more local the better, and the more common sense the decisions are, rather than having a federal government make those decisions,'' he said during his 2010 campaign. So how to explain his spoiling a move to give the District autonomy over its own tax dollars by—and this is really rich—injecting the federal government into local affairs?

We thought we could no longer be surprised by congressional hypocrisy when it comes to the nation's capital, but Mr. Paul's willingness to turn his back on his supposed libertarian principles and devotion to local rule is truly stunning.

A bill that would give D.C. officials the ability to spend local dollars—we repeat, locally collected, locally paid tax dollars—without congressional approval was pulled from consideration this week after Mr. Paul introduced a set of amendments that would dictate to the city policies on guns, abortions and unions. ''The last senator I would expect it from,'' said Del. Eleanor Holmes Norton (D–D.C.), telling us that she has never seen so many amendments offered at one time by a single member to restrict D.C. rights. Ironically, Ilir Zherlca, head of the advocacy group DC Vote, said that Mr. Paul initially had been seen as a potential ally for the District because of his views on small government.

Mr. Paul told The Post's Ben Pershing, ''I think it's a good way to call attention to some issues that have national implications. We don't have [control] over the states, but we do for D.C.'' In other words, ''I am doing this because I can''—not exactly the argument one expects to hear from someone who has railed about federal intrusion. As Mr. Zherka pointed out, Mr. Paul's brief for small government is not whether the federal government has the power but whether it should use it.

A spokesman for Mr. Paul e-mailed us a reminder that the District is not a state but a federal jurisdiction: ''Efforts to change that have failed, and until it is changed it is not only the prerogative but the duty of Congress to have jurisdiction over the Federal District.'' What we don't get is how someone who raises the banner of a movement inspired by a time when Americans were ruled without representation could be so unsympathetic to the rights of D.C. citizens who are in the same position.

□ 1430

SUPREME COURT HEALTH CARE DECISION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. It's always an honor to speak before the House of Representatives, a great storied history here, just as the Supreme Court has a great storied history. There's some moments in time with regard to the United States Supreme Court which show it to have consisted of a bastion of strong-willed, determined, principled, constitutionally minded Justices. There are other times when the Supreme Court has shown itself to consist of some great judges and some who are more interested in politics, more interested in feathering their friends' nests than they are in doing what was right under the Constitution, even though it was easy enough for them to rationalize that, gee, if they did what helped their friends, then obviously that would make it better for the whole country.

I think we get some of that rationalization from this administration. Gee, if they just throw billions or hundreds of billions of dollars at friends, then their friends will do better. And if their friends are doing better, surely the rest of the country would. We have also found that to be true with regard to things like Solyndra and the massive number of other cronies of the administration that have received hundreds of billions of dollars over time and also at a time when this country is sorely hurting from overspending and running up debt.

In fact, today we had a bill regarding transportation and a conference report. I know my friend JOHN MICA from Florida worked exceedingly hard, as had other members of Transportation, trying to reach an agreement with the conference report. It looked like the Senate got the better end of the deal. But I know these people, I know their hearts, and I know they try to do what is right for America when it comes to Chairman MICA and those who are assisting him.

But, nonetheless, we heard our friends across the aisle over and over today talk about how critically important infrastructure is, how we ought to be spending money, and how just $1 billion added to the transportation budget could really make a tremendous difference. I hearken back to a year-and-a-half ago when the President of the United States, Barack Obama, had told people that if you will give me basically a trillion—whether it's $800 billion, $900 billion, apparently it looked more like a trillion dollars by the time it was finished—you just hand me over a trillion bucks and we'll get this economy going. If you don't give it to me, then it will turn out that we may see as high as 8.5 percent unemployment. But if you do give it to me, we'll never see 8.

Of course, he was wrong that we would never see 8 percent unemployment. We've gone for many months—I guess that was 3½ years ago now—that he was telling us about his big stimulus. How quickly time flies.

As the transportation proponents were pushing their bill today and talking about what the good infrastructure will do, many of us believed that was true back in January of 2009, that it would be good. If we're going to spend money on anything, spend it on the things that we really need to do: bridges, roads, all these things that need construction, need renovation.

So the President sold America largely on his stimulus because we're going to fix all the infrastructure in America. But the last 3½ years have borne out that the President did not spend $800 billion, $900 billion on infrastructure. He spent maybe 6 percent of the largest giveaway in American history. He surpassed the terrible mistake that TARP was—$700 billion. And we haven't been able to get an exact number, but of the $700 billion, it may be $450 billion-or-so that his administration inherited. So when you get the $800 billion, $900 billion, trillion-dollar stimulus giveaway—porkulus, as some called it—and you combine that with $400 billion, $450 billion, $500 billion that he was able to inherit from the TARP fund, you think maybe a trillion and a trillion-and-a-half dollars he had to give away.

And we hear debate over what difference $1 billion would make. He was talking about a thousand times that for infrastructure. And he spent a tiny fraction on infrastructure, preferring instead to have massive grants and giveaways to programs that were his cronies, his pets, that are now producing no dividends and in fact are increasing further debt.

So we hear those things, how wonderful infrastructure would be, and yet we know when we as a Congress provided this administration with massive amounts of money for infrastructure, they diverted it. They did more damage to the country than they did good. And we look at the people that this President has surrounded himself with. He had a Solicitor General named Elena Kagan. The Solicitor General's job is to assist the White House, assist the administration with potential legislation that may come to litigation, assist them with litigation. As I know from working 30 years ago in the private sector, you can't advise people about existing litigation and do your job without advising them about the way to avoid future litigation problems that you run into.

So we know that the biggest legislative agenda item for this administration was the complete takeover of health care. And as most thinking people would understand, if you could control all health care, you can pretty well control all people. You get to decide who gets what treatments, who can have a new hip, who can have a new knee, who can have radiation therapy, who can have the surgery. And as one secretary in my hometown pointed out, her mother acquired breast cancer in England, and since the English Government's wonderful health care system decided how long you had to wait before you could get to have diagnostic tests done, before you could have therapeutic activity occur, her mother didn't get the diagnostic tests in time to find out she had it for sure, didn't get the surgery in time, didn't get the treatment in time and she said, My mother died of breast cancer because she lived in England and the government was in charge of health care.

□ 1440

She said I have been found to have cancer since I've been here in the U.S., and because the government was not in charge of my health care, I got it diagnosed in time. I got treatment in time.

I didn't have to live by any preconceived requirements of the government. So I'm alive because I was in America. My mother is dead because her health care was in England.

Some think the great panacea is government being charged with health care. We've heard over and over again that this is for the good of the children.

At this point I would be delighted to yield to my friend from Michigan.

UNITED WAY CELEBRATES 125 YEARS

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. I want to thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding me some time.

Mr. Speaker, I'm very honored today to commend the United Way on 125 years of serving our country. In particular, the United Way of Southeastern Michigan has done so much good for our region and for our people. It has helped provide shelter to the homeless, provide education to our young people and training to the unemployed.

So again, I want to thank the United Way of Southeastern Michigan for its service, and also congratulate the United Way on its 125th anniversary of outstanding work for our country.

I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding me this time.

Mr. GOHMERT. I thank and greatly appreciate my friend, Mr. CLARKE. That is obviously an important announcement. I didn't realize that the United Way had been around 125 years. They do great work, and I appreciate my friend, and I do mean my friend, calling that to our attention.

The Obama administration had an agenda item, getting ObamaCare passed. Elena Kagan was Solicitor General, and she continued to be Solicitor General even up until after the time when the first lawsuits were filed against ObamaCare. Now, she gave testimony before the Senate that satisfied them at the time that she was pure as the driven snow and she would in no way compromise integrity. That was the feeling that was gotten. She got the votes that she needed to be confirmed, and then went on to the U.S. Supreme Court.

But since that time, more questions have arisen. Wait a minute, she was there during this, that, and the other. When ObamaCare was being drafted, when it was being prepared, and even after it passed and it became law, she was the Solicitor General.

And so now that we see all of these things in perspective, we go, wait a minute, could she have been the worst Solicitor General in American history that she would never advise the President, her boss—never advise him—on the litigation that would surely be coming when his prize legislation got passed, if it got passed? Because a legitimate lawyer, an adviser, a counselor, will tell the client—in this case, the President—Look, if you want to have this pass constitutional muster, here's what you need to do. Let's get this verbiage in one place, let's get this in another.

Could she have foreseen that perhaps a weakness of the brilliant John Roberts would be, if you call something a penalty in a bill and then later call it a tax after it's passed, that maybe the Supreme Court would buy it? I don't even think that Solicitor General Kagan could have foreseen that John Roberts would totally abandon intellectual consistency. No matter how intelligent, I don't think she could have seen that coming. I certainly didn't.

But the law regarding judges, Federal judges, is not just a matter of ethics—gee, you can have an ethics complaint filed against you as you can if you're a practicing attorney or a judge. The law is 28 U.S.C., section 455, and it says:

Any justice, judge, or magistrate judge of the United States shall disqualify himself—that's generic for him and her—in any proceeding in which his impartiality might reasonably be questioned.

Well, it is absolutely clear that her impartiality is certainly questionable in her boss's most prized legislation: ObamaCare.

My friend from Alabama, one of the great Senators over at the other end of the hall, JEFF SESSIONS, had extended eight questions to Attorney General Holder asking for answers, and they were submitted timely under the rules so they were part of the hearing and would require answers from our Attorney General Holder. And three of them in particular were these. These were questions for Attorney General Holder, because as 28 U.S.C., section 455 is the law and Justice Kagan's impartiality has reasonably been questioned, there is potential here for a law violation by Justice Kagan, and we need to know more. Since this is with regard to the law that the Attorney General is supposed to uphold, fair questions. From JEFF SESSIONS to Attorney General Holder:

Are you aware of any instances during Justice Kagan's tenure as Solicitor General of the United States in which information related to the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and/or litigation related thereto was relayed or provided to her?

Another question from U.S. Senator JEFF SESSIONS to Attorney General Holder that required an answer:

When did your staff begin ''removing'' Solicitor General Kagan from meetings in this matter? On what basis did you take this action? In what other matters was such action taken?

Clearly, Solicitor General Kagan was on the email list for people who were talking about the laws that were coming up that the administration wanted to get passed, including ObamaCare, so it's a legitimate question to know at what point did she stop getting emails regarding ObamaCare.

It's also important to know what she said in those emails, because the one email they slipped and let us get a glimpse of was when ObamaCare passed. She sent an email something along the lines of: Can you believe they got the votes? Sounds like an excited utterance.

And it's worth noting that under 28 U.S.C., section 455 the law is very clear, this is the law. It's not an ethics, an encouraged rule. This is the law.

□ 1450

''Where he or she has served in government employment''—as Solicitor General Kagan had—''and in such capacity participated as counsel, adviser or material witness concerning the proceeding or expressed an opinion concerning the merits of the particular case in controversy, she shall disqualify herself.''

So, clearly, she is already disqualified because her impartiality is certainly reasonably being questioned. But is there even another law—not rule, but law—in which her impartiality can be questioned? But it makes it very clear, if she ever, ever expressed an opinion concerning the merits of ObamaCare, she should not have been allowed to sit on this case.

I think history is going to judge this case in a way that Justice Roberts never dreamed. He is so brilliant. There's no question that he was able to rationalize that coming as part of the majority as he did was the thing to do. He has gotten accolades, just as Chief Justice Taney did when he came out with the Dred Scott decision. Justice Taney got accolades from people, you know, wow. Yes, he got criticism, just as Chief Justice Roberts has, but he got some of the same accolades he's got: wow, what a brilliant man. He has removed politics from the Supreme Court when the truth is just the opposite of what occurred.

The politics of the White House prevailed. It was pure politics; it was nothing but politics. And anyone who honestly reads this opinion from an entirely objective standpoint will not be able to say this is a beautiful piece of well-reasoned legal logic because it is not. It is a hodgepodge of poorly written, poorly thought-out, poorly pieced-together opinion; and it's an embarrassment. And one day, history will record that this Court was possessed of four individuals who had political agendas and could not set them aside, and that a Chief Justice, who knew better, decided he would try to make the Court look less than political, and in doing so became very political.

We need answers to these questions.

The third one was:

Did you ever have a conversation with Justice Kagan regarding her recusal from the matters before the Supreme Court related to the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act? If so, please describe the circumstances and substance of those conversations.

Real easy. Now, we know that this Attorney General has significant recollection problems. He recalled, under penalty of perjury before our Judiciary Committee that he had only learned about Fast and Furious a few weeks, he said, a few weeks before the hearing. Within months, we found documentation showing that that was a lie. It had been months before, at a minimum,

that he had learned. Then, when he had that presented to him, he said a few weeks, months, what's the difference? Highest Justice official in America sees no difference between a few weeks and months.

These questions need to be answered. It's already embarrassing enough that a Justice hid behind the refusal to answer questions, the avoidance of questions, to be able to sit on this case and participate in one of the worst thought-out and thought-through and expressed opinions that I've read from the U.S. Supreme Court.

And it's worth looking at some of them. If you go to the opinion itself, first of all, the Supreme Court has to deal with the issue of whether the Supreme Court can consider the case because the Anti-Injunction Act basically, in essence, says: if Congress passes a tax, then the Supreme Court does not have any jurisdiction to consider the case. No one can file such case in Federal court until the tax is actually levied and the individual filing suit has actually had it levied on them. Then that individual has standing, can file a lawsuit, and the Supreme Court can consider it. But until the Supreme Court could decide and determine whether or not the penalty for not buying health care insurance was a penalty or a tax—even though the language in the act clearly said it was a penalty—well, the Court couldn't go forward. So that was the first thing they had to wrestle with. You see it particularly highlighted from pages 11 through 15.

But it's worth noting—this is page 11—the Court says: before turning to the merits, we need to be sure we have authority to do so. That's Justice Roberts, before turning to the merits, we've got to be sure we have authority. He said the Anti-Injunction Act provides:

> No suit for the purpose of restraining the assessment or collection of any tax shall be maintained in any court by any person, whether or not such person is the person against whom such tax was assessed.

Can't bring the lawsuit, the Supreme Court can't consider it if it's a tax, because it won't be 2014 or so before that happens.

So you look at this decision, page 12, our brilliant Chief Justice—and he really is brilliant, he just compromised it here:

> Congress's decision to label this exaction a ''penalty'' rather than a ''tax'' is significant because the Affordable Care Act describes many other exactions it creates as ''taxes.''

Because there are taxes. There are, clearly. There's the medical device tax that ObamaCare adds. All these other taxes, they call themselves taxes. This doesn't. And Justice Roberts points out, it's a penalty. They call it that.

Justice Roberts says, and this is page 13 of his opinion:

> The Anti-Injunction Act and the Affordable Care Act, however, are creatures of Congress's own creation. How they relate to each other is up to Congress and the best evidence of Congress's intent.

Get that: best evidence of Congress's intent is the statutory text. That's why he goes through and says the text calls it a penalty. On page 15, he says:

> The Affordable Care Act does not require that the penalty for failing to comply with the individual mandate be treated as a tax for purposes of the Anti-Injunction Act. The Anti-Injunction Act therefore does not apply to this suit, and we may proceed to the merits.

It's not a tax; it's a penalty. All right. So, page 15, all this legal reasoning, it's not a tax, it's a penalty, best evidence of what it is is what Congress calls it, Congress calls it a penalty, ergo it's a penalty and we can move on. And now we're entitled to consider the merits.

Now, he also adds—this is over at page 39:

> The joint dissenters argue that we cannot uphold section 5000A as a tax because Congress did not frame it as such.

Now, in fact, the four intellectually honest dissenters have pointed out to the Chief Justice—they called it a penalty. You said the best evidence of what it was was what Congress called it. Congress calls it a penalty, they treat it as a penalty, and that's the best evidence. So you can't uphold 5000A as a tax because it was not intended to be one.

If you look, page 39 is where—and the full sentence says: ''An example may illustrate why labels should not control here.'' This is the Chief Justice saying these lines. Labels should not control here. He just said, in page 11 through 15, labels should control. Congress puts the label on what they mean it to be: that should control. Now he's saying labels don't control here.

He goes on to say, and this is at page 44:

> The Affordable Care Act's requirement that certain individuals pay a financial penalty for not obtaining health insurance may reasonably be characterized as a ''tax.''

□ 1500

I called it a penalty so I'd have jurisdiction to write this opinion, but now that I have jurisdiction to write this opinion, now, page 44, I'm calling it a tax. Also on 44 he says:

> The statute reads more naturally as a command to buy insurance than as a tax, and I would uphold it as a command if the Constitution allowed it.

Well, that is the point I guess, that is really strange in an opinion because that's in a paragraph marked Capital D that starts with:

> Justice Ginsberg questions the necessity of rejecting the government's commerce power.

You never put that in, you're not supposed to. In good writing of judicial opinions, you don't put that in a majority opinion. You don't attack another co-majority signer, and yet he does that a few times in his majority opinion.

But then to add first person, the first person pronoun ''I'' and then follow that with a conditional future tense verb ''would'' uphold it as a command if the Constitution allowed it, why is that there?

That looks like that should have been part of a dissenting opinion, not, for heaven's sake, the majority opinion by one of the smartest lawyers in the country. He sacrificed not only his intellectual consistency, he sacrificed his intellectual ability to write as one of the best writers we ever had. It's really tragic.

But the statute reads more naturally as a command to buy insurance. I would have allowed it. It makes no sense there in that context.

One other quote we have down here, it's found at page 57. He says:

> We are confident that Congress would have wanted to preserve the rest of the Act.

He knows that's not true. He knows that the House version of ObamaCare had the severability clause. And the severability clause, every good lawyer, even every bad lawyer knows, if you want the whole document to be preserved, even if one line is struck out, you better put that Mother Hubbard clause in there so that it's all protected. You lose one line, you don't lose the whole document.

And that was in the House version, but the Senate chose to strike it out. They didn't want it in there to say, if any of these parts get struck down by the Court, it all has to fall. They didn't want that. They wanted the bill without the severability clause because if anything got struck, everything had to go. That's the way they looked at it.

In fact, that debate was even made. If we don't get this part, we don't get that part, then there's no sense even having any of it.

Well, it's pretty tragic, pretty tragic. But there's been so much sacrifice.

I'm very grateful to Justice Kennedy, Justice Scalia, Justice Thomas, Justice Alito for maintaining their consistency. The dissent is very well-written, very consistent. They not only didn't sacrifice their intellectual integrity, they did not compromise their writing ability.

It's a dangerous time, and now we know, because of this Supreme Court decision, talking to my friend, ALLEN WEST this morning, he brought this up. I didn't know he'd brought it up already in an interview. But since we now know that bringing down the cost of government function is a legitimate interest that justifies intrusive legislation, and you can now have a tax on people if they don't participate, then we know everywhere that concealed guns have been made legal, the crime rates have gone down. When the crime rates go down, the costs go down. So we need a bill that will require everybody in America to buy a gun, and if you don't, you'll be taxed.

And this Supreme Court, in their intellectual lack of integrity, will sustain that bill.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1335. An act to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide rights for pilots, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4348) ''An Act to authorize funds for Federal-aid highways, highway safety programs, and transit programs, and for other purposes.''.

GLOBAL WARMING AND AMERICAN FREEDOM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) for 30 minutes.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I have a policy in my office that every time anyone from my district actually comes to the Capitol, they have a right to see me and talk to me, especially young people. And I have, over the years, seen hundreds and hundreds, maybe thousands of young people from my home district in southern California. And I let them talk to me and ask any questions that they would like to ask.

And I have a question that I always ask them, and I thought it would be interesting for my colleagues and perhaps any of those who are watching C–SPAN or reading this in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to know the answer that I get when I ask a question of the young high school students from my district.

Mr. Speaker, when our kids come in to my office and are talking to me, I note that I was actually in high school in southern California 47 years ago. And I always ask the kids, is the air better quality today, or is it worse today than when I was going to high school in southern California 47 years ago?

And 90 percent of the students, over the years, whom I've asked that question to have had exactly the wrong answer. Their answer is, oh, you were so lucky to live at a time when the air quality in southern California and around the Nation was so good, and it's so terrible that we have to put up today with air quality that's killing us.

They've been told that the air quality when I was in high school was so much better than it is today, which is 180 degrees wrong. But this is a general attitude among today's young people because our young people are being lied to. They are intentionally being given misinformation.

Now, their teachers may not be intentionally lying to them, but their teachers maybe are given information from scientists and other sources that is an exact lie from people who know that, yes, the air quality back when I went to school, and I go into description about how the air quality was so bad at times we couldn't even go out on the playground. They wouldn't even let us out of the classroom on to the sports field because the air was so bad. Today that happens maybe once a year or twice a year in southern California. Back then it happened once a week at times during the summer and during the school year.

So our kids have this view that their generation is being poisoned, and they're willing to accept stringent measures in order to protect the environment that take away a great deal of the opportunity that they should have in their lives in order to correct this horrible problem that they're told that they've got.

Well, when I tell them it's just the opposite, they're so surprised. Well, the truth is, our Nation's environment is no longer the disaster that it was 50 years ago. And 50 years ago we did have a problem. Fifty years ago I remember that when my dad was a Marine down in Quantico, when I was a child I came up here several times and my dad would say, whatever you do, don't put your finger in the Potomac River or your finger will fall off. Well, it wasn't quite that bad, but it was really bad.

We've made tremendous progress over the years on the Potomac River. I can't help but notice there are people water-skiing and sailing and fishing in the Potomac now.

Well, we don't live in the same time of 50 years ago. The air today has never been cleaner than at any time in my lifetime. The water has never been cleaner in any time in my lifetime than it is today. And I am hopeful that my children will never have to experience the pollution that was rampant when I was their age.

So, let's take a look and give credit where credit's due. That progress is, in large part, because of the efforts of the government, well, and the EPA, yes, which came in under President Nixon, and others who have used science to fight for environmental reforms and to improve the quality of life of our people.

And while I am thankful, I also would like to heed the warning that President Eisenhower left with us in his farewell address. And I quote, ''that public policy could itself become the captive of a scientific technological elite.''

He was warning us about government-funded research becoming so intertwined with public policy and the creation of regulations it would compromise the integrity of both.

Well, in recent years, we've seen political agendas being driven by scientific-sounding claims being used to frighten the general public again and again and again.

□ 1510

An unjustified fear has been used, for example, to ban DDT. I remember when I was a kid, and I used to run through these clouds of DDT—again, when my father was in the military down in North Carolina. Yes, it was killing millions of mosquitos in North Carolina, but when they banned that DDT, I seem to remember it had something to do with the thickness of shells of certain birds. Well, they banned DDT, and because of that we have had millions of deaths due to malaria in Africa. Millions of young African children, because they don't have a good diet, succumb to a disease like malaria and die because of it. These children are dead—make no mistake about it—because we were frightened into an irrational position on DDT, banning that and thus destroying the lives of millions of children in the Third World.

We've seen alarmism with ''The Population Bomb.'' Do you remember that in 1968? It was a book claiming that increasing populations and decreasing agricultural yield would lead to cannibalism and global warfare over scarce resources by the mid-1970s. Here we are a long way from the 1970s, and I'm afraid Malthus, who 150 years ago started this type of scarism, was wrong, wrong, wrong. Right now, there are a lot of scientists, unfortunately, who are molding themselves after the Malthus mistakes that were made 150 years ago.

Today's environmental alarmists use faulty and, in some cases, deceitful computer models to ''prove'' that the world is being destroyed one way or the other, quite often, in the ones they've been using in the last 10 years, of course, was that the world was being destroyed by manmade carbon emissions. This is proven by their computer models, even though the Earth has seen significantly higher atmospheric carbon levels many times before. Those were not necessarily bad times for this planet, but those computer models were suggesting, because of carbon emissions, we were going to face a catastrophe. In fact, I remember very well the predictions of 10 and 15 years ago that, by now, we would have reached a tipping point in the temperature of the world—that we'd have reached a temperature of about now—and then it would go up 5 to 10 degrees, which is a big jump, but we haven't seen that big jump.

The alarmists, of course, are not interested when they make mistakes, and they're not really interested in solving real problems. They are part of a coalition that wants to change our way of life—that's their goal—with their computerizations showing that just horrible times are ahead of us unless we change. The idea isn't to stop those horrible times, because those horrible times are just a product of what they put into their computers. Of course we all know what ''garbage in, garbage out'' means. If you put into a computer that you're going to have some kind of disaster, that's what you're going to get out of your computer, but what they have in mind, of