

some thoughts. I look forward to our being able to continue the discussion on the floor of the House. I hope, I sincerely hope that we will be able to engage in a thoughtful, deliberate discussion of alternatives that will reduce greenhouse gases, the threat to the planet, strengthen our economy and make a more liveable world for our children and grandchildren.

DEFINING MOMENT

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

Mr. RADANOVICH. I appreciate being joined here with my colleague from Illinois to talk about somewhat of a new issue, I think, in the Congress, but more of a broad overview of the situation here in the United States and the situation of the Congress where we might be headed as a country and some new ideas that might be in order.

Mr. Speaker, I can't help but think during this special time of the references of our current situation to the Great Depression in the 1930s and the FDR administration, how Franklin Roosevelt dealt with those issues and a contract, a social contract that was written during those times that was felt to be necessary in order to deal with the trying times of the day.

And I am not suggesting that the Depression is anything like what we are facing now. We are lucky to not be dealing with 30 percent unemployment, although there are some places in California that have that. Nationally we are not there. But there are some similarities.

And I was reading a book the other day by Jonathan Alter, a very interesting book, called "The Defining Moment." And it was that time during the first 150 days of the FDR administration that it dawned on FDR that he was writing a new social contract.

Jonathan Alter said it well when he wrote: "FDR knew he was on the verge of proposing nothing less than a rewriting of the American social contract. Instead of every man being the captain of his own fate, he envisioned the ship of state carrying a safety net. He favored what he called cradle-to-grave coverage, including national health insurance. But he knew that trying to insulate average Americans from the ravages of the market was a long-term process." So, in public, he borrowed a term from the private sector and spoke vaguely of social insurance.

□ 1930

It dawned on me that having been here a number of years, having had a Republican majority for about 12 years, having thought of reading the signals back in 1994 that the American people wanted a change in their government, and less government, the fact that perhaps during that time a new social contract would have been something that

could have succeeded in achieving those goals while we were in office.

Now, the Republicans, when they came in charge, didn't do what they had promised to do in reducing government, and that has led to us being in the minority now. I think the Republicans get that, and I think we are in a position now where we are trying to assess, where do we go from here? And it dawned on me that it is probably no surprise that we are drawing up these similarities to the Depression and the time for a new deal. We have a President in the White House who has been characterized as the next FDR and very popular and spending money like FDR, but I think that leaves to Republicans the opportunity to define a new social contract, and that interests me.

And I have to go back to times of the contract with America; and that was a contract, but it wasn't necessarily a social contract. It was a political contract. If the American people gave the majority in the House to the Republicans, they would bring 10 bills to the floor, and that was it. It didn't really speak of a social contract in that what government would do and then the rest of society would do as a response to that. It didn't really define a new social contract that we need today.

So I would like to encourage some conversation about that or along those lines. I am so proud to be joined by my friend from Illinois, Mr. ROSKAM, and also my friend from South Carolina, Mr. INGLIS, to discuss it.

Mr. ROSKAM. If the gentleman would yield. I thank the gentleman for gathering us today and for his leadership, and really having a conversation that I think is very important, Mr. Speaker, to talk about where we are, because my sense is that we are at a very pivotal point in our public life right now and when the types of changes and the types of choices that are being presented to the public are choices that we are going to reflect back in 5, 10, 15, 20, 30, 40 years and say that was the time.

I remember my mother grew up in Oak Park, Illinois, and she was born in 1930. She remembers and I remember her telling me about what it was like for her as a little girl turning on the radio and hearing the voice of Adolph Hitler, and just that sort of ominous feel. And now I am kind of projecting here, but I am imagining that my mother as a little girl sort of knew that there was something that was going on, and that time that she was involved in was formative.

And I would suggest to you, take the World War II reference and abandon it now, and this time that we are in just has a feel about it. It has a poignancy to it, and it has a sense that decisions that are going to be made are going to be made and have long-term implications, and I think that one of a couple of things is going to happen.

My hope and expectation is that we are going to make decisions and we will say, thank goodness that there

were clear-thinking people in Washington at the time that the wheels were coming off the cart. But the alternative is that we surrender so much freedom and we give up so much to a benevolent government that sort of pats us on the head and says: We are going to take care of all your problems. And then we wake up, and when the government fails—and we've seen that time and time and time again lately. We wake up and we don't have those tools that should be ours, and instead they were squandered and they were given away at a time of panic and at a time of legitimate fear.

So here we are on the floor of the House of Representatives, and we are in the midst of this conversation as a country and we have got to look carefully at where we have been and then figure out where we are going. And I think any honest assessment of where we have been takes a look back and says: Okay, United States of America, you have been given an inspired Declaration of Independence. You have been given a Constitution that is the envy of the world. You, as a Nation, and your predecessors have gone through the Civil War. You have gone through the turmoil of slavery. You have gone through world wars. You have gone through a Depression like we were talking about a minute ago. You defeated communism. You defeated fascism, and here you are at this moment where great decisions need to be made. But do so as a Nation with a proud heritage, as a Nation that has understood where it has come from and where it needs to go.

But don't panic. Don't underreact. Don't act as if there are no problems, because there are problems. We know there are great difficulties. We know we have a health care system that is unsustainable. We know that the world is an increasingly dangerous place. We know that the amount of money that is being spent here in Washington begins to feel like generational theft. It really is too much. So we are rightly sobered by these things. But as we are contemplating solutions, we ought not be dismissive of this incredible heritage that we have been given.

I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. INGLIS. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I think what you just said is very true. The thing I would add to it is that it is also important that we not abandon hope in the midst of that awareness. You just talked about the important awareness of the trials that we are in. We need to be very much aware.

We also, I think, need to approach them with a hope that—well, it depends on where you come from. From my perspective, it is this: The reason I have hope is I believe there is a sovereign God who is in control of all things and, furthermore, I think he is good. So if you put those two things together, I have every reason to be optimistic. Now, I do need to be aware of

the risks that we face and, therefore, respond to them and anticipate them, but also with the hope that America has been through similar kinds of troubles before and met incredible challenges.

Since I serve on the Science Committee and Foreign Affairs, I always mention the scientific kind of things. I am not a scientist. I just play one occasionally on the Science Committee, by the way. But when you think about the things that the United States has done, we finished the transcontinental railroad in the midst of the Civil War. We finished the Panama Canal when the French had abandoned that effort after losing tens of thousands of people to malaria and other causes of death in Panama. We were the nation that fought and won World War II, that very quickly responded to the arms race, to Sputnik, and all of that.

In South Carolina, part of our claim to fame is the Savannah River site was and, as I understand it, still remains the largest construction project in the history of the country. All the stainless steel in the country was going to Aiken, South Carolina, to build the canyons that would develop some of the elements related to our nuclear arsenal, the bomb plant as we call it in South Carolina. Then, in 1961, President Kennedy said we must go to the Moon, make it our goal to go to the Moon before the end of the decade. And we did it, 1969.

So the amazing thing to me is that we accomplished all of those things with technology that now looks very old. The Apollo mission was all designed on the slide rule. Actually, the shuttles were designed on slide rules.

So when you take what America has done with this entrepreneurship, this belief in freedom that the gentleman was just mentioning, and charge that up in the right way so that you marshal those forces and you go out and you conquer these problems, that is what we are about. And I think what our friend just mentioned is very good about the importance of this free enterprise system and the American Dream.

To me, the American Dream is this: It is the fulfilling of the God-given desire to create, to contribute, to care, and to live at peace with one's self, one's neighbors, and one's God. That is the American Dream. And it starts with an understanding that it is the opportunity to do those things, not the guarantee. And that is, I think, what separates us from the other party is they are talking all the time about guarantee. We talk about opportunity. The gentleman from California, I think, talks about opportunity.

Mr. RADANOVICH. It is very interesting. Yes, we do talk about opportunity. But I am reminded about the opening line to Common Sense, which was the book written, that sparked the American Revolution, by Thomas Paine. In the very opening sentence he says: Writers have so confused govern-

ment with society as to leave no distinction between the two.

It is a reminder today that there is more than one institution in this country. In fact, if you go back to the Bible, in Genesis there were institutions created there. God said, go forth and multiply; He created the family institution. He said, tend to the garden. He created the business institution. And He said, worship me, which meant love God above all things and love your neighbor as yourself. And then afterwards, Cain killed Abel, and we needed another institution to keep from killing each other, and that was the government, and so we had four.

Even back in the Revolutionary time, there wasn't really a clear idea about what institution did what in society so that we could have the opportunity that we are looking for. Right now, I think, with this New Deal social contract that I believe that we have in place now, which started in the 1930's, Ronald Reagan, the great President that he was, the conservative that he was, still was not able to distinguish between all of those, and the growth of government still happened during that time. The Contract with America wasn't necessarily anything more than a promise to bring 10 bills to the floor. It had its purpose. It was good in many ways, but it didn't address what Thomas Paine thought was the confusion out there about what is government doing, what do we call this remaining society part, and what does it look like, and who does what in this country. Does government raise families or does family raise families? Does government provide jobs or does government protect people and business is the one and should be allowed to provide the jobs and the economy?

And so when we look today at the new administration, the change in majority that we have right now, the growth in the budget, the intention of taking over 17 percent of the business sector and the health care sector, bringing it in under government control and creating a new bubble that will happen, and that is replacing fossil fuels with solar and energy production with massive subsidies that will rack up the national debt like we have never seen, it does make you wonder about whether or not at some point in time the old ATM is going to stop giving out cash. And then what are we going to do? Because we have based our society on a complete reliance of government while ignoring the value of the other institutions, and while relying more on government, we weaken the other institutions. That, I think, is what frightens me the most.

Everybody wants the President to succeed, but we wonder whether he will under the policies that he has adopted. And our hope is there with him, but there is a realistic expectation that if a liberal left policy of dramatically increasing the size and influence of the government is going to collapse upon itself I think at some point in time.

Mr. ROSKAM. I jotted down what you just said: Relying on the government, we weaken these other institutions, and that is really to the point. You know, the gentleman from South Carolina was talking about sort of an orderliness, if I could paraphrase, an orderliness. And I know the three of us and I know every Republican in the House of Representatives recognizes the role of government. There is an appropriate role of government, and the gentleman just gave a glimpse into the seeds of that, and it goes back ancient of times in civilization, and it was to create a structure for fairness and follow-through and an ability to have an expectation of what the ground rules are.

□ 1945

But when government bleeds over into responsibilities that aren't really the government's, and when people give the government that kind of responsibility and ultimately that authority, then you see where this ends up. And it is not a good picture.

Going back again to Genesis, I am reminded of the story of Isaac and his two sons, Esau and Jacob. And as you know, in that Near Eastern culture at that time, the oldest son who was Esau had the birthright. He had the property right. Give me a little grace here. It was about 90 percent ownership expectation that the oldest son was going to get the estate, the cattle and the household. And then the number two son kind of picks up the scraps. That is sort of the way it was in that time. Well, as you know, the account is that Esau comes in out of the field, and he is famished. He is crazy hungry. And we have all been like that. We know what that is like, just being so hungry you can hardly see straight. And his brother, Jacob, the number two son, is cooking some sort of stew. And Esau comes in and says, Give me some stew. And Jacob says, Give me your birthright. And Esau agrees to it. And now I'm collapsing the story down, but Esau gets passed over. He gives up his birthright.

I have this sense that we, as Americans, right now are in a position where we have this birthright that has been given to us not really through work of our own, but it is this birthright that has been entrusted to us. It is the ability to start a company, the ability to innovate, the ability to really capture what it is you want to do; and yet we are being coaxed, as a country, right now by some people who are saying, Give up that birthright. Just give it up. Here. We will give you "stability." And in the name of "stability," many, many people are sacrificing a fundamental birthright. It hasn't happened entirely. But we are sort of on that verge. You get the sense that that is what is beginning to happen.

One of the reasons that I'm a Republican is because I think the Republican Party has this high view ultimately.

Many times it is not articulated well. Many times we bumble along. And we are far from perfect. But do you know what? There is a core there that says, We know what that birthright is. And it is a system that has been the envy of the world that has created more prosperity for more people than the world has ever seen before. And yet we are being told, Just give it up. Just give it up, and you will get stability in exchange.

And I would submit that is a very, very bad deal. And we ought not make that exchange.

I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. INGLIS. And you mentioned "orderliness." I think what we are talking about here in part and what Mr. RADANOVICH has been talking about is the rule of law, the importance of knowing that you can count on the rule of law to allow you to, among other things, enjoy the fruits of your labors. When you trade that away and you don't have that assurance, you have this system like you're talking about where there is stability or there is a guarantee rather than an opportunity. If you don't have the certainty that you can, because of the rule of law, have the certainty of knowing you can enjoy the fruits of your labor, then there is just less labor. It is just the way it is. That is human nature.

Dick Arme, our former majority leader, was the first person I heard say this. He said, "Communism is that system where he who has nothing wants to share it with you." And so it really is a pretty good definition I think of communism. And of course I'm not accusing anyone here of advocating communism. But I do think that when you break this connection between industry, work, labor, and reward, funny things start happening. You lose incentive, and you lose the certainty of reward.

The thing that we do believe in, we Republicans advocate this thing of orderliness, or rule of law, very highly. We value that very highly because there are some economies around the world you can look at where they are blessed with many resources, but yet they lack the rule of law. And as a result, there is no certainty that your work will be rewarded, and, therefore, there just isn't as much work. There isn't as much industry. If you can't own the fruits of your labor, then you labor less. And for some people, this is a real problem. There is a deep philosophical divide that, I think the gentleman here can agree with me, we face a lot. Some people really have a Utopian view of humankind and think that we will some day move beyond this need to have a linkage between work and reward. But I think that what we realize is that, no, you will never break that link. You don't want to break that link. It is just the way it is. And so you want to make clear there is a clear linkage, and then people keep working. They keep innovating.

It is why, for example, we think that economies around the world that steal

our intellectual property are so offensive to us. We think, no, we had people who worked hard, who studied hard, who invested time, energy and capital to create something, and now you have gone and stolen it and are selling it on the streets for \$5 a copy when it really costs a lot more than that to develop. And some people think that is sort of Western imperialism maybe, but I think it is pretty clear that what we are talking about is effort and reward. And you have to keep those together and make opportunity for effort and reward.

I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. RADANOVICH. I thank the gentleman.

You raise an excellent point, and you speak of the virtue of work. And I'm reminded of virtue. I just have to think about where this virtue that you say comes from, and discussing previously the idea of what other institutions do and what they provide to us in our society. One of those is the issue of virtue. Where does that come from? And there is a chapter in the Bible in Second Peter where it addresses the issue of where freedom and independence come from. And it really starts with faith. And so the growing of that virtue doesn't start here. It starts in the faith institutions. Call it "church," call it "religion," whatever you want to call it; it starts with faith. And that, as outlined in Second Peter, produces virtue which produces freedom and independence. And it all goes into the ability that you describe and that is the desire and the ability to go and reap the rewards of your own labor.

The point I would make in response to yours is that that faith institution has to be really strong in the country because the Founding Fathers relied on it to be the virtue builder in a free society. They restricted government and religion because that had been the forms of tyranny over the last thousand years. Benjamin Franklin was leaving Independence Hall after they signed the Declaration of Independence. Somebody said, What have you given us? He said, Liberty, if you can handle it. And he was really talking about this idea that self-government doesn't come without virtuous people, and virtue originates in a sector that has been beaten down quite a bit. I think that is one of those institutions that has been suffering from Big Government.

I would love to take just a second to illustrate the most artful example and the best form of describing how we love one another as ourselves. It is charity. And if you look at a cross-section of charity in this country, I have identified about \$1.2 trillion of charity that occurs in the United States every year. Americans give about 1.5 to 2 percent of their gross income to charity on average, and that accounts for about \$300 billion a year that goes to churches and nonprofits and the like. Surprisingly, corporations and foundations

only give about \$100 billion a year. That makes \$400 billion. The balance, \$800 billion, comes from government charity, that is the forced levy of taxes on you and me. Twenty-five cents of our tax dollar goes to government charity in the form of Medicaid, food stamps—rack them up—farm subsidies and everything else. It adds up to about 25 cents on every dollar. And if the Founding Fathers were relying on the faith institutions to be the originators of virtue through faith, freedom and independence, it is getting less than one-third of the charity that is operating in this country today, while the lion's share of it goes to government which, at best, can sustain people at where they are.

The story you described about the person who is hungry and the main motivator of going to work and improving your life and doing things better, how can they be motivated when the charity is coming from a government institution that doesn't really encourage them beyond their own current situation and never really educates them on the need to work and why and the benefits of it? So I'm not surprised that there is more of a dependency on government, the growth of government, the overreliance on it, and this trend toward Big Government, because you have to follow the charity money. Frankly there are less of those virtues in this country because the faith institution has been weakened by the growth of government, and they are not able to—and they are the source that brings up this notion of freedom and independence, which is wanting in this country.

Anyway, I was intrigued by your thoughts of how people are motivated to work and what are the original origins of that ethic. And it is severely underfunded and being run over today by government.

Mr. ROSKAM. These choices that we are dealing with remind me of a story I heard about a young woman who was a foreign exchange student here. I forget what country she was from. But she came over here as a high school student or a college student and spent 1 year here like so many foreign exchange students do. And someone asked her, So what did you think? Wind it up for us. What did you think about this year that you spent in America? And what was the thing that made the biggest impression on you? And they were thinking, oh, computers or the highway system or the cool kids at school or whatever some of those predictable things were. But she said something that was very, very unusual. And she said that the biggest impact on her was the number of people who approached her and said, So what are you going to do? What do you want to study? What do you want to grow up and be?

And sometimes we lose track of that. I think that is such a common experience for Americans, an expectation that one generation is going to supersede the next generation in terms of

achievement. But for this girl, it was revolutionary. She came from a culture that didn't really support that, where that wasn't the expectation. And so for her to go around and be reaffirmed on these dreams, that dream of possibility, all of a sudden it was like, wow, I could do a lot of things.

One of my favorite authors is an author named Paul Johnson. Paul Johnson is a living British historian who likes the United States. So it is nice to read his stuff. He really likes America. And in one of his books called "A History of the American People," Paul Johnson talks about our Founders and compares them to the advisers of King George III. And so he goes through this list and he says, basically, you have got this A Team, this unbelievable group of people who founded our country. And you know all the names, Jefferson, Washington, Hamilton, Monroe and Madison and a whole cast of great leaders. And he says that they were such special people, but they were ultimately eclipsing themselves because the combination of them was so great.

And he said there was a second and a third tier of leadership underneath them that in any other generation would have been tier one people, but they just had the dumb luck to be on the scene with this incredible group of talent. And Johnson writes and compares that to the advisers of King George III, the King of England during the Revolution. And I'm overcharacterizing this, but it is as if we weren't playing fair. That is how good our Founders were compared to the leadership on the other side.

And Johnson makes this point: he said all kinds of factors go into history, into how history turns out and how things happen. There are economies. There is weather. There are wars. There are a whole host of things. But ultimately the single most important thing in the determination of history is the people who are in charge at the time—and now this is the PETER ROSKAM footnote—and the choices they make.

□ 2000

And so here we are, we are at this time, almost a tumultuous time in our public life where there is a great deal of fear out there. There is a great deal of anxiety and restlessness. People have been so disappointed for the last couple of months about solutions that they have seen and expectations that Washington and big institutions were going to come through for them. And ultimately, many of those institutions have failed.

One of the reasons that I am here and one of the reasons that I am part of the party that is the Republican Party is because there is that real bedrock of knowledge that, notwithstanding all of the challenges, there is this high view of the individual and a confidence that given a fair set of laws, given a fair shake, given a fair opportunity, there is going to be, on balance, a very good

result. That is not to say we don't have responsibilities because we do. But this view that somehow government is going to come in and make problems go away is, I think, profoundly naive. And we need to be mindful of surrendering so much of our national identity and so much of ourselves to a government that hasn't always deserved our confidence.

Mr. INGLIS. I would add to that, these were exceptional people that you just listed that believed in some very exceptional ideas.

I am a conservative. We are all conservatives here speaking tonight. And to some extent, conservatives are people who sort of want to keep things together the way they are. And I am also conservative philosophically as in wanting to have things like free markets and things like that. But it is also true that at times conservatives are people who want bold change, bold strokes, not just keep it the way it is, we really want to change things.

So those folks you were just mentioning were very bold in believing some pretty audacious things. Like we hold these truths to be self-evident. In other words, they are not going to make any further explanation of it. We hold these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights. Among these are the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

That was a bodacious thing to say in 1776. You could say the conservative personality thing was to continue to believe in the divine right of kings. But here were these upstarts in the colonies who said no, listen, we have studied the laws of nature and of nature's God, as Mr. Jefferson said in that document, and we come to a different conclusion. And then he stated the conclusion that we hold these truths to be self-evident. I think it is very exciting just to see how bold they were.

Now fast forward to where we are today, and we have a big challenge. Our challenge today is that our pollsters tell us that for the first time in awhile, maybe in our lifetimes, people don't believe that their children will be better off than they have been. I think that is worth examining and figuring out why that is.

When we started this wonderful adventure here in the United States in 1776 with those incredible words of change and things being self-evident, we carried that on. That was sort of our heritage. As Tom Friedman writes, America is young enough and brash enough to believe that every problem has a solution.

Much of the world has long ago left that nation, but they need us, the Americans, to believe that every problem has a solution. And I would submit that it comes from the DNA we developed in 1776 when we said that all men are created equal. Hello, that is not what the rest of the world thought. And we are endowed by these certain

inalienable rights. That, I would submit, carries through to the thought that yes, by my sacrifice today, or my putting my kids through college or whatever it is, can create for them a better standard of living than mine, which I think is something that has driven this country to its economic success.

It seems to me it is tied in with that DNA and that political understanding, and that comes, as the gentleman from California was saying earlier, was really from a faith understanding. So it really is connected to a series of very big thoughts in America that gets us to the place now of a big challenge, which is do we believe that our children will be better off than we are.

Unfortunately, a big number of our fellow citizens think not. I think it is worth asking, why is that and what can we do to convince them that no, really, America's best days are still ahead if we just stick to these principles, we return to our principles.

Mr. RADANOVICH. I am intrigued by the gentleman from Illinois's thoughts about this person who was so amazed that someone asked her what she wanted to do with her life.

Speaking about the authors of the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence, how important it is to be able to decide your own fate and be able to choose. And I believe, I think the progress of civilization, it moves from tyranny to self-government. I think we are on that march. There are a lot of bumps along the way and a lot of misconceptions about how order and society ought to be, but I think the beauty of the Declaration of Independence was that government was reined in and religion was put in its place, and after that you had the freedom to be able to—by and large, there were still a lot of problems in the United States even in its beginning, but it was the beginning of that.

In the 1830s, a gentleman by the name of Abraham Kuyper, he was a Calvinist Prime Minister in the Netherlands, he originated a concept. And again, this was while European countries were still figuring out their social contract and who was responsible for what, but he came up with this notion called *coram deo*, a Latin term, but it meant living life in the face of God.

It reminded me of what you said about this young child having her choice. And it was quite a bold statement for the time, but the statement was that government had no authority to be able to limit your freedoms in life, and neither did the church or any other form of authority, that that connection between the individual and God was the supreme connection.

And when Thomas Jefferson wrote in the Declaration of Independence that we have the inalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, what a huge step in moving from tyranny to self-government. This idea of Kuyper and living life in the face of God came afterwards in the 1830s. This

is when Darwin came out with “The Origin of Species” and Karl Marx and fascism and some of these others things were being mulled about. I think he set a new landmark about what are our freedoms. And to me, it further illuminates what a social contract might be, but that that individual had those freedoms.

I can't help but think in addition to that what the mandates were in the Garden and the ability to create a family, to go to work and worship God and love each other as ourselves, and have a government that protects you, and the freedom to be able to live life in the face of God through those institutions that were built up. Not everybody has those freedoms. Not everybody has a loving father and mother. Not everybody has learned the ability to work or has the ability to go do that. Not everybody has the freedom to worship God and love their neighbor as they wish.

I am kind of intrigued about what a new social contract would look like if we are back to the social contract of cradle to grave by government, government is getting too big, it is likely to come to an end of itself one way or the other. And if that is the case, what do Republicans present? And do you present it in a way that people logically say by golly, I want to go with that.

Mr. ROSKAM. I think that is the great invitation. That is the conversation that we are having with the American public. That is what is such a dynamic part of where we are today.

There was a great theologian in one of the early church fathers, Saint Ambrose, who said we don't impose on the world; we propose a more excellent way.

I think that is, in part, at the essence of what we are about right now because, you know, we have all seen, everybody knows what a government that is too big and too unwieldily looks like. That story doesn't end well.

I think about the cartoon “The Jungle Book” with the Walt Disney cartoon and it has the snake, Kaa. The snake, Kaa, is very charming and gets young Mowgli in his eyes, and basically Mowgli becomes transfixed. And Kaa is able to manipulate him. Kaa says “trust in me” and he comes up with a song, and I will spare you in my singing of that song. Ultimately this young Mowgli is completely bewildered. And where does he end up? He ends up in the coils of Kaa, the boa snake.

I think there is a little bit of wow, that sounds really great. That program sounds good and that sounds like something that is great and stable, but my fear is and my hesitancy is that to surrender what the American public is being asked to surrender by, with all due respect the Democratic leadership in this Congress, is, I think, regrettable. The amount of money. And it is being done gently. It is being done very smoothly. It is being done cleverly, if I might say so; but it is being done in

such a way to basically coax people into surrendering things which I think they will do so with great regret.

I think the invitation is come along on this more excellent way. Come along on a way that says we acknowledge the difficulties of where we are. And we are rightly sobered by the challenges our country faces today. None of us here on this floor are pumping sunshine, acting as if everything is great, because it is not great. We are really sobered by the challenges we face.

But notwithstanding those challenges, we don't panic and we don't surrender freedoms that are our birthright. In the exchange, we end up with some sort of stability that I think is going to be completely unsatisfying in the long run.

Getting back, I think the gentleman from South Carolina and the observations he made about sort of the predictability of contract and the work ethic, not long ago I was traveling in another country that doesn't have a good solid rule of law. And the officials that we met with were talking about the issue that they characterized known as impunity, meaning you could commit crimes with impunity. You can do it and get away with it.

One of the countries that is in this hemisphere has a murder conviction rate of 3 percent. Think about that, 3 percent of the murders that occur in that country end up in a conviction.

What does that mean? If you can commit murder with impunity, what does that mean for somebody trying to start a business? What does that mean to try and enforce a contract, or stand up for your rights as an entrepreneur and get things going? And I would submit to you it is almost impossible. And many of these problems that we see around the world, not all of them, but many of them are exacerbated by this idea of impunity, the ability to just do whatever you want.

So here we are. We are having a conversation as a country right now about what do contracts mean? What does it mean when you sign a piece of paper? We have seen coming out of the White House some very aggressive moves trying to rewrite contracts. Again, I would submit, over an extended period of time, that is a scene that doesn't end well either. In the short term, that can be very satisfying if you are on the right side of that deal. But at some point in the future, you may not be on the right side of that deal.

Ultimately, what does it do? It creates a disincentive for people to put themselves at risk. It creates a disincentive for people to be creative. What we need at this time in our history, with all of the challenges that we have, a whole host of things, the economy and everything, we need our best and brightest leaning into this thing.

□ 2015

We need people saying, “You know what? I'm here. I want to participate. And I know if I do, there is a reward for

me, and it's a reward that is borne of my innovation and my entrepreneurship and my willingness to put myself and my capital at risk.”

I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. INGLIS. I thank the gentleman for yielding. We have been describing here, I think, as the gentleman from California really started us off with the idea of what we really deeply believe with our faith really gives us a concept of respect for individual rights and the need to protect those rights. And then we have talked some about the dignity of work and protecting and affirming that dignity through the rule of law. The gentleman from Illinois was just mentioning that.

That leads us to policies. And these all flow from that deep well of what we really deeply believe and then it comes up to the surface level of instant policy or the policies of today—the policy questions of today.

The one that I think we need to answer is: Is it possible for our children to live a better life economically than we have? I think the answer is yes, as long as we do what we know works, and that is to have a system of taxation that is not confiscatory, that allows you to keep the rewards of your work. So you want to keep taxes relatively low. You want to keep regulation relatively light and effective, not burdensome, not a gotcha, but rather calculated to produce results that are reasonable, and light touch.

Then, you have got to reduce litigation somehow so that there is some certainty that you will not lose what you have done by becoming somehow the guarantor of someone else's outcome. You can't ask somebody else to guarantee their outcome. If you do that, that is the way you end up with too much litigation, and the result is that people move productive capacity away from a developed nation to an undeveloped nation.

They decide, “Well, we will go take our risk with a less established rule of law, because in the developed country which had this rule of law, you now have such high taxation, regulation, litigation, it's too much risk for us. We are not going to get the reward.”

So, for us, really what it is, is a matter—to answer that question, whether our children's future can be brighter than ours, the answer is yes, if the top level here on what bubbles up to policy—if we keep taxes relatively low, keep regulation relatively light, and we keep litigation down, the result will be people will want to do business here and there will be opportunities for our children and our grandchildren.

I'd be happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Thank you. I thank the gentleman from South Carolina. I know the gentleman holds in such high esteem the words of the Founding Fathers in the Declaration of Independence, and what a wonderful contribution to the world that was, but I can't help but think what Thomas

Jefferson might have worded differently had he gone through the sixties—had he been a flower child in the sixties or had he lived through the Great Depression; the collapse of business the way it did.

I think what I admire the most about what they did was the reining in of government and religion and putting them in their proper place. There was the assumption that, as Thomas Paine said, the rest of society would be families and business and they would operate according to the norms.

I'm not one of those people that say we have got to get back to the principles of the Declaration of Independence, we have got to get back to our founding principles, because I think this is more about looking forward with new illumination built on that.

But what I find interesting is that, had Thomas Jefferson gone through the Great Depression or was a hippie in the sixties, or at least was around when that was happening, would he have worded life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness a little different. I wonder.

Would he have made a statement about the need for every child to have a mom and a dad, or, you know, the need for business to not be taken up by wrong principles and end up in collapse, and what would have been his advice on how to deal with the Great Depression?

The bottom line is: Would he have worded those opening lines of the Declaration of Independence any different? And I don't have the answer, but it would have been interesting to have a conversation with him today, where he has the knowledge of what occurred after that.

Not that I would ever suggest that it needs to be rewritten, but it does speak to me of perhaps some new inalienable rights that have been illuminated since then because of the history of the United States and what has happened over time and what we have experienced and what our world has become and the results of new knowledge, new science. So, I wonder.

I think it's kind of interesting because we have the opportunity, I think, in the form of a new social contract, to plow new ground and to be bold to develop a contract that really does speak to and contribute to this rise of out of tyranny to self-government. We're not there with self-government yet.

I think the gentleman from Illinois references things that are at risk. I really do believe it's the leadership we provided in the world since the foundation of the country and the Declaration of Independence and the statement of rights that we are going to lose if we are overly reliant on a large Federal Government that has increased dramatically in these last few months at the expense of these other institutions, including business, that is more encumbered daily and provides less incentive to go out and do the things that we have talked about—going out and prospering and earning an income and

taking care of yourself, and benefiting from it, as well as families and the virtue-building power of faith.

I think that is what we stand to lose. I sure don't want that to happen.

Mr. ROSKAM. I think one of the things that we find ourselves in this quandary as Americans is sort of a gotcha mentality, right? The gentleman from South Carolina referenced that a minute ago. I think of my fourth-grade teacher. My fourth-grade teacher's name was Lillian Anderson. She was a dear woman. I had her her last year, which you can interpret as I drove her to retirement, I suppose.

Ms. Anderson was one of those teachers, though, when you would go and do work, she would come back and make the corrections. And it was sort of a gentle way. I mean, she would look at the report and, "Oh, Peter, you didn't indent this." We've all gotten those marked-up papers from teachers.

So you think about American businesses today who are looking at a regulation. They have an assignment. They have a law that is passed by Congress, and then some Federal agency has come up with a rule interpreting that law. As we know—we have all dealt with constituents—some of the laws are clear as mud, and some of the rules are even worse.

So you're a small business owner, you're a big business owner, whoever, and you're not sure what the rule means, and you're doing your best. You are legitimately doing your best. And you realize, "You know what? We've messed this up. It wasn't through malice, it wasn't through manipulation, it wasn't through cheating or deception. It's an honest mistake."

Well, other countries have figured this out. Other countries have created a regulatory environment that is not a gotcha environment. Other countries have figured out you can go to a regulator and say, "Look, this is what we're doing. This is how we're interpreting this rule. Are we doing the right thing?" And in these other countries they will look at it and say, "No, you're not doing the right thing. Here's the right thing to do. Don't do this anymore. And if you do this in the future, you will be punished, but we acknowledge that it wasn't intentional and you're not trying to deceive or defraud anybody."

Can you do that the United States of America under this current environment in our country? No. If you're doing something on balance and you have an ambiguity about it, 9 chances out of 10, you're crazy if you go to a regulator and say, "You know what? This is what we're doing. What do you think?" They will come back to you and say, "You have the right to remain silent." And we know the Miranda rights. It makes no sense.

So what we have got to do, I think, in this country in order to create prosperity and in order to create an environment where we are regulating for the right things instead of regulating

for the sake of regulating—and there's a big difference there. If we're regulating for the right things, that means someone can come in and say, "Look, we're doing this," and the regulator says, "Don't do that anymore." Or, alternatively, "Yeah, you're doing the right thing. Proceed. Off with you. And be lively."

I think there is an attitude that has to develop in the United States. And I think Republicans that I have interacted with in the House of Representatives get it. They get the idea that government is not supposed to come along with a heavy hand, to go back to the gentleman from South Carolina's language, with a heavy hand and come in and just pound and pound and pound and just take the life right out of some entrepreneur or somebody who's self-employed or starting something up.

But instead, it's supposed to come in with a light touch. And if there is a legitimate area where there's wrongdoing, then we all agree there needs to be a reconciliation to that.

So none of us are saying, "Don't punish the wrongdoer," but there is an attitude, there is a way to get to that point that honors business people and honors and recognizes that people that are starting companies in all of our districts. They are the ones that are putting capital at risk, they are the ones that are working. They don't have lobbyists that are coming here to Washington, D.C. They are not represented here, except by us.

I think that as we are moving forward, we ought not fall into sort of this harsh language—harsh antibusiness language—that we see coming out of the leadership on the other side of the aisle that actually has a very low view and paints everybody with a bad brush.

Are there some bad actors? There sure are. Are there people that need to be punished? There sure are. But let's not drag business through the mud with an expectation that an entrepreneur or somebody who wants to work hard isn't well motivated. I think that that sort of degrading of business is a point that we need to be very, very mindful of.

I know our witching hour is approaching.

Mr. INGLIS. Madam Speaker, may we inquire of the time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. DAHLKEMPER). The gentleman has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. INGLIS. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from California, who started us off on a high note. We went from high notes to policy, and now we're back to a high note, maybe, for conclusion.

Mr. RADANOVICH. I appreciate the time from the gentleman from South Carolina. I think I would just leave with the note that the social contract that we are operating with right now is cradle to grave. It started during the Depression. We're back at it with full force now.

If we were to create a new social contract, what would it look like, in opposition to something like that? If we were to hold up to the American public a different social contract, try to imagine—and I'd even implore the public to do this, too—what would the alternative look like? I think it's something to think about. Because we are obviously unsustainable for the rest.

I just want to send my prayers to a colleague here who is away on a family matter and couldn't join us tonight.

H1N1 INFLUENZA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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. Madam Speaker, thank you for the opportunity to address my colleagues for the best part of the next hour.

What we are going to do, Madam Speaker, is talk about this current virus that is going around that we are now referring to as type A H1N1 influenza. I think most people would understand better if we said swine flu. Now I understand why we are trying to get away from calling it swine flu, and obviously in States across the country where the pork industry is hugely important to the economy, they don't want this fear—unwarranted fear, really—of consuming pork products that are completely safe. Obviously, you have known from almost childhood that pork should be well cooked to a temperature of 160 degrees and it's perfectly safe.

□ 2030

But that is the reason why I am going to stand here tonight and probably not use the term "swine flu" very much, because I don't want to create an unnecessary fear of a very, very safe product that could be harmful to States across this country and to other countries as well. We are in a tough time economically on a global scale, and we don't want to make those matters worse by creating a false sense of concern.

I will be joined, Madam Speaker, this evening by a colleague or two—or three or four maybe—who are part of the GOP Doctors Caucus. We formed this caucus at the beginning of this Congress, the 111th, as we grew our numbers of health care providers in their previous life who now have morphed into Members of this great body of the House of Representatives. We have that really on both sides of the aisle, but this is a Republican hour, Madam Speaker, and I will be joined by other Republicans. I would welcome, if any of my Democratic friends, health care providers, are sitting in their offices watching us on television on C-SPAN, if they want to come over and join us and weigh in on this, I would be glad to yield them time.

There is no partisanship involved here. The purpose is to try to inform

our colleagues, all 435 in the House, so that they can inform their constituents. And each one, as you know, Madam Speaker, represents almost 700,000 people in their respective districts. And we are all getting calls. I mean, people are scared.

I would say that some fear is warranted, but a pandemic of panic is not warranted. And so the more information that we, as Members of Congress, can give to our constituents and that our staff can give when they call the office, either here in Washington or in our district offices, then we get to keep this thing in its proper perspective. And that is my purpose tonight, and that is the purpose of my colleagues that will be joining me later in the hour to talk about this issue and to make sure that people have enough information that they can take care of themselves and their children, or maybe their elderly parents, or possibly someone in the family whose immune system is compromised so that they know what to do, they know what the risks are, they know what their government is doing.

And, Madam Speaker, I want to commend and compliment the Federal Government and our respective State health departments, the Centers for Disease Control in my great State of Georgia, which, as you know, is an integral part of the Department of Health and Human Services and is really the lead agency, if you will, in regard to infectious disease, communicable disease, epidemiology. And Interim Director Dr. Besser and previously the Director of CDC, Dr. Julie Gerberding, these are the kinds of people, both with experience in infectious disease—in fact, Dr. Gerberding, internal medicine specialist, subspecialty being infectious disease. It is comforting to know that these kinds of professionals are standing guard, they are watching our back.

We had a hearing last week when, both Republicans and Democrats, the new Secretary, the day after she was confirmed, Kathleen Sebelius, former Governor of Kansas and now Secretary of Health and Human Services, former Governor of Arizona, Janet Napolitano, now Secretary of Department of Homeland Security, and Admiral Schuchat from the CDC, all spoke to us and told Members of Congress exactly what the plan was and what was being done and what is currently being done in regard to this impending pandemic. We are pleased, a week later, to find out that things are much better today on, what is it, the 5th of May, than they were a week ago or 2 weeks ago. And it looks like we are not, Madam Speaker, going to have a pandemic of this potentially very virulent virus that has occurred in our past history.

We will talk a little bit maybe about what happened in 1918, when 50 million people across the world died from influenza. Of course that was a different time. It probably started in the United States in very confined quarters as

men were training to be rushed into the battle of the great war, World War I, and in very close contact. But of course back then there were no vaccinations against any kind of flu, seasonal flu, avian flu, this current type, H1N1 influenza virus, no vaccine, and more importantly, Madam Speaker, no antibiotics. It was not until 1941, I think, or thereabouts, that penicillin was discovered.

So you really had no effective way of treating complications, and of course the complications that would lead to death. And let's say even the 35,000 deaths that occur today following just regular seasonal flu, complications from seasonal flu, they are respiratory; it's pneumonia, it's sepsis. And back in 1918 I don't think there were any respirators that I'm aware of. I don't think that's true. My colleague from Georgia, Dr. PAUL BROWN, a family practitioner, has joined me. And when I yield time to him, we can talk about that in a colloquy about what was available.

But I think we could compare the current situation, this 2009 concern over this influenza, to 1976, when a very similar virus struck—again, originated in a military facility; I think it was Fort Dix. There was, I think, at least one death, and five soldiers came down with this type A influenza, H1N1, very similar—I said I wasn't going to say swine flu, but very similar to what we are looking at today.

Back then, a vaccine was developed very specifically, and we started a big vaccine program. I think 50 million people in 1976 during the Ford administration were vaccinated against this virus. In retrospect, it may have not been necessary. And finally that program of vaccinating everybody was canceled because of complications. We had more complications really from the vaccine than we did from the flu. And I say that not to suggest today that we shouldn't prepare ourselves—and again, I compliment the respective Secretaries in the CDC and the States that are ready. And they are ready, and people should be very comforted by that. But we need to question how much money we spend. Is it appropriate to, let's say, spend \$2 billion in the upcoming emergency supplemental that is primarily for the ongoing cost of trying to win in Iraq and Afghanistan, a very important spending that is probably going to end up being \$90-plus billion in this emergency supplemental? But whether or not we need to spend \$2 billion specifically in this emergency supplemental on developing a vaccine and vaccinating 50 million people like we did back in 1976, there is some question in my mind, as a physician who practiced for 30 years, although not infectious disease, but I do have some concerns that we don't overreact and that we make sure that we have a measured response.

The President has an obligation to do that. And I can understand that he doesn't want to take this too lightly.