

we cannot underestimate their appetite for influence. When we are talking about China's track record, China has a history of aggressive actions which have been the source of tension in Southeast Asia.

In 1974, China seized the Western Paracel Islands from Vietnam. In 1988, China seized six of the Spratly Islands from Vietnam and sank three Vietnamese ships, claiming 70 Vietnamese lives. In 2007, China fired upon Vietnamese fishermen in the disputed area, killing one and wounding six others.

The Vietnamese American community has denounced China's claim to territory in the Spratly and Paracel Islands as unofficial, with no legal, historical or factual basis. China, in turn, ordered a ban on all Vietnamese fishing in these disputed territories until August 1, 2009; and during this ban, approximately 50 Vietnamese fishermen were detained.

China's actions infringe upon the sovereignty of the Vietnamese people to freely navigate crucial waterways that support their livelihoods, which is a direct violation of international treaties.

China's harassment is not limited to their neighbors. China has also engaged in hostile confrontations with U.S. vessels traveling through the disputed area.

Given these violations, it is time that the United States take aggressive action against China, and to, hopefully, resolve these disputes without resorting to any force.

We must pursue a peaceful resolution to this conflict in the South China Sea, and the United States must take actions in doing so.

In 2001, a Chinese Naval vessel attacked the USNS *Bowditch*, a U.S. surveillance ship, in the Yellow Sea, and, in another occasion, a Chinese Navy F-8 fighter collided with a U.S. Navy EP-3 reconnaissance plane in international airspace over the South China Sea. China detained the 24 U.S. crew members for 11 days.

In 2009, there were reports of aggressive encounters with the Chinese Navy and unarmed U.S. ocean surveillance ships, which were freely operating in international waters in the Yellow Sea and the South China Sea. A U.S. destroyer was called to escort the surveillance ships as they continued their operations and avoid further hostility from the Chinese Navy.

China's aggression poses a threat to the U.S.-China relationship, too. And, there is no excuse for these territorial disputes potentially pitting two powerful nations against each other.

The maritime disputes over the South China Sea must be addressed immediately to protect the United States' regional relationships and agreements.

For example, the United States is involved in the U.S.-Japan Security Treaty that covers the Senkaku Islands, which are actively disputed. If tensions increase for these islands, Japan might seek assistance from the United States against China.

Likewise, the United States continues to collaborate with the Philippines, and, if regional

tensions were to rise, the Philippines, too, might seek assistance from the United States against China.

China has test-fired missiles at enemies trespassing onto claimed Chinese territory. This may trigger other countries to expand their naval forces as well, which may cause more tension in these disputed waters.

I appreciate Secretary Clinton's statements on Friday that the resolution to the South China Sea dispute is a "national interest" to the United States, and I agree with her that we must seek a peaceful solution.

United officials including Secretary Clinton must demonstrate their strong concern for China's hostile actions, which are causing a disruption of free navigation.

At the same time, China needs to recognize and honor the freedom of navigation of all neighboring nations as well as the United States.

While the Chinese Foreign Minister said yesterday that the United States should not internationalize the South China Sea issue, which could worsen matters and complicate the situation, as an influential nation, we must not remain neutral and passive.

We must take action to end Chinese harassment—not only to ensure the freedom of navigation, but also to restore the respect and interests of the U.S. and these Asian nations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. QUIGLEY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. JONES addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

□ 1950

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. POE of Texas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFazio) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFazio addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PUTNAM) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PUTNAM addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE YEAR IN REVIEW

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate being recognized to address you here on the floor of the House of Representatives. It is always an honor and one of the reasons I try to come down here often and convey the values that emanate from the Midwest; and hopefully some of the people across the rest of the country that don't adhere to those values can index with the things that we believe in.

But what I have found out, Mr. Speaker, as I have traveled around the country is that we have a tremendous amount of common values, from corner to corner of America and up through the Midwest as well. When I think of the States that I have been to in helping other candidates in trying to convey a message, from the Northeast to the Southeast to the South, up through the Midwest, down to the Southwest and off to the West, what I have found is that the people that show up, that care about our Constitution, the constitutional conservatives, the newly energized Tea Party groups that are out there, the 912 Project people that

are there, the independents that aren't affiliated that care a lot about America and fiscal responsibility, when they show up, they show up with their American flags, they show up with their yellow Gadsden flags, the Don't Tread on Me flags; they carry a Constitution in their pocket or on their heart; and they know that if this country is going to be refurbished and put back together again, that we need to go back to the Constitution and this Congress needs to adhere to our oath to the Constitution. We have to ensure that our road map, and a road map is not someplace out there in Never-Never Land of progressivism that has always failed. We have a century and a half of progressivism that we can look at that goes clear back to the shaping of those kind of ideals in the utopian segments of non-English speaking western Europe.

We've watched what's happened. They have been at each other's throats in wars. They've killed tens of millions of each other. Their economy and their industry has collapsed over and over again. They've propped it back up. Their growth has been slower than ours. We've provided them the global defense from the enemies to enemies that are still lined up against each other. The Soviet Union imploded because Ronald Reagan was right. He was right because he decided that we could press the Soviet Union to the point where their economy would collapse before they could keep up with us economically and build themselves up militarily. All of that has taken place.

When we saw the Soviet Union go down, I thought, now it will be obvious even to the most leftist American that you can't grow and prosper and move on into the 21st century and lead the world economically, culturally, politically, militarily, every measure that there is, unless you have a free enterprise system.

Free enterprise. Free enterprise. A simple thing. It's so simple that on the flash cards that are produced by USCIS, the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services, the services that provide the path for legal immigrants to become citizens of the United States. When you're training and you're studying to become an American citizen, there are a lot of things there. You have to learn a little about our history; you have to be able to have a command of the English language in both the spoken and written English language; and there are a number of questions in the test. And the flash cards that are proposed, that stack of flash cards produced by USCIS, Citizenship and Immigration Services, glossy flash cards, red cards, about like that, they will ask questions. They would be questions such as, Who's the father of our country? You snap that card over and the other side says—you know the answer, I trust, Mr. Speaker—George Washington. Another one will be, who emancipated the slaves? Abraham Lincoln. What is the

economic system of the United States of America? You flip that flash card over, if you study and you want to be a citizen of the United States, and it says free enterprise capitalism. How about that? Now that's one of the questions we would consider to be basic, rudimentary, something that any third grader—well, they may not know that, but a sixth grader will; an eighth grader will for sure, or should. It should be taught in all of our schools: The vigor and the vitality that comes from free enterprise capitalism. It is a basic question. If you want to become an American, you have to understand our economic system; free enterprise capitalism.

I wouldn't say that the President doesn't understand the system, but I am not convinced that he adheres to the free enterprise capitalism system that we have. I have yet to see a single move on the part of the President of the United States or this administration or the progressive leftists in this Congress, House or Senate, that supports the underpinnings of free enterprise capitalism as the engine of our economy. And I've seen move after move after move that undermines free enterprise, over and over again.

Nobody over here is going to stand up and say, "You're wrong, STEVE KING. You're wrong. I'm a free enterprise capitalist." You can't say that. If you're going to raise taxes, if you're going to raise taxes to the tune of something in the area of \$1.5 trillion? If you're going to be part of a \$1.5 trillion deficit on top of it? A deficit that we have never seen in this country. And be part of punishing—they say punishing the rich. What about the job makers? What about the job givers? What about the employers in America? What happens when you punish the people that produce the jobs? What about big employers, big job givers? Do we punish them?

Yes, you guys want to do that. You're doing it every day. You're advancing regulations. You're advancing taxes. You think that the goose that lays the golden egg which is free enterprise capitalism, that somehow if you slaughter the goose, you find all of those golden eggs inside. Well, it doesn't work that way. It's one egg at a time by the economic engine that is out there struggling to make some profit. And the people over on this side of the aisle, I wish somebody would stand up and tell me that they created a job, that they signed somebody else's paycheck on the front, not the back; somebody that had invested capital to establish a business, that had a chance to make some profit. And out of that, you're only as good as the employees that you have and you're not going to make money in business if you don't have good employees. So you want to hire the best employees you can hire and get the most production out of them that you can. And in today's world it's not good enough, Mr. Speaker, to work hard. Hard workers are re-

spected, certainly. But this is a technological era. You've got to work hard and work smart; do both of those things together. If you work hard and don't work smart, you're going to be down there in the lowest income levels in America, the under-skilled jobs. And then those folks are the ones that are receiving public benefits in greater percentages and numbers than anybody else.

Here's how this works out. And tomorrow morning, Mr. Speaker, I will have a guest at the Conservative Opportunity Society, an organization that was founded in 1984 by Vin Weber, Newt Gingrich and others for the purposes of identifying the roots of our prosperity; the Conservative Opportunity Society. I happen to be the chairman of the Conservative Opportunity Society. Over the course of the last 6 years or 5½ that I have had the honor of that task, we've had a whole variety of excellent educators and speakers that have come forward. Tomorrow morning it's Robert Rector of the Heritage Foundation.

Robert Rector is one of those guys who goes back in the back room and does that deep due diligence research to try to come up with the numbers to quantify and identify what is actually happening in America, economically, socially, culturally. Robert Rector is one of the people that I think if you take him out of the equation in 2006 or 2007, that grand coalition of the President and Teddy Kennedy—President Bush and Teddy Kennedy and others—would have passed a comprehensive amnesty piece of legislation on us. But Robert Rector gave us the facts that showed us the cost to illegal immigration in America. And now he's done a new study. This is a new study that identifies what's happening with welfare reform in America. This study goes back and looks at that time in the mid nineties when this Congress went into showdown mode on welfare reform. And for a time the government was shut down because the Republican majority in the Congress refused to knuckle under to the demands of President Bill Clinton at the time and he demanded that they spend more money and he demanded that they not reform welfare, that we let people continue to be paid not to work in the same numbers as before, because of his sense of compassion. But Republicans persisted, and we got a welfare reform bill. In the end, though, they blinked when it came down to who was going to give in. It's kind of like a street brawl when whoever's standing there when it's over is the one that won. Well, in that case Bill Clinton won the final showdown on who would give in to put the government back at work instead of leaving them shut down.

□ 2000

But we got some welfare reform. America thinks that there was a real model of welfare reform that was accomplished, and some of that was a

model that came out of Wisconsin from Governor Tommy Thompson, who's done an outstanding job in Wisconsin and set a pace here for Washington. A lot of that actually was done in the neighboring next-door Iowa without that level of fanfare, but that came here to the Capitol. That's where our federalist system that leaves the decisions as much as possible to the State had manifested itself. And the model of Wisconsin and Iowa—as some will say, it's a better program even than Wisconsin—was reflected here in Washington with welfare reform.

Well, we thought we reformed welfare in the mid-1990s. But when you track the dollars that are handed out in welfare benefits, you look and you find out it's not just that handful of welfare components that we might think of such as food stamps and rent subsidy and heat subsidy and aid to dependent children and some others, but it's 72 different programs. And these programs are so myriad in their number and disparate in their varieties that it's impossible for a citizen that's sitting at home reading the newspaper or tracking—maybe they're tracking the Internet now. If you're a student now, you could figure this out. Seventy-two different programs, many of them, most of them, maybe even all of them, growing.

And so what we've seen, if you chart the graph, is welfare spending was going up. You hit the mid-1990s, the reform came and it leveled off, dipped down just a little bit. And then it went up again at a pace that accelerated at a level greater to or equal to what it was in the mid-1990s, because they added so many programs in, blended so many in that it crept in on us before we knew what was going on. Robert Rector's nailed that down.

Now I'm looking forward to hearing him at 8 o'clock tomorrow morning, and I hope there will be a good number of Members that will arrive down at the Capitol Hill Club at that 8 o'clock breakfast, and we will get into this subject matter. This is one of the things, Mr. Speaker, that goes on in this Congress that doesn't get any press, that we're back behind those doors constantly sticking our nose, our eyes, and our ears into programs trying to find ways that we can better configure this government, ways we can save money, ways we can get more productivity out of the people in this country. And our job, our job, Mr. Speaker, is to increase the average annual productivity of our people.

Average annual productivity. That doesn't mean everybody is going to be producing. Some people are going to be in a hospital bed, some are going to be in a nursing home, some are going to be shut-ins at home. Some will be retired because of their age or maybe they've earned it. Maybe they're retired because they have earned the kind of wealth that let's them retire. Their capital is still working.

But we need to have the able-bodied people and the able-minded people in

this technological era—doesn't always have to be able-bodied; able-minded—that are contributing to this economy, that are producing something on a daily basis, that are proud of what they do, that are creative. And when you add that all up, 306 million Americans. And just think, if every single one got up every day and did something that's constructive and productive in the private sector, how much difference that would make.

Think of this. If we're all on a great ship sailing out across the ocean back in the era where you had to grab ahold of the oar and pull on the oar to go anywhere, you're in the calms. Sails aren't helping you. You can man the sails when the wind is blowing. So if everybody goes down there and grabs ahold of an oar and pulls on that oar, you sail through the water without a lot of effort. But every time somebody let's go of the oar and goes up and sits in the steerage passage, in the steerage compartment and watches as the ocean goes by and watches everybody else work and pull on the oar, do you know what that does? Every time somebody lets go of an oar, it's harder to keep that ship going at the same speed. In fact, it must slow down because you've got fewer people pulling on this economic engine.

And the more people that quit and give up or are provided an incentive—let's just say it pays the same to pull on the oar as it does to sit up there in steerage. Let's just say the food is the same. The service is the same. You get a bunk that's just as good. Why would you pull on the oar? If you're living as good a life without having to go down in the hold and do your share of the work and carry your share of the load, why would you do it? Just out of good conscience because you like to row the boat?

Mr. Speaker, that's not the way it works in the real world. Some people do like to row the boat. Some people work just out of conscience. Some of them give from an altruism from within their heart. But that's not what keeps the economy going. What keeps the economy going is—it contributes. But what ensures that the economy goes is people are rewarded for their labor. People are rewarded for their creativeness, for their entrepreneurial spirit, for inventing, for producing, and for marketing.

People that add to this economy need to be rewarded for what they do in proportion to their contribution. And only the markets can determine that; not some government bureaucrat, not some pay czar, not somebody that decides this CEO should get paid X and this CEO should get paid Y. Or like the President who can decide this CEO needs to be fired.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm not making that up. That is a fact of history, undenied by the President of the United States or any of his spokesmen in the White House. The President fired the CEO of General Motors a year ago,

a little more, fired him. Came out in the press. President eliminates the CEO. There was no denial out of the White House. He essentially took a bow.

Remember how many times he said Barack Obama or President Obama or just put "Obama" in there and then put in quotes in your Google search "I'm the President." How many times has he said "I'm the President" in the last year and a half or a little more? A number that I can think of. He constantly reminds us that he's the President. But no President in America should ever have the authority to fire the CEO of a Fortune 500 company or anything else. Let him fire his own staff. Let him fire his own Cabinet. Let him fire his own executive branch right on down to the lowest person on the totem pole. That's fine with me. That's his shop.

General Motors and Chrysler were private companies taken over by the Federal Government, and the President of the United States fired the CEO of General Motors and approved the replacement hire, and he fired and replaced all but two of the board members on General Motors. And he ordered, his people ordered, the elimination of 3,400 car dealerships. Why? Because his car czar and his people in the White House had some off-balance idea that, if you eliminate dealerships, you can sell more cars.

Now, I come to this office with, I think, maybe a gift of the common sense that comes from the Midwest, and I'm sure that it exists in all of the rest of the country, too. But here's what I know from where I come from. If you want to manufacture widgets, especially if you invent a widget, but if you want to manufacture them—let's just say you go in your little shop and you go and create and you manufacture a widget, and you decide, "I can make these things pretty good and I can mass produce them, even, so now I want to sell them." What would you do? Simple. You'd go to the county fairs. You'd go to all of the county fairs and you would show these widgets to all of the people walking by. And when they stopped and showed a little interest, you'd say, "Hey, I'll tell you what. You should be a franchisee. I want to let you be my dealer, and you can take this widget home with you—pay for it, of course—stock it in your inventory. I'll give you the material and you can sell widgets out of the window of your shop or out of the implement lot" or whatever the widget might happen to be.

And you would know that if you want to sell a million widgets, you can't stand there and sell every one of them. There's not enough time. But if you can get enough dealers out there, if you can get 3,400 dealers out there with enough widgets on the lot, you can sell a whole lot more widgets than if you don't have any dealers.

So do 3,400 less car dealers sell more cars than 3,400 car dealers? The answer

is obviously no. It is a stupid decision to believe that you can eliminate car dealers and sell more cars. And what's happened? The company that was not dictated to by the White House is the one that's selling the cars and growing and turning a profit—Ford Motor Company. And I've not been one that went out and bought a Ford as the first vehicle. In fact, it's been hard for me to buy a Ford in the past. But it's looking a little more attractive to me now because they're American cars, American made, that are not propped up by the taxpayers. And they're proving what free enterprise does. When you get out there and compete, you can build a good product.

Now, I'm not saying necessarily that I'd go out there and change the brand that I currently drive. I'm happy with that. But, Mr. Speaker, my point is the White House has been dictating to the private sector. They have nationalized and taken over General Motors and Chrysler and three banks, three large banks; AIG, the insurance company, to the tune of \$180 billion; Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac—this just popped up a couple of days ago—in addition to that, the \$145 billion that has been poured into Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac to prop them up.

We also have the other agencies—FHA, Federal Housing Administration—and some other loans that are rolled down through other Federal agencies. The loans that have been issued throughout those other agencies, now the no down payment and the very low down payment loans, and that means the low down payment of 3½ percent.

□ 2010

From 3½ percent down to zero, that's \$1 trillion in loans that the Federal Government is the guarantor of, \$1 trillion. Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac give the taxpayers a contingent liability of \$5.5 trillion.

So what happens if these loans all blow up? That means the taxpayers are stuck at 5½ plus one, and I know the math on that: \$6.5 trillion in contingent liability for the American taxpayers because the people that don't understand free enterprise think somehow the only reason that somebody that doesn't have an income, doesn't own their home, is because nobody's offered them a no down payment loan, and somehow they're going to figure out if they don't have any money how they're still going to pay mortgage payments on a house.

Now, that means here's your house, you have no skin in the game, and it takes at least 6 months to foreclosure in most of the States on a loan like that. Well, who wouldn't take a home? I wouldn't actually, but there are many people that would take a home for no down payment, you get to live here for 6 months without making payments before we figure out how to evict you.

We had a bankruptcy clawback bill that was brought through the Judici-

ary Committee and here to the floor of the House that exempted some people and gave them breaks in whose homes are being foreclosed on. And I offered just a simple amendment in the Judiciary Committee, and it was this. If someone had defrauded their lender or attempted to defraud their lender, they wouldn't be able to take advantage of the special provisions in this special bankruptcy clawback law. That amendment passed the Judiciary Committee, Mr. Speaker, by a vote of 23-3.

But guess what happened? The will of the committee was reflected in the vote, the recorded vote, but by the time the bill got to the floor the language was changed miraculously. By whom? Well, maybe the staff of the Judiciary Committee, with the consent of the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, JOHN CONYERS, with the complicity of the Rules Committee chaired by LOUISE SLAUGHTER, and I think that at least in the silence of it all, within the arrangement of the Speaker of the House's method of running this place, Speaker PELOSI.

So this franchise that as every Member of Congress, each of us that represents about 700,000 people in this Congress, we come here to carry the values of our constituents, and out among our districts we have all the solutions for America. We have all the answers that man and woman can devise out there among our constituents, 700,000, I have the privilege to represent, added to the other 305.3 million or so that are represented by the other 435 Members of Congress.

We have an information network. We gather input, we gather data, and we have those voices coming into my office constantly. That's what we do, and it's part of my job to weigh those ideas, place them in the right place, get them to the subcommittees, get information before the hearings, get them to the subcommittees for the markups, and get them to the full committee for the secondary markup, get them to the floor with amendments, before the Rules Committee, if it's just that they go there, and get this into the debate. If we don't get it solved, we want to go down the hallway to the Senate and weigh in over there and use whatever kind of influence we have because it's so important that we collect the wisdom of the 300-plus million Americans. That's what a constitutional republic does. That's what it's designed to do, Mr. Speaker.

But we have a draconian House of Representatives that has shut off the input from the citizens of the United States, has shut down the process to the point where an amendment can be offered and passed in a markup of a bill before a full committee like the Judiciary Committee, or the Energy and Commerce Committee would be another example, Mr. Speaker, where this has happened on ObamaCare, on cap-and-tax as well, where the will of the committee is just ignored and they go rewrite the bill and bring it to the

floor. They don't say anything to anybody. They don't ask permission. They don't ask for a signoff or a consent from the people that recorded their vote in support of those amendments. They just simply ignore the entire will of the committee or defy it and rewrite the bill after the fact and send it to the floor without notice.

And when caught red-handed, their answer is, well, it was so obvious we knew you'd catch us. That really gives me a feeling of comfort. How many were not obvious, how many didn't we catch when they changed a little word like a "may" to a "shall" or vice versa, something that can completely transform the meaning of an entire piece of legislation. If you're looking at every word, I suppose you would catch it, it's obvious a "may" to a "shall" or a "shall" to a "may" or a "notwithstanding" slipped in somewhere or was taken out.

But it should have the integrity that the will of the group as brought out by the chairman of the committee and that decision of the committee must be sacrosanct and honored, and it should not ever be changed unless it's changed by a vote, not of the Rules Committee, to change the language of a bill that goes up there. If there's something that's been a mistake or there's a change of opinion, then whoever wants to change that conclusion of a committee should have to bring an amendment to the floor of the House of Representatives and debate it here. That's how a constitutional republic is supposed to work. That's how it was designed to work, and in fact, it's dysfunctional if it's not run that way. This is a dysfunctional Congress, Mr. Speaker. The will of the people is not being reflected in this Congress in many, many ways. So this takes me to a couple of issues.

Cap-and-tax passed this House almost very close to a year ago today. Looks like it's balled up in the Senate, and I hope that it stays buried there. They will keep trying. That didn't reflect the will of the people. That was a high-handed leverage operation, and I won't go so deeply into that because I actually don't expect we will see that at least before the election.

And after the election, if there's a lame duck session—and there likely will be—it better be just pro forma activity of this Congress to get the business done that must be done so this country can function, because the people in November will have spoken, Mr. Speaker, and their will needs to be reflected after the election. A lame duck session that brings transformative pieces of legislation breaks with the trust of the American people. It would be a defiant action, and it should be met with the defiance of the American people, and anything they should try to do in that kind of environment should be repealed, and the President of the United States ought to say so. He ought to say no transformative legislation should be brought before this

Congress in a lame duck session. A President that honored the Constitution and the will of the people would reinforce that position right now and do it today, Mr. Speaker.

But another one of those pieces of legislation that was brought before this Congress that defied the will of the people is ObamaCare, and I will just tell you what ObamaCare is. It is what the President has identified it. He's referred to it as ObamaCare. I happen to remember February 25 at the Blair House this year when President Obama talked about this health care plan as ObamaCare. That's the moniker he would like to have on it, and that's what he would like to have for his legacy. The American people can't have ObamaCare and have freedom too. It has to be one or the other. It cannot be both. They are not compatible with each other. Freedom and liberty cannot coexist side by side with ObamaCare, Mr. Speaker.

This ObamaCare that was contrived and recontrived and manipulated and remanipulated and sent up to the Congressional Budget Office for another CBO scoring after another CBO scoring turned logical contortionism inside out to get to a conclusion that ObamaCare wasn't going to be expensive, and the assumptions that were made defied rational thought.

One of them was, well, we'll save \$532 billion by cutting Medicare \$532 billion. Think of it. Here we are, the senior citizens are now the baby boomers arriving at retirement age, and in my district—I have Iowa—Iowa has the highest percentage of its population over age 85 of all the States, and there are 99 counties in Iowa. Ten of the 12 most senior counties in Iowa are in my district, western Iowa, the Fifth District of Iowa, which is 32 counties. Draw a line from Minnesota and Missouri and put a third of the State on the west side of that, that's the Fifth District.

In those 32 counties, we have 10 of the 12 most senior counties in the most senior State in America. So I will submit by that standard that I represent the most senior congressional district in America, a district that would have most likely the highest percentage of its people on Medicare and Social Security.

□ 2020

This President and his administration proposed and force fed legislation on the American people that would slash the already tight undercompensated budget of Medicare by \$532 billion because of a couple of things. One is they allege that there is fraud and corruption and waste, fraud and abuse in ObamaCare. We don't know whether that's true everywhere in America, but we know or I am confident that it's not true in the small towns in the rural areas, especially in the Midwest where I happen to have the privilege to serve. And so the idea is slash the budget of Medicare and

then if you do that it will magically find the corruption and the waste and chop it out.

Well, the people that are involved in gaming the system are the best at gaming the system. So those that are simply working on a stable budget providing services that aren't waste, fraud and abuse, they are likely the ones that get their budget cut because they are not going to be gaming the system. They are just honest people that are trying to provide services to senior citizens that need the help.

A \$532 billion cut, now here is where we find out also that ObamaCare, if you look at the real numbers, the numbers that are emerging, it's a trillion-dollar deficit, a trillion dollars over the budget projections. We are also seeing that they are putting things in place to ration our care; they are putting a CEO in place who is convinced that the United Kingdom, their socialized medicine is the best plan, worships at the altar of socialized medicine.

It looks like the British are starting to repeal their socialized medicine plan, and we have just adopted one in the form of ObamaCare. The American people don't yet know what all of this means.

The Speaker tells the Americans we have to pass ObamaCare, we have to pass the bill, she said, in order for you to learn what's in it. As if we can't read 2,300 or 2,400 pages and figure it out. Well, it's true, it isn't possible to read the bill and figure it out because you have to be able to understand and predict what the bureaucrats will do to write the rules in the aftermath, and that is just beginning.

But here are some things that I have seen and things that I know, Mr. Speaker, and that is that the President said he wanted to provide some competition into the health insurance industry and the problem was there wasn't enough competition for health insurance. So he wants to set up a public option. Do you remember that public option?

His public option would be Federal Government setting up an insurance company that would compete with the private sector health insurance companies. All right, so if there isn't enough competition, the first question the President should have asked and the first question that the pundits should have asked would be, Mr. President, do you have any idea how many insurance companies, health insurance companies there are in the United States?

If you want one more company to provide more competition, wouldn't you at least, before you came to such a conclusion, as the President has, wouldn't you ask the simple question, this is like the dumb question, how many insurance companies are there in America selling health insurance? I know it sounds a little dumb, Mr. Speaker, but there are a whole lot of people out there that made decisions on this that don't know the answer to this question.

So I checked it out: 1,300 health insurance companies in America, 1,300; 1,300 health insurance companies selling insurance in America and the President says we need more competition, so let's have a government company to compete against—I don't know what's in his head, one or three or five or so health insurance companies—1,300, Mr. President. That's a far cry from not having enough companies, I would say. And if you add one more and it's a government company, it's 1,301 companies. Is that really the bright, perfect balance number?

His motive isn't to provide more competition. His motive is to replace the private sector. He campaigned early on for the public option and also for a single-payer. The President is on record being for a single-payer. Single-payer is the government takes care of everything. They take care of providing all of the health insurance and all of the health care that there is.

By the way, where they get to the point where they would have a monopoly, it would wipe out the insurance component of this by arguing that we are wasting money administratively by helping people's health insurance policies. Why don't we just give them the health care? Why would we tell them you have to own your own policy, carry your own insurance card, pay your premium and we will back-fill your account. We will subsidize your premium if you aren't making enough money. We will tax you if you are making too much money.

This is a share-the-wealth Robin Hood strategy. The only thing is the President's idea that we are not going to increase taxes on anybody that is making less than \$250,000 a year turns out not to be true. It turns out to be false.

The question that needs to be asked there with the President is, Was it a mistake, Mr. President, or was it a willful misinformation to the American people? That's the question.

I remember during the campaign in 1996, when Charlton Heston at the time was the president of the National Rifle Association, ran commercials against Bill Clinton, the President. Charlton Heston said, you know, the question was did President Clinton tell the truth or did he lie, Mr. Speaker?

Charlton Heston's comment was this. He said, Mr. President, if you say something that's wrong and you don't know that it's wrong, that's called a mistake. If you say something that's wrong and you know that it's wrong, that's a lie.

The question becomes what did the President believe when he repeated to the American people that he would not raise taxes on the American people if you made less than \$250,000 a year?

ObamaCare raises taxes on many people that make less than \$250,000 a year. It imposes an individual mandate that requires everybody to buy insurance or be fined and punished and penalized for doing the same. That's never been a requirement by the Federal Government

in the history of this country that the Federal Government would produce a product or approve a product and compel the American people to buy it.

So if they are going to approve the health insurance policies that are produced by, let's say, Wellmark or some other company, we say, we like your policy and your policy and your policy and our health choices health administration czar, I call him the commaczarishioner, will pick some of these 1,300 companies that exist when ObamaCare was passed and say, I anoint these policies but you have got to adjust them all to match the demand of the rules to be written by the Health Choices Administration commaczarishioner.

Once we approve all this, then it will be a decision of how many companies will be left to do business and the Federal Government injecting themselves to compete directly against that, and then every health insurance policy in America under those standards—well, actually, every health insurance policy that is effective today will be effectively canceled by the Federal Government under the law and under the rule.

They will have to requalify. Actually, they will have to qualify under Federal standards yet to be written.

There is not a single policy in America that the President of the United States himself, even if it was at a beer summit back in the South Lawn of the White House, of all 100,000 policies in America, Mr. Speaker, there is not one that the President of the United States himself could pull out of that stack of 100,000 policies. That's a pretty deep stack, maybe that high, and point to it and say this policy, Mr. or Mrs. American, is your policy and you get to keep it, and the substance of the benefits on it will not be changed, and your premiums will not increase or be altered dramatically different than the markets would normally move it. Not one policy out of any one of the millions of Americans that are insured and not one policy out of the 100,000 varieties that are out there to be sold can be guaranteed, even by the President of the United States.

The man who fired the CEO of General Motors, replaced the board of directors, all but two, reminded us that he is the President and he gets to do these things. Maybe he is also the one that has brought about the firing or the elimination, the replacement of the CEO of BP. I think he would be pretty proud of that if he could get right down to the inner soul of who he is.

But there is not one policy in America that he can point to and say this is yours, you get to keep it; the premium is not going to be altered substantively and neither will the terms of the benefits that are in it, not one. They will all get canceled. All of them that will be viable on the other side of the implementation of ObamaCare after 2014, all have to qualify.

You know, that's like, that's like going to the racetrack and having the

fastest car and you have been around and around the racetrack, and you set your standards. And when you pull on there with that nice, fastest car, and you have got to go back and you have got to run the laps and go again and qualify again and again and again, that's what it is.

□ 2030

That's what it is. Everybody's got to qualify. Many won't. Many companies will be broke. They will be driven down. A lot of these policies will have to be rewritten, premiums will go up, but that's also part of the equation. There's more to that. Employers will look at the penalty, the 8 percent penalty on payroll, those that employ 50 or more, and they will decide, many of them, I can pay the 8 percent penalty for not insuring my employees cheaper than I can pay their premiums, so why would I knuckle under and comply with a Federal mandate when it's cheaper to do something else?

And then you will have individuals that will be self-employed, those who will be working for companies that don't have 50 or more employees. Those companies are going to be providing health insurance less and less, and those employees that don't have health insurance are going to be more likely to just pay the penalty because they know this: They've got guarantee issue. They've got preexisting condition language that's there. So why would you buy insurance if you could just simply buy the insurance when you get sick, on your way to the hospital, in the hospital, from intensive care? Sign the application, pay the premium like somebody that's completely robustly healthy and pay the same premium.

This is the myopic thinking that comes from the White House and from the other side of the aisle. They don't understand how business works. They don't understand how insurance works. They understand how socialism works, and they're seeking to drag us there.

Now, I used to refrain from saying such things, Mr. Speaker, but the evidence is so replete, and it's a constant out there among the American people. They understand this. Some of this actually began at the end of the Bush administration—all of this, though, with the blessing of now President Obama. But we had a \$700 billion TARP program that was a mistake; \$350 billion of that was passed in the lame duck of the Bush administration. And then there was the nationalization of three large investment banks, AIG, Fannie Mae/Freddie Mac, General Motors/Chrysler, a takeover of the student loan program in the United States that not that many years ago was all private. Now it's all run by the Department of Education, every bit of it. And if you're wondering about this pattern, this isn't something that they don't understand. They know what they're doing.

Back in 1960, 1960, 1961 and 1962, in that era, the only flood insurance that

you could buy in America was sold at the private sector, property and casualty flood insurance. So if you lived in a floodplain, you could pay the premium to a private sector company and you could protect yourself from floods. But the Federal Government decided they would get involved in the Federal flood insurance program and they passed that. Just a few years later, there was no longer any private sector property and casualty flood insurance in America. There hasn't been any for almost 50 years. Almost 50 years since we've had private sector property and casualty insurance, because the Federal Government got in the business and they couldn't compete well enough in the beginning, but then they passed legislation that required that anybody that had a loan through a national bank had to buy flood insurance. So the flood insurance premiums were compelled as a condition of the loan, and so they imposed a requirement to pay those premiums. And over time, they pushed out the property and casualty people, the private property and casualty people, and the flood insurance program became 100 percent Federal Government.

Now, you can't go out in the market—and for years you have not been able to go out in the market—and buy flood insurance. You have to buy that through the Federal flood insurance program. And curiously, that program is \$19.2 billion in the red, Mr. Speaker, and they're looking for ways to compel more people to pay premiums because the value of those premiums hasn't reflected the risk or else they paid out the benefits in such a way. I think it's a combination of the two, but mostly the premiums haven't reflected the value of the risk. They haven't run their insurance company very well. They're the government, after all. And if they fail to meet a casualty, they don't go broke. They just run deficit spending or come back to this Congress and ask us to borrow money from the Chinese to backfill their business inefficiencies, and that's the model.

So we've got a Federal flood insurance program that is a bust—\$19.2 billion. We've got the student loan program now taken over by the Department of Education and done so in the dark of the night as part of a reconciliation package that circumvented the filibuster rules in the Senate and was attached to the last-minute deals that were made in place on ObamaCare. And now we've got ObamaCare, and it will move itself towards the nationalization of our health care. In fact, I'd say it is the nationalization of our health care, because there isn't anybody in America that will be able to manage their health care anymore at their own choice.

The markets will not establish the demand. You will not be able to go to an insurance company and, say, if you and a million other people in America want to be able to buy low-premium catastrophic insurance—let's just say

you're 22 or 23 years old, in robust health and you've got an income where you're making \$25,000 a year and your employer is not providing your health insurance, but you want to be responsible and you want to pay for catastrophic insurance and you say, I want to have a \$2,500 deductible premium that only pays catastrophic.

You should be able to buy that really cheaply in the marketplace. And what's going to happen? I guarantee you, it will not exist. It will not exist because the community ratings at 3-1 already eliminate catastrophic, low-premium health insurance for young people, which means they have to pay a disproportionate share of the premium.

And when they look at that, they wonder, What am I getting back for my money? Well, they're getting the privilege of paying somebody else's health insurance premium that levels this out a little bit, as if the generations has an equal shot at it.

But here's what happens. Young people that are healthy don't have very many health insurance and health care claims. Their premiums generally have reflected the risk in the States where the States allow them to do that, and it's many—in fact, it's most. But under ObamaCare, with the 3-1 community rating, now that premium can't be anything less than one-third of the highest premium that's charged out there.

So if you have somebody with, let's say, a bad health record that you would charge a high premium to, your low-income guy has got to subsidize the high-claims guy. And the world doesn't sit there just so that a younger person with low health care claims can't afford to pay a lot more premium than that. Well, they're not a lot more risk than that either. But somebody that gets on upwards to their income peak earning level—I don't know what that number is but I'm just going to say 55 just to pick a number. Your income earning capacity increases throughout your lifetime to a certain point and then it tends to level off as people start to retire. So let's just say mid-fifties. That's the time also that health tends to cost more, in the aftermath of the mid-fifties. So the premiums go up, and that's a higher income time of life.

Why would we go down to the younger people and discourage them from buying insurance, people that will drop off and pay the penalty instead of the premium because we've rigged the game in favor of the people at the upper age group and the upper claims group of this? Again, it defies logic.

We could go on and on about how bad ObamaCare is, Mr. Speaker, but I just want to make this point. I brought legislation to repeal ObamaCare. I could not sleep the night this passed. I typed up a request for the bill draft and I sent it to leg. counsel at the opening of business that morning. It was a Monday morning. That draft came back to me completed in legislative form within 3 minutes of the time that Congress-

woman MICHELE BACHMANN's repeal bill also came down. Within 3 minutes. Each of them were 40 words. They were verbatim to each other, pieces of legislation that were pure in their simplicity, 2,000-plus pages of ObamaCare ripped out by the roots, lock, stock and barrel if we pass this legislation that is so simple that repeals all of ObamaCare, 100 percent of ObamaCare, lock, stock and barrel, not one vestige of it left behind, not one particle of ObamaCare DNA left behind.

It has become a malignant tumor in our society. It is metastasizing as we speak, and it has got to be repealed. Every single word of it, every component of ObamaCare has got to be repealed. MICHELE BACHMANN's legislation does that. Mine does that. CONNIE MACK's of Florida repeals it. Also, Parker Griffith's of Alabama, BOB INGLES of South Carolina, all—those are the ones I can think of. I think JERRY MORAN will be another one—have introduced legislation that repeals ObamaCare, all of it, lock, stock and barrel. That needs to happen, Mr. Speaker, if we're to have our liberty back, if we're to have our freedom back. If we're to have our American vitality back, it's got to go, all of it.

Now, what I have done is worked that legislation pretty hard. I ended up with 89 signatures, and I'm still taking more if they will sign them on, to the repeal legislation.

□ 2040

Most of those people who signed onto my bill I asked to sign onto the bills of the others, especially onto MICHELE BACHMANN's, because she had worked it so hard, but it ended up there were a few more signatures on my bill than on the others, so I introduced a discharge petition some 5 or 6 weeks ago.

A discharge petition, Mr. Speaker, is the one single tool that the disenfranchised majority opinion in this Congress can use to bring legislation to the floor over the will of the Speaker of the House, NANCY PELOSI. Any other method that we might have to move legislation here in the House is blocked by the iron fist of the Speaker. Any legislation we try to move through committee will go nowhere. No matter what the support is for a bill, if the Speaker doesn't want it to move, it doesn't move. If you want a hearing for a piece of legislation before a committee, you will not get that hearing. If you want a markup before a subcommittee or a full committee, you will not get that markup. The Speaker will decide whether it moves or whether it doesn't. It is an iron fist, a draconian hand, that shuts down the opportunity for the will of the people to be manifested in a recorded vote on the floor of the House of Representatives.

There is only one tool—only one tool, Mr. Speaker—and that is a discharge petition. It is there to give relief for the will of the people in America reflected in this republican form of government that is guaranteed to us in the United States Constitution.

It is a discharge petition.

When a bill has been introduced here into the House and has been allowed to cure for a minimum of 30 legislative days, then it can be converted into a discharge petition on file right over here with the Clerk of the House, and that requires a signature on that document and an initial of the Members of Congress who support it. Now, those signatures are accumulated here on this discharge petition, Mr. Speaker, and it is discharge petition No. 11 that repeals 100 percent of ObamaCare. That discharge petition that is on file has my signature at the top. It has MICHELE BACHMANN's right there with mine and with CONNIE MACK's at the top, and it goes right on down the line.

When I first filed it, some of the critics out there in America said, Well, there's an act of frustration. He won't be able to get anything done on this. They aren't going to sign onto that discharge petition.

Well, we can take a look and see what has happened today, Mr. Speaker. In fact, we can check it currently, and I might be able to do that, actually, on the fly. We are at least at 159—I think at 160—on the discharge petition. When we get to 218, then we will be able to bring that bill to the floor for an up-or-down vote. No amendments. It cannot be blocked by the Speaker of the House. That is what a discharge petition does.

Let me see. There we go. I'll get this going and try to give you a report, Mr. Speaker.

This discharge petition No. 11 is here in the well. Republicans have lined up to sign that petition, and they have done so repeatedly and consistently. It is a logistical difficulty to get that many people to go to the well and sign a discharge petition, but we are up to 159 or 160 on this petition, and there are others who have agreed to sign.

Of the Republicans, Mr. Speaker, there are only 14, by current count, who haven't either signed this discharge petition or haven't agreed to sign the discharge petition. All of the elected leadership has signed. In fact, I am seeing a notice here that all of the appointed leadership has signed. The entire leadership team has agreed to sign the discharge petition. Actually, the entire leadership team on the Republican side has signed the discharge petition. That's 100 percent support by the leadership team and by the Republican Conference. That is Leader BOEHNER. That is Whip ERIC CANTOR. That is Republican Conference Chair and master communicator MIKE PENCE. That is everybody along the line who you will see who line up at the microphones to lay out our Republican policy.

One hundred sixty of us altogether have signed. There is at least another four who have agreed to who haven't quite made it down here to put their John Henrys on the discharge petition. That is very, very close to a full court effort here in the House, and I think

that the Republican numbers have an opportunity, by the end of this week, to be signatories on the discharge petition, totaling perhaps all but maybe four who have a little difficulty getting there. I'm expecting that we'll have a chance to get to that point, and maybe, just maybe, on the best day, every Republican will have signed the discharge petition. I hope we get there because here is what it is about, Mr. Speaker.

Thirty-four Democrats voted "no" on ObamaCare. Every single Republican voted "no" on ObamaCare. It was universal. Every Republican opposed it and 34 Democrats opposed it. Why did they vote "no"? That question is out there. The American people are wondering this, Mr. Speaker. Why? Did they oppose ObamaCare? Did they do so on a philosophical basis? Was it a policy question?

Every one of them would like to tell you it's a policy question. Well, is it ever a policy question in some of their cases? I think we're going to find out. Were they voting "no" on ObamaCare because the Speaker of the House said, "I don't have to have your vote. Go ahead and vote 'no,' and then you can posture yourself back in your district as someone who is against ObamaCare and as someone who is not necessarily doing the bidding of the Speaker of the House from San Francisco"?

Well, this San Francisco agenda has been driven through this House because every single Democrat voted for NANCY PELOSI as Speaker—every one. All 34 of those Democrats who voted "no" on ObamaCare voted for NANCY PELOSI.

So, when you think about how this fits together, if they voted for NANCY PELOSI for Speaker, they enabled the San Francisco agenda to be driven through this House of Representatives. That includes cap-and-tax. It includes ObamaCare. It includes Barney Frank's financial reform legislation that sets the Federal Government up to be in a position to take over our lending institutions, or at least the larger ones if they decide to do so. All of that agenda and more has been driven by the Speaker of the House—NANCY PELOSI from San Francisco, a San Francisco agenda imposed upon America—because every Democrat voted for NANCY PELOSI for Speaker.

Now they'll be going back home at the end of this week, and they're going to say, I voted "no" on ObamaCare. It was a tough vote on cap-and-tax. I was doing something because I had a little nuance here.

I know one Member of Congress, who is part of the Iowa delegation, who said, Well, I think the bill has gotten better here in the House, and I'm going to vote for cap-and-tax because I think they're going to fix it down the hall in the Senate.

You'd sell out your franchise like that? If you had any leverage to fix anything, you just lost it when you voted for it and sent the bill down to the Senate. You stand here, and you hold your vote "no." You don't hold

your nose and vote "yes" and say you've done something responsible.

Where we are, Mr. Speaker, is this: ObamaCare has got to be repealed. There are 34 Democrats who said they were opposed to it who will have an opportunity to prove it right here at the well by signing discharge petition No. 11. Thirty-four Democrats voted "no" on ObamaCare. If they are sincere, they will sign the discharge petition. They will be added to the Republicans who have signed it and to those who will. There will be more tomorrow, and there will be more the next day. I can guarantee that, Mr. Speaker. When we get to this point, we will find out the separation between the women and the girls and the men and the boys.

Were they for the repeal of ObamaCare? If they opposed it in their votes, they shouldn't be for it in policy today. If they are going to duck and cover and try to have it both ways, a discharge petition will help separate that. In fact, it will separate it, and the American people will know the difference. We will gavel out of here perhaps on Thursday night, and most every Republican will have signed the discharge petition. I am hopeful there will be a handful of Democrats who will step up to it, who will take a stand and say, I really meant it when I voted "no" on ObamaCare, and I'm going to put my signature down here on this discharge petition, which commits them to voting for the repeal of ObamaCare if we get 218 signatures and it comes to the floor.

That is being honest with America. That is sending a message out across America. It is giving the constituents in each of these congressional districts an opportunity to take a look at the real record, an opportunity to evaluate the real positions of the Members of Congress—not the smoke and mirrors version, not the duplicity, not the straddle-the-fence version, but the real version, which is, if you voted "no" on ObamaCare, you'd better be for the repeal of ObamaCare. If you voted "yes" on ObamaCare, you might want to reconsider and sign the discharge petition anyway because it is bad policy. It is lousy policy. It can't be afforded. In no way can it be calculated to fit within anything that we might be able to sustain. It is unsustainable.

It is unforgivable to do this to the American people and to take away our freedom to manage our health care—to go out in the market and buy the health insurance policy that we want.

There are many things we can do for reform. There are many things we have tried to do for reform. We sent some of them over to the Senate when the Republicans were in charge here in the majority, and they got locked up with the trial lawyers in the Senate. We are going to have to roll the trial lawyers. That has to happen in this next Congress and in the Congress after that, Mr. Speaker, but we cannot tolerate a Congress that drives up the spending in America, one that runs in a \$1.4 trillion

or \$1.5 trillion deficit. That is 10 times the average deficit under George Bush.

□ 2050

And still they stand up and say, Bush's fault, Bush's fault. Bush's fault?

\$140 billion deficit under Bush. Now, I'd like to have balanced the budget, and I voted for a number of balanced budgets and I'll keep doing that. And I'm an original cosponsor of the balanced budget amendment.

But, Mr. Speaker, to equate a \$1.4 trillion deficit and \$1.8 trillion deficit coming the year behind that, and to equate that to a \$140 billion deficit, it defies any rational thought, Mr. Speaker.

And I hope that I have conveyed some rational thought for you tonight, and I'm glad that you paid attention.

CORRECTING THE RECORD

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

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I'm going to rise this evening with some of my colleagues to repudiate some of the comments that have been made here tonight, to correct some of the record, and to provide, I think, the real story, Mr. Speaker, of what is going on in America and compare that—and my friend from Iowa, who was up here prior to me stated that it's about the record. And I would 100 percent agree: it is about the record.

And if you look at the past few years prior to the Democrats taking over, our friends on the other side had complete control of the entire Federal Government. And in States like Ohio, they had control of the whole Ohio Government.

And with President Bush, Republican House, Republican Senate, they had an opportunity to implement their economic policy. They had an opportunity to implement their foreign policy. They had an opportunity to implement their energy policy. They had an opportunity to implement their health care policy.

All across the board, our friends on the other side had an opportunity to govern this great country. And the end result, we saw just a few short years ago with deregulation of Wall Street, turning a blind eye to what was going on, hoping that the health care problem would go away, hoping that the energy policy, the energy problems we had in this country would go away.

And the end result was what happened just a couple of years ago with the complete collapse of the American economy, with trillions and trillions and trillions of dollars lost by American families and American businesses, with millions of people losing their homes due to foreclosure, with the Federal Government down here saying that government never works, it has no