

and that we make sure that the Federal Government under the Constitution fulfills its first obligation—to protect Americans.

And that's just the way it is.

A VOICE NO LONGER—SURRENDERING THE ROLES AND RIGHTS OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PEARCE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise today to address the House on issues that all of us may not be paying attention to but that all of us should feel are extraordinarily important. We have at this time in our Nation's history eased into constitutional concerns for our future. Those constitutional concerns arise in many different areas.

For instance, you might not be aware of it, but there is a policy to establish different things which Congress is supposed to establish. Yet, right now, agencies are taking over those responsibilities, agencies that are taking away the roles and the rights of this Congress. What that means to our citizens who vote is that they will not have a voice any longer in the policies of the United States. If they don't have access to unelected bureaucrats, they are not able to effect policy that comes from agencies because they can't elect or unelect those people. In the House of Representatives and the Senate, we are surrendering that capability to pass legislation.

A good example is that the Forest Service is closing roads in forests across the country. They are declaring these roadless rules that put off limits much of our Nation's forests. If you were to Google the words "forest" and "roadless," you would find that all of the articles deal with killing and doing away with timber jobs. The people who are in the agencies have adopted an extreme point of view regarding jobs in this country. They do not want any timber to be harvested, so they declare what sounds to be a friendly policy of roadless rules, but the offshoot is that we have no timber industry. In New Mexico alone, which I represent, we used to have 20,000 jobs in the timber industry, and today we have zero.

As we look at the problems of this Nation, we have to understand that the great pressure economically that we face is that our revenues to the government have diminished. That's because people are out of work. They're no longer receiving income and wages, and they're not paying taxes on those. So we're now at a deficit in our government where we're spending more than we bring in. Simultaneously, we're killing jobs in the forests.

You could say, Well, we like the wilderness. We like roadless rules. Our government has a process by which this body and the Senate are supposed

to declare the wilderness areas. Now, instead, the head of the Forest Service can actually just declare that those areas are going to be roadless. They are then made into de facto wildernesses, which shut down jobs. Even more, they shut down near access.

Recently, the Forest Service decided they would simply declare 95 percent of the Gila National Forest off limits because they're closing the roads. If you aren't able to backpack in 35 miles, then you probably will never see parts of this forest. When the law was passed, the forests were created for "our enjoyment"—those are the words—and then it was also to use the resources in the forests. So with an agency that is allowed now to establish these rules without congressional oversight, you would say, Aha, that's a constitutional thing that we should be a little bit concerned about.

Simultaneous with that particular endeavor, there has then come along the wildlands. That's a policy just recently announced by Secretary Salazar. Secretary Salazar has created the wildlands policy that allows him to create a de facto wilderness in BLM lands. BLM lands are a source of great production of oil and gas. So for our voters, for the constituents, for the citizens of this country, they are seeing their gas prices now climb to \$4, and we are limiting access to lands where that price could be diminished and lowered. We have an agency that is killing the jobs and putting off limits the drilling for oil and gas on American soil.

I saw the President of the United States just recently travel to Brazil and encourage the oil and gas company there that is creating offshore jobs. While he is encouraging the leaders of Brazil to develop their offshore production, he is killing offshore production here. There is a disconnect that is causing great problems in our country. Those great problems in the country are basically this:

Our Nation is faced with a \$3.5 trillion budget, and we are bringing in \$2.2 trillion. Now, you cannot live that way in your home. You cannot live with this kind of disparity in your home budget, and neither can the Federal Government. It doesn't work. It's not going to work. We are having to borrow the money. When we run a deficit—and you can do the math here—of 3.5 trillion spending and 2.2 revenue, and those are taxes paid by citizens and by corporations—that gives us a deficit of \$1.3 trillion. As that deficit then is accumulated and as it goes into our debt barrel, we owe \$15 trillion worth of debt. That's the black barrel you can see there.

Since our Nation's inception, since George Washington, we've accumulated \$15 trillion in debt. You can see the green sludge running over the barrel because we have actually more debt than we're willing to count in Washington, so we absolutely just quit counting at \$15 trillion. Social Secu-

rity, Medicare and Medicaid are the green sludge that has poured over the sludge of the barrel. We don't declare it as debt anymore. We are going to pay it; we owe it; we've made promises about it, so we just don't talk about it. It's so uncomfortable and it's so large. That's \$202 trillion we owe. We call that now the "fiscal gap." That's the difference between what we're bringing in and what we owe, \$202 trillion. That's 100 years' worth of revenue. That's 100 years to pay off what we have made promises for.

The U.S. Government is making promises for things that it cannot do. It is paying out money that it does not have, and it's doing it all on credit. The credit, itself, would be alarming enough except now there is a small wrinkle that's developing here. If you were running this sort of deficit and debt in your home, your banker would come to you and knock on the door and say, We need to visit. This is not sustainable. It's not workable.

Our banker is called China and Japan. They buy Treasury bills. Those Treasury bills are the way that our government borrows money to fund this deficit. As you have seen with the recent problems in Japan, Japan will not be buying Treasury bills from us anytime in the near future.

Also, China twice in the last year has knocked on the door and said, We really are alarmed at what you're doing here. We're alarmed at this situation. We're alarmed that you're taking on more debt than you can pay out ever—ever—and we're afraid that your currency is not going to sustain itself. So when the Premier of China recently visited the White House about 3 weeks ago, you might have heard him say—maybe you missed it—that they're concerned about the currency. Since they're concerned about the currency, they do what your banker would do to you. They simply say, We're not going to lend you any more money. We're not going to do this anymore.

□ 1510

Now, then, we're in real trouble. But our government again, working outside the Constitution, is printing money to make up the difference for what we can't borrow overseas. So the Federal Reserve is in the process of buying the debt for the U.S. We here in Washington give the Federal Reserve money, and then they turn around and they lend the money back on this hand. Now, that would be cool if you could do it for long, and we all dream of the situation where we have an unlimited supply of money coming to us where we can lend it here and borrow it here, and that is what we are doing to ourselves.

This entire sequence, then, is made complete if you look at the chart in the upper right-hand corner, and we see that the whole game fails. Just as the Soviet Union collapsed economically, President Reagan viewed that if he could cause them to spend more than they brought in, he could collapse their

economy. President Reagan assisted and helped, with the rest of the world, in the collapsing of the Soviet economy and the ultimate collapse of that entire country, the breakup of the Soviet Union.

And so now, then, we are doing it to ourselves. We are making those promises that we cannot keep. We're killing jobs that should not be killed on behalf of roadless rules and on wilderness, and we are accomplishing the funding of a government by the Federal Reserve which has basically no oversight by Congress. So you, as citizens and taxpayers, contemplate what that means for you.

When the government prints money, it begins to devalue the currency that you have in your pocket. If you have \$100 in your pocket and the government prints \$2.6 trillion, let's say, then the money in your pocket becomes worthless. That is: We have not created any more wealth in the country; all we created is more paper money. It's like in the Monopoly games when you suddenly start getting more and more properties, you know that is Monopoly. Well, this has become Monopoly money that our government is doing here.

You will notice, if you're watching, that the price of food is going up both in this Nation and worldwide. In fact, many of the disruptions in other countries—Egypt, Libya, other countries in Africa—those disruptions were caused by the shortages of food, and people were suddenly finding that the cost of food was outside their reach. All of us are going to demonstrate in the streets when we are not able to feed our kids, and that's what is happening there. The price of food is escalating because they're doing the same thing. They're living on borrowed money. They're living on money that no longer is available, and so they begin to print it. You're seeing the price of gasoline rise to \$4 a gallon. It's not because gasoline is worth more to you today than yesterday. It's that the dollars in your pocket are worth less.

Vegetables to you have no greater value today than yesterday. It's that the dollars in your pocket have less value, so it takes more of them to buy the food. The price of gold and silver are going up, skyrocketing. That's not because silver is used for any more manufacturing today than last week or the week before. It's because the dollars in your pocket have become worth less because we're doing this, because we're spending almost twice what we make, because we have a deficit each year of over \$1 trillion. It's going into an accumulated debt that we owe long term, and to solve the problem our government is printing money.

Now, you could object to it, but you can't object to anyone that listens, which takes us right back to the Constitution. The Constitution is very clear on who should create the money and the value of money. The Congress ceded that authority away, and when it ceded that authority away, they gave

away the responsibility, then we have no control over it. There is no process by which I can ask Mr. Bernanke, Please, don't keep buying this debt.

This is taking away savings accounts for our seniors. This is taking away the ability for families to make ends meet. This printing of money is sustaining a problem that is not sustainable, and it's making believe that we can make it work and just passing the buck down the road one more week, one more month, one more year.

The real sadness is that if we begin to do the things that are within our reach, if we simply begin to allow the cutting of timber—and I do not diminish the need to protect our environment one bit. I don't think we should clear-cut. I don't think that the spotted owl should be allowed to go extinct, but I do believe that we should create jobs and simultaneously protect our environment and simultaneously protect the species.

It's a false choice that we've been given the last 30 or 40 years that says you've got to give up the jobs in order to protect the species. That's management of our entire country for a single species. I think that's a mistake. That mistake is playing out here as we export jobs overseas that traditionally would have been here in this country. Oil and gas production is one. Timber production is another. If you read the quote above me, Daniel Webster, on the wall above us said, "Let us develop the resources of our land." That's a quote that is here on the wall of this House. They are visualizing, in an earlier period in our history, that our great resources are there to be developed, and that's what will make us jobs. That's what will make us be able to have homes, be able to move into new forms of transportation.

Whatever this country has done has been available because we had jobs and we had economic status in the country. And yet some believe that that economy should be diminished and given away around the world. I don't believe that we should average our standard of living down to the rest of the world. I believe that we should average the rest of the world's standard of living up toward ours.

But if we were simply to create jobs, then a magic thing happens—it's not magic at all. But every person that comes off of unemployment does not receive these government checks; instead, they're down here making a wage and paying taxes. So every time we hire one more person incrementally, we decrease the amount that our government is spending, and we increase the amount that our government is taking in. So employment, the creation of jobs, is not sort of a random possibility for us. It is an absolute necessity if we're to avoid this breakup of our economy that's projected down the road because of the way that we're living now.

The Constitution is the agreement between the people and the govern-

ment. Our Founding Fathers came from Europe where they were living under monarchies. Our Founding Fathers came from Europe where they had seen the excesses. They had seen the monarchies rule every single aspect of their lives. When they got to this country, they were fearful of a government that was too strong, so they visualized this contract called our Constitution between the people and the government. The purpose of that contract was to keep the government in check, to keep the government's powers limited and small and to increase the powers of the individual that gave us the liberties that we have so well trumpeted and used as a guiding light for the rest of the world.

Liberty and freedom are the great assets of this country. It's not our wealth. It's not the houses that we live in. It's the ability to choose for ourselves. That is what our Founding Fathers wanted to protect in this contract called the Constitution, and that is what right now in Washington agencies are walking past that Constitution as if it has no meaning. When it has no meaning, the individual, the voter, the person who just goes to work every day begins to have less and less rights and the government begins to take more and more rights away from them.

We see an alarming case in the issue of Libya. Now, I don't support Colonel Qadhafi at all in his reign, in his service, but I do wonder about a nation that will step aside from the rule of law and take the fight to Libya.

We have, in this country, an act called the War Powers Act, which describes circumstances that say there are issues when a President might be able to want to commit troops. But our Constitution doesn't quite give him the right without congressional approval, but we're going to allow it in certain instances and then he can come back to Congress for approval.

Just last week, we heard the administration, Secretary Clinton came and addressed Members of this body, and Secretary Clinton said that they had fully complied with the War Powers Act. Now, that's untrue because there are three very definite requirements for the War Powers Act, and we're not facing any of those. There were no U.S. soldiers that were attacked.

The President said, with all respect, that this country is different. Well, this country is different because we have a rule of law and we have a Constitution, and we abide by it and we transport freedom. And when we begin to walk away from that freedom, then we walk away from the essence of the country.

So he committed troops from the U.S. into actions in Libya with no clear and apparent reason, with no constitutional basis for doing it, and even the rule of law was simply ignored.

□ 1520

If they were using the War Powers agreement, which Secretary Clinton

said that they were, in order to justify this action, then the War Powers Act actually says that they should come to Congress within 60 to 90 days, 60 days under one circumstance, but we could extend it for another 30. She said they have no intention of coming for a 60-day authority, that they are well within their rights to accomplish the actions.

So by itself, it would be alarming, but when you put it into context of agencies who are willing to create de facto wilderness and the roadless rules of our forests, the agencies that are willing to say we are going to create wildlands, that is de facto wilderness, without congressional approval in the BLM, and now we're going to go to war without complying with the Constitution or with the laws that are on the books of the land, now then that should be an alarming trend no matter which party you're in. Now, then, this is about America and that essential agreement between the people and the government called the Constitution.

The rule of law is what differentiates this country from other countries. The rule of law is what protects the rights of citizens. The rule of law is the essence of what made this Nation great because the government can not come in and take private property from individual citizens. They can't just go out on their own and begin to make rules. And yet that's what we're finding is happening at an alarming trend right now.

The downside to all of that is economic. You can say, Well, I'm not much interested in all of that constitutional stuff and the Founding Fathers. That might be possible. But you cannot ignore what is going on in the personal lives of individuals right now struggling with the economic situation that is cast on them by decades of spending in Washington that is beyond our ability to sustain.

If we're to look at this debt, this \$15 trillion in the barrel, it's instructive for us to consider how that debt originated. You could take the time from George Washington up to President Bush and we accumulated, you can say that we basically accrued about a \$5 trillion debt in that whole period of time from George Washington up until President Bush, II was sworn in.

President Bush, II, with the war in Afghanistan and Iraq and Katrina and those problems, ran up about \$5 trillion in his time in office. So almost the equivalent in 8 years to what we had done from the founding of the country. But then in the 2½ years since President Obama came in, we've now bumped it up almost another \$5 trillion.

So we see that this filling of the debt barrel is now accumulating at a much more rapid pace, which simply means that our economy is going to fail at a period closer to us, not one further away from us.

And all the while, Americans are saying, How does the Constitution affect

this? The Constitution affects that because we're seeing different industries simply sent to other countries because it's too hard to do business in this country anymore. We make it against the law. We make the regulations too high. We make the circumstances too difficult. People would say, Now, in what ways do we make the circumstances too difficult?

One way that we should be creating jobs right now would be the medical field. Baby boomers are moving to retirement. Retirement is a very expensive age in anyone's life. And retirees are very expensive for governments to attend to. So baby boomers are moving to that area very quickly. They should be demanding tremendous amounts of medical service. And yet we find that those jobs that should be created in the medical field are frozen in place, unable to move forward because of uncertainty. And so rational people would say, What uncertainty?

That then leads us to another chart that shows the ability of government to make life more complex.

This is the medical system now since the passage of ObamaCare, since the passage of that 2,200-page bill. It created new agencies, new institutions. You can consider yourself at one end of the chart and your physician at the other end. And you have to make your way through and touch the appropriate agencies before you get to see your doctor.

Now, this is the reason this chart would cause anyone to sink back in horror and say, That's not what I wanted. I just wanted a checkup to see if I'm okay with my local doctor. It is this chart that has been creating uncertainty in the minds of the health care field, and they're saying, We're not sure how this chart affects us so we're simply not going to get into that new line of work. We're not going to expand and put money into research to create those jobs in the medical field because we have to go through so many pieces of this equation, and we are just going to let itself sort itself out. This is always the problem with government. Government will build in processes that just simply can't be overcome.

And so this country, which has been the source of so many good medical inventions and medical jobs, this country that has been outsourced now is being burdened down with regulatory agencies that simply say we're going to impose this in your life, and companies are saying okay, we're just going to wait it out.

Other companies are saying we're going to have to lay off other people. We've got 9½ percent unemployment—8 percent, whatever it is today. We've got unemployment, we need people to work, we're running at a deficit because we're spending more than we're bringing in. The last thing we need to do is put more people on welfare and unemployment and put them out of a job. And yet people in New Mexico, I'm

hearing employers say, "Well, we've got to cut employees to get down below the caps required in this bill." So people are voluntarily terminating employees in order to comply with some aspect of this bill that says if you have more than this, then you have to jump through different hoops.

So we, in many ways, our government, again, is creating the distress. It is man-created distress. It's government-created distress that is causing this 3.5 and 2.2.

This is the root of the problems that we face economically.

As our government is then spending more than it brings in, as it kills jobs so that we are bringing in even less and driving more people to unemployment and to welfare, the disparity grows greater, the government has to print more money, the money in your pocket becomes worth less, the uncertainty in the Nation increases, and uncertainty again causes business owners to say, "I don't believe I'll create jobs right now. I'm afraid they're going to go up on my taxes to try to make this balance."

When the government creates that mood on the part of employers, then they simply stop the creation of jobs, and that's what we're finding going on.

You would say, "Well, uncertainty is not really that big of a deal for a company." And I would simply ask you, do you put money in the stock market when you aren't pretty certain you're going to get a return? If you think it is just a roll of the dice to put your savings into the stock market, you would do that very hesitatingly. Well, companies are doing the same thing. They don't want to pour money into a venture and then have something regulated to end on them, to have the taxes go up, to have it made to where they can't get their money back. So companies are making the same decision that you would make personally.

Now, recently the President complained about 6 weeks ago about companies hoarding cash. He said it as an accusation. It is a true thing that companies have tremendous amounts of cash right now, but they're afraid because of the regulatory environment, they're afraid because of the prospect of taxes, they're afraid because of the prospect of new regulations to put money into industries. And so therefore jobs are being frozen again by the actions of our government.

Two things would cause this situation to begin to balance.

□ 1530

Number one is not raising the taxes, but lowering the taxes. There is a truism that says when you increase taxes you kill jobs, and when you decrease taxes you create jobs. So it is counter-intuitive that if we want to increase the 2.2 and lower the 3.5, then we need to lower taxes to where there is more certainty that the people can say, ah, I will invest in that. I am pretty sure I have got enough money for next year's tax bill. I'm sure that I have got

enough money in the bank to pay for this new equipment to hire a new person. On the other side, then, the regulations have to match also.

A friend of mine in Artesia, New Mexico, Bill Sweatt, recently said to a group that was asking what does it take to create a job; there is all this speculation in Washington what does it take to create a job if we want to increase the 2.2. Mr. Sweatt says, I will tell you what it takes to create a job. He has a company that runs bulldozers. He said it takes \$340,000 for me to create a job. That's what new bulldozers cost. He said, by the way, I have to have a pickup truck because they just frown on me driving the bulldozer down through the main streets of Artesia to get to the location, so I actually have to leave it out there on a truck and drive a pickup through town. So he said, basically \$400,000, I can put a new employee on.

As we tax away money from businesses, it takes longer to accumulate the \$340,000. It takes longer for jobs to be created when we tax that money away. So our tax policy will cause Mr. Sweatt not to hire a new worker as soon as he would otherwise. That causes our economy to be stagnant. That's happening to businesses across the country.

But then the bigger thing is if the government passes, say, a new regulatory framework that is similar to this, the regulatory framework again alarms him, and he says, I can't make my way through that government regulation. I believe I am just not going to do it. Those two aspects are creating the great imbalance here between jobs and between our economy. Those can be balanced and should be for the sake of our future.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title.

H.R. 4. An act to repeal the expansion of information reporting requirements for payments of \$600 or more to corporations, and for other purposes.

STOP INTRUDING IN D.C. LOCAL AFFAIRS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I have come to the floor because in a very real sense I feel surrounded. Mr. Speaker, I was sent to Congress, like every other Member, to attend to the business of the Nation. But in fact, I have been surrounded. I have been surrounded by the new House majority that has decided to spend huge amounts of time,

in the most autocratic fashion, trying to deprive the District of Columbia of its self-governing rights.

Mr. Speaker, Congress delegated home rule to the District of Columbia in 1973. Before that time, the District of Columbia had no mayor, city council, was ruled by the federal government without any democracy. That was mostly the work of Southern Democrats, whose reasons were, among others, but most definitely, racial. What is happening today is not the work of Southern Democrats. It is the work of the new Republican majority.

I am pulled off the Nation's business day after day after day because of yet another zinger from Republicans to intrude into the local affairs and local spending of the District of Columbia. I had to call the administration and Majority Leader REID today, cautioning them that the District must not be used as a bargaining chip in the present battle over Federal spending underway here.

The latest intrusion is hard to bear. The District has decided to spend its local funds, among other things, on abortions for poor women. Dozens upon dozens of jurisdictions do that. No Federal funds. Funds raised by the taxpayers of the District of Columbia. What does that have to do with the Federal budget? What does that have to do with overspending or a deficit here? That has to do with somebody's, some majority's, ideological obsession with placing their autocratic desires on a jurisdiction that did not elect them, cannot put them out. It's the very definition of an autocracy.

So they pick on the jurisdiction that has no Senators and throw us into the pot because the far right social conservatives here want something in this CR. So give them the District of Columbia. You can't have us. Who do you think you are? The residents of the District of Columbia are free and equal citizens. We will not be traded off like we were slaves or a colony that can be thrown in by those who don't care. We care.

So whether it is the other body, or this body, or for that matter the President of the United States, get your hands off the local funds of the District of Columbia. You didn't raise a penny of it. We will spend it the way we please. And especially in this battle, which has to do with your deficit spending.

D.C. has a budget that is balanced. Why should that budget be over here in the first place? Our budget was approved last year. It came here and was approved by the House and the Senate before the lame duck. Yet last year's D.C. budget is still here, and we are now sitting on the possibility that when the Federal Government, which now looks like it's stupid enough to close down because the Republicans won't take the best deal anybody has had in the history of this body for what they wanted, that may shut down. And the American people will be shocked to

know that would mean that the local government of the District of Columbia, which is not in this fight, will be shut down too.

This has gone much too far. It's one thing to start the session with your first act being to strip the District of Columbia of its vote in the Committee of the Whole, although two courts have said that that vote is constitutional.

□ 1540

Then to move on to intrusion after intrusion, reinsert riders that we just got out, riders that have nothing to do with any Member of this body except me, who represents the citizens of the District of Columbia, a rider that would increase HIV/AIDS in D.C., the District of Columbia, by keeping the city from using its own funds to fund needle exchange.

Again, dozens upon dozens of jurisdictions have driven down their AIDS rate this way. We have the highest AIDS rate in the United States only because the Congress of the United States has killed—I use these words advisedly—killed men, women and children in the District of Columbia by keeping the District for 10 years from using needle exchange, so that AIDS spread throughout the city.

So we have a higher AIDS rate than Baltimore—poorer city—than New York, than Detroit, than Los Angeles because of the wishes of the Congress of the United States which is responsive to nobody in the District of Columbia.

They move to abortion. And if it wasn't enough to keep us from using our own local funds in this budget, as they still hope to do, they have put us in H.R. 3. H.R. 3 is a bill, and instead of a rider which lasts 1 year, they would permanently keep the District from spending its own funds on abortions for women. This is the majority that does not even want the Federal Government in Federal matters. What in the world are they doing in the matters of the local jurisdiction?

What kind of tea party Republicans are these who have just added to the deficit by voting \$300 million for private schools in the District of Columbia, adding to the deficit and not paying for it? How do you explain that back home? We didn't ask for these vouchers. Nobody even consulted with public officials in the District of Columbia before they put that voucher bill on the floor last week. That's the kind of contempt this majority has for the residents of the District of Columbia.

We are going to fight back each and every time, and we are going to say to this administration and to the Senate: Don't give in. Don't give us away because they want a chit and they have decided that chit is the District of Columbia.

I went to the Rules Committee from the very beginning when a shutdown looked like it was going to occur. I said, look, this is our money. We are