REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS

Mr. ARCURI, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 111–35) on the resolution (H. Res. 229) waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

OUT-OF-CONTROL SPENDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Madam Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to be able to speak this afternoon to the American people about something that has been on all of their minds for the last 5 months, and that is spending, the out-of-control spending that they see occurring here in their Nation's Capital. And they are worried. They are worried, Madam Speaker, about what they are seeing.

And there is an old adage that we have heard as a precursor to a joke. Since we have been children, we have heard the adage that asks a simple question: What comes first, the chicken or the egg? And we ask that question in public policy: What comes first, spending or taxes? And clearly, spending is the precursor to taxes. And what we have seen the Obama administration and the Democrats who currently control both the House and the Senate embrace is a new initiative never seen before in the history of our country, a level of spending that is unprecedented.

Joining me now in this hour that we have to speak to the American people is one of our new freshmen. His name is Mr. JASON CHAFFETZ. And he hails from Utah's Third Congressional District. We are very excited to have him join us and to have him speak now to this body and to the American people on spending and what that means for our economy. Mr. CHAFFETZ, I yield.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. I thank the gentlewoman. It is a pleasure and honor to serve in the United States Congress. I'm a freshman here. I didn't create this problem, but I am here to help clean it up. I argued for a long time that the Republican spending was far too egregious, that we were spending far too much money and continued to propel ourselves into debt that was unsustainable and unacceptable in my opinion.

It is funny, though, that as I hear the Democrats argue that while there was all this out-of-control spending when the Republicans were in charge, that somehow that has changed, that somehow deficit spending has changed. It has not. It is partly what got us into this problem.

We, on an average day, have added $2.8 billion to our national debt since January of 2007. That doesn't count the stimulus. That doesn't count the bailout. That doesn't count any of these nearly $2 trillion, trillion, of additional spending that we have seen this Congress all too often just quickly go off and give away.

We cannot run this government on a credit card. Our families can't do that. My family can't do that. The American people can't do that. This Federal Government has got to stop doing that. We don't have a revenue problem in this country for our Federal Government. We do have a spending problem. We have a huge spending problem.

I remember when I was in college, not too long ago, but it was a while ago, and I had my monthly stipend for the month. And at about week 3, I ran out of money. And I thought I will just call mom and dad and they will just send me the money. So I called up and talked to my mom. And she said, no, I'm sorry, you're going to have to figure it out. And my dad, whom I really didn't want to call, said, you had your allowance, you have got to learn to live within it. It is one of the most valuable lessons that I ever learned. I learned more about Top Ramen noodles than anyone in this country in that week. And it was a good thing. It was a healthy thing. It made me reprioritize what was important. And it made me think through what was a priority in my life, that I couldn't just go on the credit card and continue to spend more money.

The primary reason I ran for the United States Congress is because I care about the future and because we are on a trajectory that is unsustainable. Until we return to those core principles of fiscal discipline, limited government, accountability and a strong national defense, we will continue to suffer as a Nation. And right at the top, right at the top of that list is fiscal discipline. Because there are things, there are roles and responsibilities that our government has to execute on. And we can all point to failures. We can all point to successes. But fundamentally, the spending in this Congress, the spending that is proposed by the Obama administration, is simply unacceptable.

We cannot be all things to all people. And my concern is that the rhetoric is not matching the reality. I sat right here at in this Chamber, row 7, thrilled and honored to watch the President of the United States address the joint session of Congress. He asked in that session that we present appropriation bills free of earmarks. And yet the very next day, it hadn't even been 24 hours, the House of Representatives passed a bill with more than 8,500 earmarks. I'm proud to say I voted ''no'' on that. There was a presentation that said that they wanted more openness, that we wanted more transparency, that we were going to get 5 days to review a bill online, that the American people would get to see what is in these bills, and that we as a body here in the House of Representatives would have 48 hours, 48 hours, to be able to see what is in a bill before we voted on it. It unanimously passed this body in a resolution. And yet just over 12 hours later, we got the single largest spending bill in the history of the United States. It was more than 1,000 pages. We had just over 12 hours.

That is not openness. That is not transparency. And the consequence is this out-of-control spending. It was $1 trillion, a number so big it is not even fathomable. And now we look and we hear people say, well, 95 percent of Americans are not going to pay one dime more in taxes. That is not true. It is not true. American people, I hope you digest this, it is not true.

The so-called carbon tax, or the cap-and-trade, is a tax that will be paid by 100 percent of Americans, 100 percent of Americans. If you consume or use any form of energy, you're going to have to pay this tax. Now, I want to take care of the environment. I care about the environment. But this is simply not the time and the way to do it. And if you look at this chart here, what is sickening to me and our future is what is going to happen with our debt. Based on the President's presentation, based on the spending plan that he has put together, based on the President's budget, we are going to double, double, our national debt to $20 trillion. Somebody has to pay that. It is the American people that are going to pay that, my kids and their grandkids. We have got to cut the size and scope of government. We cannot be all things to all people.

Somehow, some way, we have got to find a way to be disciplined enough to say, enough is enough. Let's prioritize those things that are most important that we have to do to protect and take care of the American people. But we cannot continue this out-of-control spending.

Just over 10 years ago, our Federal budget was $1.5 trillion. Now we are over $3 trillion on our way to $4 trillion. And that doesn't count the bailouts, the stimulus and the others who are already beating the drum saying, we need more. No, you don't. We need to cut spending and cut back the size and scope of government, because in my opinion this government right now is spending too much, the administration is taxing too much, and this administration is absolutely borrowing too much money.

□ 1530

Mrs. BACHMANN. I thank Representative CHAFFETZ from Utah's Third Congressional District, and what an honor to serve with you. What an honor to know that we have freshmen who have learned the true lessons of life, that you live on Ramon noodles rather than get money from mom and

dad. That's where it all comes from. Our country is well served from having his representation.

Spending is the issue that we need to address right now. It comes down to a philosophical claim and a philosophical shift. That may not seem like much, but we are here debating ideas on the floor of the House of Representatives. And there is a big idea that we are grappling with right now: where are the answers to the problems that lie before our Nation? Where are those answers? Who is the best person to solve those problems?

What we have seen in just the last 50 days is a decided shift, a transformational shift, a groundbreaking shift from the way America has previously done business, and it says this. It says that there is a real belief that the genius of America lies in government, and that it lies in Washington, D.C., and that it lies with the Federal Government making more and more decisions over the personal areas of our lives. And that the Federal Government is far wiser with our money than the individual is with their own money, or that a private business is with their money, or a local community is with their money.

These are troubling times to be sure, but is the answer to be found in a larger government that comes about through greater levels of spending? Well, that is not what a Harvard study found back in about 2002. Researchers from Harvard made an exhaustive study, one of the largest of its kind done over a series of years. This is what they studied. They studied over 18 different economies across the world. Of course not all of them are free market-based economies like America's economy. It was the whole gamut of economies across the world, and they asked a very simple question and one that would be prudent for us to look at now as we are engaging in this economic debate, and it is this: What are the courses of action that causes an economy to climb and to grow and to find prosperity? Just exactly what we are trying to find now here in the midst as we grapple with these very real problems. What is the way out? And conversely, what is not the way out? What causes economies to contract, to fail, to have hyperinflation ensue, to see a misery index go up? What is that policy? And this is the result. I think for the common sense quotient that makes up most Americans today, the answer is not real startling.

This Harvard study from 2002 that looked at 18 different economies said this: When nations have contracted their spending, when they have brought their spending under control and reduced their spending, when they have lowered the amount of spending that they pay for government wages so they aren't increasing government public wages, in fact they are lowering government wages, and when those same economies cut taxes for the people of the government, then you see the economies turnaround and you see the economies thrive and you see the economies grow.

The study also found just the converse. It found that where nations decided that the answer to the economic problem would be to grow spending, in fact dramatically increase spending, to increase wages for public employees in the government sector, where taxes would be increased on the people and burdens would be heaped up on both businesses and on private individuals, again the common sense quotient that makes up the great majority of American people won't be surprised by the results from this Harvard study.

These are the results: the results are when governments decide to dramatically increase spending, as the current Obama administration and the current Democrat-controlled Congress is about to engage in and in fact have engaged in, then government economies at that point fall into a spiral. It becomes negative, the revenue that comes in, and there is not growth out of the economy.

That only makes sense because where do governments have to go to finance what they have to do. There is one place that they have to go, and that is in my pocket and in the pocket of the American consumer and that is in the pocket of private industry.

Now there are some nations that don't allow for private industry. They have government-controlled economies. We have seen that in the living laboratory of the last 100 years of history across the world. We have seen the engine, the greatest engine of prosperity known to man through the annals of history which would be the United States free market capitalist-based system.

You look at the dramatic growth and increase of standard of living, opportunity and freedom, it has occurred on America's watch from 1900 to the year 2000. You saw dramatic growth and wealth creation like we have never seen before in the history of the world.

In fact, up until about 2006, we saw the greatest wealth enhancement in recent times. Under six of the eight years of President Bush, we saw some of the greatest increases in private wealth enhancement than we had ever seen in all of history. How did that happen? How did that occur? Well, it didn't occur because of dramatic increases in government spending. Where it occurred was the genius of private wealth creation. That is what America has given to our people. We have given the genius of freedom which in turn has given us the genius of prosperity and the genius of private wealth creation. It is what I wish for my parents. It is what I wish for my children. It is what I wish for my neighbors, that they would have private wealth sufficient to be able to satisfy not only themselves, but so that they can give out of their bounty to others. And that is what we have seen occur in this country, and the genius of wealth creation in private hands that has led to some of the greatest levels of compassion and of charitable giving that we have ever seen in the history of our country.

But what has been the response of the Obama administration? President Obama in his State of the Union address stood in this Chamber addressing this body as well as the United States Senate and the American public. And he said very simply and unashamedly, he planned to cut the deduction that Americans can take for charitable giving.

Now I don't know about you, but I think it is very good, Madam Speaker, to encourage Americans to give more money to the charity of their choice. Whether it is their local church, and local churches and religious groups were the groups which began America's hospital system. In every community across the United States, we boast wonderful hospitals—Presbyterian hospitals, Lutheran hospitals, Catholic hospitals, Baptist hospitals. Denominations saw to it that in their local communities, they weren't just meeting the needs of their parishioners only—only of Catholics, only of Presbyterians, only of Lutherans—they saw as Christ reached out to the infirm with his own hand, that they wanted to reach out in a charitable context and reach the needs of people beyond their own denominational doors, reach out to literally give a glass of cold water to those who were infirm, and meet the health care needs of those in their community.

I worry, Madam Speaker, I fear, Madam Speaker, that as President Obama is seeking to cap the gift giving that Americans will now be able to do to their local churches, to their local hospitals, to their local charitable institutions, that we will see these great givers of gifts, local charities, dry up. Why, because the Federal Government, the philosophical direction that President Obama has taken is that he believes the Federal Government can do a far better job spending your money than the American people can spending their own money. Madam Speaker, I beg to differ. No one spends their money better than the individual, and no one needs their money more right now than the individual. No single mother needs their money more right now than that single mother who may have three kids, who may have four kids.

I know personally in my own life when my mother found herself a single mother after a divorce that left her with four children, she had to take a low-paying job because she was determined that her children would be fed, sheltered and clothed. There wasn't much money available. We went immediately overnight from being middle class to being below poverty. But I had a mother who was determined that her children would have shelter. We didn't have a home any longer in the suburbs. That had to be sold. But we had an

apartment, we had somewhere to live, and my mother made sure that she worked. And I began at about age 12 getting baby-sitting jobs. My brothers got newspaper routes. We did what families are doing today. They are doing whatever it takes so they can survive so their children can have a meal tonight when they come home from school. They are doing whatever they can.

So, Madam Speaker, it strikes me as cruel that a philosophical decision has been made by the Obama administration and by the Democrat leadership that runs both the House and the Senate now in Washington, D.C., every lever of power today is controlled by the Democrat majority, and that decision has been made. Clearly it has been made affirmatively, and it has been made time and time again in the last 50 days of this administration. And it has been that we need to spend more money which in turn will mean the poor American people will have to be taxed almost into poverty to pay for this profligate spending.

Madam Speaker, I would ask: what is this emergency spending that the President believes must be done to save the economy? And I think, Madam Speaker, that it would sicken the American people if they knew what some of these spending projects are. Here are some among them. My colleague, Representative JASON CHAFFETZ of the Third Congressional District of Utah talked a little bit about the stimulus bill that is costing the American taxpayers well over a trillion dollars with debt service.

We received that bill and had only limited hours to be able to debate and vote on that bill. But the nasty little secret, Madam Speaker, that the American people are sadly learning is that not one Member of Congress was given an opportunity to read this bill before we were asked to vote on the highest spending bill that has ever come before this body. Ever in the history of man, no one has ever spent in one fell swoop a trillion dollars before in a spending measure. And the Members of this body, the people's representatives, weren't even given the courtesy of reading this bill which broke every promise that was made to the American people during the course of the last election.

On the campaign trail, we heard over and over again from then-Senator Obama that he wished to give the American people 5 days to read these bills online so the people's representatives would have time to read these bills before we vote on them. He wanted to ensure complete transparency, complete openness. We cheered President Obama when we heard that, and we are sadly disappointed that President Obama has chosen, together with the Democrat leadership that runs Congress, that they did not want, that they were so ashamed, could it be, of the stimulus bill, we don't know what their motives were, we don't know. But what would lead them to keep this bill in hiding?

As a matter of fact, there isn't one Republican word in the trillion-dollar spending bill, not one word of bipartisan support. There were some offers of bipartisanship that we heard in the press, but no real extending of the hand to the American people to have true bipartisan intervention in this bill.

As a matter of fact, President Obama came over to meet with the Republicans, and we were so delighted. When President Obama came over to the Capitol, the Republicans in the House came together. We welcomed President Obama. When he came in our closed-door meeting, we prayed for our President and we promised him that we will pray for him at every meeting and that we will also have an open door to him. We have an eternal olive branch held out to President Obama because we want to be able to work with him. However, what we saw was that olive branch was not extended to the House Republicans.

□ 1545

We were not invited to those negotiations. As a matter of fact, the ranking member, the House Republican, lead member on the House Ways and Means Committee—and that would be Ranking Member U.S. Representative DAVE CAMP from the great State of Michigan—he said he was walking to the rotunda, and never in his career here in Congress has this ever happened to him. He walked past Senator HARRY REID, who was at a microphone announcing that a deal had already been struck in negotiations on the stimulus bill. Where was Representative CAMP going? He was going to attend the conference committee that was supposed to come up with the agreement on the stimulus bill. Representative CAMP, the Republican, hadn't even yet made it into the conference committee meeting and Senator HARRY REID was already at the microphone announcing that an agreement had been made.

The Republicans had been had. But what was worse, Madam Speaker, the American people had been had because there was no bipartisan agreement. We questioned President Obama. One of our Members, Representative ROSCOE BARTLETT from the State of Maryland, said, Mr. President, I have lived through the Great Depression, I have seen it. What evidence do you have that this radical spending and radical government intervention into a troubled economy will be able to pull our economy out of these current doldrums? Because it's never occurred before in the history of America where radical spending has literally brought us back to American prosperity. Prosperity does not follow spending. Prosperity follows the belt tightening that government has to do so the American people have more of their own money to spend.

When our Member, Representative BARTLETT, asked this question of the President, here was the President's response; he said, I disagree with your premise. He said, I believe that the problem with President Roosevelt is that he failed to spend too much in the 1930s. I, for one, was incredulous, Madam Speaker, when I heard President Obama say that he believed that President Roosevelt failed to spend too much to bring the economy out of the doldrums. That was amazing. No President has ever intervened more, has ever spent more. In fact, many historians agree that what was a recession that President Roosevelt inherited turned into a Great Depression. And we don't want to see that happen again for the sake of our children, for the sake of the United States economy.

And then the question was asked about taxes to our President. He was asked about the massive tax increases that will surely result as night follows day from all these dramatic spending increases. And President Obama said simply this—he was attempting to be humorous, and he said, Well, I live down the street in a very nice house, Pennsylvania Avenue, 1600. I really like it there. And he said, I don't have a lot of expenses and I don't pay property taxes; I can afford to pay a little more. And again, I was incredulous by that statement. It almost reminded me of Marie Antoinette when she said, ''Let them eat cake,'' meaning that the rest of us aren't living in public housing, the rest of us are struggling with the day-to-day expenses that we deal with. We are all in need of as much money as we can keep in our own hands, not sending it on to the Federal Government.

We have joining us in the Chamber right now another representative from the great State of Missouri. His name is TODD AKIN. And TODD AKIN has long been a champion against dramatic increases in government spending. He has long called on this body to get its house in order. And I will now yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. AKIN. Well, thank you, gentlelady. It's a treat to be able to join you this afternoon on the topic that I think arrests the attention of Americans everywhere, the state of our economy, and what should and could the government be doing about it?

If we just back up a small amount and try to frame the question, we go back to a time, a number of years ago, when there were created these Freddie and Fannie quasi corporate entities. And what happened was, under President Clinton what happened was that they decided they were going to increase the number of loans that were going to be made to people who couldn't afford to pay their loans—which is a little bit of a risky thing. And so we created these entities and we issued a whole bunch of loans to people.

And while the real estate market was doing well, it looked okay on the surface. And then, as everybody knows, what happened was the real estate bubble popped, and now all of a sudden you

have this socialistic kind of policy that was implemented by the Democrats that was supposedly to help people with loans, and now the whole thing is collapsing and people say, well, this is a failure of free enterprise. It's not. It's a failure of another one of these government programs that's trying to take two plus two and get eight out of it. So that's essentially what happened.

If you want to take a look at the New York Times, you can look at September 11, 2003. And you can see what happened in 2003, and that was the President, President Bush at that time, was saying, hey, we've got problems with Freddie and Fannie, you've got to give me authority to regulate these guys. And a Member of the House here, Congressman FRANK, said there's no trouble with Freddie and Fannie. A couple of years later it turned out he was radically wrong, and now the whole world is in an economic tailspin because we had these loan programs. Well, that's where we are.

So the question then becomes, what should we do? Well, obviously we shouldn't keep making loans to people who can't afford to pay them. But the other thing that you know in a recession is this; you don't want the government spending too much money. Well, why would that be? Well, because there is an effect that goes on. When the government spends too much money, it's like a big vacuum, it sucks that liquidity out of the regular private sector. And the private sector are the very ones that have to fix the problem.

To get the economy going, you've got to get the private sector going. The government can do anything it wants, it can do handsprings and all this sort of stuff, but the government makes no wealth whatsoever, all it does is spend wealth. It can print money, it can tax people, it can spend money, but it doesn't create prosperity, it doesn't create efficiencies. It simply can hamper the process.

So what's going on here? You've got two basic theories about what you do in a recession. One of them was started by FDR. And he had a guy, this fellow here that I have a quote, his name was Morgenthau. Morgenthau was Secretary of Treasury under FDR—and this is the first theory of what to do. And Morgenthau's idea was, we're going to spend a whole lot of money to stimulate the economy, and that will make everything better—because we're starting to enter into a recession back in the 1930s. And so Morgenthau, along with this Little Lord Keynes—who was a little weird—came up with this idea that they were going to spend a whole lot of money. And so they did it. And here at 1939, after he's done this for 8 years, Morgenthau meets with the Ways and Means Committee, and he takes a look and says, we've tried spending money. We've spent more than we've ever spent before, and it doesn't work. I say after 8 years of the administration, we have just as much unemployment as when we started, and enormous debt to boot. So that's one theory. The theory is—and this is one that the liberals have always liked because they love to spend money—is if you spend enough money, you can get out of trouble.

It's a little bit like if I were to tell those of you here today, reach down, grab your shoe laces and lift hard and fly around the House Chamber. That's what this is like doing. And, you know, there isn't hardly an American family I can think of that's dumb enough to support this idea, and Morgenthau finally figured it out in 1939. There's not an American family that would say, when you're in economic trouble, go buy a brand new car, spend money like mad because maybe things will be better the next day. We just know intuitively, when you get in trouble, you've got to hunker down a little bit. That's what you do in Missouri, you've got to hunker down and use a little common sense. So this theory doesn't work.

Now, what's the other approach? What do you do when you have a recession? Can the government do anything? Well, it can. What it should be doing is not spending so much money, which is the topic of the congresswoman's discussion this afternoon. We're doing the wrong thing, we're spending too much money. The reason that that doesn't work is it pulls money out of the basic, particularly out of the places in the economy that need to have money in order to create jobs and productivity.

So, you see, jobs here, they had a big problem with unemployment. Eight years of government spending, they still had a big problem with unemployment. Now, what we've done is spent money like mad in the last couple of months, and people say, I'm not sure it's going to work. The stock market is saying, I don't think that's going to work. And history says, I don't think that's going to work. And the Japanese tried it and they say, that didn't work for us. You don't want to go spending a whole lot of money when you're in trouble.

What do you want to do? Well, here's what you want to do. You want to make sure particularly that the small business people have enough liquidity to get their companies going. And so what you want is policies that are going to keep money in small businesses so they will invest because 80 percent of the jobs are in small business. You've got unemployment? You want small businesses going like mad to create more jobs.

And so how do you do that? You let the small businessman keep money so that he can plow it back into the business, create the jobs that create the productivity. You need people who are entrepreneurs and who are inventors and investors. You want those people with the liquidity to be able to get the economy jump-started. And that means the government has got to stop spending money.

Well, what way are we spending money? Wow, we're really spending money. This last thing that they called the stimulus package—I call it the porkulous package—I'm on Armed Services, we deal with things like military things. And one of the biggest, most expensive things in our budget is called an aircraft carrier. We have ships surround them to protect them. We've got 11 of them. They're really expensive and they're really big, and we protect them because 11 of them are very valuable. And they cost about $3 billion apiece.

So what we passed in the House, do you know how many aircraft carriers you could buy for the money we borrowed that our kids and grandchildren have to pay back? You could make 250 aircraft carriers. Can you picture 250 aircraft carriers in a row? That's an incredible number. Or if you want to look at it a different way, you've heard us complain, you've heard the media complain about how big the spending was in the war in Iraq and Afghanistan. Add the spending in Iraq and Afghanistan together totally for both wars, add it up. Well, we spent more than that in the first 5 weeks we were here in Congress this year. That's a lot of spending.

And now here we've got, on top of that, here's the President's tax increases for 2010. And what exactly does this big tax policy do? One, this is cap and trade. What this is is global warming, which means your electricity and your power is going to be more expensive. Guess who uses that? Small businesses. This is going to be hammering not only to small people, not people making a lot of money, the little guys. You have to pay an electric bill? You're going to get hit with this tax. This bit about this is just for rich people is baloney. If you have an electric bill, you're going to pay this tax.

And this one over here is on small business. Both of these things affect small business. This is exactly the wrong thing to be doing. Tax increases is not what we should be doing. We should be going in the opposite; we should leave the money in the small businessman's pocket to create the jobs.

And the gentlelady, Congresswoman BACHMANN, I really appreciate you taking some time to talk about the economics because this is on the minds and hearts of Americans. I appreciate your sharing a little bit of your time on the floor with me.

I see you have some other distinguished colleagues here that are very qualified to talk on this subject, so I don't want to rattle on too long. But I thank you very much for giving me a few minutes.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Thank you for yielding back.

The gentleman from Missouri, TODD AKIN, is so well respected in Missouri for a reason; he's a great historian and a lover of history. And I had done some reading myself on depression-era economics because that's really, I think, a very important area for us to look at

right now when you look at the parallel and compare and contrast between the policies that are being implemented today and the parallel nature that they have with the 1930s. Eleanor Roosevelt said that there were only two people who could say anything to her husband and cross him; one of them was Henry Morgenthau. And Henry Morgenthau, the United States Treasurer, as Mr. AKIN had stated, was one of the people who came to the very clear conclusion that overspending had been a huge mistake. And that is the focus of this Special Order hour this evening is on spending. And we saw that, throughout the 1930s, a misery index unlike any other had been created because of rampant out-of-control spending. And Henry Morgenthau said—probably the person who could testify the best to that level of government intervention—it was wrong, it was a mistake, it didn't work. And the one thing we know about history is if we don't learn from it, we will live to repeat it.

And I believe, Representative AKIN, you can correct me, that it seems that you are saying clearly to the American people, let's not, President Obama and the Democrats who run the House and Senate here in Washington, repeat that same mistake.

I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. AKIN. I think you're absolutely right. And that is definitely my point. The point is is it was tried under FDR. You can at least say they were trying a new theory of how to get the economy going. And they tried it and it didn't work and he made it clear it didn't work. And now, apparently the Japanese didn't learn too much from our history, so they tried it for 10 years, did all kinds of government spending like mad, and they basically wasted 10 years of the productive use of their own economy because the Japanese knew it didn't work.

And the thing that's ironic is, not only do we know what doesn't work, we know what does work. JFK and Ronald Reagan, both of them did the right kind of tax cuts. The economy turned around. We had long periods of very productive, good economic times in America because they did the right thing. Why don't we use the good example? Well, I think part of the reason is is because we have a mindset now in Washington, DC. that big government is God and it knows better how to spend our money. And we just like spending a whole lot of money, but it's not what's going to make the economy better. And there are going to be more and more of your and my constituents who are going to be suffering because they don't have jobs, they've got mortgages that are too big, and they're really feeling the squeeze.

And it's a shame when you can't learn when history is staring you right in the face. But I really appreciate your putting the focus where it belongs in this excessive government spending. And you can take a look at billions and billions of dollars—and the numbers just seem so big, but when you put it in perspective, the whole war in Iraq, the whole war in Afghanistan, added together, spent by this House in the first 5 weeks of this year, that's a lot of money, that's an awful lot of money. But I do see we have some experts on the floor, and I thank the gentlelady for yielding me time.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I thank the gentleman from Missouri again, Mr. AKIN.

And this is a tremendous historic shift in philosophy that has occurred in the last 50 days. Again, the Obama administration, what's occurring—and this just came out in the Washington Times, ''The world loses over $50 trillion.'' The markets are responding, the markets aren't happy.

□ 1600

When they take a look at this massive government spending and, as Mr. AKIN had said, the new shift that says that government is God, what we are doing now is we are embarking on a new level of tyranny never seen before in the history of this country. And that's really the divide: liberty/tyranny. There is a constitutional scholar, Dr. Mark Levin, who's writing a book that's about to come out that talks about that chasm between liberty and tyranny. America was birthed out of liberty. We want to make sure that that continues.

And a cradle of liberty was the great State of Tennessee, and hailing from the Second Congressional District of Tennessee is Mr. JIMMY DUNCAN, one of the great gentlemen of this body, Mr. DUNCAN, with his words of wisdom on spending.

Mr. DUNCAN. I certainly want to first commend the gentlewoman from Minnesota. She has been a real leader in the Congress here in attempting to call attention to the great problems that we're going to face if we don't get our fiscal house in order.

And she just showed an article from the Washington Times. Just yesterday there was another article in the Washington Times that said the Polish currency had dropped 60 percent in value since last August and the Ukrainian currency had dropped in value 43 percent just since last September. And those are the kinds of things that we're going to face.

A few years ago, I was told that in Argentina, they got into such bad fiscal or financial shape that suddenly they had to start raising the prices in the grocery store every 4 hours. And the American people, I don't think, realize how tough and how difficult and how extreme our problems are going to become if we don't get our fiscal house in order.

It's mind-boggling, in fact, it's incomprehensible, that Congress voted a few months ago, and we voted against it, but they voted to raise our national debt to $11.315 trillion. And nobody can really comprehend a figure like that, but what it really means is that it's not going to be long at all before we're not going to be able to pay all of our Social Security and veterans' pensions and all of the things we've promised our own people with money that will buy anything, and people are going to face some really tough times if we're not careful.

Some of our leaders are looking dreamily back at the New Deal, and our colleague from Missouri just gave a quotation from one of President Franklin Roosevelt's Cabinet members. What we are doing now is, unbelievably to me, astoundingly to me, we're almost making Franklin Roosevelt look conservative by what we're doing. And I have talked about debt that we have. Under the administration's most optimistic predictions, we are going to add $4 trillion more to our debt over the next 3 years. I'm in my 21st year in the Congress. I never believed that we would be facing the kinds of deficits and debt that we're taking on and facing over these next 3 years. So I want to commend our colleague from Missouri, Congressman AKIN, for his remarks. I heard a lot of the things he had to say, and I know that Judge CARTER, our colleague from Texas, is going to speak shortly, and I'm going to just take just another minute or two. But I think this problem that's being discussed here is so very important, we can't emphasize it enough because it overrides and affects everything else that we are talking about here in the Congress.

David Walker, who's the former head of the GAO, has been going all over this country over the last few months trying to be a Paul Revere and sound the warning about what we're facing and what we're getting into, and he talks about the $11 trillion debt that we have, as mind-boggling as that is.

But what is even worse, in one of the Capitol Hill newspapers today, he has a column and he mentions, as he has mentioned before, that we have over $56 trillion of unfunded future pension liabilities. Under our law if a private company sets up a pension plan for its employees, it has to fund it, and its leaders can be put in jail if they don't fund those private pension plans. But our leaders, we've done this very thing over these last few years. It started with the Great Society because President Lyndon Johnson didn't think people would stand in the late 1960s for huge deficits at that time, but what we did back then was just nothing, was minuscule, compared to what we're doing today.

We talked about the New Deal. A few days ago in the Washington Times, 203 leading university economists signed a full-page ad, and they said this:

''We, the undersigned, do not believe that more government spending is a way to improve economic performance. More government spending by Hoover and Roosevelt did not pull the United States economy out of the Great Depression in the 1930s. More government spending did not solve Japan's 'lost

decade' in the 1990s. As such, it is a triumph of hope over experience to believe that more government spending will help the U.S. today.''

These economists, as I said, 203 leading university economists, continued and said this: ''To improve the economy, policymakers should focus on reforms that remove impediments to work, saving, investment, and production. Lower tax rates and a reduction in the burden of government are the best ways of using fiscal policy to boost growth.''

Unfortunately, we're going in the opposite direction now, and it is a very dangerous road. We're going down a socialist path, and socialism, my colleagues, has never worked anyplace in this world. If it had, the Soviet Union and Cuba would have been heavens on Earth. Instead, every place where we have let the government get too big and get out of control from a financial standpoint, we have ended up with a few elitists at the top, almost no middle class, and a huge starvation or underclass. That's the only thing government is good at is wiping out the middle class.

And what we have got to make more people realize is this: There's waste in the private sector, I recognize, just like there's waste in government. But the waste in the private sector pales in comparison to the waste that is in government. So every dollar that we can keep in the private sector does more to hold down prices and create jobs than does any money that's turned over to government, and that's been proven all over the country. And the best way we can help the poor and the lower income and the working people of this country is by keeping more of our money in the private sector where it will be spent much more economically and efficiently than it will be if we turn it over to the government.

I know there are others that want to speak, and I have taken up more time than I should have, but I once again want to thank the gentlewoman from Minnesota for taking out this Special Order and for all the good work that she does in this Congress.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I appreciate the gentleman from Tennessee's Second Congressional District, Mr. JIMMY DUNCAN. He's a tremendous gentleman of the South but also a tremendous fighter for the people, the common man, who understand how they have to run their own family budget. And they look at this Congress and they look at this current Obama administration, and they are shaking their heads. In coffee shops and barber shops and beauty parlors all across the United States, Americans are disgusted because they know in their own life, they can't begin to spend that kind of money and think that their family can possibly remain afloat. And they know that they are going to suffer, that their local neighbor is going to suffer, that small businessmen are going to suffer, and suffer they will.

But that does not have to be our story in the United States. It can be completely different. The House Republicans have a very positive solution to all of this, and we can come out of these economic doldrums very quickly, and the solution is this: If we would zero out capital gains, the taxes that you have to pay when you invest your money, if we would zero that out for 4 years, people would invest in this economy. And if we would take the business tax, it's the small businesses, after all, that create 70 percent of all jobs in the United States. If we would take away their crushing burden and, instead of the second highest tax rate in the world, give them about one of the lowest rates in the world, 9 percent, make that a permanent tax.

Right now all across the world, nations are scared to death financially. They want to go somewhere where they can invest their money. Imagine if we would make the United States the premier place in the world to invest for business creation and advancement. We would bring jobs into the United States, high-paying jobs. Zero out the capital gains tax, 9 percent corporate tax, and then lower everyone's income tax by 5 percent. And the death tax, the most immoral tax there ever could possibly be, that Uncle Sam would reach into your coffin at the time of your death and say now you pay taxes once again. Get rid of that tax. Get rid of the alternative minimum tax. Our problem would then be finding enough workers to fill all the jobs.

Someone who understands this very well is a southerner named Judge John Carter from middle central Texas, representing Texas's 31st Congressional District. He has been a champion. He understands the devastation of overspending, and he's here to bring that, Mr. Speaker, to our body.

Mr. CARTER. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. She has done a wonderful job in expressing, I think, the mood of the country and the mood of the people in the country.

This weekend I had a great weekend. I opened up a park in one part of my district, then moved to another part of my district and opened another park. And then I went to something called a Daffodil Festival, which is put on by the elderly in our area to raise funds for their center. And there was a huge crowd there, and I just wandered around talking to people. I wasn't there to make a speech or do anything like that, just to talk. And it was amazing how much people wanted to talk about what's going on in Washington.

Maybe my part of the world is different from everybody's part of the world, but everybody that I talked to said we are scared to death about what we're spending our money on and how much of our money we're spending.

When you start tossing around trillions of dollars, those are numbers that the American people, it's so big, they don't conceive what it means. But when somebody gives them an example like it's a stack of $1,000 bills 63 miles high or if you started giving $1 million away on the day Jesus was born, you still wouldn't have given away $1 trillion today. Those kinds of numbers make people say, wow, that's a lot of money.

The average person, they know what they've got in their pocket. They know what the government takes out of their check every month. At least most of them do. And they know what they care about. They want to live a life where they can live the comfortable life of being a free American, the life of liberty that we created when we founded this country. And they see this spending to be enslaving not only this generation but generations and generations to come. And especially, especially, this is such a risk because we have the experience of the New Deal, which, according to the Secretary of Treasury Morgenthau, after 10 years, 9 years of trying, didn't work. He was the guy in charge of the program, and he said the spending didn't work.

Now, today there was a fact that came out and it was given to me as the truth. I don't know what the source was, but I think it is the truth, that we have now seen the most rapid fall in the stock market in American modern history, that history going back to 1900. Now, that means during the Great Depression the stock market didn't fall at the rate it has fallen now.

Now, I'm not telling people that to scare everybody because everybody is already scared. The truth is it's time for us to step up and say what would you do in your house if the ski was falling, as it seems to be falling in Washington, D.C. today? Most everybody would say, man, you know what we're doing? I'll tell you what we're doing. We're making sure we hold on to our jobs. We're making sure that we are going to have the resources to feed, clothe, and shelter our family first and foremost. We're going to take care of the basics, and we are not going to waste a dime in our budget.

I know waste is in the eye of the beholder, and, of course, I probably don't agree with many of the programs that the President has put into the budget and the stimulus package because we have a different view of government and of society. But I can tell you that there was so much put into the package that didn't even have a target to stimulate but rather was to promote an agenda which was a part of political promises that were made on the campaign trail. And when you're talking about three-quarters of $1 trillion, almost, then you're talking about an awful lot of money being spent on promise and not on production.

□ 1615

What our job is here in Washington is to produce jobs for the American people.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I just wanted to give one illustration of this, and it

caused me to think of this when you were speaking, if you take a look at just the money that's been spent in the last 50 days, just in the past 50 days, let alone the debt that the Comptroller General David Walker said the American people owe, which is $53 trillion in unfunded Federal debt liabilities, just in the last 50 days, the Obama administration and the Democrats that control the House and the Senate have spent and committed and put a burden on the back of every American household, $18,500, $18,500.

So not only do the American people have to figure out how to pay their water bill and their electric bill, they have got to figure out how to come up with $18,500 just to come up with the spending of the last 50 days.

Mr. CARTER. And that spending was new spending.

Mrs. BACHMANN. That's correct.

Mr. CARTER. That was new spending. You see, we are creating new spending. Well, just for example, we are expanding welfare spending by $2.9 billion.

We were proud, and the Democrats and the Republican puffed our chests out when we said we fixed welfare in the 1990s. We did, but we turned it right back around in 2009 and put it right back where it was when we fixed it.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I think the American people would be shocked to learn, because the welfare reform that passed in the 1990s was with a Republican House and a Democrat President, President Clinton, has been dramatically effective to reduce even illegitimate rates and reduce welfare rolls and reduce costs to taxpayers all across the country.

I think the American people would be shocked to learn that all of those positive reforms have been repealed in one fell swoop. In the stimulus package the Obama administration rolled back the positive reforms that Republicans, working hand-in-hand in a bipartisan way, were able to bring about for the American people.

Mr. CARTER. Here we have got some other things that are curious, Barney Frank's Affordable Housing Trust Fund of $1 billion. Here is one, this is something that concerns me.

And I am going to state this on the record so it's very, very clear, that I did not vote for the stimulus bill, and I will tell you why I didn't vote for the stimulus bill. I spent almost the whole night before that vote talking with the former chairman of the FDIC, and the question that he couldn't answer, the question I couldn't get anybody in this House to answer, including my President, the President from my party and the Treasury Secretary from my party, the answers I wanted were what exactly are you going to do with this money?

And they said buy bad assets and other things. It was the ''and other things'' that I didn't like. It was the ''and other things'' that said who in their right mind gives a blank check to anybody? I don't care who they are.

Mrs. BACHMANN. That's a tremendously powerful point that you are making, tremendously powerful. You cannot spend trillions of dollars and not see massive waste, fraud and abuse. In fact, it's so bad that a lawsuit was filed by Bloomberg Media to the Federal Reserve saying we would like the American people to see the data.

Who is getting these loans out of this $350 billion, now $700 billion, that have been spent on these bailouts? Every day the Federal Reserve is spending money in bailouts, but no one knows. No one knows, no one knows who is getting these loans, what is it for?

The American people deserve answers. The American people aren't getting them, and that's the kind of immorality that occurs when we have dramatic spending like we have never heard before. This is real people, real people are paying out this money. This is no joke. These are people that literally will become slaves to the government in order to pay their taxes in future years, and this is a crime for the next generation.

Mr. CARTER. I bring this up because I want to point out that one of the things we are about to do in the omnibus is health care reform fund, $634 billion. Now, what does that mean, health care reform fund?

Well, we don't know what it means. Just yesterday the President was asked, are you a socialist, and he said, in several different answers, no, he was not. And yet you hear people say it's for some form of single-pay socialized medicine, but you don't get any commitment that's what it for. In fact, it just says ''fund.''

Mrs. BACHMANN. I wonder if this bill will come to us the same way that stimulus bill came after midnight, and then we are expected to take up the debate at 9:00 in the morning. In fact, experts said we had 23 seconds per page to read that bill.

It was a slap in the face to the American people to spend that kind of money in stimulus, and now you are talking socialized medicine. This is nationalizing. This administration loves to nationalize every aspect of every American industry that there is. The health care industry, which could be 18 percent of our economy, in one fell swoop, could be nationalized.

Mr. CARTER. Even more important, the Constitution of the United States says the Congress initiates spending, not the executive, the Congress.

I have absolutely nothing against the President, this is not any criticism, any man sitting in that office, not just Barack Obama, but any person, male or female, and if you give them a blank check and they don't tell you what they are going to use it for—$634 billion, then Congress is not doing its duty.

Mrs. BACHMANN. It doesn't matter which person is in that office, which party.

EXCESSIVE GOVERNMENT SPENDING AND WASTE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LUJÁN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. CARTER. Well, it's hard to change from one bicycle ride to another one, but we will give it a shot anyway and finish up what we were talking about on that spending.

I just want to tell a story to you about a little old, a real good little school that's in my district, Tarleton State University, who took on a project which was started by Congressman Stenholm and then later supported by me to do a little data mining on crop insurance. This is a relatively small but important program used in the farm community, crop insurance.

And they wanted to see if they could find, by doing data mining, waste, fraud and abuse. And, in reality, they found and actually, I guess, went forward on, prosecuted, $500 million, a half a billion, $500 million of waste, fraud and abuse in the crop insurance program. This is a little small but good university in central Texas.

They also, by going actually going after these people, turned around, they estimated, another $1 billion worth of crop insurance fraud that was out there. Now, if Tarleton State University, this fine little school in my district, can go out and do a data mining project on a small program and find that kind of waste, fraud and abuse, what could we find in a put together rapidly massive spending program like we have been describing in the previous hour?

I think that's what the American people want this government to do. They want to find out where we are cheating and wasting the government and getting rid of it, and they want us to put together a tax structure that encourages businesses to hire people. I had a conversation, and this will be the last thing I will say on this, I had a conversation with a family, a Hispanic family, four or five, I forget, at that fiesta I was telling you I went to.

They were talking about one of them lost his job, the other two had gone on reduced hours, and you know what their comment was? They made a joke about I haven't received my check yet, about the famous percentage check they thought they were go going to get.

And then they laughingly said and got serious, they said, we don't want a check, we want a job. And we want something to turn around to where people want to keep their jobs open. Let us work a full, 40-hour week. We want to work. We are not looking for a handout.

I really think that's the American people and that's what they stand for, and I think that is our challenge that we go forward on that. But today there are some other issues that I think there are issues that go hand-in-hand