

American communities. In the nearly 365 days, Edith has been in sanctuary, my staff and I have met with her family, legal representatives, advocates, and community stakeholders.

#KEEPINGTHECRUMBS

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

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, like every American, every Member of Congress has a lower tax rate because of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act. Every Democrat voted against this law. It was mocked as mere crumbs.

Well, folks back home have a question for House Democrats: #keepingthecrumbs?

The Tax Cuts and Jobs Act ended the death tax. The junior Senator from California said repealing the death tax is “a giveaway to those at the top, not something that will create jobs.”

Here is a response from a friend back home in Fort Bend County, Dan McDonald. Dan says, “E-I-E-I-O.” Dan’s comments are echoed by those of Rosenberg Tractor’s Gary Allred. Gary says, “Getting rid of the death tax keeps jobs right now and adds jobs in the future because Texans can keep their lands, pass them on to their kids, grandkids, and great-grandkids for all eternity.”

Let’s step up and pass version 2 and get #keepingthecrumbs.

HONORING WARREN G. GOSS

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

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize U.S. Army Private First Class Warren Goss.

A western Pennsylvania native, Warren answered the call to defend his country and joined the U.S. Army in July of 1943 at the age of 18. He was deployed to the European theater where he underwent training for the D-day invasions as a rifleman.

Under heavy enemy fire and without air support, Warren and his fellow comrades were some of the first soldiers to bravely storm the beaches of Normandy, succeeding in their mission to secure a German communications tower.

Afterward, Warren was transferred to the 70th Division’s 274th K Company, where he continued to fight in France and across Europe until the end of the war.

Upon returning home, Warren met his wife, Mary, and fathered two daughters, Rhonda and Paula.

For his heroic actions to liberate France, Warren was recently made a Chevalier of the National Order of the Legion of Honour, France’s highest order of merit for military and civil merits.

Congratulations, Warren, on receiving this distinct honor, and thank you

for your valiant and selfless service to our Nation.

PAKISTAN IS STILL HARBORING TERRORISTS

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the State Department has released its annual country report on terrorism.

Terrorist attacks are down worldwide, but there are still frustrating details that we must expose. The biggest frustration is that Pakistan, a so-called major non-NATO ally, continues to harbor terrorist groups that target the United States and its allies.

The report says that the Taliban, the Haqqani Network, LeT, and JeM, all terrorist groups, they all still operate in safe havens in Pakistan. Some are able to raise money, recruit, and train in Pakistan.

For too long, I, as well as others, have come to this floor to point out Pakistan’s duplicitous behavior. When will we stop appeasing Pakistan and sending billions in American money to these fake friends, money that ends up in the hands of terrorists who make war on America?

We must designate Pakistan as a state sponsor of terrorism, then revoke their major non-NATO ally status. Then we must go after these terrorist groups.

And that is just the way it is.

□ 1645

THE TRAJECTORY OF GOVERNMENT SPENDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, with due respect to my colleague from Oklahoma who has been kind enough to yield me a bit of time, what I am going to do is yield to him, ultimately, and he will take the bulk of this time.

I just was thinking the other night about the larger issue of government spending, and I would just like to walk through a couple of numbers here in a few minutes on its importance, because we have a big tax vote tomorrow. We had one today, and we had a vote before that, I guess the day before that, tied to spending and what the trajectory looks like on that front here at the Federal level.

But I want us to step back for one second and look at the bigger picture on why containing spending is so important and why it is not so important in our kids’ or grandkids’ time, but why it is so important right now.

I think it is interesting, if you were to look at the words of Erskine Bowles, the words of Sir Alex Fraser Tytler,

the words of Paul Kennedy, and the words of your local fifth grade elementary school teacher, what you would find is an amazing correlation between all four of them.

It was Erskine Bowles, who was, I guess, former President Clinton’s former Chief of Staff who said that we are walking toward the most predictable financial crisis in the history of man.

As we remember, they put together the Bowles-Simpson Commission of 2010. That ultimately led to the sequestration that we are in the process of getting rid of, but it was a “nuclear weapon” that said we have got to do something, yet we haven’t.

If you look at the words of Sir Alex Fraser Tytler, he was a Scottish historian who lived in the 1800s, and his words, after looking at world history over the whole of his life, were that a democracy cannot exist as a permanent form of government. It can only exist until the voters discover that they can vote for themselves largesse from the public treasury, with the result that a democracy always fails under loose fiscal policy and is generally followed by a dictatorship.

The average age of the world’s great civilizations has been 200 years. These nations have progressed through this sequence: from bondage to spiritual faith, spiritual faith to great courage, great courage to liberty, liberty to abundance, abundance to selfishness, selfishness to complacency, complacency to apathy, apathy to dependency, and dependency back again into bondage.

And indeed, if you look at the timeline of civilizations across the annals of history, what you see is that up and down of the way that civilizations have come and gone.

And it was Paul Kennedy, in his book “The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers,” who talked about how, traditionally, open political systems have basically spent their way into oblivion and that the largest thing that you used to be able to buy was a standing army—nowadays, the largest thing that you can buy is entitlement spending—but that in every instance, a civilization came to a tipping point wherein they had to decide: Do we go back to what made us competitive and, perhaps, a world power in the first place or not?

And that dovetails, actually, with another book that was written, entitled, “This Time It’s Different,” by professors from Harvard and University of Maryland. They looked at the last 800 years of financial history and they found, in every instance, civilizations got to this same point, which brings me back to the local fifth grade math teacher.

One plus one equals two, period. Numbers always work. Can they be manipulated? Yes. But at the end of the day, in the same way that gravity works, numbers work.

So I think that we just need to acknowledge that we are living in a weird

time. Debt, deficit, and government spending are not things that are talked about in Washington, D.C., as they should be, and what we are doing is we are hoping that things will get better. We are hoping that economic growth will take care of the problem.

Well, it might, but it was Gordon Sullivan, former Chief of Staff of the United States Army, who wrote a book entitled, "Hope Is Not a Method." Hope, indeed, is not a method. It may work out that way, but it may not, and, therefore, we have got to be really prudent with the way that we budget and spend going forward, given the implications of what history has said will come our way if we don't get the numbers right.

So that leads me to a few numbers I would just like to share with you, and these numbers are interesting in what they point to. They point to the fact that this is not a problem for our grandchildren or for our children. This is a problem that is coming down the pike really fast.

If you look at the Congressional Budget Office numbers over the next 10 years, what they show is that we are running trillion-plus deficits on a yearly basis and that there is going to be a snowballing effect with regard to debt to GDP, that we are going to get to spaces that we have never been to before in peaceful times. That is what this chart refers to right here.

A lot of people say we don't really need to do something that much because we got into a real problem—if I pull that chart over this way—back at the time of World War II. We were over 100 percent debt to GDP, and we are just not that far right now, 79 percent.

But that doesn't include the social safety net promises that are built into the budget. If you include those off-balance sheet promises that are real-world promises and that do have to be paid, we are actually up around 107 percent, which is not that far from the 106 percent or 119 percent that we saw in the wake of exhausting ourselves after World War II as we fought against the Japanese and Nazi Germany for our very survival.

If you do an apples-to-apples comparison and include, again, the social safety net payments that weren't in place at the time of World War II, we are eerily close to that all-time high that we saw in the wake of World War II. That is just sort of a little bit longer perspective.

Going back to the CBO numbers that I was just referring to, again, we are going to be hitting the trillion-dollar mark year in and year out, year in and year out, and that is without a recession, which is really the point of what I wanted to get to.

Well, before I get to it, actually, let me take one last snapshot.

If you look at sort of blood and turnips, you can only squeeze so much blood out of a turnip is the saying. If you look at the long run, we have taken about 17½, a little shy of 20 per-

cent of the gross product of everything that we do in this country has gone off to the Federal Government, and we have been consistently spending a little bit more than that 20 percent here over the last 50 years. Those numbers really begin to grow as we have the baby boomers retiring.

So what we have is a math and demographic trap that, unless we get ahead of it, is going to, again, have profound problems and implications in terms of the value of the currency, in terms of, ultimately, the future inflation, in terms of the value of everything that you or I may have saved to date.

We have been on a spending binge and a debt binge not just as a country, but around the world. So if you look at the numbers that we were all troubled by back in 2007, the spike that we saw in 2008, 2009 with the financial crisis, which was the worst crisis that we have seen since the Great Depression, we thought that there would be a deleveraging after that, but, in fact, the reverse has occurred.

There is \$68 trillion worth of new debt around the globe, and so we have seen roughly 300 percent increases in China. We have seen that, more than that in the United States. We have seen that in Spain. We have seen well more than that in Japan. Debt has gone up, not down. In other words, we are more susceptible to a financial storm than we were at the time of the financial crisis back in the mid-2000s.

Add to that, if you look at what is happening in most of the developed world, they are actually doing a bit of deleveraging. America is outside of that norm on that front.

But here is the part that I want to get to, and there are a lot of other charts on a different night that I would like to walk through. But if you look at, again, the numbers, those CBO numbers basically anticipate that we are not in for a recession right now. If the recession comes soon, our numbers balloon in terms of debt and deficits going forward, so that makes it that much more relevant if you look at the history of recessions.

The average recession, basically over the last 50 years—excuse me—the average economic expansion has been about 58 months before a recession came along. We are now in the second longest economic recovery in American history.

Now, when it ends, I don't know. But what I do know is that trees don't grow to the sky, and when you begin to go to the point where you are, in essence, double the average that we have seen since World War II, you know that we have to be not too far from the next recession, which, again, will have incredible implications in terms of debt and deficit going forward.

Let me give you a few other indicators that say that that recession and, again, the spiking of deficits and the spiking of debt that will come with it is not too far.

We are now in the longest bull market in American history. Again, think

about that. Think about the wealth effect that comes with that and, again, the multiplier effect that that has in a consumer-driven economy, which is what we have in this country. We have had quite the run on that front.

And not only has there been duration, there has been levity, if you want to call it that, not in terms of humor, but we have seen the numbers really rise. We are now, in terms of PE, our price-to-earnings multiples, up around where we were at the time in 1928 of Black Tuesday, at about 32 times in terms of the average market pricing.

This chart, I think, is really interesting. What it shows is that there have only been two other occasions in the history of our Republic over the last 70 years when we have had the kind of wealth effect that we have right now. One occurred—and this is, again, household net worth as a percentage of disposable income in our country. Once it occurred just prior to the tech bubble bursting. The other time it occurred was just prior to the real estate boom bursting in 2008.

Now we are at a level that is, again, more than 600 percent of household net worth as a percentage of disposable income, again, the highest level that we have ever seen over the last 70 years and a number that has only been prefaced twice: once, just prior to the tech bubble bursting, and the other time, just prior to the real estate bubble of 2008 bursting.

Now, what does that mean?

I don't know exactly what it means, but if I am looking at any kind of trend line, you would say: I don't know that it is good. It says the obvious.

When I drive to Hilton Head Island, South Carolina, and I go into Sea Pines, the mansions of the 1970s are being torn down to make way for big houses now. The mansion of the 1970s is no longer a mansion; it is a little house that is a tear-down. People are wealthier than they have ever been.

But what comes up oftentimes goes down, and I want to go into some of the wealth effect that has taken place here, which is what you have seen with this number right here.

The Fed balance sheet has exploded, from about \$800 billion in size to over \$4 trillion in size. As we go on the opposite side of the curve, deleveraging, it is going to have an impact on interest rates, which, again, is going to impact this debt and deficit number.

This is yield curve flattening. In every instance over the last 70 years, within 10 months of the yield curve flattening, there has been a recession. Ours happens to be flattening right now.

Finally, I would make this point in these couple of slides that I wanted to show, which is that the unemployment rates are bottoming out right now. In every instance over the last, again, 70 years, when that has occurred, there has been a recession within 9 months.

There are a lot of other indicators for a different night that I would like to

walk through in terms of walking through why, again, the economic challenges that are before us are, again, not in our grandkids' time, not in our kids' time, but in our time, which makes spending restraint that much more important.

I have taken up more than my share of time for my dear colleague from Oklahoma, and I don't want to burn through the entirety of his time, so I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma profusely for allowing me to walk through a couple of slides this evening.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

UNIFYING AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. RUSSELL) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, he was a soldier who had given 45 years of service to his country. 222 years ago, this month, he crafted a farewell address to the Nation. In it, he made no attempt to recount his time as a businessman, warrior, lawmaker, founder, Framers, battlefield commander, or President of a United States that he, more than any other, helped to create.

□ 1700

Instead, George Washington, chose to offer "disinterested warnings of a parting friend," which he felt were, important to the permanency of our felicity as a people.

Leaders today departing public service might recount their personal journey and thank those who shared some of their path. Washington's final words were nothing of the sort. He chose, instead, to look far into the future and address all of us, the future. None of us can know it. We get occasional glimpses of it by talking to older people, those a little further down the road.

From them, we gain wisdom and counsel. Yet, sadly, each generation imagines that it faces unprecedented problems only to dismiss the counsels of the generation or two before them. We find it tough to absorb the Wisdom of Solomon when he stated, "There is nothing new under the Sun." Another way to put it is this: Times change, people don't.

Taking this truth, what would George Washington say to us if he were here today? What counsels would he give our Nation? What relevance would it have? Fortunately, in this gleaming alabaster city that bears his name, we have rich archives to continue to hear from George Washington. Whether we are wise enough to heed Washington, is another matter altogether.

Surprisingly, he gave no recommendation for us to love liberty, as liberty is in the very fiber of the human race, and was certainly heightened among the early Americans whose efforts had recently secured it. Instead,

Washington made a vital observation while trying to give future Americans a heads-up. Here it is: Liberty does not secure independence.

Washington knew a fallen mankind would flourish in liberty, and as such, Americans would be enticed to reduce and erode our independence for temporary gain or perceived future benefit. Instead of liberty, he identified unity as the essential factor to retain American independence.

At first ponder, this seems counter-intuitive. After all, unified efforts require a certain accommodation to one another for greater good, necessitating an occasional deferential voluntary reduction in one's personal liberty.

Unity achieves result without reducing liberty through power, pen, statute, or sword. For these reasons, Washington told America that unity was the, "main pillar in the edifice of your real independence, the support of your tranquility at home, your peace abroad, of your safety, of your prosperity, of that very liberty which you so highly prize."

Even after 242 years as a Republic, we still embody this idea in our national motto: *e pluribus unum*, a Latin phrase meaning, out of many—one.

We see it in our pledge, with terms like "one Nation," "indivisible," but what of our behavior today? We still, on occasion, employ the words, but we deploy actions that could better be described as *e pluribus pluribus*. One hyphenated nation and divisible.

Washington warned of it: "But as it is easy to foresee that, from different causes and from different quarters, much pains will be taken, many artifices employed to weaken in your minds the conviction of this truth . . . that you should properly estimate the immense value of your national union to your collective and individual happiness; that you should cherish a cordial, habitual, and immovable attachment to it; accustoming yourselves to think . . . of it as . . . your political safety and prosperity; watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety; discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can in any event be abandoned; and indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest, or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts."

Washington's words today read like stinging rebuke to all Americans. Instead of guarding our institutions jealously with cordial, habitual, and immovable attachment, we in these august Chambers across every aisle allow disruption to displace discourse, polarization to pass for politics, and resistance to replace result.

Mr. Speaker, we stand condemned, but not irredeemable. Like any first step, admitting the problem is the path to recovery. How did we allow these congressional Chambers to suffer such infiltration? Our own history contains sharp lessons of discord, the loss of our

own lawmakers by caning and shooting—sometimes by our own selves; a preference for conflict over Constitution, and a division so great that we ended up destroying each other on America's fields and farms from Gettysburg to Vicksburg.

Washington's warnings went unheeded a mere 100 years after he gave them. We self-corrected, but only after great harm to ourselves. It has been 150 years since we nearly destroyed each other. Are we on any more secure a path? It would appear from our treatment of each other and our view of our own Nation's future that we are tempted to walk an old path. If that be the case, then taking counsel from George Washington might be a timely exercise.

With regard to unity, we must realize we are all in the ship of state together. Crashing it on the rocks as we fight each other for control of the helm will deny any safe harbor we wish to obtain. Washington believed that we must view our unity as a sacred tie that links together the various parts.

"Citizens by birth or choice of a common country, that country has a right to concentrate your affections. The name 'American,' which belongs to you in your national capacity, must always exalt the just pride of patriotism more than any appellation derived from local discriminations. With slight shades of difference you have the same religion, manners, habits, and political principles. You have a common cause fought in triumph together; the independence and liberty you possess are the work of joint counsels and joint efforts of common dangers, sufferings and successes. . . . your union ought to be considered as a main prop to your liberty, and that the love of one ought to endear you to the preservation of the other."

If the unity of our people be the main prop of our liberty, what was it that George Washington believed would knock out that prop?

Warning number one and number two from George Washington, Geographical and Party Disunion: Washington believed, "a government for the whole is indispensable." When various parts of the country come to feel that they are more important than the others, they will "acquire influence within particular districts to misrepresent the opinions and aims of other districts."

Disregarding government for some regional or geographical preference to suit our own interest is a sure way to erode our unity. Washington's view of our government was to show "Respect for its authority, compliance with its laws, acquiescence in its measures, are duties enjoined by the fundamental maxims of true liberty."

Washington believed that the Constitution and its authentic amending was an act by the people upon themselves, and that every American would naturally have an obligation to obey the established government for the experiment even to work.