

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I think my time is pretty close to the end, is it not?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I will take this brief opportunity to thank my colleagues Mr. MARINO and Mr. WENSTRUP for being here and Mr. LAMBORN for being here and for your indulgence and for the American people's.

We have often said—and we have shared these moments together many times—that we have not just a responsibility but an obligation not just to ourselves and to our current generation but to all of those who came before us for all of the sacrifices that they made—for the 1.6 million men and women in uniform who gave their lives that we could have this moment today and those into the future. We have a responsibility to guarantee to them that we made a conscious decision to make sure that their future would be as secure as the one that we were given.

In having said all of that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### OBAMACARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. I want to thank my friends, Mr. Speaker, who are both from Pennsylvania, for their superb comments. They are so right on everything they have said.

In following up on those comments, there was an article today from The Washington Free Beacon: "Employers Say ObamaCare Will Cost Them \$5,000 More Per Employee." How much more can businesses absorb?

Actually, in the last month, we have been finding out about more groups that are getting money from a health care program informally called "ObamaCare," because it is so hard to call it "affordable" when it is not. They are groups that are getting money from the Federal Government that, it sounds like, are using it more as an opportunity to register voters as Democrats when that money could be used to get a pacemaker or to get a mammogram or to replace a knee for some 85-year-old widow who could really use a new knee or a new hip. Yet millions and millions of dollars are being paid to groups to go out and find people and to do all they can to get them signed up so they can say they had 7 million people sign up. They sign them up all over the country, using millions and millions of dollars that should have been for health care, yet they are using it to try to recruit votes for the Democratic Party. Millions and millions and millions of dollars are being spent on hiring big names that young people will recognize to go on television, to go on radio to try and talk people into signing up for health

care to pay for the health care of others—because they hope they are in good health and won't need it—and that will fund all of the millions and millions of dollars that they are paying to celebrities to convince them to buy ObamaCare.

We know that insurance companies cannot run like the Federal Government and, certainly, not like the executive branch. They can't just announce 7 million people have bought a product if they have not bought it. I haven't seen any insurance companies come out and say, Do you know what? We have had 1.5 million of these or we have had 3 million of these 7 million. Insurance companies have to know who has paid for their services, who has paid for their products. They can't just go along and announce to the IRS, We had 7 million people who bought our products. We don't know who paid for them. We will probably not know for a year or so. We don't know, but 7.1 million have bought our products, but you are going to have to give us a pass for a year or two until we find out who actually paid for it, and then we will eventually get around to telling you how much we owe you in income tax from all of the people who bought or who didn't buy our insurance. They can't work like that, because the IRS will not let them work like that. The insurance companies have to know how much money has come through their doors. They have to account for it. They can't get into this magical math that the executive branch gets into that 7.1 million have paid for ObamaCare and count that as some kind of glorious thing.

We were told there were over 30 million people who didn't have health care and that that was the whole reason health care, itself, had to be turned upside down. Cancer patients had to be turned away from their cancer treatment providers. Of the people who had the doctors they wanted, who were doing great things for their health—keeping them alive—oh, they had to lose them because we had over 30 million who didn't have health insurance. Then we were told, of the 7.1 million or so who may have acquired health insurance under ObamaCare, there is only a small fraction of them who were people who didn't have insurance, part of the 30 or so million who didn't have insurance.

If you are going to cut off people's cancer treatments and if you are going to cut off their ability to get the health care they need—cut off their ability to go to the cancer hospitals they have been going to for treatment—if you are going to basically bring people's lives to an early end because we have got to help those 30 million or so who don't have insurance, then wouldn't you want to get the 30 million signed up? Why are you happy that it is only, maybe, 1 million or 2 million or many fewer who didn't have insurance who have signed up? If it is a fraction of the 7 million who have actu-

ally paid, and if it is an even smaller part of the fraction who paid who didn't have health insurance before and who were part of the 30-plus million, then how is that a good thing?

Why did every Democrat in the House and in the Senate who thought it was such a good idea without a single Republican's input—we didn't get to have any input in ObamaCare. They shoved it through this body and down the throats of the American people. They shoved it through the Senate, and they had to do it quickly before Scott Brown ended up in office, in having that seat. Tragically, they shoved it through without any bipartisan assistance, so nearly half of Americans were not represented in the creation of that bill.

□ 1745

It wasn't done on C-SPAN, as the candidate for President, Senator Obama, had promised. It was done in back rooms at the White House, here. Who knows where. We don't even know who was present.

We know there were some union leaders that met with the President about it, without anybody there to record what was said. We know that they ended up wanting every health care worker eventually to be a union member because their numbers have declined everywhere except in the area of government workers, where Franklin Roosevelt said we should never even have government unions.

So if the 30-plus million who purportedly didn't have health insurance were the real important reason we had to turn health care upside down, that we had to cut \$716 billion from Medicare, so seniors are not going to be able to get care they would have before ObamaCare was passed, if we had to turn away seniors from health care they need just for those 30-plus million that don't have insurance, then why should we be happy that maybe only one-thirtieth or so of that has signed up for insurance?

In the 4 years since ObamaCare passed, the best they could do is sign up 1 million of the 30 or so million that didn't have insurance. That is a good thing?

Most Americans are ready to have some real reform, like having competition. If you need an MRI, you shouldn't have to do like one of the people in my office who was in Boston and under RomneyCare at the time.

The President said they modeled ObamaCare after RomneyCare. She was in a car wreck and couldn't get an MRI for a month or so after the wreck, so she had to fly back to Texas and get an MRI to find out she had broken bones.

This is the kind of care we are heading to. You get put on a list. This is what happens in England and Canada, and that is coming to a health care provider near you. You will get on the list. Why? Because we are told 30 million people didn't have health insurance.

Well, real reform would have made sure not that everybody had insurance, but that they had health care that was affordable and that they could get all the health care they needed and that it was affordable.

In some cases, it would have been a whole lot cheaper than having insurance. Also, having catastrophic insurance for the things you can't afford. Those were some reforms that we wanted to make.

Most of us were okay with fixing a problem called preexisting conditions, which had allowed some insurance companies to really screw over people unfairly. We offered to address that in a bipartisan manner, but the Democrats didn't want our input.

They said they didn't need it. They had the votes without it. They didn't care what we wanted. They didn't care what our constituents thought was a good idea. So we got ObamaCare, and it is wreaking havoc across the country. It is time to repeal it.

So we are told that, under this administration and under those two glorious years when the Democrats had the White House, the House, and the Senate, full control of all the powers here in Washington—and what did they put in motion in 2009 with control of the House, the Senate, and the White House?

Well, now, we find out—the President admitted this last September. It didn't get much press at all, if any, from the mainstream because, of course, they got the President elected, and so they have got to cover for him. We understand that.

But this is staggering. It has never ever happened before in American history. When the President, the Democratic House, and the Democratic Senate put these things in motion, 95 percent of all of the income made in America went to the top 1 percent of Americans. The top 1 percent of income earners in America got 95 percent of the income. Wow.

We talk about how we have really got to help the poor and we have really got to help the middle class, and then we find out the actions of this Democratic-controlled House, Democratic-controlled Senate, and Democratic-controlled White House put in motion the mechanics to ensure that 95 percent of all the income for those years—2009 until it was admitted last September—went to the top 1 percent income earners. Staggering.

Why isn't there more in the mainstream about it? They love to go after the wealthy. Well, because these wealthy are about 70 or 80 percent of the people on Wall Street who donate to Democrats over Republicans. People don't get that. It is shocking.

But it is about 4 to 1 that donations from executives and their spouses on Wall Street go to Democratic candidates.

It is shocking, I know, for some people to come to the realization that most of the wealthiest people in Amer-

ica are Democrats, and they are ready to pull up the ladder behind them. They are thrilled to have a President that will talk about the fat cats.

They don't mind being called fat cats, when they are making 95 percent of all the income in America, they have got a President that talks about the poor and the middle class, and the ones he has helped like nobody else are the ultrawealthy in America.

At some point, people are going to figure this out. At some point, the middle class and the poor are going to say: You know what? I have been supporting Democrats all these years, and now, 95 percent of all the income is going to the top 1 percent. How is that a good thing? Why should I keep supporting the party that is sending 95 percent of the income to the top 1 percent and the Wall Street fat cats have gotten richer than they ever have in their lives?

I don't mind people getting wealthy, but not at the expense of the whole country, and you look at the separation of the wealthy and the middle class. It has never been so dramatically far apart as it is now under this President, with what was set in motion with ObamaCare and all these things that this administration has done.

Crony capitalism has been amazing. How? You can pay over \$600 billion to your buddies that you have known for years to create a Web site. Oh, they forgot to do security. That is going to cost people billions of dollars to try to save their own identity information that has now been out there on an insecure Web site.

You have a Web site that keeps breaking down. Why? Because crony capitalism kicked in and people that are buddies got the contract.

It is just like British Petroleum should have never been allowed to continue drilling in the Gulf of Mexico, but they were buddies with the administration. At the time the Deepwater Horizon blew out, I read that they had people from BP talking to John Kerry about coming out in support of cap-and-trade, so they didn't want to shut them down.

They had hundreds and hundreds of egregious safety violations, compared to others like Exxon and Shell. I think they had one or two or none.

Well, they should never have been allowed to operate. Why? Because crony capitalism is alive and well in this administration and with Democrats in control. Yes, we will let them keep operating. Never mind they are the unsafe drillers in the Gulf of Mexico. That is okay because they are on our side.

America is sick of cronyism. They are sick of favoritism. We don't begrudge anybody getting wealthy, but what we begrudge is gaming the system so the middle class and the poor have no chance because the ladder has been pulled up behind ultrawealthy Democrats by a Democratic administration, and it continues.

So employers are saying ObamaCare will cost them \$5,000 more per em-

ployee. This has got to stop. We have got to repeal ObamaCare and have true health care reform. I know some people say: well, you don't have any ideas.

Are you kidding? The last I saw, there were about 80 different bills—ideas for reform; and what I really want to see us do is, once we get ObamaCare repealed, let's have the full debate. Let's have it on C-SPAN.

Like Candidate Obama said, let's let America see who is really standing up for them and who is cutting those sweetheart deals with unions, who is cutting the sweetheart deals with AARP, the big pharmaceuticals, the AMA, the AHA; who is cutting those big deals behind the scenes in private rooms, so that mainstream America sees 95 percent of the income going to 1 percent, the most wealthy?

Let them see that. I welcome that. We have got to repeal ObamaCare. We have got to.

There is a book Glenn Beck had pointed out a week or so ago. I had not seen it before. It was copyrighted originally in 1942. The Library of Congress has this book. It is "The Road We Are Traveling." It is interesting.

He basically talks about the ways that socialism and communism have failed. Really, socialism and communism are bad words, so you don't want to call it that. We know now it is called progressivism.

Here, at page 95, he talks about:

In war and peace, boom and depression, the march towards centralized, collective controls has continued. Planning has often been identified with socialism. Yet orthodox socialists themselves are far from pleased with the collectivism practiced in Russia, Germany, Italy, Japan, Spain, and they look with grave suspicion on the New Deal. Something has appeared which nobody anticipated, nobody wanted, and nobody really understands.

This was written in 1942.

Mr. James Burnham has called it the "managerial revolution," in the first intelligent attempt to understand it which I have seen. Many more studies will be needed before the mystery is cleared up. We have something called "X," which is displacing the system of free enterprise, all over the world. If we do not know yet what to call it, we can at least describe its major characteristics. They include, in most countries, free enterprise into "X."

He goes on and lists these things. Again, this is 1942. It is interesting.

You can still find on the Internet, Mr. Speaker, a presentation about President Obama from, obviously, a supportive Obama group, called "The Road We've Traveled." It appears to be a clear takeoff from "The Road We Are Traveling" that was written in 1942.

But here is what is described as this new progressive ideal that we are moving toward that he was excited about in 1942 under President Roosevelt and these characteristics of what they call X because they know socialism and communism doesn't go over well. Progressivism sounds a lot better.

□ 1800

But here is this X, a strong centralized government, an executive arm

growing at the expense of the legislative and judicial arms. In some countries, power is consolidated in a dictator issuing decrees.

Well, we have certainly seen, Mr. Speaker, the legislative and judicial arms compromised in this trilateral government, which the executive arm has even said, and got a standing ovation in here, basically, that he will usurp legislative power if we don't use it. It turns out that was an aim that was set out for progressives, socialists, X, as he called it, back in 1942.

He goes on, these are the other things that we are trying to shoot for, according to him: control of banking, credit, and security exchanges by the government.

Well, we know under the Democrat control of the House and the Senate and the White House, the Federal Government took control of all student loans. What a great thing.

Thank God that my kids, we were able to get student loans for them before I had to go begging to a Democratic administration, because it isn't difficult to figure out how easily corruptible it is when the government controls who gets to get a college loan and who doesn't.

So this was set out as what they were shooting for back in 1942. He says also:

The underwriting of employment by the government, either through armaments or public works.

The underwriting of Social Security by the government, old-age pensions, mothers' pensions, unemployment insurance and the like.

Well, we have seen that all come to pass since 1942, just as this Progressive had hoped.

The underwriting of food, housing, medical care, by the government. The United States is already experimenting with providing these essentials. Other nations are far along the road.

This Progressive says he is also shooting for:

The use of deficit spending technique to finance these underwritings. The annually balanced budget has lost its old-time sanctity.

The control of foreign trade by the government, with increasing emphasis on bilateral agreements and barter deals.

The control of natural resources, with increasing emphasis on self-sufficiency.

We have seen the government, with every passing month, take more and more control of natural resources. And since Texas is doing so well, producing more oil, more natural gas than ever, basically, the Federal Government is, in effect, declaring war on Texas. Economically, they have sicced the EPA after Texas. They want to do everything they can to destroy any private resource production.

It just sounds like somebody has had this book, and that the book, "The Road We Are Traveling," fits right nicely in the road the President's supporters say he has traveled or we have traveled.

This goal's progressive—they call it X in the book, but clearly it is the progressive. They want control of transportation, railway, highway, airway,

waterway. Well, that has progressed right nicely since 1942. They want control of all agriculture production. Well, we have certainly seen that take effect as well; control of labor organizations, often to the point of prohibiting strikes.

Now, that is something we haven't seen, but there really hasn't been a need, because when the President, as this President did, issues an executive order that even the IRS cannot enact policies until they have a private meeting with the head of the labor union to work things out behind private doors and it can't be recorded and nobody can know what they discuss, there is really not much reason for strikes. When top labor union heads sit down with the President in a private meeting about health care before they come out with ObamaCare and nobody gets to know what was said and done, why do you need strikes? The heads of the labor unions are working hand-in-hand with the executive branch.

In this book, X, which clearly is progressivism, shoots for:

The enlistment of young men and women in youth corps devoted to health, discipline, community service and ideologies consistent with those of the authorities. The CCC camps have just inaugurated military drill.

Well, it is also interesting that in ObamaCare, in my copy, at the beginning of Page 1312, it talked about—or section 1312, but it talked about the new President's Officer and Non-commissioned Officer Corps, created under a health care bill for international health emergency or national emergencies, and they can be called up involuntarily at the present. So it sounds like that fits right into what was sought as the road to travel.

Then here is another:

Heavy taxation, with especial emphasis on the estates and incomes of the rich.

Well, we have certainly heard that enough.

He goes on and says:

Not much "taking over" of property or industries in the old socialistic sense. The formula appears to be control without ownership. It is interesting to recall that the same formula is used by the management of great corporations in depriving stockholders of power.

And last:

The state control of communications and propaganda.

We have certainly seen that take effect since 1942. And we have people in the House and Senate, my Democratic friends—some of my Democratic friends—that want even more control through the FCC and other government entities to control people's thoughts and what they can put out on the air. Let the government control all of that. It really is outrageous what is happening.

In any event, it appears that "The Road We Are Traveling," written in 1942, by Stuart Chase, setting out what he called X, because socialism, communism were not as popular, are the road that we have traveled. It is time to give the people their power back.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

## COMPREHENSIVE IMMIGRATION REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) for 30 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much the honor and privilege to address you here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives and to follow my good friend, the gentleman from Texas, Judge Gohmert, in this presentation here tonight.

I have been watching forward with increasing concern about some of the potential decisions that might be made here in this House of Representatives. We have been through some long immigration debates in this saga of what happens to the future and the destiny of the United States of America. It is something that goes back, I will say, in the modern era, to sometime January 5, 2004, when then-President George Bush gave his speech that launched their effort to advance "comprehensive immigration reform."

Mr. Speaker, I had my discussion with the President's west wing at that time, meaning west wing of the White House. I advised them—I should say, I advised him that what you have described here is amnesty. However you want to redefine it, however you want to try to call it comprehensive immigration reform, in the end, amnesty is amnesty. The American people will know what amnesty is, and they will reject amnesty because it is bad policy for our country.

Well, since that time, I will say that that has proven to be true in each one of these national debates that we have had and these waves of national debates that we have had.

That debate that took place in 2005—excuse me, 2004 into 2005 and beyond, when there were, at times, tens of thousands of people, often coming in on buses wearing identical white T-shirts, pressing Congress to suspend the rule of law and give them a special path to citizenship. Through that, this discussion has pivoted on what I called, at the time, the scarlet letter A, called amnesty.

The definition of "amnesty," it comes in different forms. Black's Law has one. There are a couple of other definitions for "amnesty." But the practical definition that applies in this political arena that we are in, this cultural American arena that we are in, Mr. Speaker, is this: to grant amnesty is to pardon immigration lawbreakers and reward them with the objective of their crime.

Now, the objective of their crime—and in most cases it is a crime. It is not necessarily someone who is unlawfully present in the United States or necessarily guilty of committing a