

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

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

Mr. CARTER. And that spending was new spending.

Mrs. BACHMANN. That's correct.

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

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

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

I think the American people would be shocked to learn that all of those positive reforms have been repealed in one fell swoop.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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

EXCESSIVE GOVERNMENT SPENDING AND WASTE

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

with what we are doing with the economy, because in reality, the real issue of what drives the markets and what drives the confidence of the American people support the trust issue.

It's can we trust the people we put in charge of this mess in Washington to be doing this thing as straight and as straightforward as they honestly can without any particular person or agenda or personal profit from the procedure, but, rather, to be doing the best they can for the American people. Can we trust them?

And that's really what we are up here about. You know, when I ran for Congress, I made the statement, which I was loaned from JOHN CULBERSON, his campaign, that it's all about who do you trust to go a couple of thousand miles away from home and do what they say they are going to do.

Well, that's the real issue. The real issue is trust. If we start to see it, and in the last Congress, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, they came up with the culture of corruption and used it very effectively to defeat Republicans and raised issues, certain issues that ended up with people going to prison, and I understand that.

But that doesn't mean when we change that those issues all of a sudden don't matter any more to be discussed, because they need to be discussed, and we have issues right now that are destroying the underpinnings of trust that the American people have for those who are in charge.

And I have, on a couple of occasions prior to today come in and talked about the Rangel rule. I was interested to see this morning on the news, some gentleman wrote in to the IRS that he had failed to pay his taxes and he was going to catch up when he could. Until that time, he was exercising the Rangel rule, and he named three or four other people's rule, and that he didn't expect to pay penalties and interest when he got caught up with his taxes.

Well, I didn't tell you that was the law, I told you that's what I thought the law ought to be. But the point is somebody gets it, that's not fair. Somebody gets it, how can you trust somebody when they get special privileges and you don't?

Then I picked up this morning's newspaper, Roll Call, and I find that we have got another issue that ought to be talked about, and these are people that we work with and we respect, and there may be an explanation, but I think we are owed an explanation. Congressman MOLLOHAN, according to this morning's paper, his family foundation received \$75,000 worth of free rent from a group that he helped start and he got millions of dollars of earmarks for so they could exist, and he got \$75,000 worth of free rent for his family foundation.

I don't know if that's a bad thing or a good thing, but it doesn't sound right. It doesn't meet the "'tain't right test." Maybe it does meet the "'tain't right test," and something needs to be explained.

I am not calling anybody corrupt, like we were called corrupt, which, by the way, irritated the heck out of me. But, I am saying it ought to be explained, and I am saying that it is part of what I have been talking about, that there is accountability that's required of folks in this House.

Besides the things that I have raised against Chairman RANGEL and the taxes, there are those and other things. I have a poster over there, which I guess I am not going to put up, I forgot to, but it shows a long line of people waiting in New York City to sign up for rent-subsidized apartments.

And by Mr. RANGEL's own admission on the floor of this House, he had four rent-subsidized apartments—and I understand none of which qualified to live in—that he knocked out walls and made it into one big apartment and a campaign headquarters in a building where lines were going around the corner for families who were entitled to live in rent-subsidized apartments were waiting to get in.

I think that needs to be more adequately explained than it was. Just by turning yourself into the ethics department does not mean that you have answered the question.

□ 1630

So these issues are issues that are with us. They are issues that, if we are going to talk about trust in Washington, we have got to also be able to talk about trust from the American people about the activities that are going on in Washington.

We learned that the Chief of Staff of the White House, Rahm Emanuel, he lived rent-free in an apartment that was owned partially by one of our Members, Ms. DELAURO, but also owned by her husband, who the DCCC, which Rahm Emanuel is in charge of, gave \$500,000 in projects to do I think it was surveys and such and so and so. So, he benefited of a value of \$100,000 worth of free rent over a 5-year period of time, and it can be argued that he gave contracts to the people that he benefited from. Now, maybe that's not what happened.

You know, I used to tell juries all the time—for 20 years, I looked every juror in the eye and said, You're not to read anything about this case in the newspaper, watch anything on television, or listen to anything on the radio about this case. Because, believe it or not, sometimes the newspapers get things wrong. And they would all laugh because they knew that was the truth.

And I'm just saying, we have at this time probably the biggest crisis in American history, certainly in my lifetime, and I have been around much longer than the Speaker has, and I can tell you that this is the biggest crisis. And I had a man, one of the most highly respected former Members of this body, both sides of the aisle respect and love him—I won't use his name because I don't want people to know how he feels—but he said, Never, in all the

things I have been through, war, recessions, and other things, have I ever been so concerned for the future of my country as I am today.

When that kind of statesman makes those kind of statements, we are in a time where at least it is the feeling of our Nation that we are worried about the future. And we are worried and want to trust those we have put in office. And I want them to be able to trust us.

So, I am saying when I raise these issues, these are issues that cause more distrust. And they need to be responded to, and they need to be resolved. Quite frankly, they need to be resolved, in many instances, by a body of this House—the Ethics Committee. The Ethics Committee needs to function.

And I don't know if the American people would think, if they don't know the Ethics Committee, they would say, Why wouldn't it function? I don't know. I'm not on the Ethics Committee. But I can tell you this. It's a committee made up of 50 percent Democrats and 50 percent Republicans. If everybody votes their party line, nothing happens, because it's 50-50.

So, it's a serious committee to be assigned. It's a committee that requires you to sit in judgment upon your fellow Members and to do what is right for America, not what is right for either party or any Member of this House, but what is right for the United States of America under the rules we operate under.

That Ethics Committee needs to function, and it needs to function now.

Mrs. BACHMANN. If the gentleman would yield, I appreciate the remarks that you're making regarding ethics. Ethics, after all, is the study of what's right and what's wrong. That is really, if you want to get down to the brass tacks, that is what ethics is all about—what is right, what is wrong.

And what the gentleman has been talking about is the behavior of Members of this body, as well as the actions that Members of this body take, that lead to what's right and what's wrong.

If we look at this current economic mess that we are in the middle of, what is the morality, what are the ethics that got us into this mess, what are decisions that Members of this body made?

We are taking our fingers right now—and our mothers often said to us, If you point your finger at someone, remember, there's always three fingers that point back at yourself.

One thing that I think would be a credit to this body is if we examine—now, I am a fairly new Member of this body. This is just the beginning of my second term. But we need to look, how did government contribute to this economic meltdown. How did individual Members, individual Senators, individual House Members contribute to this economic meltdown.

I believe that my colleague, Judge JOHN CARTER, is asking the right questions when it comes to ethics. And I

commend Speaker PELOSI, who said she wanted this to be the most open, ethical Congress ever when she took the gavel as Speaker of the House. We agreed with her. We applauded her for making that statement. However, what we have seen since that time has given us great concern.

The same with President Obama. He has said he wants the most open, ethical administration. But we have been very concerned about what we have seen. And I would just bring up one example of that, and that would be one of our former colleagues—my colleague, Judge JOHN CARTER, brought that up himself.

Again, we don't necessarily know the answers. We aren't a court of jurisdiction here. But we are asking questions that I think the American people have the right to know.

We know that the Chief of Staff of President Obama was one of our former colleagues. A very bright, intelligent man. But we wondered what was missed during the Obama team's vetting process because the Chief of Staff served on the Freddie Mac Board of Directors. Why is this important?

When you look at the economic meltdown, what we often hear is that all roads lead to Freddie and Fannie. That is the government-sponsored entity that was the guarantor of all of these mortgages that are now falling—many of which are falling into disarray.

Well, our former colleague, the new Chief of Staff of the President, served on the Freddie Mac Board of Directors during the time that the Freddie Mac lied about its earnings. It was a leading contributor to this current economic meltdown.

The Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight Agency later singled out Freddie Mac, that Board of Directors of which the current Chief of Staff sits on. And, again, we are not condemning. We just don't know. We are asking questions. That is all we are doing. We are not trying to cast aspersions.

But the Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight Agency said this; that the Board of Directors of Freddie Mac, of which the current Chief of Staff to the President sits on, contributed to the fraud that took place in 2000 and 2001 for, "failing in its duty to follow up on matters brought to its attention." In other words, the Board of Directors ignored the red flags that we are waving in their faces.

Later on, the Securities and Exchange Commission fined Freddie Mac \$50 million for deliberate fraud for those years, 2000, 2001, 2002.

The Chief of Staff currently for President Obama was paid more than \$260,000, again, according to records and, again, this has to be answered, for the service that he gave while he sat on that Board of Directors for Freddie Mac. And after he resigned from that Board to run for Congress in 2002, Freddie Mac, or the troubled agency's PAC, gave the current Chief of Staff of the President, gave his campaign

\$25,000, the largest single gift to a House candidate.

Well, again, this is incredible because currently the Chief of Staff to the President of the United States is in the process of trying to dig us out of the mess that it appears Freddie Mac started, all while he sat on the Board of Directors and information was given to that Board.

Again, we don't know. And I agree with my colleague, Judge CARTER, we don't know what those answers are. But surely the American people deserve to have answers. They deserve to have answers about Freddie Mac and Fannie Mae. Who knew what; what did these Board of Directors know; what did they attempt to do, what was their role in all of this? After all, they were fined by the FDIC for their failure to be diligent. Who would have suspected that that failure could have resulted in a multitrillion-dollar meltdown that has brought a terrible disservice to our country, as well as the Community Reinvestment Act.

We need to know what did, for instance, Chairman FRANK, who's currently the chairman of the Financial Services Committee, of which I am a member, what did he know during his time? We know that he has made statements that Freddie Mac was in good condition, Fannie Mae was in good condition, when in fact they weren't in good condition.

What we need to get are answers. What did Members of Congress know about these organizations? Did they contribute or didn't they contribute to their failure? The American people know these are ethical questions because ethics is an issue of what is right, of what is wrong, and we all stand before the American people. None of us are perfect. We don't pretend to be perfect. But the American people deserve answers because we are in a very precarious situation right now and, Judge CARTER, I want to thank you for bringing these questions up before the American people.

Mr. CARTER. I thank the gentlelady. Reclaiming my time, I want to point out this is the same Rahm Emanuel who I think flippantly said, A crisis is a terrible thing to waste. As he added all these programs that had been promised programs of various sorts into the various spending bills that we had, he made that statement.

That statement has been quoted on multiple occasions in the newspaper. Probably a flippant statement. But it shows the cynicism within which this whole thing is viewed, and it undermines the trust that we are supposed to have for the people that are in charge.

Mrs. BACHMANN. If the gentleman would yield, I would just add to that. That statement has been repeated many times, and American people wonder exactly what that means. But it's not a standalone statement. That was something that the current Chief of Staff to the President said, but also our Secretary of State, Hillary Clinton,

just last week in Brussels, advised a European audience to, Never waste a good crisis.

Those were her words. Exactly what the Chief of Staff to the President said. In fact, 5 days before President Obama became President, he said that we are, "5 days away from fundamentally transforming the United States of America."

Judge CARTER, I think you would agree with me, the last 50 days of American history we have seen a fundamental transformation of the United States of America, and Americans have questions.

Mr. CARTER. Reclaiming my time, that is exactly what we have seen. And that is exactly what I think these statements mean. I mean, when we're talking about that trust factor, I don't think that anyone, including the President of the United States, ran on that he was going to fundamentally change the United States of America. What he said was: Hope. Give hope a chance. We are going to bring a new world to this world. But he didn't say, I'm going to change the whole United States government. And maybe it won't. We are still a democracy. And life changes as we move through this 4-year period of time.

But getting back to what I'm here to talk about, which is what we've been talking about, is accountability and ethics. And I want to continue to emphasize that I do this out of no malice toward any of the individuals, and I would hope that all of those issues are resolved favorably. The reason I would hope that is I'm not in the business, as others have been, of burning down this House. That's a slogan that's been used for years, but nobody ever went that far. That is far enough to where the American people distrusted the Congress. Yet, we are sitting still at around a 20 percent approval rating, both sides, the Senate and the House. So that means 80 percent of the people don't approve of us.

It's because we burn down the Congress. We called each other corrupt. I'm a person who believes that every person has the right to be heard and every person has the right to a fair defense. Everyone. And I would hope that we hear those defenses and see those defenses, because the list goes on and on.

John Murtha, with the millions of dollars he's funneling to companies in his district, with the explanation that they create jobs. Yet, those questions by Defense Department to see if they even have a purpose. Hilda Solis, who is the Treasurer of the America's Right to Work Association, which were fiduciary duties, and she lobbied Congress and took direction action. None of those things would entitle her to be holding office. She failed to pay taxes to the IRS for 16 years. Nothing has been done about that.

William Jefferson is under indictment for \$90,000 in cash in his freezer. The cold cash case. I'm sure that's

going to be resolved sometime, now that it is in the court system. And it goes on and on.

We have Tim Mahoney, who was using taxpayer funds to pay extortion to a former staffer to keep his mistress a secret from his wife. The voters kept him from coming to Congress. Recently, Senator BURRIS, who now it's pretty clear that there are accusations that he perjured himself when he gave testimony about the Governor's campaign funds, and yet no one seems to be wanting to do anything about that. This just goes on and on and on.

□ 1645

And, quite frankly, there is so much more to go, I don't really want to go into it. I have talked about some of these things previously.

And what is the issue that I am trying to bring forth here? The issue that I am trying to bring forth here is: Government, when you send someone to Washington, whether you send them 100 miles or 50 miles away from home, or whether you send them 2,000 miles away from home, you expect to be able to trust those people to do what they said they would do and to stand for what they say they stand for. And one of the things you want to know is that these people are trustworthy.

Now, when we have issues like this that are raised without being answered and we have a body whose job it is to resolve those issues, the Ethics Committee, and the Ethics Committee is not doing their job, or if they are we are not seeing the results, then you can't expect people in Wichita, Kansas, or Round Rock, Texas, or San Francisco, California, to hear these things and see these things and not wonder, are those people trustworthy enough to be taking care of my business in the Nation's capital? And I think many of them would then say, if it sticks to one, it sticks to all; which is basically the message that was put out by the Democrats in the last Congress.

I don't agree that if it sticks to one, it sticks to all. I think any time you gather the amount of people that gather in this Congress there are going to be mistakes made. I don't think you can get past it. And I think you can take any body of people, even any membership in a church, and you are going to find that there are issues that would cause people to be concerned. That is not our job. Our job is to make sure that we are the most honest, ethical Congress in history, as the Speaker has challenged us to be. And it is her job as the Speaker, I think, to promote going forward on these issues in every way she can to get these matters resolved; because until they are resolved, they deserve to be talked about, and when they are talked about they can't help but cause people to be concerned.

I am going to tell you that I have been in Congress now since 2002, and prior to that time I served 20 years as a trial judge in Georgetown, Texas, trying felony cases among other

things. But I can tell you, I have encountered an awful lot of people on both sides of the aisle in this Congress, and the vast majority of these people are beyond reproach and outstanding individuals and great Americans. They are working long, terrible hours, and wearing out a lot of shoe leather marching up and down these halls to subcommittee and committee hearings to make sure that the Nation's business is done to best of their ability. And that is why, as someone who believes that there is a world of right and wrong, good and evil, that it isn't what each person thinks it is, but there is a concept among humanity that says certain things are right and certain things are wrong. And you can't make it relative to anything. It is a fact.

As one who believes that way, I think it is our duty, and, in particular, it is my mission to point these things out and say let's resolve these issues. And that is part of my message here, because I don't want the vast, vast majority of the people in this Congress tainted. I don't care what party they are in, I don't want them tainting the whole body politic of the Congress. There are just too many good people here working too hard to do the right thing, what they and their constituents perceive to be the right thing. That is as it should be.

But for us to not address these issues, allow them to be swept under the carpet and forgotten, whenever you mention something and it just logs a little thought pressed in the back of somebody's brain, it is always there until it is resolved. We need to resolve these issues and they need to be resolved properly. And if we are going to put people who have unresolved issues in a position of authority in this Congress, I think that brings consequences that are grave to the Congress and this Nation.

So, therefore, if people are in a position where ethics is questioned, morality is questioned, it is for the good of the Congress that they not serve in those positions. It happens to be a Republican party rule that if someone is indicted, they must step down from the position of leadership. And that actually occurred in the last Congress.

I happen to be someone who, for 20 years, told juries every week: An indictment is nothing but a legal accusation. It is no proof of guilt, and no assumption of guilt should be taken by any member of the jury based upon the indictment. It is a legal acquisition, a form by which the State knows what it has to prove and the defense knows what it has to defend. But the Republicans decided that was enough to require someone to step down, which is kind of above and beyond the call of duty; but if that is the standard, it ought to be the standard for everybody. Everyone should choose to adopt the high standards that are set by the highest of standards in this body.

So that is what I have been talking about in these days when I have come

in here, and that is what I will continue to talk about, because I believe in our court systems. I believe that our court systems are good sources of justice for the people who use them. And every time somebody walks out the door, one party is unhappy. But the fact is, they resolve the conflict, and they do it justly and fairly between the parties.

I believe we should justly and fairly deal with each other in this Congress, and I believe that we should justly and fairly respect each other in this Congress. And I believe that when there are issues which taint the Congress, we should be willing to demand those issues be resolved; and, if they aren't resolved, we should demand that the persons who are not trying to get it resolved step down from positions of authority that they may hold.

Now, that may be harsh, but I believe in justice. If you believe in justice, right is right and wrong is wrong. And if there is wrong and it goes unresolved, it is bad for the entire Nation and the world. And for that reason, I have been standing before this House many days all by myself, kind of the voice crying in the wilderness. Let's get to be a just body again. Let's get to be where people look at congressmen and say, I am proud to know that Congressman.

You know, when I ran for the Congress, I was in College Station, Texas, and I ran into three of my colleagues in the judiciary, trial judges, district judges, in College Station. And they asked me, why would anybody leave the branch of government that generally makes sense to go to the branch of government that never makes sense? And I laughed and I said, well, maybe an old judge can help make some of it make sense. And maybe not. But I also at that time thought they thought, and as I thought and still think, that the Congress is worthy of respect.

So that we may be a body worthy of respect, I raise these issues. I will continue to raise these issues until we have resolved these issues, and hopefully we can go forward in raising the standards for this body so that people look with respect upon the Congress of the United States of America.

I yield back the balance of 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 Ms. KAPTUR) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. LEE of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.