

A GOVERNMENT THAT WORKS

(Mr. BOSWELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to continue a discussion started by a good friend and former Iowa Congressman, Berkley Bedell, in yesterday's Des Moines Register, page 9A.

In Congressman Bedell's column titled, "Those Who Own America Should Help Pay for Government," Congressman Bedell argues that Congress's budget focus on cutting costs instead of generating revenue is fundamentally skewed and not good business.

He writes, "Show me a company that ignores revenue and focuses on cutting costs, and I will show you a firm that is headed for failure. Show me a government that ignores revenue and focuses on cutting costs, and I will show you a government that is a failure."

Congressman Bedell writes that corporations and the richest Americans need to properly contribute to the government through taxes that are relevant to their wealth. For me, this means eliminating billions a year in subsidies to multibillion-dollar oil and gas companies; it means ending mortgage deductions for vacation homes and yachts that cost taxpayers billions a year in lost revenue; it means ending the Bush-era tax cuts for the wealthiest 2 percent to increase our revenue by more than \$40 billion a year.

Americans deserve a government that works, and blindly cutting costs and services doesn't accomplish that.

[From the Des Moines Register, Apr. 12, 2011]

GUEST OPINION: THOSE WHO OWN AMERICA
SHOULD HELP PAY FOR GOVERNMENT

(By: Berkley Bedell)

I started a fishing tackle manufacturing business, Berkley and Co., with \$50 saved from my newspaper route when I was 15 years old.

From the beginning, my main focus was on sales and revenue.

The business was successful.

In my 50s, I ran for Congress. I won and appointed a person to run the company. He focused on cutting costs rather than building revenue and the business was soon headed for bankruptcy.

My son, Tom, came back to Iowa to run the company. He focused on marketing and research to build revenue, and when he sold the company a few years ago, it was by far the largest most successful fishing tackle manufacturing company in the nation.

Show me a company that ignores revenue and focuses on cutting costs, and I will show you a firm that is headed for failure. Show me a government that ignores revenue and focuses on cutting costs, and I will show you a government that is a failure.

Today that is exactly what we have in our state and federal governments.

Like most people and most corporations, I would prefer not to have to pay taxes. I am now 90 years old. I lived during the middle of the 1900s when our top income tax rate varied between 70 and 91 percent—more than double that of today. I saw what we can do when we properly tax ourselves to build a better nation.

Today the top 1 percent of households have over 38 percent of all privately held stock, 60

percent of financial securities and 62 percent of business equity. The top 10 percent own 80 percent to 90 percent of stocks, bonds, trust funds and business equities, and over 75 percent of non-home real estate. Since financial health is what counts as far as control of income-producing assets, we can say that just 10 percent of the people own the United States of America.

My wife and I are part of that 10 percent. We are heroes in our hometown, just as Bill Gates and Warren Buffett are national heroes.

Like them, we are not bad people, we want to be good people and contribute so we have formed a foundation for alternative medicine (FAIM.org) to try to do good with our money.

But our government is all screwed up. Instead of using everyone's wealth to build a better society as we did in the 1950s, we are cutting taxes to the rich and corporate America while we cut back on services and jobs for the masses. You do not create jobs by firing teachers and lowering wages.

People are starting to rise up in Wisconsin, Ohio and other states. They are correct to be disturbed and to protest. I hope they will keep it up. I hope they realize the basic problem. It is, revenue matters!

Until we properly tax corporate America and those of us who can afford it, and use those revenues to put our people back to work, clean up the environment, replace fossil fuels, reduce the deficit and bring back the prosperity we had in the middle of the last century, I believe we all need to join those protesters.

Having served in Congress, I have seen how political contributions from the wealthy, and now corporations, control our government. It is time for the people—all of us—to do as did the people of Egypt and join the street marches to demand that our government bring back the time we had in my youth, when we worked together, rich and poor, to contribute the tax revenue needed to build a nation that was the envy of the world.

SHUTTLE SNUB

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE of Texas. "Houston, we have a problem." These were the words from space when Apollo 13 was in trouble. The NASA folks in Houston, Texas, helped bring Apollo 13 back to Earth safely.

Now, Houston, we have another problem, because for obvious political reasons none of the four shuttles are going to be retired at Space Center USA—Houston, Texas—the home of NASA, the Johnson Space Center, and the home of the astronauts.

For nearly 50 years, Houston, Texas, has been the center of world space exploration. Why the apparent shuttle snub to Houston and to history? Well, it's blatantly political. Texas is a red State, and the four winners of the shuttles—one of which has nothing to do with NASA—all are States that voted for the President.

When the U.S. won its race to the Moon in 1969, the first word on the Moon was "Houston," not "New York City." Now it should be said, "Houston, the shuttles have landed, but only in the blue States that voted for the President."

This ought not to be, but that's just the way it is.

HONORING SERGEANT ROBERT
TREADWAY

(Mr. LUJÁN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LUJÁN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor U.S. Marine Sergeant Robert Treadway, who gave the ultimate sacrifice in service to our Nation.

Sergeant Treadway was killed in a plane crash in 1976 while on active duty; however, it wasn't until earlier this week, nearly 35 years later, that Sergeant Treadway received the memorial service befitting all of our fallen heroes. On Monday, a memorial service was held for Sergeant Treadway at the Sante Fe National Cemetery, helping bring closure to his mother, Theresa Treadway.

For nearly two decades, Mrs. Treadway tried several times to arrange for the memorial service that Sergeant Treadway had earned. Her unwavering dedication to her son brought her to my office. I was honored to have the opportunity to help Mrs. Treadway pay tribute to her son, a marine to his core.

The men and women who serve our country in the armed services sacrifice a tremendous amount, but so do their loved ones they leave behind while they protect and serve our great Nation. This is why I was honored to be able to help Mrs. Treadway finally give her son a memorial that is befitting of his sacrifice and honors his memory.

To Sergeant Treadway and his mother, thank you for being examples of the American spirit at its finest.

THE BUDGET

(Mr. KINGSTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, the spending debate in Washington boils down to a couple of fundamentals: We spend 23 percent of our GDP; that is the level of spending of Congress. The revenues to GDP are only 18 percent. So you have a 5 percent difference in what your revenues are and what your spending is. Years of doing this means that, right now, for every dollar we spend, 40 cents is borrowed. You can't continue to defy gravity.

This week, we will consider the Ryan budget. It has tax reform; it has spending reform; it has regulatory reform—all things that are very good. I'm glad to see that the President will be reintroducing another budget this week, because I think it's very important that if you do not like the Republican Ryan budget, that's fine, but put your budget on the table because surely the Democrat Party has some ideas.

So far all we've heard from the Democrats is criticism. That's not

good enough in times like these. We've got to come together as a country to do what's best not for the next election but for the next generation and, indeed, for our future.

MEDICARE ELIMINATION AND MIDDLE CLASS TAX INCREASE ACT OF 2011

(Mr. WEINER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WEINER. Ladies and gentlemen, later this week, we are going to be considering the Medicare Elimination and Middle Class Tax Increase Act of 2011. We've heard it called the "Ryan bill," but that's what it does.

First, it does some things that I'm sure are very popular in America. It says let's eliminate the Medicare program. Let's say to senior citizens, You know what? We're going to give you a voucher, and you go out and shop for health care—and good luck finding it. That's one proposal.

And then it says, let's take \$750 billion of Medicaid expenses and shift them to the States so that the States have to raise taxes and localities have to raise taxes. This is some new interesting idea?

It was said by the previous speaker that Democrats haven't come forward with any ideas. Yeah, we came up with the idea of Medicare to provide health care for seniors and Social Security to provide a safety net for seniors in their advancing years. These are the programs that we care about and are going to fight for.

This week on the House floor, Republicans are going to say we're against Medicare. They want to eliminate it as it stands. Now, isn't it ironic? They spent all last year criticizing the health care act because it harmed Medicare, now suddenly they want to eliminate it. Hypocrisy.

□ 1920

THE U.S. CONSTITUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RUNYAN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, America is facing some very perilous times because of the joblessness, because of the poor economy, because of the outrageous spending that's been going on for the last 2 years through the last Congress.

I come tonight, Mr. Speaker, to discuss something that I think is critically important for the American people to understand, because we've gotten away from what the Constitution says and what the original intent of the Constitution might be.

I've seen Member after Member, Mr. Speaker, hold up a copy of the Con-

stitution. I carry a copy in my pocket. And they'll hold up a copy of the Constitution and talk about this being a living and breathing document. Nothing could be further from the truth in the philosophy of our Founding Fathers.

In fact, our Founding Fathers meant this to be a very solid foundation. The Declaration of Independence expresses the philosophy of liberty in America, and the Constitution is an embodiment of those principles into a governing document.

Mr. Speaker, if we don't have a solid foundation upon which to build all of our laws, all of our society, then we're building our society and laws on shifting sand. You can ask a 6-year-old, if you build a house or a building on shifting sand, what's going to happen? It's going to fall, it's going to fail. That's exactly what's happening in our country today, because we've gotten away from the original intent of the Constitution.

In Hosea 4:6, God says, "My people are destroyed for a lack of knowledge." We have a tremendous lack of knowledge about the foundational principles, what our Founding Fathers meant for government to be. We have a tremendous lack of knowledge in this Nation even in Federal jurists, even in jurists sitting on the U.S. Supreme Court, about the Constitution.

In fact, I was very shocked—as I got interested in politics, I started talking to lawyers who had gone to law schools all over this country. The majority of lawyers that I've spoken with—law schools, public and private all across this country, they all have a course called constitutional law. But the American public would be absolutely shocked to understand that lawyers, even when they take constitutional law—and in a lot of law schools it's an elective even—when they take constitutional law, they don't study the Constitution. All they study is case law, what the Federal court system has said about the Constitution.

And we've got Federal jurists all the way up to the Supreme Court, but in all levels, from Federal district courts to the appellate system all the way to the U.S. Supreme Court, that bring down ruling after ruling that is not based upon the Constitution in its original intent. That philosophy leads to tyranny in all possibility.

Our Founding Fathers never meant this. In fact, if people would read the Constitution and read what our Founding Fathers said about the Constitution, they would understand that.

There's a great resource that talks about what our Founding Fathers meant for the Constitution to be. The architect of the Constitution, James Madison, John Jay, the first U.S. Supreme Court Chief Justice, and Alexander Hamilton, who was an ardent Federalist who believed in a strong Federal Government, wrote a series of essays. These essays were printed in the newspapers in New York State.

They were written to tell New Yorkers about what government should be under the Constitution in its original intent.

They explained in minute detail what government should be not only then but 200, 400, 600 years later, because they knew very firmly, very strongly that if we didn't have that original intent and a strong, solid foundation of government, that we could lose our liberty. That's the reason they wanted us to stay with their intent in the Constitution.

They wrote these series of essays. Those essays have been bound together—this little booklet, "The Federalist Papers," contains these essays. These essays were written by James Madison, Alexander Hamilton, and John Jay about the Constitution to explain the Constitution.

If people will get "The Federalist Papers" and read them, they will see how far off track we have gotten as a Nation. They will see that our Nation is being destroyed from within, being destroyed by a philosophy of big government, and this philosophy has been fostered upon us by Democrats and Republicans alike, by liberals and conservatives alike. We've got to change that.

Mr. Speaker, the only way that we're going to change governing here in the United States is not here in Washington, not here in the U.S. House of Representatives, not over across the way in the U.S. Senate, not down the street on Pennsylvania Avenue in the White House. The only way we're going to change the philosophy of governance is if the grassroots, the good people across this Nation, start demanding a different kind of governance.

We've got to stop this outrageous spending. We've got to get our economy back on track. We've got to start creating jobs. What's made this country so rich, so powerful, so successful as a political experiment, the greatest political experiment in all of history, in all of mankind, is right here in the United States based on the Constitution of the United States in its original intent.

We have a tremendous lack of knowledge.

Now, "The Federalist Papers" in the old language, it's a bit difficult to read. Their style of writing, their style of English was a bit different from ours.

We've got another resource that I highly recommend, which is "The Federalist Papers in Modern Language." A person can buy this off Amazon, they can get this in Barnes and Noble bookstores around the country. If they don't have it in stock, it can be ordered.

The editor, Mary Webster, got some folks to transliterate "The Federalist Papers" from old-style English into modern English. What "transliterate" means is to change one word in the old style to another word in the new style. This is not an editorialization of "The Federalist Papers," it is not a commentary on "The Federalist Papers."