I made a comment here in the Judiciary Committee a month or so ago that of all of these regulations that we have to comply with, if you look across America, there are some really good companies in this country. Of all of them, thousands and thousands of companies in America, hundreds of thousands of companies in this country in America altogether. They advertise everything under the sun that you can imagine. They have banners on their Web site. They will tell you that they are the best or first at—you name anything. Put it into a Google search. You’ll find an American company that will provide it for you, and they’ll advertise their quality. They’ll advertise their personnel. They’ll advertise the efficiency and the cost. But as soon as a bureaucrat comes on the scene and says, there isn’t a single company in America, not one, Mr. Speaker, that has a little banner on their Web site that says, “We are in compliance with all Federal regulations.” Not one single company takes that position, and I’ll tell you why: because they know if they ever advertise that they are in compliance, there would be a Federal bureaucrat that represented an agency, or two or more, or up to 682, according to the Constitution Daily Web site, Federal agencies—and those are sub-agencies, divisions within the agencies. You can begin to write down the names of those agencies, 682 of them, and this count is about 5 years old, by the way—that can levy sanction actions against American businesses.

And so the number one fear I had was: Can I comply with all of these regulations? Can I identify them? Can I comply with them? And what do I do about the conflicting regulations where, if you meet one regulation, the other one contradicts it? You’re bound to be in violation.

So today there isn’t a single company in America that advertises that they are in compliance with all Federal regulations. And if they did, I think we should give them the Do-Nothing of the Year Award for that because they would be surrounded by bureaucrats, Federal regulators that are in there to inspect, to make sure that they are completely in compliance.

And they have to justify their job. So I would predict that any company that would announce that they are in compliance with all Federal regulations probably wouldn’t survive beyond about 18 months before they would be tied up in knots and tied down and they couldn’t produce those goods and services that have a marketable value. Now, there is a tradeoff on this always, and it doesn’t mean that we should not have wise regulations. Yes, we should. But they need to keep in mind the regulatory burden of those rules and what it does to slow down production.

Now, I’ve said goods and services that have a marketable valuable both domestically and abroad. That means, if you run a company, you want to go to work every day, and you look around, what do we do? We produce a product. We manufacture and market a widget. And you want to do that as efficiently as possible. So if you put 100 people out there on the factory floor to manufacture widgets, and it doesn’t take them all day and the answer mail, you’re in pretty good shape. You’ve got one of those 100 people that’s tied up doing administrative duties, that’s pretty good efficiency. That’s 99 percent producing that product, that product, you’re manufacturing. And perhaps invented.

But as soon as a bureaucrat comes along and says, Wait a minute. You have to have somebody here that’s overseeing, that’s coming in, the electricity that’s coming in, the sewage that’s going out. You have to have safety inspectors and you have to have safety meetings, so that once a week you line everybody up and spend 15 to 30 minutes telling them what they need to do, which is safe. Not a bad idea, but when the government calls for that, they put more on your overhead and they’ve shut down the production of that entire plant for that period of time that they prescribe.

And the other regulations that come along in our construction businesses, the Federal Government saying, let’s see, you have to pay the Federal Government scale for your equipment operators on construction projects. Davis-Bacon wage scale. That really means union-imposed scale on those projects. And it might change the wages. In the past, I’ve seen them double or be cut in half, depending which direction you’re going. The highway, you go into a different division and it’s a whole different wage scale. The guy running the shovel gets a different wage than the guy that’s running the grease gun, different from the guy that’s running the machine that’s being greased or having the track scooped out on it. And I have to keep track of all of that and do what the government tells me, which means not just is it costly to keep track of it all, but it consumes the efficiency on the project. It makes it difficult, if not impossible.

Mrs. ELLMERS. I thank the gentleman from Iowa.
enforce them, and then you also had to calculate, when they contradicted one another, what the likelihood would be of one entity showing up, one agency to regulate you versus another.

If they had conflicting regulations, then you ran your operation to try to comply with the one that’s most likely to show up to regulate in contradiction with the other. That goes on in America every single day. There are floors and floors of lawyers and administrative experts whose job it is to try to keep those companies from avoiding the conflict that comes from Federal regulations and, of course, our State regulations that are part of that as well.

It is a great frustration to enter into a business wanting just to provide that good or that service and do it with in a marketable, competitive way; to have a margin of profit and control your destiny and raise your family and do those things that are acting out the American Dream, and find out that a lot of your life is really just tied up in meeting with government regulations and complying also with so many people that can control the destiny of some 300 million Americans, who have never signed the front of a paycheck, who have no idea what it’s like to not maybe have any capital and go out and build a little bit with some sweat equity and take that little bit of capital and roll it and invest it, and after a while find enough margin out there and enough customers that you’re compelled to hire a person to help you.

Now there’s two people working there instead of one. And then you multiply that again and you take some more sweat and your little bit of equity and now you get to double up the equity and now you get to have another employee and another. While that’s going on, you’re building a capital base that bridges you through the hard times.

And the attitude, especially over on this side of the aisle, is an attitude that employers somehow are victimizers of the proletariat. Ladies and gentlemen, Mr. Speaker, I would say to you that those folks here in this Congress—and most of them are over on the liberal side of this aisle—believe that the employee has a certain virtue to them. I’ll just say that we have good and evil in all of us. But the people who risk their capital and many times put everything they have on the line and hold stand to lose it all if it doesn’t work, they’re not taking advantage of the employees. They’re giving the employees a job.

Republicans over on this side, we say: jobs, jobs, jobs. Well, you, we want those jobs. I don’t believe that government creates the jobs. I think we should stop saying we need to create jobs. We don’t. We need to get government out of the way so that investors can see an opportunity for profit. And if they see that opportunity for profit, they won’t just invest their capital or their sweat; they will produce the kind of jobs out there that will sustain people in a market economy.

That’s what’s going to happen because, first, there have to come profits. You can’t pay payroll very long if you don’t have profits, which means that you’re not going to have jobs unless people make money. So what do we do in this Congress? You people over here, you people over there, the people that are making money. On this side of the aisle, we don’t want to call those people that are seeking a profit because we’re saying we want jobs.

We should all say we want to see profit in these companies so that that profit gets reinvested and more people have an opportunity to go to work and receive a paycheck and perhaps a raise and a better benefits package. And the reason I’m saying that is great in those companies, they’ll spin off of there and the people that learn the business going to work for the boss end up in competition against the boss. That’s another thing that is the American way.

These kinds of things need to happen organically over and over again in America millions of times. And if they don’t happen, then this country devolves itself down into a European-style social democracy, it’s hard to argue for me to even say those words and think of America in that fashion. We’ve moved in that fashion dramatically.

Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States doesn’t believe in these things that I have described that I think are good. He’s advocated this Keynesian economy on steroids. He’s advocated for spending trillions of dollars, borrowing it. About half of that money, by the way, is borrowed from the rest of Europe. We’re tied to them financially with hundreds of billions of dollars invested over into the European banks. If they should fail, then it hurts us badly. We’re highly leveraged in this country. The comparison of us to Greece is one that is considerably disturbing. There is a good side to a potential Greek default, and that would be that it would give this Congress a lesson for what America needs to do to avoid a similar calamity. I would like to see us steer our way out of this, but we’re here having a debate in this Congress about minutiae in proportion to the scope of the problem that we are in.

We came into this new Congress with a new Speaker, John Boehner. We have an opportunity with 87 new freshman Republicans that came here. Most of them pledged not to raise the debt ceiling. Most of them pledged to bring us back to fiscal responsibility and fiscal accountability. They all believe that to this day. I don’t think they’ve lost their beliefs. But along the way there were a lot of big decisions that needed to be made without time to analyze. And so what happened?

I said the first thing we needed to do was repeal ObamaCare, repeal ObamaCare, repeal ObamaCare. I can’t say it enough. We need to repeal ObamaCare if we’re going to have a chance to avoid calamity and operate economically again. It drives us so deeply into debt that just removing a couple of those components of ObamaCare, according to Denny Rehberg, the chairman of the HHH Appropriations Committee—Health, and Human Services Appropriations Committee—it would cut our spending over the next decade by $1.379 trillion. It would solve the whole problem of the supercommittee, that $1.379 trillion cut that comes just from ending the expansion of Medicaid and repealing the CLASS Act was going to go anyway.

The administration admitted that they couldn’t sustain that component.
One other component in ObamaCare was the individual premium subsidy for those who were compelled to buy insurance under ObamaCare. Those components totaled $1.379 trillion. So we strike those out, shut off any funding to the those that would have been $1.379 trillion. That would more than handle the $1.2 trillion that we’re directed in the debt ceiling deal.

But, Mr. Speaker, this went this way. We had a chance coming into this new Congress, this 112th Congress, to draw bright lines and to ensure fiscal responsibility and actually fix the real scope of this problem. Step number one was to repeal ObamaCare.

We passed that out of this House, H.R. 2, sent it over to HARRY REID in the Senate, Mr. Speaker, where he set it up for failure and they shot it down. So every Republican in the House and every Republican in the Senate has voted to repeal ObamaCare. Congratulations, thank you all for doing that. We didn’t get it done, but we got it voted on. And it’s on the conscience of the people that voted “no” that that monstrosity, that legislation that went through, consuming $105.5 billion in automatic appropriations that were written deceptively into ObamaCare in an unprecedented fashion. Oh, yes, the tactic had been used before, but the scope had never been used like that before.

And so that $105.5 billion is in there. And it’s around $26 billion in the first 2 years of ObamaCare, this year, next year, $26 billion being chummed away. And if we had reached an impasse on our negotiations with the continuing resolution, the CR that hit at midnight on March 4, if that had resulted in a showdown that would have been the President causing a shutdown, that might have been the lights going out in Federal offices all across the land, Mr. Speaker. But you could have driven around the Federal buildings here in this city and around the Federal buildings across America, and where the lights were on in that eventuality, they would be on because the money that funds ObamaCare goes on anyway: it’s automatic, they call it mandatory spending. And we tried to shut that off as well. And we did send the amendment language out of this House of Representatives but shut off all of the funding to ObamaCare. And it went over to the Senate, but it was attached to the bill that went with the CR as an appendage so that they could separate it out and vote it down in the Senate—and that’s what HARRY REID did in the Senate also, Mr. Speaker.

And so here we are with a Congress that began kind of on the right foot with an opportunity to force a showdown with the President of the United States, and make him defend ObamaCare or would have ultimately funded all of the functions of government—or we could have responsibly funded all of the legitimate functions of government would be a better way to phrase that. Mr. Speaker—and shut off all funding to ObamaCare. The President of the United States then was predicted to veto a bill like that. Had he done that, he would have had to explain to the American people that his signature legislation, ObamaCare, means more to him than all of the legitimate functions of government combined. That would have been the showdown. It should have been the showdown. I believe that we would have prevailed on that showdown. And I think the President would have had to accept the funds that we put on his desk in a CR appropriations bill, minus any funding that goes into ObamaCare, cutting off all the automatic funding that goes to ObamaCare—could have, would have, should have done that, Mr. Speaker.

We moved past that point. The CR was going to be $100 billion in cuts; it didn’t have the $1.379 trillion down low enough that I won’t utter it into this CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It’s just not something that people go back and revisit that even voted for it. And then we were going to do yeoman’s work and put trillions of spending with the budget bill. That would have been the floor of the House, known as the Republican budget resolution, that was championed by PAUL RYAN of Wisconsin, who has done great work here on fiscal responsibility. That budget didn’t balance, Mr. Speaker. That was all we could get out of this Congress. It’s hard to craft a budget that comes that close. He did a lot of hard work on it and laid out some good parameters that we need to pick up and deal with.

But the budget resolution here on the floor of the House was a promise from ourselves to ourselves that we were going to hold this spending down. And this spending allocation was agreed to by the House of Representatives, excuse me. The Senate hasn’t passed a budget in so long I don’t remember when. And so Mr. Speaker, that budget was passed, balancing in 26 years, spending too much money, leaving us with $23 trillion in national debt 10 years down the road. And it was a great step in the right direction—not as strong as I wanted it to be, not as strong as the RSC budget, which I voted for, but the Senate’s budget that is the one that constrain our spending. I voted for them both. The RSC budget that balanced in about 9 years and the Ryan budget that balanced in 26 years left us with $23 trillion in national debt 10 years down the road. That doesn’t sound very appealing to those of us paying the highest percentage. You would argue that it’s progressive.

And, you know, you’re never going to be satisfied. I know you won’t be satisfied. If I can tell you today—and tomorrow is the first day of December—that I have a magic wand, and I promise you all that we’re going to give you what you want, and you’ve got all of the month of December to put your wish list together. And when the ball drops in Times Square in New York on the new year, 2012, begins, here would be the deal—here’s the magic wand: Give me a list of all the things that you
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And I hear some of you that say,
America has created now this culture
within us that somehow the Federal
Government is going to guarantee a
middle class standard of living to ev-
everybody that lives in this country,
legal and illegal.

Mr. Speaker, I know you're going to
be astonished at this, but there are 72
different means-tested Federal welfare
programs functioning in the United
States today; 72 of them. There isn't a
single American that can name them
from memory. If they can't name them
from memory, neither can they de-
scribe them.

And if they can't describe them, nei-
ther can they understand how they
solved their own problems. But you
understand how 72 different welfare
programs can interact with each other
and function to provide an incentive for
people to do the right thing, which is
produce for themselves, maybe get an
education, develop some job skills, go
get a job.

William Bennett told us, when I came
to this Congress, that he said he could
solve 75 percent of the Nation's patholo-
gies. Get married, stay married, go
get a job. That's 75 percent.

You know, if he's right on that, I'd say
the other percent is substance abuse.
I'd bet we could get to about 99 per-
cent if people would get married, stay
married, go get a job, keep a job and not
abuse alcohol and reject illegal drugs.

You'd solve a lot of the domestic
squabbles that go on and this society
would go on. We need to be a moral so-
ciety.

But we are a Nation of doers and ac-
ungers, and our culture is being eroded
by those who want to expand the
dependency class in America.

And that's you folks over on that
side of the aisle. You're in the business
of expanding the dependency class in
America. It goes on over and over and
over again. And you do that because
some of you believe, maybe even all of
you believe, that it is somehow a hu-
mane thing to do to take from the
sweat of one person's brow and hand it
over to someone who won't sweat for
his own. But you do it because it ex-
ands your political base, and then you
pander to and cater to the people that
you're promising somebody else's labor
to.

And you think that America's going
to be stronger? No, we're getting weak-
er. We've reached the point now where
these 300 million Americans that we
have, when you add up—we talk about
how many on unemployment do we
have. Oh, it was 15 million; now it's 14
million.

You look at the weekly numbers of
the new sign-ups and that number
ranges down there under 400,000 or so.

There was a little bit of wealth that
was created out of the labor that's
there. When they were scavengers and
foragers, they still made tools. And
along the way, somebody else could
make a tool a little better, a little
more efficient, and someone else could
raise a little garden and trade some
vegetables for some arrowheads, what-
ever it might be. Someone else could
tan a hide better than the person that
hunted for the pelt, and so they traded
labor.

And in the middle of all of that, they
acquired things. They said, I'll tell you
what. Let's do two pelts. You keep one,
I'll keep the other. Fine. Now there's
two blankets where there had only
been one before. And on and on they
went, building and building and build-
ing capital because we had free enter-
prise capitalism. We let people invest
their sweat, and they turned it into eq-

Eventually they invented the
wheel, and along came the industrial
revolution, where we built things and
we put them on ships, and we traded
around the world. And we found that
there were a lot of labor skills that had
been developed in other countries more
efficiently than we could here.

Adam Smith wrote in "Wealth of Na-
tions" about how they had the wool in-
dustry going off up in England, and
Scotland and in Ireland, and so they
should be the ones there that were
shearing sheep and turning that into
clothing, and put the wool products
that they did on well on ships and sail
them down to Portugal, where they
purchased and turned them into wine
and brought back a load of wine and a ship full of wool,
and that was the division of labor that
he described. And both countries were
better off.

Mr. Speaker, whenever there are two
people that trade a dollar, and it's a
business transaction, or it's two or
more, maybe it's three, four, five or six
people in this exchange, these business
deals are set up because each party
benefits. There doesn't need to be a
loser in an economic transaction.

And when I hire somebody to go to
work for me and I pay them a wage, they
get something out. They want the money; they want the
benefits. They might want the challenge.
I hope they do. And they want to con-
tribute, and we reach this agreement.
It is a contractual agreement between
two consenting adults. And so capital
is built; wealth is built. It's not a zero
sum game.

Gold got mined out by the Incas and
the Aztecs, and Adam Smith wrote about
that. And he said the Spanish chal-
lenge to the Incas was over having cut
out the cost of labor—he didn't say by stealing the gold from
the Incas and the Aztecs. He said they
cut out the cost of labor. And once
they removed a significant cost of the
labor of producing the goods from them,
they dumped it into the markets in Eu-

erope, and the price of gold went down.

Well, supply and demand, the cost of
the capital and cost of the labor goes
together to determine that we have there.
And over the centuries we built ships and we built buildings
and we built highways, we built
bridges, and we created cash and cur-
tency to trade our labor back and forth
with a wealth that would be willing
to exchange. That's money.

And then the capital that's built in
this world now is trillions and trillions.
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think they get a case of the "poor
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contribute to the gross domestic pro-
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You'd solve a lot of the domestic
squabbles that go on and this society
would go on. We need to be a moral so-
ciety.

But we are a Nation of doers and ac-
ungers, and our culture is being eroded
by those who want to expand the
dependency class in America.

And that's you folks over on that
side of the aisle. You're in the business
of expanding the dependency class in
America. It goes on over and over and
over again. And you do that because
some of you believe, maybe even all of
you believe, that it is somehow a hu-
mane thing to do to take from the
sweat of one person's brow and hand it
over to someone who won't sweat for
his own. But you do it because it ex-
ands your political base, and then you
pander to and cater to the people that
you're promising somebody else's labor
to.

And you think that America's going
to be stronger? No, we're getting weak-
er. We've reached the point now where
these 300 million Americans that we
have, when you add up—we talk about
how many on unemployment do we
have. Oh, it was 15 million; now it's 14
million.

You look at the weekly numbers of
the new sign-ups and that number
ranges down there under 400,000 or so.
And we think, oh, it was a good week. We had less than 400,000 new sign-ups to unemployment. And people run off the other end and they expire and they’re no longer eligible, and so that number went from around 15 million unemployed down to around 14 million unemployed — or a little more — not in the work force, Mr. Speaker.

The Department of Labor has that on their Web site. Anyone can go there. I think it’s dol.gov, something like that. And on that Web site you’ll see different age groups of those working age. It starts at age 16, 16 to 19. There are around 9 million Americans of that working age that are simply not in the workforce. Yes, they may be in school. A lot of us worked our way through school. And I started before that age of 16.

And then you go from 20 on up to 25 or so, there’s another chunk. Work your way on up. Americans of working age not in the workforce. A letter I then came to this Congress not that long ago were 69 million. Then it became 80 million. And about 2½ months ago the number, for the first time in the history of this country, the number of Americans of working age not in the workforce exceeded 100 million Americans — 100 million. Think what you could do with the labor of 100 million Americans.

And while that’s going on, now we have, what is our number, 11, 12 or more million illegals in America? I actually think it’s 20 million or more, but they keep tamping that number down. They keep coming across the border, and the number got lower instead of greater by some analysis.

But we know this: about seven out of every 12 illegals here in this country work. That’s marginally a little greater than the number of Americans that are working. And that seven out of 12 that are there are part of around 8 million, 7 million to 8 million documented, I’ll say study-analyzed consensus numbers, 7 to 8 million illegals in America that were working. Now, if they all woke up tomorrow in their home country, that conceivably creates 8 million new jobs.

We know how they weren’t coming into this country illegally, you wouldn’t need so many people to go guard the border either, and they could do something productive rather than something that’s not contributing economically to this country in the fashion that produces goods and services.

So there’s 8 million jobs there. But there are many other jobs out there for the people that will go out there and start a business, go ask for a job, compete in this marketplace. And every one of the 100 million Americans who are not working that puts in 1 hour’s work even a week contributes to the gross domestic product of the United States of America.

People who are not working, not producing, are not contributing, unless of course they’ve got investments that are returning, and then I’ll give them some credit. But 100 million, Think if you were on a boat or a ship, and let’s say you had 300 people on that boat or ship, and you had to have some trimming the sails, some pulling the oars, some swabbing the decks, the galley, some cooking, cleaning, housekeeping and somebody up there taking care of the captain.

And what if you had 100 out of those 300 people that said, I’m going to sit here in steerage. Bring me my food, clean up my mess. That’s the scope of what America is faced with today.

I’d put the people on the oars. I’d put them up there trimming the sails and swabbing the decks, and we will sail a lot smoother, we’ll be a lot stronger country, and we’ll feel better about ourselves. This dignity of work is there for every man and woman that takes that job on.

And I challenge all of us: let’s step up, take the freedom we have left. Let’s grasp for more of that liberty. Let’s grasp more of that freedom, and let’s put some of these 100 million people to work so they can contribute to their gross domestic product.

The rest of the world will respect us more. We’ll be stronger economically. We’ll have more prudent people that are contributing to the ideas in this Congress, and we will get to a balanced budget, and we will start to pay down this national debt, and we will enforce and respect the rule of law.

Mr. Speaker, I would go on for another half hour articulating some of the other pillars of American exceptionalism, but I recognize there is a limit to your patience, but my time.

I appreciate your attention, and I would yield back the balance of my time.

**LEAVE OF ABSENCE**

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DUNBAR (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for November 29 and November 30 on account of official travel.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn. The motion was seconded; accordingly (at 7 o’clock and 40 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, December 1, 2011, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

**EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.**

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker’s table and referred as follows: