he believes so much in that standard quality of care. It's because he knows that he can regulate some of his competition out of business. That's what goes on in the barbershops in the gold mining towns in Colorado 150 years ago, but that's also what goes on in big business in the United States of America today.

That's what is going on, Mr. Speaker. Big business says, Come and regulate me because it's a cost of doing business at big-business level, the multibillion dollar level. And by the way, those people that can only do business down in the few millions, they're not going to be able to compete.

So we should not accept big business as the purest form of free enterprise capitalism. We should look at big business as coming here to this Capitol, ask us to level the playing field, all the while they're looking to turn into a playing field that it's often difficult for a small business to climb into.

So, Mr. Speaker, that is the status of big business regulation versus small business regulation, and it sets the tone for I think what we're about to take up next. Although I recognize that in a moment we will be asked to yield for the esteemed chair of the Rules Committee as soon as she gets prepared. But in the meantime, I see that the gentleman from Texas is about to get prepared.

I would suggest that, Mr. Speaker, we need to take a look at this regulation that's coming in from the Senate and the regulation of the financial services industry and the credit industry in America. This idea that here in the United States of America we would establish government entities that would look in on every business in America, anybody that's got a credit transaction, whether it would be AIG doing business with a large investment bank or some smaller entity—Mr. Speaker, I will pick that up in a moment, but I would be so happy to yield so that the gentlelady who chairs the Rules Committee can conduct business.

## REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Ms. SLAUGHTER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 111–494) on the resolution (H. Res. 1392) waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules, and providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

## WHAT HAVE THE DEMOCRATS DONE WHILE IN CHARGE?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, as I watch this regulation that's coming through in the financial services component of this, it's a regulation that sets up Tim Geithner, the Secretary of the Treasury, to decide which businesses are too big to be allowed to fail, which businesses would be deemed to fail, and all he needs is the agreement of the FDIC and the agreement of the Chairman of the Fed. Those things concern me a great deal. But this conversation could go almost in any direction, Mr. Speaker, because I am prepared to yield to my good friend, the gentleman and the judge from Texas, LOUIE GOHMERT.

Mr. GOHMERT. Well, I appreciate my friend for yielding, but I want to follow up on that very point.

We're told that there is going to be a financial ''reform'' bill that sounds more like a financial ''deform'' bill. All these reforms end up being deformities. But this in particular, financial reform? To get us out of the mess that had been building through the nineties and through this past decade, for the last 20 years?

And nonetheless, as I understand, in this bill we're going to take up, it still has the Systemic Risk Council that is going to pick the winners and losers in America. That is so grossly un-American; it has no place in our law coming out of this body. That's the kind of thing that the Revolution was started over, that some King was going to get to tell them who would be the business that would stand and who would fall, because the Americans here wanted to be able to let the market decide that.

Now, one thing we've seen, and it has been accentuated, is you do need a government that will ensure that people play fairly and play right. We saw that down on the coast as President Obama expressed that we have gotten a relationship too cozy between his administration and the Big Oil companies. Now we've heard people say on television that Republicans took contributions, Democrats take contributions; but it was the Department of the Interior in 1998 and 1999, some of the Clinton administration people, that pulled the language from the offshore leases that would allow the oil companies, ultimately, to make millions and millions and millions at the expense of the government and the taxpayer getting full value for the leases for those offshore oil and gas developments.

When we had the Inspector General in front of us in the Natural Resources hearing a couple years ago, I asked why he had not talked to the couple of people that the Inspector General said were apparently responsible for that language being pulled out of the leases that hurt the revenue of the government and helped the massive oil companies at the time. He said, Well, they've left government service; we can't talk to them. Well, certainly you can at least try to talk to them, but the Inspector General indicated that they left government service.

□ 2120

Well, after I'd heard the President announce that we had to end this cozy relationship between people in his administration and the big oil company, I wondered: Whatever happened to those two people?

Well, it turns out one of the people with whom, apparently, the inspector general did not talk but felt probably had the best information on why that language was left out—when she was not working for the government, she went and worked for a company called British Petroleum. Perhaps my friend has heard of British Petroleum. In fact, after the inspector general said he couldn't talk to her about why that language was pulled—the language that helped the oil companies so much during 1998 and 1999—and why she would pull language that hurt our government, it turns out she has now returned to government service. In fact, she did last summer. This administration hired her to be the Deputy Assistant Secretary of MMS, the Minerals Management Service, which is the agency of this administration that is supposed to ensure that blowout preventers work properly.

Well, we've got people here in the House who had asked for the results of the tests that were done by MMS within 2 weeks of the blowout preventer's failing. Apparently, the information has come back from this administration's MMS: We are not providing that information to you, maybe to a Democratic chairman of the committee but not to you guys.

You would think that this would be public information, that MMS would want to be as transparent as they're demanding the CIA be, but apparently, they're not willing to be as transparent as they want the CIA to be. They're more in the nature of obscurity like the Federal Reserve continues to try to be and is. So they won't release the information of how badly bungled the tests were. You have to figure they didn't go well or they would have released that information to show that they were exonerated, that they did proper tests.

In fact, as a trial judge back in my days in the courtroom, oftentimes, one side would produce evidence to show that the fact that there is no evidence indicates a fact. I think here the fact that they won't produce those test results indicates that the MMS of this administration is too cozy with British Petroleum because of the interactive business that has gone on here. It must not have gone well.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOHMERT. Certainly, I'll yield to my friend.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Just remind me. I'm standing here thinking we're drawing a rational conclusion that the Minerals Management Service would not release the information that showed the results of the testing of the blowout preventer.

Mr. GOHMERT. If they had even done the testing, actually, yes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. If they'd done the testing.

There are reports out there that there is testing that had failed some 10 days or so before the well, itself, had failed. Now, I don't know if that's true or not. I don't want to start a rumor.

Mr. GOHMERT. They won't release the records.

Mr. KING of Iowa. But are we drawing a rational conclusion here that we could have a government that we could draw conclusions from based upon their response or lack of response and not the answer to the question?

I would yield.

Mr. GOHMERT. Well, yes, it would certainly appear that that's exactly right. If the MMS of this administration will not produce the records to show exactly what testing was done and exactly what the results were, which should be public record for heaven's sake—they're public waters controlled by our government—then you've got to pretty well figure it would not make this administration look very good.

I yield.

Mr. KING of Iowa. The gentleman from Texas, we've got an open government. This is the most open, the most honest government in history, and we are drawing conclusions based upon not getting an answer as opposed to the answer that we might get if they would just simply give us the information. I mean, this really saddens my heart to hear this. I'm not that surprised, but it saddens my heart, Mr. GOHMERT.

Mr. GOHMERT. Well, that also brings us back to this problem with the Federal Reserve and with the Secretary of the Treasury. Yes, we had some people saying we've got to confirm Timothy Geithner as the Secretary of the Treasury because he worked with Paulson in the early days of TARP. He knows the plan. Well, that tells me he should never have been confirmed if he'd worked with Paulson on the original plan, because it was a disaster, and it should never have been allowed to have happened as it did; but now we've got these guys—the head of the Federal Reserve and the head of the Treasury—who are going to pick the winners and losers in the country.

I yield.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Would we choose some mainline IV drug users off the streets to go in and take IVs in hospitals because they happen to have had the kind of experience that they're good at even though it's illegal?

If somebody were proficient in how he operated Turbo Tax and were able to avoid paying his taxes, would that mean he'd be a good person to have as the head of the IRS so that he could probably set up a system to prevent other people from avoiding paying their taxes?

Mr. GOHMERT. Well, that's an interesting issue.

You know, obviously, Secretary Geithner had great problems complying with his certification 4 years in a row. He swore that he would pay the tax that was shown on the form, and he certified, if they would just pay him that money, he would pay it. Then he didn't pay it.

In answer to the question, I guess an analogy comes to mind, which is the FBI. For example, there was a movie about a gentleman who was so good at forging and acting as someone else, and he could create a forged document out of anything. Well, the FBI ended up hiring him because he was so good at forging checks and making fraudulent checks. The FBI hired him because he knew more about ways to cheat other people and to cheat the government. They felt like he could be an immense help, and apparently he was. As I understand, he has helped prepare more secure documents and more secure institutions because he was so good at cheating those very institutions and the government.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Who best to catch tax cheats.

Mr. GOHMERT. So perhaps that was the thinking, that this is somebody who would be an expert in not paying taxes. Maybe that's who we want in charge of the tax entity, the IRS. It's an interesting point.

It still cuts to my core to think that the land of the free and the home of the brave is being converted into a land of the unfree where liberties are taken away because people have decided that the Secretary of the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Chairman get to pick and choose what entities or what banks get to stand when the smoke clears.

I mean, what happened to competition? Why not let people play and play fairly and just enforce fair rules?

That's what is needed here. We don't need the Federal Government saying what companies they're going to support and will never let fail, because as soon as the Federal Government says they're not going to ever let this bank or this company fail, then that's going to be the last one standing, because it knows it can operate in the red and that its competition cannot do that. At the end of the day, that government-supported entity or bank will end up being the one left.

That is outrageous. It is un-American. Anybody who would stand for that proposition that we're not going to let these companies compete fairly, that we're going to come in and pick the winners and losers, needs to start wearing a name tag that reads, ''King George III wannabe.''

I want to pick the winners and losers. I want to tell you who prevails and who doesn't. I will tell you who ends up getting to be the dominant force in America instead of letting people live in freedom and in liberty and letting them pursue happiness and pursue opportunity. The Constitution never guaranteed equality of outcome. It guaranteed equality of opportunity, and that's what ought to be done.

Anybody who says they support a systemic risk council that gets to pick the winners and losers—these are too big to fail, and we can't let them fail—are enemies of this country as it was founded.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Well, in reclaiming my time then, I have to pose the question:

If you're in business, if you're an investment banker, for example, if you have a large credit operation going on and if you've watched the Barney Frank bill and the Chris Dodd bill and now your knees are knocking on what might be going on in a future conference committee that's going to produce a bill that likely spills out over here in the House for passage, that's sent over to the Senate and rammed through there and that's put on the President's desk, we know the President will sign the bill.

□ 2130

But what is your business model? Let's just say you are providing credit transactions, Mr. Speaker, to a large portion of America, whether it is credit cards or whether it is the toxic assets of mortgage-backed securities, the subprime loans that might be out there. Whatever that might be.

Now, if you are sitting there with billions of dollars in those kind of assets and you are making your profit off of those margins of those assets going through, I am going to suggest that if you don't already have a lobbyist, you had better hire a bunch of them. Bring them into this Congress and start to convince people like chairman of the Financial Services Committee BARNEY FRANK, a majority of the members on that committee and others, perhaps through the Ways and Means Committee, start to work your angle. Because your business model, Mr. Speaker, is no longer the business model of providing the most competitive, the most service-oriented, the most customer-focused service that there is.

Your business model is do what you have to do out here on the streets in the business world in America, treat customers fine, that is good, come here into Washington and get that playing field not leveled, but tipped in your favor, because you can't do business without, so that you have those kind of chips when the time comes that the regulators would come in and take a look at your balance sheet and determine, well, you weren't quite big enough to be allowed to fail, so we are going to shove you into receivership and we will chop you up and deal you out to our preferred companies.

I know the model, I know the pattern, even though it is done in a pretty good fashion with the FDIC when a

bank has to go under. We have had too many of them go under. In the farm crisis years in the eighties we had 3,000 banks that went under, and those banks were split up sometimes and dealt out and sold to other investors that had a better track record with managing banks.

All right. Well, that looks good and it works well in the micro version. But when you get into the macro version of big business and you have Tim Geithner as the Secretary of the Treasury making the decision on a business that is too big to be allowed to fail, and calling in Sheila Bair and calling in Ben Bernanke and saying, well, don't you agree? They are too big to be allowed to fail, so let's go prop these people up. And, by the way, what would help is if we go in and shove this company into receivership and we deal the assets of that company over into the company that is too big to fail.

You pick the winners and you pick the losers out of government. And who wins? The people that pay the lobbyists. The people that have paid for the most political influence. Government cannot make rational decisions on business. They make political decisions on business.

Peter Wallison spoke today on Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, the American Enterprise Institute scholar, one of the brightest minds we have on free enterprise economics in America, a very solid man. Many times I have listened to him illuminate the issue for me in a way that helps me understand it even better.

He spoke today about Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, and his sense is that they aren't yet nationalized, that they are still quasi-government. My position is they are nationalized, because the Federal Government calls all their shots, and we have got roughly $50 billion each dumped into either one of them and roughly another $30 billion rolled on top of that $100 billion. So we are around the $130 billion range.

Peter thinks that there is not $360 billion, but $400 billion in losses that will have to be swallowed up by the American taxpayers. And we knew and we know now that we were looking at $5.5 trillion in contingent liabilities that the Federal taxpayers would have to swallow if Fannie and Freddie were flushed down completely the way the markets might drive them.

Concluding my statement and then yielding, that was an example, Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac are an example of how government can't set values, neither can they evaluate risk, because they are doing political calculations based on political pressure, not economical calculations based upon the risk of success and failure.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GOHMERT. I was just asking if the gentleman would yield for a question, if he would.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I would.

Mr. GOHMERT. With regard to the financial deform package that apparently is going to be coming to the House, is the gentleman aware of whether or not these two entities, Fannie and Freddie, that kicked us into the spiral downward in the fall of '08, whether they are included in this reform package? Is there any reform of these two entities that nearly brought our economic house of cards down?

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, in scouring the financial reform package and the Barney Frank bill or the Chris Dodd bill and setting up the word search and chasing it through there, Mr. Speaker, I don't find anything in either one of those bills that addresses the necessary reform for Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. They are completely insulated.

I recall a debate here on the floor of the House on October 26, 2005, that the chairman of the Financial Services Committee, Mr. FRANK, was very much engaged in. He came to the floor to vigorously oppose an amendment that was offered by Mr. Leach of Iowa that would have established higher levels of collateralization for Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, higher standards for underwriting in the secondary market, and higher standards for capitalization for Fannie and Freddie.

The vigorous opposition of Mr. FRANK flowed out that day. And the gentleman from Texas remembers the exchange that took place on the Thursday before Easter in 2009 here on this floor. The gentleman from Texas was there, the gentleman from Massachusetts was there, and I think me up there somewhere. Because we talked about what had happened with Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac.

In that debate on October 26, 2005, the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. FRANK said, If you are going to invest in shares of Fannie and Freddie, don't do so believing that he would ever vote to bail out Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, because he would never do that. He would let them go down instead. That is the core and the essence of the statement made by the gentleman from Massachusetts, who now is the chairman of the Financial Services Committee.

Well, we know what has happened. Fannie and Freddie have been bailed out. And on that day, the gentleman from Massachusetts said that he wasn't biased in favor of or against Fannie or Freddie because the man whom he had had an intimate relationship with was not a senior executive. It is in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I don't pull this out of thin air. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that you check the RECORD. For me, that is an astonishing confession. To draw a fine line between the reason for bias and not bias is because this individual was not a senior, but more apparently a junior executive for Fannie Mae.

So that is a little too intimate for me, Mr. Speaker. I don't choose to go there any further, except to point out that there are a lot of things going on in this United States Government that are not what meets the eye. There are undercurrents here that threaten to swallow up the United States of America. There is a driven philosophy on this side of the aisle that wants to swallow up free enterprise capitalism, that abhors the words of capitalism.

There is a driven philosophy that is reflected by 77 members of the Progressive Caucus who come to this floor with their blue charts and say come visit our Web site. Well, not that long ago, a few years ago, the progressives' Web site was hosted by, managed by and taken care of by the socialists in America. But when they took a little bit of heat, they decided they would manage their own Web site so they didn't have to take the criticism. So the socialists ran the progressives' Web site.

Now, dsausa.org, that is the socialist Web site, it stands for Democratic Socialists of America, dsausa.org. Mr. Speaker, you should go visit that Web site and understand who your colleagues are. Seventy-seven of them are self-professed progressives.

The progressives, according to the socialist Web site, are their legislative arm. They write that they are not Communists; they are socialists. That is a step above a Communist. They don't want to nationalize everything, they just want to nationalize the Fortune 500 companies in America. And they have got a big start on it.

They don't run candidates on the banner or under the political party called the socialists, because there is a stigma attached to being a socialist in America. So what do they do, Mr. Speaker? They push the candidates that are self-professed progressives.

Progressives are not distinct from socialists. They are one and the same. They are just wearing a little bit different-colored jersey. And they are the people here who have driven the idea that we should nationalize the Fortune 500 companies, nationalize the oil refinery industry. Mr. HINCHEY in New York, take over the oil industry. MAXINE WATERS from Los Angeles, operate these Fortune 500 companies, and I quote, ''for the benefit of the people affected by them.'' That is the unions.

The Speaker is a member. The Speaker advocated and said that she would not give, in the case of the car companies, a bargaining advantage of the auto makers over that of the unions. Right off of the Web page of the socialists, and she followed through on it.

□ 2140

And today, 17½ percent of General Motors is owned by the unions, without a cash outlay, without a concession of any kind. The President of the United States, who voted to the left of self-professed Senator BERNIE SANDERS, crammed that down the throats of the investors, the secured investors in General Motors; and now we have the unions owning 17½ percent, the Federal Government owning 61 percent, and the

Canadian Government owning 12½ percent of General Motors, exactly off of the playbook of the socialist Web site.

Mr. Speaker, the American people need to go visit the Web site. They need to understand the playbook is written. It's being carried out by the progressives in this Congress; 77 of them are the core driving force here. When you add to that the Congressional Black Caucus, the Hispanic Caucus, a whole lot of these people that are self-segregating caucuses, instead of integrated caucuses, you understand who's running America today, Mr. Speaker.

I'd yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GOHMERT. Well, if we go back to the day that the Wall Street bailout passed, that first week in October of 2008, I made the statement that when the Federal Government buys private assets and holds them in order to try to make money, or the Federal Government decides it's going to start trying to make money for the taxpayer, it's called socialism. And I was belittled by colleagues that serve here in this body for saying that it was socialist. One person even said, well, I only know three Socialists in America, and they're all against the Wall Street bailout.

Well, I was pretty depressed and devastated when the Wall Street bailout passed. The next morning, Saturday morning, I was watching Neil Cavuto, and he had the Presidential nominee of the Socialist Party, and the Socialist candidate for President being interviewed by Neil Cavuto was asked, basically, what's the deal? I thought you guys were against the TARP bailout, the Wall Street bailout? And now this morning you're saying it was a good thing. And in essence, the Presidential nominee of the Socialist Party said, well, yes, they were against the TARP, Wall Street bailout.

In essence, they didn't feel like the government should pay anything to take over the assets they were taking over. But once it passed and was signed into law, they realized this is probably the greatest day for socialists in American history because the Federal Government has begun the takeover, in a substantial way, of private assets.

And of course he went on to say now that they've made this wonderful great step of taking over, socializing, nationalizing private assets from the financial sector, the government just needs to go ahead and finish taking over the rest of the financial sector because, he said, because we know then the government takeover of all of that area would not be done out of greed, and so they would do a much better job of spreading the wealth around the country, and that under the present system, greed rules the day, and that just that great, wonderful step of the TARP bailout, socializing America, as he saw it, just needed to be followed by the final step of completing the takeover of the financial sector.

So the gentleman from Iowa is exactly right: according to the Presidential candidate of the Socialist Party in 2008, this is a socialist move to nationalize more and more of the assets, just as the Presidential nominee of the Socialists had hoped would happen.

I yield back.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming and thanking the gentleman from Texas, I'd point out into the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, that some months ago the Secretary of the Treasury, Tim Geithner, came before a couple of committees, Financial Services and Ag. And the question that I posed to him, and he was bound to answer that question under oath, was I made the point that President Obama was elected at least in part because he had declared and effectively made an argument, however it might have been true or untrue, that President Bush had gone into Iraq without an exit strategy. So I made the point in my question that President Obama had engaged in, supported, and participated in the nationalization of about half of our private sector, and that is the three large investment banks, AIG, Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac, General Motors, Chrysler, I didn't go on into the nationalization of our skin and everything inside it which is ObamaCare. But in that letter that he was obligated to answer under oath, 2 months later I got a response back.

And I do want to give Secretary Geithner credit. There are some members of this Cabinet that simply don't answer my letters. They apparently don't think they're accountable to Members of Congress, and they don't think that we might decide to send them a little less money when it's time to do the budget. But Geithner did answer the letter. It was seven pages long. It took 2 months to get it back, and that's not a particular complaint of mine because I know that it's difficult to make the machinery of government work. But in those seven pages of answering the question, What is your exit strategy for taking over all of these huge chunks of the private sector, his answer was, well, it's not a written strategy, and he would know when the time was right, and he would execute that when the time is right. In other words, don't you be asking me. I'm the Secretary of the Treasury, and I don't need to answer to you or to anybody else.

I'm going to submit this, Mr. Speaker: there is no plan; there is no exit strategy. The President of the United States is delighted to see these companies taken over by the Federal Government and managed by the Federal Government, as is the Secretary of the Treasury and most or all of the members of the United States Cabinet because it fits in with the Web site of the Democratic Socialists of America.

You know, there used to be a little bit of resistance that came up over here on this side of the aisle when someone might imply that the President of the United States is a Socialist. But I've made the argument I think so effectively that they don't try to rebut me anymore; and if any of you choose to do so, I'd be happy to yield.

But the President of the United States as a United States Senator voted to the left of BERNIE SANDERS. BERNIE SANDERS is in the Senate still today, self-professed Socialist. And no one argues with him. But there were three Senators that voted to his left. Barack Obama was one of them, and he is the chief nationalizer.

And when I saw the picture of Barack Obama standing next to Hugo Chavez, and he's doing the double grip glad hand handshake with that great nationalizer from Venezuela, the Marxist Hugo Chavez, I thought, you know what? Hugo Chavez is a piker when it comes to nationalizing. Barack Obama has way outdone him. And I don't think that he would have been a man that could have done that on his own. He surrounded himself with people that had for years worked toward this vision.

Had I been assigned the task of writing the screenplay to turn America into a Socialist state, and if they would have even created for me a charismatic figure that matches that of the President and started me down the path of my imagination, and with 3 years to get ready to do it, could not have unfolded a scenario even close to what is reality today for the businesses that have been taken over by the Federal Government. Neither could have been anticipated some of the things that they're seeking to do now.

But when you add these up, and you add up the takeover of three large investment banks, Bank of America, Bear Stearns, Citigroup, and when you see that AIG, for $180 billion swallowed up by the Federal Government, and Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, for the tune of $130 billion and perhaps another $400 billion piled on top of that, and still remaining at $5.5 trillion in contingent liabilities, and the takeover of General Motors and Chrysler, both of them now under the control or influence of the Federal Government, being managed now, exactly off the Socialist Web site, ''run for the benefit of the people affected by them,'' the unions, who made no concession whatsoever, except to concede future claims that they think are going to be paid anyway by ObamaCare.

And the student loan program taken over completely, exactly within the mold of what happened when we had Federal flood insurance that came in to provide one more competitor for the private market back in 1963. Now there is no private market. Now the Federal Government runs it all.

When the Federal Government stepped in to compete on student loans, people said, well, you know, we need to keep these people honest. Somebody's making money off these students. Now the Federal Government runs it all.

And the President's idea was that he would set up one more insurance company to provide health insurance for Americans to compete against these insurance companies whom he demagogued relentlessly, for getting one more company, correct?

□ 2150

But there existed, up until ObamaCare passed, 1,300 health insurance companies in America, 1,300 companies that produced a variety of policies numbering to 100,000 policies. So who can imagine that one more company and a handful more policies was going to provide more options for people that would help with the competition and take some of the profits out of the industry? If these 1,300 companies competing against each other, Mr. Speaker, couldn't take the profit out of the industry, how could the Federal Government do that? Regulate and subsidize. And that's what governments do. They regulate and they subsidize their competition out of existence like they did on the flood insurance programs from 1963 and the student loan programs culminated this year.

And now here we are, ObamaCare, the law of the land, the law of the land that has not just nationalized three large investment banks, and Fannie and Freddie, and General Motors and Chrysler, and the student loans, now they have nationalized our very bodies, the most sovereign thing that we have. The Federal Government has taken over the management of our skin and everything inside it and decided who will buy what policy and what the premium will be.

And now they're trying to decide our diet. And now they have decided a mission across the country that the retailers need to cut 1.5 trillion calories out of the products that are going to these kids. Because one-third of our kids are obese, they want to cut the calories down on a bag of Doritos. I didn't ask them how to do that. I think they just take a few chips out of the bag of Doritos.

But I know what they do to a PowerBar. A 150-calorie PowerBar gets reduced to 90 calories because some fat kids will eat too many and they will get a little heavier. But I don't know what we do with those two-thirds of the kids that are probably too skinny, that need more than the 150 calories that are in the PowerBar. And I don't know what we do with the fat kid that hoards three PowerBars now for 270 calories as opposed to maybe one at 150 calories. But we cannot put a one-size-fits-all regulation in and reduce calories going into kids that need them for energy and need them for growth.

More kids need more food rather than all kids need less food. And so those kids that are overweight, they need more exercise. And maybe they need to watch their diet a little bit, and that's education and that's parents, yes. But don't starve the hungry kids so that those that are eating too much have to work a little harder to keep getting too much.

The super nanny state. The recycling of all of these components. Here the Speaker of the House in the House of Representatives has decreed that you can't go to the cafe over here and eat an omelet unless the eggs that are broken are from a free range hen. I think that the chicken that you eat is probably not free range because it's pretty tender and good. I didn't check on that, but I'd like to know. Doesn't taste like free range to me. But the eggs are from a free range hen.

The paper, the napkins that we have around this Capitol, most of them are brown because they are recycled paper. And when I go look at my coffee filters, I wonder why they're running over, they're recycled paper. So we have these decrees that come down from on high. And the light bulbs themselves are regulated by the Speaker of the House. How much nanny state does this country need? And how much nanny state can we stand?

I want American people making their own decisions. It's a free market economy. I want them to be able to exercise all of their constitutional rights. I want them to be able to own guns and defend themselves and hunt and target shoot and be in a position to defend us against tyranny. And if we do not, you know, there is something about constitutional rights and liberty. It's use it or lose it. If you don't use it, you lose it.

You've got to use your freedom of speech, religion, assembly, press, second amendment rights. You've got to exercise those rights. We must do so. Mr. Speaker, we have to take this country back.

I yield back the balance of my time and thank the gentleman from Texas for joining me tonight.

## THE BORDER SECURITY CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MURPHY of New York). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. GIFFORDS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Ms. GIFFORDS. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to address the border security crisis that is part of daily life in my southern Arizona district in Arizona's Eighth Congressional District. I am really proud to represent one of the most diverse parts of the entire country. I represent a district that is over 9,000 square miles and is one of 10 U.S.-Mexico border districts.

The U.S.-Mexico border has changed a lot over the years. I am a third-generation Arizonan. I represent a lot of people in my district who are multigenerational Arizonans. After decades of building up the U.S.-Mexico border in California and in Texas, there has been a systematic funneling of illegal immigration, the flow of traffic, illegally through southern Arizona. This has become the most porous part of the U.S.-Mexico border.

So today, together, my constituents live in a situation on the front lines of a national border security crisis. We live and breathe the Federal Government's failure to secure the border with Mexico. Every day my constituents are subjected to home invasions and to burglaries and to cut water lines and to graffiti, an unbelievable amount of garbage and trash that's left behind by illegal immigrants who are crossing through the border, and by people increasingly who are drug smugglers, people that are human smugglers, the cutting of fences, the threats and intimidation by armed smugglers, and the violence that they experience on their own land, on their own ranches, their own property.

In this hour, I am going to talk about action that I and others have taken along the U.S.-Mexico border here in Washington. But more importantly, I am going to talk about the lives of the constituents that I represent, the people of Cochise County, the ranchers who live on the U.S.-Mexico border.

It's always been my belief that if the decision-makers here in Washington, if they could hear the stories, the impact that illegal immigration has on the lives of my constituents, that there would be greater action here in Washington, the decision-makers, elected officials, people in the administration, policymakers, that they would move to greatly enhance the security along the U.S.-Mexico border. So that's what we are going to talk about tonight.

I think it's important to begin this hour with the most heart-wrenching story of all, the tragic death of Robert Krentz, a fourth-generation rancher whose family has been on his land for over a hundred years. Actually, the Krentz family has had their ranch before Arizona even achieved statehood.

On March 27, Rob Krentz, who was working on his ranch, was murdered by an assailant who was later tracked to the Mexico border. He and his dog were both ruthlessly murdered on his land. They were left to die. They were shot. Law enforcement officials believe that Rob was killed by a smuggler.

Next to me is a photograph of Rob and his brother Phil, the two Krentz brothers. This was run on the front page of a local newspaper, the Tucson Weekly. Frankly, the image tells it all. You see the two brothers, you see them in the tack room, their hands, their boots, their lives right there represented.

Reporter Leo Banks wrote the companion story in which he interviewed Rob's family and the neighbors. Banks wrote the following:

''What has to be noted first is the inevitability of what happened. Something like the Krentz murder was coming, and everybody knew it. The stories residents told this newspaper, the frustration that they feel trying to keep property and families safe in smuggler-occupied territory were like a freight