

Mr. Speaker, the new model for all Americans, the new paradigm, is a paradigm of public and private partnership that creates a new era of accountability. We don't have to look back to the old America where we don't turn to our government for help. Sure our government can play a role. It can establish a new paradigm of participation for all Americans.

And so, Mr. Speaker, it is my sincere hope that my colleagues who are in their offices, who want to advance the idea of public-private partnerships, that they will look closely at the arguments that we made in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, look at our approach and our processes that we followed at the local level with complete transparency, so that we can grow an economy for all Americans that all Americans can be proud of.

I want to enter one more thing into the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, just before I yield back the balance of my time. I was reading in a local newspaper here that in the month of December, our Nation's busiest airport experienced the worst delays ever.

"Chicago's air travelers endured the worst delays in the Nation during December, as foul weather offset any benefit that airlines might have gained from a steep drop in flights at the city's major airports, new data show. O'Hare International Airport, the gem of our city and the gem of our region, reported the worst performance for on-time departures among major U.S. airports for December and calendar year 2008, even after the November opening of a new runway that is designed to help reduce the problem in the first place."

Because it's not just a function of new runways at existing airports, it's about new runways in a new airspace. God has only given us so much space above this building. He's only given us so much space above airports. And so there's only so many circles they can drive around or fly around an airport. You have to build new airports in new space. But by building them in new space, it means that we change the habitual traffic patterns of people who normally go one way to go to the airport, they now have options to go both ways. And by doing that, Mr. Speaker, we create balanced economic growth for all Americans and all Americans can begin to participate in the bounty that is America.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I thank the leadership for allowing me this opportunity, and I thank the Speaker for his indulgence.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Byrd, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has agreed to without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 41. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint session of Congress to receive a message from the President.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 276d-276g of title 22, United States Code, as amended, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints the following Senator as Vice Chairman of the Senate Delegation to the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group conference during the One Hundred Eleventh Congress:

The Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO).

The message also announced that pursuant to section 5 of title I of Division H of Public Law 110-161, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints the following Senator as Chairman of the United States-Japan Interparliamentary Group conference for the One Hundred Eleventh Congress:

The Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUE).

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. POLIS of Colorado, from the Committee on Rules (during the Special Order of Mr. JACKSON of Illinois), submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 111-14) on the resolution (H. Res. 157) providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

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

Mr. POLIS of Colorado, from the Committee on Rules (during the Special Order of Mr. JACKSON of Illinois), submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 111-15) on the resolution (H. Res. 158) waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ECONOMIC STIMULUS BILL AND THE FREEDOM OF CHOICE ACT

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

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, thank you, and I'm grateful for the opportunity to be before my colleagues this evening to discuss a couple of very important issues. One, of course, is immediate and that is this crisis in our economic situation and the so-called economic spendulous—excuse me, stimulus—bill. I use that slip of the tongue, Mr. Speaker, deliberately, because when I talk to my colleagues about the amount of money that we're about to spend to try to stimulate our economy, I think all of my colleagues will agree

it's a tremendous amount of spending. And so we do want to spend at least the first half of this allotted time, Mr. Speaker, talking about that issue, about this bill that we're going to be voting on, probably tomorrow, if my intelligence is correct, and then the Senate will vote on the conference report on Friday and President Obama, no doubt, will sign this spendulous bill into law. So we want to spend at least half of our time talking about that and talking about the process and talking about the policy and talking about the missed opportunity to have done this in a better way.

And then in the final time allotted to me this evening, I want to speak about something that is of great concern to a lot of people across this country, certainly of great concern to the members of St. Joseph's Catholic Church in my district, the 11th of Georgia, in my parish, St. Joseph's Catholic Church. As my pastor and my fellow parishioners asked me, many of them I'm sure didn't realize that one of their co-parishioners was their Congressman, but from the pulpit the request to ask Members of Congress to not allow something called the Freedom of Choice Act to be allowed to come into law. And so we are going to discuss that.

I'm very pleased, though, that I have a colleague with me tonight and we'll share time, that's Representative MICHELE BACHMANN from Minnesota, and we may have other Members that will join us. I want them at any time to feel free to ask for time and to speak, or we can have a colloquy on either one of these issues.

Let me just start out, Mr. Speaker, as I said at the outset, and let's talk about this economic stimulus package. It is, as I understand, in the final analysis going to be \$798 billion. We currently have a national debt of \$10.7 trillion. This is almost going to increase that national debt by 10 percent, Mr. Speaker—by 10 percent—and under the ruse, unfortunately, I truly believe that it is a ruse, of stimulating jobs. Now we have had, indeed, an opportunity, many opportunities over the last several weeks to look at some alternatives, to do things under the regular order, regular process, of subcommittee, committee markups, amendments made in order, so that both sides of the aisle had an opportunity to do this right, to make it better, to concentrate more on across-the-board tax cuts at every marginal tax level as the Republican alternative does, to lower the corporate income tax rate from 35 percent to 25 percent, so that these multitude of small business men and women across this country who create most of the jobs. In fact, the organization of franchisee members are on the Hill right now for their first annual, first inaugural advocacy day, and they will be across the Capitol tomorrow in both Chambers, in the offices of the Members, talking to them about the strain and struggle that

they're going through in regard to very thin margins, high taxes, high cost of health care.

When we designed, we Republicans in the minority, designed a bill, I think it's H.R. 470 is the number, but, Mr. Speaker, it had a strong emphasis on a tax break for all Americans, anybody that paid taxes, 5 percent across the board, to give them an opportunity to have money in their pockets right away, to either spend or save or pay down debt. In addition to that, we are very much in favor of spending on infrastructure projects, roads and bridges and mass transit, things that indeed would put people back to work, I have no doubt.

My State of Georgia, our Department of Transportation board members and commissioner and senior staff are up here as we speak to talk about the shovel-ready projects that they have. And when this bill was first discussed back when President Obama was President-elect Obama, all the talk was about the amount of money that would be spent in all 50 States, all 50 States that are suffering, my home State of Georgia facing a \$3 billion deficit, to have the opportunity, as I say, to get some of these projects done and put people back to work.

Mr. Speaker, in the final bill, now could it have changed a little bit in the conference report? It is possible, but unfortunately the Democratic majority who pledged to allow the bill to be posted on the Internet so that we could see it 48 hours in advance and be able to know what exactly is in there, but that hasn't happened, but it is my suspicion that the percentage of that \$789.5 billion is probably no more than 7 percent, Mr. Speaker. No more than 7 percent. It's almost as tricky as the so-called TARP legislation.

□ 1900

Remember that, Mr. Speaker? My colleagues, remember that one? Just before the end of the 110th Congress, when Secretary Paulson came to us and said "the sky is indeed falling, and you have no more than 48 hours to give me the absolute power to take \$750 billion of taxpayer money and use it to buy toxic assets, troubled assets, from financial institutions." And of course, what happened was something far different from that. The TARP became a totally inappropriate acronym. The Troubled Asset Relief Program turned into a capital infusion program. And \$750 billion, half of it, was doled out to the biggest financial institutions in the country, I think nine total. Some of them were even forced to take the money. And then, of course, the money that went to General Motors and Chrysler. We even made the GMAC a bank so they could qualify for the capital infusion with no oversight, no responsibility and no transparency.

And so you say, Mr. Speaker, as a Member of Congress, and also as one of our constituents, a voter, whether a Democrat, Republican, independent,

libertarian, said look, "fool me once, shame on you. Fool me twice, shame on me." And I don't think the American public is going to fall for this so-called "stimulus package" that was supposed to be money for infrastructure projects with a good balanced amount of tax cuts. It is just not there. It is just not there.

So, Mr. Speaker, we're going to talk about that this evening. And before I yield to my colleague from Minnesota, I just want to put these numbers a little bit in perspective. Now I have a few posters. And these were drawn up as we voted on the House version. In the House version, the number was a little higher than the \$789.5 billion that we're going to vote on tomorrow. But it was in the same ballpark, believe me.

Let me show this first poster to my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, and this one is entitled, "Sizing Up the Stimulus." Well, the proposed stimulus in the bill that passed the House a few days ago was \$1.2 trillion. Now that includes the debt service over the next 10 years on that borrowed money, and it would be disingenuous not to. You could say, "oh, no, no, Congressman, you have got it wrong. It was \$826 billion. Where do you come up with that \$1.2 trillion?" Well, ladies and gentlemen, that is the debt service. And you cannot ignore that. That has to be paid. And pretty soon, the debt service and the payment for Medicare, Medicaid and entitlement programs is going to take every dollar of our budget.

So, anyway, the proposed stimulus, \$1.2 trillion, put in comparison, I know this is a little difficult to see, the writing is a little small, but the Vietnam war, \$111 billion, the invasion of Iraq, \$551 billion. The New Deal, the New Deal, remember that one? Thirty-two billion dollars. And then the Marshall Plan, \$12.7 billion. Just to kind of put these numbers in perspective of what we're talking about because people, Mr. Speaker, easily get a little confused here. Did he say \$1 million or did he say \$1 billion? And what is \$1 trillion? We could describe that. And maybe my colleague knows a good description of how far you could stretch \$1 trillion. It would probably cross the globe three times.

Also continuing on that vein of trying to put the cost of this in perspective. Now this is based on the estimated number of jobs that would be created by the Democratic majority by this "spendulous plan" that we're going to vote on, as I say, tomorrow. They're estimating that the number of jobs that would be created may be five or six, well, I think it is down to 4 million. And actually the President is not even saying the creation, Mr. Speaker, of 4 million jobs. He is saying the sustainment of and/or creation. So there is really no guarantee and no pledge of that, indeed, but if it does create 4 million jobs, the cost of this, just simple math, \$275,000 a job, \$275,000 a job. And I'm sure many of these jobs will be paying \$25,000 a year. You could

hand that money to a worker and keep him or her employed for 8½ years at that rate with a good benefit package. So, again, the cost per job is prohibitive in my opinion.

Colleagues, I'm going to show you one more poster before I yield to the gentlelady from Minnesota. This is a very, very telling chart. And again, strain your eyes a bit because it is worth seeing. And I will try to walk you through it. And it is titled, "Can You Afford to Pay for the Democratic Spending Bill?" Can you afford to pay for it? At \$825 billion, the economic stimulus plan sailing through Congress, and indeed it is sailing through. We're not going to have 48 hours to look at it. The stimulus plan would cost each American family more than \$10,000 on average, each American family more than \$10,000. Here is how that price tag compares with typical family expenses in a year. And, Mr. Speaker, I realize I'm talking to my colleagues on this floor, both Republicans and Democrats. I'm not talking to the television audience back home. But the men and women who serve here have families. And they have family expenses. And I'm sure when I point out that on average, a typical family spends \$10,400 a year on food, clothing and health care and on shelter, their home, whether they own their home or rental cost, their shelter is \$11,657 for their family. And the stimulus spending is going to cost them \$10,520. Thirty percent of their overall family budget is going to go toward this stimulus "spendulous" bill that is supposedly going to create all these jobs and get us out of this severe economic recession.

Well, would it be worth taking the chance even if we had no other alternatives? Well President Obama says "yes." Vice President BIDEN says, "well it does have, I hate to admit, a 30 percent chance of failing." Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, that is too great a chance. Those odds are not good, not good enough for the American people. The Members of this side of the aisle, the Republican Members, the minority Members, and quite honestly, if they had a chance to speak up and to submit amendments, maybe 50 of the conservative Blue Dog Democrats would agree with us. I wish they would have the opportunity to take a vote. Unfortunately, that has not occurred in this new open bipartisanship spirit that Speaker PELOSI has promised in the 111th Congress.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I would love to yield some time now to my colleague from Minnesota. MICHELE BACHMANN is in her second term, but you would think that it was her tenth term. She is doing an outstanding job. She is very knowledgeable on this issue.

And I will gladly yield to my colleague.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I want to thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY). He has done a marvelous job laying the groundwork and pouring the

pillars of this important discussion. This is historic, as we all know. Our colleagues understand how historic this level of spending is. Never before in the history of this country have we seen the type of profligate spending that has occurred just since January of this year. Just yesterday, as a matter of fact, we had a \$3 trillion day here on Capitol Hill. That is big money. You have heard of fantasy football before. Well, this is fantasy economics that is happening here in Washington, D.C.

My colleague will recall it wasn't that long ago that we were fighting on expanding the SCHIP program by \$35 billion before we first take care of the children who needed to be on the SCHIP program. We didn't want to expand eligibility until we first took care of the poor children that needed to have that SCHIP funding. So to just get things in perspective for the American people, we've moved from fighting tooth and nail over spending \$35 billion to today we're talking, as my colleague mentioned, what appears to be \$798 billion. But again, that is the raw number. It is just like when you buy a house or if you buy a car on credit and you're making your mortgage payment, you know you pay an awful lot more back to the bank because you have to make all those interest payments. This bill will be well over \$1 trillion, including the debt service. So we're not talking about a small amount of money.

And just also to put this in perspective and in context, normally this Congress spends about \$1 trillion a year in Federal discretionary spending. And we will take what, perhaps 1,000, 1,200 votes in the course of a year until we finally spend about \$1 trillion in spending. Well, consider, it wasn't even the end of January and this body spent, in one vote, what this body normally spends in over 1,000 votes over the course of 12 months to spend in discretionary spending.

And remember, this body has hasn't even taken up yet the normal appropriations bills that we have to take up for parks, public safety and education. We haven't even gone there yet with regular budgetary spending that is the duty of this House of Representatives to spend. We've already over and above spent now another \$1 trillion on the spending package. We're very concerned about the level of profligate spending.

I wanted to mention a study that was completed by Harvard in the year 2002. It was a long-term study. It looked at 18 different economies across the globe. And it asked this very simple question. What is it that governments can do to stimulate or cause economies to prosper, and concomitantly, what do governments do to cause economies to go in a downward spiral? Well, here is the bottom line. Here is what the nutshell of what this long-term study discovered. It was this: If you want an economy, any kind of economy, to prosper and advance, governments need to do

two things. You need to cut government wages, number one, and number two, you need to cut transfer payments, which is redistribution of wealth.

This stimulus package, which is a big government bailout package, does just the opposite. It increases funding eventually of government wages and also of transfer payments. The reverse then also is true in this Harvard study. It said what can governments do to hurt their economies? And it is very simple: Tax increases. That is what hasn't been talked about in this discussion. The only subject of discussion in Washington, D.C. has been, how big can this bill be? How much can we spend?

I'm a former Federal tax litigation attorney. That is what I did for a living, deal with taxes. This bill doesn't answer the question, how are we going to pay for this bill? I don't think the American people realize that yet. Congress has been so free with the American people's money to spend it in every direction they possibly can, but they haven't even addressed the question yet of how they are going to pay for this trillion dollars. And my colleague from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) is exactly right when he said that we have over \$10 trillion of debt, \$10 trillion in debt. And now we're going to add to that another 10 percent, and we haven't answered the question, how are we going to pay for it? Well, it is real simple. This is not too tough to figure out. There are only two ways to pay for that kind of spending. You either borrow it from other countries, or you increase the tax load on your citizens, or the Federal Government prints money and puts that money out into the money supply.

□ 1915

Well, what does that mean? Massive tax increases. We already know it's going to hurt the individual. It will hurt the economy. What about borrowing? Borrowing is the same thing. We have to pay that money back. We pay it back to other countries. Well, guess what? Other countries right now are suffering globally with their economies as well.

What about printing money, putting that into the money supply? We could do that, but that's the cruelest tax of all because that's the tax of inflation. So hardworking, prudent Americans who've done all the right things, who've invested well, will see the value of their dollar drop dramatically because their money isn't worth what it once was.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. If the gentlelady will yield just for a second. Reclaiming my time. I'm so glad that Representative BACHMANN brought that out about inflationary spiral; and that's absolutely true. You print this money and this debt has to be paid back. First thing you know, the value of our money goes down, and then we've created all these jobs that maybe pay \$25,000 a year, and first thing you

know, people wake up and realize that their money is only worth \$15,000 a year. So that is a huge, huge problem.

And I wanted to make one other point before yielding back to my colleague. As we look at what she was talking about, this national debt, we are approaching a, what, \$15 trillion national debt, which is the Gross Domestic Product. The sum of all goods and services in this country is about \$15 trillion. And after we add on this death we're going to be at \$12.5 trillion. So anybody that has just a scintilla of knowledge of economics knows that this is unsustainable.

And I yield back to my colleague.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I thank the gentleman from Georgia to bring that point up, because what he is stating for the American people is that this Congress is making a decision, together with the Obama administration, we are adding to uncertainty in the marketplace, and that's really the issue, will this Congress address the issue of certainty versus uncertainty in the economy.

I have the largest window manufacturer in the United States in my district. I met with the president of that company several years ago and he said to me, MICHELE, what we need more than anything is certainty in the marketplace.

If you go back to January of 2008, when this Congress made a decision to spend \$168 billion in rebate payments that went back into the economy, that decision only led to uncertainty for the American people, uncertainty for American business.

We could go through all of the spending initiatives that Congress took through all of 2008 and now into 2009. But I think yesterday said it all, when our United States Treasury Secretary, Mr. Tim Geithner, made his press conference that was well anticipated, what will the Obama administration do about the TARP monies that are available? We saw Wall Street's response, and it was to tank. Why? Because the Obama administration said what they want to do is have bigger and more powerful government. That's what they wanted, bottom line, bigger more powerful government. That did not calm the markets. That only led to uncertainty in the marketplace. It didn't lead to certainty. That's what we need. What would lead to certainty? And what would lead to certainty into the marketplace would be permanent tax reductions. If businesses and individuals who were interested in risk-taking with their investments knew that we would permanently cut the capital gains tax, permanently lower the business tax, the corporate tax rate, permanently lower marginal tax rates, do something about the estate tax problem that's going to spring open in 2010, and also, if they knew that we were going to radically reform the Sarbanes-Oxley rules, that would send a signal.

Instead, what does the stimulus do? It tells the American people, well,

we're also going to embrace socialized medicine. What? Embrace socialized medicine? This is not what the American people bargained for. This is not what they asked for.

We also know that the current administration wants to impose the largest energy tax we've ever seen in the history of our country, also known as the cap-and-trade system. This leads to massive uncertainty.

If we would have taken \$1 trillion last year that we spent on spending and put \$1 trillion into permanent tax relief, I think the gentleman from Georgia would agree, this year, our biggest problem would be finding enough workers to fill the jobs that would have been created from permanent tax relief. That's an alternative that the Republican positive solution has put on the table for American business and American individuals. We've got a plan. We've got a big plan. And that's the genius of America. We trust the American people to take their ingenuity to pour it into the marketplace, because we understand that's true wealth creation.

Governments can't create wealth. They never have, they never will. It's the American people and American businesses that create wealth. How? By productivity. How do you get productivity? You produce goods, you produce services. How do you do that? You put capital at work. Why do you do that? You know that you're going to have a return on your investment.

Today, the American business world sees there will be very little return on investment. But the Republican plan offers all sorts of return on investment. And that's why, to the gentleman from Georgia I know this is a marvelous way to go, and I'll be happy to add to your colloquy as we go.

I'll yield back.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Reclaiming my time. Absolutely, what you say couldn't be more true.

And I want to briefly, Mr. Speaker, talk about another colleague from Georgia in the other body, and that's our junior Senator, JOHNNY ISAKSON, a neighbor of mine in Cobb County who has been serving so well, first in this House, Mr. Speaker, and now in the United States Senate.

But JOHNNY ISAKSON, who has been in the real estate business, I think he spent 40 years in the real estate business. His dad owned Northside Realty. And he has gone, he's seen us go through periods like this in the past. And as he was explaining to me, I believe Gerald Ford was President when we went through the last real downturn in the housing market. And what stimulated the market to come back, Mr. Speaker, was a \$2,000 tax credit for the purchase of a new home, not for flipping or investment, but as a home-
stead. And within a short period of time, I'm going to say, 6 months to a year, that economy, that housing market was back to life, and nails were being driven, and walls were being

framed and foundations were being laid and, indeed, happy times were here again.

So what JOHNNY ISAKSON, Senator ISAKSON proposed, Mr. Speaker, to get this housing market going and stimulated, and let's face it. As he pointed out, and I completely agree, it was the housing market which brought us down and got us in this situation, and it's going to be the resumption, restoration of the housing market that is going to pull us out.

And Senator ISAKSON had an amendment on the Senate side. And his amendment, my colleagues, that anybody that purchased a home, it doesn't have to be a home in foreclosure, it could be one of these homes that 200, 300, \$400,000 homes that are just sitting there with weeds growing in the front yard, beautiful new homes that have been in inventory for a year and a half, builders, many of them, of course, bankrupt and out of business. But if any homeowner purchased a new home, they would get a \$15,000 refundable tax credit. And it would not have to be paid back. And of course that amendment was welcomed with open arms on the Senate side, as I understand. I think it may have been approved by voice vote.

And now, all of a sudden, maybe it's they're suspecting that the Senator cannot, in good conscience, support this overall package. I'm not really sure. But his amendment is pulled out. And I get a notice of that, Mr. Speaker, when I'm looking at the fact that the conferees have come to an agreement on this \$789.5 billion, and Senator ISAKSON's amendment is gone and we've receded to the House version, which is a pittance in comparison and, quite honestly, not nearly enough to stimulate the housing market.

You know, Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, let's speak frank on occasion. The meddlesome activity of this Congress, and maybe former administrations caused the problem that we're in. It caused the subprime loan crisis. It turned renters into homeowners when they had poor credit, they had no money to pay down, not a bit. They didn't have to verify their income. They didn't even have to verify they had a job. And then the thinking was, well, it doesn't matter, because the houses are going to appreciate in value, and they can pull the equity out. And you know, we've got this never-ending, wonderful cycle heading for the pot of gold at the end of the rainbow.

Well, all of a sudden that bubble burst, and now we're in a terrible situation. But that what started it all. That's what started it all, Mr. Speaker.

And it seems to me, and I'm sure my colleague will agree with me, that if we address the housing crisis with a bold amendment, it should maybe now should be a stand-alone bill that Senator JOHNNY ISAKSON has presented, and we take a spending bill, a true stimulus spending bill with a major

emphasis, as Representative BACHMANN has just pointed out, on tax relief, tax relief for men and women who are paying taxes at every marginal rate, and certainly for these small businessmen and women who bear the brunt of the taxation, and create most of the jobs, if we combine those two things with maybe some targeted, meaningful infrastructure spending for the 50 States that are struggling, many of them here in town this week, and I understand their needs, then I could support that and I could support it with enthusiasm and I think you could see bipartisan support.

But this bill, it became just a wish list for the Democratic majority for things, Mr. Speaker, that they've been wanting to do under regular order for years and couldn't do it. I mean, I can enumerate and I can point out certain things and it would make you laugh if it didn't make you sick. But did it have anything to do truly with creating jobs? I say no. And that's why I said no when I voted.

By the way, Mr. Speaker, before I yield back to my colleague from Minnesota, we did have a bipartisan vote on the floor of this House of Representatives. We, indeed had a bipartisan vote. We had 11 Democrats joining 178 Republicans voting "no." We did not have one single Republican voting "yes." So the bipartisan vote was the "no" vote because I think you've got wise men and women on both sides of the aisle that realize that this is not the way to go.

And I yield back to my colleague.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I thank Mr. GINGREY from Georgia for his fine words. And I think one thing that also we should address is the issue that was brought up earlier this week by our President in his press conference, when he stated that only the Federal Government, he said the Federal Government is the only entity left big enough and powerful enough to pull us out of this recession. And I was really struck by that comment that he made. That is a tremendous amount of faith to have in the Federal Government. And it views the Federal Government almost as a Good Fairy, or as the Easter Bunny, or as Santa Claus, that it's the Federal Government that's going to be able to pull the economy out of the doldrums. If that is the case, then why doesn't the Federal Government go ahead and take over everything and just run this country and we just decide we're going to become full-blown, socialist state. I don't think that's what the American people are calling for.

If you look at the living laboratory of the last 100 years of economics, you look at when America has prospered, what economic policies we followed, and when America has foundered, and it's almost like an economic punctuated equilibrium. If you look at the 1930s, under FDR, with historic levels of government spending, historic levels of government intervention, the United

States Secretary of the Treasury during the 1930s was Mr. Henry Morgenthau. And after nearly 8 years of historic levels of government spending, and historic levels of government intervention, unemployment levels remained the same as they were at the beginning, about 20, 22 percent level. That's horrific in the United States. The economy had not turned around after that period of time, after historic levels of spending.

□ 1930

Sitting before the Democratic controlled Ways and Means Committee in 1939, Henry Morgenthau said this:

"After historic levels of spending, we aren't any better off now than we were when we first started. The formula we tried did not work."

Then if you leap forward to the 1960s and 1970s and look at the historic levels of spending that occurred under both LBJ and again under Jimmy Carter, we heard my colleague Mr. GINGREY talk about the housing recession that we had during the time of Gerald Ford and about this massive government spending. This was not the policy that brought us out of the economic doldrums. You look at what did work. Look at the dramatic tax cuts that took place in the early 1980s under Ronald Reagan that turned this country around, that pivoted us economically and started us moving forward. Under that policy, under welfare reform that President Bill Clinton signed into law in the 1990s, we saw the government rise, and we saw the local economy rise across our Nation.

It is phenomenal what can happen, and it is because of the genius of American initiative. We could do that again. We are still the United States of America. We can still flower and can succeed. When I think that all across the globe we look at global economies that are tanking right now, the United States has the potential for being the center of the storm of security because we have so much in place that could offer the world a safe haven for dollars if we were to embrace the policy that both Representative GINGREY and I have been behind, which is this:

Dramatic cuts in government spending and dramatic cuts in taxation. If we have permanent levels of taxation cuts where we lay a ground of certainty in the marketplace, we will see investors want to put capital out if we can zero out capital gains for 3 years. The United States now has the second highest level of taxation in the world. Why would anyone choose the United States to invest in right now? We are not a positive investment climate, but if we would cut corporate tax rates from 34 percent down to 9 percent, zero out capital gains for 3 years, cut marginal tax rates at all levels, as Representative GINGREY has said, and also wipe out the death tax, you would see the economy turn around. Within 6 months, we would be shooting up. Within 18 months, I believe we would

have gone through a recession and that we would be roaring, and the rest of the world would look to the United States to invest their currency, and we would forever, I think, be the leader on into the future. We have a good story to tell.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Reclaiming my time, yes, there is no question about it. As for many of these companies—international companies and United States domestic companies that might have an offshore location—the reason they don't bring their profits back into the United States and bring their employment bases as well is due to this tax burden that Representative BACHMANN just pointed out in regard to—I think she is right—the industrialized countries. We may have the second highest corporate tax rate of any country. Of course, then you add State and local. So no wonder we're struggling.

But I will yield back, and we will continue this very, very important discussion.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I thank the gentleman for yielding back.

One thing that I am very concerned about as a former Federal tax lawyer is the burden on the 20- to 25-year-olds. I cannot look 20- and 25-year-olds in the eye and in good conscience say to them, "This stimulus bill will be good for you." It will not. Why? Because kids born during that time period already are inheriting a huge tax bill.

Studies have been done. In my postdoctoral studies that I did in tax law, what my research showed is that, by the time they reach their peak earning years, 20- to 25-year-olds will have to pay a tax burden. Just the Social Security portion of their tax burden will be about 25 percent of their total income. That does not include the Medicaid portion of their tax bills, the Federal tax portion of their tax bills, the State portion, their property tax, their gas tax, their local taxes. By the time all of it is added up, the estimates are, in their peak earning years, that 20- to 25-year-olds could be paying anywhere from 70 to 85 percent of their income in taxation. You heard me right. They could be paying 70 to 85 percent in taxation. That cannot happen. We will see a revolt in this country before people get out of bed in the morning to go and hand over 70 to 85 percent of their checks in taxation.

We can not do that to the next generation. We can not impoverish them by taxing them against the wall. That is why the kindest thing that we could do for the next generation is to hand them a well-run country with low tax rates. We cannot spend our way into prosperity. That is something that Leader BOEHNER has said over and over again. My colleague from Georgia agrees with that. We cannot spend our way into prosperity. What we can do is look at the fundamentals of what works. This Harvard study from 2002 bears it out. This is how you do it:

You cut government wages. You cut transfer payments. You do not increase

taxes. Under this current stimulus bill, there is no provision for payment for this \$1 trillion in expenditures. The day will come when we have to pay this bill, and it will come sooner than anyone thinks. That is what we are concerned about today.

We have to be adults now. We are Representatives in Congress. We have to be adults with people's money. We cannot just spend money without thinking through how it is going to be paid for, and I think it is important that the American people realize that this Congress has not made provisions for paying for this party, and it is the 20- to 25-year-olds, in the mother of all ironies, who will be the ones to pay for this bill.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Reclaiming my time, I am going to finish up on this very important subject, Mr. Speaker. I want to save some time for the other issue that I want to discuss, and I hope Representative BACHMANN will be able to stay with me for a little while longer because I know this is something that is very near and dear to her heart as well.

In conclusion, when the Democrats—Mr. Speaker, your party—took control in the 110th Congress and when Madam Speaker became the first female Speaker in the history of this body, it was an exciting time. I think we were all excited. Obviously, we Republicans would have preferred the Speaker to be our minority leader, JOHN BOEHNER, but certainly we had to tip our hat to NANCY PELOSI for that historic occasion. You could not ignore her words and what she had said and what her promises were, particularly during the campaign in 2006 that led up to that historic win and to the new Democratic majority:

It is going to be a new day. It is not going to be the same old bipartisan stuff. We are going to make sure the minority has an opportunity to participate. We have been in the minority for 12 years, and it has been a little painful. We feel like we have been shut out. We have not been able to have amendments. There have been too many closed rules, and there have been too many bills brought to the floor without going through the regular process, without going through subcommittee and committee and the Rules Committee and without amendments made in order and without giving Members on both sides of the aisle, who might not have been on the committee of jurisdiction, an opportunity to weigh in.

That is the right way. That is the way, Mr. Speaker, that I and MICHELE BACHMANN and everybody in this Chamber discuss it with our youngsters, whether they're from middle school, high school or whether they're in their first year of college, when we're talking about government and civics and about how things are done.

Speaking of process, I want to take just a minute and describe the comparison now in the way we Republicans did an energy bill back in 2005—in fact,

the Energy Policy Act of 2005. Listen to this, Mr. Speaker:

Hearings and subcommittee markups. The Energy and Commerce Committee held eight public hearings and six subcommittee markups, consuming 29 hours and 10 minutes of public consideration, followed by the full committee markup. The full markup consumed a total of 24 hours during which time 86 amendments were considered. I am sure 86 amendments were not just from one side of the aisle. Then there was the conference committee on this bill.

In advance of the formal conference committee meeting, Representative JOE BARTON, the gentleman from Texas, who was the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee, and Representative JOHN DINGELL, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan whom we honored today because of his longevity and wonderful service to this body, were on the conference committee. There was a Democratic Senator and a Republican Senator, and they actually met. Now, this was not a faux pas conference committee. This was a real committee. They met eleven times for a total of 23 hours to create the basic text of legislation that would then be presented to the full conference committee.

Finally, the formal House-Senate conference committee included Members from multiple House and Senate committees. It conducted five public sessions in the cavernous Energy and Commerce main hearing room during which 90 amendments were debated over a total of 20 hours.

Now compare that to the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009. This bill, this conference report that we're going to vote on tomorrow and that the Senate will vote on Friday: Hearings? Subcommittee markups? No hearings. No subcommittee markups. Full committee markup. The Energy and Commerce Committee spent 12 hours and considered 56 amendments. Three Republican amendments were made in order by the committee only to be immediately pulled out by the Speaker, so none of those amendments were made in order. The conference committee? Our ranking member, JOE BARTON, who included Mr. DINGELL on his conference committee for the energy bill that I talked about in 2005, was not even on the committee. He was not even on the committee. Where is the bipartisanship?

So the Speaker, I guess, and the Senate majority leader met in private to rewrite this stimulus package to come up with this final number. A total of two House Republicans were appointed to the conference committee, neither of them from the Energy and Commerce Committee, and I'm sure neither of them were called to any meeting. They were probably asked to sign the final conference report, which I fully trust that they did not.

Of course, in conclusion, I will say, Mr. Speaker, that the process part of it

is annoying and degrading. It is demeaning. It is disrespectful. It is hurtful to our constituents and to 48 percent of the American people. It does not help at all when the President of the United States says, hey, there was an election last November—and guess what? I won. Well, if that is the spirit of bipartisanship, I will have none of it. I want none of it. That is not exactly what I had in mind nor had any of my colleagues.

Well, let me take a breath because I want to talk to you tonight, my colleagues, about something else that is troubling me.

I said this at the outset. I was in church this past Sunday morning when our parish priest said to the parishioners—and I don't know whether my parish priest is a Republican or a Democrat. I have absolutely no idea. I know some of my pastors in the past have been Democrat because they've told me I am the only Republican they've ever voted for. So they weren't playing partisan politics from the pulpit.

The parishioners at mass were asked to contact their House Member or their two Senators about something that was of great concern to the church community, and that was something called the Freedom of Choice Act. I know my colleague from Minnesota is very familiar with this. The bill was introduced in the last Congress, and my parish priest fears that it will be introduced again.

What alerts them? What is their concern? Well, the concern is that President Obama, who is pro-choice, has already rescinded something called the Mexico City Policy.

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, you all know what I'm talking about. The Mexico City Policy is a policy that we have had in place for the last 8 years. It was in place under President Reagan; it was rescinded by President Clinton, and now it has been rescinded by President Obama.

□ 1945

That policy prohibited any Federal tax dollars that went to international non-government organizations through our foreign aid appropriations bill. It prevented any money going to any of these organizations involving family planning activities if they performed or referred or advised for abortion knowing full well that most Americans don't want their hard-earned tax dollars to be spent on abortion, particularly overseas.

And now President Obama has rescinded that policy. That money can be spent in that way.

President Obama has also stated that he is going to rescind President Bush's restriction on using Federal dollars to destroy human life in the form of embryos at fertility clinics for the sole purpose of harvesting stem cells. I think that was a very good decision that President Bush made back in the summer of 2001 shortly before 9/11 because it's not necessary. And that's

what I've argued with my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, repeatedly.

The science has brought us to the point now where we can get stem cells, adult stem cells, from many, many sources. We can get plural potential cells, and the success rate has been with harvesting those cells and not the cells that have been obtained from destroying human life.

So this bill that was introduced in the last Congress called the Freedom of Choice Act, says this, Mr. Speaker, and I want my colleagues to listen very carefully: "Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, that it is a policy of the United States that every woman has a fundamental right to choose to bear a child, also the fundamental right to terminate a pregnancy prior to fetal viability, or to terminate a pregnancy after fetal viability when necessary to protect the life or the health of the woman, and to restrict any State or local government from putting any limits on that whatsoever."

So that means basically, Mr. Speaker, that a woman at any stage of pregnancy—I mean, carrying an 8-month baby—could terminate that pregnancy.

Now, we have laws in the State of Georgia that say after the period of viability, a pregnancy cannot be terminated without two additional consenting physicians to verify that this is an extreme medical necessity.

But this would take any ability, any power of any State, away from them, and the Federal Government will say a woman has a right to choose. That right includes not only to terminate her pregnancy in the first trimester, not only to terminate her pregnancy in the second trimester, but even in the third trimester when you're talking about maybe even a 6-pound child if someone just says, "Well, you know, we're doing this because we're concerned about the health of the mother."

And the health of the mother can be a case of panic attack, a sleep disorder, an episode of anxiety, you know. So we are very concerned about that.

And I wanted to ask my colleague from Minnesota to be with me tonight to help bring this issue, Mr. Speaker, to our colleagues to really kind of tug at your heart strings and at your conscience and help you to understand that we—it looks like that we may be heading in that direction. God forbid, Mr. Speaker, it looks like with the policies that have been enacted thus far in the pronouncements of the new President, that we may be headed in that direction.

I'd like to yield to my colleague on this.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I thank my colleague, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. I think he has every reason to be very concerned about this Freedom of Choice Act coming before this body, the House of Representatives, and the Senate.

Why? Because during the campaign, the President stated quite clearly that

he wanted the Freedom of Choice Act to be the first piece of legislation that he would sign as President. So important to this pro-abortion President is the issue of the Freedom of Choice Act, he wanted to make that the signature item of his Presidency.

It's a cruel statement to make to the children of this country because there's a lie that's been perpetrated over the years since the 1960s. Planned Parenthood has said "every child, a wanted child;" which, by implication, means that if a mother does not want the child, it's better to kill the child than to allow that child to receive life.

But I can attest to the fact that I believe every child in the United States and across the world is a wanted child because there are arms that are open and waiting of childless parents all across this country who would love to receive a child, but children just aren't available for adoption.

My husband and I are fortunate enough to have 5 children born to us, and we were also fortunate to have 23 foster children come into our home. We were delighted to take at-risk children into our home, thrilled that we could have that opportunity. There are people all across this country who would also like to have that opportunity.

It is horrific to know that in the African American community, 50 percent of all African American pregnancies in the United States end in abortion, 50 percent. That is a genocide of African Americans of the United States. It should not be. There are Americans all across this country who would love to adopt African American babies, but they can't because 50 percent of all African American pregnancies today are ending in abortion.

What would the Freedom of Choice Act do? Very simply, it's this: It would eviscerate, it would take away every State and local restriction that there is today on abortion—reasonable restrictions, restrictions like making

sure every woman has the right to know what options are available to her, to know what is an abortion, what does it mean. For women who have the opportunity to see their unborn child on an ultrasound machine, it's an earthshaking experience to see your baby, your flesh and blood, moving on an ultrasound machine.

It takes a woman, it takes the father of that baby to think of what this means. This is human life, and it causes them to want to choose life and give life to that unborn child.

Reasonable restrictions have been passed all across this country in many hard-fought battles, and 35 years of effort from the pro-life community would be extinguished just like that. But that's what our President wants to have happen. He wants to take away any pro-life opportunity available from American women.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Reclaiming my time just for a second because I had a little difficulty pulling up the bill.

But this is what Representative BACHMANN is talking about, and this is what the bill says. "A government may not"—a government may not—"number 1, deny or interfere with a woman's right to choose, (a) to bear a child, (b) to terminate a pregnancy prior to viability"—that's probably about 24 weeks of life—or (c) to terminate a pregnancy after 24 weeks of life, viability, "where termination is necessary to protect the life or the health of the woman."

And then it goes on to say a government may not "discriminate against the exercise of these rights set forth" in that paragraph "in the regulation or provision of benefits, facilities, services, or information."

Just like the gentle lady from Minnesota was talking about. Let them see an ultrasound. Why not? It's being taken anyway. Why shouldn't they have the opportunity to see it?

Well, I want to thank, first of all, my colleague for being with me this

evening. Two important issues. I thank Mr. Speaker for his indulgence.

Let's be thinking, men and women, and ask God for the wisdom of Socrates as we debate and make decisions on these terribly important issues facing our Nation and our people.

With that, I yield back my time.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALTMIRE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

- Mr. ALTMIRE, for 5 minutes, today.
- Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. STUPAK, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. ENGEL, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. RAHALL, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. POE of Texas) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

- Mr. PENCE, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

- Mr. FORTENBERRY, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. WOLF, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 12, 2009, at 10 a.m.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, MICHAEL PATRICK RYAN, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN DEC. 20 AND DEC. 24, 2008

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Mike Ryan	12/20	12/21	Kuwait		167.00						167.00
	12/21	12/22	Iraq								—
	12/23	12/23	Afghanistan								—
	12/23	12/24	Germany		321.00						321.00
Committee total					488.00						488.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

MICHAEL RYAN, Jan. 26, 2009.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2008

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Collin C. Peterson	11/30	12/2	United Kingdom		614.12		10,501.39				11,115.51
Hon. Tim Holden	11/30	12/2	United Kingdom		614.12		7,928.39				8,542.51
Hon. Bob Etheridge	12/1	12/2	United Kingdom		399.92		7,565.39				7,965.31
Hon. Jim Marshall	11/30	12/2	United Kingdom		614.12		7,928.39				8,542.51
Hon. Jim Costa	12/1	12/2	United Kingdom		399.92		9,793.39				10,193.31
Rob Larew	12/1	12/2	United Kingdom		399.92		8,699.39				9,099.31
Clark Ogilvie	11/30	12/2	United Kingdom		614.12		7,898.39				8,512.51
Kevin Kramp	11/30	12/2	United Kingdom		614.12		7,898.39				8,512.51