from the Federal Government to intervene and to listen to your communications between one American and another.

So I stand here today to emphasize that the court system, the FISA system, the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court, is an imperative to protect you as Americans when your government wants to spy on you.

Will we be safe from terrorists? Absolutely. Because part of the terrorism is to ensure that information is shared with law enforcement so that we can be in front of this issue.

I am looking forward to the markup. I'm looking forward to an opportunity to devise legislation that preserves the preciousness of the Bill of Rights and the fourth amendment. We cannot step back and be subjected to our own terror, and that is to be frightened so much that we take the Bill of Rights and extinguish it.

I may not agree with the interpretation of the second amendment, but it does exist and it is part of the Bill of Rights. You may have a different interpretation of the first amendment, but it is part of the Bill of Rights. You may have a suspect interpretation of the fourth amendment, but the language is clear: you are to be protected against unreasonable search and seizure. It is unreasonable to not go into a court established to do that, to protect you, to have a court objectively look at what the urgency is and to provide that intervention to protect your rights.

I look forward to working with a number of colleagues on language that I have joined and written to establish the parameters of protecting us from the violation of the fourth amendment.

Keep the FISA law as it is. Modernize it. Ensure that the FISA court that intervenes protects our rights and keeps our values, the values that so many have strived so hard to seek a place in the sun in this Nation because they truly believe that the democracy and the liberties that we have are worth protecting, worth protecting with their lives. And I believe here in the United States Congress, we must stand in that tradition.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings or other audible conversation is in violation of the rules of the House.

PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION FINANCING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I thank you, and I'm proud to be on the floor this afternoon to talk about some issues that are very important to me and I think very important to most Members of this body and certainly to the American public.

Just a few minutes ago, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), a very well, well respected, fine Member of this body, did a 5-minute talking about the problem with Presidential election financing. And I think her comments, Mr. Speaker, were so compelling that indeed people, our guests in the gallery, when she completed her remarks, broke out in spontaneous applause. Maybe they knew that they shouldn't, or maybe they didn't know, but, you know, they were responding to something that they heard that they liked. And certainly, I can understand that. Folks do that every now and then. I almost felt like applauding Ms. KAPTUR as well because she was speaking the truth and bringing our attention to a real problem.

I used to enjoy so much going around the district, Mr. Speaker, and talking to school children, whether they were at the elementary, middle or high school level, and saying to them, of course, they'd always ask, Well, Congressman GINGREY, what's your favorite issue or what is your favorite thing that you do as a Member of Congress? And I would say to them, what I'm doing right now; what I'm doing right now, speaking to young people to try to inspire them. And heretofore I would say to them, the great, one of the great things about our country is anybody in America can grow up to be President. It doesn't matter who you are or what your background. Anybody in this great country of the United States of America can grow up to be President.

Sadly, today, that's probably not true, and I think that's what Ms. KAPTUR was trying to point out. There's just something wrong in River City with all these hundreds of millions of dollars that have to be raised for a candidate of either party, the two major political parties, to have a chance to, yes, be grown up now and have an opportunity to become President. There are many people that are very qualified, I think, that would make a great President, man or woman, white or black, it doesn't matter where you come from, your meager beginnings possibly. But you don't have that chance because of what she was pointing out.

And by the way, Mr. Speaker, I want to digress just for a moment. Speaking of young people, I don't think we take enough time to thank our young men and women, our young students, our pages that work in this body and in the other body, in the House and the Senate, on behalf of Members of Congress. And usually the pages are here at the request of a Member. And this young man that's here on the floor tonight put these posters up for me and made sure that I've got a cup of water in case my mouth gets a little dry, as we continue to speak over these next 30 to 45 minutes. I think we just owe them a lot of thanks. What they do is much more, of course, than these tasks. And this young man, Edward White, Mr. Speaker, is from Atlanta, Georgia. I'm from the metropolitan Atlanta, Georgia area. I represent northwest Georgia. He's here through Congressman JOHN LEWIS, the dean of the Georgia delegation, his office. And I just want to take an opportunity to thank him and all the young men and women that help us so much and don't get as much credit as they should.

□ 1615

But my purpose of this hour was to bring to my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, another issue which has gotten completely out of control. And, yes, it has to do with spending, kind of on the theme that Ms. KAPTUR brought to us in regard to Presidential elections, and that is the issue of earmarks.

Now, the general public, I think, is fed up with so-called earmark abuse. Sometimes we euphemistically will refer to those as ''Member initiatives.'' Some people, of course, don't like that term and they will call it ''pork.'' But the situation is getting completely out of hand, and that's what I want to talk about primarily in the next 30 minutes or so, Mr. Speaker.

We can solve this problem. We have got a problem, and it is not unique to the Republican Party. It is not unique to the Democratic Party. I know some of my colleagues, hopefully, who are watching us during this time and maybe the general public is aware of an article just this past week. And I hold up the magazine, Mr. Speaker, it is known as ''CQ Weekly.'' This magazine comes out every week. I know that it's difficult for Members in the back rows of the Chamber to see the magazine that I'm holding up. Maybe the cameras can focus in on that. But basically the title of this article, and there are several articles written about the problem, is ''Playing the Earmark Game.'' ''Playing the Earmark Game.''

Let me reference here in just a second my first slide, this poster to my left, to show you what I'm talking about.

Now, what is an earmark? Well, an earmark is when a Member of a congressional district sees a need among those 670,000 people that he or she represents. Possibly a school system or a county commissioner or just an individual, or maybe it's a Head Start program, has brought an issue to that Member, Mr. Speaker, and says, We have a great need, Congressman or Congresswoman, in our district. You represent us. We voted for you. We have great confidence in you. But our community has a desperate need, and I want you to ask the Federal Government to try to help us in the funding process.

Well, when the Member looks at that and decides that that is a very worthwhile project and then sort of applies

to the appropriators, that's called an earmark. And it could be a very, very good, worthy project. It could be a sewer project, to help a community to redevelop to get themselves back on their feet, and that is an earmark, but that's not bad. And that is when I would say this is a Member initiative and it is an appropriate thing to do.

But, unfortunately, as this magazine so clearly points out, this process is ripe with the potential for abuse. Just like Ms. KAPTUR was talking about in regard to the financing of Presidential elections and that money chase. It is absolutely ripe, this earmarking opportunity or Member initiative, it is so ripe for abuse.

And let me ask my colleagues to reflect on this first chart, this first slide, for just a minute. And this is from the Citizens Against Government Waste, a watchdog group. Thank God for watchdog groups. Citizens Against Government Waste calls this slide pork barrel spending. Pork barrel spending or earmarks or Member initiatives, if you like. Pork barrel spending, 1995 to 2007, this year.

My colleagues and Mr. Speaker, this is the total amount for the House and the Senate, 535 Members. The total amount in 1995 was $10 billion. You can say that that is a very small percentage of the overall world of discretionary spending or the total budget, which includes, of course, Social Security and Medicare and Medicaid and all the entitlement spending, mandatory spending. But $10 billion out of the discretionary amount. Well, over these 12 years, Mr. Speaker, that amount has grown until the year 2006 to $29 billion. In 2007 it drops down a little bit, but that was an anomaly because we only passed four of the 12 spending bills, and the rest of them had no earmarks in them when they bundled. But this trend is a steep slope upward, and it is getting worse and worse, both in total amount and in the percentage of all the discretionary spending that Members of Congress have an opportunity to control.

So, Mr. Speaker, this chart points it out very clearly that this spending for earmarks is becoming what I would call runaway spending, totally out of control. And, again, the CQ Weekly does such a wonderful job of explaining why this process can be so bad. It can be good, and I think, and I will talk about that a little later in the hour, with meaningful legislation that, hopefully, Members on both sides of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, the majority party and the minority party, can look at this and say, you know, Congressman GINGREY, you are absolutely right. We're getting sick and tired of picking up the newspaper almost weekly and seeing yet another Member of this august body who has this tremendous privilege, Mr. Speaker, to represent 670,000 for the House Members and an entire State for the Senators. What a privilege. What an honor. But you pick up that newspaper, and the names are people where you say, That's one of our best Members. That is a guy or that is a lady that I have known for the last 5 or 6 years, and whether she be a Republican or a Democrat, and you think, I just can't believe this. I can't believe that that Member would be doing anything that potentially is dishonest.

Now, sometimes these newspaper articles are not a court of law and you have to take some of that with a grain of salt. But I am telling you, when you look into that, Mr. Speaker, and you read and you kind of connect the dots, and they are fairly easy to connect, you start thinking if it looks like a duck and it walks like a duck and it quacks like a duck, it may well be a duck. So we have got a problem. We have a problem that we can correct, and I think I have got a solution.

Now, Mr. Speaker, one of the solutions that Members have talked about, and the gentleman from Arizona in particular, Representative JEFF FLAKE, one of my colleagues, has talked about this, about why don't we just absolutely eliminate, totally eliminate, all earmarks? In fact, I have got another slide, and I think I will reference that in just a second because this is certainly the appropriate time. Another Member on the majority side of the aisle has virtually said the same thing. Let me show you a quote, as we put up that second slide.

Colleagues, I want you to look at this poster, this second slide, if you will. I referenced Mr. FLAKE of Arizona, but here is another Member. And I will read it for you because it is very difficult to see in the back of the Chamber, and I understand that. The printing is small. And here is what it says, and this was a quote from last year in the Wall Street Journal, in fact:

''If she were to become Speaker in the next Congress, Pelosi said she would press to severely reduce earmarks.''

And then here's the quote:

''Personally, myself, I'd get rid of all of them.'' Then the quote begins again. She says, ''None of them is worth the skepticism, the cynicism the public has, and the fiscal responsibility of it.''

Now, I want to repeat this. Mr. Speaker, bear with me because I think this definitely needs repeating because it is really what Ms. KAPTUR said just a few minutes ago in regard to the Presidential fundraising activities, and she got, I guess, what you would call a standing ovation for her remarks.

''Pelosi said she would press to severely reduce earmarks. 'Personally, myself, I'd get rid of all of them. None of them is worth the skepticism, the cynicism the public has, and the fiscal irresponsibility of it.'''' Virtually the same thing that my colleague from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) has said in this body, Mr. Speaker, on numerous occasions.

And yet, Speaker PELOSI is on track this year to take home $100 million, more than 1 percent of all the House earmarks. And I am not standing here, Mr. Speaker, suggesting that those Member initiatives on behalf of the Speaker or anybody else, any other Member of this body, is for anything but the most worthy projects in her district, and I'm sure that that is the case. I am sure that every one of those Member requests on behalf of Speaker PELOSI would pass anybody's smell test and would survive any kind of challenge to strike them if a Member wanted to do that on this floor, and a Member can do that and then we have a fair and open vote on it. No, I am not suggesting any such thing, and I have great respect for the Speaker.

But as this article points out so clearly, everybody in this process of being able to get earmarks for their district, all Members are not treated equally. I can't remember the exact quote from ''Animal Farm,'' but you know what I am referring to. All Members definitely are not treated equally. That $29 billion worth of earmarks, it's not divided equally. If you look at it and you look at it very carefully, as CQ Weekly has done, and nobody in this Chamber, I think, Mr. Speaker, can deny this, you will see that members of the Appropriations Committee, that is about 65, it is a very selective committee. Most Members want to get on that very powerful committee. They do a lot of great work and it is a nice position to be in. But when you look at each Member, as they have done in CQ Weekly, and you see the discrepancy where some Members may get an opportunity to bring home $6 or $7 million to their district and other Members get an opportunity to bring home $180 million to their district or $100 million to their district, and as you look at it very carefully, it would seem that the members of the Appropriations Committee certainly get favored treatment. The members of the leadership certainly get favored treatment. Members that have been here for a long time who maybe are committee chairmen or chairwomen get favored treatment. And the last favored group, Mr. Speaker, are those Members who are representing districts where it is very competitive and they won by a very narrow margin, maybe literally by the skin of their teeth, and they are up for another re-election where it is going to be really tough.

□ 1630

So no matter which party is in control, Republicans do this, the Democrats do this, you let that Member get more opportunities, a bigger bite of the apple, if you will, to give the impression to the folks back home that they've elected the right person; we've got a Member who really can deliver this pork back home. They might rail against everybody else's pork, but that which is brought home by their Member, Mr. Speaker, is welcomed. So this is the way this process goes.

On the other hand, a rank-and-file Member, let's say a Member of what we might refer to pejoratively as the ''obscure caucus,'' who represents a district where they are absolutely having

no challenge, no difficulty getting re-elected, maybe their district is inner city and it's been gerrymandered and drawn for them so that no Member of the other party has any opportunity to win that congressional seat. So they're in what we call, and we all know this, my colleagues, they're in what we call a ''safe district.'' They don't have to worry about re-election. Hopefully, they're doing constituent services and they're representing their people well in the way they vote, but they really don't have to worry about a political challenge.

So when you look in this magazine, and you look at this article in regard to the fairness issue, you find that they are the ones that get the least amount. And yet in many instances, Mr. Speaker, they are representing districts, maybe an inner-city district, a poor district, a district that has a very poor tax base, it has a decaying infrastructure, it doesn't have a good water and sewage system in a certain part of the district, and they are the ones that need help more than anybody. And yet the way this game is played up here, they're at the back of the line in regard to what they can bring home to their district. I think many times Members don't complain about that because they're afraid if they complain, they'll get nothing. You know, it's a little dangerous to complain.

So, Mr. Speaker, I come here this hour and talk about this, yeah, with a little bit of trepidation. Have I, as Congressman GINGREY, who represents the 11th Congressional District of northwest Georgia, have I ever asked for a Member initiative? Absolutely. And I've been able to deliver on occasion, not always; most of these requests are turned back. But if it really has merit, yes, I have. And I hope, as I spend this time on the floor talking about this issue that's so problematic, that there won't be any reprisals or repercussions because of that. Because I'm trying to do it, Mr. Speaker, in a bipartisan way with a spirit of cooperation and wanting to do as Ms. KAPTUR was wanting to do in regard to Presidential election financing, do what's right for this Congress, do what's right for this body.

So here is my proposal: we have introduced legislation, and it's called the Earmark Reform Act of 2007, H.R. 3738. We just introduced it today; we had a press conference on it today. I was very, very pleased to be joined with two of my colleagues at the press conference, the chairman of the Republican Study Committee, Mr. HENSARLING of Texas, and my good friend and classmate, the gentleman from New Jersey, Representative SCOTT GARRETT.

And here is what I would do, Mr. Speaker: I would immediately say to the American public, we are going to slash these so-called ''earmarks'' in half for the next fiscal year. We're going to drop the number down from $29 billion to $14.5 billion. And then we're going to simply divide that number by the total membership of the Congress, the House and the Senate, and that's 535 Members, 435 here, 100 in the Senate. And when you do that division, you come up with a number of $27 million.

And you would say to each Member, Mr. Speaker, in this bill, you would say, you have an opportunity to look in your district, and if you want to ask for and receive money from the John Q. Public hardworking taxpayer to fund this project in your district, you're going to be limited to this amount in the first year of this legislation to $27 million. That means the most powerful Member of this body, the most powerful Member of leadership, the most senior Member of this body is not going to be able to get $180 million worth of earmarks while the Members who represent districts that are most in need end up with maybe 3 or $4 million. Each Member has an opportunity, then, to ask for and receive the exact same amount. Because, after all, Mr. Speaker, think about it, we represent 670,000 people, approximately, each Member. You know, they have the same need. And if we're going to do Member initiatives, it ought to be fair and evenly balanced, and that's basically what this bill does.

You know, if a Member like Mr. FLAKE or like Ms. PELOSI, as she was quoted in the Wall Street Journal last year, decides, you know, I don't like this process, I think it's inherently wrong, and it has the potential for massive abuse, and as she says, None of them is worth the skepticism, the cynicism the public has for them, and the fiscal irresponsibility, then if Mr. FLAKE or Ms. PELOSI said, you know, I don't want any earmarks for my district, let them apply for grants through the normal process, I will help them, my office will help them, Mr. Speaker, and try to show them how to write a grant if they don't know how to do it, but I'm not going to specifically ask for any earmarks, then that amount, if it's one Member, $27 million, Mr. Speaker, what we would do is subtract that amount from the 302 Allocation of Discretionary Spending.

So you would spend $27 million less during that fiscal year because that Member said, you know what, I agree with Ms. PELOSI and I agree with Mr. FLAKE and several other Members of this body that it's wrong; it has too much potential for corruption. And if we have enough Members, let's say you had 10 Members say that, then you're talking about $270 million. People could say, well, Congressman GINGREY, you know that's a very small portion of the budget; it's just a drop in the ocean. Well, $270 million in my district is much more, Mr. Speaker, than a little drop in the bucket. It's real money.

And so, this idea, then, of, first of all, in my bill, immediately cutting this number, that number of $29 million in half, and then just say let's give every Member the same opportunity, the fairness issue, and also let each Member who is philosophically opposed to earmarks, give them back to the taxpayer, what a breath of fresh air, I think. And then in subsequent years what we would do on this bill, Mr. Speaker, is we would say that you can only earmark 1 percent of total discretionary spending.

So that would drop that number $14.5 billion down to $10 billion. And when you make that division, you're not talking about $27 million per Member, maybe you're only talking about $20 million. And eventually, it may be that the Members of this body, Mr. Speaker, will come to the conclusion, as Ms. PELOSI did and as Mr. FLAKE has done consistently, and he has, indeed, put his money where his mouth is, that maybe more and more Members, my colleagues, will say, you know, we don't really need this earmarking business. We let people apply for grants and let projects get funded on their merit, and Members then don't get tempted to have someone come to them and say, you know, I know you're a powerful Member, and we've got this little project back home, wherever it is, in whomever's district in whatever State, and, oh, by the way Congressman, what can we do for you? Can we have a little fund-raiser for you? I've got some people back in the district that would love to help you, know you're doing a great job for us, and you just get back to us and let us know what you want us to do for you; but keep this project in mind, it really means a lot to us. And that project may be $2 million, it may be $5 million, it may be a $25 million project. So that's how this happens, Mr. Speaker. I think Members just sort of fall into the trap of all of that.

What I am trying to do is two things. I'm trying to save money for the taxpayer of this great country and stop this runaway spending and cut down these budget deficits and reduce this national debt, which is approaching $9 trillion; but I'm also trying to keep my colleagues on both sides of the aisle from becoming corrupted because of a corrupt system.

And that's really what it's all about. That's why I wanted to not rush out of here on the last vote and catch the first plane back to good ole Georgia, which I'm looking forward to doing maybe tomorrow; but I felt like it was important enough to come to the floor and to say to all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle that I see a better way. And I think we can do this in a bipartisan fashion.

And I will say this, Mr. Speaker, if we can't do it in a bipartisan fashion, this Member, this Republican Member, and hopefully his colleagues on this side of the aisle, would make a pledge to the American people that, you know, we got your message loud and clear in November of 2006. We understand why we're no longer in the majority, because we lost our fiscal discipline; but we're going to get it back, and we're going to start with this.

And this is not a baby step; this is a giant step. If you feel like maybe the

better approach would be to totally eliminate earmarks, well, maybe we will get there. Maybe Members will see that this can work and it will work.

And so, Mr. Speaker, again, the opportunity to be here on the floor to talk to my colleagues, I'm sure I would have some other speakers if it were not for the fact that we had our last vote an hour and a half ago and Members needed to get home to their district, and work hard, and I understand that. But there are a lot of Members that feel very strongly about this.

We have, I think, 25 cosponsors of the legislation, again, H.R. 3738, the Earmark Reform Act of 2007. It's an issue, Mr. Speaker, that's not going away. And I wouldn't be a bit surprised if next week and the next week and the next week we don't hear about more and more Members whose action in regard to earmarks is a little questionable. And, you know, when you start connecting the dots, in some cases it can become very, very questionable.

So let's try to do the right thing. I'm going to appeal to Members on both sides of the aisle to be a cosponsor of H.R. 3738, which immediately cuts the total amount of earmark spending in half, and it makes sure that no one Member, no matter what party, majority or minority, no matter what committee, committee chairman or ranking member, no matter how threatened a Member might be politically that you want to shore up with these little trinkets of goodies, that's not right, that's not the right way. And if we can't do it the right way, then I would join Mr. FLAKE in saying, Let's get rid of all earmarks.

In the meantime, I think this is not a baby step, as I pointed out, indeed, a giant step in the right direction. And if we can't do it right with that, then the next step should be, I think, total elimination.

I thank the Speaker and I thank my leadership for giving me this opportunity to do this hour. I thank my colleagues for listening, for being here, and to try to understand that this is a Member who is not overly partisan, who has friends on both sides of the aisle, that wants to help all of the Members, but ultimately to get back to helping the American taxpayer and to restore fiscal responsibility in this place.

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

30-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It's an honor to address the House one more time.

As you know, the 30-something Working Group, we come to share with the Members fact, not fiction. I'm so glad my good friend from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY), we came into the Congress together, Dr. GINGREY, good friend, I want to borrow that chart from him because it shows how earmarks were cut in half when the Democrats took over. But that's another story. But I'm glad that he has the accurate numbers there, and I'm glad that we're going to have an opportunity to talk about that a little bit more in the future.

□ 1645

Mr. Speaker, we came to the floor yesterday, or last night, and talked about the issue of the President's veto of the SCHIP bill. We, the 30-something Working Group, received a lot of e-mails on that, and we received a lot of phone calls. There were a number of Members that even had questions like, ''Is it true that 41 days of what we spend in Iraq could pay for a full year of health care for children? Is it true, 3½ months of what we spend in Iraq, which will come out to almost $35 billion, will pay for children's health care for 5 years?'' On both of those questions I would say, ''Yes. Absolutely. The numbers are there.'' I am going to have my charts here that I had last night hopefully join me here on the floor pretty soon.

It is very unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, that there are people that are focusing on the President. As far as I am concerned, the President said he was going to veto the SCHIP bill, the children's health care bill, and he did. Now it is up to Members of Congress. Yesterday we voted to set the date for the time that we are going to take up the SCHIP bill again to override the President's veto. I think between now and then, Members are going to have to reflect on if they are on the side of the President, of a bad decision that was a bipartisan bill, Mr. Speaker, that Democrats and Republicans voted in a bipartisan way to send that bill to the President, or are they with the uninsured children of this country.

Like I said last night, there are a number of provisions in the bill that some Members may not agree with. I have been in elected service now going on 14 years, Mr. Speaker. There has always been a provision in a bill that I didn't agree with. But for the greater good, especially when you are talking about health care for children, I saw past that one line or that one provision or that one piece that was not in there. I just want to say that this health care, and let me just share this because I want to make sure that the Members understand, that 10 million low-income children would have had health care in this country. Now, that is in every State. That is in my State of Florida. That is in Ohio. That is in California. That is in New York. That is in Texas. That is in Wyoming. All over. I think it is important that we shed light on that and we continue to talk about that in the face of wasteful spending in the past.

Another thing about this children's health care bill that wouldn't have been a reality in the 109th Congress, the Congress before this Congress, is the fact that it is paid for. Now, I am going to illustrate in a few minutes how things used to operate here on this House floor. The American people want to move in a new direction. At my house, if we are going to do something, we have to figure out how we are going to pay for it. We are not going to say, We will put it on a credit card and get it on some unforeseen date somewhere down in the future that is not necessarily lined out or identified yet, but we will figure it out somehow. We are going to end up in foreclosure or we are going to end up in a financial situation we can't get ourselves out of.

That is the position we find ourselves in now, Mr. Speaker. That is the reason why, in the majority, this House and the Senate agreed in the pay-as-you-go principles to make sure that if we say we are going to spend something, we are going to pay for it. So that is very, very important. When we look at some of the issues that the other side may bring up as it relates to fiscal responsibility, you have to look at, you just have to look at the irresponsibility, or the lack of responsibility, that the Republican side had when they were in control of this House.

When you look at $70 billion for the war in Iraq, $50 billion in subsidies to oil companies, $8 billion, these are billions, these are not millions, in loss, waste, fraud and abuse of no-bid contracts and billions for schools and roads and clinics in Iraq, but we cannot do the same for our children.

I am speaking in a very simple way here today, Mr. Speaker, because I want to make sure that Members totally understand what I am saying. I don't want to lose anyone with a whole bunch of acronyms in talking about things that are way out, pie in the sky, and some folks may not understand what is going on. The bottom line is, 10 million kids need health care for 5 years.

The other bottom line is the fact that we showed how we would pay for it, not building into an everlasting debt. Now, I am glad that this chart has made it to the floor. I think it is important. I pulled it out last night, and I have been using this chart almost for the last 3 years. We have been updating it, but I think it is important. We talk about foreign debt and we talk about the Bush administration and Republicans here in Congress what they were able to do, $1.19 trillion in get debt over the last 6 years, and that is between 2001 and 2006. These numbers are from the Treasury Department. These are not KENDRICK MEEK numbers. Forty-two Presidents, 224 years, $1.01 trillion. I say that to say that the days of just stacking on top of the $1.9 trillion are over.

Now, when we start going down the line of what is important here, and what is important is making sure that domestically we look at the needs of our children and also of our country.