

people here have the right to, in some cases, lie, in some cases commit adultery, in some cases some of these things are illegal, but that has been changing. And we've changed this society from one in which the Founders said, I disagree with what you say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it, and we've turned it into one where what you say offends me, and not only am I not going to defend to the death your right to say it, I'm going to force you out of your job, I'm going to do everything I can to cause you to lose all of your assets, I am going to do all I can to make your life nothing but misery from now on. How did we get so far from the founding that we would want to destroy people's lives because what they have said offends?

When the Pilgrims came over, when so many of the groups that came over to what they called the New World, they were fleeing from the kind of persecution that has now started. This was a National Day of Prayer, and yet we had Franklin Graham—what a great, great man—he was uninvited from speaking to our military. We had Tony Perkins not long ago uninvited from speaking to the military at Andrews Air Force base even though he served this country's uniformed military services for 6 years because there were some who said in the administration we disagree with what you say and we're going to ruin you and try to do all we can to keep you from speaking.

The military is fighting for people's right to say what they want, and yet we're denying people the right to come speak to the military while they're fighting and dying for the right to speak freely under the First Amendment? How did that ever happen?

From 1800 to 1860, and again intermittently until 1880, there were church services held right down the hall, non-denominational Christian church services. I was asked earlier by a CNN reporter, how do you reconcile the separation of church and state with a group reading through the entire Bible in 5 days over here at the west side of the Capitol? Well, I reconcile it because I know where the phrase "separation of church and state" came from. It came from Thomas Jefferson in his letter to the Danbury Baptists.

There was nothing about preventing people from having church or having religion or praying in Jesus' name, or doing any of those things, or speaking to the military. To the exact contrary. Thomas Jefferson used to ride down Pennsylvania, according to CRS, most of the time—the Congressional Research Service, they've authenticated this—most of the time when he came to the church service every Sunday here in the Capitol he liked to ride his horse down here, down Pennsylvania. He's the one that codified the phrase "separation of church and state" because it's not in the Constitution. It's so unfortunate that so many of our judges over the years have been so poorly educated about our history.

And then you've got James Madison as President who came to church most every Sunday he was in Washington here in the Capitol, in the House of Representatives, but according to CRS, he was different from Jefferson. Jefferson liked to ride a horse and usually Madison liked to ride in a coach drawn by four horses to come to church in the Capitol. Jefferson—who coined the phrase "separation of church and state"—sometimes brought the Marine band to play hymns for the non-denominational Christian worship service here in the Capitol.

The Constitution's First Amendment was never about discriminating against Christianity as this administration has done by uninviting people to speak to the military who are fighting and dying for the very beliefs that the people were denied the right to come talk to them about. And yet we have people who are so politically correct they're afraid to say that a guy who makes very clear about what he screams before he shoots these other servicemembers, that this is an act of a crazed jihadist, Islamic jihadist.

Thank God that the vast majority of Muslims are not jihadists of that type, but you need to recognize the ones that are and that they're out there and they want to destroy our way of life. And you can speak to moderate Muslims—many of them are afraid to speak out openly because they've become targets—but you speak to moderate Muslims, they know. They're some of the first to be killed when the crazed jihadists take over. They don't like moderate Muslims.

But the Nation was founded on principles such that the church, the Christian church, was at the heart the Declaration of Independence. Over one-third of those who signed the Declaration of Independence were not just Christians, they were ordained Christian ministers, had churches. And the church was behind the effort to abolish slavery because they, just like John Quincy Adams, knew it was so wrong. And as Adams, for about a year and a half, took a young, tall, slender, not very handsome man under his wing down the hall, as Christians, they became so close in that short time, John Quincy Adams affected him so he knew as a Christian that slavery had to end because we could not continue to be blessed by God if we were treating brothers and sisters by putting them in chains and bondage.

And he preached that sermon over and over and over just down the hall. And the churches were preaching—some weren't, but many were—that was the heart of that movement. And what was Martin Luther King, Jr.? Dr. King was an ordained Christian minister. The church has been behind the great movements here in America, and now we're discriminating against it? We're saying what you believe in a Christian church so offends us, not only are we not going to fight to the death for your right to believe what

you believe and say what you want to say, we're going to destroy you and keep you from doing anything publicly that you want to do in observing your religion. How did we go so wrong?

□ 1815

How did we go so wrong? Abraham Lincoln struggled with this terrible war that was going on because he believed in a just God, and yet this thing was going on and so many brothers and sisters were dying and it was a terrible thing. And that is why he said in his second inaugural, How do you reconcile this? He said, Both read the same Bible and pray to the same God, and each invokes his aid against the other. But he goes on and he says, If we shall suppose that American slavery, and you might substitute in there abortion, American abortion, abortion is one of those offenses of 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 the 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, said the President, that this mighty scourge of war may speedily pass away. Yet if God wills that it continue until all of the wealth piled up by the bondsman's 250 years of unrequited toil shall be sunk and every drop of blood drawn by the lash, or by the abortion doctor's hand, as was said 3,000 years ago, so must still be said today, Lincoln said, the judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether, as he quoted scripture.

We are told it may not be appropriate for the military to hear from somebody who believes the things that Jesus taught. So you have Tony Perkins cancelled. You have Franklin Graham cancelled because they believe the things Jesus taught. You have others who we have been hearing about the last couple of days who have been uninvited to speak to military. And yet I was given by my aunt a Bible that was given to an uncle in World War II. It has this metal front, May the Lord be with you. And inside on the first page, it says at the top: The White House, Washington. As Commander in Chief, I take pleasure in commending the reading of the Bible. That is signed by Franklin D. Roosevelt.

We all need to pray that God will continue to bless America.

TAX CUTS

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the privilege to be recognized here on the floor of the House, and I appreciate my colleague from Texas

holding the ground until I come here to hold a little ground with him. I always stand on the same ground as my friend, Judge GOHMERT. In fact, all of the way from wading to shore on a free Cuba to climbing a mountain in the Himalayas, and all that free country in between and a bunch of it that is not.

I came tonight to talk about a couple of subject matters. One of them that is on the front of my mind is the tax situation here in the United States. We are watching and we watched as the two Bush tax cuts were passed over the last 8 or so years, the 2001 and then the 2003 tax cuts. May 28, 2003, is when the effective ones were passed, the reduction in capital gains, dividend taxes and a series of things. And of course the language that is there on the estate taxes which are suspended for this year, and they go on in full force at the end of this year, and nothing has yet been done. Something does need to be done.

I am for a complete abolishment of the estate tax, Mr. Speaker, and I am for the reinstatement or the extension of the Bush tax cuts, if we can get them. But we have watched as the former chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, as he was coming in to be the chair, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), traveled around through all of the talk radio circuits and the talk television circuits, and they asked him over and over again, Which of the Bush tax cuts would you like to preserve and which ones would you like to see go away or end?

There never was a definitive answer, Mr. Speaker, but the process of elimination brought people to a conclusion over the period of November 2006 until about February of 2007 that there really wasn't a Bush tax cut that soon-to-be Chairman RANGEL would support. So we are watching now the eventual sunset of those very effective economic stimulating tax cuts that went in on May 28, 2003.

Capital understands when it gets more expensive and less of it gets invested. When less capital is invested, then there are fewer technological advances and the productivity of the American worker goes down and it makes us less competitive as a Nation. It is awfully hard to measure that, but what we can see from that period of time of November 2006 until mid- to late February of 2007, we saw industrial investment go down and the decline in industrial investment was precipitated, the economic decline that came about, about the time that Speaker PELOSI first took the gavel. We can see the data that indicated that there was less capital investment because in part—not entirely but in part—Chairman RANGEL signaled to the investment world that taxes were eventually going to go up, and the cost of capital would go up. There would be less capital invested, and that means with less capital invested, it reduces the productivity of the American worker. Reduction in American worker productivity

means we are less competitive as a Nation. That means other cultures, other economies, other civilizations would be ascending and the United States would either slow or diminish its ascent economically or decline. And then we saw the economic crisis.

The calamity that goes back into the seventies with the passage of the Community Reinvestment Act and then on the heels of that came, with the Community Reinvestment Act, the effort to encourage bankers to make bad loans in bad neighborhoods and deal them off on the secondary mortgage market to Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac who had underwriting requirements that were a little too stringent for some groups in the country, particularly a group known as ACORN. And so ACORN came to this Congress and lobbied for a couple of things in the early and mid-nineties under the presidency of Bill Clinton. They weren't having a lot of success under Ronald Reagan, but under Bill Clinton they were successful enough that they were able to get the Community Reinvestment Act rewritten that put even more requirements for the lenders to make more bad loans in more bad neighborhoods and prop up real estate whose asset value couldn't support the mortgage on it.

While that was going on, ACORN was also lobbying here in this Congress, by their view successfully, to lower the underwriting standards for Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. And they succeeded in doing that. Some in this Congress wanted to tighten the standards and wanted to move them toward complete privatization, which they used to be. And some in this Congress wanted to move Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac to complete nationalization. There was a debate here on this floor. There were several debates on this floor. The one that comes to mind for me was October 26, 2005, when at the time Congressman Jim Leach from Iowa had an amendment on the floor to raise the underwriting requirements for Fannie and Freddie, raise the capitalization requirements for Fannie and Freddie so that they would become a more viable economic institution and to move them away from what appeared to be coming, which would be the Federal Government, the taxpayers, eventually having to bail out Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac.

Well, that amendment that was offered by Mr. Leach and supported by myself and also Mr. LATHAM of Iowa and others, did fail here on the floor in the face of a very aggressive rebuttal that came to the floor in the form of the current Financial Services Committee chairman Mr. FRANK, who said during that debate, if you are going to invest in Fannie and Freddie, don't count on me bailing them out, I will never vote to do a government bailout of Fannie and Freddie.

Well, "never" is a word that shouldn't be used by people in this business, Mr. Speaker. And I don't bring it up to be particularly critical of

the chairman of the Financial Services Committee, Mr. FRANK. I point it out because "never" didn't last very long. It lasted maybe 4 years, moving on 5.

But when President Obama signed the executive order that finally swallowed up all of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, and we had to go in and bail them out at the end of the Bush administration, that is true. The Executive order before Christmas swallowed up the rest of this, and the Federal Government, the taxpayers of America, took on \$5.5 trillion in contingent liabilities with Fannie and Freddie. Now they are completely, no longer a quasi GSE, but they are completely owned entities within the Federal Government and the taxpayers are on the hook for all of it.

Now, let's presume that Fannie and Freddie could be operated at a profit. Gee, that would be nice. But we know how government works when it comes to profit. They don't have the right incentives, and eventually it can't work.

So the Community Reinvestment Act was passed in the seventies, refreshed in the nineties under Clinton which put more pressure on lenders to make bad loans in bad neighborhoods. ACORN lobbied for that. ACORN also lobbied to lower the underwriting standards so that Fannie and Freddie could swallow up the secondary market. Fannie and Freddie did that, and today the Federal Government owns more than 50 percent of all of the home mortgages in the United States and the taxpayers are on the hook for the default of those mortgages in the United States.

We also had mark-to-market accounting which was put in place during that same period of time. Mark-to-market accounting is a system whereby on your balance sheet you have to write down the marks and what the actual bids are for those commodities.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would put it this way. I happen to know a bank in the area, in the Midwest, that had \$60 million worth of commercial paper. That commercial paper had always performed, it had always paid and drew a reasonable interest rate. It would be the equivalent of a very effective, well-established company that had an operating loan that they funded through this commercial paper. It had a market and a value to it, and the value was \$60 million. And that was on the balance sheet of the lending institution.

But when we saw the downward spiral and the threat that could have been a crisis in credit in America, there was not—temporarily there was not a market for that commercial paper. So that lending institution, even though commercial paper had always performed, even though the company was viable and made their loans, the value of that had to be marked from \$60 million down to zero, let me just say, figuratively speaking, overnight; \$60 million down to zero. Now there is no asset value. We had lenders that were being pressured by FDIC regulators coming in to turn up the capitalization requirements to the banks and require

them to, let's say, solidify their balance sheets and to make up for the missing \$60 million. It was a temporary situation.

And to make sure, Mr. Speaker, that people can understand what mark-to-market accounting is, I would use this example. I think whether you are a city person or whether you are a country person, whether you are a farm or some other type of economics, you can understand this. I come from corn country, and so let's just say that under mark-to-market accounting rules it would work like this: If a farmer had 100,000 bushels of corn in his bin, stored on his farm, dried, 15 percent moisture in good condition, he would look at that, and let's just say the market price for that corn was \$4 a bushel. So in those bins on storage in the possession of this farming operation, there would be then \$400,000 worth of corn. That is 100,000 bushels at \$4 a bushel. That could go on the farmer's balance sheet at that amount, and you may want to mark it down less shrink and less the basis to the marketplace. But for simplicity sake, \$400,000 worth of corn on the balance sheet, stored in the bin in good condition.

□ 1830

Now, that's all real fine, but along comes a flood, maybe a flood like we've seen in the tragedy in Tennessee, who the folks down there our hearts go out for, Mr. Speaker. But along comes a flood, and it washes out all the bridges all the way around the farm, and it washes out the bridges in the area. So the grain elevator where the bids were coming from at \$4 a bushel is shut down. They're operating. They're in good shape. They've got their generators running, and their grain storage is okay. But no trucks can go to haul any grain. Nothing can move. And so magically, there would be no bids for the corn a day after the flood washed out the bridges, and there would be no bids for corn until the bridges were put back in place. That could take months, or it could take days, depending. Well, let's just say a couple of months before the bridges can be put back together. In that period of time, that corn would sit there. It would be in good condition. It would be worth \$400,000 someplace else, but not \$400,000 sitting there, because he didn't have a bid where he delivered the corn. He can't get it out. So this farmer that had \$400,000 worth of asset value would have to write that down to zero on his balance sheet.

Meanwhile, the bridge is still open to go to the bank. You need to borrow money to operate from so you can pay your bills. But he couldn't borrow the money because his asset value had gone from \$400,000 down to zero, even though that corn would have some value when the bridges were put back together. That's what mark-to-market accounting does. It accelerates the downward spiral with market trends going down and distorts them and

takes us down into the economic decline, or it accelerates the upward spiral and distorts the markets that way, because when you get temporary upticks in the market, then the assets go up almost immediately in direct proportion, which increases the borrowing capacity of that balance sheet.

We need a better system. The mark-to-market accounting system was abolished in 1938. It came back on us again in the Clinton era, and when it did so, it helped set the foundation for the economic crisis that we have been in. And now here we are with the President having spent a couple of trillion dollars or more, taking over the economy of the private sector in the United States—not all of it, but certainly a majority of the private sector activities have been taken over. It started the end of the Bush administration, accelerated in the Obama administration, and we have three large investment banks—AIG, Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac. You've got all of the student loans swallowed up in America, and General Motors and Chrysler were taken over by the Federal Government, with 61 percent of the shares of General Motors owned by the Federal Government. That's the taxpayers' investment.

And when General Motors is running an ad that says they've paid off their loans, yeah, they did that, all right. They paid off a loan. I don't remember the exact amount of that, but it was in the low few billions of dollars. Meanwhile, the taxpayers are still holding 61 percent of the shares. The Canadian Government's holding 12.5 percent of the shares. The unions were gifted 17.5 percent of the shares of General Motors. And we're watching ads that say that General Motors paid us back?

Well, then, why didn't Tim Geithner sell those shares of General Motors into the open market? Why doesn't he divest the Federal Government from their ownership in General Motors? If this administration doesn't believe that they should be in the private sector, why are they running banks, insurance companies? Why have they taken completely over Fannie and Freddie? Why are they running two car companies? Why did they take over the student loans? Why did they nationalize our bodies?

Mr. Speaker, that's not a misstatement, and it's one perhaps for those who have not heard of this before, they should pay attention a little to the description. But the most sovereign thing we have, the most valuable thing we have is our health, our physical body. And part of our freedom is to be able to buy a health insurance policy that suits our needs and make the demands of the insurance companies that there's a market for what we want to buy so they produce a policy that meets our demands.

Up until a month ago, there were 1,300 health insurance companies in the United States and approximately 100,000 policy varieties that could be chosen from. So if you're a consumer

out there on the market, you could look around at those 1,300 companies and decide which one you'd like to do business with, weigh the merits of their policy, settle on the company, look through the variety of policies, and between all those policies, 100,000 policy varieties, choose your policy. That's a lot of choices. You don't have that many choices in the grocery store on how many different kinds of food you want to buy, but it sure looks like choices when you walk into the grocery store. Health insurance in America has a much, much larger selection—or it was—than you find seeing single individual items in the grocery store, because the markets had demanded those kinds of varieties and the companies were seeking to meet the demand.

But now under ObamaCare—in effect, by the year 2014, every health insurance policy in America will be effectively canceled by this government. They will all have to be refreshed and requalified, and there isn't a single policy that exists today that the President of the United States can point to and say, Joe, Sally, your policy, the one I told you, Don't worry, you get to keep it, you can't say that you get to keep it.

Have you noticed that? Have you noticed, Mr. Speaker, there hasn't been a single policy that's been pointed to by this administration, let alone the President of the United States, that they can say to any consumer out there, This is your policy, and you can keep it. And even if they could find a policy that they could tell you you could keep, they can't tell you that it's going to not cost you any more money. They can't tell you that the premium's not going to go up. And when I make that statement, they will throw up their hands and say, Well, obviously we can't because health care costs are going up. It's a natural thing for them to go up double digits while inflation is going up single digits. But the followup to that is, Yes, you can throw up your hands and say that.

But the other thing that cannot be stated by the President's spokesman or by the President or by this administration or by Speaker PELOSI or HARRY REID or anyone else, no one can make the statement that health insurance policies are not going to be increased because of ObamaCare's passage. Yes, they will be. They certainly will be.

We see a community rating of seven to one today. That means that the cheapest policy is going to be one-seventh the price of the most expensive policy. This pushes it into three to one. That means that that young person that's paying for a health insurance policy that is—let's say, if it's \$100 a month, the most expensive policy out there would be \$700 a month by that comparison. But with this new legislation that's there, for the \$100 a month, the highest then can only be \$300 a month. So we know what happens. The person down on the lower side with the

cheaper premiums that is a lower risk will pay a lot more for their premium because the upside of this thing has got to be ratcheted down some.

We saw some numbers, and I can only go to a generalization now because it's far enough back in my memory. These are numbers that had to do with Indiana. We saw a 23-year-old healthy young man's insurance go up almost triple, and we saw the family of four at age 40, two kids and a mom and a dad, we saw their insurance go up a significant amount, and the only people that had a lower premium would be the couple in their early sixties with marginal health that would see their premiums drop off perhaps 11 percent, which is a number I do have confidence is a correct one. So the people with the highest premiums might see an 11 percent reduction. The people with the lowest premiums might see as much as a 300 percent increase in their premiums, and that's why the President can't point to anybody's policy and say, "We're not going to increase your costs."

And he can't, either, guarantee that you're not going to lose your policy, because a lot of companies are going under in this. There will not be 1,300 health insurance companies doing business in the United States 5 years from now or 10 years from now. And if the President had his way, there wouldn't be anybody doing business in health insurance in America except the United States Federal Government. And if you wonder if that's a stretch of the imagination, Mr. Speaker, I can give you two examples. One of them is the Federal flood insurance program.

In the early sixties, all the flood insurance in America was private sector. Property and casualty, if you wanted to insure yourself against a flood, against the river waters coming in and filling up your basement, you went to a private property and casualty insurance company that would write you up a policy and set a premium. But this Congress, "in its wisdom"—and I say that in quotes that this Congress, "in its wisdom," decided that the premiums were too high and the varieties of policies for flood insurance in the early sixties were not great enough, and so they decided to set up a Federal flood insurance program that would provide one more alternative for the consumers to put some competition into the property and casualty business with regard to flood insurance.

Does that sound familiar, Mr. Speaker? I'll submit that it clearly does, because the President said he wanted one more health insurance company to provide competition for the other health insurance companies. He said we didn't have enough competition in health insurance. I don't know why he's forgotten about that. I have not, and I will not. So when the President of the United States says, "We just want to add one more competitor, we don't have enough competition, and that competitor will be the Federal Government, as soon as you inject the Federal

Government into the private sector—or what was the private sector in this case—then you have an unfair competitor with a comparative advantage. They don't have to be profitable. The Federal Government doesn't have to be. If they run up short, they just tap into the pockets of the taxpayer, and we run up an IOU that might be raiding the Social Security Trust Fund in Parkersburg, West Virginia, where every single dollar has been raided by this Congress. It might be borrowed money from the Saudis or the Chinese, provided they are willing to loan it to us and jack up the interest rates. They will. But the Federal Government does not have to be profitable. And they wouldn't have to be profitable with health insurance, which is an unfair comparative advantage that would drive some of the health insurance companies out, probably lots of them, and take this where the President wants it to go, single payer.

The President, as a candidate, consistently argued that there should be one entity that paid for all health care in America. That would be the Federal Government taking over all of those 1,300 health insurance companies and those 100,000 policy varieties and those hundreds of millions of Americans that have legitimate health insurance programs. Eventually, the President wanted to take it all over, but he had to fall back on an argument of just providing some competition because the American people rejected that.

So we're supposed to believe that the idea of wanting the Federal Government to sell insurance was just an innocent thing that was designed to provide more competition. Well, we rejected that. And by the way, the United States Senate rejected that. So we didn't end up with an ObamaCare package that has a Federal health insurance component to it other than they're regulating every single policy in America, canceling every policy in America, deciding which ones they want to renew, setting up community ratings that go from seven to one down to three to one and driving up the premiums.

But what comes from all of this, Mr. Speaker? I'm taking you then back to property and casualty insurance. The private sector that used to insure all flood insurance in America saw their competitor come in. I think the year was 1963, plus or minus a year. I'm real close. And 1963 is going to hit it, actually.

In 1963, the Federal Government came in and provided us one more flood insurance company to provide a little more competition to level the playing field for the people who lived in the floodplain that didn't have enough alternatives. That sounds exactly like the argument that we have today. So the Federal Government got into that business. And over a few years, the property and casualty companies, those private sector insurance companies that reflected the risks and the

market in the premiums that they charged—and yes, they're in it for a profit. Thank God for profit. It's done more for the world than all the missionaries that went anywhere. As much as I believe in faith and the Lord's hand in everything that goes on on this planet, free enterprise capitalism has been a wonderful contribution to the well-being of all humanity, and it was a contributor in the flood insurance and property casualty insurance.

But the Federal Government got in the business in 1963, and over a period of time—and not a very long period of time—slowly those private sector companies realized they couldn't compete with Uncle Sam because they had to make a profit and they had to charge premiums that reflected the risk. So they dropped out, and for a long time, and certainly today, we cannot—no one in America can go out and buy flood insurance from the private sector. It all is sold by the Federal Government.

The Federal Government has taken over the flood insurance program in America lock, stock and barrel, root and branch, all of it. Every single vestige of flood insurance is all controlled by the Federal Government today. They set the premiums not by risk. They set the premiums by whatever bureaucrats think they ought to be, and they don't have to be profitable.

So that would explain why they are \$19.2 billion in the red in the Federal flood insurance program, and it would explain why in my district, FEMA has come out and has a new ruling that broadens the floodplain dramatically. It's just breathtaking to look at the map of the floodplain that was in blue—and, by the way, national banks that are making loans on mortgages that go into these floodplains require flood insurance to be paid and premiums to be paid.

So when they're in the red \$19.2 billion and they can't figure out how to charge premiums that reflect the risk and be able to get by with it because people probably can't afford those premiums, but they've expanded and developed their real estate in the floodplain based upon those premiums, having trouble raising the premiums on the people that owe the national banks money that had to buy them, so FEMA puts out a new map, a new map that widens the floodplains dramatically. These tiny little narrow areas become wide areas in the whole river valleys. And in one area, just one area within one of my 32 counties, there are 2,200 individual real estate parcels, most of them rural, that are now in a new floodplain created by FEMA's map and ruling, 1,100 property owners, 2,200 new properties, all of them now in a situation where they're going to have trouble expanding and building.

□ 1845

A lot of them are going to have to pay increased premiums for flood insurance that they didn't even have to buy before because they were out of the

floodplain, and the Federal Government cashes in. If I take this plan that they're trying to implement in my district and if I multiply it across all the real estate in the United States where it is awfully hard to use, the model that they use goes clear back to the early 1970s. It's nearly 40 years old, this model. The technology that they use is nearly 40 years old, so I can only guess.

If I use what they have in one of my counties as a measure, it looks to me like FEMA will be able to collect enough premiums that they can, maybe, recover their \$19.2 billion and more. Maybe FEMA will make so much money off of this that they'll be able to help subsidize Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. Don't hold your breath, Mr. Speaker, but this is 40-year-old technology.

We know this: anybody who has ever filled any sandbags and who has fought a flood knows, first, that the adrenalin rushes up in your blood. As the water is coming up, your adrenalin boils up in you, too, and you work harder and more feverishly as the water comes up. Many times, those sandbags along there are just, maybe, high enough, an inch or two, because you're stacking them on there as the water comes up. They're maybe 5, maybe a half an inch or a half a foot, maybe 5 inches or a half a foot—or even a foot.

Do you know, Mr. Speaker, that the FEMA model is so imprecise and of such ancient technology that their accuracy is within plus or minus 10 meters? That's 10 meters. Now, I didn't do the precise multiplier on it, but let's just say it's 30 feet, plus or minus. Let's just say they're right on the average. Let's just say I stand on this floor, and they say, Well, the flood might be here or it could be 10 meters up. Well, in looking at the ceiling of this Chamber, they could be that far off. They could be off more than 30 feet on the elevation of the water that they're predicting.

Meanwhile, we have the Corps of Engineers, which has hydraulic models that can tell us whether we can build in a floodplain and what the flow is and how we might have to construct our structures so that we don't constrict the flow when we have a flood. They can tell us where the 100-year flood event is and where the 500-year flood event is.

Yet who should be surprised that FEMA and the Corps of Engineers can't get together on this and use modern technology? I'm wondering if they have the will or if it happens to be that someone decided that they could just use this 40-year-old model that is plus or minus within 10 meters and impose flood insurance premiums on a whole bunch of Americans, who are unsuspecting and who are probably unable to pay these premiums, to make up for the \$19.2 billion in loss that they've got in flood insurance.

Now, I tell this long story to describe what is in store for us if ObamaCare is not repealed 100 percent—every single

bit of it—and done in the shortest order possible at the will of the American people. Though, before I get to how ObamaCare will transform out, it is really worthwhile for us to look back and see how the Federal Government swallows up other formerly private entities.

Back during that period of time when the Federal flood insurance was passed, it was also true that education loans were private sector. If you wanted to go off to college, you went and borrowed the money from the private sector. Then they set up the student loan plan as a means to provide other alternatives so that private lenders weren't handling all of the student loans. The Federal Government came in and did that, by my recollection, at about that same period of time.

What is predictable about this? What is predictable is, if the Federal Government gets into a business to compete, they have an unfair advantage, an illegitimate comparative advantage. They don't have to have profit. They don't have to balance their books. They don't have to be good at it. They just have to drive the competition out. They do what a monopolist would do. If somebody is trying to become a monopoly, they try to drive all of their competition out by underpricing, and they distort it to the point where nobody else can stay in the business. Then they're the only one in the business. Then they start to jack the prices up again.

Well, it took the Federal Government a long time, but in the dark of the night, in the heat of the ObamaCare battle—in the reversion legislation that slipped through this Congress without an opportunity to evaluate it—there was the sneaky piece of legislation that converted what was left of the student loan plans from the private sector into completely the maw of government, itself.

So, in this period of time that I have described, we have seen the transformation of a completely private, independent-standing property and casualty flood insurance that faced a Federal Government that wanted to provide just one more competitor into the marketplace so that people had more choices and a Federal Government that swallowed it all up and that drove everybody out of business and a Federal Government that has done so, the same thing, with the student loan program in the United States. They had to hitch it onto ObamaCare to do it.

What a bunch of cynics that they couldn't do something like that in broad daylight in front of all of America. No. They had to stick it in when they had the major diversionary tactic of another swallow-up of the private sector—remember, a month ago or 6 weeks ago, whatever that date was—of all of the health insurance in America.

Some will say that there are exceptions—Medicare, for example. Medicaid would be another. Then you can argue whether those are insurance policies or

government programs to pick people up when they're destitute and to take care of them when they reach retirement age. But for those folks who are under Medicare eligibility or who have incomes outside of Medicaid, we didn't see a Federal health insurance program except for SCHIP, which is the State Children's Health Insurance Program. This was another effort to try to close this gap.

There has been effort after effort for the liberals, for the progressives—for the people who just simply deny the liberty of the American people—to take over the health care in America.

Bill Clinton stood here, I believe, on September 13 in about 1993, and he gave his health care speech. He wanted to take it all over then. He turned Hillary loose with HillaryCare, and Hillary began meeting in private and in public. She actually had more public meetings, I think, than we had this time around. Although, we were quite critical of the private meetings she had, too. She wrote a bill, and that bill was the government takeover of health care. Well, they couldn't get that done. Bill Clinton came back, and he said, You know, we can't get this done, but we're going to do it incrementally.

I believe in that September 13 speech he actually made the proposal—and I know I can find it in his speeches during that era—when he wanted to lower the Medicare eligibility from 65 to 55. That's when they brought the idea of SCHIP, the State Children's Health Insurance Program, which is set up to buy very, very cheap health insurance for kids. They put that out through the States. In Iowa, it is known as Hawkeye with a little better than a 2 to 1 Federal match.

So, when you're sitting in a State legislature, the Federal Government says, You know, help out with some of these cheap health insurance premiums for these kids who can't afford them. Otherwise, here's what we'll do. If you'll put \$1 down out of your State tax coffers, we'll put \$2 and change down. Let's see. I think it's 70 percent funding by the Federal Government and 30 percent by the States.

The States adopted it because it was—do you remember the phrase?—free money, Mr. Speaker. Well, nothing is free. We know that, but it was viewed as free money by the State legislatures. They adopted SCHIP. In Iowa, it was Hawkeye.

Then at the same time that Bill Clinton would have liked to have dialed the Medicare eligibility age down to 55, you can see what's happening. If you reduce the age of eligibility for Medicare and if they're seeking to expand Medicaid—and they've been doing that and have been lowering the standards for eligibility to Medicaid from the lower income side of the scale—and if you make these kids eligible for SCHIP, you're squeezing this from the outside, from the middle. You're lowering the senior age to 55, and you're making sure you're insuring the kids—pick your age—well into their 20s.

We had States that had as high a percentage as 66 percent of people who were not kids but adults who were on the SCHIP program. Wisconsin would be one of those States. There was another State that went higher than that. It may have been Minnesota. They had a number that went up into the 80s. I think it was 87 percent. So they were using SCHIP to expand it where they could provide health insurance premiums for people because they wanted to have a single-payer plan eventually. That's what was going on with the strategy of trying to establish this single-payer plan.

In the middle of all of this, you know, the Republicans came in, and we fought some of that back. Then Nancy PELOSI was finally elected as Speaker of the House. What did she bring to us here on this floor but an SCHIP program, which had been set at 200 percent of poverty so that a family of four at 200 percent of poverty in my State would be set at about \$52,000, in order to turn it up to 400 percent of poverty. It passed the House at the insistence of the Speaker, and I was the only member of the Iowa delegation to oppose it. It would have gone to 400 percent of poverty, which would have meant that a family of four in Iowa who was making \$103,000 a year would have had the health insurance for their kids paid for by some taxpayer who would probably not be making that much.

While that was going on, there would be people who would have to pay the rich man's tax, the Alternative Minimum Tax. There would be 70,000 families in America who would be paying the rich man's tax, the Alternative Minimum Tax. I have trouble saying "AMT" these days. It's the Alternative Minimum Tax. There would be 70,000 families who would be paying the Alternative Minimum Tax who would still be eligible for the SCHIP funding for health insurance for their children.

Do you see where this goes? If you have the subsidy at the means testing side of this where lower income people are multiplied from 100 percent of poverty, to 200 percent, to 300 percent, to 400 percent—and by the way, we ratcheted it back down to 300 percent—and allowed \$3 billion or more worth of Medicaid funding to go in and fund illegals into the market of all of that, it squeezes it against the middle.

Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, someone who would be about 45 years old who would watch the eligibility of the Medicare age drop down to 55, who would watch somebody who is collecting SCHIP who is now 35 years old and who would watch those at 400 percent of poverty—families with \$103,000, families of four—having their health insurance premiums paid while they would still be paying the Alternative Minimum Tax? People are looking at this, thinking, Well, the people 10 years older than I get free health care, and the people 10 years younger than I get free health care. I'm the one who's working, who's paying for my own pre-

miums and raising my own family, and everybody else is, too. Why do I try? Do I do that because I'll have higher quality health care?

Yes, that would be a good answer. The people who are responsible should live a little better than those who don't in this country. We have got to leave incentives in place.

That was the strategy—to squeeze the middle, to put such a load on the people who were still paying for their own or who were earning their own health care, their own health insurance at their workplace or wherever their deal might be, that they would just capitulate, throw up their hands and say, Give me the European model. I've got it anyway. I'm paying for it for everybody else. Why am I buying my own with after-tax dollars? That is the strategy.

It is so cynical to crush the spirit of people, to take away their constitutional rights and to impose upon them a national health care act. It was rejected during the Hillary era. They called it HillaryCare. They rejected it in Massachusetts, Mr. Speaker. The people in Massachusetts rejected ObamaCare. Still their hearts were hardened, and still they were determined to come down here and impose the policy on the American people.

Well, I'm not letting it go. I will not let it go for a whole series of reasons, but the constitutional reasons are the most important ones.

It is unconstitutional to require any American to buy a product that is either produced or approved by the Federal Government under penalty of law. It has never happened in the history of this country. It is a violation of a series of components within our Constitution—and don't think I can't come up with them, Mr. Speaker. Certainly, I know what they are. They are four places.

It is a violation of the Commerce Clause because there will be and always have been babies born in States who didn't advantage themselves of any kind of health care whatsoever. They didn't participate in any commerce when it came to health care, and they maybe didn't travel outside of their States at all, so there wasn't even the risk of their going out to be eventually, potentially, picked up by ambulances in other States. The risk didn't exist, so they didn't use health care in the States they lived in. They didn't go outside the States they lived in. They lived lives long or short, healthy or not, and passed away into the next life never having engaged in interstate commerce that had anything to do with ObamaCare, which means it's a violation of the Commerce Clause, swift and certain, without a lot of hard analysis required.

If the Commerce Clause doesn't apply to say that the passage of ObamaCare is verboten under the Constitution, if the Commerce Clause doesn't apply on ObamaCare, then it doesn't apply whatsoever for anything imaginable,

and it's no restraint whatsoever. You would believe that if you were an activist judge. I reject that.

The second part is that it's not in the enumerated powers. There is nothing there in the Constitution that defines any power to impose an obligation by any citizen or any person in the United States to buy a product that is produced by the Federal Government or approved by the Federal Government. That's the second thing.

The third thing is that it violates the Equal Protection Clause of the Constitution.

We're going to go to four here, Mr. Speaker.

The Equal Protection Clause of the Constitution says that all citizens whatsoever shall be treated the same regardless of race, ethnicity, national origin or the color of their skin, which is the whole list of the things that are there within title VII of the Civil Rights Act.

□ 1900

Well, people are treated differently in the States. The Cornhusker kickback notwithstanding, still the legislation treats people differently in Louisiana than it does in the rest of the country, Florida than it does in the rest of the country, several other jurisdictions or something like eight to 11 different areas in ObamaCare that treat people differently depending upon the geography of where they live. That's forbidden under the equal protection clause of the Constitution.

Fourth thing, and this is where we get to, it's a violation of the 10th Amendment. Not only is it not in the enumerated powers to impose this ObamaCare on Americans, but those powers that are not specified in the enumerated powers of the Constitution are reserved for the States or to the people respectively. And this is a violation of the separation of powers doctrine, which is in the 10th Amendment.

Four places, Mr. Speaker. It's not in the enumerated powers; it's a violation of the commerce clause; it's a violation of the equal protection clause; and it's a violation of the 10th Amendment. This Supreme Court will see these cases eventually, and when they do, an honest reading of the Constitution compels the Supreme Court to overturn the ObamaCare legislation. And I understand, and I have not read every word in there, that there's not a severability clause in that. And if that's the case, any component most likely that's found unconstitutional throws the whole business out.

I wish we had a provision that would put all of that paper back in the tree, Mr. Speaker, and give people back their liberty because that's what this bill does. It violates the Constitution and it takes people's liberty.

It takes our freedom to buy a policy that we want. It nationalizes our body. It takes over the most sovereign thing that we have, that's our skin and everything inside it; and the Federal

Government manages when we get the tests, what policies we will be able to buy, what the premiums will be. They'll regulate the premiums. They will decide what's offered in the policies, and the Federal Government will impose mandates on those policies that we don't even see in the legislation.

There will be mandates there for contraceptives. There will be mandates there for mental health. There will be mandates there for drug treatment. There will be mandates there probably for physical therapy. And we see also an effort to tax your pop if it's not diet pop, tax your soda if it's not diet soda. They want to tell you what you can eat and what you can drink. The next thing they'll be doing in this super-uber nanny state is run us across the scales and tax our fat. That will actually be the simplest way. If they're going to tax our diet, I wish they would just let me alone, run me across the scales and tax me by the pound.

But I want the freedom to eat what I want to eat, buy what I want to buy, live the way I want to live. And I want to be able to make my own decisions on whether I am going to exercise or whether I am going to go to a health club. And if my insurance company wants to set up an incentive for that because it's cost effective and they can offer me a lower premium, I'm quite likely to take advantage of that, and I think many Americans would do the same.

But this Federal Government cannot be allowed to continue on becoming even more of a nanny state than it already is. We've got to reject that, Mr. Speaker. We've got to abolish ObamaCare. We've got to pull it out root and branch so that there's not one vestige of it left behind, not one particle, not one cell, not one DNA particle of ObamaCare left in this Federal code because if we leave it, it's the equivalent of going in and removing a malignant tumor and leaving part of it there. It still is at great risk of metastasizing; and when that happens, it's the death knell to freedom and liberty in the United States of America.

We are not some other people. We are not the mirror of Europe with the stirring in of the later generations of more newly arriving immigrants, legal and illegal. We are a unique people. We have a unique character and a unique quality about us where we stand alone, apart from the rest of the world, for a lot of reasons, Mr. Speaker. Some of those reasons are self-evident, and some of those reasons are in the Declaration, and some of them are in the Bill of Rights. Some of them are actually in the Constitution in a broader sense.

But just to enumerate some of those reasons for American exceptionalism, and it's not politically correct to remind people but it's necessary that we do this, that we talk American exceptionalism, a number of them are these: we have the rule of law. The foundation for that is the Constitution.

The philosophy for the Constitution is in the Declaration. We have the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. And life is the paramount right, and it is paramount to liberty, which is more important than the pursuit of happiness.

So working from the bottom of the scale up, Mr. Speaker, it works like this: someone in the pursuit of their happiness cannot infringe on someone else's liberty because liberty trumps pursuit of happiness. And, by the way, pursuit of happiness, it was understood by our Founding Fathers to go back to the Greek meaning, which the Greek word for pursuit of happiness is *eudaimonia*, which in its definition speaks to a search for knowledge, a search for truth, and it implies both the physical and the mental. So to be sound in body and mind and in a search for truth and a search for knowledge, that's the pursuit of happiness because they believed that out on the other end of that scale that ultimate knowledge would provide that ultimate level of happiness. And there's some wisdom in that philosophy. It's Godless, but there's some wisdom in the philosophy of achieving ultimate knowledge. Pursuit of happiness was *eudaimonia*, that search for knowledge.

But someone in their search for knowledge, in their pursuit of happiness/knowledge, cannot travel on someone else's liberty. Liberty is more important than the pursuit of happiness. And someone in the search for their liberty cannot use that liberty to take someone else's life. Individual life is too precious. It cannot be taken by someone because they say they have a liberty. Neither can someone who is in pursuit of their happiness take someone else's liberty because it makes them happy. Our liberties are guaranteed here, and the infringement upon them is that we have to respect life more than liberty. We have to respect liberty more than the pursuit of happiness. Those are prioritized rights that are self-evident that come from God, endowed by our creator.

And here we sit in the United States with that philosophical foundation in the Declaration that was basis for our Constitution and the rights that are there that made America a great country—freedom of speech, religion, press, the right to peaceably assemble and petition government for redress of grievances, the right to keep and bear arms. Moving up the line, the right to be free from double jeopardy and to be tried by a jury of your peers.

And the right to property in the Fifth Amendment, which has been amended now in the Supreme Court of the United States in the *Kelo* decision where they struck the words "for public use" out of the Fifth Amendment, which says "nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation." Now the effect of the *Kelo* decision was that Fifth Amendment has been usurped by the last nine people that should be amending the

Constitution, the Supreme Court Justices—it wasn't nine, by the way, and I applaud those that opposed it. But now the Fifth Amendment reads: "Nor shall private property be taken without just compensation."

Mr. Speaker, I know mentally you put "for public use" in there, but they took it out. Local governments now occasionally, and I hope not routinely, confiscate private property, individual private property, and they give it over to other private property owners because they think they will get more tax dollars out of it.

But property rights are a foundation of the success in America. And along the way, free enterprise capitalism is another foundation for the success in America.

So you can buy a piece of property and it's yours. As long as you pay for it and pay the property tax on it, you get to keep it. And that can be the basis for your equity that you engage in starting businesses, setting up factories, building homes, expanding farms. Those things that have been the basis of our prosperity are rooted in the rule of law, the right to property, free enterprise capitalism. Also the moral foundation that came over for the freedom of religion rooted in our Judeo-Christian values, which are the thread of our culture today. All of those are reasons why America is a great country.

Another reason is because we have skimmed the cream of the crop off of every donor civilization that has sent legal immigrants to the United States. The cream of the crop, the people with the vigor and the vitality and the dream. And they found a way to get on-board a ship or whatever means they could to come here and enter into the United States through a legal port of entry to chase their dreams.

And some of them came with a significant amount of capital to give it a go. And a lot of them came with the clothes on their back and the possessions they had in their bag, like my grandmother. And as they arrived here, they began to carve out their American Dream with the kind of vision and the kind of vigor that gave them the idea to come here in the first place. This America, this land of almost unlimited natural resources, a land that has the very foundation of liberty and freedom as the essence and the core of its being, welcomed legal immigrants here who were called by that clarion call of liberty and freedom and property rights and unlimited natural resources and unlimited opportunity in a moral society that was rooted in Judeo-Christian values. And they came here and built a Nation in the blink of a historical eye, settled the North American continent, expanded manifest destiny from sea to shining sea. And all of this has attracted people to come to America.

Now, we are either the first generation immigrants that came here, hopefully legally, with that vigor of that dream or the second, third, fourth,

fifth, or multiple generations, the descendants of that same dream, imbued with American self-confidence and American can-do spirit and a confidence that we can face any challenge, we can bear any burden. That's the American spirit.

And we cannot be capitulating to the European utopian version that's going to have a social program to fix any ill. We can't be trapped into this idea that we can sit down and produce some kind of a policy that will solve every problem. All we need to do is have our default system come back to the Constitution, come back to free enterprise, come back to individual responsibility. If we do all of those things and adhere to the Constitution itself, free enterprise capitalism, maintain our moral foundation, nurture the family unit as the means through which we pour all of our values, if we do all of that, America will be just fine.

But Jimmy Carter, when he was running for President and as he was exploring the first-in-the-nation caucus and establishing that as a viable route to the Presidency in Iowa, I read in an interview back in those years in the mid-1970s where Jimmy Carter said the people that work should live better than those that don't. Now, I don't know that Jimmy Carter ever actually acted on that, but that's what he said, and it caught my attention. It was a very simple way of describing this. The people that work should live better than those that don't.

Well, that's not the prevailing philosophy in this Congress any longer. It is the people that don't work need to live as well as anybody. So we have 72 different welfare programs, according to Robert Rector of the Heritage Foundation. In the mid-1990s when we reformed welfare—I wasn't here—but when this Congress reformed welfare in the mid-1990s, there wasn't the dramatic drop in the cost in welfare. It reduced it a little bit and then it stayed on a plateau and then it climbed again. The welfare has been climbing at a rate that's comparable to or greater than the rate that it was climbing going into the mid-1990s. And we have accepted this. I don't accept it but this society has.

This society has also accepted rampant drug abuse so that there's a huge demand for illegal drugs coming out of Mexico, from or through Mexico. That is the core of the problem that we have with the border today and the violence on the border today, and whatever we do to help the Mexicans and seal our border, we need to do that. We need to stop the bleeding, but as long as there is a powerful demand in the United States for tens of billions of dollars in illegal drugs, then there will always be the illegal traffic coming across the border.

□ 1915

Mr. Speaker, this is a bit of a rendition on where America is today, a little bit on how we got here, a little bit

about the economics of it, a little about the history, a fair amount about what's going on with ObamaCare.

This is my statement and my commitment, that I will not rest. I will continue to turn the pressure up to get the passage of the repeal for ObamaCare that I have introduced in this Congress and now should have, if I can add this up, 66 cosponsors on this legislation today.

Mr. Speaker, the number of the legislation, should you choose to look it up and sign on is H.R. 4972. That's the legislation that will one day, at least the language of it if not that particular bill number, arrive at the President's desk, where this President would veto it. But with a new majority in 2011, we will have the votes in here to shut off any funding of ObamaCare so that it cannot be enacted.

It doesn't become fully enacted until 2014. So 2011 and '12 this Congress, has to start all spending, by the Constitution. We say, no, there won't be any funding for the implementation of ObamaCare, so we will put it on ice for 2011 and 2012. While that's going, we will put the repeal on President Obama's desk and make him veto it. And when he vetoes it, we can take a look and see if we can override it. That will be very hard, but it's not completely impossible.

But in 2012 we elect a new President and a new Congress. And that new President and new Congress need to take the pledge that I have taken, which is plank number one, full 100 percent abolishment of ObamaCare, all of it, without any hesitation, without any caveats.

And let's put that on the desk of the new President, Mr. Speaker, that will be sworn in January 20 of 2013. And while he stands on the west portico—we will gavel in on January 3, 2013, in here. That's what the Constitution says we do. We will be thy then in a position where we can pass the repeal of ObamaCare, have it sitting there so that when he takes his oath of office January 20, 2013, and puts his hand down as the President of the United States, his first act, Mr. Speaker, can be to put his pen to the bill that repeals ObamaCare and sign that legislation on the spot at the podium on the west portico of this Capitol building and give America back our economic freedom, but more importantly, give us back our human liberty.

That's the goal that we have to follow if we are to achieve the greatness that America has ahead of us. If not, we will be trailing in the dust the golden hopes of men and forever diminishing our opportunities, forever diminishing our potential, taking away human potential, discouraging individual entrepreneurs, people that would never realize their dreams because they would be growing up in a nanny state that has taken over the banks, the investment companies, the insurance companies, the car companies, Fannie and Freddie, the student

loans, nationalize our body, our skin and everything inside it, and, by the way, put a 10 percent tax on the outside if you go into a tanning salon. All of this taken over and the financial institutions. I want it all back. I want it back for the American people, the American workers, and the American entrepreneurs. I want our spirit back.

I am going to work to get it back, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate your attention.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

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

Mr. BONNER (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of his required presence in his district relating to coordinated oil spill response efforts with constituents and State and Federal officials.

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 Ms. WOOLSEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KLEIN of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHIFF, 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. JONES, for 5 minutes, May 13.

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, May 13.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, May 11, 12, and 13.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, May 13.

Mr. PAUL, for 5 minutes, May 12 and 13.

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. 3111. An act to establish the Commission on Freedom of Information Act Processing Delays, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the