ensure American cancer patients received greater access to lifesaving clinical trials. Shortly thereafter, pancreatic cancer claimed his life.

Pancreatic cancer is the fourth deadliest cancer in the U.S. and the only one of the four that does not have a known cure. In fact, in the last 5 years, 92 percent of those that have been diagnosed with pancreatic cancer died during the first year of their diagnosis.

Sadly, pancreatic cancer is one of the few cancers for which the survival rate has not substantially improved over the last 25 years. It is time that we eradicate the scourge of cancer once and for all. We must again focus American ingenuity, dedication, and resources in the fight against cancer, particularly pancreatic and lung cancers that have lagged behind in diagnosis and survivability. It is vital that Congress champion early detection and research during the 114th Congress.

CONSIDERING THE NEEDS OF ALL AMERICANS

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I proudly, over the last 2 days, voted for a temporary extension of the small business tax exemption and the food inventory charitable exemption because I realize that America has many needs that have to be addressed, food stamps that have been denied to many people with a $40 billion cut in the last Congress by my friends on the other side of the aisle. I realize that if we continue in the mode of a permanent tax exemption, where will the funding come from? Social Security? Medicare? Medicaid?—a variety of needs that our community has.

So today I want to make sure that the $1.5 trillion debt that we have, that is now $440 billion, that we continue to be responsible and be concerned about our children's education and about health care and about many other things. So today we must stand, considering all the needs of Americans.

Finally, let me say that I represent an area that is trying to protect Freedmen's Town bricks laid or bought for by freed slaves. I believe we should come together in the city of Houston with our Freedmen's Town coalition and those citizens in that area and let's resolve this. Let's do trenching, preserve the bricks, and provide a quality infrastructure program that I have helped fund by Federal dollars.

IN REMEMBRANCE OF FITZHUGH FULTON

(Mr. KNIGHT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KNIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the loss of a true American hero. Colonel Fitz Fulton lost his life on February 4 of this year, and we lost the true ''Dean of Flight Test.''

The aerospace community mourns his passing. He had 23 years of service in the Air Force as a colonel and 20 years with NASA. Colonel Fulton was responsible for flying the YF–12 or, as some people would know, the SR–71, the XB–70, the B–52, and many other aircraft in his 16,000 hours in the air.

Where I got my connection to Colonel Fulton was he was the B–52 pilot for dropping my father in the X–15 in the middle 1960s during the record flights.

I will always remember Colonel Fulton as honorable and one of those people that you just looked at those steely eyes and you knew that he had a true sense of commitment to this country and what we believe in, and this country will mourn his passing.

HONORING THE LIFE OF HENRY LOVELACE

(Mr. DESAULNIER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Henry Lovelace. Henry was born November 22, 1931, in South Boston, Virginia, and passed away on January 28 of 2015.

Henry was a vibrant, pleasant, peaceful person who always kept a positive attitude. He began to work at the early age of 16 as a schoolbus driver. Henry joined the United States Army in 1950 and was promoted to the rank of sergeant. He was stationed at Fort Sill Army Base in Oklahoma where he worked as a mechanic. After his military service, he worked as a public transit bus driver and maintenance worker at a local church in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

In 2003, Henry moved to California to be closer to his family. He was a beloved father of two children, grandfather of six, great-grandfather of eight, and father-in-law to Pete Longmire, mayor of the city of Pittsburg, California, in my district. He was an avid storyteller, shared stories about his military life, all of his life experiences, and his many travels. He enjoyed meeting new people, going to church every week, riding the public bus, playing checkers at senior centers, and wearing his crisp white dress shirts, ties, and dress hats.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the remarkable life of Henry Lovelace. I send my deepest condolences to Henry's family, friends, and loved ones.

ANGELMAN SYNDROME

(Mr. ROKITA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to raise awareness for Angelman syndrome, an extremely rare neurogenetic disorder. This Sunday, February 15, is recognized as International Angelman Day.

Originally described by a pediatrician in 1965, Angelman now affects roughly one out of every 15,000 children or young adults. They are also known as Angels.

My son, Teddy, is one of those Angels. There are hundreds more just like him. My wife and I are extremely blessed by Teddy's presence in our lives, and we are thankful for the joy he brings.

In recognition of International Angelman Day, I encourage you to join me to increase awareness for Angelman syndrome this Sunday. You can participate by using the #angelmanday on Twitter and Facebook or by visiting www.angelman.org.

Together, Mr. Speaker, we can increase awareness and support of Angels everywhere.

THE KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the time.

I would like to begin by yielding to my friend from the Georgia delegation, Mr. LOUDERMILK.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO TIMOTHY F. JOHNSON

Mr. LOUDERMILK. I thank the gentleman for the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart to pay tribute to a constituent, a friend, and a brother in Christ, Timothy F. Johnson, who, on January 30, left this life to spend eternity with our Savior. However, I stand before you today not to mourn the passing of a friend, but to honor a legacy, a legacy of a statesman, a soldier, and an American patriot.

Born and raised in Cleveland, Ohio, Tim's compassion towards others was evident through the earliest part of his childhood. Joining the Boy Scouts, Tim was able to develop his natural leadership ability, which advanced him to the rank of Eagle Scout by the age of 14. After completing college, Tim's passion for service led him to join the U.S. Army, where he rose to the rank of major.

After a distinguished 21-year career as an officer, Tim retired from active military service, but not from community service. Tim was always committed to excellence. He believed that although we may do good, we can always do better. Not only did Tim dedicate his life to the service, he also inspired others to do the same.

As a Black American who completely understood the vision of our Founding Fathers that all men are created equal, Tim wanted to help other conservative Black Americans to pursue elected service. Believing that actions speak louder than words, Tim cofounded the Frederick Douglass Foundation, which today is the largest Christ-centered, multiethnic Republican ministry in America.

Tim also felt great compassion for his fellow veterans, especially those returning from combat in Iraq and Afghanistan. To better help them transition back to civilian life, Tim accepted an appointment as the chairman of the Georgia Jail Diversion and Trauma Recovery for Veterans advisory council.

□ 1145

Tim never stopped serving others and remained active in minority engagement, veterans assistance, and community service until his passing.

My friend, colleague, and constituent, Major Timothy F. Johnson lived a life that epitomizes the traditional American values of faith, family, and freedom. I knew him as a man of strong faith who loved God, his family, and his country. While he will be missed by many of those whose lives were touched by his service, we are comforted to know that what is our loss is Heaven's gain.

Godspeed, Major Tim Johnson. Your legacy lives on.

Mr. WOODALL. I thank my friend from Georgia.

This is a country that is about individuals. It is about individual leadership, and it is about individual opportunity. The story you tell of Tim and the impact that he had on people's lives is going to be known long, long after he has gone to be with our Lord.

I want to talk about opportunity at a much smaller level than what my friend from Georgia was talking about, Mr. Speaker. I want to talk about it in the context of the Keystone pipeline that we passed this week.

At the end of the day, America is about opportunity. And if opportunity doesn't live here anymore, I am not sure what the point of America is. If freedom doesn't live here anymore, I am not sure what the point of America is. If families can't raise their children and believe that their children, if they play by the rules, if they work hard, can create a better life for themselves than their parents had, if you don't believe that anymore, the promise that is the American Dream is lost. And I think with one minor Federal regulation at a time, followed by a couple of major Federal regulations, followed by more minor regulations, we are eroding the ability of our young people to succeed and for their families to succeed.

The Keystone pipeline we voted on this week, Mr. Speaker, it is about employment opportunities. It is a job-creating program. We have dozens upon dozens of pipelines across this country. Why in the world the President has chosen the Keystone pipeline to use as a political football is a mystery to me.

Building pipelines is honorable work. It is hard work. It is often dangerous work. But it is important work that goes to the price of energy in every single one of our homes back home.

Having passed it in the Senate, having passed it in the House, it now goes to the President's desk. He could create jobs tomorrow.

It is about energy security, Mr. Speaker. It is energy from our friends in Canada, one of our most loyal partners across the globe. We need North American energy security. I don't want to rely on folks across the oceans who oftentimes wish us harm. I want to use those resources here.

Creating this partnership with Canada gives us that energy security. It is enhanced safety, Mr. Speaker. You don't think about it. But if we are not moving oil through a pipeline, we are moving it on trains, we are moving it in trucks. Trains and trucks and their safety record, Mr. Speaker, are much less reliable than pipelines, not just in terms of spills but in terms of lives.

I heard the gentleman from North Dakota down here earlier this week, Mr. Speaker. Of course those trucks and trains are moving through his district. He said if we put in the pipeline instead of using those trucks, lives would be saved. Traffic accidents would be avoided. Lives would be saved, not just oil spills but real human consequences.

We talk about environmental protection, Mr. Speaker. This is going to be the most advanced pipeline ever constructed in the United States of America. Now that is just the environmental protection of the pipeline.

We go on to talk about, where would that oil be refined if we don't do it here under U.S. safety and environmental standards? Well, the answer is we are going to ship that overseas. It is going to get shipped to China. It is going to get processed in a much less environmentally friendly way. We have an opportunity to take that step.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, we are talking about an exchange with our friends in Canada. Can you imagine if we had a product we were trying to get to market, and the only way to get it there or the simplest way to get it there was to move it through Canada, and the Canadians said: No, I don't care about your economy, America; I don't care about jobs in America; I don't care about your resources; the answer is, no, we won't partner with you.

If you read the comments coming out of the government in Canada, they are just flabbergasted that all they are asking is for this minor connection into the U.S. pipeline system, and the country they thought was their great friend—America—has been so resistant. For 7 years, we have been waiting on this solution, Mr. Speaker, and finally it has passed in this Congress this week.

I want to talk about what is happening in this Congress because when you slow down things like the pipeline, Mr. Speaker, you are slowing down America. You are slowing down economic growth. You are slowing down job creation.

I have here from Atlanta's own CNN a headline titled: ''Harry Reid: Dems won't engage in 'obstruction.' '' This is from November 12, 2014.

He is making the point as the former—at that time, he was the majority leader in the Senate. He is now the former majority leader in the Senate. He is making the point that America is not helped when the Senate engages in obstructionism. He says this: ''I am ready to work with'' MITCH MCCONNELL—now the Senate majority leader—''in good faith to make this institution function for the American people.'' In good faith to make this institution function. He says: ''I saw firsthand how a strategy of obstruction was debilitating to our system. I have no desire to engage in that manner.''

I am grateful to HARRY REID for that wisdom. I think he is absolutely right about that. There is a right way and a wrong way to run this institution. He has observed the wrong way to do it. Unfortunately, that was back in November.

Fast forward to this month, Mr. Speaker. Look at the headlines from across the country. Washington Post: ''Senate Democrats should be careful about their filibuster strategy.'' As you know, the filibuster is the definition of obstruction. It is in full force in the Senate as we sit here today.

February 4, from The Atlantic: ''The new Democratic obstructionists.'' That is the headline of the article, Mr. Speaker. It was just 3 months ago when Majority Leader HARRY REID said: This is not the right path for America; this is bad for America. And he was right when he said it. It has taken 3 months for him to change his mind and go in the other direction.

Politico: ''Democrats learn to love the filibuster; party leaders change tune now that they are in minority.'' Change tune now that they are in the minority.

Mr. Speaker, America's needs are no less great today. Job creation is no less important today. The American economy is no less fragile today. But the Senate Democratic leaders have changed their tune.

Finally, back to CNN: ''Democrats block funding for DHS to protect Obama immigration orders.'' What that means, Mr. Speaker, is they have blocked debating the bill to fund DHS, that they are so intent on protecting the President and what he alone has done from the White House, they refuse to even allow the Senate to debate the merits of those issues.

If this institution is not about debate, Mr. Speaker, I don't know what it is about.

I begin with that to get us into the economy, Mr. Speaker. And I have to tell you, I have the vice chairman of the House Budget Committee down here today, the gentleman from Indiana, TODD ROKITA.

The Budget Committee right now is involved in the gargantuan task of trying to balance the Federal budget and present that budget to this House before April. But their task is complicated, Mr. Speaker. You can't see the chart that I have, but their task is complicated because economic growth

in America is slowing. The obstructionism in the Senate, the obstructionism from the White House can't build simple things like the Keystone pipeline.

Do you know, Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest public works projects in the history of our Nation, the Hoover Dam? The Hoover Dam was built in less time than it has taken the White House to consider the application for this short pipeline connecting America and Canada. We built the Hoover Dam more quickly than we can sign off on the paperwork for a pipeline.

Let me show you what the impact of that is. Economic growth—in 2013, Mr. Speaker, CBO projected that GDP would be growing about 3 percent a year, 2.9 to be precise. By last year, in February, when they gave us their projections, they lowered it to 2.5 percent. Today, January 2015, they have lowered it to 2.3 percent.

Mr. Speaker, that is not just 2.9 to 2.3 percent. That is trillions of dollars in economic activity. It looks small on this page, but it is giant on the Federal budget, and it is even bigger when you talk about the job creation that hasn't occurred. It is even bigger when you talk about Americans who are trapped in part-time work. It is even bigger when you talk about young people graduating from college who cannot find a job. That is the impact of obstructionism. That is the impact of inaction. That is the impact of having a former majority leader, now minority leader, in the Senate who, as the newspaper headlines say, has changed his tune.

I have heard folks say—I laugh, Mr. Speaker. It is not funny. It is sad. But I have heard folks say, Well, what are you complaining about, ROB? Deficits have come down by half in President Obama's administration. They have come down by half.

Well, that is true. When I showed up here 4 years ago, Mr. Speaker, deficits were at their single highest rate in the history of the Nation. And by ''single highest rate,'' I mean they were four times higher than they had ever before been. So they have dropped from being four times higher than ever before down to just higher than ever before. You can call that progress, but I don't.

I have it charted here as a percentage of the size of the economy, Mr. Speaker. I go all the way back to 1965. We have had Republicans. We have had Democrats. We have had Republicans in Congress, Democrats in Congress; Republicans in the White House, Democrats in the White House. This isn't about the parties. For Pete's sake, if we look here for the only surpluses in our Nation's history, it comes at a time when we had—much like we do today—Republicans here in this institution, Republicans in the United States Senate, and Democrats leading from the White House. It was a bipartisan way we created some economic growth.

But what I want you to see, Mr. Speaker, is that we come here into the current administration, deficits dramatically higher than ever before in American history, dramatically higher. Coming down to the dotted line I have on the chart, Mr. Speaker, is the historical average, from 1965 to 2014.

Now it is embarrassing for the both of us that we have to talk about our Nation's finances by the historical deficit. Neither one of us came here to be involved in deficit spending. We came here to stop borrowing from our children and from our grandchildren, to start being responsible by paying the bills today, to improve opportunity in the future, not to diminish and borrow from opportunity in the future. But that has been the historical average.

What you would see if you could see this chart, Mr. Speaker, is that even as the White House is preaching the good news of declining deficits, they have only declined from those record highs. They have declined to a level where they are going to continue to rise again at levels higher than the historical average.

The President just sent his budget—2 weeks ago now, Mr. Speaker, he sent that budget. It arrived here on time for the first time in his administration. I applaud him for that. But it never balances—never, ever. Not this year, not next year, not 10 years from now, not 20 years from now, not 100 years from now.

The idea of the United States of America and the budget that should control it, from the President's point of view, is a budget that should never, ever balance and, thus, a balance that should continue year after year to borrow from the prosperity of future generations so that we can spend it on ourselves. That is selfish in ways that I can't be a part of.

What is the nature of the problem, Mr. Speaker? We are talking about this in the Budget Committee right now. Total spending in this country is about $3.5 trillion this year. The little part that Congress has control over, it is the defense and the nondefense discretionary—this little corner of the pie. We are able to control that.

In fact, Mr. ROKITA, the vice chairman of the Budget Committee, arrived here in 2010, as I did. Every single year since you have been here, leading at the Budget Committee, I would say to the gentleman from Indiana, we have reduced that discretionary spending every single year. It hasn't been easy. It has been hard, deliberate, bipartisan work. But you have done it because it was the right thing to do. $3.5 trillion is a lot of money. But the small part that you have had control over, you have made a difference in. It is the rest of this pot that continues to grow.

I yield to my friend from Indiana.

Mr. ROKITA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman is exactly right. By the way, while I am at it, let me just say that the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL), in my humble opinion, is a blessing not only for this Congress and for the people of Georgia but for this country because of the tenacity you bring, the energy you bring. If I had a list of all the pieces of legislation, all the things that we have gotten done around here for the last 4 years that you and I have been in here, that you have had your fingers on, that you weren't mentioned about, the work you have done behind the scenes, that list would be very long and would probably go out these doors.

One of the things that you have done, that we have done together, is for the first time since the Korean war, we have cut discretionary spending 4 years in a row. It hasn't been done since the Korean war.

□ 1200

Now, as you pointed out in earlier slides, there is a lot more work to do, and we are going to continue to get to it. We need a partner at some point. We need people to put on what I call their big boy pants and their big girl skirts and get to the bottom of this, and that is getting to a balanced budget.

I will tell you that this pie chart is very good. You are exactly right. Mr. Speaker, Mr. WOODALL is exactly right. The two blue pieces that we pull out for you in this pie chart are what you would get at in a traditional, regular budget process.

This is what we call our discretionary spending both in the nondefense area and in the defense area. As you can see, it is really no more than one-third—or 40 percent—of our total Federal spending. The rest, all that red that you see there is on what we call autopilot spending because the budget, line by line, doesn't touch that. Why? Because it is on autopilot.

That is your Medicare, that is your Medicaid, that is your Social Security, and that is your interest that we owe ourselves and other countries for all this debt because that is a contract. That red is just going to continue to grow as a percentage of that pie until it takes up nearly all of it over the next several years.

Then we are not going to have the money we need to spend on the things that constitutionally we need to spend it on, like defense and like some of the other 167 other agencies around here. That is a bad, bad situation. It is unsustainable.

Until you get to the underlying law, that is Social Security, that is Medicare, that is Medicaid, and that is the other mandatory spending, until you reform those programs, until they fit how we live in the 21st century, so they can be saved for our children and for our grandchildren, then you are really never going to get to balancing the budget or paying down this awful debt.

I can't imagine anything more immoral than passing on to future Americans—our children and grandchildren who do not yet exist—this burden. Talk about taxation without representation.

Well, thank you, Mr. WOODALL. I appreciate your letting me as a member

of the Budget Committee, under the excellent leadership of Chairman PRICE, chime in here. We are going to have a budget, the fifth time we will do it in a row here, by the statutory deadline. We intend to get it over to the Senate, and we intend to move this country forward.

Again, I say, Mr. Speaker, chiming in with Mr. WOODALL, I hope we have a partner this time. I hope we have personal responsibility on the floor of this House and the floor of the other Chamber.

Mr. WOODALL. I thank the vice chairman of the Budget Committee.

Mr. Speaker, people think these things happen in a vacuum. They don't. They happen because folks like Mr. ROKITA take time away from their family and away from their constituents back home sometimes to work the long nights and the early mornings it takes to get a budget like this done.

Just to give you an example, Mr. Speaker, I don't know if you have ever thought about it—$3.5 trillion is the size of our annual spending—annual spending. People often characterize—and I would tell you mischaracterize—Republicans as folks who want to shut down government. That is nonsense.

You heard the gentleman from Indiana's heart as he was up here talking about his love for people, the needs that people have, and our opportunity to aid people and their families as they struggle with some of those challenges. We spend $3.5 trillion a year in that effort.

It is not that we don't want to spend the money. It is that we want to spend it effectively, efficiently, and accountably. That is all folks ask for back home. They don't say, Shut the government down. They say, Spend my tax money effectively, efficiently, and accountably—$3.5 trillion, Mr. Speaker.

If any of the young people who are coming to Congress to watch what goes on here on the floor of the House, Mr. Speaker, if any of those young people were born the day that Jesus Christ was born and, beginning on that day, they spent $1 million every day, $1 million every day, 7 days a week, Mr. Speaker, from the day that Jesus Christ was born until today, they would have to continue spending $1 million a day, every day, 7 days a week, for another 732 years, to spend their first trillion dollars.

As a Federal Government, we are spending $3.5 trillion every year, and we borrowed from those same young people $18 trillion that they are going to have to pay back one day. These numbers are mind-boggling, and sometimes, I wonder if we as a Chamber, Mr. Speaker, are taking this crisis as seriously as we must.

It is, at its core, a spending crisis. It is not a revenue crisis. It is not that $3.5 trillion isn't enough to handle the needs of this country; it is. This chart, Mr. Speaker, you can't see it, but it is a historical chart of spending, which is in the red, and revenues, which is in the green.

Now, when we have had this big economic downturn here, so many families out of work, so many families in part-time work, and so many young people who couldn't find jobs, revenues absolutely went down.

They went down because there were no jobs, and if folks don't have jobs, they don't have incomes, and if they don't have incomes, they can't pay taxes. We want people to go to work. You can't pay taxes if you don't have a job.

Historically, Americans have been willing to pay about 18 percent of GDP in tax revenue, so I draw that line on out for the foreseeable future.

The red line represents spending in this town, Mr. Speaker. The red line represents if we did nothing, if we adjourned the Congress this afternoon, we went down to Pennsylvania Avenue, we picked up the President, and we all left Washington forever—I was wondering if there was going to be a loud group of cheers and applause that broke out when I said that, Mr. Speaker, I am not actually advocating for that—but if that were to happen, the laws that are already on the books have made promises to people that spend the money on this red line, going into historical debt territory, the likes of which we have never seen, and we cannot survive as a nation.

Spending is the problem. The red line is the problem. The green line is what we take from American families in taxes. It has been constant over time—not constant in actual dollars, but constant as a percent of the economy. It is the red line that is growing ever faster.

Now, if you will permit me to scare you just a little bit further, Mr. Speaker, let me talk about interest rates in this country—interest rates in this country.

This chart right here, you can't see it, again, Mr. Speaker, but it is charting the interest rates that America is paying on its debt. We borrow in all sorts of different instruments from short-term, week-long instruments, all the way up to 30-year instruments. I put on the 3-month bills and our 10-year notes on this chart.

This chart covers most of my lifetime, Mr. Speaker. In fact, it goes a little further than my lifetime. What you are going to see, Mr. Speaker, going all the way back to 1965, it is charting the 3-month bills and the 10-year notes.

This is where we are today. This is where we are today, and what you see here, Mr. Speaker, is that we are at the lowest level of interest in the history of our country. In the history of our country, we have never paid less on Federal debt than we are paying today; yet we have never had more of it.

What do you think is going to happen, Mr. Speaker, when these low interest rates that we have today return to these historically high levels? In fact, The Economist, as I pointed out here in blue, projects that interest rates will return.

By return, I mean that our 10-year notes are going to more than double, I mean the 3-month bills are going to more than sextuple. We are talking about an interest rate explosion around the corner, Mr. Speaker, that we are not going to be able to sustain.

Now, let me take you back to what we are spending here today. As we sit here today, we are spending $229 billion in interest on our national debt—$229 billion—while we are at the lowest interest rates in American history.

Now, if the rates on those 10-year notes are going to double, if the rates on those 3-month bills are going to sextuple, what do you think 229 billion changes into within the next 3 or 4 years, Mr. Speaker?

It doesn't change into 300 billion. It doesn't change into 400 billion. It goes northward to $500 billion in interest. In fact, as the President lays out his budget, we are looking at almost $1 trillion a year in interest payments within the next 10 years, in a single year, at year 10.

One trillion dollars, Mr. Speaker—enough money to pay for all of our national security, enough money to pay for all of the Medicaid program and the Medicare program, enough money to pay for the entire Social Security Program for a year, we are going to throw it away in interest payments because we didn't have the discipline to control spending in this bipartisan Congress that we have.

The lowest interest rates in American history, Mr. Speaker, every economist projects a rise, doubling to sextupling in the next 10 years.

We are only borrowing money, Mr. Speaker, because we have lots of spending going on. There are those who believe that the more we spend, the better results we are going to get. I want to tell you that is nonsense.

If this Chamber were full to capacity today, Mr. Speaker, and we asked folks to have a show of hands of when was that great time in the American economy they remember, when were the cares of whether or not you could afford to pay your house note, whether you could afford to pay your car note, whether you could afford to take care of your children, when was the time that those cares were the least?

I daresay most of the hands would think back to the 1990s. Whoo, the economy was on fire. You remember that. The stockmarket was on fire, you had to hide under a rook to keep from finding a good job—again, Republicans controlling this institution, Democrats in the White House. We were working together to constrain spending to grow the economy.

This chart that I have here, Mr. Speaker, shows per capita spending. It is not really meaningful to talk about spending in the abstract. It all distills down to an individual man, an individual woman, an individual family, what are we spending on individuals here in this country?

This is Federal outlays per individual. You will see a constant increase going back to the Truman administration. This is World War II, where we

were really fighting for the future of not just the Republic, but of the world, going through the Truman administration and the Eisenhower administration. This is per capita spending. You see that it increases as inflation does, as government does. It just naturally rises little by little, year after year.

What you will see, Mr. Speaker, if you look here at the Clinton years in blue, that in those years that Americans would look back on with fondness and contentment, those years where the cares of the world seemed just a little bit lighter on their shoulders, we weren't spending more from Washington, D.C. It didn't require more spending from Washington, D.C.

The stimulation of the economy is not dependent on spending from Washington, D.C. In fact, arguably, it is the opposite. The more Washington sucks out of America, the less that individual Americans have to grow their families, grow their businesses, and expand their opportunities.

It is meaningful to me, again, you think about the Reagan years, you think about the first Bush years, and you think about the Clinton years, the economy was on fire and spending from the Federal Government held constant.

Fast forward to today, Mr. Speaker, you see spending begin to grow out of control. It happened in the Bush years. Again, this is not a partisan problem, this is an American problem.

Spending began to grow. We are fighting a war on terror. Folks are beginning to worry about their families and worry about their jobs. Spending today continuing on that rise—well, continuing until I arrived here in 2010, until you arrived here in 2014, when the cavalry arrived here to say, Wait a minute, I know the challenges are vast, but we can't just push the can down the road; we can't pass our problems on to the next generation; we have to confront those problems together.

That is what we have been doing in this budget.

Mr. Speaker, this chart shows if we do nothing, if we do nothing, if we never make another promise—and the budget the President just sent us is full of new promises to the tune of about $2 trillion over the next 10 years—if we never make another promise, if all we do is keep the promises we already made, if we never pass a new law or a new bill to do something else, simply by the force of the laws already on the books, debt grows to levels higher than we borrowed as a nation to defeat the Nazis in World War II.

Think about that, Mr. Speaker. I was down in front of the White House. I had some friends in town. I took them down to see the White House. All Americans ought to make that journey. It is the center of the executive branch here in Washington, D.C.

We walked over to the Old Executive Office Building because that is a fabulous, fabulous building. On the front steps of the Old Executive Office Building, they have two cannons from the Spanish-American War, 1898, and they have a little plaque there on the fence.

Of course, you can't get through the fence. In fact, they pushed you back a little further now with the new Secret Service regulations, but you can see the plaque hanging there on the fence. It says that we used to have more than 20 of these historic cannons around town, dating back to the Revolutionary War, but during World War II, we melted most of them down to be a part of the war effort.

□ 1215

Think about that. In World War II, the situation was so dire, Mr. Speaker, we were going around to our national monuments, we were going around to our Nation's history, and we were finding anything made of iron or steel, and we were melting it down. Because World War II wasn't a fight; it was the fight for freedom on the planet.

And amidst that terror, ration stamps across the land, folks standing in lines for food at the end of the Great Depression, amidst all of that turmoil, all of that crisis, arguably the greatest crisis not just this Nation has known but that the world has ever known, America borrowed about 100 percent of the size of its economy. That is a heavy load, but it was for an important cause.

As we sit here today, Mr. Speaker, we have borrowed about three-quarters of that same load. And if we change no law and if we make no new promises, we will borrow not one time, not two times, not three times, but four times more than we borrowed to defeat the greatest evil the world has ever known, just to keep the lights on in the United States of America. That is dangerous and it is irresponsible.

Mr. Speaker, you can count on a budget coming to the floor of this House. It is going to be here. I would guess it is going to be here on the floor by the end of March, because certainly we will have it here by April. It is going to be a budget that brings us back to balance, and it is going to be a budget that makes the hard decisions that have to be made.

No one is saying don't invest in America. What they are saying is don't let growing interest payments on irresponsible borrowing push out the room in the budget to invest in America. Do you know we are investing less in America today, Mr. Speaker, than any other time in my lifetime? We are investing less. Now, we are spending more, but we are investing less because, as I showed you on that pie chart earlier, Mr. Speaker, what we are spending on isn't investments in America. It is income maintenance programs.

If we do nothing, revenues continue and debt grows out of control. 2046, Mr. Speaker, about the time you are entering your retirement, dead at 250 percent of GDP.

Spending $3.5 trillion today—today—at the lowest rate of interest the country has ever known, and today, in that most favorable of environments, Mr. Speaker, we are almost spending more on interest than we are on our Medicaid program, the health care program that covers children and the poor across this land. We are spending more to pay our creditors than we are to protect our children's health—and that is at the lowest rates of interest the country has ever known.

It only grows, and that is if the only thing that changes are the interest rates, Mr. Speaker. That is if we stop borrowing more money. But the President projects to borrow half trillion after half trillion after half trillion after half trillion. In fact, as I said, the budget he presented never ever, ever comes to balance. It borrows year after year after year after year, as far as the eye can see.

I don't argue that that is not the easier decision to make today, Mr. Speaker. It is. Doing nothing is always easier than doing the heavy lifting. Spending and borrowing more, always easier than tightening your belt and making the tough calls. Sacrificing our children's future so that we don't have to make those tough decisions today, that may be the easy call, but it is immoral. It is immoral, Mr. Speaker.

We have been able to cut budgets, as the gentleman from Indiana said, 4 years in a row for the first time, for the first time in my lifetime. We are moving the needle, but there is more to do. And it can't be done alone. It can't be done with just Republicans, it can't be done with just Democrats, and it can't be done with just the Congress. It requires the House Republicans and Democrats, it requires the Senate Republicans and Democrats, and it requires the President of the United States to come together to make those decisions that matter.

Mr. Speaker, we will be talking a lot more about this in the coming weeks. I want to make sure that every American has all the answers they need about how we are trying to prioritize in this budget.

But I want to be clear: the days of kicking the can down the road ended when Republicans took over this Chamber in 2011. The trust and confidence that we have earned in a bipartisan way over the last 4 years, we are going to continue today, and Senate willing—going back to the obstructionist provisions I noted at the very beginning of this hour, Mr. Speaker—Senate willing, we will conference the first budget, agree on the first budget, have the first American budget in my entire tenure in Congress.

The House has always done its job. This year, we have an opportunity to have the Congress do its job collectively, and I look forward to that conclusion.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to you for being down here with me this afternoon, and I yield back the balance of my time.

PUBLICATION OF COMMITTEE RULES

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON ETHICS FOR THE 114TH CONGRESS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ETHICS,
February 13, 2015.

Hon. KAREN HAAS,
Clerk of the House, The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MS. HAAS: I am submitting the 114th Rules for the Committee on Ethics to be submitted to the Congressional Record.

Thank you for your cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,

CHARLES W. DENT,
Chairman.

Enclosures.

(Adopted February 12, 2015)

FOREWORD

The Committee on Ethics is unique in the House of Representatives. Consistent with the duty to carry out its advisory and enforcement responsibilities in an impartial manner, the Committee is the only standing committee of the House of Representatives the membership of which is divided evenly by party. These rules are intended to provide a fair procedural framework for the conduct of the Committee's activities and to help ensure that the Committee serves well the people of the United States, the House of Representatives, and the Members, officers, and employees of the House of Representatives.

PART I—GENERAL COMMITTEE RULES

RULE 1. GENERAL PROVISIONS

(a) So far as applicable, these rules and the Rules of the House of Representatives shall be the rules of the Committee and any subcommittee. The Committee adopts these rules under the authority of clause 2(a)(1) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, 114th Congress.

(b) The rules of the Committee may be modified, amended, or repealed by a vote of a majority of the Committee.

(c) When the interests of justice so require, the Committee, by a majority vote of its members, may adopt any special procedures, not inconsistent with these rules, deemed necessary to resolve a particular matter before it. Copies of such special procedures shall be furnished to all parties in the matter.

(d) The Chair and Ranking Minority Member shall have access to such information that they request as necessary to conduct Committee business.

RULE 2. DEFINITIONS

(a) ''Committee'' means the Committee on Ethics.

(b) ''Complaint'' means a written allegation of improper conduct against a Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives filed with the Committee with the intent to initiate an inquiry.

(c) ''Inquiry'' means an investigation by an investigative subcommittee into allegations against a Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives.

(d) ''Investigate,'' ''Investigating,'' and/or ''Investigation'' mean review of the conduct of a Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives that is conducted or authorized by the Committee, an investigative subcommittee, or the Chair and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee.

(e) ''Board'' means the Board of the Office of Congressional Ethics.

(f) ''Referral'' means a report sent to the Committee from the Board pursuant to House Rules and all applicable House Resolutions regarding the conduct of a House Member, officer, or employee, including any accompanying findings or other supporting documentation.

(g) ''Investigative Subcommittee'' means a subcommittee designated pursuant to Rule 19(a) to conduct an inquiry to determine if a Statement of Alleged Violation should be issued.

(h) ''Statement of Alleged Violation'' means a formal charging document filed by an investigative subcommittee with the Committee containing specific allegations against a Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives of a violation of the Code of Official Conduct, or of a law, rule, regulation, or other standard of conduct applicable to the performance of official duties or the discharge of official responsibilities.

(i) ''Adjudicatory Subcommittee'' means a subcommittee designated pursuant to Rule 23(a) that holds an adjudicatory hearing and determines whether the counts in a Statement of Alleged Violation are proved by clear and convincing evidence.

(j) ''Sanction Hearing'' means a Committee hearing to determine what sanction, if any, to adopt or to recommend to the House of Representatives.

(k) ''Respondent'' means a Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives who is the subject of a complaint filed with the Committee or who is the subject of an inquiry or a Statement of Alleged Violation.

(l) ''Office of Advice and Education'' refers to the Office established by section 803(i) of the Ethics Reform Act of 1989. The Office handles inquiries; prepares written opinions in response to specific requests; develops general guidance; and organizes seminars, workshops, and briefings for the benefit of the House of Representatives.

(m) ''Member'' means a Representative in, or a Delegate to, or the Resident Commissioner to, the U.S. House of Representatives.

RULE 3. ADVISORY OPINIONS AND WAIVERS

(a) The Office of Advice and Education shall handle inquiries; prepare written opinions providing specific advice, including reviews of requests for privately-sponsored travel pursuant to the Committee's travel regulations; develop general guidance; and organize seminars, workshops, and briefings for the benefit of the House of Representatives.

(b) Any Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives may request a written opinion with respect to the propriety of any current or proposed conduct of such Member, officer, or employee.

(c) The Office of Advice and Education may provide information and guidance regarding laws, rules, regulations, and other standards of conduct applicable to Members, officers, and employees in the performance of their duties or the discharge of their responsibilities.

(d) In general, the Committee shall provide a written opinion to an individual only in response to a written request, and the written opinion shall address the conduct only of the inquiring individual, or of persons for whom the inquiring individual is responsible as employing authority.

(e) A written request for an opinion shall be addressed to the Chair of the Committee and shall include a complete and accurate statement of the relevant facts. A request shall be signed by the requester or the requester's authorized representative or employing authority. A representative shall disclose to the Committee the identity of the principal on whose behalf advice is being sought.

(f) Requests for privately-sponsored travel shall be treated like any other request for a written opinion for purposes of paragraphs (g) through (l).

(1) The Committee's Travel Guidelines and Regulations shall govern the request submission and Committee approval process for privately-sponsored travel consistent with House Rules.

(2) A request for privately-sponsored travel of a Member, officer, or employee shall include a completed and signed Traveler Form that attaches the Private Sponsor Certification Form and includes all information required by the Committee's travel regulations. A private sponsor offering officially-connected travel to a Member, officer, or employee must complete and sign a Private Sponsor Certification Form, and provide a copy of that form to the invitee(s).

(3) Any individual who knowingly and willfully falsifies, or who knowingly and willfully fails to file, a Traveler Form or Private Sponsor Certification Form may be subject to civil penalties and criminal sanctions pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 1001.

(g) The Office of Advice and Education shall prepare for the Committee a response to each written request for an opinion from a Member, officer, or employee. Each response shall discuss all applicable laws, rules, regulations, or other standards.

(h) Where a request is unclear or incomplete, the Office of Advice and Education may seek additional information from the requester.

(i) The Chair and Ranking Minority Member are authorized to take action on behalf of the Committee on any proposed written opinion that they determine does not require consideration by the Committee. If the Chair or Ranking Minority Member requests a written opinion, or seeks a waiver, extension, or approval pursuant to Rules 3(m), 4(c), 4(e), or 4(h), the next ranking member of the requester's party is authorized to act in lieu of the requester.

(j) The Committee shall keep confidential any request for advice from a Member, officer, or employee, as well as any response thereto. Upon request of any Member, officer, or employee who has submitted a written request for an opinion or submitted a request for privately-sponsored travel, the Committee may release to the requesting individual a copy of their own written request for advice or submitted travel forms, any subsequent written communications between such individual and Committee staff regarding the request, and any Committee advisory opinion or travel letter issued to that individual in response. The Committee shall not release any internal Committee staff work product, communications, or notes in response to such a request, except as authorized by the Committee.

(k) The Committee may take no adverse action in regard to any conduct that has been undertaken in reliance on a written opinion if the conduct conforms to the specific facts addressed in the opinion.

(l) Information provided to the Committee by a Member, officer, or employee seeking advice regarding prospective conduct may not be used as the basis for initiating an investigation under clause 3(a)(2) or clause 3(b) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, if such Member, officer, or employee acts in good faith in accordance with the written advice of the Committee.

(m) A written request for a waiver of clause 5 of House Rule XXV (the House gift rule), or for any other waiver or approval, shall be treated in all respects like any other request for a written opinion.

(n) A written request for a waiver of clause 5 of House Rule XXV (the House gift rule) shall specify the nature of the waiver being sought and the specific circumstances justifying the waiver.