem strange that any men should dare to ask a just God's assistance in wringing their bread from the sweat of other men's faces, but let us judge not, that we be not judged. The prayers of both could not be answered. That of neither has been answered fully. The Almighty has his own purposes."

Then he quotes Scripture, and he says: "Woe unto the world because of offenses; for it must needs be that offenses come, but woe to that man by whom the offense cometh."

"If we shall suppose that American slavery is one of those offenses which, in the providence of God, must needs come, but which, having continued through His appointed time, He now wills to remove, and that He gives to both North and South this terrible war as the woe due to those by whom the offense came, shall we discern therein any departure from those divine attributes which the believers in a living God always ascribe to Him?"

"Fondly do we hope, fervently do we pray, that this mighty scourge of war may speedily pass away. Yet if God wills that it continue until all the wealth piled by the bondsman's 250 years of unrequited toil shall be sunk, and until every drop of blood drawn with the lash shall be paid by another drawn with the sword, as was said 3,000 years ago, so still it must be said 'the judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether.'"

"With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in, to bind up the Nation's wounds, to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and his orphan, to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations."

Powerful, powerful words. And having lost my brother a couple of weeks ago, sometimes it is a struggle when you believe in God to know the kind of hurt and suffering that goes on.

□ 2230

But as Lincoln said, and so it must still be said, "The judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether." And I do believe, and I don't

try to push my religious beliefs on anyone else, that God normally allows us to suffer the consequences of terrible decisions. If you follow the rules, you do what we are told allows your nation to be blessed, and your nation gets blessed. If you follow the things that cause your nation to be cursed, it just seems throughout history, that is usually what happens.

This is such an important time in our history. We have got people who would gladly destroy everything we believe in, all the liberties we have, and yet we have people who are at the same time striking at our freedoms of speech, striking at our liberties to assemble as we wish. Those things need to stop. We need to stop those who by terror and by warfare would try to take away those things that the Founders and all those who have fought and died since have put at our feet and given to us as a gift, and we need to fight those from within who attempt to take them away through misrepresentations of what are truly the facts in order to pass bills that actually are based on lies and hurt the country.

I appreciate my friend so much yielding to me.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Texas. I was deeply engaged in that presentation, and much of it I reflect upon, having stood there many times at the Lincoln Memorial and read the second inaugural address. It has been too long since I have been back down there. I need to go back.

As the gentleman from Texas talked about Voltaire, another statement of his, even though he was a bit of a Utopianist and not necessarily one whose teachings would fit the beliefs that I follow, there is one of his quotes that stands in mind for me, and I think it is appropriate here in the United States.

I've watched us turn from a nation of rugged, can-do, highly spirited people to a nation that is slowly, and I shouldn't say slowly, dramatically turning into a nanny state.

I grew up in a society where we understood we had freedom, and we exercised that freedom, and the prohibitions were there a law that prohibited us. The gentleman from Texas and I have exercised that American freedom, that American freedom, pretty interestingly, in the country of Tibet, when it was the idea of Judge GOHMERT that we should climb a mountain in the Himalayas.

So we set about from Lhasa, Tibet, to go do that. But we had Chinese minders. The Chinese minders' job was to mind us, to make sure we minded them; that we didn't get out of line; we didn't go do things they didn't want us to do; that we didn't see things that they didn't want us to see; and we didn't hear Tibetans or Chinese tell us things that they didn't want us to hear. So they presented themselves often as the interpreters, the protectors.

So when we said, we are going to go climb a mountain in the Himalayas

here, they said, well, no, you can't. You are not authorized to go up there, and so you can't.

Well, China and Tibet is a society where it has to be permissive for you to act. America has been a society where you have got permission to do everything that is not prohibited. We don't ask the question, do we have permission? We ask the question, is there a law against it?

So we told the Chinese minders, well, you may say we are not going, but we are Americans. We are going to go climb this mountain in the Himalayas. And that is what we did, because we didn't realize, I don't think, we were in a country where you had to have permission, because we have got the American spirit.

We went to the top of that mountain. And it is something that I will never forget, that experience going up, being there, looking at that vista of snow-capped peaks all the way around the horizon, the huge glacial lake down below, that spot on the globe. I am so glad we stepped forward and did that.

I don't know if there are any other people on the planet that would have just gone up to the top of the mountain, because that is what we do. We don't wait for permission. If there is not a law against it and we think it fits within our moral standards, we go.

Well, this can-do America that we are has been an America that came in, and by the sweat of our brows we built a nation for hundreds of years, that can-do entrepreneurial spirit with free enterprise and freedom and the liberties that are laid out that come from God, that are in the Declaration, most of them, not all of them.

Voltaire said back during that period of time, History is the sound of hobnailed boots storming up the stairs, and silver slippers coming down.

That describes a lot of what goes on. The ascendancy of history are the people that work hard, that are industrious, that produce, that are competitive, and sometimes, Madam Speaker, combative. And when people get a little too soft and they are sitting on the silken pillows and they have the waiters bringing the grapes to them and popping the grape in their mouth while they fan them a little bit, like Ahab the Arab, the sheik of the burning sand, that is kind of the image of what happens when a person lays back on the silk.

What has happened with the Voltaire statement was hobnailed boots storming up the stairs, silver slippers coming down. And a lot of the French elite, the aristocracy, were the silver slippers, and they came down the stairs, because they got too lazy and they got too laid back without being competitive. They lost their sense of where they were going or why.

I don't want to do that as a nation. I don't want to watch the hobnailed boots come up the stairs. I don't want us to be the silver slippers coming down. I want us to step forward and

compete. I want free enterprise. I want freedom, I want liberty, I want a strong national defense. I want to have a tax policy that stops punishing productivity, and it can tax consumption, because that is an incentive for more consumption. I want that strong national defense, as I said. I want school choice, so kids can be raised at the will and the wishes of their parents with real American history and real American values.

If we can do all of those things, we can take this Nation to the next level of our destiny. And should we fail, we will trail in the dust the golden hopes of men.

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. LUCAS (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of travel delays.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of the Indiana primary.

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. PRICE of North Carolina) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. BURTON of Indian, for 5 minutes, May 5 and 6.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, for 5 minutes, May 5.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, for 5 minutes, today and May 5.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, for 5 minutes, today, May 5 and 6.

Mr. KING of New York, for 5 minutes, May 5.

Mr. DREIER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, May 11.

Mr. PAUL, for 5 minutes, today and May 5.

Mr. POSEY, for 5 minutes, May 5.

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, May 11.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, May 11.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, May 5.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the fol-

lowing titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 3714. An act to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to include in the Annual Country Reports on Human Rights Practices information about freedom of the press in foreign countries, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5146. An act to provide that Members of Congress shall not receive a cost of living adjustment in pay during fiscal year 2011.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House, reports that on April 29, 2010 she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 5147. To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the funding and expenditure authority of the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, to amend title 49, United States Code, to extend authorizations for the airport improvement program, and for other purposes.

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House, reports that on May 3, 2010 she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 5146. An act to provide that Members of Congress shall not receive a cost of living adjustment in pay during fiscal year 2011.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 5, 2010, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

7306. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's annual report for 2009 on the STARBASE Program, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2193b(g); to the Committee on Armed Services.

7307. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Army, transmitting report on future research and development of man-portable and vehicle mounted guided missile systems; to the Committee on Armed Services.

7308. A letter from the Director, Office of Standards, Regulations, and Variances, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Coal Mine Dust Sampling Devices (RIN: 1219-AB61) received April 13, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

7309. A letter from the Director, Office of Standards, Regulations, and Variances, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — High-Voltage Continuous Mining Machine Standard for Underground Coal Mines (RIN: 1219-AB34) received April 13, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

7310. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 10-04, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of