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The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker. It is always my privilege to be recognized to address you here on the floor of the House of Representatives. And I find it a bit ironic that I’m watching the Representatives from Florida, New York and Texas speak to the Speaker pro temp just previous to you about the election situation. I’m thinking about the 2000 election when it was reported—not substantiated to my satisfaction—but reported that as many as 25,000 people from New York voted both in New York and in Florida. I was told by a President from Texas or one from Tennessee where the Speaker pro temp momentarily ago was from. That’s a bit of an irony as I listen to this discussion that’s going on about the election process here in the United States. And I think there’s too little concern on the part of my colleagues whom I do respect and appreciate and count as friends in many respects, I think there’s too much focus on how you get more warm bodies to the polls as many times as possible and not enough on the legitimate vote.

Now as I listened, the gentleman from Texas said there’s no demonstrable evidence that fraud is occurring. I would disagree. I think convictions are demonstrable evidence, and the convictions particularly in Troy, New York, of election fraud. I have seen it in the State of Iowa in a fashion that didn’t result in convictions, but I have conviction that it happened. We have paid too little attention to election fraud in the case that I mentioned of people voting in the State of New York and in the State of Florida. If they did it lawfully voting in each of the States. They may not be lawfully able to vote in either State, but voting in both States.

And how does that happen. Mr. Speaker? This is an unexamined subject, but reported that as many as 25,000 people from New York, they also registered to vote in Florida, or any adjoining State for that matter, New Jersey, Connecticut, you name it. All we have to do is go in and register in one State and go register in the other State.

In fact, in my own State, it was the case—and probably is not still the case—that the voter registration list does not integrate itself county to county in a definitive way. If John Doe registers to vote in Washington County in New York, then he also registered to vote in Florida, or any adjoining State for that matter, New Jersey, Connecticut, you name it. All we have to do is go in and register in one State and go register in the other State. And if he still is voting in both counties, he can vote simultaneously.
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spoke within the last half hour—and I do agree on this. There should be a paper trail so we can audit the votes that are cast. Now, we’ve agreed on that. We’ve worked together on that cause. We have not arrived at that as far as a conclusion for this Congress is concerned that can be passed into law, but I think there should be a paper trail. And the gentleman from New York and I are in conceptual agreement on that, Mr. Holt. I appreciate that; I really do think it’s out of the right spirit of his head and his heart, but it might also be from suspicion that the people that produce the electronic voting machines—they may be Republicans, they may be Democrats, and that seems to color our judgment.

Mine is. Don’t give anybody a chance to cheat. And don’t let the electronic voting machines be offered in such a way that some programmer can jigger the machine to give an advantage to either party.

I think of the election situation that took place in Florida in the year 2000. I spent 37 days focusing on that. I was the only Iowa State and the State Government Committee. It was my job to see to it that Iowa didn’t become a Florida, the fiasco in Florida. So, therefore, I chased all the way through the Internet, everything that I could find. And the last thing that I could come up with on the election processes State by State, 37 days of focus. And then after that, not quite as focused, but I followed through on legislation which passed the Iowa Senate, and I discovered a significant amount of election fraud in this country. This is in the year 2000, well before the American public had heard of ACORN. I found, I believed, a significant amount of election fraud.

There were a pair of brothers in Florida that had done research on election fraud in Florida, the Collier brothers, both of them now passed away. They’ve written a book on this and did a video on it. One of the brothers was walking into the maintenance shop where they took care of the machines that counted the punch-card ballots, the notorious punch-card ballots that were prevalent in Florida in the year 2000. And they have the video of the former election commissioner, who had retired from that and handed it over of course to his successor and gone to work maintaining the vote-counting machines, the machines that you wouldn’t think it’s out of a stack of punch-card ballots and it would run through, and the machine would read it and it would spit the number out the other side. And on that video—and it was available at the time. I don’t know if it’s available now. I have walked through his shop and pulled out of the drawer a gear. And he said, here’s how we do this, we just grind one tooth off of this gear, and then every time 10 ballots go through it kicks an extra one in on our side. So there, there it was. And of course they got nervous afterwards and tried to do what they could to suppress it.

Those kinds of things have gone on in America. They have gone on in Florida. They’ve gone on in other States. And the people that advocate for or defend more open election laws and process are, whether they realize it or not, enacting fraud. They’re actually doing this. I don’t want it to be as clean as possible, as legitimate as possible. I don’t want a single qualified vote to be canceled out by an unqualified vote, let alone one that’s designed to be fraudulent. I don’t want buses going across State lines loaded with people that are in there to do same-day registration to vote and disappear.

We had voters in Iowa that registered from a hotel room where the campaign had out-of-State workers. People don’t live in hotels in these kinds of neighborhoods. It may happen in the inner city. It doesn’t happen in a hotel in the neighborhoods I’m talking about in Iowa. These are people that come and stay a couple days, or 4 or 5 days, and then maybe we’ll go again. These are folks that have a home of their own. It isn’t a residence. When you register to vote from a hotel, where they didn’t have a single guest that stayed longer than 2 weeks in the last year. We’re sure that if that’s the hotel where they put their campaign workers that came from out of State, it’s a pretty good bet that those votes that were registered in that hotel are votes from people that are not legitimate to be citizens not within that precinct, within that district, or probably, in almost each of those cases, within the State.

Here’s another one, the statement made by the gentleman from Texas: If you have no Texas driver’s license, you have to get someone to take you to the polls. Well, is that person a recluse? Don’t they have an opportunity for an absentee ballot? Do they ever go to town, for example? And if they do, can’t they time their trip to the grocery store to go on election day and vote?

And the concern about the primary part of this, yes, I think there are some fraudulent primaries that take place, and there are some that are stacked up that I’d like them revisited. I’d like to see the Granite State revisit their primary process that lets people go to the polls and vote and say the Democrats go to the polls and vote in the Republican primary have a caucus system for our President, and there we require that they be registered either as Democrats or Republicans. They have to pick one or the other. And they don’t get to switch sides that easily, although it is possible in the State of Iowa. But here’s what needs to happen in this country. We need to have voter registration lists that are free of duplicates, free of the deceased, and free of felons, where the laws apply. And they need to be certified to be citizens, not a motor-voter law that people go in that don’t speak English, that get their driver’s license and then they ask them a question, check this box, check that box. If they don’t understand English, they don’t know what they’re saying yes to. They don’t realize that they are under penalty of perjury if they claim to be a citizen and they are not. And so we’ve got a situation here that just now they’re registered to vote. Now a noncitizen—quite often illegal—is in a position to cast a ballot.

And we saw 537 votes be the difference in the State of Florida in the year 2000 on who would be the President of the United States; the Commander in Chief and the leader of the free world decided by 537 votes in the State of Florida. Now, every time they recounted those votes in Florida, I think that Republicans on this side and Democrats on this side will agree that it came back to that same number. And if you’ve got some other narrative, again, I’ll yield to you, you can tell me what your narrative is. But the consensus now, after all this analysis, is we’ve got a legitimate vote there. George Bush was not the appointed President; he was the elected President. But it was very, very close in the year 2000 and it did have an impact.

But how far apart would that election have been if one could actually know which of the votes were fraudulent and which were not?

The last time I came to the floor I heard the minority whip come to the floor and make the statement that we didn’t have evidence—again, as we’ve heard from the gentleman from Texas—no demonstrable evidence that fraudulent voting was occurring, and the gentleman from Maryland’s statement was close to that, although not exact. I’d argue the opposite. We have ACORN—Acorn that admitted to more than 400,000 fraudulent voter registrations, more than 400,000 confessed to fraudulent registrations.

This is the acorn that I carry in my pocket, Mr. Speaker. I carry it in my pocket every day to remind me what happens to this country if we let organizes like ACORN that seek to diminish the integrity of the vote take over. If they do that, then they erode the faith of the American people in the election. You can have fraudulent elections, but as long as we believe that they’re legitimate, the American people are going to accept the results because we do have great faith in this constitutional Republic, which is guaranteed to us from Article IV, Section 4 of the Constitution by the way, states that guarantee a republican form of government.

But this country respects the election process, and that’s why we accept the results of the election process. And we respect the faith in the election process, legitimate or not, then the very bedrock that the foundation of our country—the Constitution—sets on cumbles and the Constitution itself crumbles, and we crumble into some form of anarchy because we will have lost our integrity in our election process.

Now, is it too much to ask that if someone goes to the polls that they
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would bring with them a picture ID? I wonder if any of those folks have ever gotten on an airplane or if they’ve ever gone to rent a movie and they’re asked for an identification to support their credit card when they rent a movie. That’s not too much to ask. I’ve never heard anyone ask to this Congress and say: I demand my civil liberties. I demand that I be able to rent a movie without any identification, without any credit card. Why can’t we just do that? I don’t know why we haven’t walked in and said that paper that says, I’m Joe Blow and I live at 100 Exotic Avenue and I want to rent an exotic movie, and I don’t want to have to have identification to do that. We’ve never had anybody ask for that this Congress. They know they don’t have a civil right to do business in this country without identification.

If the merchant requires that identification, they willingly supply it. And yet to choose the next leader in the free world, the Commander-in-Chief, the President of the United States, the advocates, the Democrats, who stood on the floor have said to the effect of, anybody that walks up there and attests that they are a living, breathing human being and that they live somewhere, they can vote and they can register on the spot, and they can walk away showing not having any identification whatsoever. And in some cases it just takes someone to attest to that they are the individual that they say they are.

So they don’t really even need to misrepresent themselves. They can walk up and say, I’m Joe Blow, I want to vote here, and I live in this precinct. They sometimes will lie about where they live, but they can actually say who they are. And then they can walk to the next precinct and say, I’m Joe M. Blow, and then I’m Joe N. Blow at the next precinct and say, I’m O. Blow and P. Q. R, right on down the line. They could put a number in for their middle name and they can do it in the States of Iowa, and they can do it in many of the other States as well.

We do not have the integrity in our election process that we need. I know that it’s being gamed. I also know that we’re not getting the convictions and the prosecutions because we don’t have the structure in place even to get those convictions because we’ve eroded the integrity to the point where there’s not a backbone there to bring that kind of a prosecution.

But then we watch George Soros invest in the campaigns of multiple secretaries of state across the country. And where was it? Swing States. And what was evident in those close elections, where George Soros was a campaign contributor?

We know what happened. Those real close elections, in the last minute votes showed up that were surprises, and the election turned. We have at least one Senator down the aisle in my neighborhood that arrived in that fashion, Mr. Speaker.

And so I am disturbed about the results of these elections if they do not reflect the actual will of the American people, the actual will of the people within the jurisdiction that should be voting for those candidates; and I believe we need to enhance the integrity of the ballot process.

I would shorten the terms that a person could be asking for an absentee ballot, and I would tighten the conditions and so that if it’s reasonable for you to vote in person on election day, do so. Absentee ballots should not be a drawn out, 45- or 90-day absentee ballot affair. The more we do the absentee ballots, the more we cast our ballots from afar, the more likely it is we’re voting for a candidate who’s passed away during the campaign, and the less likely it is we will know all the things we need to know to make a reasoned judgment about that candidate.

In fact, at spots we have elected a United States Senator who was, who had passed away the day or the day before the election. And I regret that that happened, but the people went to the polls and voted to elect that person who was passed away.

I’m for a voter registration system that’s free of duplicates, deceased and, where the law applies, felons. I’m for a picture ID, a government-issued picture ID that has legitimacy, and I’m opposed to motor voter. I’m opposed to satellite voting, and I’m opposed to same-day registration.

And all of these components of the election process. I add to that again, there needs to be a paper trail for the ballots. Let’s have integrity. Let’s have a certification that they be citizens from the secretaries of state of each of the States. And then, if we don’t have enough integrity in our ballots, something’s got to happen where we crunch the databases of the voter registration against those of the other States. They can find out how many duplicates there really are. And there would be many.

So I have less faith in this than most of the American public does; and if they had the exposure to what I’ve had the exposure to, I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that there wouldn’t be the confidence in this election process that the American public has; and that lack of confidence might result in a different kind of a result here within this Congress and within the States. I think that they would lose more integrity in the ballot process.

And so I didn’t come here to speak about that. I listened to the gentlelady and the gentleman that spoke in the previous period and felt that I had to express the other viewpoint. I actually came here, Mr. Speaker, to talk about how we transform this economy here in the United States.

And being from Iowa, I’ve listened to the economic proposals of each of the Presidential candidates. I listened to them make their pitch for their vision for America. And I said last January, February, March and on throughout the summer, clear into August, at least, that we don’t have a Presidential candidate on the Republican side of the aisle that’s put together an economic recovery plan. Yes, they have pieces. Yes, they have components, and they are doing it around the edges, and yes, they are asking another is what it takes to bring our economy back around to where it belongs.

Well, I’ve watched this economy de- volve downward, and it has. It’s a deep trough, and worse through that is the length of this trough that we’re in. And it is an economic fact that if you look at the patterns of economic growth and decline throughout the history of the free market world, one will see that whenever there has been a Keynesian economic theory applied, the more vigor with which it is applied, the longer is the trough for a recovery. If one will look at the greatest experiment of Keynesian economics we had seen up till this point it was Franklin Delano Roosevelt. He had unleashed on the American people, starting at the beginning of his term, The Stock Market crashed in October of 1929, and we saw Herbert Hoover caught up in the throes of that cli- matic shift economically that was a global trend.

Herbert Hoover had—everything he’d touched had turned to gold up to that point. He believed that he could steer government to solve the problem. Well, he did too work to steer govern- ment, and it went the other way on him.

Cool Cal Coolidge had a pretty good handle on it earlier, in the previous century, and that was: Don’t just stand there, do nothing, because the free market system will recover itself.

Well, instead we had Smoot-Hawley; we had trade protectionism. We had then the New Deal that flowed out of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. We had bil-
lions of dollars that were spent throughout that period of time, at least in today’s dollars. And the CCC camps, the WPA programs, the TVA, the list went on and on and on that came out of Roosevelt. Throw another plan at it, throw some more money at it, borrow some money, grow the Fed- eral Government and put money into the hands of people. And if you do that, the theory was, according to John Maynard Keynes, who was the most inf- luential economist of his time, and his curse lingers on us in this Congress today, that if you would get money into the hands of people, they would spend it and that would stimulate the economy and the economy would re- cover. In other words, we could spend ourselves into prosperity, according to John Maynard Keynes.

Now, Franklin Delano Roosevelt bought into the Keynesian economic theory with more vigor than George W. Bush bought into the Henry Paulson stimulus plan, or should I say the TARP plan. $700 billion tossed in there to pick up toxic debt was the plan. But back in the thirties it was FDR’s plan
to follow Keynes' directive, which was put money into the hands of people and get them to spend and you’ll stimulate the economy, because they believed that our economy was consumer-driven.

Well, Mr. Speaker, every Keynesian experiment that I know of in history, and that includes Roosevelt’s New Deal, it includes the Japanese, and it absolutely includes Barack Obama’s economic stimulus plan, plans his approach to this.

And by the way, the President, President Obama has told us directly, face-to-face, that he believes that Roosevelt lost his nerve; that he should have spent a lot more money in the thirties; that because he lost his nerve and didn’t spend more it brought about a recession within a depression, and unemployment went up because Roosevelt didn’t borrow and spend enough government money.

Well, I know what it’s like to compete with a government that has more money than the private sector has. I know what it’s like to try to hire somebody off of unemployment. I know what it’s like to train employees, put them on a benefits plan, and have them finally in a place where they can be full-time employee that can yield a return on the work that they’re doing and you can count on them being to work every day, and look at how their career is laid out working for your company, and how the Federal Government or the State government, or the county government, or even the city government come in and outbid you for those services.

And how do they do that?

Well, they do that by looking around and thinking, here’s this trained employee. What’s it take to get them? And they will up the ante until they can hire this trained employee, and inevitably that employee will take the offer of the higher paycheck and a benefit that competes or exceeds the one that you can offer from the private sector and go to work for the government where they don’t have the responsibility, where they don’t have to work as hard, where the hours are more predictable, where the risk of employment is less and it’s more stable.

I recognize that. But better wages and better benefits and all of those comforts that come with a government job work against the private sector.

And so private sector employers then find themselves faced with having to go out and hire more help and train more help and have that competitive edge in order to operate the government employment.

The real downside, though, is this. Where does the government come up with the money to pay more wages and pay better benefits, which they have been increasingly doing over the last generation. The government raises taxes. It raises taxes to get the revenue to bid against the private sector. And then the government comes out and makes an offer that says we’re going to extend unemployment benefits out to 99 weeks.

Now, it makes it harder yet for the private sector to recover because they’re competing with the government’s offer; the government’s offer to hire employees that can go on the government’s offer to pay people not to work. And where does that money come from? This Federal Government borrows it.

This Federal Government borrows it. It borrows it from the Chinese, borrows it from the Saudis, borrows it from multiple countries around the world. And about 50 percent of it, to be fair, comes from investors within the United States domestic funds that are invested into U.S. Treasury bills, for example.

So a government that believes that it can stimulate an economy by stimulating consumption and completely ignores the part of the equation that requires the production for the economy to function. And I would point out that if no one is producing any food, clothing, or shelter, if no one is producing any transportation links out there in the private sector, if no one is making it available any of the recreational facilities that will attract those dollars, there’s no production. If there’s no production, there’s no place for anyone to spend their money.

This economy is production-driven, not consumption-driven. And we must, to grow out of this economic situation that we’re in, we must produce goods and services that have a marketable valuable, both domestically and abroad. When we do that, and we will eventually do that, this country will grow out of this problem that we are in.

But we must get government off of our back. We must keep a competitive tax rate for the rest of the world. We must reduce our regulations. We must stimulate our entrepreneurs.

And this Republican side of the aisle has now for about 3 years been saying, Where are the jobs? Mr. President, where are the jobs?

Well, I’ve heard him echo many times in this Chamber and across the country that has to build itself on profits. It is a very good thing. America is a country that has to build itself on profit, on free enterprise, capitalism.

I just took a look in my desk drawer today. There are flash cards in there that were published in 2008. These are the flash cards that enable one to be trained for naturalization here in the United States. So if you want to become an American citizen, and you come to America legally, get yourself a green card, and what you do is you have to take the test. And part of that test is, what’s the economic system? Free enterprise capitalism. That’s on the test. It’s a little head’s up, Mr. President. I hope you could pass that test.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your attention, and I yield back the balance of my time.
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The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the opportunity to be here this evening sharing some observations.

It is, of course, always interesting to have shared the floor with my good friend from Iowa listening to his view of the universe, and even wincing a little bit as I hear him talk about the vilified public employees, where they don’t have to work as hard and they get lots more money than the private sector.

It is interesting that most independent studies suggest that for many categories of public employees, they are not above the market. And it’s sort of a fantasy land, I think, to have this disdain that was overwhelmingly rejected in Ohio when voters had a chance to put a stamp of approval on the fairly radical agenda of Governor Kasich, our former colleague here in the House of Representatives. Things, by the way, that Kasich and his fellow traveler, Governor Walker in Wisconsin, didn’t talk about during the election.

But turning their guns on public employees, voters in Ohio had a chance to give their verdict. And it’s interesting that they overwhelmingly repudiated this notion, the lack of value of public employees, the fact that they’re slackers, laggards, and that what they do is not worthy of public support.

It wasn’t the public health nurse, the firefighter, the teacher, the marine, the person in the Navy that almost destroyed the economy. Many of these people are providing essential services. They are extraordinarily hardworking, and I’m happy to invite my friend from