which would lead to another element of the Constitution that I think this Obama health care-Democrat-Reid-Pelosi, whatever you want to call it, is violating, which is Federalism.

But before I do that, I would yield back to the gentleman from New Jersey to allow him to at least give some comments upon this particular issue, and then if we want to go back into Federalism—you don't have a whole lot of time—I'd be more than happy to pick that up at some later date. But I'd like to yield back to the gentleman first and at least give you a shot at this thing.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. My shot is just to be able to bring this issue to the floor and to the American public and to Members of Congress as well. As my opening comment was the importance of looking at the constitutionality of any legislation, or particularly this legislation—you probably recall this—I was not the first one to bring this issue up. Reporters were actually the ones who brought this up to our leadership here in the House and to the White House as well. I wasn't there when it happened. All I know is what I read in the paper.

But when the issue of the constitutionality, whether it was the mandate provision that we are talking about principally here or the other aspects as well, my understanding from what I read in the press is when the reporter asked Speaker PELOSI about, Did you consider the constitutionality of this legislation, she just laughed it off and said, Of course not. We are not looking at that.

My understanding is, likewise, when that question was posed to the administration, Did you consider the constitutionality of the health care bill, their answer was even more emphatic: no, we didn't look at that at all. That is so profound of an answer, to think that the administration would not look at the constitutionality of a piece of legislation that is going to impact upon personal choices of the health decisions of Americans and one-sixth of the economy as well.

The Founders understood this issue as far as protecting our freedoms and our liberties and that you need a document in order to do so. One of our first Chief Justices, Chief Justice Marshall, famously observed that the powers of the legislature, here in the Congress, are defined and limited, as the gentleman from Georgia just enumerated the 18 powers in it, and that those limits may not be mistaken or forgotten in the Constitution as written.

What he said was that the Constitution—I have a copy over here—was written because we want to put down the limitations on the power of the government to go and exercise authority over the public to a limited factor so the public still has some freedom and liberty at the end of the day. He continued on with that by saying, Should Congress, under the pretext of executing its powers, pass laws for the accomplishments of objects not entrusted—perhaps some of those list of requirements or ideas that this lady who called you from Alabama, was it—that she would like somebody to take care of her for her—should Congress under the pretext of executing its powers pass laws via accomplishment of objects not entrusted to the national government—this is where I yield back to you on the Federalism issue—it would become the painful duty of this tribunal—that meaning the U.S. Supreme Court—should a case requiring such a decision come before it, to say that such an act was not the law of the land.

What does that mean? That means that Congress does not have the ability to say that something is constitutional just because we say it is. Congress does not have the ability of saying that something is necessary and proper just because we say it is. Congress does not have the ability to say something is providing the good and general welfare for the country and therefore is constitutional just because we say it is.

We have a Constitution that is a contract entered into by the people of this country with their government defining what the authority is on the various levels of government, and we here as Members of Congress must live within the terms of that contract. We cannot go outside of the terms of the contract any more than any one of us can go outside the terms of a contract that we entered into when we buy a house or buy a car or enter a contract with some store or what have you.

We are limited by what the Constitution does and says. That is what we are trying to ask that this administration keep in mind and what we are asking the Speaker to keep in mind as well when they bring forth a bill to the floor trying to do something that we all agree needs to be done, and that is to reform the health care delivery system in this country. But we would suggest that it be done in a way that is constitutional and protects the freedoms and liberties of the American people.

And with that, I yield to the gentleman whatever time remains.

□ 2130

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I appreciate you yielding again on this.

Let me just say that there are several concepts that we have talked about here. One, does it meet the threshold of the commerce clause according to the courts? I do not think it does. You have also mentioned several other concepts, that just because Congress says this is a necessary and proper act doesn't necessarily mean it is a necessary and proper act.

It also bothers me that we forget the very essence of federalism upon which this country was founded, which means simply, it is not essential for the Federal Government to have to solve every problem. In fact, sometimes it is better if the Federal Government does not. I have used that example many times before about records. When I was younger, if I wanted a song, I had to buy the entire record. Now there is an iPod that my kid can download the song that I want, too. If I want vanilla, Ben and Jerry's still has 34 flavors from which I can choose.

Every part of our lives is now based on the concept of choice and options for American people, except the government. The Federal Government is still the last bastion of one-size-fits-allism, where we tell people what they ought to be doing rather than allowing them to have choices and options. I say this because some people said, Well, if we don't do this, we have nothing. That is not true. States are moving forward. My State already has implemented a process that gives people 66 options based on the demographics of my State, and everything we are doing in Utah is stopped dead. If this Federal bill passes, they succeed, they now dictate everything that will happen.

States are different. Massachusetts has a program they seem to like. It would not work in Utah. The demographics of Utah would not allow our program to be successful in Massachusetts. But that is why there is the brilliance of federalism, so there can be 50 different innovative ideas and people have the chance to experiment and try and prove and find something that works for their particular area. In a nutshell, that is a very brief problem. This destroys the concept of federalism.

I will yield back to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. I am trying to think of the quote. You can try to help me out here. ''States were created as the——''

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. ''Laboratory of democracy.''

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. ''—laboratory of democracy'' so all of those experiments could go on. Instead, what we have are the States becoming the guinea pigs for the democracy because the States are being controlled by the Federal Government in a way that is not the way the American public would like to see it.

So I thank the gentleman from Utah for, once again, joining us on the floor in an eloquent and educational format, as you always do. I appreciate that in a commonsense way that we can all understand it as well.

YEAR IN REVIEW

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I apologize for the delay in getting down here to answer the call of the gavel.

There are some distractions taking place around America as we speak. A lot of America has been transfixed by

what has happened this year. I could go back and recap some of the events, but we pretty well know what they are: $700 billion in TARP spending. We've watched three large investment banks be nationalized by the Federal Government. We've watched AIG be nationalized, taken over by the Federal Government. We've watched Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac be taken over by the Federal Government and then by an Executive order right before Christmas, have them open up the debt ceiling on Fannie and Freddie to where every American is a guarantor of the national debt, which could be $5.5 trillion of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. We watched negotiations take place behind the scenes that told the bankruptcy court how to push our automakers through there, and both of them were nationalized, taken over by the Federal Government. Then we watched the $787 billion economic stimulus plan be passed in an urgency that hasn't produced a product and a resolve, except a debt that is going to drag down the economy for the American people. Then behind that, out of this House came hurry up and rush cap-and-trade, cap-and-tax. Pass it. It passed out of the House, and it went over there on the docket of the Senate.

The American people began to realize what was happening. They couldn't believe it. They didn't think, first, the $700 billion TARP was really real. Somehow they trusted that we knew what we were doing here, as a majority. The majority knew what they were doing. So they sat back, and something else happened, and something else happened. That's the list that I have given you, Mr. Speaker.

The American people have risen up. In the month of August, they filled up town hall meetings all across America over and over again. Hundreds and thousands of people came out so that their voice could be heard. Some of them stayed up all night long just to craft their question and do the research so that if they got a chance to ask a Member a question—you could tell there was a tremendous amount of American intensity going on all across America.

Into September and after Labor Day, we came back here and the grind began. The effort to pass a national health care act began. The socialized medicine effort wound up again, and they began pushing this through, Mr. Speaker. Speaker PELOSI's agenda, HARRY REID's agenda, and President Obama's agenda, the idea of nationalizing proud, private sector companies and taking over one-third of the private sector profits and doing so in a little more than a year in the United States.

Then taxing all of our energy and putting restrictions on America's economy, where the end result is to send jobs to India and jobs to China. The American people watched that, and they thought, Well, surely these people know what they're doing. But the more mistakes they saw and the list of misguided liberal ideas that had been passed out of the House and sent to the Senate—and some passed out of the Senate—was stacking up higher and higher and higher, Mr. Speaker. And the American people, in groups, incrementally began to realize that they knew better than the people that were in charge of Congress, and they lost their trust and their faith in the good judgment of the people that they elected in this constitutional Republic, especially when they saw that there was a determination on the part of the President of the United States, the Speaker of the House and the majority leader of the United States Senate to nationalize our bodies, to take over the management and the control of the most personal and private thing we have, that is this thing inside our skin, our bodies, and the Federal Government deciding what we were going to have for insurance and who was going to pay for it and what the premiums would be and what kind of mandates would be on it and what kind the coverage would be and the decisions that we would have.

And then on top of that, an effort to start to tax, oh, let's say, trans fats or foods that they think we shouldn't eat, or sin taxes so that they could manage our lives, regulate everything that we do, nationalize and take over the control of our very private bodies and then tell us what we can eat and probably when we can sleep. It's way, way too much government intrusion on a proud and independent people.

So when we looked across America, we looked around for, ''from whence cometh our help?'' Well, we had help from all over America. The Tea Party Patriots came up from all over America, and they had huge rallies. They came to this Capitol on 9/12, and they filled this city up with people with American flags and yellow ''Don't Tread on Me'' flags, and they cried out for relief from the overspending that's been taking place. They held up their Constitutions, and tears went down the cheeks of men and women who love this country. It happened all over, in every State, and it really packed people in here in Washington, D.C.

Still their hearts were hardened, and still they were determined to force socialized medicine down the throats of the American people. And then more people came to this Capitol, and as they came closer to a vote on health care here in the House of Representatives, a call went out one day, and 3½ days later somewhere between 10,000 and 50,000 Americans showed up here in the United States Capitol so their voices could be heard. They filled up over here on the west side of the Capitol and packed people out there with their American flags and their yellow ''Don't Tread on Me'' flags. They cried out for relief from this oppressive government that was taking their liberties away and my liberties away.

And still their hearts were hardened, Mr. Speaker. Two days later, we called people back to town. Over here on this side of the Capitol, thousands came again, and again they pleaded with the legislature and the Congress here, Give us some relief. We just want fiscal responsibility. We want our liberties. They told us, We're not Europeans. We're Americans. We're a different people. We didn't come here for dependency. A lot of people came here under the New Hampshire motto, ''Live free or die'' in the United States of America, have a chance to succeed, take the risk of failure, take your own personal responsibilities. All that they asked for was a chance to succeed, and that was taken away, taken away by a President of the United States, a Speaker of the House, and a majority leader in the United States Senate, three people.

The American people began to understand that when the House bill passed here by a vote of 220–215, that if three people changed their minds, that bill goes down in defeat on the House floor, and the rest of that saga doesn't happen, Mr. Speaker. But it went over to the Senate where they ground it out and churned it out and cut deals in back rooms. There are no longer smoke-filled rooms, I don't think. At least there are not on the House side, because by order of the Speaker, that's another freedom that you lost. And if you want to eat an omelet over here in the cafeteria, it shall be made out of the eggs of a free-range hen. Don't forget that, Mr. Speaker. That's another liberty that we've lost.

So the health care bill went to the Senate, and they cut deals. And we heard things like, Louisiana Purchase II. How do you buy off the Senator in Louisiana? And then we heard things like the Florida purchase of the Senator down there so they could be exempted from losing their Medicare Advantage. Then we saw the ''cornhusker kickback,'' Senator NELSON. I can say that now. We changed the rule. Why? Because he lost the amendment, which was the pro-life amendment, the Stupak amendment, in the Senate by a vote of 45–54, so crafted some new language that would still leave the United States Government in the business of brokering abortions through mandated health insurance premiums and got a special exemption for Medicaid increases in Nebraska, the ''cornhusker kickback.''

The American people saw this with revulsion, and still they came forward and produced 60 votes to end the filibuster in the Senate on Christmas Eve, Mr. Speaker. And about that time, I had a conversation with my senior Senator in Iowa, Senator CHUCK GRASSLEY, who is engaged in this debate in a serious way with the full intention of trying to find the best policy that could be put together in the legislative body, but he had to walk away from it at a point because they didn't need his vote. They were going to go for the most liberal, the most left-wing, the most leaning into socialism policy that they could pass, and it wasn't going to be

with Republican votes. So that's what they did. They put the votes together to end the filibuster, and the deal was made on the 23rd of December. The vote for the end of the filibuster came up on the morning of the 24th, Christmas Eve morning.

I talked to my senior Senator, and I said, What can we do now, Senator? How do we kill this bill? And he said, We have to pray, and we have to pray for a victory in Massachusetts in the special election in the United States Senate. Mr. Speaker, you know, that didn't seem very plausible at the time. I started to take a look at this, and I followed the Senator's advice. I put a little work in up there myself. I just came back from Massachusetts a few hours ago. A few minutes ago they've announced that Martha Coakley has conceded to Scott Brown.

Mr. Speaker, I want to tell you, there was a shot heard around the world up there in Lexington 200-plus years ago. There is another shot heard around the world tonight. In fact, it's the Scott heard around the world tonight, and it's the American people rejecting socialized medicine. It's the American people rejecting overspending and fiscal irresponsibility and living for the now and passing out the government dole and making sure that nobody has to worry about anything except how their children and grandchildren are going to pay this massive debt that's been created in the trillions of dollars.

□ 2145

Voting here on the floor to increase the national debt by smaller increments, $300 billion, and next time it will be a big old chunk, and there is no restraint whatsoever in spending. The Blue Dogs are more groundhogs. They have gone underground, Mr. Speaker. They used to come down here and harangue Republicans about spending too much money because we would have a little deficit at the end of the year. Now, I have always been for a balanced budget, and I will vote to balance it every time I get the chance. But the Blue Dogs demagogued Republicans for a long time. Now they are groundhogs. They went out and saw their shadow and they went underground because the people on their side of the aisle are spending money irresponsibly, like crazy.

How could you possibly take away, spend enough money and take away enough liberty that the three-and-a-half to one Democrats to Republicans in Massachusetts would elect a Republican to come down to the United States Senate and vote against cloture so that the Harry Reid bill could be killed in the Senate? How could you ever spend that much money? I didn't believe it was possible, Mr. Speaker.

Some would say a miracle has taken place tonight, and I wouldn't disagree with that. I believe there has been intervention. And I am grateful for it. It is what I asked for and what I worked for.

I spent 3 days up there and experienced a lot of good people in Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I want to say into the RECORD that working with the very liberal agenda of the Massachusetts delegation doesn't always give a person the most positive attitude about the people that they represent. I come from Iowa, where we have the privilege of making a recommendation to America on who we think should be the next President of the United States. We take it seriously, and we have a lot to say about it, and we are grateful for that privilege and that honor, but it is only a recommendation, Mr. Speaker.

Tonight, today and tonight the people of Massachusetts not only made a recommendation, they made a decision, not just for the people of Massachusetts, they made a decision for the United States of America. And that decision is no socialized medicine in this country. Keep our liberty. Get the budget under control. Let people take care of themselves and each other. The government is not a nanny. That is the message that comes from the place where liberty began.

Yesterday I was standing at Plymouth Rock. Three hundred and ninety years ago the Pilgrims landed there. And here we are, 390 years later, Massachusetts, of all improbable places, has brought us back to that rock of liberty. I could not be happier tonight. This is all I could ask for. I am looking forward now to the battle we have ahead to preserve the liberty that we have left and restore some of that we have lost.

I am happy to yield to the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS).

Mrs. LUMMIS. I thank the gentleman from Iowa. I think it is a tribute to you that over these many months of the last year, you have been stalwart in your support of the liberties of this country and the first principles of this country. The gentleman from New York (Mr. KING) was so committed to the American people and the vote on health care that he missed his own son's wedding because the vote was taken on a Saturday, and we needed every single vote, not knowing if it would go our way or the vote of socialized medicine. And this gentleman sacrificed seeing his middle child's wedding in order to cast his vote for the American people that day. I applaud you for going up and participating in Massachusetts' election observing.

I would like to ask the gentleman before I begin to discuss budget issues. Did you talk to people in Massachusetts today and yesterday? What was on their mind? What was guiding their decisions in deciding to make a change in party after that seat had been held by Democrats since 1953. What was on their mind in casting their ballots today?

Mr. KING of Iowa. Some would say it is all about health care and socialized medicine. In fact, quite a few did say that.

But if you listened a little more closely, they are also telling people on our side of the aisle, Don't you spend too much money, either. We are tired of you being irresponsible with our tax dollars and with our children and grandchildren's future. That is definitely a core in the center of this. And underneath it is that list of things that I gave at the beginning: The TARP funding, the stimulus plan, the nationalization of eight formerly private entities. They see all of that spending, and they see government trying to manage everything. And as liberal as Massachusetts is, they said, Enough.

The first version of it is, and some have said it is all about health care. And for them it was. For others it was health care and too much spending. For others, it was health care, too much spending, and the government injecting themselves in and taking over private businesses. They don't want to have a social democracy here in the United States. They understand we are not Europe. I mean when the first people arrived here in the United States it was down at Jamestown in 1607. And then 1620, the Pilgrims landed up at Plymouth Rock. They came for freedom and liberty, for religious freedom and economic freedom. I think it is the sweetest of symmetry in history to think that the Mayflower landed at Plymouth Rock in 1620, and 390 years later in 2010, their descendants in Massachusetts said, We are going to send you somebody to defend our freedom for America.

I was asking for reinforcements. We are outmanned and we are outgunned. We are fighting a scrappy fight. We need reinforcements, and we get some reinforcements tonight.

Mrs. LUMMIS. The father of the Massachusetts Constitution, John Adams, died 50 years to the day that the Declaration of Independence was signed. And as he died, he said ''Jefferson lives.'' And ironically, Thomas Jefferson died that very same day, 50 years to the day after the Declaration of Independence was signed. These are people whose founding principles and founding beliefs carried them until the day they died. Although during the years they were political rivals, they respected and admired each other so much because of the work they had both done to help found this country, that they wanted to nurture it and guide it and see that it survived.

I believe tonight we are seeing that same nurturing and guidance and seeing the founding principles verified in Massachusetts. So it is indeed an exciting day for our country.

Among the things that you mentioned that the people of Massachusetts chose to be concerned about in casting their ballots today is the deficit. I would like to take a minute to show you a chart that explains how this deficit has grown over the last year and that the debt that our majority party here in Congress today says they inherited actually has grown to

unprecedented levels while they were in control. When they espouse the fact that during the Clinton years, the deficit was rejected and that there were budget surpluses, it actually happened when there was a Republican Congress.

But the gentleman from Iowa has given me the opportunity to bring this chart and show it to you. The Federal deficit tripled in one fiscal year as tax revenues fell and Congress pumped out large sums to stabilize financial institutions and stimulate the economy. This top line shows you where the Federal budget deficit was. Well, that is neutral. That is neutral ground. That is a balanced budget. Down here on this dotted line is the debt that the majority party inherited 1 year ago, a $459 billion budget deficit. That is the difference in money collected from the taxpayers of this country and the money spent during that year.

Now look at 2009. Below this dotted line is the amount of deficit spending that has occurred during the last year. And as the gentleman from Iowa just went through, these are the elements that have stepped that deficit to unprecedented levels: $950 billion increase from 2008, and our deficit is $1.4 trillion, almost a trillion dollars more than the Democrats inherited 1 year ago, and here is how it goes. First of all, lower tax receipts due to the recession, something that they didn't factor in. Then the stimulus money, which at $787 billion was about twice what the Republicans proposed to spend on stimulus, and our bill would have created twice as many jobs. And in fact the Democrats' bill that they said would keep unemployment below 8 percent ended up blossoming into double digit unemployment.

That is what people are worried about. They are worried about whether they will have a job tomorrow, and whether their children will have a job and whether they will be able to pay their bills and whether they will default on their mortgage. And on top of that, whether their health care benefits will be taxed or whether they will be penalized because the government hasn't approved of the health care plan they have now. But I digress.

Now let's go on to the bailouts for financial institutions and auto industries, taking it to even lower levels. Bailouts for Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, an area where the government in its wisdom decided that people who may not financially qualify for loans to own a home should have them, and this is the resultant deficit. And finally, unemployment benefits due to the recession. Plus you add other spending and here we are, $1.4 trillion in deficit spending in addition to the debt that has accumulated over the years.

Now if the gentleman from Iowa would indulge one more chart. When you hear the term structural deficit, this is the structural deficit, the difference between spending and taxes. This chart runs from the 1970s through 2019. And if you look, this dotted line is today. Look at how the gap between spending and taxes grows and separates going forward, and here is where we are today at a massive point in terms of the difference between spending and taxes.

But over the years, regardless of who was President, regardless of who was in Congress, we didn't have those abrupt and wild and dramatic swings. In fact, when the Republicans controlled Congress under a Democrat President, you actually had tax receipts higher than spending. These are the years that the gentleman from Iowa talked about, about which he is most proud and about which I am most proud as a person who was observing as a non-Member of Congress during those years.

This chart here shows you where spending went over the last period of time, 1969 to 2008. This very high number for defense, when over 40 percent of the Federal budget was going to defense, was at the height of the Vietnam War. Look at its abrupt decline after the Vietnam War into the 1970s, then back up for a little bounce during the period of the 1980s while we were ending the Cold War, and then you see it declined after the fall of the Berlin Wall, and this is the area of the so-called peace dividend, and then back up only slightly during the war after 9/11.

But the real kicker on this chart is the bottom line, the red line, Medicare and Medicaid, because before we were a welfare state, the amount of the Federal budget and in terms of the use of the Federal budget, only about 5 percent went to entitlement programs, Medicare and Medicaid. That number has been dramatically increasing with no end in sight because people of your and my age are going to move into retirement, meaning that Medicare will be more expensive. There will be more of us on it, and Medicaid benefits have increased over time.

Consequently, this is going to be eating more and more of our budget. Nondefense discretionary spending is actually down, and Social Security, more level than you would think at about 20 percent of the Federal budget. But there again, that number is going to go up unless we get a handle on entitlements. So these are the areas with which we need to grapple. These are the areas which I believe were on the minds of Americans in Massachusetts as they went to the polls today.

□ 2200

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentlelady from Wyoming for the interesting charts. I think it's important for us to refresh ourselves with these trends consistently. They have changed dramatically under this administration.

I think the American people now realize that Republicans in the majority disappeared here in November of 2006, and Democrats have been in control of this Congress ever since then. In the previous years, they all said that if you would just let them have control of this Congress, things would be better. Give us the majority, they said over and over again. The 30-something Group, which now I think is in the 40-somethings, just consistently, night after night, made the same case: the economy would be a lot better off if you had Democrats in charge.

Well, they came into control in November of 2006 and immediately what we saw was a significant decline in industrial investment. That was the first indicator of what was happening with our economy, and it happened this way: CHARLIE RANGEL became the likely, and not yet formally named, but he did become the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. And he went on the talk show circuit all over America; he was a very busy guy. And the pundits were asking Chairman RANGEL, Which one of these Bush tax cuts don't you like, or do you like them all? And CHARLIE would never be able to say that he liked any of them, but he never really answered back on which ones he didn't like.

But because of his answers and the process of elimination, from November through February it became clear to the investors in America that there wasn't any Bush tax cut that CHARLIE RANGEL liked and that he liked spending better, and he was going to do what he could do to let them expire so that the government could collect more money so they could start more programs and grow government spending.

Investment knew that; business figured it out. And as they did, the capital investment went down; the industrial investment went down almost in direct proportion to the appearances of CHARLIE RANGEL on national TV. Because capital is always smart money—it wouldn't be capital if it weren't smart—and so if the cost of investing in a business goes higher because there's a tax increase, what do you do? You invest less in business because the return isn't as likely or the margin isn't as good.

So when America and the world were promised that the Bush tax cuts were going to be, let me just say that they would say it this way, ''allowed to expire,'' which is willfully kill them and raise taxes, industrial investment dropped off. When industrial investment dropped off, of course when you invest in capital investment, you get a return in productivity. If you stop investing in industrial investment, then you start losing efficiencies.

There was a professor—actually, he was a professor that served underneath Lenin in Russia, his name was Professor Khodnev. He did a study, it's called the Khodnev study. Nobody really knew about this study until MIT University did a computer study some 25-or-so years ago analyzing what happened with capital investment and returns and how the cycles of the economy went. Somebody remembered that they read this old study from Professor

Khodnev, a Russian who was commissioned by Lenin to prove that capitalism would be self-defeating and expire.

So he went through their data and he showed that there was a decline, that unemployment would go up and gross receipts would go down, profits would go down and capital investment would go down. He showed a cycle that showed that when the capitalism of the economy peaked out, it would then drop back down over the course of about 26 years. That showed capitalism's decline. Then it would go back up again to peak out again in another 26 years. It's a 52-year cycle, Professor Khodnev's 52-year cycle.

And so he was commissioned to prove capitalism was self-defeating, but he found out that, well, it defeats itself for a while, but then when you get down to the bottom, entrepreneurs start to come up with good ideas. They all figure out what they're going to do, and they invest in research and development. They implement new ideas, new ideas improve technology, technology improves productivity, improved productivity improves profitability. And when you're down at the bottom of this trough where you're making these investments, your productivity then goes up because of the capital investment at the trough. And as it goes up, your profits go up.

Then you get up there 26 years later to the peak and you realize, this is pretty good, I'm making money, I think I'll coast awhile. They stop making capital investments like they stopped under the beginning of the Rangel term and then your productivity drops off. And you don't realize it for a while. You're not quite in a free fall, but you're coasting. I remember seeing a poster on a fellow's wall years ago of a little kid sitting on a tricycle. He's got his hands on the handlebar and his hair is flying a little bit, he's got his feet off the pedal and a great big grin on his face. He's having fun, but the bottom of the poster says, If you're coasting, you're going downhill.

And we went downhill, Mr. Speaker. We went downhill because taxes were too high and because the wrong message got sent to capital investment, apparently because of Khodnev's theory that was matched by the computer study at MIT, by the way, and you can pick your cycles within the cycles too.

But it's the nature of capitalism to invest money, improve your productivity, and then have that equipment get old. Then you can't compete so much anymore and your productivity then diminishes in the face of this competition. You still get profits because you've got the return back on your capital investment and you own your equipment, but if the profits get narrower and narrower and the harder it is to get that competitive production out of the older equipment, then you peak out and you start to slide. And then you think, what are we going to do now? Well, let's go invent some things. Let's get our productivity back, and let's compete with the rest of the world.

That's what needs to happen, but it has to happen in a competitive environment, Mr. Speaker. It needs to happen with low regulations and low taxation. And you can't be punishing business. And we can't have a President that is demagoging the capital investment in America and telling the bankers that they're greedy. Bankers will pull back.

I think this is a lesson out of Franklin Delano Roosevelt: he went around and punished capital throughout the thirties. And then he had his New Deal that he said was a good deal; I said it was a horrible deal. The President said it would have been a better deal only FDR didn't spend enough money. Well, now we're finding out what America thinks of the FDR-New Deal-President-on-steroids Obama who went to Copenhagen twice and went 0 for 2. He wanted to get the World's Fair in Chicago; that was a goose egg. Then he went to Copenhagen to get a deal for cap-and-trade. He got a fig leaf, but not a deal. So that's 0 for 2 in Copenhagen.

Then he went to Virginia to try to win the governorship down there, about three stops across the river. Well, we've got Governor McDonnell. Then he went to New Jersey to save that for the very rich and, as of yesterday, former-Governor Corzine. We have Governor Chris Christie. Then he went to Massachusetts, a place where you would never have to call the President of the United States to Massachusetts for reinforcements, never. No one could imagine a scenario like that and have the President's political capital on the line. He has a situation where he couldn't win because the race was already too close.

But this is worse than taking a black eye, this is a thumping. This is a real thumping. It is a movement along the east coast. And if it can move like this on the east coast, it can really move across the rest of the country as a dynamic sea change.

The American people reject some other things, as I said earlier. The most personal thing you have is your body. And the government comes in and nationalizes General Motors; that's like nationalizing the Dallas Cowboys. But your body? The most private thing you have, to have the government decide they're going to manage it and tell you what you're going to pay for insurance and set up a health choices administration czar to write the rules after the fact? To pass legislation that would appoint someone to have power over life and death, someone to be appointed later—maybe by, let me see, and confirmed by some Senators to be elected later. Well, they have gone way too far. And the wisdom of the Founding Fathers has been, I think, ratified and established.

While I'm here talking about how things have to change, Mr. Speaker, I, not by accident, have an acorn here in my pocket. We know what ACORN has been doing to try to redirect America's destiny. They have admitted to over 400,000 fraudulent voter registration forms. They have said that they've gone to swing States and turned up their organization. They said they're a 501(3)(C), not-for-profit, nonpartisan organization.

I went down to their headquarters at 2609 Canal Street in New Orleans. And there, where they run most of their operations out of, there was a huge ''Obama for President'' sign right smack dab in the front window of the national headquarters of not-for-profit, tax exempt, 501(C)(3) ACORN campaigning for the President of the United States. He was elected about 8 months earlier, 9 months earlier; they still had a sign in the window. The President wrote the book ''The Audacity of Hope.'' This is a lot of audacity to see what ACORN is doing. They've got to be pulled out by the roots, Mr. Speaker.

That is the next piece that comes along. The American people have to step up and make sure that our elections are legitimate, that they're not stolen, that every American citizen registered to vote that counts a ballot has their vote counted. But the rest of those people don't have any business voting, and once is enough. And the threats that came and the stories that we've heard—we will pick up more about Massachusetts; but I suspect that they're not going to look very far because on a victory you don't go examine very deeply.

□ 2210

Yet, in the close races, those that can scramble things and those that can produce fraudulent voter registration forms, those corrupt criminal enterprises will take and steal our liberty and our freedom, and I think we've seen it happen in several States. Thank God it didn't happen in Massachusetts tonight.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Wyoming.

Mrs. LUMMIS. I have a couple more questions for you.

We look at the fact that, in the health care bill, the Senator from Nebraska sought an exemption from the impacts of Medicaid expenditures in his State and at the fact that the Amish sought an exemption because their religious freedom requires them not to be mandated to have a certain health insurance program placed upon them. There were other exemptions. The unions went to the White House recently because they wanted to be exempted from the Cadillac insurance plan tax that was going to help pay for the Senate bill to create socialized medicine.

Then there was the citizen who asked: If this is such a great bill, why do so many people need exemptions? Could that be part of the reason, the very simple question: If this is such a great bill, why does everybody want to

be exempted from it? Could that have anything to do with tonight's election results in Massachusetts?

I yield back.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentlelady.

I think there are lots of things that had to do with the election in Massachusetts tonight. I think a lot of it was that the American people are fed up and that they've had enough. You know, people will rise to their responsibility. I don't know how many times I've seen a town that needs a mayor, a small town, but nobody wants to bother. Somebody else can do that. If the wrong person steps forward and says, Well, I'll be mayor, well, we've got a little syndrome—and I won't say the person's name—but it's a syndrome that says, if somebody who's going to do a lousy job steps up, somebody who'll do a good job will step up to protect them from the damage that will be caused. I think that's part of what happened in Massachusetts. I think, when this announcement was made that the Coakley candidate would support the bill, whatever it was that came out behind closed doors, that that really mobilized a lot of people.

We need to be thinking about what actually has happened here. In this House, a bill was passed, and there were amendments that were offered in committee, but there wasn't much of a process here. I offered something like 13 amendments in the Rules Committee at 1:30 in the morning, and there was nobody there to hear that. It's like if a tree falls in the forest. The Rules Committee sat there and chastised me for wasting their time for asking them if they'd give me permission to come down here to the floor and argue for the liberty of the American people. They had the audacity to chastise me for using up paper. It was a waste of paper to print these amendments because, surely, I should have known that Speaker PELOSI wasn't going to let these amendments come to the floor. So what was the point of putting them on record?

My advice to them was take that 2,000-page bill and put the paper back in the tree. The world would have been a lot better off if we'd had a few more trees and a few less 2,000- or now 4,000-page bills.

I think something else we need to talk about, Mr. Speaker, is they're not going to break the filibuster in the United States Senate on this bill anymore. So what kind of shenanigans do we have to guard against?

Are they going to delay the certification of the votes in Massachusetts to try to delay the swear-in of Senator-elect Scott Brown? I like the sound of that. I haven't said that before. Senator-elect Scott Brown. Are they going to delay that? Are they going to try to keep him off the floor?

Are they going to try to push a bill through with the 60 votes they have and defy the will of the American people?

Is Speaker PELOSI going to try to take the Senate version of the bill now, which is something that the House has lined up to reject, and bring it to the floor of the House before people figure out what's going on and send it to the President even though the American people have not just at every opportunity—and the election today was an opportunity today for the voices of the people in Massachusetts and America to be heard. Thank you, Massachusetts. Not only that, the people have stepped up to do everything they can, and they have created opportunities that their voices be heard, and I say still their hearts are hardened.

If they circumvent the will of the American people, if there's a bill from the Senate that gets brought to the floor and sent to the President because everybody over here just sucks it up and decides they're going to go ahead and lose those seats, there will be holy thunder to pay in the ballot box in November. I pray the streets will be peaceful until then, and I'm not sure they will be, Mr. Speaker.

This is a rejection. This is a referendum on socialized medicine in Massachusetts today. This is President Obama's socialized medicine agenda rejected in Massachusetts. This is heavy-handed legislation and backroom dealing rejected in Massachusetts. This is special deals for different States, exemptions, carve-outs for Florida, Louisiana and Nebraska and others rejected by the people in Massachusetts. No secret deals. That's all rejected by people in Massachusetts.

A situation that we have now is—and I said this going into the election a year ago November—excuse me. Well, it was last November actually. Going into the election, I said, If you elect Barack Obama as President of the United States and if you return majorities to the House of Representatives for Democrats and to the United States Senate—and I didn't anticipate it was going to be 60. I think, if you went back and did a recount in Minnesota, it wouldn't have been 60, but that's what it turned out to be—I predicted then that those majorities and a President Obama, the three of them—President Obama, Speaker PELOSI, and HARRY REID—could go in a phone booth and dictate to America what they wanted to do to this country. I put that in an op-ed here a couple of days ago, or at least in a press release, because I wanted to make sure it was down in print.

There is no formal function that has taken place in the House of Representatives all year long or in the United States Senate all year long that controls the negotiations on the part of the ruling troika in America—Obama, PELOSI, and REID. They plan to and strategize to draft a whole new bill, one that's not guided by anything except their judgment on whether they can get the votes to pass it and bring it directly to the floor of the House of Representatives—bypass the committee process, not allow any amendments, just write a draconian bill like King George would write. You know, he vetoed the will of the colonists, and now the colonists have vetoed the will of the President today.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. KING of Iowa. I yield.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Interestingly, over the August recess, when we were all at home having town hall meetings and the people had their opportunities to step forward and express their opinions about this bill, one of the leaders of the majority party in the Senate was quoted as saying, It's getting harder and harder to pass legislation that the American people don't want.

So they even acknowledge that the American people don't want this. They even acknowledge that it is the judgment of the leadership of the Democratic Party that this is good for the American people whether the American people know it or not.

That's what King George was doing. King George was deciding that he knew what was best for the American colonies whether they knew it or not, but they rose up, and they told King George otherwise—that they knew what was best for them, and they formed a more perfect union.

That's what, in part, tonight's election was about. That's what the elections and the discussions may be about throughout this calendar year unless there is some recognition by the majority party and by our President that ''change'' means moving more towards the center.

You and I want what's best for our country. We don't want to stand up here and bash the other party. We want to work with them to come up with solutions for our country. I come from a State where we have frequently a boom-and-bust economy. I served in the Wyoming Legislature when we were in boom years and when we were in bust years. We know how to ramp up an economy, and we know how to ramp a government down in response to a declined economy. We could work with a President and with a majority party now if they were willing to do so; but as you and I know, we've seen no indication that they're willing to do so, and you expressed an example of it.

It was the night that you were there at 1:30 a.m. in the Rules Committee to try and get an amendment. I had three amendments to that bill. I was there an hour before you were, and I was told that there were going to be two amendments allowed on the floor tomorrow to that 2,000-page bill. One would be Minority Leader JOHN BOEHNER's substitute bill, which they already knew was going to go down and that it would get the votes of all of the members of the Republican Party and none of the members of the Democrat Party. That was one of the amendments.

□ 2220

The other one was the Stupak amendment, because that was demanded by of course every Republican

and enough Democrats that they had to allow it to go to the floor in order to get that bill passed. But every other bill that was sponsored in good faith by Democrats and Republicans alike, rank-and-file Democrats and Republicans, were rejected, was not allowed to go to the floor and in fact was essentially blown off in the Rules Committee.

That is not government of the people. That is government the way that King George ran it. That is government that the people tonight rejected in Massachusetts.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentlelady. This is an exhilarating day for a lot of reasons, and many of us have poured our hearts and souls into this. I have argued that even when you are surrounded and there isn't hope, it is no time to give up because you never know when the cavalry is going to come over the hill. Well, they came over the hill in Massachusetts today.

There was a fellow that gave up, though, and I think it is important to put this into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

[From the Washington Times]

BOOKIE PAYS OFF EARLY, PREDICTS BROWN WIN

(By Joseph Curl)

BOSTON On Monday, an Irish bookie paid off bettors who had wagered that state Sen. Scott Brown, a conservative Republican, would win the special election for the Massachusetts U.S. Senate seat held for nearly 50 years by liberal Democratic icon Edward M. Kennedy.

''Enough is enough. It seems that Senator Brown just has to get out of bed tomorrow to win convincingly. As far as we're concerned, this race is well and truly over,'' said Paddy Power, Ireland's largest bookmaker, 24 hours before the actual election.

Before shutting down the betting, Mr. Brown had gone from 5–4 odds to 1–5 (meaning if a bettor put down $5, they only stood to make $1 if Mr. Brown wins). The odds against his opponent—Democrat Martha Coakley, the state's attorney general—soared from 4–7 to win to 3–1 to lose.

''Paddy Power has also cut the odds on the Republicans winning the 2012 presidential election from 11–10 to evens and have installed Senator Scott Brown at odds of 20–1 to win the Republican presidential nomination in 2012,'' the bookmaker said.

Mr. Brown, Mrs. Coakley and Joseph Kennedy, a Libertarian who is running as an independent, entered the final day of campaigning before Tuesday's special election to fill the U.S. Senate seat left empty by the death of Edward M. Kennedy.

The Irish bookie also paid off early on the 2008 presidential election. About a week before Election Day, Mr. Power paid out more than $1 million to all bettors who wagered on then-Sen. Barack Obama, saying Sen. John McCain was too far behind in the polls to win.

One fellow gave up, and his name is Paddy Power. He is the lead bookie from Ireland. This is in the Washington Times printed today, so you can guess he capitulated sometime in the night, and it made the Washington Times. Paddy Power started to pay out the bets to the people that bet that Brown would be elected over Coakley today. And he said the polls were far enough apart that he didn't need to wait until the polls closed and they counted the votes. It was over. So Paddy paid out somewhere around—here we go. Mr. Brown had gone from 5–4 odds to 1–5. Meaning that if you bet $5 that he would win, you would pay out $1. And so Coakley went from 4–7 odds to 3–1.

Now, the people from Nevada would understand all that instinctively, but I believe that, if I read this right, Mr. Power paid out more than $1 million to all betters who wagered on the Obama race. So he paid out the bets. He just decided that he didn't need to wait for the polls to be counted. He gave up, but he predicted it right.

From my view, Mr. Speaker, I think when we have a public policy that is completely wrong, that violates the Constitution and it violates the spirit of the American people, in fact diminishes and damages, the American people should never give up, should never give up until it is all over. Then, you figure out how to start it all over again.

I had a poster in my construction company office for years, and I just found it as I cleaned out my office over the Christmas break and I was snowed in. It was of this shore bird, a tall, long-legged bird, and he was swallowing a frog. And the frog is going down the throat of this bird, but the frog has his arms out and he is holding that bird by the throat. He is not going to be let up, or if he does he will be swallowed. The message is, Never give up.

We didn't give up in this House. A lot of us stood and we fought. And we have got a lot of battles ahead of us, but the cavalry has arrived, we have got reinforcements. And now, there are people who will not be sleeping tonight trying to figure out how to pass a bill the American people don't want.

I think that this time in history, this vote and this election and this special election in Massachusetts represents the most significant congressional race in my lifetime and maybe in the history of the United States. Time will tell. Time will tell on that. But I am exhilarated to see the spirit of freedom and liberty that has emerged in a place where we didn't see a lot of that in the past.

I yield to the gentlelady, and then I will come back with any closing comments.

Mrs. LUMMIS. I thank the gentleman from Iowa. And I look forward to the day when you are in the majority party, next year on this floor, and I am in the majority party, God willing, and that we can work together with President Obama to solve the problems of this country; that we can go back as happened in the 1990s, where you had a member of the Democratic party as President and a Republican Congress, and they worked together to balance the budget.

That is what the American people, I believe, are yearning for. That is what I am yearning for. And I look forward to working with the President in a way that we can balance the budget and bring the American people back to have faith and confidence in its government because we return to founding principles.

You know, there is an old saying: When all else fails, read the directions. The Constitution of the United States is the directions. And at a time like this, when we have record deficits, when we have soaring U.S. interest payments like you see on this chart, when we have Americans concerned about their health care, about their jobs, about the ability to earn an income, when people are concerned about the growth in China and what they see in some cases as the decline in jobs in the United States, that is when you return to founding principles.

Let's look at our Constitution more often. Let's return with our President next year, as a majority party, and I hopefully will be serving with you in the majority party at that time, and get back to those founding principles. Read the directions, what made America great, and restore the confidence of the American people in this institution and in our ability to self-govern.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentlelady for joining me tonight in this Special Order.

You have heard, Mr. Speaker, my enthusiasm to put an end to this socialized medicine bill. You haven't heard what has been refreshed, at least, although I am confident you have heard, the things that the Republicans would like to do.

Republicans have introduced at least 42 different health care bills here in this Congress. We have passed good pieces of legislation in the past when we were in the majority and sent them over to the Senate, where the trial lawyers blocked any reform. And one of those is to reform lawsuit abuse in medical malpractice.

The number that I get from the health insurance underwriters is 8.5 percent of all our health care costs is wrapped up in lawsuit abuse—the litigation, the defensive medicine, and the premiums that are unnecessary because of the lawsuit abuse. That 8.5 percent represents $203 billion a year going out unnecessarily wasted out of health care.

This 4,000-page bill. And we don't know how many pages it is now. I don't know if they are back there now writing more pages, or if they are burning up pages trying to balance out their carbon footprint. But in this 4,000-some page bill, there is not anything in there that does one single thing to reduce one penny in unnecessary health care costs that has to do with lawsuit abuse.

So that is number one. We want to fix that. We have introduced legislation on it. We passed it out of the House in 2005 when we were in the majority, and sent it over to the Senate where the trial lawyers blocked it, lawsuit abuse.

JOHN SHADEGG for years has been pushing legislation to allow people to

buy health insurance across state lines. So today, in Governor Christie's state, someone who would pay a premium there, a young 25-year-old man, buys a health insurance premium for about $6,000 a year, a healthy young man, can go to Kentucky, can buy a similar—not the same, but a similar policy, for $1,000 a year. So why wouldn't we adopt the Shadegg language and let the people in New Jersey save $5,000, and let them buy that policy in Kentucky until they start to lower the premiums and lower the mandates in New Jersey?

Buying insurance across state lines does a lot to lower the cost of health care. And the President has said there isn't enough competition in the health insurance industry. Remember, he demagogued the health insurance industry mercilessly for a long time: Not enough competition. So he wanted to create a new Federal health insurance company that would offer a handful or a dozen health insurance policies.

Here are the real numbers, Mr. Speaker. There are 1,300 health insurance companies in America—1,300 companies. That is a lot of competition. The President's idea is, well, we need 1,301, then. And that will be the deciding factor. And of those companies, there are approximately 100,000 different varieties of policies. If one wanted to go shopping, you could conceivably buy 100,000 different policies. That is a lot of policies and a lot of options and a lot of companies, and they are not allowed to compete across state lines. In fact, some of them don't want to do that. Some of them want to protect their little bailiwick, and some of them are trying to establish a de facto monopoly in their States. The Shadegg bill fixes that, and it breaks that down and lets people go out of state to buy insurance. Those are two big things.

I want 100 percent deductibility of everybody's health insurance premiums. If a corporation or a company, a sole proprietorship, partnership, limited liability corporation, if they can deduct health insurance premiums for their employees, why if they don't provide that insurance can't the employee deduct 100 percent of that premium in the same way? It is completely unjust.

When I bring that up, some say it costs too much money. Well, then let's level the tax a little bit. It is $32 billion, if I remember right, on the number. That is not too much money to give people equity and give people justice.

So let's have full deductibility of everybody's premiums. Let's buy insurance across state lines, make all of the insurance companies in the country compete against each other. Let's end this lawsuit abuse, Mr. Speaker. Let's have transparency in billing, so we can start to reduce the cost shifting that takes place. Because some people underpay; others have to overpay.

And, by the way, cutting Medicare by half a trillion dollars and alleging that there is waste, fraud, abuse, and corruption out there—and they'll be able to find that all if we just let them cut Medicare by half a trillion—how is it the President of the United States can make an allegation that there is waste, fraud, and abuse, and can end corruption to the tune of hundreds of billions of dollars and not point one finger at the people that are corrupted or doing it? And how is it that the President of the United States can hold a right hostage to an ultimatum?

□ 2230

We have a right to a legitimate government; we have a right to government oversight. If there's waste, fraud, abuse, and corruption in Medicare, we shouldn't have to be held hostage to pass socialized medicine to find out where it is so the government can go fix it. That should happen every day, automatically, every time, by due-diligent public servants. A half a trillion dollar cut. By the way, wiping out Medicare Advantage. Oh, except for Florida. That's the carve-out on there.

The American people are full up to here of those kind of shenanigans. They're tired of special arrangements. They really don't like the idea that everybody's Cadillac health insurance plan is going to be taxed at 40 percent, except the unions. They're not going to be taxed quite so much. Give those an exemption because, after all, they helped the President get elected.

So this is like a huge, right-out-in-the-open, shine-the-spotlight-on-it, political payoff. This is America. And this is what the people in Massachusetts revolted against today. A peaceful revolution. People that came up and said, I'm going to exercise my right at the ballot box. And if they exercise their good judgment and their right at the ballot box, then you don't have to go to the other form of changing government, which gets a little bloody. The French had it kind of rough after our Revolution. We don't want that in this country. We're grateful for people that go to the polls and provide that kind of revolution with good judgment and good energy and good organization and a great and wonderful spirit.

For me, I get to pack 3 days of good memories about Massachusetts into my mind, and I can carry that with me forever. That's something that will never change now. I look forward to going back up there. Massachusetts, that deep, deep blue State turned a little purple today, Mr. Speaker.

So I appreciate your indulgence and you listening and I appreciate the opportunity to address you here before the House of Representatives on this glorious day. I look forward to every day we have from here on out to the end of this session as we shape this policy and we start to move back to sanity in America. I look forward to the elections in November of this year, 2010.

I look forward to the new faces that will come, the freshman class. It will be a large freshman class—a class of vigor, people that are full of energy, that really do come to change this country. I intend to team up with them, bring us a balanced budget, bring us back more liberty, strengthen our families, strengthen our foreign policy and, by the way, while that's going on, we need to shape a President for 2010.

Thank, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. TIAHRT (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of attending a funeral.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today and the balance of the week on account of attending his brother's funeral in Alaska.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

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

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BLUMENAUER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. QUIGLEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GRAYSON, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. PAUL, for 5 minutes, January 20 and 21.

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, January 21, 22, and 26.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, January 21, 22, and 26.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, January 21 and 22.

Mr. INGLIS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, January 20, 21, 22, and 26.

Mrs. SCHMIDT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 20, 2010, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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