

rather than revamping our entire health care system.

Mr. AKIN. I think you have brought an exceptionally important point. Unfortunately, our hour has just flown by. I would just like to thank my good friend, Congressman LAMBORN, for his expertise and great leadership you've shown here on the floor. I thank my other colleagues for taking part in trying to get through some of these details.

FREE ENTERPRISE AND THE INVISIBLE HAND

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOSTER). 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. Mr. Speaker, as always, it's an honor to address you on the floor of the House of Representatives. Having listened to some of the dialogue of my colleagues that have been here just prior and hopefully will join me in the next hour, I think it's important that the American people return their focus again to the values that made this a great Nation.

We're a country that needs to be cognizant of our history. And that's why we teach it in our public and our private and parochial schools. It's why we teach it in our families. We pass the lore of the American Dream and history of the United States of America on down to our children, and we ask our children to pass it to their children, and on and on. And to make sure that there is a consistent continuity, we teach the history of the United States in the context of the world.

And so something that seems to be missing from the awareness of the people on this side of the aisle that are advocating a national health care act, a socialized medicine plan, is the foundation of the greatness of America. And I could go off into a lot of different tangents about the pillars of American exceptionalism, but central to those pillars is the idea of freedom—the freedom and the free markets and the freedom of the markets to make a decision on what they want to provide to the consumers.

And so this is Adam Smith. This is Adam Smith that laid this out. Even though you can read through all 1,057 pages of *The Wealth of Nations*, you'll not find him use the expression "the invisible hand." But it's the invisible hand, indeed, that best describes the vision of Adam Smith in 1776, having printed and published his book *The Wealth of Nations*.

It's the very foundation of free enterprise. And centuries later we come up with Keynesian economics. The idea that there is no basis for the economy. That the economy is just a great big huge national or global chain letter. And that if the government would just print a lot of money and spend the money a lot of ways and maybe go drill some holes in an abandoned coal

mine—this is according to Keynes—and bury that money in those holes and then fill the abandoned coal mine up with garbage and turn the entrepreneurs loose to go dig up the money, he said he could solve all of the unemployment in America.

I know, it sounds bizarre, Mr. Speaker. I am not making this up. This is the characterization of John Maynard Keynes and the difference between the Keynesian approach, President Obama's approach to economics, and this approach from the free market side of this, where the consumer makes the demand by pulling with its invisible hand the loaf of bread off the shelf.

Let's just say there's a good loaf of bread for a buck. And the invisible hand will pull that good loaf of bread for \$1 off that shelf over and over again and the shelves will be bare. And somebody else comes in and they say, Here's a loaf of bread that's not quite as good for a buck and a quarter.

Well, they might just pass up that purchase, even though they need the bread, and wait until the fresh ones come from the bakery that provides the good bread for a dollar. And so the bakery that provides the good bread for a dollar is filling the shelves up with their product and selling a lot of volume. And the bakery that sells the not quite so good bread for a buck and a quarter doesn't sell very much bread, if at all. And, over time, the company that's being out-competed with the higher-priced, lower-quality bread either learns how to make good bread for a competitive price or they give up the market to the company that makes the good bread for the competitive price. And it isn't the end of the world if we end up with one company producing bread in that fashion.

What if we get down to where only one company is baking bread, and it's for a dollar and it's a good price and it's high quality and it's a value to the consumer. Not so bad. But if that company realizes that they are running a monopoly and they decide to jack the price of their good loaf of bread up to a buck and quarter, buck and a half, \$1.75, maybe lower the quality, pull a little wheat out, put a little something else back in there, then what happens? The consumer gets dissatisfied. And the dissatisfied consumer then either bakes their bread at home to get the quality and the cost that they want, or they open up their own little bakery.

Maybe they bake that bread at home and they decide, I'm going to provide a little bit for my family. Then it's so popular that you provide a little for your neighbors. And then the family and the neighbors decide, I want mom to keep baking bread. So they want to pay her so she keeps baking that bread.

Now, high-quality bread that was now a buck and a half because you had a monopoly. The price of that is competitive because the homegrown business begins to compete into that volume and quantity and the cost of the marketplace and pull the cost back down.

That's the difference between the free enterprise system and central command, central planning, the 5-year planning, the Federal Government deciding what's going to be made and what the price will be. And if it doesn't work, you subsidize the people making. And if that doesn't work, you subsidize the people buying it. Sound like the car industry? Yes, it is, Mr. Speaker.

This is the difference between the philosophy on this side of the aisle. They think that they are smart enough to make all of these calls for all of the consumers, except for perhaps the butcher, the baker and the candlestick maker.

Mr. AKIN. Wait a minute. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING of Iowa. A moment here before I yield. On this side of the aisle are the people that believe in free enterprise, the invisible hand, Adam Smith's vision, Adam Smith's dream, and the idea that you cannot manage an economy. You have got to let the supply and demand manage the economy. That's the difference. We believe in free enterprise. You folks do not. And if you disagree, I will certainly yield to you, but not one of you is going to stand and take this argument on.

I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. AKIN. I can't help but jump in when somebody is defending the cause of free enterprise. I guess there's different ways to describe or explain the phenomena that you're talking about. And one of them is that one side of the aisle tends to be much more in favor of free enterprise and the other one is much more in favor of having the government do things.

□ 2015

I guess what we start to get to is a question that's kind of a fundamental question, really the biggest thing that we divide and talk about and argue and debate about on this floor is, what is the proper function of the civil government, particularly the Federal Government? What should the Federal Government be doing? Should it be baking bread or should it not be baking bread? Should baking bread be left to citizens out on the street? Should it be the job of the Federal Government to be giving food away to people? Should it be the job of the Federal Government, according to Joe the Plumber, to take money from one person and give it to another person? Is the job of the Federal Government to be the big sugar daddy, dispensing favors? Is it the job of the Federal Government basically to be Big Mama, taking care of everybody? Or is there a different purpose for government, which is simply justice, simply creating a level playing field so that everybody can go out and use their God-given potential as they're directed to do it? And it seems to me, gentleman, that you can make the case of Federal control of everything versus free enterprise, or you could just say,

What's really the legitimate job of the Federal Government?

Now we had some liberals in this Chamber some years ago, and they discovered there were people in America who were hungry. Of course there have been people in America who have been hungry for a long time. But they came up with a bright idea that we're going to socialize a little bit, we're going to steal money from some other people through taxes, print food stamps, and give food stamps to people who are hungry to take care of the problem of hunger. In fact, they declared war on hunger, and hunger won, of course. That was their approach.

What's being proposed here today, gentleman, is an entirely more radical agenda. This would be the equivalent of somebody discovering that there is hunger in America and the government taking over the farms, the grocery stores and the distribution houses in between, taking over the entire food industry. That's what's being proposed with this socialized medicine. It's not a matter of just giving somebody Medicare or Medicaid who can't afford to pay for medical care. It's about the government taking over one-fifth of the economy. This is a whole radical step more in the direction of a challenge to freedom and free enterprise. It is fundamentally un-American is what we're dealing with.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, the statement that was made on the floor of the House the night before last by the gentlelady from Minnesota, MICHELLE BACHMANN, the analysis of a lead economist in the country that had done the analysis, what is the percentage of the private sector profits that now have been nationalized by the Federal Government? If you add that up, if you add up the three large investment banks that have been nationalized, if you add up Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, AIG, General Motors and Chrysler, look at the profits that come from that, roll that up, and compare that to the net profits of the private sector overall, this Federal Government—most of it under the administration of President Obama—has nationalized 30 percent of the private sector profits in the United States.

Mr. AKIN. Gentleman, just a minute. I can't help but interrupt. Thirty percent has been nationalized if you just add up those big corporations?

Mr. KING of Iowa. Thirty percent of the private sector profits have been nationalized, most of it by this administration, of those corporations that I have mentioned, those eight entities.

Mr. AKIN. Thirty percent of the profits. And that's not even counting health care yet.

Mr. KING of Iowa. When you add health care to it, that's 17½ percent of our overall economy, round it up to 18 because I can do the math—30 plus 18 is 48 percent. If they succeed in passing socialized medicine, 48 percent of the private sector profits in the United States will have been nationalized,

most of it by this administration. This free country, this country that has built upon free enterprise, in part—and one of the pillars of American exceptionalism is free enterprise—will have had almost half of it swallowed up by an aggressive appetite of the White House without justification but only because we are in a time of an economic crisis. Magically, the solutions that have been advocated by the President and the hard-core, left-wing, jump-off-the-cliff liberals in this Congress and across the country, those solutions that they've been advocating for 20 years magically become the solution for the economic crisis that we have been in over the last year.

Mr. AKIN. If you would yield, gentleman, one of the things somebody once said—and I was not a whiz on taking history in high school—but if you don't learn from history, you are bound to repeat mistakes. And I do recall a very threatening and ominous nation that we saw taking over country after country called the Soviet Union. If you were to try to just simplify their philosophy, it was that government was going to take care of food, clothing and shelter. They were going to pay for your education, set you up with a job, and take care of your health care. We laughed when that country collapsed, a little bit with a sense of anxiety because they had nuclear weapons aimed at us and all. We said, you know that Communist/Socialist stuff won't work. Their economy was a mess. They couldn't keep up with us in the arms race because their economy was a disaster. The government can't run all that stuff efficiently. People starved to death over there. Their medical care was so abysmal, people that went into their hospitals would shudder. There was no anaesthetic, no clean bandages. It was a disaster.

And when the whole thing went down the drain, we said, Everybody knows Communism/Socialism won't work. So what are we proposing now? The government's going to provide food. The government's going to provide housing. The government's going to provide your education. We just decided to nationalize a whole lot more of that. No more private loans. We're going to have the government take care of all that. And now we're talking about the government—not only the insurance and the automotive, but now the government wants to take over one-fifth of the economy in terms of health care.

Now, it seems to me we should learn something from history, don't you think, gentleman?

Mr. KING of Iowa. Well, in reclaiming from the gentleman from Missouri, I will go further, Mr. Speaker; and that is, I recall those years when they had collective farming in the Soviet Union. They had a 5-year plan for the production of the entire nation. They would sit down and decide, Okay, here's what we're going to do. We are going to set up our factories and hire our workers and provide—to the extent that they

can manage it—the raw materials necessary to run all that out. And here's where we're going to go in 5 years, doing that with farming, for example.

Can you imagine, we have farmers that are making crop decisions right up to the moment that they plant, and then they are cutting-edge on fertilizer and herbicide, et cetera, and equipment to get efficiency out of a GPS control of our equipment so that they can apply fertilizer according to the soil types and yields that they get back out of it. All of these things are going on in realtime.

Mr. AKIN. I can tell the gentleman is from Iowa. He has got this farming technology down. Isn't that incredible, GPS in your tractor, telling you how much fertilizer to put in a section of a field? It's amazing what free enterprise can do.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I actually have seen the corn planter parked—not in Iowa, but the State south of me—when people went fishing, but it's pretty rare. So what we saw instead in the Soviet Union was that farm workers, when it was time to harvest the crop, their 8-hour shift would end. They would park the tractor, park the combine, and a crop could rot in the field or be hauled out or rained out or frozen out. Because they were hourly employees, they didn't have an interest in the actual product result. They just had an interest in—remember, the old saying was that the workers in the Soviet Union will pretend to work, and the Soviet Union will pretend to pay the workers. That's what happened, that's where they went, and it is a big difference.

By the way, this would be the 16th of September. We're 3 days away from the 1-year anniversary of the first time that I had heard Members of Congress say to me in the years I've been here, See, this proves capitalism doesn't work. They said that on the day that Henry Paulson came to this Capitol and demanded \$700 billion to try to stop what he predicted was a free-fall in the financial industry; and they said, Well, see, free enterprise is the cause of this, it's the problem, it doesn't work, and it's proven. They said so September 19, almost a year ago today.

Mr. AKIN. You know, the thing that just amazed me about that comment, Free enterprise doesn't work because we've got this big economic crisis. And you go, Well, let's see. What's the economic crisis caused by?

Oh, it's a real estate problem. Oh, real estate. In what regard? Well, it seems like a whole lot of people have mortgages that they can't pay in real estate. Well, how did that happen? Oh, well, we've got Freddie and Fannie. And what sort of agencies are those? Quasi-governmental agencies. And what have they been doing? They've been instructed by the U.S. Congress to make loans to people who can't afford to pay their loans.

Now guess what's happening, the people can't afford to pay their loans, and

all this stuff is sliding down the wall in a big mess. So we've sold this stuff all over the world, and now the economy is in a mess. Let's see, how did this economy get in a mess? Oh, the Congress created an agency who distributed lots and lots of loot to Congressmen in the form of PAC checks. They created an agency to sell stocks and bonds, packaged up in a nice clever way by Wall Street that weren't worth anything because the people couldn't pay their mortgages, and we say this is a failure of free enterprise? It's a failure of socialized government trying to impose itself on the free market and in the idea of trying to be charitable, saddling somebody with a loan they can't afford to pay so they have got to go into bankruptcy. What a compassionate solution.

Mr. KING of Iowa. The gentleman from Missouri is referring to, I believe, the Community Reinvestment Act that passed this Congress in 1978, signed into law by Jimmy Carter. It was brought about because of the allegation—and there's a basis of it in truth—that there were large lending agencies that were doing home mortgages in particular but writing real estate mortgages that drew red lines around districts, usually in inner cities, because the real estate values were declining because of crime and other activities in those areas. The real estate wasn't being kept up, so nobody wanted to buy real estate in those neighborhoods. They drew a red line around them and said, We're not going to loan money into these neighborhoods.

They passed the Community Reinvestment Act as a means to try to address that, and that planted the seed. Even though the motive was probably pretty good, that planted the seed for organizations like ACORN to come in and seek to intimidate, let me say, intimidate them into making bad loans in bad neighborhoods to people that didn't have the means to pay the loan.

Mr. AKIN. Gentleman, you just jumped out of the realm of free enterprise, didn't you? You jumped into the realm of government planning.

Mr. KING of Iowa. You jumped into government-managed regulations of lending institutions that were trying to comply with the letter and intent of the law.

Mr. AKIN. So there's no failure of free enterprise at all. It wasn't a failure of free enterprise, was it?

Mr. KING of Iowa. It was not a failure of free enterprise.

Mr. AKIN. It was a failure of another government socialized scheme is what it was.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I think I can't embellish that a lot more and be more accurate than the statement the gentleman has made.

Mr. AKIN. What I was getting at even more so was Freddie and Fannie, because you had the Reinvestment Act. But parallel to it was Freddie and Fannie. And Freddie and Fannie were

encouraged to make all of these loans to people who couldn't pay. But then the bankers got smart, and they cut the loans up in lots of little pieces and packaged them up and sold them all over the place. The thing that is interesting was, people were really getting down on Bush for making such a bad economy and it was free enterprise's fault, it was George Bush's fault.

In reality, you go in The New York Times and you see President Bush in 2003—I remember because it was September 11, 2003, New York Times, not exactly a conservative document. And this is Bush saying, Hey, I've got to have more authority to control Freddie and Fannie. They're out of control. They're making loans that are going to become a huge disaster.

And at the same time you have a quote in that article of BARNEY FRANK from the floor of this House, who is now the chairman of the committee that runs all of that saying, Freddie and Fannie are fine. You can read the quote.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Would the gentleman repeat that date again?

Mr. AKIN. It was September 11, 2003, New York Times.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Why does the gentleman remember that?

Mr. AKIN. Of course, obviously, September 11, 2001.

Mr. KING of Iowa. So 2 years from the date you had the now chairman of the Financial Services Committee coming to the floor, resisting regulation and increased capitalization on Fannie and Freddie—they're a government-sponsored enterprise that had the implicit guarantee of the full faith and credit of the Federal Government behind them in 2003, September 11.

Now there is another date that sticks in my mind. Two years and a little more than a month later, October 26, 2005, an amendment was brought to the floor of the House of Representatives that would require Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac to be capitalized, comparable to that of other lending and competing institutions and to require them to be regulated in a similar fashion. That amendment was vigorously resisted by the now chairman of the Financial Services Committee, BARNEY FRANK, and yet BARNEY FRANK came to the well on the Thursday before we broke for the Easter vacation this year and set up a 60-minute period of time to explain to Americans in that little lull—everybody else was going home but me and a couple others—that none of that was his fault. That it went outside of him, that the regulations were not necessary, the capitalization was not necessary.

Well, we know the answer. The implicit guarantee—and by the way, the gentleman from Massachusetts said on the floor of the House of Representatives on that day of October 26, If anybody thinks I'm going to vote to support a capitalized guarantee of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, they're wrong. I won't do that.

Mr. AKIN. They learned from his mistake.

Mr. KING of Iowa. We ended up with a nationalization.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. AKIN. The interesting thing was, he was not in the majority party at the time. I think he opposed legislation, but we passed it here in the House. Republicans were in charge at that time. We passed legislation in the House to regulate and to require that capitalization of Freddie and Fannie. It went to the Senate. But because of Senate rules, Democrats in the Senate were able to kill that legislation. And yet they want to blame President Bush, they want to blame free enterprise for what was another one of these socialized schemes where the big government is going to step in and try and repeal the laws of economics.

□ 2030

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming briefly from the gentlemen, I would point out that October 26, 2005, went the other way. The gentleman from Massachusetts, now the chairman of the Financial Services Committee, succeeded in convincing this body that Fannie and Freddie didn't need to be capitalized and regulated. And that amendment failed here on the floor of the House of Representatives in 2005, and it has gone in that direction since more support for Fannie and Freddie, who spent tens of thousands—in fact hundreds of thousands of dollars lobbying this Congress so that they would be exempt from the standards that were required of other lending institutions.

And that is part of this package, the Community Reinvestment Act, Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, ACORN asserting themselves as a broker in the middle of this and brokering bad loans in bad neighborhoods, intimidating bankers to give those loans, and then passing those along in the secondary market to Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac and getting blocks of loans from the lending institutions for them to underwrite themselves and give the authority on loans that would be approved.

Mr. AKIN. And of course we are going to use Federal money to pay ACORN to do all of these activities, which has become an interesting topic lately, as well, as we've seen some enterprising young people going in and checking out exactly what the story was in these different ACORN locations.

Mr. KING of Iowa. And as you mentioned an ACORN location, the gentleman from Missouri, I happen to have an ACORN location here. This little picture is taken not off the Internet, not by somebody that slipped in surreptitiously. This is a picture I personally took the weekend before the 4th of July, I'm going to guess the 2nd or so of July, 2009.

I went down to ACORN headquarters, Mr. Speaker. This is at 2609 Canal Street, New Orleans, and this building is ACORN's national headquarters—for all I know, the international headquarters of ACORN. It is the most fortified building in the neighborhood.

The door, itself, is mostly bars and so is the ground floor, the second floor. And you can see through these bars it's a four- or five-story building. And if you look, Mr. Speaker, you can see this huge Obama picture right inside the window at the national headquarters of ACORN.

Mr. AKIN. Now, that's getting millions of dollars of Federal money. So we're using taxpayer money—

Mr. KING of Iowa. Fifty-three million at least, and I think significantly more, actually.

Mr. AKIN. Fifty-three million of taxpayer dollars to advertise for a political candidate.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Well, I don't know that it all goes for advertisement, but the law says not one dollar can go for advertisement, that they cannot be involved in partisan political activity.

Now, I am an objective observer here. I know a little bit about partisan activity. When you put a poster in your office window—in my construction office, for example, if I put a poster in my office that says Bush for President in 2004, if I were a 501(c)(3) corporation, I would be in direct violation of the not-for-profit, nonpartisan requirements of the IRS. I would be in violation of the tax laws. If I put a poster in my window, I am also in violation of some of my customers that are of a different political persuasion. So I'm a little sensitive to this, although I've been fairly bold. I follow the law. This cannot be following the law.

ACORN should have its not-for-profit status removed immediately for them and every one of their affiliates. They should be taxed. The IRS should go in and audit every dollar that's coming in to ACORN and their affiliates. There should be a Justice Department investigation. There should be a congressional series of investigations done by a number of committees, including the committee chaired by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK). Financial services should investigate. Judiciary should investigate. Government Reform should investigate. Ways and Means should investigate. If I could find a way to get the Ag Committee investigating, that's what we need to do with ACORN.

Mr. AKIN. Well, it almost makes you wonder about the Attorney General investigating. I suppose, perhaps, the gentleman has seen some of the various tapes that were cut with hidden cameras as people went into various ACORN locations.

It was kind of an interesting phenomenon, nothing that was broken by the big media in America, but it just shows that that underground kind of media, the new Web and the Internet and the bloggers and all—you have an enterprising gentleman and a young lady going in and being very bold at various ACORN offices talking about the fact that they want to open a house of ill repute and want to get some help from ACORN to help them figure out how to buy the house. And they are so

candid with what they're saying. And the comments that were recorded in camera I think have been getting a lot of hits, a lot of people watching it. The mainstream media has paid no attention to it, and yet all over America people are looking at this. They have already heard about ACORN and the dozens of violations of this organization that we're paying for with tax dollars. I mean, what in the world is going on?

You've got—these two are just actors, you know, but they're entrepreneurs in an information kind of age. They're just going in pretending like they want to open up a house of ill repute so he can raise money to run for Congress. It's almost laughable if it weren't true.

Mr. KING of Iowa. As a Republican? Run for Congress as a Republican?

Mr. AKIN. I didn't hear that word somehow or other.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I didn't either. I heard run for Congress as a Democrat. That must have been the measure of plausibility that they had to inject to get ACORN to bite on the rest of the bait would be my speculation.

Mr. AKIN. But they were some interesting sets of tapes, and some courageous people that were willing to do that because there is some threat potential there.

Mr. KING of Iowa. It is, for me—and reclaiming from the gentleman from Missouri, it is astonishing to get a look inside the offices of ACORN in four cities in America. And I ask the question, is this the culture of ACORN? And I don't know how you argue that it's not. But each of them were so willing and so eager to be complicit in helping to set up a house of ill repute, as the gentleman from Missouri said. I have different names for it. A brothel would be another one. For them to go in and pick out this outrageous—I think it was really a far-reaching scenario. I'm the pimp and this is the prostitute and we want to set up this house of ill repute and bring in 13- or 14-year-old girls from El Salvador so that they can turn tricks and we can take the profits and use some of the profits to put into the political campaign so that the pimp can run for Congress? I mean, I don't know. I would have a hard time holding myself in if somebody came into my office and said such a thing.

But in each of those cases that have been published—in Baltimore, in Washington, D.C., in Brooklyn, in San Bernardino—in each of those cases, Mr. Speaker, ACORN reacted as if that was the business that they were set up to be in. We will help you facilitate a loan for the house of ill repute and we can get you good terms. And furthermore, don't report more than about three of those illegal girls that are illegally here, and that are most likely illegally here and in the business of child prostitution, a slave sex ring before their very eyes. They also advocated that they could provide the childcare tax credit and qualify for that, that's \$1,000

per child per year, and the earned income tax credit as well.

So the numbers work out to about this: ACORN being complicit in drawing down, fraudulently, Federal dollars while helping to facilitate evasion of income taxes and child prostitution. But the Federal taxpayers, if they're successful in what they proposed at least in Baltimore, then the child care tax credit and the earned income tax credit would add up to, for a family of—let me say a family of five, if the prostitute is the mom and the pimp is the dad and three of the underage 13- or 14-year-old girls were qualified under the child tax credit, that would be about \$6,000 from the taxpayers that goes in to subsidize the house of prostitution. And this doesn't cause anybody to bat an eye at ACORN in four cities in America. That's the culture of ACORN. That's this right here.

Mr. AKIN. I have to interrupt just a minute, if the gentleman would yield some time.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I would yield.

Mr. AKIN. I have always had a deep respect for my congressional friend from Iowa and the fact that you're a small business man, but the way you put that together, I mean, I can see why you're a good businessman. But in your construction business, you tried to stay kind of a little closer within the law, and yet here we're talking about an organization that's paid for with Federal money.

Now, what's happened with ACORN, though, is that there have been so many of these kinds of things that all of these community organizations that used to be under ACORN have changed their names—and it doesn't mean they've changed their stripes, but they've changed their names so that when we try to withhold funding from ACORN, all the other community organizers which used to be ACORN, no longer called ACORN, they are still wanting to pull down Federal money to do this wonderful entrepreneurial kind of proposal that you're talking about or many other kinds of schemes along the same lines.

And again, I think it suggests it's just one more nail in the coffin that says maybe the Federal Government shouldn't be doing this stuff. Maybe we've gotten our Federal Government just trying to do too many things for too many people. Maybe we better pull back to the idea, as you started, gentleman, with the concept of free enterprise, with the concept of the Federal Government creating a set of laws where everybody is equal before the law, not a setup of special deals, and a place where every American can have the freedom and the risk to chase the dream that God puts in their own heart, to be whatever it is, whether it's a contractor with heavy equipment, as you were, or in the steel business, or working in the computer business with IBM, as I was, that you can chase the dream that's in your own heart without the government doing any special

deals, either taking your money or giving you any money.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming from the gentleman from Missouri, I so appreciate the analysis and the way that you've delivered this. I think that this goes deep. And I think because I've had to live, and I know the gentleman from Missouri has had to live, and been fortunate to live with the underpinnings of what has been the greatness of America, these checks and balances that come in not just between the three branches of government, the checks and balances that come in between our moral values, our values of faith, the laws that we have passed that reflect the moral values of our faith and the reverence for the rule of law, the letter and the intent of the law that is so necessary if we're going to have a civil society.

And then we've watched, if we go back to Lyndon Baines Johnson and the Great Society, they made a decision that they were going to take from one economic sector and they were going to pass it along to another. I remember seeing a film of hungry children in Appalachia—I don't know that they were actually hungry, but they needed some dental work. That's what I remember was in the pictures. They weren't dressed all that well. Some were barefoot. Some didn't have a shirt on. It was summertime in Appalachia. But they kept running these images over and over again. And we passed the Great Society right into the middle of the Vietnam war and we set up a dependency class of people, this dependency class of people that rewarded mothers that had children that didn't have fathers in the home.

And if you will pay mothers to have babies if they don't have fathers in the home, women will have babies to become mothers without fathers in the home. And if you punish them if there's a father in the home, the father won't be around anymore. He might stop by and visit, but he's not going to be a resident, not one that can be caught there because it will cut the government welfare check. And slowly over time, we created a dependency class of people that was dependent upon the Federal welfare check to come in.

And now I look at the inner cities in the United States of America and I ask the question, when I see the film within the offices of ACORN and I think, what wealth is created in these cities? What is coming out of the inner city that is rooted in new wealth? I know what it is that comes out of the land. All new wealth comes from the land. You can mine it out of the earth in gold or platinum or gravel or limestone, or you can raise it out of the soil in corn or beans or—I'll say rice or rutabagas. You can actually sing some fish out of the sea. You can cut some timber. But all of those resources that I've talked about become the foundation of new wealth, that wealth that's necessary if you're going to provide the

essentials of life that we've long called food, clothing and shelter.

Food, clothing and shelter comes out of the soil. And we do that as productively as we can and we value add to that as many times as we can, and that's the wealth that pays for—the adage is the butcher, the baker, and the candlestick maker. It pays for the accountant, the doctor, the lawyer, the school teacher, the pastor. Everything that grows out of this economy in a legitimate productive sector can be traced back to our land, our earth, our soil.

But in the inner city, their new wealth doesn't come out of the soil. Their new wealth comes from the taxpayers of the United States of America, and it's brokered by ACORN. And the benefits are distributed back out through the city, and some of it goes into prostitution, some goes into illegal drugs.

The culture that you saw in ACORN is a culture that promotes and supports, as a matter of fact, illegal behavior, including prostitution, child pornography, and helping to enable bringing in illegals into the United States to commit illegal acts. And no one batted an eye.

So the astonishing thing to me—

Mr. AKIN. If you would yield.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. AKIN. It seems like what we're really talking about is kind of two visions of government. One vision of government is that government is limited and government is interested in justice, and it's a vision that promotes freedom. It promotes people having the freedom to go out and succeed or fail. It allows the individual to take the greatest gamble of their life, to live whatever dream God put in their heart. And America is full of people that came here and they were nuts, they had these crazy dreams, and they worked on them and they worked on them, and those dreams became a vague possibility and then they became a possibility. And finally those dreams became a reality, and America was built one dream at a time.

There was some nutty guy that had the idea of making a light bulb. He made 100 light bulbs and none of them worked, and he said that's good because now I know 100 ways not to make a light bulb. His name was Thomas Edison.

□ 2045

It became so common, we called it the American Dream.

The other view of government is not a rule of law. It's not people equal before the law. It's the special deal society. It's the special deal for me or for you. If you've got the right government contract, you can get a bailout; but if you don't, you go bankrupt. It's a special deal that, for one person, you get treated one way, but for somebody else, the law is different.

So the question is: Do we have a rule of law, or do we have basically a polit-

ical kind of controlled anarchy? That's the question. Where are we going as a country? Are we going to have a rule of law? Are we going to have people equal before the law, or is the government going to be the big sugar daddy that's supposed to take care of everybody and that will reward people for behaviors which will destroy their lives? Is that the sort of government that we want?

That's the question before the American public today as they watch what happens on the floor of this Congress.

I yield back.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman.

I would point out my view on this that you'll never get the people on the other side into that particular debate. They don't want to go down that path because, first of all, they don't like the result that one logically gets. The other component of it is that I think they actually hide their own eyes from the result of what they're seeking to do. I think that their endeavors are incremental endeavors to expand the power base and to expand the political base, which is the power base, and I don't think they've gamed this thing out to what America will look like if they succeed in these endeavors—if they expand ACORN, if they succeed in writing into law cap-and-trade, if they succeed in writing into law a socialized medicine plan or if they succeed in writing into law a comprehensive amnesty for illegals.

In the end, what does America look like? They can't bear the thought of having to admit the logical conclusion of the policies that they propose, but they're certainly for the things that give them a short-term power base.

I put the poster of ACORN up here because, I think, they are the largest cancer America has ever seen. They're in over 100 cities in the United States. They have divisions within the cities. They've drawn down over \$53 million. They qualify into pots of money of up to \$8.5 billion. They won't draw it all, but they do. It's the pressure that has come from the houses of prostitution that they're seeking to help fund, from the criticism that has come from the Community Reinvestment Act, from shaking down lenders, from over 400,000 fraudulent voter registration forms, from the prosecutions and convictions of ACORN people—up to 70 in the United States, another 11 indictments in the State of Florida with six of them arrested and five they're on the hunt for, and convictions of, or I'll say at least indictments of ACORN as a corporation in Nevada, from their policies of directly violating the election laws, and from setting up quotas for people who are registering people rather than hiring them by the hour or by salary.

Now, here is the latest news flash. First, before I do the news flash, I have to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that there has been some backing off from ACORN, and it's the vote that took place on the floor of the United States Senate. There were seven U.S. Senators who

voted to defend ACORN. Two of them are from Illinois, by the way—the President's home State, Rahm Emanuel's home State and David Axelrod's home State. Those two Senators continue to defend ACORN. It is Rod Blagojevich's home State, I might add, and he has also been a beneficiary of ACORN's work. They defended ACORN. The other Senators voted not to fund ACORN through ACORN housing.

Then we know about fraudulent votes and about a whole list of things that are going on. We also know that the U.S. Census Bureau finally announced a couple, 3 days ago that they were not going to continue with their relationship with ACORN and that they'd already signed off a month or two ago. I don't believe them yet.

This is a news flash that came while the gentleman from Missouri was speaking, and this is an article that tells about it. It says: Days after the Census Bureau announced it would cut ties with the organizing group ACORN and barely 24 hours after the Senate voted to withdraw funding from the lightning rod activist group, the White House, which is speaking for the President of the United States, expressed support for measures to hold the group accountable for unacceptable behavior.

Mr. Speaker, listen to this. This is a Jeremiah Wright moment. White House Press Secretary Robert Gibbs alluded to video taken by the conservative site biggovernment.com showing ACORN employees giving advice to individuals posing as sex traffickers. We've just talked about this.

The quote from Robert Gibbs: Obviously, the conduct that you see on those tapes is completely unacceptable. I think everyone would agree to that. Gibbs said, The administration takes accountability extremely seriously.

That's good because I will tell you I want to make sure that is the case with the President.

Then it goes on and says, Characterizing the Census Bureau's decision as a move based on a lack of confidence in ACORN's ability to perform its expected duties, Gibbs said he was not sure whether the President would ask Democrats to pull back from any campaign year collaboration with the group.

A quote from Gibbs: I don't know that I've had any discussion with him about that, Gibbs said.

So, Mr. Speaker, what we have here are a few more platitudes, a little more word processing that's going on here that would indicate that the President is a little concerned and that maybe Robert Gibbs is concerned about some fraud and corruption and blatant violation of a whole series of laws that seem to be apparent if you watch the film of ACORN, but we have yet to hear the President do, let me say, a mea culpa. I have not heard the President say, Even though I played for ACORN as a young man, even though I coached

ACORN employees, even though I headed up Project Vote, which is indistinguishable from ACORN, even though I'm part and parcel of ACORN—and where is the ACORN logo on his shirt? Oh, by the way, I happen to have a little visual of this, Mr. Speaker.

Even though this is all the case and it's a fact, we still don't have the President saying, Well, let's do what we did with Jeremiah Wright. Let's get ACORN out of our lives. Let's go investigate them with the FBI, with the Department of Justice and with every possible committee in the United States Congress, giving them a complete forensic analysis and coming back for every dollar that flowed through ACORN and all of their affiliates to the extent where we can purge the poison from that corrupt enterprise, ACORN.

That needs to happen, Mr. Speaker. It needs to be directed by the President, or this ACORN albatross hangs around his neck until he does.

Mr. AKIN. If the gentleman would yield, my memory may be a little weak on this, but we were involved about a year ago with this big Wall Street bailout. My understanding was, of part of that Wall Street bailout money, there was some sort of a tax that was going to be placed on some of those companies that was going to go directly to fund ACORN.

Do you know if that part of the bill passed on part of that Wall Street bailout? Do you know whether the funding for ACORN was built in there? I remember there was talk that it would be. If that's the case, my concern is this: that all of these organizations known as ACORN are not stupid. They're changing their names to community organizers so that you'll have all of these people who used to be ACORN still sitting there, still collecting Federal money and yet will no longer have the ACORN name because the ACORN name has been so incredibly disgraced.

So I guess my question and concern is—and I think as you're saying—if we're really serious about dealing with this corruption, then it seems like we're going to have to deal with more than ACORN. We're going to have to deal with all of those organizations which came under that ACORN umbrella.

I would yield.

Mr. KING of Iowa. In reclaiming my time from the gentleman, I have to agree. I don't know that that money is in that fund, but if one were going to do a search, I'd look for the number \$1.6 million. That seems to be the number that I recall. I'm not sure which bill that was in, but that sticks in my mind. I remember numbers better than I do names.

Thanks to Congressman DARRELL ISSA from California, who is a ranking member of an Oversight and Government Reform subcommittee, they produced a nonpartisan report that came to a whole series of conclusions about

ACORN. In that report, they list 361 ACORN affiliates. Now, I don't know that all of those are live, active ACORN affiliates. I suspect some of them are defunct at this point. The pattern looks like whenever ACORN had a new project, they created another corporation, but many of them—I can't say all of them—a majority of those corporations are housed and reside in this place on Canal Street in New Orleans.

Now, can you imagine as many as—and probably not quite that many—but as many as 361 different corporations and affiliates inside these doors? This is a four- or a five-story building. It's not that big. In there, the finances that come are commingled through one single corporation that handles all of this. Now, money is fungible, and if there's a single Federal dollar that goes into any of these and it goes into a centralized account and gets redistributed out of that central pot, you can't sort that. There are not firewalls in that. It is a fact that there are not firewalls in that, which means that any of the money that's used in any of the 361 corporations is used for political purposes, and it's a violation of Federal law.

This, itself, is a violation of Federal law, Mr. Speaker—"Obama '08" right in the window of a 501(c)(3). There it is blatantly for all to see.

We do need to do a complete investigation. We need the President of the United States to come forward and to come clean. This is what the President has been. He is the consummate community organizer. He has risen to the top of his profession. He has done it through the path of ACORN, through the path of Project Vote and through a series of other organizations, all of them affiliated within. This isn't a man who has come up through the free enterprise system, who has signed the front of the paycheck. He has signed only the back and has worked within these community organizers who are sitting there; and Chicago politics, Chicago politics that are steeped in the Rod Blagojevich and steeped in the Rahm Emanuel and in the hardball politics where he would tell the supporters during the campaign, Get in their faces.

He stood here at the rostrum in the House of Representatives and said, "We will call you out," because he disagreed with what turns out to be the fact that is in the bill H.R. 3200.

This country has never been to this place before, Mr. Speaker. We have never seen this level of audacity, and we've never seen this level of a criminal enterprise that's so pervasive tied up into the United States of America. We haven't even gotten to the SEIU and to a number of other affiliates that are part of all of this political agenda. It is something the American people are going to have to spend a lot of time working at studying and understanding and being outraged about because, in the end, we can't sustain it here on the floor of the House of Representatives if

we don't have the support outside in America, Mr. Speaker.

I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. AKIN. I am encouraged, Gentleman, and it just seems to me in the last 6 months that many Americans, who are many great patriots—and I'm not talking about rich people. I'm just talking about the people who love our country are getting engaged. They're getting energized, and they're asking the question: What can we do?

As they're busy asking these questions, all of this kind of information is coming out, and people are understanding, just as this President said that he was running on a platform of change, and many of us are realizing that there have to be changes inside us. The changes that you and I in a free enterprise system believe in are the changes that come in our own hearts—the changes of how we're going to run our businesses differently and of how we're going to do better for our families. Those are the kinds of changes a lot of Americans are looking at.

It's not so much a change of Big Government's telling everybody what they're going to do. Some of the change is going to have to be repairing some of the moral infrastructure of our country, a sense of outrage over a system that has gotten out of control. Particularly as good old Ronald Reagan said, We're buying a lot more government than we can afford. I think there are a lot of Americans, regardless of their political affiliations, who have come to the conclusion that we are buying more government than we can afford, in the order of trillions of dollars of more government.

I think the time is coming when there are going to have to be some changes here on the floor in terms of before we can get the changes that we need in policy, we have to rein in a beast that seems to be somewhat out of control, which is the Federal Government, which seems to be more in the business of telling us what to do than in being the servant of the people—the way it should be.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman from Missouri.

In about, oh, the 8 or 9 minutes that, I think, we have left, Mr. Speaker, I would seek to just transition this just a little bit and take the segue on the "government that we can't afford" and address this issue.

The President has laid out an argument. The argument is that we have to fix health care before we can fix the economy. The economy is in crisis, but it can't be fixed without fixing health care.

When answering the question of What's wrong with health care in America?, he came back with two responses: one is it costs too much money. The other one is we have too many uninsured.

Well, costing too much money, we can discuss that. It costs about 14.5

percent of our GDP. In other industrialized countries, by their analyses, it costs about 9.5 percent of their GDP. So half again more for health care in the United States. I'm not sure we're half again richer than they are. We are richer than they are, and we can afford a little more, but we can have that discussion, and we can take a lot of it out if we would just simply do tort reform. Buying insurance across State lines and having a full deductibility for health insurance premiums could deal with some of this.

I want to, Mr. Speaker, make this point, which is, those uninsured—that being the biggest situation that is not resolved here by Democrats or Republicans. Democrats want to do socialized medicine, and Republicans have some other solutions. So I began to ask the question: Of the 47 million uninsured—that's their number, not mine. I don't know that it's high or low. You hear lower numbers but not higher, so take the higher number.

□ 2100

This number is supposed to be here. It's not on my chart, but I can tell you, this is 47 million. I know that. And, as you subtract from those lists of those that are uninsured in America, you start with the undocumented noncitizens, that's the illegals.

Well, this is a new chart, so it doesn't say the things that I remember. I am going to go off what I remember, and these are new numbers, 5.2 million illegals are part of the 47 million. This number has been 4 million who are here that have arrived recently that are under the 5-year bar by law.

These two categories of immigrants, the illegals and those disqualified legals becomes 10.2 million. This number shows 10.

And those that earn more than \$75,000 a year, Mr. Speaker, presumably they could resolve this out of the their own checkbook. Then you go for the Americans that are eligible for a government program but not enrolled. Now I see what's going on, this software has rounded it out to even millions. That number is 9.7 million. Those Americans that are eligible for government programs but not enrolled, usually Medicaid, didn't sign up. That's this number.

Now we are subtracting from 47 million. This number is those eligible for employer-sponsored, but didn't bother to sign up or opted out. That's 6 million, and that is the actual decimal point. This number here comes down to 12.1 million Americans without affordable options.

Now, we have too many uninsured in America, 47 million, according to people over on this side. But 47 million includes all these categories that we don't want to include in a new bill. They don't either, for the most part, or at least they won't admit it. So you are down to 12.1 million people, and that's less than 4 percent of the population.

Now, what does that mean? We are going to try to solve the problem by

transforming 100 percent of the health insurance in America and 100 percent of the health care delivery system in America to try to reduce a 4 percent number down to something less.

Now, what is 4 percent, 12.1 million, that's these people right here, these are the whole uninsured. This is the whole population of the United States. We are a lively bunch of people in the United States. It's hard to get a handle on us.

But you can get a handle on this. This is 306 or maybe 307 million people. These are the categories in that other pie chart that includes the coverage for those eligible by employer in blue; those insurance-eligible for government programs, usually Medicare, Medicaid, in green; the orange are those earning over \$75,000; and the black, those are legal immigrants that are on the 5-year bar and are not eligible. And the other 2 percent are the illegal immigrants. This is the 12 and 1.1 percent right here. This little orange sliver, that's the percentage of the population that we want to address, because they are Americans without insurance who do not have affordable options.

And the proposal is to transform all of the rest of this, the best there is in the world in insurance and delivery of health care, in order to reduce this sliver of 4 percent down to something, maybe around 2 percent.

Now, I think that Einstein would have a way to define this thing, and I think it would come down to something such as, if you have a flawed premise, you will have a flawed conclusion.

Mr. AKIN. I just appreciate the gentleman, I am not a big fan of pie charts, I love pie, but I don't like pie charts. But this chart, I think, is a good graphic. It depicts something which almost defies reason.

What we are seeing is, we are going to take all of that green area, if you can point to that green area with your pointer, there—but I am talking about the turquoise area, the whole thing. We are going to change all of that. We are going to scrap our whole health care system, have it taken over by the government in order to address that little sort of orange-red sector.

What that suggests to me is that somebody has an agenda, and it's more federalizing anything than it is really solving a problem. And this is something that I find, from an integrity point of view, really distressing, particularly as an engineer.

I mean, we just passed the biggest tax increase in the history of our country because we are under the premise that CO₂ is such a bad thing that we have got to tax everybody in order to put a tax on CO₂. So in spite of a promise—if you are making \$250,000 or less, you won't be taxed—in fact what we have passed in the House is, if you flip a light switch, you start getting taxed.

So the simple problem is, though, if you want to get rid of CO₂, all you have

to do is take the nuclear power plants—that's 20 percent of our electric generation in America—take the 20 percent and double it. So we have 40 percent of our electric coming out of nuclear. If you do that, you would get rid of all the CO₂ from every passenger car in the country. And yet we have come up with this complicated, tremendously intrusive, huge tax increase, when you could just simply say in a page or two, just double the number of nuclear.

Now, here what you have got is, you have got all this folderol about health care, we have got to take it over, the government has got to do all this stuff, and you have got 4 percent of people who are uninsured. It just seems like, it seems like we have made our conclusion ahead of time that we want our government to run everything, and our excuse is that little tiny 4 percent wedge. Even I like cherry pie. If all I got was 4 percent, it isn't worth it. It just plain isn't worth it. That's the obvious conclusion of your chart.

And I appreciate you just taking us into the world of free enterprise and what's really going on with our Federal Government. I appreciate your leadership. The gentleman from Iowa is really a saint, and we are thankful to have some good old midwestern common-sense values here on the floor of the U.S. Congress.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Let me conclude. I reflect upon a pair of auto mechanics

that run a repair shop in my hometown of Kiron called Sandberg Brothers. They have a sign behind their counter that says, "Complicated, difficult, technical nearly impossible jobs are our specialty. Simple jobs are beyond our comprehension."

I think that's what we have here. We have taken a simple job and turned it into a complicated, technical, difficult problem. And I think it falls back to the wisdom of Congressman Tom COLE, who said one day that highly intelligent people will always overcomplicate things. If they didn't, there wouldn't be any particular advantage to being highly intelligent.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CULBERSON (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today until 2 p.m. on account of personal reasons.

Mr. MCHUGH (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of a family medical matter.

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. NYE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. NYE, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. MAFFEI, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. GRAYSON, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. FALCOMA, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, September 23.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, September 23.

Mr. FORBES, for 5 minutes, today.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1243. An act to provide for the award of a gold medal on behalf of Congress to Arnold Palmer in recognition of his service to the Nation in promoting excellence and good sportsmanship in golf.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, Sept. 17, 2009, at 10 a.m.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Speaker-Authorized Official Travel during the first quarter and second quarter of 2009, pursuant to Public Law 95-384 are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO BOSNIA, HERZEGOVINA AND LITHUANIA FOR THE ANNUAL SESSION OF THE OSCE PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY, EXPENDED BETWEEN JUNE 26 AND JULY 3, 2009

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Departure	Return		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Alcee L. Hastings	6/29	7/3	Lithuania		1,030.00		(³)				1,030.00
Hon. Robert Aderholt	6/27	6/28	Bosnia & Herzegovina		313.99		(³)				313.99
	6/28	7/3	Lithuania		1,450.00		(³)				1,450.00
Hon. Madeleine Bordallo	6/27	6/28	Bosnia & Herzegovina		313.99		(³)				313.99
	6/28	7/3	Lithuania		1,450.00		(³)				1,450.00
Hon. G.K. Butterfield	6/29	7/3	Lithuania		1,030.00		4,055.56				5,085.56
Hon. Lloyd Doggett	6/27	6/28	Bosnia & Herzegovina		313.99		(³)				313.99
	6/28	7/3	Lithuania		1,450.00		(³)				1,450.00
Hon. Mike McIntyre	6/27	6/28	Bosnia & Herzegovina		313.99		(³)				313.99
	6/28	7/3	Lithuania		1,450.00		(³)				1,450.00
Hon. Gwen Moore	6/27	6/28	Bosnia & Herzegovina		313.99		(³)				313.99
	6/28	7/3	Lithuania		1,450.00		(³)				1,450.00
Hon. Louise Slaughter	6/27	6/28	Bosnia & Herzegovina		313.99		(³)				313.99
	6/28	7/3	Lithuania		1,450.00		(³)				1,450.00
Hon. Christopher Smith	6/27	6/28	Bosnia & Herzegovina		313.99		(³)				313.99
	6/28	7/3	Lithuania		1,450.00		(³)				1,450.00
Fred Turner	6/27	6/28	Bosnia & Herzegovina		313.99		(³)				313.99
	6/28	7/3	Lithuania		1,450.00		(³)				1,450.00
Edward Joseph	6/27	6/28	Bosnia & Herzegovina		313.99		(³)				313.99
	6/28	7/3	Lithuania		1,450.00		(³)				1,450.00
Robert Hand	6/27	6/28	Bosnia & Herzegovina		313.99		(³)				313.99
	6/28	7/3	Lithuania		1,450.00		(³)				1,450.00
Neil Simon	6/27	6/28	Bosnia & Herzegovina		313.99		(³)				313.99
	6/28	7/3	Lithuania		1,450.00		(³)				1,450.00
Shelly Han	6/27	6/28	Bosnia & Herzegovina		313.99		(³)				313.99
	6/28	7/3	Lithuania		1,450.00		(³)				1,450.00
Clifford Bond	6/27	6/29	Bosnia & Herzegovina		570.67		(³)				570.67
Alex Johnson	6/29	7/3	Lithuania		1,030.00		(³)				1,030.00
Winsome Packer	6/27	7/3	Lithuania		1,740.00		1,538.00				3,278.00
Daniel Redfield	6/27	6/28	Bosnia & Herzegovina		313.99		(³)				313.99
	6/28	7/3	Lithuania		1,450.00		(³)				1,450.00
Josh Shapiro	6/27	6/28	Bosnia & Herzegovina		313.99		(³)				313.99
	6/28	7/3	Lithuania		1,450.00		(³)				1,450.00
Committee total					30,096.53		5,593.56				35,690.09

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

³ Military air transportation.