

Mr. KINGSTON. You know, the town meetings that you and I had, the town meetings where you did not have to have an invitation, the town meetings where you invited Democrats, Republicans, Tea Party members, independents, out-of-towners, nonregistered voters, the kind of town meeting where you had open mikes and anybody could stand up and say anything they wanted—

Mr. AKIN. Those meetings seemed to have been pretty exciting this last year.

Mr. KINGSTON. Well, you know what I found though? The people were reading the bill. And I've got to say this to the people who supported the bill, they found some good stuff in there and said to me, you ought to support that. And there were some things in there that I think are worthy of supporting.

But I still think it's very difficult to make a bad bill a better bill. I think it would be better to start all over, pick and choose some ideas from Republicans. You don't have to start at Ground Zero as if you've never heard of health care reform ideas, but you should start all over in this legislation.

What if this was the Pelosi-Boehner-Reid-McConnell bill? What a different thing. And I think that's what we want to do. We want to work with the Democrats.

We were shut out of the stimulus bill. We were shut out of the omnibus bill. We've been shut out of health care. Maybe tomorrow isn't just theater. Maybe it's the turning point. I hope that it is. You know, I'd like to see something get done. But a lot of times, you know, these things are just positioning.

Mr. AKIN. Let me just respond to what you're saying because maybe I'm being too pessimistic about this. But let's take a look at the format. The format is we're going to huddle behind closed doors. We're going to produce a bill. You get 24 hours to look at it, and then we want you to come and tell us how much you like it. That doesn't seem to me to be sort of an open the kimono and let's work together as a team. It's more like, if you don't support me, then my way or the highway.

Mr. KINGSTON. Well, let me ask you this now. Who gets to look at it in 24 hours and when? Who is this group of people and when?

Mr. AKIN. Well, I'm not exactly sure of that. My understanding was the bill was supposed to be released 24 hours from the day that they're talking about it, and the only thing I'd seen earlier this morning was outlines, and the outlines, of course, the Congressional Budget Office can't score it. And it appears to be very much the same thing as the Senate health care bill is everything we can tell. We've been told that there aren't special deals in it, and yet as we take a look at it, we find that there are. Somebody managed to take a look at the ones that were there before and a lot of them are still there. The Louisiana Purchase is still in it, as I understand.

Mr. KINGSTON. I understand there's some special interests for Louisiana, Connecticut, Michigan, and those are the deals we know about because those were a little bit more visible. But you can imagine all the other oddball stuff in there, the hospital wings that will be built here and there.

Mr. AKIN. Hospital's in—my understanding is the hospital is in Connecticut; Medicaid dollars, Vermont, Massachusetts, New Jersey; drug companies; extra cash for union health care plans. I have a list of some of these. Montana coal miners. Florida seniors don't have to pay that Medicare Advantage. You know, Medicare's being cut, but you don't if you're a Florida senior. It's not cut there, but in other States it is. If you're a union guy, it's not. But if you aren't, you know. And then there's North Dakota Medicare payments. Hawaii hospitals are exempt from the cuts. And longshoremen. I didn't know about longshoremen. But there are, of course a bunch of these special deals in the program.

Mr. KINGSTON. So special interest groups have clearly been on the inside of this and their fingerprints are all over the health care bill.

Mr. AKIN. Yeah, exactly. That's the situation.

And I guess the other thing is, I think the American public is worried about this job thing. Excessive taxation is a big deal, because if you own a small business and you tax that guy really heavily, the small business owner is not going to have any money to invest in new equipment or new plants and things, so heavy taxation on a small business owner is going to be a job killer. And yet, this bill on medicine puts a heavy, heavy tax on small business owners. So, in that sense, it's a job-killing bill.

Mr. KINGSTON. And, you know, not to mention there will be a new tax on individuals because, you know, when you're forced to buy something, that is a tax. And so there would be less money for customers of small businesses on a discretionary basis. Whether they're buying hamburgers or clothes or tires or whatever, they'll have less of it in their pocket.

Mr. AKIN. Did you know that there are supposedly 36—I know Missouri is one of them. That's my home State. There are 36 States that have legislation moving exempting the States from having to be required to purchase health care when the government demands that everybody has to buy federally approved health care? There are 36 separate States moving legislation to stop that. That doesn't say something's popular.

Mr. KINGSTON. Well, again, the American people do understand this Pelosi-Obama-Reid health care package. And, you know, I think one of the great examples of government efficiency we saw in August, Cash for Clunkers. It was a program, actually pretty simple program. You turn in your old gas guzzler, you trade it in for

a more fuel-efficient car. We give you a tax credit. They take your old car, put it out to pasture and put it down. And, you know, it's kind of an easy thing to follow. Stimulates the car dealerships.

Well, that program was supposed to last from August to November. It was a \$1 billion program. I think they hired 100 employees, came back a week later and said they needed 1,100 employees and \$3 billion. And even doing that, Cash for Clunkers was dead and defunct within a matter of weeks.

So you now feel that that same government that brought us Cash for Clunkers, a \$3 billion program, is going to be able to run a \$2 trillion health care bill.

Mr. AKIN. Well, I thank you, gentleman, for joining me today. And the question at the beginning was is this going to be a credible theatrical performance tomorrow or are people just going to tune in to the Olympics. I guess we'll see tomorrow what's going to really happen, but I'm not sure there's much new, from what we can see about what's being proposed from the White House.

□ 2045

HEALTH CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OWENS). 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 the privilege to address you here on the floor, and I appreciate the dialogue that came from my colleagues the previous hour discussing this health care issue that has so consumed this Nation.

And we are here now on the eve of the 6-hour meeting that is scheduled at Blair House that the President has invited both Democrats and Republican leadership to join. And Mr. Speaker, I came to the floor to talk about this issue and help to put it in a perspective so that as the American people watch what's going to happen tomorrow, they understand it in perhaps a better perspective than they might otherwise.

Now, I would lay it out this way. I think there are two points, Mr. Speaker, that need to be addressed by Democrats. And these are significant points of vulnerability where there has been a persistent criticism from the public. They have made the point that of all of the agonizing national debate that's taken place on health care, that the Democrats have first of all shut Republicans out. They shut Republican out of the room, shut them out of the negotiations, shut them out of the office.

And the second thing is, the Democrats haven't had transparency. They've been cooking up these health care deals in secret. And as this thing unfolded, some time in early September was the last time that I am aware of that a Republican senator or

a House Member was sitting in a room talking with Democrat leadership about how to come about this health care policy.

From that time forward, it became secret back-door meetings, and it became secret deals and combinations of secret deals that brought about in the end the American people were repulsed by what they saw. They were repulsed by the special deals that came down. They were repulsed by the idea that if you live in Nebraska, if you live in Florida, if you live in Maine or Vermont, you've got a different deal a different cost.

I would interrupt what I am about to say and yield to the gentleman, Mr. KINGSTON.

Mr. KINGSTON. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

I was looking at the Tea Party list of priorities, which they call a contract from America, which you know, this is a grassroots deal, just popped up. And there are even different Tea Party groups. But they have nationally been surveying their members on what their priorities are.

The number one priority is to cut the size of the Federal Government spending. The number two priority, would the gentleman from Iowa like to guess? The number two priority of all of these thousands of participants on a grassroots' basis is, do not put something in the bill that doesn't belong in the bill.

So as the gentleman talks about these secret deals to the senator in Nebraska, the senator from Florida, the senator from Louisiana, people don't like that at all. If it's such a great deal for the good people of Nebraska, maybe it ought to go for the rest of the 49 States and maybe it doesn't need to be brokered in some smoke-filled back room.

So what you're saying is very important. It can't be understated. If this bill is such a great deal, why do you need to have all of those special interest side deals in order to get the votes from Nebraska or from Florida or from Louisiana?

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, of course that is what it takes to get the votes for a bad deal. That is what the American people know, that's what the Tea Party patriots know.

I would go further. When you start out and you have a good idea. Let's say it's a stand-alone idea. What about the idea of putting an end to the lawsuit abuse in America? We've passed that legislation out of this House, and Republicans were in charge, and we sent it over to the Senate, where it was blocked in the Senate. But it was a clear, concise idea that makes everybody whole that has been actually the victim, perhaps, of medical malpractice. Three hundred million people, some things are going to go wrong. It allows for them to cover all of their health care costs, allows for someone who is a victim to receive their loss and income. And actually it established pain and suffering and an addi-

tional \$250,000 on top of that. And in Texas, there's three different increments that go to three-quarters of a million, but that's it.

Trial lawyers don't walk away with pockets full of money. It's a very simple concept that can stand alone, that the American people can look at and see that it isn't a special deal.

But if you put an idea out for health care and then you have to patch something else to it, and something else to it, and when you get this whole toxic stew that I've talked about so many times, and you still can't sell that to get 218 votes in the House or 60 votes in the Senate, and you have to go out and get a special deal in Nebraska to get a vote from the Nebraska senator and a special deal in Florida to exempt Florida from Medicare Advantage cuts, or if you go up and you build a bunch of public health clinics in Vermont out of that deal, or Louisiana—the list goes on and on and on.

The American people know that when you're buying votes with their taxpayer dollars, they reject that concept, Mr. Speaker. The American people know that if you have a good idea, it should stand alone, it should be able to be passed on its merits and move through the House of Representatives on an up-or-down vote so everybody knows what's going on.

We're not at that point. This is a conglomeration of a bill, and this is frustrating to me that we can't put a good idea out in front of the American people and vote up or down and go on to the next idea.

Mr. AKIN. When you start talking about what you're saying, the American public does not like these special deals—and special deals a lot of times happen in the darkness, in little dark corners, like the kind of places where cockroaches breed. And these special deals, people aren't real proud of them. And so they're done behind closed doors. They're done when people can't see it. And when they get all put together in a great big piece of legislation, those special deals are rolled out in a big hurry. Hurry up and look at it so that we can pass it before anybody reads it too closely because sometimes they're disguised in little ways so you won't see them.

So the public, they're starting to get wise to this. The idea is that if the public sees more of this health care bill they'll like it. No. If you see something that's ugly, the more you look at it, the uglier it's going to get. And when you put all of these special deals in it, then people have a tendency to want to bring it out in a hurry and don't bother to look at it too closely.

If some used car salesman says, I want you to get this car but don't bother to look under the hood, you're kind of thinking, I wonder if there is an engine under there or not. And that is what's going on. And the public is wise, and they're sick of this special deal kind of stuff.

And we do this in a lot of different ways. We'll put two things together

that would never pass, and then we pass it on a regular basis.

I don't mean to step on toes, but the farm bill is an example of that. You take the farm bill, and there is a farm piece and there is all of this food stamp stuff, and neither one could pass on their own. But you put the two together, and you can pass something. And I think the public is starting to stay. Time out. We're tired of this because we can't afford it any more.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, I will bring this back to that, that time they had 51 votes counted in the Senate on the health care bill. I went back to the Midwest, and I usually fly into Omaha. Well, Omaha, of course, is a central metropolitan area for the State of Nebraska.

And as I went in, I did a whole number of meetings around on both sides of the river, the Nebraska and the Iowa side, did a lot of media around there and took phone calls on a call-in radio show. And this was the day before the agreement was made for the Cornhusker kickback. And the senator from Nebraska was the linchpin that could put together, hold together the entire health care package up or down. If the senator from Nebraska decides to pull the pin, the whole thing falls apart.

So the day before, people were calling in and they understood that the Nebraska senator held the future of this socialized medicine bill in his hand. They didn't know what was going to happen. In the middle of the night, there was some kind of agreement that got made. There were accommodations that were made. All of a sudden there was an announcement that HARRY REID had 60 votes and he could break the filibuster in the Senate and they could pass the socialized medicine bill. And what does it include?

First of all, it includes a provision that will allow for Federal funding of abortion, and it exempted Nebraska from the increased costs in Medicaid in perpetuity. Now, no one should ever sign a document or make a pledge for anything in perpetuity. Actually perpetuity probably lasts longer than forever.

I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. KINGSTON. I can't imagine what the HARRY REID U.S. Senate was thinking. How stupid do they think the American people are? How callous can they be to the sense of fair play? What kind of almost thuggery is it when you do that to people? It just doesn't sound right for the taxpayers all over the country to have to float the bill for one State. And as the gentleman from Missouri pointed out, there was also a special interest deal for Florida.

And I think the presumption was people are Christmas shopping, they're getting ready to have their families in. They're not paying attention. Let's just push through whatever we can.

Well, a funny thing happened in Massachusetts. They were apparently paying attention, and I think that that has woke up a lot of people around here.

We have a group in the House called Blue Dog Democrats. I am not exactly sure what a Blue Dog is because they certainly vote like the yellow dog Democrats from what I can understand. But I don't think there is any distinction except there is a lot of Democrats right now who are saying, Hey, I saw what happened in Massachusetts, and if this bill comes back, I think I am going to vote "no" and maybe make up for my "yes" vote previously.

Mr. AKIN. I just have a question if I could jump in.

Tomorrow there is going to be this big drama, I guess, 6-hour—maybe it will be pretty boring. I don't know. But it's supposed to be dramatic. Six hours of people sitting around a table talking about this same old health care plan basically.

And there were different people that were chosen to go to participate in this. And I am just wondering if you know—I know there were a few Republicans invited, but were there any Democrats that voted "no" on the bill that were invited to participate? Do you know of any?

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, I can't name a single one. I haven't looked over the list of the Democrats but that would be quite unusual. It would be unusual to see Democrats in there negotiating a vote of "no" on the bill. I'd be very surprised if there was even a token Democrat that voted no.

Mr. KINGSTON. How many Democrats did vote "no" in the House, do you remember? It was 220. You need 218. So there were two votes over 218.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I would guess that was nearly 32 Democrats that voted "no." It would be in that neighborhood somewhere.

Mr. KINGSTON. You would think they would probably have something to say at the White House. They would be a little more moderate and have some good productive contribution to make.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Wouldn't you want to know what their objections are? I would think that would be important.

BART STUPAK on the pro-life amendment worked very closely with SMITH and Pennsylvania Representative JOE PITTS. They worked very hard to pass, and they received 64 votes on a pro-life amendment to that.

I understand that BART STUPAK is not on this negotiation either. And what we're seeing come out and what came out of the Senate, it looks to me like the package that's there—there's going to be a bill that still funds abortion and compels Americans to fund abortions through their premiums in one fashion or another, or brokers them through an exchange, and also one that funds illegals. And those are two things that are completely egregious to me, to think we compel taxpayers to do that.

Mr. AKIN. I got another question for you.

After tomorrow, after this 6 hours of drama, do you think people are going to say that you and I and my good friend Congressman KINGSTON, do you think they're going to say that we're obstructionists? I am trying to figure out—I wish it were true that we could be obstructionists, because if we were obstructionists, that meant if we vote "no," it would stop the bill. But they have got 40 more votes than we do, so how in the world could we be obstructionists?

I need some help on that because the logic seems to be very hard for me to grasp.

Mr. KING of Iowa. There are a lot of things that get spun around this thing, as you know in this town. It's been, Republicans are blocking the bill. We have no capability of doing that, obviously, not from a vote-count standpoint, when the Speaker of the House has 40 votes to burn, a 40-vote advantage, and they're sitting behind closed doors cooking up a closed-door deal. They can't get enough Democrats to pass 218 votes here. I don't think today they can bring a bill to the floor and get it passed.

This is about, though, the public criticism of shutting Republicans out and about this bill being negotiated in secret. Those are the two things that the President seeks to resolve tomorrow. Six hours of C-SPAN time, and then he'll say, Listen, we're doing what I promised we'd do. We're negotiating this bill out in public, and, by the way, we're doing it with Republicans, so who can complain?

Well, for me, it controls the entire format.

Here's the real centerpiece that I don't think anybody has articulated at this point yet.

The President of the United States, as Senator Obama and as candidate for President, said to the Iranians, If you just simply unclench your fist, we will offer our hand. We will negotiate with the people that we have been at odds with since 1979, the Iranians and Ahmadinejad—with no preconditions whatsoever—and offer an open hand to the guy with the clenched fist.

And yet the President of the United States refuses to come to the negotiating table with Republicans with a blank slate. The President has insisted and demanded upon preconditions. He has to have his conditions of his bill that has failed, his concepts that have failed. And he also puts out there the threat that they have been putting together behind closed doors, too, of reconciliation. Reconciliation is what President Obama and others called "the nuclear option" when it was Republicans looking at a 51-vote opportunity on the other side of the aisle.

□ 2100

In fact, this is posted today on the Web site, biggovernment.com. This is a statement of our President, and we

think about reconciliation. This is what blows things up in the Senate. This is the nuclear option. This is how they would circumvent the anticipated and very legitimate legislative process by taking a Senate version of the bill that sits over here on the calendar of the House, pass amendments to the Senate version of the bill in the Senate called a reconciliation package, then both bills would be here on our calendar.

Then the House, under the direction of Speaker PELOSI, would take up the fixes that the House Members have insisted on which is called the reconciliation package, pass it first, and then pass the Senate version of the bill, message them both to the White House where the President would sign them in the proper sequence, one bill amending the first bill. Then this would be, as far as I know, the first time in history that the White House has replaced a legitimate conference committee, which would be the Members of the House and the Senate, Democrats and Republicans, having an open dialogue about resolving the differences. And what did President Obama say about this reconciliation nuclear option?

Here is what he said: Passing a bill with 51 Senate votes is an arrogant power grab against the Founders' intent. That's what President Obama said. The point is, he said that in 2005, not 2010.

Mr. KINGSTON. Well, I would say if the gentleman is saying it's an arrogant power grab, he certainly is accurate, and that's apparently the model that he wants to have. The gentleman may also have quotes from Senator JOE BIDEN, who denounced using this nuclear option, as well as HARRY REID.

When they were in the minority, I think they were right. When we were in the majority, I think we were wrong. I don't think you should do that. I think that it is a desperation thing. And if you can't get the requisite number of votes, maybe you need to start all over on the legislation. But you do have very strong, unequivocal statements by Senator Obama, candidate Obama, Senator REID, Senator BIDEN and yet total hypocrisy, that's what it is, is hypocrisy at this point.

The gentleman was talking about needing Republican votes. They do not need a Republican vote to stop anything or to pass anything. It's not just with this \$950 billion health care bill; they could pass a jobs bill without a Republican vote.

They could pass the tax-and-trade bill without it. They could get out of Iraq or Afghanistan without a single Republican vote. They could have energy independence without a Republican vote. They could pass that card check, that special interest bill for unions, without a Republican vote.

Why aren't they doing it? I just think that they had no idea that America was not asleep at the wheel. They found out in Massachusetts, and they're scared to death, hey, this

might not be an isolated election. So we are seeing a lot of backpedaling right now. It's hilarious when you see some of these people, like the Senator from Nebraska who had the special interest deal on the health care bill. Now, he is all over this jobs bill. Oh, too much spending. You've got a \$950 billion health care bill which he supports and a \$15 billion jobs bill that he is against because of the spending.

Only in this town.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Let me suggest to the gentleman from Georgia that the problem is, no, Republicans can't stop anything that Democrats decide they want to get together and vote for because of the margin of 40 votes to burn here in the House, 19 in the Senate.

But the problem is, Democrats can't agree among Democrats on what they want to push for policy. If they can't find the votes among all of these extra Democrats that there are and they still point their finger back over at Republicans and say, you guys, you wouldn't vote for the stimulus package, you won't support a health care, most of us wouldn't support that abysmal cap and tax, that cap and trade bill that, by the way, passed off the floor of this House. A bill that didn't exist passed off the floor of the House of Representatives and a bill that didn't exist was messaged to the United States Senate. That's another part of this component.

Mr. KINGSTON. If the gentleman will yield quickly, a bill that was still being amended at 3:30 a.m. before we started debating it at 9 a.m. in the morning, a bill which you could say truthfully in your heart of hearts believe that not one single Member in the United States House of Representatives had read.

Mr. KING of Iowa. To the gentleman, in fact, I can say that with a factual knowledge, and I don't have to ask any of the 435 Members, did you read this bill, because I was here on the floor that night when we suspended the debate for 35 minutes to resolve, where is the bill? I mean, sometimes they will say to us, you don't have any ideas, where are your bills?

We have a lot of bills. We have 40 some bills that we've filed on health care. But we said, where is the bill that we are debating? This is actually LOUIE GOHMERT from Texas that deserves a lot of credit, and JOE BARTON also was very good on that night. So we looked down here at the well. The bill didn't exist. There was an old bill. There was an amendment that had never been integrated. Actually, even the amendment wasn't here. It wasn't findable.

So what was going on was we were debating a bill that didn't exist, so it was impossible for anyone to have read a bill that didn't exist. That bill was then passed and messaged to the United States Senate. A bill that didn't exist was passed and messaged to the Senate, so no one read the bill.

I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. AKIN. The funny thing is, a number of us have served in legislative bod-

ies for a number of years. One of the rules has always been the public never pays any attention to the process of how we go about passing legislation. You can complain about different stuff like we had a bill that was done here, where we had a choice of voting for either a big tax increase or voting for a cost of living and we had to take a choice between the two. The process or the procedure there is unfair. Anyway, we got this bill here, 300 pages of amendments passed at 3 o'clock in the morning, and we're here on the floor. The Congressman from Texas, he has sort of the sense of humor of Eeyore, and he just asks in this plaintive kind of way, is it normal procedure that we have a copy of the bill on the floor when we are going to be debating a bill?

There is muttering and talking to the Parliamentarian and he says yes, indeed there is supposed to be a copy of the bill on the floor. So he comes back a couple of minutes later and says, I've been wandering around the Chamber and I'm having trouble finding it. Is it north, south, east or west or something like that. Pretty soon the Speaker starts laughing and we go back and forth about four times in a row. Finally he says, I've come up to the podium, and the place where you say there is a copy of the bill there isn't because the Clerk is still trying to stick 300 pages of amendments in this bill. So here we are passing a bill that doesn't even exist.

And the funny thing was—I guess it wasn't funny—the public was paying attention. They understood that we passed a massive tax increase on energy that's affecting very many small people who have to pay that power bill. Everybody who flips a light switch is going to get taxed, along with a massive amount of red tape. And it was done, they thought, in the secret and in the dark of night. But the public was paying attention, and, in my opinion, that started a lot of that Tea Party movement, that very event that we actually were standing here on the floor for.

Mr. KINGSTON. Let me just ask both of you, should Republicans take over this House, would you be willing to change the House rules to say any bill has to be posted online at least 72 hours before it's voted on; would you support that?

Mr. AKIN. I would support that in a heartbeat. If you're not proud enough of it to put it out there, then you shouldn't be sticking it out there at all.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Not only would I support that, but I would go further, and I would have a lot more bills come down here under an open rule. I would sign the pledge and the oath that every appropriations bill would be open rule.

Mr. KINGSTON. I am an appropriator, and I can tell you, generally all appropriation bills have been open rule. There have been a few rare occasions when we were in the majority that we

had maybe a modified rule or a closed rule, but traditionally open rules were always the case on appropriations bills. When all else failed, at least there were appropriation bills to allow the minority party an opportunity to put in some amendments.

But the iron hand of the oppressive majority has closed down that system. It's not about Republicans versus Democrats; it's about 435 people who have been elected by 600,000 people to represent their views in their Nation's capital.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Another thing that happens around this town is the hole in the wall gang, the Rules Committee, sits up here on the third floor in a place where you very seldom see any press from the room. And only on one occasion have I seen a television camera in the room. They control what gets debated here on the floor and what is voted on on the floor. The last time we had a legitimate open rule on our appropriations process was in the spring of 2007. That was when Speaker PELOSI first came in and got the gavel before this draconian shutdown of the open debate process.

In that spring period of time through the appropriations process, I was successful in getting passed—not those I introduced—but those that actually passed this floor, nine amendments. As far as I know, that's the most amendments of any Member of Congress during that period of time.

Yet I have taken dozens of amendments up to the Rules Committee and submitted them, and I can't think of a single one that they ever allowed to be debated. That process has to change. That's got to be out in the open. We need the Rules Committee on television, out front, meeting in a published hour so that they can be watched by the press and the public and then, additionally, while we are here watching what goes on with the rules and the shutdown of what's going on, we need more sunlight.

Mr. KINGSTON. If the gentleman would yield, I want to tell you one of my rules experiences at the Rules Committee. Now, remember, the Rules Committee, when the bill is passed by, say, the Agriculture or the Education or the Energy Committee, it goes to the Rules Committee and they determine how long it's going to be debated and what amendments will be allowed and what amendments won't be allowed. That's why they're called rules. Four hundred thirty-five Members, you've got to have rules, strict rules, or you won't get anything done.

I was going to the Rules Committee. I had submitted an amendment, and I was waiting my turn to present my amendment to the Rules Committee for their consideration. And a staffer wrote me an e-mail and said, Your amendment has been rejected. Do you still want to sit in here and present it?

I said, Well, how could it be rejected? I haven't presented it and until I present it they can't reject it.

And my staffer said, I have some inside information. I've got a friend on the majority. Your amendment is not on the list.

I said, Well, what list?

The list of amendments they're going to allow.

I said, Well, this is just a total farce. You have Members of Congress sitting in a crowded room waiting their turn to present an amendment, and the Rules Committee behind closed doors had already decided which ones they were going to take and not take.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Because they got a list from the Speaker as to what amendments to approve and which ones not to approve. And on this health care bill, this monstrosity here, I was before the Rules Committee at 1:30 in the morning, I offered 13 separate amendments, to ask to be able to debate them and get a vote on to approve this health care bill. And I was chastised by members of the Rules Committee because I had wasted paper and staff time to have them drafted up, because I should have known, as the gentleman from Georgia apparently should have known, that they weren't going to allow these amendments, so why should I try.

But any Congress that can pass a bill that doesn't exist, debate a bill that doesn't exist here, pass a bill that doesn't exist here, and message that bill to the United States Senate, I suppose can also put out a list and say, we're going to reject the amendment that you never offered in advance.

Another thing that happens in this Congress—and it happened on this floor today—is committee action. And the committee action that goes on is designed to take this language apart, take a look at it, examine the ramifications, hold hearings, get educated, evaluate the impact of legislation and then bring that legislation through the committee and amend it and perfect the legislation when you have a debate where you can focus it with people that are experts on the subject matter.

The legislation that came through today on this insurance across State lines political bill that came to the floor, had been amended in the Judiciary Committee with an amendment by DAN LUNGREN, passed by a majority of members, Republicans and Democrats voting for the Lungren amendment. The bill passed out of the Judiciary Committee, and on its way to the Rules Committee it magically became a different bill without the Lungren amendment language in the bill. That's what we voted on on the motion to recommit today.

So we have committee action that's a farce, as well as the Rules Committee which is a farce, as well as the debate here on the floor of the House, which is a farce, when we are debating a bill that doesn't exist. That's just three egregious things that need to change in a Republican-run Congress. I will stand to change all of those with anybody else that will stand with me.

Mr. KINGSTON. You know what's interesting about that bill, though, is dispute that strange route that it went for the strange product that wasn't passed by the committee, we still had a decent debate on it and passed the bill.

The importance of that is if you want open debate on health care, we now have an example that shows, hey, you know what, it works. This was a health insurance related piece of legislation. We had an open debate on it. It didn't have special deals for Nebraska or Louisiana. It did not have a big price tag on it. It had some Republicans against it, some Republicans for it, and the thing passed.

□ 2115

Oh, hey, what about doing that on everything else about health care? Wouldn't that be an interesting experiment in democracy?

Mr. KING of Iowa. Well, I hope, as I reclaim, that what we see tomorrow is more than a dog and pony show. I hope it's not just a show that's designed to resolve the two things that seem to be giving Democrats and the President heartburn, which are the very legitimate point that they have shut Republicans out of the process and the very legitimate point that the President has promised that negotiations will take place on C-SPAN. That seems to be what is going to be presented tomorrow.

But I'm going to say again, the requirement of preconditions that the President wants to negotiate from his position—and by the way, he doesn't have a bill yet that I know of. He just has platitudes and bullet points that are out there. But to start with his platitudes and bullet points—and maybe we'll be guessing at the amorphous combination of the Senate and the House version of this, that all needs to go off of the table, and this threat of reconciliation, the nuclear option needs to be renounced and rejected by the President of the United States.

I would be just as happy if he would just read his 2005 statement verbatim tomorrow. He should start out the meeting and say, Well, all in good faith, I want to talk about health care with you on C-SPAN. I know I made a campaign oath. It probably wasn't the best promise, but it was good political leverage and good theater at the time, so I'm going to try to follow through on that so that I can resolve some of the criticism. And by the way, I know we've shut you Republicans out of this thing. We've done so since clear back last September, but I'm going to open this up at least so we can have the semblance of negotiations take place, and to demonstrate my good faith—and then read from the 2005 statement.

Then the President should say, "Passing a bill with 51 Senate votes is an arrogant power grab against the Founders' intent." That's what the President should say tomorrow. That's actually what the President said in

2005. That would demonstrate good faith. And then we would have a blank slate, a blank piece of paper, however you want to characterize it, except Republicans have their package bill. I'm suggesting we should concede that too. Slide that off the side of the table, really start with a blank slate, and then bring up, as the gentleman from Georgia said, a stand-alone idea can be debated and it be perfected and it can be passed. We need to do it with tort reform in a real way that takes the money out of the pockets of the trial lawyers as opposed to taking it out of the pockets of our senior citizens.

The gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. AKIN. It seems like, to me, what you're talking about is, in a way you are defining something that's bipartisan, where people in good faith come to the table, they all have some ideas, they talk about them and say, Well, I don't like this part of your idea, and they say, Well, I don't like this part. Well, what part can we all agree to and put together?

Now, my understanding is the way the President is defining bipartisanship tomorrow is that what he's going to do is go behind closed doors, come up with a legislative product, then give the Republicans the chance to agree with him. And Republicans aren't allowed to bring anything they have in, but he has something that he has concocted. He's going to kind of spring it on them and say, Now are you going to go along with me?

Is that your concept of bipartisanship?

Mr. KING of Iowa. You know, I think they have been sitting up behind closed doors cooking up this reconciliation/nuclear option. They've been doing this for over a month. Senator HARKIN announced, after SCOTT BROWN won the election in Massachusetts—again, thank you, Massachusetts, Mr. Speaker—announced that they had already reached an agreement within a couple of days before SCOTT BROWN was elected in Massachusetts. This is a continuation of it, and the strategy was what I've described with reconciliation/nuclear option.

So, yes, they have worked behind closed doors. They are operating in secret, and they have cooked up this and they are going to say take it or leave it.

Mr. AKIN. Is that bipartisanship or is that ramming full speed ahead? That's what it seems like to me.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Well, it's truly not bipartisanship; it's only the show of bipartisanship designed for two things: so they can say, Well, we've negotiated with Republicans on C-SPAN. We didn't shut them out. That's really it.

The gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. KINGSTON. You know, the amazing thing is, I was in the State legislature, and we had, out of 180 members, 26 Republicans, and yet the philosophies were still reflective of the State of Georgia. You could roughly say one-third of the people were fairly liberal, one-third of the people were

fairly conservative, and then another third were either right of center or left of center. And so you had to have the legislative deliberations to get a bill in order to get, for the Georgia House, 91 votes to pass something. So I assumed that Congress would be the same way, where you would have some people from really safe hard left, hard right districts, and then people maybe from more swing districts where it's reflective of the American people, but every bill would have the mark of both parties on it.

I was shocked when I came here and saw that it's full speed ahead with the majority party. I think that's why, when we took over the House in the 104th Congress, we had open rules. And you know what, we strayed from that. That was one reason the people threw us out and put the Democrats in. But now they've seen the Democrats, and they are sick and tired of this partisan stuff. They do want open debate on C-SPAN and amendments.

So you know what would really be nice? If Mr. AKIN offers an amendment and I vote against it and you vote for it—and it's okay to vote against your party members. And maybe you prefer a Democrat one. But you know, once you understand something, you have the opportunity to debate it, as we did today, you get a better bipartisan product.

And so today, I don't know if the Speaker is in town, but perhaps she saw that and said, Oh, my goodness, so this is the way democracy works? Maybe we should do this on another dozen bills and cobble together a collection of health care reforms. Because it seems to me somewhere in the town meetings that's what people were saying; fix what's broken. Don't throw out the entire system. And if you did some one-shot bills, you could have targeted health care reform without some \$950 billion government takeover of health care.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Well, reclaiming my time, I would label the gentleman from Georgia as not necessarily right or left or center, but perhaps an optimist on the grounds that the Speaker has been around here for a long time, and she surely would have seen this over and over and over again over the last 20 or more years that I believe she has been here. So I actually don't think that it is about trying to arrive at a means to get Democrat and Republican votes. I think it's about trying to move a hard-core left-wing agenda.

The President has said he is for single payer. The Speaker is for single payer. HARRY REID is for single payer. That's all socialized medicine. That's government-run health care. Now it's a matter of—it isn't necessarily, in my view, what's right or wrong with the way they're looking at this.

I had said before the election—a year ago last November—if we elect President Obama, the most liberal President in American history, the most liberal Senator in the United States Senate, if

we elect him, with a strong ideology—and by the way, he told us in Baltimore, the President said, I am not an ideologue, I am not, but I am not aware of anyone that actually believes that. A strong left-wing President standing with the Speaker of the House from San Francisco, HARRY REID from Las Vegas, those three are the ruling troika in America.

And I said before Mr. Obama was elected President that the three of them could go into a phone booth and do what they would to America—and they wouldn't have to ask any Republicans for sure—and the only thing they would have to do is be able to verify that they could produce the votes within their own Democrat Party to pass any bill. And what happened? Just what I said, essentially. The ruling troika cooked up a bill. They just couldn't agree in the House and the Senate and they had trouble finding enough Democrats to get it to pass. Now they come back to Republicans.

I would remind the Speaker of this, Mr. Speaker, and that is, Thomas Jefferson's quote, when he said, "Large initiatives should not be advanced on slender majorities." This is a large initiative and it should never be advanced on slender majorities. It should be something that is debated and deliberated and perfected in a legitimate process, not a partisan process, which the committee markup actually was.

The gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. AKIN. Gentleman, this is my 22nd year—I hate to admit it—in an elected office, and I have seen 22 years' worth of bills, 12 in the Missouri legislature, and this is my 10th year here. I have never seen a bill like this that is going to affect so many different Americans so profoundly. This is larger than anything we've dealt with before. And I know there are a number of us that believe that if this bill were to pass the way it stands now, not only would it destroy health care in America, it would destroy our budget and would be tremendously detrimental to the lives of Americans from coast to coast. This is a very big deal and it is right for the American people to be very exercised about it.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, I will make another point of this that I think has been completely understated—if stated at all, Mr. Speaker—here in the House of Representatives or across the dialogue of this land, and that is this: This President and this administration participated with—the beginnings of this during the Bush administration—the nationalization of a huge chunk of our private sector. We have seen three large investment banks nationalized: Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, General Motors, Chrysler, AIG.

According to The Wall Street Journal last August, they printed that one-third of the private sector profits had been nationalized, and most of it by the Obama administration, depending on how you actually pick the dates

that it is declared to be nationalized. But one-third of the private sector profits, and now we are looking at another 17 percent of our economy nationalized. That takes, at 33 percent, you add it up and you're at 50 percent, right there at half.

But the important thing, the part that seems to be missed in the dialogue of this debate is, when the government nationalizes and takes over the private sector economy, which they have done, and they want to take over the health care and take over the management of everybody's health care in America, this unique thing happens. When we look back to 1973, the decision of *Roe v. Wade*, and since that time when the Supreme Court made their ruling—which I think is not grounded in the Constitution and I reject the rationale of *Roe v. Wade*—we have continually heard every year since then, people on this side of the aisle primarily, a few on this side of the aisle, say the government has no business telling a woman what she can and can't do with her body. That is not the government's business. That is between the woman and her doctor and her priest. It is not anybody else's business. No one can tell a woman what to do with her body. That is what I heard from these folks over here mostly since 1973.

Now the same people, the same voices are saying government should tell everybody what they can and can't do with their body. Government should take over and nationalize everybody's bodies, our health care, and determine whether our health insurance is the one that they will approve; determine what tests we get at what age; what age you get a mammogram; how long you're going to wait for a hip replacement or a knee replacement; the government taxing the nondiet pop to try to tell you don't buy anything or eat anything or drink anything but diet pop; the government punishing trans fats so that we can have a healthier diet, managing our diet, managing our health care. They've done everything except promise to run us across the scales, check our body fat index and tax us for our fat and tax us for failing to exercise.

They already tax about every sin that you can put in your body by trying to control our behavior. This nanny state is wanting to fund the takeover of the private sector, our bodies. They want to do this, and it is the most private thing we have, the Federal Government taking over our bodies. The very people that said that the government has no business telling a woman what she can do with her body, they want to tell everybody in America what we can and can't do with our bodies.

Gentleman.

Mr. AKIN. There just doesn't seem to be a lot of consistency there, does it? We've got 36 States that have legislation they're considering trying to protect their citizens from us demanding that those citizens have to buy the

government-approved package of health care. I mean, there are a whole lot of people fighting back, and they're sick of the nanny state telling people what to do.

I think, gentleman, when you talk about the Federal Government taking things over, what I have seen in the last year seems to me to be three nets that are being tossed over our economy.

The first net is the net that government is going to make all the decisions about energy. And energy is a key component of almost everything, so the government wants to regulate in all kinds of very fine ways the use of energy.

The second net says we are going to control all of health care. Now, that affects everybody because everybody has a body.

And the third one, which has not received a lot of attention but is equally insidious, is that the government is going to throw a net over all financial transactions. In fact, the bill that was proposed would allow the government to determine the salary of a teller in a bank.

So when you put a net over energy, a net over health care, a net over financial transactions, talk about Big Brother looking over your shoulder. No wonder people are exercised.

□ 2130

Mr. KING of Iowa. In reclaiming my time from the gentleman from Missouri, it causes me to think about what I have talked about for some time here on the floor, and I'll see if I have the notes on this. I can also speak from memory, however. I have long talked about the Democratic Socialists of America and their Web site. It seems as though Americans just don't seem to want to take a look at what's going on at dsausa.org.

I got to wondering on one of my nights that I wasn't sleeping very well. I guess it was bothering me that the liberals are deconstructing our Constitution, so I was doing a little research to figure out what they were thinking.

I went to their Web site, the Socialist Web site, and I just typed in "Socialists in America," dsausa.org. What I came up with was this Web site that said, Here is what we want to do. At first, the definition in there says, We are Socialists. We are not Communists.

Now, I always want to trust those people who start out their introductory paragraphs with "I am not a Communist." Okay. Well, tell me why you're not. Now I'm really interested, and I'm not actually sure after I read it.

Well, Communists, they say, want to nationalize everything right down to the butcher, the baker, and the candlestick maker. Socialists really don't want to do that. They just want to nationalize the Fortune 500 companies and anything else that's in their way. So they say this is the difference. So

we're not Communists; we're Socialists. We do want to nationalize the Fortune 500 companies, and we also want to nationalize the oil refinery industry and the energy industry in America. We want to take that all over, and we want to manage these corporations "for the benefit of the people affected by them."

Now, I read that, and I might have been a little blurry-eyed because I thought: Let's see. You'd run a restaurant for the benefit of the customers. That wouldn't be profit-based. You'd run a bar the same way. Oh, you can't benefit people by serving them a lot of drinks because they might hurt themselves or somebody else.

No. Really what it is is the benefit of the people affected by them will be the trade unions. They'd run the corporations for the purposes of creating jobs for trade unions to work in there, and they'd put the unions into the management of the companies. That's what they say at dsausa.org, Democratic Socialists of America.

So then I read further, and it reads, Yes, we are Socialists. We're not Communists, remember. We're Socialists, but we don't run anybody, any candidates, on our banner. We don't have a party that advances candidates to go on the ballot, because our legislative arm is the Progressives, the Progressive Caucus in the United States Congress.

If you go to their Web site—and they're quite proud of this, and they put a poster up over here on a fairly regular basis—there are 78 of them listed. There are 77 House Members who are proud Progressives, and the one other is BERNIE SANDERS, the Senator from Vermont, who is a proud Socialist. He is a Socialist. He is a Progressive. He is on the list with the others.

The Socialists say the Progressives are Socialists. I don't hear the Progressives saying they are not Socialists. I'm going to take all their word for it. They are Socialists, and their agenda is the same agenda that has been advanced on the Socialist Web site, and we hear it on a regular basis here, and the agenda that is being advanced by the President of the United States is an agenda that, for all the world, looks like the one I read on the Progressive Web site and that I read on the Socialists Web site.

I yield to the gentleman from Missouri before I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. AKIN. You know, it was interesting to me that there was a country—it was the U.S.—and they had a theory. Their theory was that the government should provide you with a job, with an education. They should provide you with health care. They should provide you with food and with clothing and with a place to live. That was the job of the government to do those things. We watched that country. It was a big country. After a while, it collapsed. It wasn't just the U.S.—It was the USSR.

Aside from the fact that they just hated people of the Christian faith, aside from that sort of prejudice, that was their operating philosophy—that the government was going to provide things that were necessary for your survival. You've got to have food to survive, so the government is going to give it to you. You've got to have health care, so the government is going to give it to you. You have to have education, so the government is going to give it to you. That was their operating premise. We sat there, as I was a young man, and we went "yuk, yuk, yuk" when the whole thing fell apart, because we knew it was a dumb idea.

So what are we doing in America here under the Pelosi and Obama leadership? The government is not only providing education and housing, but now they're going to jump into expanding to take over all of health care, and they are going to tell you where to work.

I guess my question is: How come we are doing the same thing we knew that wouldn't work before? I think that's what a lot of American citizens are saying. Time out. What is going on? We need not just to get the budget in control. We need to deconstruct Washington, D.C., and we need to remove them as a threat to the freedom of this country.

Mr. KING of Iowa. In reclaiming my time, I have a remark to the gentleman:

Free enterprise capitalism is what defeated the Soviet Union and is what ended the Cold War, because our economy could outproduce their economy, and they eventually collapsed. I don't know why we are trying to emulate them.

I have a very brief question to the gentleman from Missouri before I yield to the gentleman from Georgia, which is: In the Akin household, when you serve breakfast to those kids growing up down there, to that whole conservative family, do you serve them grits on a regular basis, or do you not?

Mr. AKIN. Well, you know, now, when you get to the State of Missouri, that's one of those things that just kind of depends.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Am I going to have to go down there and have you show me?

Mr. AKIN. Yes. We're going to have to do some showing down in the State of Missouri. We're not too bad on oatmeal, but I'll tell you what is something, I think, of a little bit of New England that I would want to recommend, and that is that you'd get that cornbread and put maple syrup on top of it and then homemade apple sauce over the top. I'd even stack that up against grits in spite of what my good friend from Georgia might say.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Well, I'll reclaim my time, and yield to the man who does have grits for breakfast, the doctor from Georgia, Mr. BROWN.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Thank you, Mr. KING. I appreciate your yielding.

I think the American people need to know that socialism never has worked, never will work, and we've got people here in Washington who are so arrogant, so ignorant, so incompetent that they will think that their brand of socialism is going to work, but it will not. It never has worked. It never will work. I don't care who is trying to force socialism upon our people; it's still not going to work.

In fact, the Progressives, as Mr. KING was talking about recently, said way back years ago with Theodore Roosevelt, who was the first Progressive and started the Progressive movement here in this country—the Progressives back a century ago were saying, The best way to socialize America would be to socialize the health care system. They have been trying for 100 years now to socialize the health care system.

We have a sham of a meeting tomorrow at the Blair House that the White House has set up. When it was first announced, I was very hopeful that maybe the President had seen the light from everything that the American people had been saying, in that they don't want to have the government take over the health care system. Maybe he was beginning to see the light and reach out a hand to try to work with us as Republicans. I'm a medical doctor, and I was hopeful that my input and even my health care reform bill, H.R. 3889, which is a comprehensive health care and financial reform bill, which totally looks at the private sector, would maybe be considered.

No, that's not what the White House wants to do. In fact, they've stacked the deck, actually, the final chapter of this whole sham—of the ruse, of the dog-and-pony show—that's going to occur tomorrow.

Now, I've challenged Democrats individually—in fact, many of them—to introduce a bill that would do four things which are totally market-based, which would give patients many options and which would literally lower the cost of health insurance for every American. Four things.

One is to have cross-State purchasing for businesses and individuals so that people could go out and buy their health insurance anywhere in this country.

The second thing is to develop an association pool so that people could join an association and could have a choice of one or more multiple products in the way of health insurance that they could buy.

The third thing is to stimulate the States to set up high-risk pools to cover those people who are uninsurable.

The fourth thing is to have tax fairness for everybody so that everybody could deduct 100 percent of all their health care expenses. We don't have that today.

In fact, last night, I led the Doctors Caucus discussion about health care.

Just following us, the Democrats came to the floor, and they were talking about a bill that passed the House today. It's a big insurance company protection bill, is actually what it is. BETSY MARKEY from Colorado, a Democrat, said she has had a small business, and she was remarking, as to her small business in Colorado, that she only has two choices of buying health insurance, and that she would like to see her employees be able to get insurance across State lines. I've had Democrat after Democrat tell me they'd like to introduce this bill, but they said that their leadership would punish them if they were to introduce it and promote it.

JOHN SHADEGG, CHARLIE DENT and I, all Republicans from different parts of this country, wrote an op-ed that was published in The Washington Times to challenge Democrats to introduce that bill. If we were to have it on the agenda tomorrow, we could introduce that bill. The Democrats could take control of it and could claim the bill as theirs.

Mr. KING of Iowa. In briefly reclaiming my time, to the gentleman from Georgia, I'd make the point that, as to what's going on tomorrow that you referred to as a dog-and-pony show, I don't take issue with that statement.

I just think that the American people need to know that this isn't a negotiation taking place tomorrow. This is about putting up the front and the show that there will be C-SPAN discussions taking place and that there will be Republicans in the room.

By the way, there hasn't been any dialogue on our part about the dynamics of what happens with the faces of the Democrats who will be in the room or whose job it will be to enhance the image of the President of the United States. This is the President's image. He has lost his mojo, and he cannot get it back by simply continuing to work in the backroom with Democrats. That's how he lost it in the first place. So the President can't get his juice back. He can't get his mojo back unless he gets Republicans in the room—and he has got to have some of them either looking silly or nodding their heads, one of the two—and I'm going to suggest going cheek-to-cheek with the President of the United States after we've come all of this way.

The American people have won the debate, and we are with them. We've now recovered the fumble in Massachusetts. We've got the ball. We're playing offense. They're playing defense. This is the best that they can come up with—allowing the President of the United States to set conditions on the negotiations by which we are going to consider his defeated bill, to which 47 percent of the people say scrap it and start over, to which 23 percent of the people say just throw it out and do nothing—don't start over—and to which about a quarter of the people say, We'll pass the President's bill. Well, that's how far down he is when 25 percent of the American people think that might be a good idea.

So I think that we need to understand that this is about the show. It's not about getting anything negotiated. But if it were, I'd do tort reform.

The gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. AKIN. That's what we called it during the last hour. We called it "Political Drama."

You know, there isn't anything, first of all, that the Republicans can do that could block his bill. The problem he has got is he doesn't even have enough Democrats who want to do this thing, so he is trying to drum up, as you say, support for this thing to make it look like there are people who are supporting it. Yet he goes behind closed doors, puts some deal together, comes out, and says, Now are you going to agree with it?

There is nothing bipartisan about that. It's just a scam. I just don't think the American people are going to buy it.

Mr. KING of Iowa. In reclaiming my time, in addition to this reconciliation package is the, figuratively, gun to the head of Republicans. They've been cleaning their gun all weekend and spinning the cylinder. They'll put it to our heads tomorrow, and they'll say, We have cooked up this reconciliation package. We've got our deal.

They're going to think we believe they have the votes.

They'll put that gun to our heads, and they'll say, Now, you can either accept the terms we're going to offer at the Blair House tomorrow or we're going to drop the hammer and go with the nuclear option and try to push this thing through the Senate.

I don't think they've got the votes in the House to do it. I don't think they've got the votes in the Senate to do it. I will say, Mr. Speaker, if they try to move that, they're going to be looking at a whole stack of amendments in the Senate that will take an awful long time, with more exposure on the Senate votes than there will be at the Blair House tomorrow.

The gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Thank you.

I believe the American people know what's going on up here, and they're going to say "no" to ObamaCare. The American people have already spoken. They're going to say "no" to all of this sham, this secrecy, this putting things together with just a few people who won't let Democrats or Republicans be engaged in setting things up. It's all a show. It's a joke. It's a bunch of clowns who are just trying to make something look different than it is. It is nothing but trying to ramrod a health care takeover by the Federal Government, by this administration, and by the leadership.

The American people need to stand up and tell their Congressmen, their Senators "no" to this sham, "no" to ObamaCare—and we can defeat it. I encourage people all over this country to start calling first thing in the morning, Mr. Speaker, every Congressmen in this Congress and every Senator and

say “no” to this sham, “no” to ObamaCare and “no” to a government takeover of the health care system. My patients and my patients’ families depend upon it—the American people just saying “no.”

With that, we as Republicans are not the party of N-O; we are the party of K-N-O-W. We can lower the cost of health care if our issues will get on the table and if we can discuss those.

I yield back.

Mr. KING of Iowa. In reclaiming my time and in thanking the gentlemen from Georgia and Missouri, in our last minute here, Mr. Speaker, I’d make the point that I’m happy to say “no” to bad ideas, N-O to bad ideas. The American people are glad of that. They were glad when Nancy Reagan said, “Just say ‘no.’” We’re just saying “no” to socialized medicine.

We’re saying “yes” to good ideas, including ending lawsuit abuse, selling health insurance across State lines, full deductibility, HSAs, portability, and transparency.

I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. PITTS (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

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

Mr. CUMMINGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. DELAUNO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. McDERMOTT, 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. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, March 3.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, March 3.

Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KINGSTON, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. SHUSTER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, March 3.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at their own request) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GARAMENDI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FARR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RAHALL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. LOWEY, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CAPUANO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DRIEHAUS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STUPAK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WELCH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. COHEN, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker’s table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 30. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to prohibit manipulation of caller identification information; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 4532. An act to provide for permanent extension of the attorney fee withholding procedures under title II of the Social Security Act to title XVI of such Act, and to provide for permanent extension of such procedures under titles II and XVI of such Act to qualified non-attorney representatives.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o’clock and 45 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 25, 2010, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

6192. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — 2-propenoic acid, butyl ester, polymer with ethenylbenzene, methyl 2-methyl-2-propenoate and 2-propenoic acid; Tolerance Exemption [EPA-HQ-OPP-2009-0691; FRL-8800-6] received December 15, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6193. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — 2,6-Diisopropyl-naphthalene (2,6-DIPN); Time-Limited Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2009-0802; FRL-8798-5]

received December 15, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6194. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Bifenazate; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0126; FRL-8804-1] received December 15, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6195. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Chlorimuron Ethyl; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2009-0009; FRL-8798-1] received December 15, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6196. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Dinotefuran; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2009-0013; FRL-8803-1] received December 15, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6197. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Endothall; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0730; FRL-8804-8] received December 15, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6198. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Fenarimol; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2007-0536 and 2007-0097; FRL-8793-5] received December 15, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6199. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Fluoastrobilin; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0704; FRL-8803-4] received December 15, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6200. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Glyphosate; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0385; FRL-8408-1] received December 15, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6201. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Mesotrione; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0811; FRL-8799-1] received December 15, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6202. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Prometryn; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0773; FRL-8801-8] received December 15, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6203. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Prosulfuron; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0276; FRL-8800-8] received December 15, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6204. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Quinclorac; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0937; FRL-8800-7]