Commonwealth: Hereby calling upon ministers and people of every denomination, to assemble on the said day—and in the name of the Great Mediator, devoutly and sincerely offer to Almighty God, the gratitude of our hearts, for all His goodness towards us; more especially in that He has been pleased to continue to us so a great a measure of health and prosperity, that we are enabled to yield her increase, so that we are supplied with the necessaries, and the comforts of life—to prosper our merchandise and fisheries—and above all, not only to continue to us the enjoyment of our civil rights and liberties; but the great and most important blessing, the Gospel of Jesus Christ: And together with our acknowledgments, I do earnestly recommend, that we may join the penitent confession of our sins, and implore the further continuance of the divine protection, and blessings of heaven upon this people; especially that He would be graciously pleased to direct, and prosper the administration of the Federal Government, and of this, and the other States in the Union—to afford Him further smiles on our agriculture and fisheries, commerce and manufactures—to prosper our university and all seminaries of learning—to bless the virtuously struggling for the rights of men—so that universal happiness may be all the people of the United States, and to afford His almighty protection to those who are established in the world; that all may bow to the Scepter of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the whole Earth be filled with His glory.

And do I also earnestly recommend to the good people of this Commonwealth, to abstain from all servile labor and recreation, inconsistent with the solemnity of the said day. Give thanks to the Lord for all the favors you have received from Him, and for all the provisions of His providence. The first President of the United States, Mr. Washington, made it a custom to trust all public business to the care of his Secretary, and to spend this day in prayer and thanksgiving. And in the name of Almighty God, I would recommend this practice to all who love their country and their religion.

This is from James Madison, the fourth President, 1815. Many credit James Madison as being the most productive person in the writing of our United States Constitution. The greatest building block for any Nation in the history of man.

This is James Madison’s proclamation:

No people ought to feel greater obligations to celebrate the goodness of the great Disposer of Events of the Destiny of Nations than the people of the United States. His providence originally conducted them to one of the best portions of the dwelling place allotted for the great family of the human race. He protected and cherished them under all the difficulties and trials to which they were exposed in their early days. Under His fostering care their habits, their sentiments, and their pursuits prepared them for a transition in due time to a state of independence and self-government.

Signed James Madison, fourth President, March 4, 1850, Thanksgiving Day proclamation.

And then in conclusion:

Know that the Lord Himself is God; It is He who has made us, and not we ourselves: We and our fathers have served the sheep of His pasture. Enter His gates with thanksgiving and His courts with praise. Give thanks to Him, bless His name. For the Lord is good; His lovingkindness is everlasting and His faithfulness to all generations.

Mr. Speaker, it is the wish here that you and all those in this body and around the country have a wonderful day of Thanksgiving in the week ahead. With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

THE FAIR TAX

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, this is my first time down here as a freshman during Special Orders, my first time trying to coordinate charts and talk the talk and walk the walk all at the same time.

But I’m excited about it because I’m down here to talk about the Fair Tax. And if folks don’t know what the Fair Tax is, it’s H.R. 25. You can find it at www.thomas.gov, that site that everybody should have bookmarked if you care about what goes on here on the House floor. Because if you don’t know, everything that goes on here is available in real-time at www.thomas.gov. It’s done in the Office of Congress. It’s not a Republican thing or a Democrat thing. It’s just the real deal, what’s actually happening down here.

And if you go and you look up H.R. 25, it’s the Fair Tax. What the Fair Tax is is a bill that repeals all income-based Federal taxes and replaces them with consumption-based taxes.

Now, my friend from Texas (Mr. Gohmert) was just down here on the House floor, Mr. Speaker. He was talking about our Founding Fathers and those things that were happening between 1776 and 1787. And in that time, we funded all the Federal Government with consumption taxes—it was not income taxes; it was consumption taxes—under the theory that if you had enough resources to go out and buy that silver tea set from England, then you had enough resources to help fund the Republic. And if you spent all your time working on your farm, and you just had enough money to buy thread at the local five-and-dime, then we weren’t going to tax you as heavily.
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If you look at this poster, Mr. Speaker, in 1913, right before the income tax began, we had 400 pages of Tax Code in America. Just the last century, in the 1900s, 400 pages of Tax Code and regulations. By World War II, that had grown to 8,000 pages, 20 times as much Tax Code by the end of World War II. By the time we were in Korea, 14,000 pages of code and regulation. By the 1970s, 19,000 pages of code and regulation. And in the 1980s, 26,300 pages of Tax Code.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I’m a reader. I love to sit down and educate myself through the written word; but I have to tell you, 26,000 pages of Tax Code and regulation is going to make a criminal. I can’t of all these pages, I can’t possibly understand all of the ramifications of the tax consequences of your decision.

Do you remember 1986? That was the last time we fundamentally overhauled the Tax Code. 1986. In fact, if you go to www.Thomas.gov, like I suggested, and you look at the laws and regulations, you’ll see the Tax Code of 1986. It was the Tax Code of 1954, updated Tax Code. That was the time when we flattened rates and broadened the basis. Flattened the rates and broadened the base. And where did we end up? Between 1984 when we had 26,000 pages of Tax Code and regulation, we went through this process of simplifying the income tax, and 10 years later in 1995, we have 40,000 pages of Tax Code. By simplifying the income tax, we grew it from 26,000 pages to 40,000 pages.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if you’re like me, you go out and you shop around. Are you going to use the H&R Block tax software? Are you going to use the Microsoft tax software? What kind of tax software are you going to use, because you hate paying accountants to do your taxes for your.

You know, I used to just sit down with a pen and paper and do it myself. I used to go through with my calculator and do it myself, but it has gotten too complicated. Why? Because since 1986, we have reached the age of majority in 1988, here we have 1995 when I’m coming out of college, between 1995 and 2004, we added another 20,000 pages to the Tax Code, from 40,000 pages to 60,000 pages. In 2007, to 67,000 pages; 2008 kept it to just a little over 67,000 pages. And in 2009, it jumped another 3,000 pages; 70,000 pages of tax legislation.

And to be clear, Mr. Speaker, when we talk about tax legislation, we’re talking about the ways in which the government separates you and me and all of the American people from our paycheck. That’s all there is in the Tax Code. All the Tax Code is, how do we separate the American people from their productivity? It takes 70,000 people in 2009 to do the same thing. And 71,000 pages in 2010. And now, 72,000 pages of Tax Code in 2011.

Folks, what the FAIR Tax does, H.R. 25, it asks the question that if we could start from scratch—and by scratch I mean from the 72,000 pages that we do today, to just a blank sheet of paper—if you could start from scratch and draft the Tax Code that America ought to have instead of the one that has been forced upon us, what would you do? What would you do?

Well, there’s a lot of difference of opinion on what to do, but simplification seems to be one of those things that we can all agree on.

You know, I didn’t come to this House to try to be a good Republican. I came to this House to try to be a good Republican, and there are lots of opportunities to do that. I like to think those things occur simultaneously more often than not. But look at what folks are saying about the United States Tax Code.

I’ll quote House minority leader NANCY PELOSI: Any tax reform and
closing of loopholes, which is really important for us to do as a sense of fairness, must also reduce the deficit.

Right, because if you close the loopholes, if you close all of the lobbyist-funded loopholes, close all of the special exemptions and exceptions and carveouts by definition it brings in more money.

Mr. Speaker, did you get the free golf cart in the 2009 tax bill? Does anyone want to admit to having gotten the free golf cart?

In 2009, in the name of a good energy bill, in the name of green energy, we in the wisdom here in the U.S. House and across the way in the United States Senate, of course I wasn’t here at that time, but in our wisdom we created a tax credit, a $6,500 tax credit if you would go out and buy an electric vehicle.

Well, Americans are smart, and I love that about America. We are ingenious folks. And what folks figured out was that their folks were giving it to them if they’d go out and buy an electric vehicle, if you put brake lights, seat belts and side view mirrors on your golf cart, you could get yourself a free golf cart.

Well, it turns out, because we produce golf carts in the great State of Georgia, you couldn’t actually get an American golf cart for $6,500. But our friends in China were willing to import a golf cart to America for $6,500, Mr. Speaker.

And so in the fall of 2009 and the spring of 2010, the IRS had to release guidance—hear this, Mr. Speaker—the IRS had to release guidance that said when we first crafted the free golf cart regulations, we said actually had to have delivery of the cart by December 31. But so many Americans are trying to avail themselves of the free golf cart provision that we’re going to change the rules here in late December and say if cart comes in—100 days, 90, 75, you need an ID number from the manufacturer, and that’ll give them several more months to fill all the orders.

Really, Mr. Speaker? Is that what we need in the Tax Code, a Tax Code that distributes free golf carts to folks who likely didn’t even want a golf cart but it was free, and so they availed themselves of it?

NANCY PELOSI agrees with me that we need to get rid of those loopholes.

House majority leader HARRY REID: Our tax system is broken and needs to be fixed.

Let’s take the poll, Mr. Speaker. Let’s go to the most liberal Democrat in the House, to the most conservative Republican in the House, who doesn’t agree with majority leader HARRY REID? Our tax system is broken and needs to be fixed.

And we have the ability to start with a blank sheet of paper and make it the way we want to make it. Listen to our President, Mr. Speaker.

This is President Barack Obama: You’ve got too many companies ending up making decisions based on what their tax director says instead of what their engineer designs or factories produce, and that puts our entire economy at a disadvantage.

That’s true. Talk to any small business owner, find anybody who’s at a CEO or CFO level in a business close to you, at your dealership. You are making business decisions, or are you making tax decisions?

And every single time they make a tax decision instead of a business decision, America loses. Their shareholders stand to lose in the short term. Profits may gain in the short term. But when we in America decide we’re going to do something to comply with these ridiculous 75,000 pages of Tax Code, instead of doing what’s best for business, instead of what’s best for customers, instead of what makes sense, America loses. And in these challenging economic times, we cannot lose that productivity.

Let me go back to President Barack Obama. He says this: We need to make America the best place on Earth to do business. The Tax Code is a barrier government can remove, a burdensome corporate Tax Code with one of the highest rates in the world.

Hear that. We talk so much about Republicans and Democrats. Here, common sense coming from the President of the United States: We need to make America the best place on Earth to do business. A barrier government can remove is a burdensome corporate Tax Code with one of the highest rates in the world.

Folks, that’s agreement. I will tell you, if I had to characterize him, Mr. Speaker, I would tell you that the President sits a little further to the left than I do. If I had to characterize my own voting record, I’d say I sit a little further to the right than most folks here in this House. But this is common ground that we can all agree on.

Let me just show you what that tax rate is.

I hope the colors are showing up, Mr. Speaker, for folks back in their offices watching on TV because the red line here is the U.S. corporate tax rate. The blue line is the OECD average excluding the U.S. Now the OECD is that group of developed nations around the world, those folks that we would say have free economies and growing economies.

This chart goes back to 1981. It goes back to the beginning of the Reagan era. You see America’s corporate tax rate higher than the average tax rate in the rest of the world. The other—that tax reform that I talked about in 1986 where you see the tax rate dramatically drop—dramatically drop—and for a short period of time, Mr. Speaker, we became, on the red line, more productive and more competitive with the rest of the world. The rest of the world was on the blue line.

And look at those years. Do you remember those years—1988, 1989, 1990?

Do you remember those productive years? I think that’s when the yuppy label came around and folks were buying all their fancy automobiles and the first of the big houses. I was just coming of age in that time, but I remember the conspicuous consumption. And you know what? American ingenuity, American wealth. And then what happened? Here’s the tax increase of the Clinton years, bumps right up there, and you see a flat line of American corporate taxation at about 39 percent, that flat line of corporate taxation. Fair enough, I prefer predictability. I think we ought to know the direction things are going, and I think we ought to be able to plan to make business decisions.

Here is a very predictable line of corporate taxation. But what’s the rest of the world doing? While America has a very predictable 39 percent tax rate, what’s the rest of the world doing? Getting lower and lower and lower. Lower and lower and lower. Folks, do you know who can’t leave America? The American worker. Folks in my district. They can’t leave. Capital can leave. A click of a mouse and you can take a billion dollars and move it overseas. If you have a business in America, you can pack up your bags and go. I talk to CEOs every day who do exactly that. They say, Rob, it’s just not worth it doing business in America.

Why? Because we’re not competitive. Do you want to talk about growing jobs? Mr. Speaker, let’s talk about keeping the jobs that we’ve already got.

I see in the Chamber my friend from Iowa, Mr. STEVE KING, who has struggled with these issues firsthand and who I know understands as a small businessman before he came to this House what it means to be out there trying to make payroll and trying to stay competitive.

And if the gentleman would indulge me, what do you think it would mean for jobs in America if we got this U.S. corporate tax rate line below that world average, if we, once again, made it competitive to build jobs in America?

Mr. KING of Iowa. If the gentleman would yield.

Mr. WOODALL. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. WOODALL. Why not take it to zero? Mr. KING of Iowa. Taking it to zero?

Mr. WOODALL. Why not take it to zero? Well, I’ll tell you what I might have said at home. I say to my friend. And what do you want to do? Do you want to give business a free pass? Because my understanding is there are only two places we can get taxes. We can either take them from me or we can take them from McDonald’s. And I’m pretty sure I’d rather tax McDonald’s than tax me.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Of course we know if the gentlemen would yield—
Mr. WOODALL. I'd be happy to yield. Mr. KING of Iowa. The folks that are buying food in McDonald's are going to pay the tax if we try to get it from McDonald's. So we know corporations don't pay taxes; they are aggregators of taxes paid by individuals, by consumers on the last stop. And so they're efficient aggregators of those taxes. They are actually the tax collectors on behalf of the Federal Government. The corporations that collect taxes don't pay them; they transparently charge them through these taxes, through the way they charge us for the $152 billion a year that it costs to comply with the Federal Tax Code.

And so I find it an act of frustration to see to try to collect taxes from corporations when what I'm really doing is adding to the administrative costs for corporations so they add the taxes and the administrative costs on to the cost of the goods that have to be competitive in this marketplace, and that makes the goods that are used by individuals pay taxes. But it also means that jobs go overseas because corporations that are taxed in America are at a disadvantage to the corporations that are overseas who aren't very good aggregators of America's dollar and so they have to raise the taxes here more.

That's kind of the vision that I see that I would lay out here for the gentleman from Georgia. And we've got a long ways to go before America embraces the concept that I think will solve this problem.

Mr. WOODALL. But you ask the all important question, I say to my friend. Why not take the rate to zero? Why are we arguing about whether it ought to be 25 or 28? I just quoted the President of the United States. He said, let's make America the most competitive place in the world to do business. Well, if we were to lower it to 10, maybe somebody else is going to lower it to 9. If we lowered it to 8, maybe somebody else lowers it to 7. What if we take it to zero? And I have voiced my concern that, well, if you take it to zero, that's $152 billion. And of course that .0765 that I have multiplied so many times with my employees that I've had over the decades. And I'm going to have those .0765 tax payments be 15 percent, that I think will solve this problem.

And I think, as you suggested the studies suggest, it's about 22 percent of the cost of everything we buy because if Derek didn't have to pay those $3, he'd be charging me $7 for a haircut, and he would still take $7 home to feed his kids.

To have an honest discussion about what kind of spending we ought to do in this place, I think we ought to bring all of those hidden taxes out of price. Not only does it make us more competitive, as you suggested, but it makes it possible for us as Americans to have an honest discussion about is government doing too little or is government doing too much.

And by the way, one more thing: I would not have picked up a nice Georgi--a Coca-Cola to use them as an example, but then that's just me.

Mr. WOODALL. As Coca-Cola is spread out all over the world, where they happen to have their corporate headquarters in Atlanta, but for how long? But for how long? We talk so much about trying to grow jobs in America. What about just trying to keep the jobs that we've got? What about just trying to make it a joy to do business in America instead of making it a joy to leave America?

You might not believe this, Mr. Speaker, but this is a $10 haircut I just got over the weekend. You probably think I paid a lot more than that for this haircut. But as you think about what the gentleman from Iowa said about where costs are hidden, where taxes are hidden, I paid $10 for this haircut. But Derek, my barber, he had to pay 15.3 percent in self-employment taxes, and $1.50 of the $7 he has to pay to the Federal Government in self-employment taxes. Now he's a good barber, so I suspect he is in higher than the 15 percent tax bracket, but let's just say for the sake of argument, he's in this 15 percent bracket. So out of my $10 haircut, he had to take $1.50 right off the bat and send it to the government in self-employment taxes, then take another $1.50 right off the bat and send it to the Federal Government in income taxes. So for the $10 haircut he charged me, he's only taking home $7 to feed his wife and kids. So is it a $10 hair cut, or is it a $7 haircut?

What we tell Americans is, oh, we're going to lower your taxes. And so we do. But what we've done is to hide that tax burden in the cost of everything we buy because if Derek didn't have to pay those $3, he'd be charging me $7 for a haircut, and he would still take $7 home to feed his kids.

Mr. KING of Iowa. If the gentleman would yield, I'd slip another anecdote into this that comes from just last weekend. I was over in eastern Iowa doing an event, and I happened to get reacquainted with a young gentleman by the name of Michael Dicks. Now, he is 13 years old; soon he'll be 14. But when he was 8 years old—I've told this story in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in the past—he saved up his money to go buy a little box of Skittles. So he had his change counted out just right in his pocket—89 cents for a box of Skittles—and had to reach up to the counter, I presume, and got his Skittles off the shelf and put them up on the counter. And he counted out his 89 cents and the checker rang it up and said, that will be 96 cents. And he said, but the price says 89 cents. And the checker said, but you have to pay the tax—that's the sales taxes in Iowa—so that's 96 cents, you're good.

And he turned to his dad and he said, Dad, I have to pay taxes on Skittles? What a painful experience for an 8-
year-old young man. But think of what that means if our taxes are transparent. That young man is going to grow up to be a conservative. He’s going to put fewer demands on government. He’s going to demand one thing—less taxes, less services. We’re going to have more people take personal and individual responsibility, and we’re going to let people provide for their own security in a lot of ways and achieve on their own. That is a cultural transformation that comes if you have tax reform and if you stop using the tax and stop punishing productivity and put it on consumption. 

Mr. WOODALL. Well, I would say to my friend, you talk about cultural transformation, I would tell you that transformation is actually taking us back to that entrepreneurial, self-reliant experience that America began as a Nation. This business of hiding taxes and trying to make people think they’re getting something for nothing, that’s a relatively new experience in American culture, and it has transformed this country.

I’m big on saying you’ve got to have skin in the game. To make good decisions you have to have skin in the game. That’s a relatively new experience in the American population isn’t paying any income taxes. They don’t think they have skin in the game. Now, they do because they’re paying tax in all of these hidden consumption opportunities that you and I are talking about, but they vote as if they’re getting something for free.

And as a Nation, if we’re going to make responsible decisions—particularly as it comes to borrowing from our children and our grandchildren—we have to let Americans know what they are really paying for the size and scope of government. And that’s not to say they can’t say, I understand how much I’m paying and I’m willing to pay even more, or I hate how much I’m paying and I’m going to pay less. But it will absolutely bring us away from a culture that believes there is a free lunch and back to a culture that understands that decisions have consequences and that there is no taxpayer in America except for we, the American consumers.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I’m happy to yield.

Mr. KING of Iowa. History is replete with the Founding Fathers, literary giants of the time, philosophers of the time, who looked at the Greek democracy and they were appalled at what it was as representatives of the citizens of the Republic are to have higher responsibility than to listen to, let’s say, people who want the fruits of someone else’s labor and don’t want to labor themselves.

And so we’re at this situation now where, in the early part of this country, there was a policy that you had to be a land-owning male of age and other qualifications in order to vote because they wanted the public policy to be established by people that had skin in the game. And today we saw a constitutional amendment requiring a balanced budget fail here on the floor of the House of Representatives. I’d like to have seen a stronger one, but it failed here on the floor of the House. And today we saw the constitutional amendment with a cap at 18 percent of GDP and a supermajority to raise taxes.

Put some of that philosophy back in where it requires a supermajority to raise taxes, there is a restraint there that says the philosophy that helps offset the disadvantage that the working American has today who’s paying those taxes. Your barber is at a disadvantage because some of the hair that he cuts is of people that don’t have a hair cut done out of every three heads of hair that your barber cuts is somebody that is in that role of 100 million Americans of working age who are not in the workforce, many of them are voting, they are voting themselves benefits from the public trough.

And I’d suggest that we take the tax off of productivity in America, stop punishing production, put it over on consumption. And I’m just looking around for a bill number that I could attach myself to because I’m drawing a blank.

Mr. WOODALL. I thank my friend.

You’re absolutely right. When I talk to young people—I try to get out to the middle schools and high schools in my district every week when we have time back home—I say, I’ve got a $10-an-hour job in my congressional office. Who wants to come to work for me? Who wants to come to work for me? And I just gave a powerful presentation about how you can come here and return America to its foundational roots. All the hands go up. And I say, now, just to be clear, though, we’re going to have to put a $9 income tax on that $10 an hour, so you’re only going to be able to take home $1 at the end of the day. Now, who wants to come work 80 hours a week for me? And all of the hands go down.

The power to tax is the power to destroy and weaves the citizens of the people here. With all due respect to our colleagues on both sides of the aisle, the Fair Tax that I supported—that you were such a strong supporter of—it has detractors on both sides of the aisle, because what the Fair Tax says is we’re not going to manipulate your behavior through the Tax Code anymore. Because the Tax Code allows us to say, if you buy wool sweaters, we’re going to give you a tax credit; if you buy polyester sweaters, we’re going to take taxes away from you. If you go out and buy Levi’s jeans, we’re going to give you a tax credit; if you go out and buy Lee jeans, we’re going to take taxes away from you.

And over and over we decide who’s supposed to win and who’s supposed to lose, and we punish or reward the American people and the American small business environment through the Tax Code. And what you and I have said in the Fair Tax is, I don’t want that power in Washington. I give that power back to the American people. You choose what kind of jeans you want to wear. You choose what kind of sweater you want to buy. You choose whether you want a golf cart or not.

We are not in the business of picking winners and losers. We’re in the business of raising as little revenue as is necessary to run the federal government. And that takes power away from this body right here. And it is only those folks who believe that the American people are still smarter than you and I who want to return that power. And I thank you for being my partner in that.

Mr. KING of Iowa. And I appreciate the opportunity to be your partner in this.

And I would say to the folks on either side of the argument that disagree, they’re both wrong, whether they’re from the left or from the right. And the bottom line is this; the Fair Tax does everything good that anybody’s tax proposal does that is good; it does them all and it does them all better. And I’m happy to talk about that debate anywhere in this land and have folks that will try that on and we’ll finish second in that debate.

Mr. WOODALL. I yield back because the gavel is in the air.

Mr. WOODALL. If the gavel is in the air, I’ll just say to the Speaker, if you needed more information, Mr. Speaker, you could find it at www.fairtax.org, or you could visit my Web page at Woodall.house.gov. This really does speak to the challenges of America.

I thank the Speaker for the time, and I thank my friend from Iowa.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker’s table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 99. An act to promote the production of molybdenum-99 in the United States for medical isotope production, and to condition and phase out the export of highly enriched uranium for the production of medical isotopes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce; in addition to the Committee on Science, Space and Technology.

The Budget for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in