

could have Made in America products going overseas instead of importing everything from China or India.

I think if we were to reform the Tax Code along the lines that I am talking about, and that I see in some of the fiscal commission reports, that we could actually use some of that savings to reduce our deficit, seriously, going forward, reducing the deficit on an ongoing basis. Now I am not proposing necessarily that we reduce or get rid of all tax expenditures over the long haul. We should have an opportunity to add back for set periods of time with specific sunsets targeted tax expenditures that help our economy or help those most in need of our help. I think that's the more thoughtful discussion we need to have going forward that's missing so far.

Social Security. Social Security is going to be gone, cut benefits, 25 percent in about 25 years if we do nothing. So if you don't care about Social Security, don't do anything. Don't do anything. That's what we are doing right now. We are not doing anything.

If you care about Social Security, I mean, I have friends, I have friends that are 30 and 40 years old, and they don't expect Social Security to be there when they get of age. And I don't think people already know Social Security's age for full benefits is 67. It's not 65. That was changed back during the Reagan years.

We could do some pretty smart fixes here. The commission talks about raising the retirement age to 69, over 65 years gradually. I know it's going to feel that, we are not going to affect the seniors right now. The seniors right now, full benefits, fully protected. Even those about to become seniors, full benefits just right now.

But if you raise that age to 69 over 25 years or over 65 years, I think that's a pretty good deal if that helps keep Social Security solvent. The payroll tax originally was set up to be roughly 90 percent of payroll. It's down to about 85 and scheduled to go down to about 82 percent of the payroll out there. That's not the way the system was designed.

The system was designed to work at a higher level. If we just go back to that same payroll level that's subject to the same payroll tax to fund Social Security, it helps keep it in balance. And there is early means testing. I mean, I have to admit as a new Member of Congress, a hardworking, small business guy, I was not focused on Social Security. But in Congress it's a big, big thing, and I am getting close enough to where it becomes a personal issue.

I did not know Social Security is already means tested. The commission suggests a little tweaking of that to make sure the poorest of the poor still get good benefits and get maximum needs taken care of. They add another bracket, if you will, in Social Security.

And with those three simple little things, with some hardship exclusions, obviously, for people in tough, labor-in-

tensive jobs, we can make sure that Social Security is protected for the next 75 years as opposed to going away or seeing a 25 percent reduction in just 25 years.

There are smart things we can do, folks. We already started down the road to being smart in our Medicare program. There is discussion of Medicaid. I don't think voucher programs or privatizing have any place in this discussion. But there are smarter ways that we can come together on, Republicans and Democrats, working together to really get at taking care of our country's deficit needs. We can reduce our debt, the deficit, dramatically in the near term if we just pay attention to what I have talked about here.

Let's get off the H.R. 1 bandwagon, the political theater, the circus that's consuming a lot of taxpayer dollars and really not moving this country forward. Let's begin the dialogue right here, right now about taking care of the big cost drivers, the big spending items that are affecting our future and our children and grandchildren's future.

EVEN COWBOY POETS WANT TO CUT SPENDING

(Mrs. MILLER of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I was absolutely dumbfounded recently when I heard the Senate majority leader slamming the long-term continuing resolution passed by this House, which cut government spending by more than \$100 billion below the President's FY 2011 budget request.

He particularly lamented the elimination of funding for an annual cowboy poetry festival in Nevada.

Mr. Speaker, I can assure the Senate majority leader that the rugged individualism of the American cowboy will not be snuffed out due to the lack of a Federal subsidy. In fact, I believe that the American cowboy supports our efforts to get this out-of-control Federal spending under control.

Let me quote, Mr. Speaker, from a poem written by Yvonne Hollenbeck, who has been featured at the National Cowboy Poetry Gatherings in Elko, Nevada. The title of her poem is "How to Cut Taxes":

So, I think if I was the President of this home of the free and the brave,

I'd close up all those departments and think of the money I'd save.

Mr. Speaker, this is the poet that I would give a personal subsidy to, and I would hope that our colleagues in the other body would take that good old American cowboy common sense and help us start saving the American people's money.

OBAMACARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Iowa

(Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I very much appreciate being recognized to address you here on the floor of the House of Representatives. I have come to the floor to raise some issues here, to address you and hopefully be able to penetrate with some rationale and logic that I think is essential that the American people benefit from, and that is this, that, for some time now, we have been making the case that there are automatic appropriations in ObamaCare in an unprecedented fashion with regard to the magnitude and the duration of them.

These automatic appropriations were written into the bill in preparation. The automatic appropriations were written into the bill in preparation for and anticipated, I believe, the loss of the majority by the Pelosi Congress, because I think they expected that this Congress would be handed over by the American people to a Republican majority that had been assigned the task by the American people to repeal ObamaCare, to defund ObamaCare.

That's what everyone ran on. There are 87 Republican freshmen here, all of whom have voted to repeal ObamaCare, and I believe all of whom, if they spoke to the issue at all, Mr. Speaker, also pledged to cut off the funding to ObamaCare.

I have sought to facilitate that happening and taking place. In doing so, I have drafted legislation that's patterned after the language that was written into a continuing resolution in April of 1974. That's the language in a continuing resolution that shut off the funding to the Vietnam War.

It says something very similar to this. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds made available in this act and no funds heretofore appropriated shall be used for offensive or defensive operations in Vietnam or the countries adjacent to it.

In other words, it's not really an exact quote, but it is the compression of the language, and it's an accurate depiction of what it said. What it did was it shut off all funding for anything that was used to support the South Vietnamese military, including M-16 rounds, 105 rounds, MREs, anything that was going to support a military operation offensive or defensive was shut off by this Congress by language in a CR.

Now, who could conceive, Mr. Speaker, that this Congress couldn't figure out how to write language on how to shut off funding to ObamaCare. They didn't find the Vietnam War unconstitutional. Two Federal courts have found ObamaCare unconstitutional.

□ 1410

I hear arguments that say, well, there is an obscure rule somewhere that says that this is written into a legislation that makes it what they call mandatory spending. Therefore, this Congress, this 112th Congress, is