President Obama could be a constructive part of trying to solve America's debt problem. But, he has chosen not to participate. Here is my theory as to why: In his first 2 years, the President showed his true colors – enormous increases in spending and deficits and government intrusion through the stimulus plan; ObamaCare as a move towards socialized medicine; and national energy taxes in furtherance of a radical environmental agenda, to just name a few of his way left-of-center initiatives. And, although he won't admit it publicly, I believe that he understands that the "shellacking" (his word not mine) that his party took in last November's elections was the result of the public's disapproval of his policies and his agenda. This is, after all, a center-right country. So now, as his re-election bid approaches, he needs voters to forget what he really believes and what he really wants to do. Since he can't bring himself, as President Clinton did, to adopt a centrist or center-right agenda, he has chosen to simply do and propose nothing of substance. His State of the Union speech laid out nothing new or specific. On Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, he basically said that there are a number of options and we should pick one of them. Wow. That's leadership. And then, on budget and deficit reduction, he says we must reform entitlements, but makes no proposals whatsoever on how. He creates a deficit commission to give him bipartisan guidance and then does nothing with any of it, refusing to adopt any of the commission’s suggestions.

This President is moving to the center in rhetoric, but on policy matters he is going back to his old days as an Illinois State Senator when he often voted "present". If he is re-elected, he will return to the radical, unpopular and, in my opinion, destructive agenda in which he genuinely believes. Don't be fooled.

Anecdotal Evidence: I hear a lot of stories from constituents and others about what is going on in "the real world" (not Washington DC). Last week, there were 3 that really got my attention. These 3 are evidence of how government action still continues to impede job creation and economic growth. It is further evidence that, as Ronald Reagan said, "…government is not the solution to the problem, government is the problem." I submit for your edification:

1. The owner of a California-based business was in Texas at a national convention for his industry. The good news was that a number of companies in the industry were doing somewhat better and looking to hire. But, many of these businesses reported difficulty in finding people to hire because so many people wanted only to work part time and be paid under the table so they could still collect their unemployment. These people were not interested in working full time as long as they could get unemployment because the after-tax additional return was not worth working for and giving up free time. This example was pervasive amongst businesses at the conference.

2. A CEO of a Southern California-based medical device company explained to me that venture capital and private equity capital are not very interested in his industry any longer. "Why not?" I inquired. He responded that the FDA and other regulatory approvals were so long, ponderous and difficult, and knowing what you would be paid because of ObamaCare was so uncertain, that they have moved to other industries. Several sources have told me that the "hot" industry is "green energy", like wind and solar. So, an industry with great fundamentals that makes products that are high-value and dramatically improve people's lives can't attract capital because of burdensome regulation. But, an industry with no fundamentals, which has no prospect of ever being substantial in the energy space and which has a higher cost than existing alternatives, is attracting capital because of government subsidy. This is not a recipe for economic growth.

3. A friend passed on an e-mail to me from someone they know with young kids in Madison, Wisconsin. The children, who attend public schools from which the teachers are striking, were told that they will get "extra credit" if they join the teachers in the protest. Now, I think that Governor Walker is right and the teacher's union is wrong. But, regardless of that, to use kids to advance your political agenda is reprehensible behavior.