

going to be another stimulus package. We don't know how much that is going to cost.

Speaker PELOSI is quoted as saying that she is open to a second stimulus package. That was on CNN. It says, "The Democrats eye another stimulus bill on the Hill." "Pelosi open to another stimulus," in Roll Call. "Pelosi raises the prospect of another stimulus economic package, a second one, this year," in CQ. "Pelosi leaves the door open to a second stimulus," in Reuters. And the Wall Street Journal talks about that by saying, "Lawmakers weigh the need for a second stimulus to spur job growth."

If you add all this together, Mr. Speaker, we are spending God only knows how many trillions of dollars that we do not have, and we are mortgaging the future of our kids and grandkids.

I have been down here night after night talking about this, and I cannot understand why we don't approach the solving of these problems in a logical and orderly manner as we have in the past under people such as John F. Kennedy and Ronald Reagan. They cut taxes to stimulate economic growth, and it worked, giving us economic recovery and long periods of economic growth. But what we are doing is just throwing taxpayers' money at it as fast as we possibly can, and it is money which we don't have. And we are going to print that money, the money that we can't borrow from somebody else.

We already owe China about \$800 billion, \$900 billion. We owe Japan about \$600 billion. They are not going to continue to loan us money. We have borrowed money from the Social Security trust fund, so much so that it is probably bankrupt if we were to really look at it today. Yet, we continue to spend money and spend the future generations right down the tube.

The inflation rate that we are going to face in the next 2, 3, 4 years I think is going to be untenable. I really believe we are going to have double-digit inflation as well as double-digit unemployment because of the way we are going about solving these problems. Mr. Speaker, I just cannot understand it.

Then, on top of that, what did we do to stimulate buying homes? We cut the amount of mortgage deductions that people can deduct from their taxes by about 30 percent. So if a person has a mortgage deduction on their house, we cut that. We reduced it by 30 percent. There is a real inducement for people to buy a home. Then, as far as charitable giving is concerned, we reduced the amount that people can deduct from their taxes for giving money to charities, and that is going to put the charitable institutions in a real bind, and that means the government will probably pick up more of the responsibility of taking care of the people of this country. That is just unconscionable, in my opinion. We need to be doing what is necessary to stimulate

economic growth and not put this country into a financial trick bag.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues and I have been down here night after night talking about this. We feel like it is falling upon deaf ears, but we must come down here and try to explain to our colleagues and the American people how really horrible is the approach that we are taking right now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MCHENRY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PAUL addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. CHAFFETZ addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

TAX TIME

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, many people were quite relieved when

President Obama promised to reduce taxes on 95 percent of Americans. Last week, the President introduced his new budget that depends upon a staggering tax increase of \$1.4 trillion over the next 10 years. If that fell on every one of us, that would come to nearly \$15,000 for an average family of four, or about \$1,500 per year, out of that family's paychecks. So what a relief it was to hear the President's assurances that that is only going to be a tax on the rich. Except, it is not.

As we begin dissecting the President's new taxes, it is becoming crystal clear that they are actually hitting squarely at the middle-class, working families who are struggling to make ends meet in the worst economy in a generation. Let me walk you through the reasons why the President's new taxes are something that every middle-class family should fear.

There are about \$650 billion of direct tax increases, including a boost in the income tax of nearly 40 percent. Now, that is the part that the President says will only be on the very wealthy, which he defines as people making \$125,000 a year or couples making \$250,000. But when you scratch the surface, you learn that more than half of these folks aren't folks at all; they are small businesses. So if you work for or you own a small business, chances are this tax is for you. The rest is coming from increases in business taxes, either directly, or as cap-and-trade taxes for carbon dioxide emissions. That is a huge levee on every business that emits carbon dioxide. That includes construction, agriculture, cargo transportation, energy production, manufacturing, baking, distilling. Is that anything for the middle-class to worry about? You bet it is.

I will let you in on a little secret of government finance: Businesses do not pay business taxes. There are only three possible ways that a business tax can be paid. It is paid by us as consumers through higher prices; it is paid by us as employees through lower wages; or, it is paid by us as investors through lower earnings, that is, what is remaining of our 401(k)s. There is simply no other possible way a business tax can be paid.

The income tax deduction for charitable contributions is being curtailed for upper income taxpayers upon whom charities rely for the vast bulk of their donations every year. That means a lot less charitable contributions and a lot more demand for government services.

At just the moment when investment is desperately needed to create new jobs, the President proposed hiking the capital gains tax. That means a lot less investment and a lot less job creation.

Now, this is not a complicated principle: If you tax something, you get less of it. If you tax productivity, you get less productivity. If you tax charitable contributions, you get less charitable contributions. If you tax investments, you get less investments and less jobs. If you tax energy production, you get less energy.

So just at the time when we need more productivity, more charity, more investment for jobs, and more energy, the Obama administration proposes a massive tax increase that they have the gall to tell us will stimulate the economy. These taxes will hammer every American, either directly or indirectly. At exactly the time when we should be reducing burdens on the economy, this administration wants to increase them.

If the President wants to raise taxes because the government is out of money, what makes him think that the American people happen to be flush with cash? This is exactly the mistake that Herbert Hoover made in responding to the recession of 1929. He dramatically raised income taxes, import taxes, and spending, and he turned the recession of 1929 into the depression of the 1930s.

Adam Smith, the father of modern economics, pointed out that a government that raises taxes in response to a recession makes exactly the same mistake as a shopkeeper who raises prices in response to a sales slump. California has again ignored that warning. It is set to impose the biggest State tax increase in history on April 1. That is going to be \$13 billion from California families, proportionately a little bit less than the President's taxes, but it is in the same ballpark. I suspect that by the time the Obama budget, with all of its tax increases, comes up for a vote, California will have become a poster child for what not to do. Maybe, by then, the administration and the majority in Congress will figure out that raising taxes in a recession is not exactly the smartest thing that we could be doing.

SO MUCH MONEY TO GIVE AWAY AND SO LITTLE TIME

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, these are interesting times we are living in. It just seems like the motto we hear in Congress is, so much money to give away and so little time. Wow.

How can we give away more and more money? Well, to give it away, we have got to tax, we have got to borrow, and we have got to print more money. All of these are not good things to be doing. And how ironic this week to see an article in national papers that, as Mr. Geithner is encouraging other countries to follow our lead and spend and spend and tax and spend and borrow and spend, Europe, of all places, is saying, we are not sure that this idea of spending and spending more and more money is such a good idea. Whoever would have thought that Europe would be the ones to give us a lecture on overspending not being the way to go? But these are the people that have

been overspending. They know, it doesn't work. Yet, here we are, trying it ourselves.

Now, we keep hearing about the deficit. When I was here as a freshman in 2005 and 2006, I was upset about the overspending. I was upset about the deficit going up. And it wasn't the tax cuts that created the problem. The tax cuts created the greatest revenue coming into the U.S. Treasury in American history, more money than ever coming into the Treasury. That wasn't the problem. But as it came in faster and faster, we were spending even faster than that, and there were some of us who were upset about it. The American people were upset about it. So as our friends across the aisle kept pointing out, you have got to cut out this deficit spending, the voters heard them. They said, they are right. The Democrats are the ones saying don't be spending and running up the deficit on our children and grandchildren. The voters were right. The Democrats were right to say that, because we were overspending. Many of us in the Republican party were saying the same thing. But that was not what carried the day. There was overspending.

As a result, we got this comment after the election in November of 2006 from our now Speaker: "The American people voted to restore integrity and honesty in Washington, D.C., and the Democrats intend to lead the most honest, most open, and most ethical Congress in the history."

In fact, we even voted a few weeks ago in here that we would not even vote or take up this horrible spending bill, spendulus, porkulus, whatever you want to call it, until we had at least had 48 hours to review it. We voted on that. The vast majority, it seems like it may have been a super majority, voted that we would not vote on that bill until we had seen it for at least 48 hours. Then it gets on the web at 11:00 or 12:00 at night. I got my copy to review the next morning about 9:00, and we are debating at 10:00. And we are told, people are losing their jobs every minute you are delaying passing this bill. We have got to pass it. You don't have time to read it, you have just got to trust all the people, the staffers and everybody that put this together. We don't know what is air-dropped in there; we don't know what all is part of it, because we don't have time to read it, either. Nobody on either side of the aisle read it, but we had to pass it.

It doesn't exactly match up with the transparency and the openness that was promised. It doesn't match up with the President of the United States, President Obama, promising there would be no bill that would be taken up and voted on unless we had 5 full days before he signed it to have comments, 5 full days. Well, we were told we had to pass it, we had no choice, people are losing their jobs. And the thing is, people were hearing things that were supposed to be in the bill, and yet the very week that this bill was being brought

to the floor to vote on, there were tens of thousands of jobs every day being lost because businesses were giving up hope. They were trying to hang in there, hang on to their good employees. So many of those jobs lost were good union jobs. They were trying to hang in there. But then, from what they were hearing it didn't sound like this so-called stimulus or spendulus bill was going to allow them to come out from under the trouble they were in, so they gave up and kept laying jobs aside. People, families were hurt. So we were told, "It has got to be fast. Don't read it, just vote on it." So it was passed, and 4 days later it gets signed into law.

□ 1515

Now, how is that an example of being open, honest and transparent? As a young attorney, I always advised people, if people want you to sign off on something but say, "you don't have time to read it, just sign it," then it is even more important to read before you sign off on it, before you put your name on it. And here we had the Congress of the United States put their names on a document that they were not allowed to read all because it had to be passed immediately. And then 4 days later, once we get the press and all of that going on, have the photo op there in Colorado, then the bill gets signed. And I'll bet the folks there, I'll bet the President had not read the bill. Of course he hadn't. He hadn't had time.

I am joined by my dear friend from Indiana, Mr. DAN BURTON. I would love to yield time to him such as he would use and do so at this time.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Thank you very much. I appreciate it. And I'm happy to stick around here tonight with you to go into some of the things that I think ought to be explained to our colleagues and to the American people if they happen to be paying attention here tonight to what we are doing.

The people really do have a right to know where we are spending this money. And we had people from the Treasury Department appear before the Senate Banking Committee last week. And Senator SHELBY, as I recall, asked where some of the money was being spent. They actually would not even tell him where the money was going. And we are talking about \$700 billion that was passed by the House and the Senate. There was supposed to be transparency so that we knew where the money was going.

Now we did find out, and I mentioned this in a previous Special Order tonight, we did find out that some of the money that was given to the financial institutions to get the economy moving again was used to help other countries. Now this is \$700 billion that was supposed to be used to help the American people, help the American economy and help the financial institutions to be able to survive. And yet \$8 billion, \$8,000 million, was loaned by