

that allows you to steal their money against their will and give it to charities that only the government supports. That's not part of it.

It is supposed to protect the people, punish evil, and really incentivize good conduct and to help people reach their potential. Instead of enslaving young women, as the Great Society legislation did, good grief, we should have incentivized them to finish their education.

Instead of having 99 weeks of unemployment insurance to pay people not to work, and, yes, I know there are people who are out of work who have been trying for hours and hours every day to find new employment, but the overall studies don't indicate that that's the average. That's the exception. Generally, people only spend less than an hour a day or less than an hour a week until the last couple of weeks of their unemployment, then they begin to seek employment.

If we're going to do what some would consider the biblical approach of government, to punish evil but reward and incentivize good conduct, then we would eliminate the marriage penalty. Why penalize marriage?

And we would incentivize people finishing their education, not paying them to have babies out of wedlock and not to finish school. We would be incentivizing them to reach their God-given potential before it's too late. That's what a caring government does. That's what it should do. That's what it ought to be about. End the class warfare.

Now, I was asked recently, well, now, you've advocated eliminating the Department of Education. And yet you've also talked about schools ought to provide vocational training. Right on both counts. \$68 billion budget, throw another \$10 billion in there this year, and for what? Pays the Department of Education, have lots and lots of bureaucrats, take a hunk of the money for themselves, dole out the rest.

And I get it. I've got friends, Republicans, Democrats on school boards across the country who've said we've become so enslaved, so reliant on Federal money, we'll be broke as a school system if you cut off the funds immediately.

So what I think would be more fair, would be more constitutional is just say, we eliminate the Department of Education, and then we'll take that money and we will have a formula to distribute it to the schools across the country. And they'll get a lot more money. And then over, say, a 5-year period—I'm flexible—we could compromise on what would be a good way to do it. You provide a formula that the States and the people, under the 10th Amendment, pick up their obligation to support education and take it away from the Federal Government. We cut the required contributions to other areas, whether it's Medicaid or something else. We incentivize them to take over their constitutional obliga-

tion. Since education's not an enumerated power under the Constitution, it's reserved under the 10th Amendment to the States and people.

Let the local control take over, because when there was no Federal control and when I was going through school, high schools had vocational training. You didn't have to go to college to make a great living. You could study auto repair at our high school. You could learn to be a carpenter. You could learn to weld. You could learn all kinds of great trades and go immediately into a good job, and you're way ahead in income than those people that went to college. In four or five years eventually they catch up and went further with the money they received. But they were great livings. And we need people doing those jobs.

And one final comment as my time is about to expire: I heard Donald Trump say on Greta Van Susteren that the solution is to put a 25 percent tax on everything we buy from China. I couldn't believe it. You're going to start a trade war with somebody we owe over \$1 trillion to? You think that's smart? You don't realize we'll lose great jobs, union jobs, nonunion jobs across America?

□ 2020

How about, instead, doing something that doesn't trigger a trade war, that doesn't cause us to be penalized around the world? How about, instead, eliminating the 35 percent tariff we put on our own products for people in other countries trying to buy them? It is called a corporate tax.

If you eliminate the 35 percent tariff we have got on our own products, union jobs and nonunion jobs will come flooding back into America, because we could compete with anybody if you take off that insidious tax that tells people across America: You don't have to pay it; the evil corporations will pay it.

Those corporations pass it on. If they don't, they don't stay in business. Yet they have lost jobs across this country, union jobs and nonunion jobs, flooding across to other nations because of the tariff of 35 percent we slap on our own products, making them uncompetitive.

It is time to get this country competitive again. Bring back the jobs to America in the way that we know best, as a free market society, at the same time we protect our borders and stop the crazy deficit spending.

I yield back the balance of my time.

#### STAFF SERGEANT SALVATORE GIUNTA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TONKO). 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 of Representatives and be one of the first

speakers here on the floor in the aftermath of the election that took place a little over a week ago.

I have a number of things that I hope to discuss this evening; however, I would like to start this presentation this evening, Mr. Speaker, with a recognition of valor of an Iowan who tomorrow will be receiving the Medal of Honor that will be hung around his neck and presented to him by our Commander in Chief, President Obama, at a ceremony at the White House.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor an American hero, Staff Sergeant Salvatore Giunta. He is of the 173rd Airborne Brigade Combat Team from Hiawatha, Iowa. He will be presented with the Medal on November 16, tomorrow, at the White House by the President for distinguishing himself by acts of gallantry at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty.

In October 2007, while moving along a wooded area with an eight-man squad in Korengal Valley, Afghanistan, the squad was ambushed on three sides by at least a dozen Taliban fighters.

Even though Staff Sergeant Giunta received several gunshot wounds, he continued the fight, running straight into the path of gunfire to rescue one wounded soldier and saving his life as he drug him back to safety, then running again directly into the path of oncoming gunfire to overtake and kill two fighters while rescuing his brother in arms, Sergeant Josh Brennan. Even though Sergeant Brennan would later die in surgery, the family still had the comfort of knowing that his brothers were with him and had rescued him from being taken captive by the enemy.

That is a small segment of that engagement that day in October of 2007, and, Mr. Speaker, it is our privilege to express our great gratitude and to honor Staff Sergeant Salvatore Giunta.

To commemorate this gallantry and this Medal of Honor, which will be the first Medal of Honor that will be awarded to a surviving American servicemember for either of the Iraq or Afghanistan conflicts, probably the greatest supporter and cheerleader and respecter of our military, our veterans, our combat veterans, and especially our combat wounded, works in this Capitol every day reaching out to them—Albert Caswell. Albert has written a number of poems that he has presented to the wounded and to the families. He has provided a tremendous amount of comfort for those who have suffered so much for our liberty and for our freedom.

This poem is something that he sat up last night and penned. Mr. Speaker, I read this into the record out of great respect for his contribution, and also great respect for the Medal of Honor winner that tomorrow will receive that medal from the President, Staff Sergeant Salvatore Giunta. This poem is called "At Honor's Height." It reads, this:

At . . .

All, At Honor's Height!  
 All in the darkness of war . . . this fight!  
 All in those most sacred moments, that  
 which ignite!  
 When, who lives or dies . . . and but lives to  
 see another sunrise . . .  
 So Sal, so all depended upon you . . .  
 While, against all odds . . . as you stood so  
 tall, almost like a God!  
 As into the face of death you ran . . .  
 As did all your brothers in arms, so too, who  
 on this day began . . .  
 Such Brilliance, Such Light, So True This  
 Sight . . . your hue!  
 All At Honor's Height, as were you!  
 Hooah . . . Airborne! With but your badge of  
 courage worn!  
 As all in that moment, as when your faith so  
 chose to crest!  
 All in your actions, and deeds . . . to answer  
 freedom's quest!  
 As your heart so sailed, up to new heights  
 . . . so now!  
 All in your most selfless light!  
 Its Highest Point, At Honor's Height!  
 Turning The Darkness, Into The Light!  
 To win that day! To win that night!  
 All At Honor's Height!  
 For there can be no greater gift!  
 Nor then there, no more blessed thing as  
 this!  
 Then, but the will to give up one's life!  
 All for, your Brothers in Arms . . . this most  
 sacred sacrifice!  
 While, all in that moment of truth . . . by  
 bringing your light . . .  
 Which, so brings such tears . . . even to the  
 Angels' eyes, this night!  
 Ah yes you, Sal, so stand this day, all at  
 Honor's Height!  
 All in what you so gave . . . so brilliant and  
 bright!  
 For what child shall so be born, all from  
 your gift in future's worn?  
 Who might so save the world, or in harm's  
 way so too . . . climb to such heights!  
 For on this day, you and your Brother In  
 Arms have so shown us all the way . . .  
 To Honor's Height!

Mr. Speaker, I don't have the words to embellish the actions of Staff Sergeant Salvatore Giunta, nor do I have the words to embellish the poem that has been so brilliantly written by Albert Caswell, "At Honor's Height," to commemorate the gallantry, the bravery, the nobility of this Iowan who tomorrow will be so profoundly honored at the ceremony in the White House and the presentation of the Medal of Honor.

I have had the privilege to get to know one of our top Medal of Honor recipients in the Nation. In fact, the most decorated living American is Colonel Bud Day, also from Iowa. We happen to have three living recipients of the Medal of Honor that I claim as Iowans, and Colonel Day heads up that list as the dean of them. He was the top officer in the Hanoi Hilton in Vietnam during the Vietnam War. He is a World War II, Korean, and Vietnam veteran. He also has been an honorable and noble leader here in America that has stepped forward and worn the Medal of Honor with courage and dignity, and he has been a noble American in every day of his civilian life as well as his invested life.

He has made the advice for Medal of Honor winners that: You wear that

medal every day of your life; that when you receive the medal, everyone looks at you and wherever you go they know that you have received the Medal of Honor, so all of your behavior is observed more closely than it might be if you were perhaps significantly more anonymous. So you can cast disgrace on America or you can cast honor on America.

The Medal of Honor recipients have by and large, and in all cases that I know of, cast honor on America by their deeds, by their bravery, by their nobility, and by their actions as they proceed through the course of perhaps post-military service and being Americans in a most honorable fashion of seeking to make America a better place to live in.

□ 2030

We look forward to the future that Staff Sergeant Salvatore Giunta has and the message that he will deliver to this country as he proudly wears the Medal of Honor. I ask that this Congress stop and pause and reflect upon the sacrifice that he has made.

I think also that there are circumstances where we have lost Americans who have conducted themselves in as noble a fashion who are unrecognized. I pray that Staff Sergeant Salvatore Giunta does grow old here in America and leaves the legacy of his nobility and bravery wherever he goes as an inspiration to the young, as an inspiration to all of us. He is certainly an inspiration to me, and he should be an inspiration to us here in this Congress.

As someone says, I don't really want to have that debate. It is a brutal debate. We have never had such a thing here in this Congress. There are brutal battles in war. Lives are lost, blood is spilled, hearts are broken, destinies are changed. The destiny of America has turned for the better when the destinies of individuals are occasionally sacrificed in that noble cause. And Staff Sergeant Giunta was willing to make that sacrifice. He stepped into the gunfire over and over again. Tomorrow he steps up to receive the Medal of Honor from the Commander in Chief, the President of the United States.

I salute Staff Sergeant Salvatore Giunta, and I ask that especially the young people in America look up to him as an example. There are many others. Tomorrow we honor Staff Sergeant Giunta.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your indulgence on this subject matter, and I appreciate the privilege to deliver this summary of Staff Sergeant Giunta's sacrifice here on the floor.

I ask that as we go forward into the 112th Congress, we keep in mind, we get into our parochial battles here, and I mean that, of course, figuratively, because they really aren't battles by comparison. And we wear the Repub-

lican jerseys, the people on the other side wear the Democrat jerseys, and we go at each other day after day here trying to gain some kind of advantage.

This Congress, Mr. Speaker, especially over the last 2 years, but I think over the last four, and those on this side of the aisle would say, no, further back than that, has gotten away from the principle of doing the right thing for the American people and instead gotten involved in the one-upmanship that takes place when you have partisan conflict here.

I do recall coming to this Congress when I was elected and sworn in here on this floor in 2003. And I recall those 4 years, and subsequent to that, if I had a policy issue, I had constituents that had a problem that needed to be dealt with, if I had something that made a good argument for where we could take America, I took that argument to the committee or I took it to the committee chairs. I took it to members of the committee. I testified before committees to move that policy forward, Mr. Speaker, and there was an ear for a policy discussion. That ear was there on the part of the committee chairs, the members of the committee, to a certain degree with the leadership, that would seek to accommodate those concerns that I would bring forward.

I am convinced that most of the Members were in the same condition I was in. There was an ear there and the system was set up so that the wisdom of the American people could be synthesized and poured into each of the 435 Members of Congress. We would sort those issues out and raise the priorities of them, and as we brought those issues here and the priorities came to the top, this Congress acted upon those priorities. At least the process and the system was wired to do that.

Sometime in 2007, perhaps, that began to devolve. In 2007, in the beginning of that session, we did have a legitimate appropriations process where we had an open rule and a Member could write an amendment to an appropriations bill, bring it down here to the floor and introduce that amendment, and if it met the rules of the Parliamentarian, it would be deemed in order and one could force a debate and a recorded vote on an issue that had to do with an appropriations bill.

Now, that had gone on for 200 years in this Congress. And it went on in the early part of 2007, which I remember is the last time we had a legitimate appropriations process with open rules. And along about 2008, that began to get shut down. And by 2009 and 2010, it was shut down and Members of Congress, Democrats and Republicans, were shut out of the process.

Our constituents can't understand about electing someone to the United

States Congress, it a powerful seat, 1/435th of the spending and the initiation of the taxation and the deliberative proceedings that take place as directed by our Constitution, electing someone to establish that franchise, and having that franchise cut out from underneath them because the Speaker of the House had deemed that there wouldn't be any amendments on appropriations bills, there wouldn't be any open rules on appropriations results.

I am pretty sensitive to this, Mr. Speaker, because in 2007, my staff analyzed this—I didn't pay attention to it—they analyzed it and concluded that I had introduced and successfully passed more amendments than anybody else in Congress in that appropriations process of 2007. And I look back on that time and I think, where have we gone?

We have gone from having an active open rule that was consistent with the first two centuries of American process here in this Congress to a kind of system that not only is there a closed rule on appropriations bills, it has been shut off now for 2 years, but no appropriations bills. No budget. Just a continuing resolution, a CR, that is written in the Speaker's office by the Speaker's staff. And if someone can knock on the door and slip a piece of paper underneath the door, and if somebody inside there decides they want to incorporate it, you might actually be able to have your voice heard.

But the voice of the American people has been shut out, and that intransigence is one of the biggest problems we have had in this Congress.

If we don't have enough faith in the positions that we take here that we can allow open public debate, and if we can't allow amendments to be offered, debated, and voted upon so that we can perfect legislation in subcommittee, in committee, and here on the floor, then the system is dysfunctional, and it shuts out the wisdom of the American people and it puts it into a monopoly of one office, the Speaker's office, the Speaker's staff, and to the extent that any of the committees can weigh in.

That is the piece that I am hopeful will change. That is the pledges that I am hearing, that we are going to see more open rules, the appropriations process comes down with open rules, and that any Member of Congress, whether they be Democrats or Republicans, can offer essentially an unlimited number of amendments in an appropriations process so that the American people can see it is a legitimate process, we can debate those issues, we can vote them up or down, and we can move on.

Mr. Speaker, I am looking forward to this reversion back to the fresh air we had, some might say a new breath of fresh air. I would say it is reverting back to the fresh air we had. And it is high time. And all of the issues that have been debated up and down in the media, a lot of them didn't see the light of day here in this Congress, and

I am hopeful they will see the light of day.

The first issue that I am hopeful that is debated here in this upcoming 112th Congress with this incoming new freshman class, these 80-some arriving new freshmen, actually it might be in the nineties by the time we add those on the other side of the aisle too, I believe as God's gift to America, just in time. I think the cavalry has arrived.

I think we have been fighting the battle of the Alamo, and we actually held out before we got overrun. And this massive freshman class full of conviction and vigor and dreams and passion, the lifeblood of the vigor of America, is in this city now, going through orientation, getting prepared, putting their offices together, hiring their staff, finding out where everything is, positioning themselves for committee assignments, et cetera, so that they can hit the ground running here on the 4th of January, when they will swear in to the new 112th Congress in large numbers, 80-some Republican freshmen, who will bring their vigor and their legislative valor here to this floor. And they expect that their voice is going to be heard, and we need to make sure that their voice is heard and that the process is open.

It might mean long days, long nights, long debates. It might mean we get a little tired of coming back over here to vote time and time and time again. But the American people expect us to do our work, we should want to do our work, and in fact if we shrink from that, the work product that we have won't be the work product of the reflection of the wisdom of the American people, Mr. Speaker; it will be the work product then of folks that are sitting behind closed doors instead of out here in front of the C-SPAN cameras where we belong. We should be doing our business here.

But that first piece of business that I am hopeful comes out in the 112th Congress, and think it will have the full-throated support of that freshman class that is prepared to grab ahold of the levers here in the 112th Congress, I am hopeful, and I will seek to establish that H.R. 1, the first bill coming out of the chute, is the repeal of ObamaCare.

If there is any piece of legislation that symbolizes this dramatic change that has taken place here in the seats here in Congress, these 290-plus freshmen that will be seated here, most all of them Republicans, if there is any one single piece of policy that embodies that reason for the transformation, the passing of the gavel, it is the repeal of ObamaCare as the clearest example of what people have risen up against.

□ 2040

I remember 4 years ago—it will be 4 years in January—right behind me, Mr. Speaker, as the gavel was passed from Republican to Democrat; from JOHN BOEHNER to NANCY PELOSI, the incoming Speaker of the House of Represent-

atives. I remember that day. It was a historic day, the first female Speaker of the United States House of Representatives in its history. Nearly 4 years have gone by. Some would say a lot of water under the Golden Gate Bridge since that period of time, Mr. Speaker. And we have seen unpopular policy after unpopular policy come unfolded. For example, the theory that spending billions of dollars extending unemployment benefits is the best bang for the taxpayer's buck when it comes to stimulating the economy. I was not prepared to rebut such an argument. I never conceived of such a thing. But that's one of the principles that the American people know better, and they went to the polls and said, Uh-huh. We're really uneasy with that path it is going down.

The idea of pushing ObamaCare down the throats of the American people when it was clear that they had rejected it; when you think of tens of thousands of people who poured into this city I will say a year and a week ago on November 5, a little more than that now, but it was November 5, 2009. Tens of thousands of people were stacked up out here on the West Lawn of the Capitol building, swarmed around the Capitol. They swarmed down through the hallways of the office buildings. They came out here to say, Keep your hands off of our health care. We don't want ObamaCare.

This Nation has never seen the kind of resistance that we saw come out of the streets of America in opposition to a policy this was proposed. We have never seen that. And it says in the Constitution freedom of speech, religion, and the press, and the freedom to petition the government—peacefully petition the government for redress of grievances. And they did, all within the confines of the Constitution, a lot of them with the Constitution in their pocket. It was in their head and in their hearts and tears running down their cheeks because they saw what was being done to America. They saw what was being done to the Constitution. And they saw what was being done to their personal liberty and their personal freedom. And they came here to this city and to most of the big cities—in fact, most of the towns and even county seat towns in Iowa, people filled up the meetings to resist the coming of ObamaCare.

That was the summer buildup in 2009 to the vote that took place here in the House on November 7, 2009. And then we saw a vote on Christmas Eve in the Senate when HARRY REID decided that he had enough leverage on people that if they wanted to go home for Christmas vacation and see their families, they had to catch a plane on Christmas Eve. If they'd have held out until 9 o'clock that night instead of 9 o'clock that morning, a lot of those Senators would have spent Christmas here in Washington, D.C., which is what they deserved. They deserve coal in their stocking for what they did that day.

But they passed through by using the leverage that they had and with no margins to spare a health care bill that didn't match the one here in the House. But they moved the ball down the field a little ways on Christmas Eve. So that would be December 24.

And now some of us said, What do we do? How do we stop this ObamaCare juggernaut that had passed the House on November 7, 2009, and a different version of it squeaked—and squeaked through the House, too, but squeaked through the Senate on Christmas Eve morning—How do we stop it now? And I asked one of the senior Senators over on that side, What do we do now? And his answer was, Pray. And pray for a victory in the special election in Massachusetts.

I don't think very many people believed that SCOTT BROWN was going to be the next Senator from Massachusetts on Christmas Eve of 2009. And I went up to Massachusetts to participate, to the extent that I could contribute, and for 3 days up there I saw valiant constitutional conservative Americans making phone calls, one after another, lined up to make phone calls for the benefit of SCOTT BROWN's candidacy. Constitutional conservatives, tea party activists, regular Baystaterers from Massachusetts. And I met couples that say, Well, I'm a teachers' union member here and my husband is a member of the electrical workers—the United Electrical Workers—and we've always walked the streets and campaigned for Democrats. Not anymore. We're campaigning for SCOTT BROWN. We've had it. We've had enough. We don't like that health care proposal that's coming, and we want to send somebody there that's going to stop it. And SCOTT BROWN pledged that he would vote against ObamaCare and he would block it.

And we know what happened. January 19 of this year SCOTT BROWN was elected to the United States Senate to fill—he always said it is the people of Massachusetts' seat. It is their seat, like any seat in the Senate or the House belongs to the people who elect their Representatives to that seat. He was humble enough in that regard. And he was precisely right. We see it as the seat that was occupied by Senator Teddy Kennedy for all of those years. A dramatic shift in the political dynamics of America took place on that day on January 19, and a lot of people thought, myself cautiously included, that that was the end of ObamaCare because they would not have the votes to move ObamaCare by a conference version back through the Senate because it had to sustain itself in a cloture vote.

And so we saw President Obama's mojo be diminished dramatically. We elected a Republican Governor in Virginia when they said it couldn't be done. And even more improbably, elected Chris Christie, a Republican Governor in New Jersey when it seemed completely improbable that

could happen. And even though he had a lead in the polls going into the last few days, a lot of us thought that something would happen to trip up Chris Christie. Well, he's the Governor. Bob McDonnell is the Governor in Virginia. That message came out loud and clear and strong. And when SCOTT BROWN was elected, it was clear that President Obama's mojo had been diminished dramatically and the prospects of America having to live under ObamaCare had also been diminished and perhaps crushed.

But the President came before the Republican conference and had a conversation that lasted about 90 minutes. And subsequent to that he called the meeting on February 25 at Blair House, which was a big square-table discussion about health care, challenging that Republicans didn't want to talk, we just wanted to disagree with the proposals that he had. Well, Republicans wanted to talk and it was the President that didn't seem to want them to talk. So I had a staff person that sat there and put it all into a spreadsheet and timed everybody's speeches. It was limited time. There was a strict rule involved. But of course the President said, I'm the President. I don't have to follow the rules that we have written for the meeting that he's hosting. He interrupted Republicans 72 times that day on February 25 at Blair House. That was the level of respect that he had for our input. But he gained some traction, and they found a way to leverage ObamaCare back at us.

From February 25 until March 23, they marched through this Congress. And finally on that day when ObamaCare passed here in the House, it didn't have the majority support of the House in order to be passed. To get enough votes to pass it they had to meet a couple of conditions. One is the President had to make the pledge or the oath that he would sign an executive order that was designed to amend the legislation that was about to pass Congress. Can you think of such a thing? Standing up to take an oath to uphold the Constitution of the United States of America, so help me God, and thinking that as a President you can write an executive order that eclipses or amends legislation that's passed by the Congress and tell them you're going to do it in advance? That's what the President did.

Now if that's not appalling enough, on top of that, another group of House Members here—Democrats—wouldn't vote for ObamaCare here on the House even with the fig leaf executive order that the President promised for the gentleman from Michigan. But they had to also have a locked-down pledge that the Senate would pass a reconciliation package that would also effectively amend the package that was coming to the House.

So, for those who didn't live through this, Mr. Speaker, I'd put it this way: ObamaCare was the first big piece of legislation that made it to the Presi-

dent's desk and was signed into law and became the law of the land that on the day of its passage didn't have the majority's support in the House of Representatives and it could not have passed the United States Senate under their current rules, but they had to do this by legislative sleight of hand to package up the three components to ObamaCare—the bill itself that started out at 1,994 pages and ended up 2,500 pages—the bill itself; the fig leaf executive order that the President promised and did sign that was supposed to prohibit the funding of abortion through ObamaCare, which we know it did not; and the third thing was the reconciliation packaged that circumvented the requirement for a cloture vote under the rules of the Senate and send it over here to the House.

□ 2050

That's what it took to give America ObamaCare.

Americans rose up on that weekend, and for 3 days they would stay on these Capitol grounds. By the thousands, they would stay outside the windows of the Rules Committee and chant, "Kill the bill. Kill the bill." When I'd say to them, "We're going to have to break this up. We can't keep this up," they would say, "We won't go until they all vote 'no.' We won't go."

These are courageous Americans who stayed here all night. If they slept at all, it was out here on the cement or maybe on the grass. They would not go until they killed the bill. There were enough Americans who poured out here—tens of thousands—and who kept that vigil around the Capitol. They surrounded the Capitol building. They joined hands and surrounded the Capitol building.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not talking about one human chain with long arms each. I'm talking about six or eight deep all the way around the Capitol building and clusters in the corners of thousands who were needed to fill the human chain around the Capitol. They came to peacefully petition the government for redress of grievances, and still the Speaker marched through the crowd with her huge, oversized gavel in her "let them eat cake" moment.

So here we are, Mr. Speaker. The American people saw all of that.

They saw the takeover of three large investment banks. They saw \$700 billion in TARP spending. They saw \$180 billion go out to AIG, the insurance company. They watched the formerly private sector, then quasi-government, now completely government-owned, -operated, -functioned, -guaranteed, and -backed up Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, which has saddled the American taxpayers with a contingent liability of \$5.5 trillion.

They saw all of that, Mr. Speaker.

They saw as the Federal Government took over General Motors and Chrysler to operate those formerly private sector businesses for the benefit of the people affected by them. That's when

they handed the secured assets of the investors over to the unions.

The American people saw all of that, and their sense of justice was offended: the affront to the free enterprise system, the nationalization of three large banks, AIG, Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, General Motors, and Chrysler, and the Federal Government takeover of 100 percent of the student loan program.

How? With a debate here on the floor of the House or the Senate? With hearings before committees and markups before subcommittees and committees in a process as envisioned? No. Written into the reconciliation package as a sleight of hand that came out of a circumvention of the cloture vote in the Senate and slipped over here to the House of Representatives to be stuck in as ObamaCare. That is how they took over the student loan program.

Then we saw the Federal Government, under the direction of President Obama with the magnum gavel that NANCY PELOSI regally walked through the crowds who simply wanted to maintain their freedom and liberty, nationalize our skin and everything inside it. That's ObamaCare.

The second-most sovereign thing we have is our body and our health, and the Federal Government took it over to manage it and to make it the law of the land. They nationalized our skin and everything inside it, and they put a 10 percent tax on the outside if you go to the tanning salon. There was no square inch of skin left not nationalized by this government, and the American people rose up in a peaceful way.

I have to give the American people credit, a tremendous amount of credit. In any other country in the world, if they watched their liberty go like that, they would be demonstrating in the streets like they did in Athens not that long ago or as we watched take place in France or in Great Britain, for that matter. I mean the French may have to work until age 62, and they think that's worth burning tires and cars and demonstrating over.

What do we do in America when we disagree with our government? We come to Washington, DC. We fill up the parks in America. We do rallies all over. We fly the American flag. We run the yellow Gadsden flag up alongside it, down just an inch or so from height, the yellow Gadsden "Don't tread on me" flag, and we petition the government for redress of grievances—peacefully—and they were peaceful.

When these rallies were done, when these press conferences were done, I sent staff people out with cameras to look so they could take pictures of the litter. Could they find at least a cigarette butt out there to take a picture of to show me how disrespectful it might have been? These crowds were the most respectful crowds that the park service had ever seen. They cleaned up behind them. They didn't drop anything in the first place. They looked out for each other when they

were done. They might have walked the grass down a little bit, but there wasn't any litter to pick up. They love this country. They love this beautiful Capitol. They respect the history of this Nation, of the Constitution, and of the system that we have.

They were maybe not successful in rolling back ObamaCare in November of 2009, in December of 2009, or in March of 2010, but they understood what happened. They understood that our freedom and our liberty had been marginalized by an arrogant attitude—that the people up in the Speaker's office knew best and that the American people didn't know. When the statement came that we had to pass the bill so that the American people could find out what was in it, I met a lot of people outside this Capitol, outside the beltway, who read every word of that health care bill.

Now, I wouldn't say that I've ever met anybody in or outside of the beltway who could read and understand all of its implications—that's impossible given the depth and the magnitude of it—but they understood that this was an affront to our liberty and to our freedom, that it would forever transform the way health care would be delivered in America and that it was a component of this vast overreach, this taking of our liberty and our freedom that had been initiated, oh, several generations ago. It was brought to a head several times, but never had it seen the configuration of an intense liberal President with a determination to use the majority that a happenstance of history had given him in the House and a supermajority that was filibuster-proof in the Senate.

They used it and they abused it, and the American people rose up and went to the polls and said, Enough. Enough. We're going to send people here to this Congress who understand that the Constitution is our default position, that whenever there is a question, we look back to the Constitution for guidance; and if the Constitution constrains us, we don't disregard the Constitution. What we must do is either comply with the original intent of the Constitution or take the trouble to amend it, and it takes a lot of trouble to amend the Constitution.

The Constitution needs to be our default mechanism. We have a lot of new freshmen coming in here who understand that. One of them is Bobby Schilling, from Quincy, Illinois, who understands it. The opponent whom he ran against was PHIL HARE, who famously said, Oh, the Constitution? We don't care about that.

His constituents do.

They sent their message, and they sent a new Representative here to Congress who does care about the Constitution. His colleagues in this class are 80-some strong, and all of them, I know, do care about the Constitution. When they take their oath of office, they will take it seriously. It will be something branded on their hearts, as

it should be of any Member who comes in here and who has the privilege to serve Americans. We all have to brand down our oath to uphold the Constitution of the United States of America.

I am looking forward to this class coming in, Mr. Speaker. I understand the message that has been sent by this country, and it has been sent with those new Representatives who are arriving here in Washington, D.C. They are here now, those who will be sworn in on January 4. That message is: Adhere to the Constitution. Hold on to the Constitution. Believe in it, and defend it as there have been so many who have died in its defense. We can at least stand and defend it and adhere to it. Understand also that debt and deficit, jobs and the economy are the central theme that have been flowed out here.

But the takings of our liberty in the form of the nationalization of all of these companies and entities has been an affront to the American free enterprise system. It diminishes the vigor of America to have the government running Fortune 500 companies in America with no plan to divest themselves of it and to think that the Federal Government would make decisions with a "one size fits all" formula for our health care and do that to us when we completely have the ability to manage that health care for ourselves.

□ 2100

I think there's something also that was missing on the part of the liberals here in Congress, Mr. Speaker. And that's this: That as much as the progressive movement draws its instruction from Western Europe, when the progressive movement was generated by intellectuals that visited Germany in the latter part of the 19th century and came back here and began to inject the progressive thought process with social democracy. Western European social democracy values, to keep it simple, Mr. Speaker, came to us out of Western Europe in the latter part of the 19th century. It's been debated in this country over and over again. These are the people that decided they would undermine our Constitution not by amending it but by trying to redefine its meaning and its intent. And they made the argument that it's a living and breathing document, and therefore, it has to adapt itself to the mores of the day, otherwise we couldn't possibly be burdened with something that was so rigid and structured that we would have to amend it as society evolved.

Well, I would make the statement that human nature does not change, and that if we ever get the fundamental structure of our Constitution and law correct—and for the most part, we have the fundamental structure of our Constitution correct—if we ever get it correct, then the only reasons to meet in the legislature is to make appropriations for the upcoming year or two and to make adjustments to new technology, if that's required.

But the progressives from a century and a generation ago have polluted the thought process of Americans. And the people who are progressives—and there are some 77 in this Congress, at least today, and they're listed on their Web site, and they're linked with the Democratic socialists of America. Socialists and progressives are one and the same by essentially their own admission. They miss this thing about America: We're not a dependency people. Even if the socialism was right, social democracy is right for Western Europe, it's not right for Americans. And there are a good number of reasons why it's not right. A lot of them are in the Bill of Rights.

We have guaranteed freedom, rights that come from God. They don't believe that in—well, some believe it, but it's not in anybody else's Constitution that I know of. It's in our Declaration actually here, and it's in the Iowa Constitution as a matter of clarification. But our rights come from God. They don't come from a sovereign, from a king. They don't come from government. If rights come from government and government takes your rights away, then who are we to complain? Who do we complain to? If the government takes our rights away, they're the ones that are sovereign.

But what we have here in America are God-given rights that are vested in the people. The people are sovereign, and the people then entrust the power of their sovereignty through the representative form of government, the republican form of government, and they elect those representatives to represent them here in Washington and around the country. They must guarantee a republican form of government. That is a constitutional requirement. But it's the people who are sovereign. The vigor that Americans have that come from these rights is this vigor—a lot of it's in the Bill of Rights. The freedom of speech in a full-throated way to step out on the courthouse steps and let fly with your deepest convictions without fear of a punishment that might come from the government.

I recall standing on the courthouse lawn in Sioux County, Iowa, in Orange City during the Tulip Festival. Myself and another candidate had lined up a couple of big speakers and a microphone. It's always a good crowd during the Tulip Festival. So we just started to holler up a crowd and give speeches. As we did that, more and more people started to gather. And after a little while, a fellow came out of the courthouse, and he came over and approached Representative Dwayne Alons, who represents that area and is from there. And he said, You've got to shut this down. These men can't stand here and give these speeches on the courthouse lawn because this is a polling place. Now this is the first weekend in May. There are no elections going on, no elections near. So the fact that it was a polling place during elections was really irrelevant. But the man

said, They can't be speaking here like this. This is a polling place. This is electioneering, and it's a violation of State law.

Now we're speaking away in our full-throated positions on the things that we advocated and believed in. And Representative Dwayne Alons looked at that courthouse employee, and he said, Well, if you can't exercise your right to freedom of speech here on the courthouse lawn, could you tell me just where in the world you can exercise your right to freedom of speech? That gentleman turned around and went back in the courthouse, and that's the last we heard of him.

But the vigor that comes from this freedom of speech and the confidence that we can write a letter, send out an e-mail, put it on Facebook, put it on Twitter, get on the radio, go out on the street corner and the curb, or stand at the pulpit and express our deepest, most firmly held convictions without fear of retribution or recourse that would come from government—at least in an official fashion—that is one of the essential principles of being an American that adds to our vigor. It allows us to be the people that can use our reason, our ability to rationalize, our ability to continually self-examine our culture and civilization to make these adjustments, like the American people made adjustments when that gavel was passed to Speaker PELOSI in January of 2007. They made more adjustments in 2008, and more Republicans went home, and more Democrats came. And then they watched the results of their decision, and they weren't particularly alarmed when it was Speaker PELOSI and Majority Leader HARRY REID until President Obama came in. Their decision, all right?

I sat out there on the west portico of the Capitol, and I had a great seat. And I saw the momentous time in history when the first black President of the United States was sworn in. And I felt that uplifting feeling. We had reached a milestone as a nation, and perhaps we had put race behind us. And perhaps, just perhaps, he would find a way to blend the two sides together and get us to a postpartisanship era in America. Well, the American people gave him 2 years, and they could see the pattern over and over again. It wasn't going to be postpartisanship. It was going to be more and more partisanship, and an economic theory that had been discredited since the New Deal in the 1930s by FDR. This Keynesian economist on steroids had decided he was going to spend money hand over fist in a desperate effort to try to stimulate the economy, dug us a hole deeper than the hole the Chilean miners were in, and he was still down there with that shovel digging on Election Day November 2, 2010.

The American people looked at that. They were appalled. They thought that good judgment would take over sooner, or at least some time. So they decided

the quickest and most effective way that they could take the shovel out of the President's hands was to take the gavel out of NANCY PELOSI's. And that's what happened. Debt and deficit, jobs and the economy became the order of the day. And the American people were appalled that their ability to manage their own health care had also been taken away from them and company after company had been taken over by the Federal Government. And another principle that is a pillar of American exceptionalism, the pillar of free enterprise, also was being diminished on a regular basis by—I don't know that I can say clearly that it's an anti-capitalist administration. But certainly the President surrounded himself with many anti-capitalists.

Free enterprise, another foundation of American greatness. Freedom of speech, freedom of religion. And by the way, this freedom of religion has been diminished by the IRS by the intimidation that the churches might lose their 501(c)(3) status. So pastor after pastor steps up to the pulpit. And about the time their convictions and their conscience open up the volume in their throat, they think, ooh, but what if I lose a not-for-profit status? I will be standing on the street corner preaching from the curb? Some let fly, and I am proud of them, all of them. Some pull it back and decide they're going to be more careful. And they're afraid of the tax penalties that might come if they lose their not-for-profit status. But freedom of speech is part of American vigor.

Freedom of religion is part of America's core culture. It is the moral foundation that holds our civilization together. You cannot hire enough police officers to do that job for you. It has to be part of our moral character. If you think otherwise, take a look at what happened to the police force in New Orleans during Hurricane Katrina. More police officers, more problems in that scenario. But the core of our values is tied to our Judeo-Christian faith which is the center core of American civilization. That's part of American vigor. And speech, religion, and the press, the freedom to freely assemble, and the rights to property under the Fifth Amendment, freedom from double jeopardy, the list goes on and on. That's just in the Bill of Rights.

□ 2110

That's just in the Bill of Rights.

And then we have this other vigor, this American vigor. And it's unique to us.

This situation where, I'm going to make this argument, Mr. Speaker, that Americans are a distinct race of people, a race of people. And I don't know anybody else that takes this position; but if they listen, then I think everybody that listens will take this position.

We have a distinction that characterizes us. We may look different, we may have different skin tones and different



shapes to our facial features. We may come from every—we do come from every continent on the planet. We come from hundreds of countries on the planet.

But what we have in common is we either, people that came to America bring with them the distinct vigor of their culture and their civilization. It isn't that somebody that comes from France or Italy or Argentina or Russia, wherever it might be, Sweden, that comes to the United States, it isn't that those nationalities have these unique vigorous characteristics of hardworking industrious entrepreneurs that love freedom and want to build something and put a mark on life and leave this world a better place for the next generation.

We got the dreamers from every civilization. We got the can-do spirit from every civilization. The American culture, the American Dream is built because we are the recipients of the cream of the crop of every donor civilization on the planet that sent legal immigrants here to America. And they rose up. They had to sacrifice to get here. They had to plan. They had to sometimes sell out their future to get here. But when they came here, they were determined to build something that had value. And when they saw the Statue of Liberty it meant something to them. It's a dream. It throbbed in their heart when they looked at that and they saw themselves sailing into Ellis Island. Here was this promised land. Yes, some of them thought the streets were paved with gold. But also, many of them believed that they had an opportunity to go out there and mine for that gold and pave their own streets in this country, and nobody could take away their freedom, their liberty, their property rights, and no one could put them in double jeopardy of a crime. That vigor that is from each donor civilization is part and parcel of the character of America.

I come from a number of different sources, but some of my ancestors came across the prairie in a covered wagon. They walked beside that wagon or behind the oxen, and on a good day they traveled 10 miles across the prairie where the prairie grass was high in a sea of grass. On a good day they traveled 10 miles. Why they ever decided to drive that stake in the ground where they did and declare a homestead, I don't know how that process goes through one's mind.

I've never read nor have I heard how they were thinking. But I know this: they came to the Midwest to live free or die on the prairie. They took the State motto of New Hampshire. They transposed it to the Midwest and on to the points to the West as well, where you had freedom-loving people that wanted spaces and opportunity, and they put their stake in the ground for that homesteaded 160. However they got started and they built, they built a house out of sod, and they started raising kids and putting them to work.

And they took the axe and chopped the tree stumps out and turned them into farms, and they ran cattle and they found ways to make a living. They came out to live free or die on the prairie.

And those of us who are descended from that kind of stock, we understand why. Why are my neighbors proud, independent? They don't want to be dependent upon government. They just want to have an opportunity to work and succeed and support their church and their family and their neighborhoods and their schools. That's all they ask for. The pride, the independence, the industriousness, that's what's built America. And we took the cream of the crop off all those donors civilizations, and we gave them an opportunity here under the banner of freedom and liberty. And American vigor rose up. This giant Petri dish of this experiment of freedom and liberty rose up, and here we are.

We're not a people that's suitable to be put under the yoke of socialism, or have a Federal Government dictate to us where we can or can't get our health care, or take away our shares in General Motors or Chrysler and hand them over to the Union, or have the Federal Government say that we want a guarantee that people can buy houses whether they can afford it or not, and we're going to guarantee that we're going to charge the taxpayers to pick up the difference when they can't meet those mortgages.

These people want to be free. They want to be left alone. We want to allow for the vigor of Americans to shine and to glow and project itself across this continent and across this globe.

As I've said, Mr. Speaker, with the opening remarks about Staff Sergeant Salvatore Giunta, the risk that he took running into enemy gunfire over and over again to save his fellow troops, miraculously lived through that, will be receiving the Medal of Honor tomorrow in the ceremony at the White House. He put his life on the line. Some of his people lost theirs.

And we owe to him, and we owe to all of those who have put their lives on the line, who have put on the uniform throughout the centuries, we owe them the fight for freedom and liberty here on the floor of the United States Congress. We owe them that fight. We owe them that liberty.

We owe them that we're going to shut off this accumulation of debt, we're going to reduce and eventually eliminate the deficit. And in doing so, it will bring the economy back around, and it will produce jobs, and it will enhance our freedom and liberty, and those entrepreneurs that came to this country for that freedom, for a chance to build, and the descendants of those entrepreneurs that came here in earlier generations so that their children would have an opportunity for a better life, to earn, not to receive as if America is some giant ATM, but to earn a better life here. We owe it to Staff Sergeant

Salvatore Giunta and everyone like him our best effort here on this floor to honor his effort, to uphold the Constitution, to uphold the oath to the Constitution that we will again take on January 4, here on the floor of this House of Representatives, to raise America up to the next level of our destiny, do honor to those who've gone before us, and to leave a legacy for those that come behind us.

And this is the beginning, Mr. Speaker. This class, this new freshman class, for the 112th Congress is God's gift to America, and the American people will appreciate it. And we need to empower them to the maximum amount because I believe that they will lead us forward to that next level of our destiny.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today.

Mr. HEINRICH (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of personal business.

Mr. PLATTS (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today and November 16 on account of a family member's funeral.

Mr. WOLF (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of medical reasons.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

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

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SHERMAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFazio, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, 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. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today, November 16, 17, 18, and 19.

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today, November 16, 17, 18, and 19.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, for 5 minutes, today, November 16, 17, 18, and 19.

Mr. PAUL, for 5 minutes, November 16, 17, and 18.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, today, November 16, 17, 18, and 19.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, for 5 minutes, November 16 and 17.

#### SENATE BILLS AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and concurrent resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were