

That's what happened in the War of Independence. That's what happened in the other wars of America's past. When people threatened our premise that God gives you certain basic rights, and they got in the way of that, that's when Americans stood up and they acted.

□ 1920

Today, there are a lot of Americans that are saying to our Federal Government, No, this is not what America is built on. Our government was built on justice. It was built on the concept that people are equal before the law. If you are a rich man or a poor man, it makes no difference. Everybody is equal before the law. That's not bailout fever.

We have given up justice and gone to socialism. It hasn't worked in Europe. It didn't work for the USSR, and it won't work for us. We need to go back to what works, and that is people are equal before the law and people are free to take a gamble and try to run their business, and if it doesn't work, then they've got to pick themselves up and try again and not complain that they need more bailouts.

In short, there is a reason why there is unemployment today. There is unemployment today because it was created by government policies. And those government policies have to change. We have to take the chains off of American business, and we have to go back to the principles that work.

Well, we've talked about a couple of very philosophical kinds of things: Justice, which is a very important word. Justice does not mean that Lady Justice who has the blindfold over her eyes is peeking. It does not mean that she peeks and gives a special deal to one person or another person. We have created now, with the law, a special bill to create a whole bailout section of the Federal Government so Lady Justice can peek and give money to one person and maybe not to another.

What confidence does the individual American have that the government is going to come and bail them out when they need it? Is the government going to be there? Do you want to be servant to Big Government or do you want to be a free person? Do you want to breathe the fresh air, live in the fresh air and the sunshine of being free, knowing that you also have to be responsible? Or do you, instead, choose the gloomy path of the promise that the government will take care of you even though you know that it can't economically, or it will not take care of you well and allow you to live in some sort of pseudofreedom where you don't make responsible choices and you hope the government will take care of you when it doesn't work?

That's where we are as Americans. It has to start in our hearts. Freedom starts in the hearts of self-governing people who love God. They love their family and they love their country. And America is full of those people.

And I have confidence, I have confidence that the American public still has a passion for freedom, still has a love for this country, still cares about the American Dream and wants to live in an environment where they can be free to exercise their God-given gifts and abilities. They want their children to grow up in a better condition than they are. They want to see civilization building and suffering going down. But the only way you can do that is you have to allow some people to prosper. You can't knock down all the businesses and anybody who makes money and expect to have jobs. You just can't do that. It doesn't work.

And so we come back as we started. Do you want jobs? Let's get rid of all this excessive taxation. Let's do what every President in the past has done when there is a recession—JFK, Ronald Reagan, Bush. Let's cut the taxes. That is what we've got to do. We've got to change the regulations in the banking system so there's liquidity for businessmen to raise money. We have to create an environment where people aren't afraid of some new whacky idea coming down the pike and totally changing the business climate. We have to create a condition where people have confidence that there will be a stable government in this country which is not hostile to business, and we've got to cut the red tape and the government mandates.

What that means is we basically need to take a look at the Federal Government, and we need to say anything that the Federal Government does not have to do, it has to be just gotten rid of. We need to delegate it back to the States or the local governments. We've got to get the Federal Government out of all kinds of businesses they have no constitutional reason to be in, and we have to focus on the basic things, which are justice. We need to make sure there is a level playing field at home for people to do their work, and there has to be a secure environment internationally, which means we have to have national defense. Those are the basic functions of justice. Those should be the functions of limited government.

When the government gets too expensive, you have to go back and say, Wait a minute. Let's do the basics. Let's do the basics well, and everything else the Federal Government does not have to do, then let's get rid of it. That's where we have to be going. That's a clear path. It's something that's not going to happen overnight because it has to change in the hearts of Americans, in the families of America. In the churches and places of worship, there has to be an understanding that it's not the job of the government to take care of everything that goes wrong in everybody's life, because it won't work.

And then Washington, D.C., will change, reluctantly, but Washington, D.C., will change, and we will see a new America and a brighter day and a better day for Americans. We will see a

place where people are employed and excited about their work and where there's a responsibility and a vigor and a vibrancy that was so common of the old Yankee that the Europeans used to make fun of. And once again, that Yankee will be back again, Yankee Doodle. They used to sing about it to make fun of us, but as we have seen tsunamis and hurricanes and all kinds of crises around the world, they like old Yankee Doodle to come to help them.

And so I'm proud to be an American. I know that you're proud to be Americans. We have to move back to the policies that made this country great.

And I see that a very good friend of mine, a former judge, a Congressman from the great State of Texas is here to join us before long, and perhaps he will carry on along these lines. I know he is a man who loves God. He fears God. He loves his country, and he loves his family, and that's why I love him. And so I think the next hour will be exciting, and I urge you to stick with us here.

VACATING 5-MINUTE SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the ordering of a 5-minute Special Order speech in favor of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is vacated.

There was no objection.

LET'S FIX AMERICA

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.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it is always an honor to speak here on the House floor and have that opportunity that was provided by those willing to show the greatest love, according to Jesus, willing to lay down their lives for their friends, their countrymen, so that we could have these freedoms. And when you read the Declaration of Independence, it talks about we are endowed by a Creator with certain inalienable rights, and all men were created equal; now, not with equal talents, not with equal abilities, not with equal money or substances. That was not the point. In God's eyes, we are equal. In the eyes of the Creator, we are equal. And so we are supposed to do the best we can with what we've got.

And as my friend from Missouri was talking about light bulbs, I couldn't help but scratch my head because here in Washington, we are told that the most environmentally friendly majority in the history of the country is in charge now. But I wanted a light bulb that was incandescent so I can see better, because it takes so dadgum long for those others with the curl in there to warm up where you can see. And sometimes, there's a tiny closet there, and I flip the light switch on, well, I just need to flip it on and off. Well, now I've got to leave the energy on long

enough so the bulb warms up to where I can see what's in there. And it's interesting, you can't find, you will not be provided an incandescent light bulb. And we read in the past week that the last incandescent manufacturing plant in the United States proper has now gone out of business.

So what have we done as the most environmentally conscientious Congress in history? We have got light bulbs that have mercury in them—mercury, the substance that does not go away. If you get mercury in your system, you don't get it out. If you get too much, it's lethal. It builds up over time. So what are we doing? We are raising the level of mercury as high as we can get it, this lethal substance, and you say, what is going on?

□ 1930

How can we be environmentally friendly when we are forcing everybody on Capitol Hill to have mercury throughout their offices? It is just one of those things.

If we are all created equal, and the thing we are endowed with by our Creator, inalienable rights, life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, nobody is guaranteed happiness, but the right to pursue happiness. Nobody is guaranteed, under our Declaration or under the Constitution, that everybody is going to share and share alike. That is called a socialist manifesto: from those according to their ability to those according to their needs. It is a lovely idea but it has never worked. It always goes bankrupt because as I found when I was in the Soviet Union as an exchange student talking to farmers who had not been out in their field all day on a great day, well, it was mid-morning, but to that point, that was prime time to work. When I spoke a little Russian back then, I asked, When do you work in the field? They laughed. One of them said I make the same number of rubles if I am out there, pointing out in the sun in the field that really looked bad, or if I am here in the shade. So I am here in the shade. That is why socialism doesn't work. If you pay somebody the same thing to be working out in the hot field, sweating and wearing themselves out, and pay them the same as if they sit in the shade and cut up with their friends, they are going to be in the shade.

The reason free market systems fail is not because a free market system doesn't work; it works beautifully. You do need a government to make sure that everybody plays fairly, not to take away from those who are able to produce more than others, not to kill the incentive for people to actually produce, but to provide a level playing field where everybody can compete equally. That is the job that we are supposed to have. That is the job of the government.

And we have gotten too busy in this body trying to tell everybody what they can do, and as the President says share the wealth, spread the wealth,

you kill incentive and you kill productivity. So when you get right down to it historically, what always brings free market systems to an end is when a governing authority begins to meddle and ruin the free market system and start converting it over to a socialist system. And once a governing authority is able to manipulate the free market system over into a socialist system where you are trying to spread the wealth, you are killing incentive and you are creating class warfare, you are creating all kinds of problems. You are trying to do the things that this government is doing right now, and then you kill the free market system. Not because it doesn't work, but because you have now converted it to a socialist system, which always fails by its own weight. And then that obviously requires a dictator, somebody who forces a sharing of the wealth, a killing of incentives across the board so people do all they can to sit in the shade and not do anything and not produce and not help out their neighbors because they don't have to.

So it broke my heart to keep hearing our President talking about the rich, anybody making over \$200,000. He is talking about small business people. He is talking about people I have had come pleading to me: Stop destroying what I have spent my life building. I had nothing. I had nothing, worked 20 hours a day, put what little bit I had at risk and eventually was able to hire another employee and another employee and another employee. And finally I have in some cases 20, 30, or 140 in one case, one man that was talking to me, 140. Now he is down to about 60, I think he said. But you are killing me. You are killing my business. And you make people hate me because of how hard I worked and how much I sacrificed to build this small business. And in the process, you made me put 80 people out of work.

We should not be about class envy. The reason a free market society works is because there is fairness. When you have a government that is about fairness, then people compete. Entrepreneurship springs up all around and people comes up with ideas. It is worth risking what they have to make things work. That is free enterprise.

And when we have an administration that is so busy stirring up class envy and trying to get people to hate the people that have come to me and said, yeah, I have been making over \$200,000 a year. I have been pouring every dime back into my business. It grows and grows, and we have been able to hire more people. Now I have to lay them off, and you have got people hating me because they think I'm rich. And now you have a President that says I don't deserve the same tax rate that everybody else does. That I deserve to be punished because I took risk and I sacrificed and I grew my business and I hired people and I was fair to them and they loved their jobs and they worked hard, and it grew bigger and better and

we had a great product. And now I have a President that is getting people to hate me and saying I don't deserve to pay the same rate as other people? I mean, how much must a person despise those kind of entrepreneurs who have built a business and created out of nothing. They worked hard with ingenuity and sacrifice, created a thriving business, how much must a President or an administration despise those people to say, I am willing not to help the people that I call middle class if I have to give the same rate to the people that make above \$200,000. I am willing to punish the middle class and not let them have the same rate as they do now. I am willing to let their tax rates zoom up with the biggest tax increase in American history come January 1, I am willing to let that tax rate go up if you try to make me allow those entrepreneurs who have built a business on their own, if you try to make me give them the same tax rate as the middle class, because you see I want to punish them. They have made too much money. They took risks, they laid it all out there on the line.

One fellow talked about how he didn't even own his own trailer, those kinds of things. And he built a business, and now our President says he is rich and he needs to be punished. That is the way you end a free market system. You spread the wealth evenly from those who have risked it all and give to those who have been sitting in the shade watching them work. You kill the free market system. You kill the jobs.

So we have an administration out there saying we are all about jobs, that is our main focus. But by the way, we are going to push through this health care bill that the majority of America says don't, don't, don't, and they pushed it through. And then you see people laid off. So many people have come to me about family members, themselves, cuts in pay, laid off because the cost of the health care that was supposed to go down when this administration ramrodded and crammed this bill down America's throat without letting people truly understand all that was in it. You lose your country if it is based on a free market system when an administration and a Congress tries to make it socialist.

□ 1940

Now, I realize some people think, oh, Socialist is such a horrible word. It's really a very nice concept, actually. If you look at it, you know, we want everyone to share and share alike. Sometimes we're told that growing up: we want to share and share alike. As a parent, I tried to make sure that all three of our girls shared and shared alike, but if one of those children could take what she was given and parlay that into something even better and more productive, that was hers. Whether she shared it or not was completely up to her. I would encourage her to use and develop the talents and what she has been provided.

It is true, as an old preacher of ours used to say, that there are an awful lot of people around here who are born on third base and go through life thinking they hit a triple, and there is an arrogance that goes with that. Sometimes, if somebody comes from a poor family and has everything handed to him, then he thinks he has hit a triple because somebody else placed him on third base.

Either way, we're supposed to never forget that the Founders believed—and most Americans according to the polls believe—that the blessings we have are a gift of God; and if we turn our backs on him long enough, though he is long suffering, patient and full of grace, eventually, he will say, Okay, you turned your back on me long enough. Now I turn my back on you, and you disappear. You head to the dustbin of history.

Now, I wasn't going to bring up this matter. I was very pleased that the President was talking about the tax holiday concept. The problem is he is bringing it up over a year and a half later than it was brought to his attention by me. I told him at the time, Look, you promised everybody a tax cut. You know, of course you put a \$250,000 cap on income. I don't think it ought to be there.

Moody's did an independent study. They said the tax holiday idea, the way I read it, increases the 1-year GDP more than any other stimulus proposal if we pass this stimulus, a tax holiday idea that just said, you know, for the next 2 or 3 months, every dime you make stays in your check and does not go to the Federal Government. You get to keep your income tax in your check. Whether you want to make it 2 or 3 months, you keep it. If we passed it today and if the President signed it today, tomorrow they would have that money in their checks. It wouldn't go to Washington.

At the time, it was going to cost so little money compared to the money the government was spending. In fact, that's where I got the idea in 2008. Of course, we had the \$700 billion Wall Street bailout, which was a huge mistake, and I hope our leaders do finally realize that, but it was a huge mistake. Both sides of the aisle had about half of their Members buying into it. \$700 billion. That could have provided 4 months of every worker in America getting every dime of their income taxes back, along with all of their Social Security money for those 2 months, and it would have let the employers keep the 2 months of matching money that they normally would have to put in to match what the workers put in. That would have given businesses a boost, and it would have given employees this tremendous boost.

We did a little survey of people in our districts: What would you do? Look at your check and at how much money is going to Washington. What would you do with it?

Some said, Look, we've got a gas guzzler, and it's worth less than what we

owe for it, so we can't trade it in. We can't get another car. We're stuck. Yet, if we got 2 months of our own income tax in our checks, we'd be able to finally buy a good, fuel-efficient car. We'd be able to save money on gas in the future.

The truth is that GM and Chrysler wouldn't have needed to have been bailed out because people would have been out there buying cars. Actually, the idea for the tax holiday, when I had it in 2008, came from seeing that \$700 billion for the Wall Street bailout and then hearing here in Washington that, between the Federal Reserve and the things this government was going to do, it would probably end up costing between \$3 trillion and \$9 trillion just to try to get the economy going again. That's when I inquired: How much do we anticipate will be paid for the whole year of 2008 in Federal personal income tax? It was around \$1.21 trillion. \$1.21 trillion and \$3 trillion to \$9 trillion over here, maybe more. I like the \$1.21 trillion. It's at least three to 10 times cheaper, and it's people keeping their own money that they've earned. Then you wouldn't have needed all the bailouts, and everybody could have kept all of their income taxes for a whole year.

I don't like a government's not paying its bills as it goes along. It's not a good idea, but to say no personal income tax for a year when that is so much cheaper than what the Bush administration pushed with the \$700 billion bailout, with the \$800 billion that is now a \$900 billion porkulus bill, from January of 2009 under President Obama, and with the \$400 billion land omnibus bill the following week—all these stimulus packages, so-called—man, it would have been so much cheaper to have said, People, just keep all of your income taxes for a year.

Well, there weren't that many people here on Capitol Hill who felt like they could politically risk signing onto a full year of no income tax. Especially after January when we had the \$800 billion or the \$900 billion, my position was you could take the \$800 billion stimulus package and what was left of the original \$700 billion Wall Street bailout and pay for a whole year of no income taxes being paid. Just take the money from those stimulus packages and bailouts and use those to let everybody keep their own income taxes for a year.

John Shadegg was one. He loved the idea of having a whole year of no income tax. Boy, you talk about a stimulated economy. People would have been buying cars. They would have been eating out. They would have been buying products, buying new homes. Even with 2 months of people's own income taxes, Newt Gingrich's folks ran the numbers for me. He was very helpful. As I recall, an average family, just an average household in America, in just 2 months, was going to have around \$5,000 or so of extra money. Some people said, You know, we got behind on our mortgages when gasoline got to \$4

a gallon the year before, and we just have not been able to catch up; but you let us have all of our income taxes for a couple of months, we'll catch up, and then you won't have to do all of these ridiculous government programs to try and save people's mortgages.

There are other things that need to be done, but I brought this up when I met the President back when he very first came to our Republican Conference, which was held down in the basement here in the Capitol. I said, Look, I don't care who gets the credit. You can put your name on it. Do it. Moody's says it will help the GDP more in one year than any proposal that has been proposed. Even our own leadership's proposal wasn't going to do that much good in one year in the Republican Party. I don't care who gets the credit.

I wouldn't have minded if he had taken the idea back then and had used it, but he waited over a year and a half and then started describing, virtually almost verbatim, the way I described it over a year and a half ago and then in some of the same speeches said, But you know what? The Republicans don't have any good ideas. Well, I don't care that somebody's taking credit. The old saying goes—Reagan said it often—it's amazing what you can get done here in Washington if you don't mind who gets the credit.

□ 1950

So I don't mind other people taking credit for the idea. I do mind when it's followed or even preceded by the words, "But Republicans don't have one good idea." I think we need to pray for the President's memory. I know the pressure is great. I know it's an awesome responsibility. It's easy to forget things. Boy, do I know that. My wife will sure tell you that. It's easy to forget things. But before you go alleging that Republicans have no good ideas, think for a moment where you got the idea you're proposing. That's what I would offer, Mr. Speaker. And we keep hearing the President and others here on the floor saying that Republicans have not one good idea. They're the Party of No. No good ideas. None at all.

None at all? We need to pray for people's hearing, because there are a lot of fantastic proposals that are being tossed out there that would be wonderful. We do need major tax reform. I'll never forget how depressed I was after I left the Republican annual retreat in early 2006. I had been elected, sworn in in January of 2005, and started Congress with all kinds of hopes and dreams of making the country a better place. A year later we're told, look, there's a tiny chance we might not have the majority next year. It's possible we could lose. We don't think it will happen. We know we had talked about major tax reform this year, but instead we're going to just try to get through this year, not do anything big that will make people mad one way or the other, keep the majority next November, and then we'll come back in

January 2007 and do the major stuff like major tax reform.

Well, we've lost a lot of people who have been defeated since then, because America wants to see us keep our promises. There have been a lot of promises made by this administration, this majority, of things that were going to be done. Even on the crap-and-trade bill that passed here last year, the promises were made over and over: Oh, no, this bill is not going to cost jobs. It's going to create jobs. Create green jobs. After seeing what the people in charge have done in taking away incandescent light bulbs, it makes me wonder, are those green jobs going to have to carry around mercury, too, or what?

The American people are letting it be known, they're not happy with people not keeping their promises here. Actually the truth is, I have a real fear as a Republican that we only get the majority back one more time in my lifetime and if we do not keep our word this time, we'll never get it back again in my lifetime.

There are some great ideas. There are things that should be done. We've talked about balanced budgets for years. And there are some in the prior administration that equated compassion with paying money. There are an awful lot of people in the current administration that equate compassion with giving away somebody else's money. But that's not compassion. That's hurting free enterprise, killing incentive, killing jobs. And when you take away somebody's job, you have hurt them. Psychologists say that's one of the most devastating blows to a person mentally, emotionally, to lose a job. Losing a spouse is up there. Losing a child is right up at the top. But losing a job is one of the most devastating things that can happen. And here we keep doing things over and over.

The crap-and-trade bill is still hanging out there. The rumors are there could be a lame duck session and people that have lost their seats, who were afraid to vote for it before in the House or Senate will vote for it in a lame duck session because they've already been voted out, they've got nothing to lose, and maybe hoping if they vote for it in November or December, maybe the administration will give them a job if they really cater to them and help them do that. That would be disastrous. But if you go back and read the crap-and-trade bill, as I did, you find out that back there it seemed like—and I read from it, standing right over there—around page 900 and something, there was a fund that was created in the bill that would reimburse people or give them a little allowance for those people who lost their jobs as a result of that bill being passed.

Now I know my friends across the aisle who stood up over and over and said, no, this isn't going to cost jobs, this is going to create green jobs, they obviously had not read the bill because I know them well enough to know,

they wouldn't have stood up and intentionally lied. They wouldn't have done that. It's just that they had not read the bill so they were not aware that whoever's staffer or special interest group wrote that bill, they knew people would lose their jobs and that's why they were creating a fund in the bill to give an allowance to people that lost their jobs as a result of the bill. And as I pointed out then, the good news, I guess, to those that voted for that bill is that if it becomes law, no doubt in my mind, a lot of the people that voted for that bill will lose their job as a result of voting for that bill, and they've got an argument that they're entitled to funds from the bill for losing their job as a result of the bill. So they may have created a fund that will help them out.

But we should have a balanced budget amendment, and it's a shame on the Republicans for not getting that done when we had the White House, the House and the Senate. We should have gotten it done. Shame on the Republicans for in the last administration when we had the majority agreeing to tax cuts that we knew would stimulate the economy and but for those tax cuts we would have gone into a massive depression. But the economy was stimulated, and we brought more money into the Federal Treasury than had ever been brought into the Treasury; but the problem is we spent more than had ever been spent in history—up until, of course, this administration. And whereas I can remember being over here on this side and hearing colleagues beat up on Republicans because we were in the majority and to have a \$160 billion deficit was unthinkable, it was just so irresponsible—until, of course, the Obama administration, the Democratic majority, and then actually 10 times that much of a deficit is okay. It was not okay at \$160 billion and it's certainly not okay at 10 times that.

People in the American public were promised change, and yet what they got was not really change; they got 10 times more of what they had before. I don't know why President Bush is being demonized, because this administration and this Congress is pushing 10 times more of exactly what the prior administration did. So instead of condemning the Bush administration and the Republican majority, they ought to be rightfully saying, you know what, we thought you had a good idea when you ran up a \$160 billion deficit, that was such a good idea, we have gone 10 times that, and we're really running up a deficit now.

Shame on Republicans when we had the chance in 2005 and President Bush ran on shoring up Social Security. Now there was all kinds of discussion of privatization; what does it mean, what is it really going to do? And by September of '05, it was obvious the President's political capital was gone and what he had hoped to do would not be done. But I still had hope, because I

knew what had been done with the Texas employment retirement system. They took real money from people's checks that were supposed to go toward retirement and put it in a retirement account. Real money in a real retirement account. Now that was invested and it got hit pretty hard after 9/11. It got hit very hard after "Chicken Little" Paulson ran around and said the financial sky was falling if we didn't give him the \$700 billion slush fund he wanted, and so the market fell 777 points in one day, a self-fulfilling prophecy, and the money lost by everybody that had anything invested.

There was one Republican that I went to because he was so well respected for his business and financial mind, and I said, Look, I've talked to a lot of Republicans and I've talked to some Democrats. Something we could get through here even in September of '05 was a bill that had one thing in it that just said, Social Security tax money for the first time in the history of Social Security, since its inception in the late 1930s, will require that that Social Security tax money be put into the Social Security trust fund.

□ 2000

I don't want to hear any ridiculous talk about lock box. There's never been one. I want one. I want there to be Social Security tax money put into the Social Security Trust Fund and stop putting IOUs in there, markers that are noninterest bearing, and we have to borrow 42 cents out of every dollar that we spend. Stop it already.

Now, to put the Social Security tax money into the Social Security Trust Fund will require us to actually make some tough calls. And since this majority condemned us all the time for spending too much money, then I think a good idea would be to go back to the budget of 2006. I know some are talking about 2008. I think it ought to be 2006. We'll go back to that budget. And I think that would help us maybe take care of the issue and get us a good start of being able to put all of the Social Security tax money into the Social Security Trust Fund.

Now, the Republican is so brilliant he told me that we could never do that. I was shocked. Why not? Because the government would probably buy bonds with it. They'd be the biggest bondholder. We could never allow that to happen. Well, not really. We could create a treasury note that's interest bearing. So it's not risky. It doesn't put the Social Security Trust Fund at risk. That money makes interest. And it's there, and we stop having a Ponzi scheme. A very simple idea, and a Republican has proposed it. But when we were in the majority, our leadership didn't go for it, but I hope and pray they will if we get the majority again.

Health care. Boy, we've seen what the ObamaCare bill has done to health care. And even though people were promised there would be no rationing, then we put a doctor in charge of it

who's talked about, as I recall, not whether there would be rationing but when and who would be rationed. So all of the promises about no rationing, apparently those were not true. And it could be going back to the problem I alluded to earlier. We need to pray for the President's memory so he can remember those things that were promised.

Now, another Republican idea—and I think everybody on this side of the aisle has signed on to it, is in support of it, is an energy bill, an energy plan that says use what we've got. Make sure that when coal is used that it doesn't harm the environment. Put scrubbers on there to make sure that it goes in the environment clean and we don't harm the environment. We can do that.

Use uranium. Use nuclear facilities like we do with our ships and our submarines. It works. That's why we have sailors who are able to go underwater on submarines and stay submerged for 6 months. I was told by some of my friends from A&M that went in the Navy and were on subs underwater 6 months at a time. And he said, You know why we have to come up every 6 months? I said, I assume, to refuel.

Oh, no. Those submarines could stay underwater just on and on and on. We have to come up so that the crew doesn't go crazy, because the nuclear subs could just stay under there as long as they needed to from a practical standpoint.

But there's a source. Most of America didn't notice when our committee voted to put the second-largest source of uranium in this country off limits. People in Louisiana, Republicans and Democrats alike, have been screaming out, You are doing more damage to our State with the moratorium on gulf drilling than the oil spill did.

And when you hurt an economy and you put people out of work, tragically they don't care about the environment. They're just trying to survive. The only countries that can really do much about the environment are those who have such a prolific economy that they can take care of it. But when you have people out of work and they're just living hand to mouth and they're trying to get by, they don't care about the environment because their economy doesn't allow it.

Now, I and, as far as I know, everybody on this side of the aisle wants to develop alternative energy sources. But what a great idea, and it's been proposed, and we pushed it over and over. Instead of raising taxes and—as the President's promise would happen when he was running for office—having energy prices skyrocket if we use coal to make power, instead of doing those things—and as one 80-something-year-old lady told me from east Texas, I was born and raised in a house with no electricity. We had a wood-burning stove. And now the price of energy has gotten so high, I'm going to have to let it go. I can't pay for it. And it looks like I

may end up going out of this world the way I came in, in a home with a wood-burning stove and nothing else, no other power, because people are wanting the prices to skyrocket. And that poor woman, not to be able to pay for her energy bill. No, that's no good way to do it.

God bless this country with more natural resources than any other country in the world. Yeah, the Middle East, they may have more oil with things that are being found around the world, who knows. But we have massive amounts of natural gas, maybe the most coal in the world. We've got nuclear power. We've got wind power. We've got solar. We've got all kinds of things, so many things that can be harnessed.

But if you use the energy with which we have been blessed and designate—I don't care if it's 25, 50 percent of the royalty that we get back from the energy or from the mining or whatever it is, designate that that will all be used to find and research and develop alternative energy sources, so that when we run out—it will be well before we run out. We've got over 100 years of natural gas that's been found and finding more all the time. Before we run out, we'll be able to convert to alternative energy without raising anybody's taxes, without making any 80-year-old women living alone have to go without power, keep the power prices down. That's a Republican solution. And I have friends on the other side of the aisle over here that would sign on to that if their Speaker wouldn't punish them for doing so.

Another idea. I know it's not popular with the administration, but we call it the U.N. Voting Accountability Act. Very simple. It says, in essence, recognize the fact, first of all, that every country is sovereign. You can make your own decisions. We're not going to tell you what to do in your country. We shouldn't. But any country that votes against the United States' position in the U.N. more than half the time, the following year will get no financial assistance from us.

As I've said before, you don't have to pay people to hate you. They'll do it for free. And there are some countries that we keep pouring cash into thinking they'll end up loving us because we'll buy it. Not only do they not love us, they have even greater contempt because they know we know they don't like us and yet we're just pouring money into them. It makes them not only not like us; it makes them have no respect at all for us. It's so unnecessary.

Something that should have been passed in 2006 when we had the majority and we had the chance and some of the people that said they would not let it go through are no longer here—some are—it's a zero-baseline budget bill. It just says there are no automatic increases in any Federal departments' budgets. There's a Republican solution for you. If you want your budget in-

creased in the Federal Government, you have to come justify it, and we ought to put those budgets online where people can watch them like—I think the President put it this way, that he was going to go through the budget line by line with a fine-tooth comb. He was going to put JOE BIDEN in charge of doing that, too. They were going to get rid of everything that was waste.

□ 2010

Well, that hasn't happened yet. Since he is an honest man, I am sure it will eventually happen. But it sure hasn't happened yet. But it would sure happen if you let Americans see every Federal department's budget, how they were spending their money, put it up online, make them put those purchases online the way Congress is now doing. There would be people watching all right.

And if we had a tax holiday and people saw for a couple months how much money they were actually sending to Washington, they would demand it. And they would be watching to see how every Federal department was spending money.

And hey, I got another one for you. This is a Republican proposal from this Republican. Our leaders have not endorsed this. I am just tossing this out. But you know, we had to come in here in August, it cost an awful lot of money to turn all the lights back on, do everything to go back into session, but we did just so that we could get \$10 billion extra to go to the Department of Education to help so-called teachers. Well, it turns out across America only about 50 percent of all the public education employees are teachers.

Well, if you did away with the Department of Education here in Washington and kept that, \$68 billion I believe is what we are spending this year, and divided it among the less than 14,000 independent school districts in America, I am open to a good formula how to do that, just average it would be between \$5 million and \$6 million dollars for every school district in America. Most school districts could really use that money. And boy, that would help education. You wouldn't need near as many bureaucrats because there wouldn't be as many decrees from on high here, Mount Olympus here in Washington. The local school districts would be able to comply with the Constitution, because the Constitution does not enumerate education as a power in the Constitution, which under the 10th Amendment means it's reserved to the States and to the people, the local folks.

Another idea—they say we've got none—another idea, after having been to China years ago and having talked to CEOs about why you went. The corporate tax here is 35 percent. You lump on some of the State income taxes, you lump on local property taxes, all of the taxes, some of them are paying 40 percent, 50 percent in tax for their companies, competing with countries like

China that don't exceed 17 percent. And if they are a big enough company moving over from anywhere in the U.S. to China, they'll cut you a deal, no income tax for a while, because they get it.

If we dropped our corporate tax to 12 percent, I have had CEOs with major companies say we would be rebuilding a plant in the U.S. almost immediately when we went to a 12 percent corporate tax. And what would happen? More and more people would go back to work, and more and more people would be able to pay their taxes. And more and more revenue would come into the Federal Treasury. And then we would be able to buy more and more of those mercury lights that are going to create such a problem for the environment.

There are a lot of very good solutions. And so I don't mind somebody taking my idea. I love it. I think it's the highest form of flattery. But I don't appreciate it when it's followed up with a comment that we have no ideas, no solutions. We've got a lot of them. We just aren't allowed to make amendments on the floor to get those to the floor where they could pass.

I want to finish tonight with a tribute. It is a great honor for me to recognize one of America's greatest songwriters in our Nation's history, who turned 70 years of age this week. He is a man to whom we are indebted for many of the songs that lifted us, especially those of us who are baby boomers, from our low points because his songs spoke our feelings. They spoke our despondence, our hopes, our joy, and especially the joy that comes from loving other people.

I had not met Paul Williams until recent years, but I knew the man well through his lyrics. I have known the man through his lyrics for decades. The hauntingly clear and comforting voice of Karen Carpenter shared some of his songs and expressed our hearts that we had only just begun to live. White lace and promises. A kiss for luck and we're on our way.

For those of us who have loved, he expressed for us to the one we love that we won't last a day without you. And that all we needed was just an old-fashioned love song coming down in three-part harmony, one I am sure they wrote for you and me. Or that we had so much in common because we were all building a home for the family of man.

Paul Williams expressed for us through the voice of Barbra Streisand that wonderful love could be soft as an easy chair, love fresh as the morning air, one love that is shared by two, I have found with you. Like a rose, under the April snow, I was always certain love would grow. Love, ageless and evergreen, seldom seen by two.

Even though Paul had not yet recognized that he had a drinking problem, he forecast years down the road as a recovering alcoholic in that song with the words every day a beginning. Paul has now done that for over 20 years, as

he has made each day a beginning. He knew for many of us that rainy days and Mondays always get us down. And some days it truly did feel that it was, through Helen Reddy's voice, you and me against the world. Sometimes it feels like you and me against the world. When others turn their back and walk away, we could always count on you to say just the right thing, Paul Williams. But for all the times we cried, you always felt the odds were on our side, and we found consolation in that.

Paul Williams asked the ongoing question through the voice of Kermit the Frog as to why are there so many songs about rainbows? And what's on the other side? Well, someday we'll find it, the rainbow connection, because Paul is a lover, a dreamer like me.

Paul, of course, is widely considered one of our most prolific, talented, creative singer-songwriters. He has won awards called Oscar, Grammy, and Golden Globe on multiple occasions, and was nominated for these awards—more than 20 times he has been nominated over the span of his illustrious musical career. Even though he also wrote the theme for "The Love Boat," he nonetheless is deeply loved by so many like me who carry his lyrics in our hearts for life.

As a further attestation of his talent and wide-ranging artistic scope and appeal, his songs have been recorded by a diverse array of our most famous classic and modern musicians such as Elvis, Frank Sinatra, Willie Nelson, Ella Fitzgerald, Ray Charles, Tony Bennett, Sara Vaughan, Luther Vandross, R.E.M., and Jason Mraz, among so many others, in addition to the ones I mentioned already tonight. But this House has time restraints, so there is not enough time to mention all of them.

But additionally, Paul has appeared as an actor in many movies and has been a favorite on television shows. He was one of the most frequent guests on Johnny Carson's "Tonight Show." I used to love to watch him. Always he had the most contagious sense of humor that caused viewers instantly to smile when he was introduced as a guest, because you just knew you were going to laugh. You always knew you were going to laugh with him in the room.

On one such occasion he was a guest on "The Tonight Show" with Burt Reynolds. The chemistry was extraordinary and hilarious. It was only days later when Burt Reynolds called Paul, impressed with how much fun they had had together. He wanted to get with Paul, with Johnny Carson's beloved writer Pat McCormick, plus a few other favorites like Sally Field, Jackie Gleason, and Jerry Reeves and others and make a movie. They did. And the fun they had making that movie came across from the screen to the audience, which made it one of the most successful movies in history.

□ 2020

It was called "Smokey and the Bandit."

There were other Smokey sequels, but that first one was the best. Paul said, Billy Bob Thornton told him that in the South "Smokey and the Bandit" is not considered a movie, it's considered a documentary. Though some identify him in the movies as the short guy, I personally know him to be a full 10 feet tall.

In recognition of Paul's significant and long-lasting musical impact, he was inducted in 2001 into the Songwriters Hall of Fame, and he is currently serving as the president and chairman of the board of the American Society of Composers, Authors and Publishers, ASCAP.

But Paul will tell you that having hit rock bottom through his drinking, God blessed him even still, He lifted him and gave him new life with an even more infectious joy. He became a Christian and although some alcoholics fear that they will not be nearly as creative without drinking, Paul showed that's absolutely not the case.

Like virtually all creative geniuses, though, he has known times when he had trouble writing. On one such occasion he went to Nashville, collaborated and out came one of the most touching and autobiographical songs which became a huge hit for Diamond Rio. The words reflected a part of his own struggle with alcoholism and his recovery, though the woman who made him face the truth was not waiting for him when he completely sobered up and dried out. The words say it better than I can:

"I said, Hello, I think I am broken, and though I was only jokin', you took me by surprise when you agreed. I was trying to be clever, for the life of me I never guessed how far a simple truth would lead. You knew all my lines; you knew all my tricks; you knew how to heal that thing no medicine can fix. And I bless the day I met you, and I thank God that He let you lay beside me for a moment that lives on. And the good news is I'm better for the time we spent together. The bad news is you're gone."

"Looking back it's still surprising, I was sinking; you were rising, and with a look you caught me in mid-air. Now I know God has His reasons, but sometimes it's hard to see them when I awake and find that you're not there."

"You found hope in hopeless; and you made crazy sane, you became the missing link that helped me break my chains. And I bless the day I met you, and I thank God that He let you lay beside me for a moment that lives on. And the good news is I'm better for the time we spent together. The bad news is you're gone."

And Paul knows, however, that all things work together for good for those who love God and are called according to His purpose. But that doesn't mean that everything is good; it's certainly not. But thankfully things have worked out so that Paul has been a gift

to this planet and to the millions that he has touched.

Paul has a true driving passion for his family, for his work as a drug rehabilitation counselor with Musicians' Assistance Program, a nonprofit program created by and for the benefit of musicians to help them overcome their substance abuse issues. In 1989 Paul obtained his certification as a drug rehabilitation counselor from UCLA and has for the last 20 years been actively imparting the lessons to others that he had to learn himself the hard way.

He has been given a number of awards for his humanitarian efforts and remains a shining example of someone who has used fame not for self-centered ends but to promote the well-being of others. He is indeed devoted to his church, to the Lord, and just as I found out after I got dumped in college by my girlfriend, God had something else waiting that was supposed to have been all along.

One of the great mysteries in this world, though, is that it is only after a broken heart so often that our hearts are stretched enough and then mend even bigger with a greater capacity for loving others. And so it was with Paul. Subsequently he met and married Mariana. They are happily married and have the deepest love for and pride in their wonderful family.

Though he is a Democrat by political affiliation, he, just as Jesus did, can mingle and feel right at home even

with the least of these, like me. His favorite anonymous quote, apparently he is one we can all take to heart with our interactions with one another, "Care deeply; give freely; think kindly; act gently; and be at peace with the world."

One of my favorite quotes is: "Before the rising sun we fly; so many roads to choose, we start out walking and learn to run. We've only just begun."

We are so grateful that the good Lord led Paul down a road of expressing what we felt, though Paul expressed it in a way we never could. But we can certainly sing, even though some of us should do so only privately.

But it is also true, as Paul wrote, "Time won't change the meaning of one love." And though 70 years of age this week, Paul Williams is ageless and ever, ever green.

Here in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for all the world to read, as long as there is a United States, it will ever be recorded that Paul Williams lived, laughed, loved, and was immensely helpful to those around him doing the same thing; and hopefully he will be around the rest of my life to add the music to my life.

And, yes, to borrow from another of his songs: "As a traveling boy, Paul was only passing through, but we will always think of you."

God bless you, Paul, for blessing us. Happy birthday.

I yield back.

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. SPEIER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

- Mr. ETHERIDGE, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. BRIGHT, for 5 minutes, today.
- Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.
- Ms. SPEIER, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.
- Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. KENNEDY, for 5 minutes, today.
- Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, for 5 minutes, today.

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

- Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, September 22.
- Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, September 22.
- Mr. COFFMAN, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 27 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, September 16, 2010, at 10 a.m.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Speaker-Authorized Official Travel during the second quarter of 2010, pursuant to Public Law 95-384 are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2010

| Name of Member or employee | Date | | Country | Per diem ¹ | | Transportation | | Other purposes | | Total | |
|----------------------------|---------|-----------|---------|-----------------------|--|------------------|--|------------------|--|------------------|--|
| | Arrival | Departure | | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ² | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ² | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ² | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ² |
| Hon. Alcee Hastings | 5/28 | 6/1 | Qatar | | 456.00 | | 8,990.00 | | | | 9,446.00 |
| | 6/1 | 6/3 | Belgium | | 896.00 | | | | | | 896.00 |
| Alex Johnson | 5/28 | 6/1 | Qatar | | 456.00 | | 8,640.60 | | | | 9,096.60 |
| | 6/1 | 6/4 | Belgium | | 1,344.00 | | | | | | 1,344.00 |
| Dr. Mischa Thompson | 5/31 | 6/4 | Belgium | | 1,792.00 | | 1,005.70 | | | | 2,797.70 |
| Committee total | | | | | 4,944 | | 18,636.30 | | | | 23,580.30 |

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

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

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS, Chairman, July 28, 2010.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2010

| Name of Member or employee | Date | | Country | Per diem ¹ | | Transportation | | Other purposes | | Total | |
|----------------------------|---------|-----------|-------------|-----------------------|--|------------------|--|------------------|--|------------------|--|
| | Arrival | Departure | | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ² | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ² | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ² | Foreign currency | U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ² |
| Hon. Betsy Markey | 4/8 | 4/9 | UAE | | 389.00 | | | | | | 389.00 |
| | 4/9 | 4/10 | Pakistan | | 360.00 | | | | | | 360.00 |
| | 4/10 | 4/11 | Afghanistan | | 78.00 | | | | | | 78.00 |
| | 4/11 | 4/12 | UAE | | 0.00 | | 9,672.10 | | | | 9,672.10 |
| Per diem returned | | | | | 324.00 | | | | | | 324.00 |
| Committee total | | | | | 503.00 | | 9,672.10 | | | | 10,175.10 |

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

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

HON. COLLIN C. PETERSON, Chairman, July 31, 2010.