

he believes so much in that standard quality of care. It's because he knows that he can regulate some of his competition out of business. That's what goes on in the barbershops in the gold mining towns in Colorado 150 years ago, but that's also what goes on in big business in the United States of America today.

That's what is going on, Mr. Speaker. Big business says, Come and regulate me because it's a cost of doing business at big-business level, the multibillion dollar level. And by the way, those people that can only do business down in the few millions, they're not going to be able to compete.

So we should not accept big business as the purest form of free enterprise capitalism. We should look at big business as coming here to this Capitol, ask us to level the playing field, all the while they're looking to turn into a playing field that it's often difficult for a small business to climb into.

So, Mr. Speaker, that is the status of big business regulation versus small business regulation, and it sets the tone for I think what we're about to take up next. Although I recognize that in a moment we will be asked to yield for the esteemed chair of the Rules Committee as soon as she gets prepared. But in the meantime, I see that the gentleman from Texas is about to get prepared.

I would suggest that, Mr. Speaker, we need to take a look at this regulation that's coming in from the Senate and the regulation of the financial services industry and the credit industry in America. This idea that here in the United States of America we would establish government entities that would look in on every business in America, anybody that's got a credit transaction, whether it would be AIG doing business with a large investment bank or some smaller entity—Mr. Speaker, I will pick that up in a moment, but I would be so happy to yield so that the gentlelady who chairs the Rules Committee can conduct business.

---

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Ms. SLAUGHTER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 111-494) on the resolution (H. Res. 1392) waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules, and providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

WHAT HAVE THE DEMOCRATS DONE WHILE IN CHARGE?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, as I watch this regulation that's coming through in the financial services component of this, it's a regulation that sets up Tim Geithner, the Secretary of the Treasury, to decide which businesses are too big to be allowed to fail, which businesses would be deemed to fail, and all he needs is the agreement of the FDIC and the agreement of the Chairman of the Fed. Those things concern me a great deal. But this conversation could go almost in any direction, Mr. Speaker, because I am prepared to yield to my good friend, the gentleman and the judge from Texas, LOUIE GOHMERT.

Mr. GOHMERT. Well, I appreciate my friend for yielding, but I want to follow up on that very point.

We're told that there is going to be a financial "reform" bill that sounds more like a financial "deform" bill. All these reforms end up being deformities. But this in particular, financial reform? To get us out of the mess that had been building through the nineties and through this past decade, for the last 20 years?

And nonetheless, as I understand, in this bill we're going to take up, it still has the Systemic Risk Council that is going to pick the winners and losers in America. That is so grossly un-American; it has no place in our law coming out of this body. That's the kind of thing that the Revolution was started over, that some King was going to get to tell them who would be the business that would stand and who would fall, because the Americans here wanted to be able to let the market decide that.

Now, one thing we've seen, and it has been accentuated, is you do need a government that will ensure that people play fairly and play right. We saw that down on the coast as President Obama expressed that we have gotten a relationship too cozy between his administration and the Big Oil companies. Now we've heard people say on television that Republicans took contributions, Democrats take contributions; but it was the Department of the Interior in 1998 and 1999, some of the Clinton administration people, that pulled the language from the offshore leases that would allow the oil companies, ultimately, to make millions and millions and millions at the expense of the government and the taxpayer getting full value for the leases for those offshore oil and gas developments.

When we had the Inspector General in front of us in the Natural Resources hearing a couple years ago, I asked why he had not talked to the couple of people that the Inspector General said were apparently responsible for that language being pulled out of the leases that hurt the revenue of the government and helped the massive oil companies at the time. He said, Well,

they've left government service; we can't talk to them. Well, certainly you can at least try to talk to them, but the Inspector General indicated that they left government service.

□ 2120

Well, after I'd heard the President announce that we had to end this cozy relationship between people in his administration and the big oil company, I wondered: Whatever happened to those two people?

Well, it turns out one of the people with whom, apparently, the inspector general did not talk but felt probably had the best information on why that language was left out—when she was not working for the government, she went and worked for a company called British Petroleum. Perhaps my friend has heard of British Petroleum. In fact, after the inspector general said he couldn't talk to her about why that language was pulled—the language that helped the oil companies so much during 1998 and 1999—and why she would pull language that hurt our government, it turns out she has now returned to government service. In fact, she did last summer. This administration hired her to be the Deputy Assistant Secretary of MMS, the Minerals Management Service, which is the agency of this administration that is supposed to ensure that blowout preventers work properly.

Well, we've got people here in the House who had asked for the results of the tests that were done by MMS within 2 weeks of the blowout preventer's failing. Apparently, the information has come back from this administration's MMS: We are not providing that information to you, maybe to a Democratic chairman of the committee but not to you guys.

You would think that this would be public information, that MMS would want to be as transparent as they're demanding the CIA be, but apparently, they're not willing to be as transparent as they want the CIA to be. They're more in the nature of obscurity like the Federal Reserve continues to try to be and is. So they won't release the information of how badly bungled the tests were. You have to figure they didn't go well or they would have released that information to show that they were exonerated, that they did proper tests.

In fact, as a trial judge back in my days in the courtroom, oftentimes, one side would produce evidence to show that the fact that there is no evidence indicates a fact. I think here the fact that they won't produce those test results indicates that the MMS of this administration is too cozy with British Petroleum because of the interactive business that has gone on here. It must not have gone well.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOHMERT. Certainly, I'll yield to my friend.