

of the House, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I rise today in honor of Brent Whitley, a student at Caldwell Community College in Watauga County, North Carolina. Brent recently learned about someone in the community who was battling cancer, and instead of just moving on, Brent decided to take action. His example shows what can be accomplished by people who set their minds on doing good for others.

Brent is a volunteer at Watauga Medical Center, and during his service at the hospital, he noticed a posting in the Emergency Room about the Will Dicus fund. He immediately recognized the need to help Will Dicus, a young man in Watauga County who has been courageously battling cancer for several years.

Over his college Christmas Break, Brent decided he would organize a fundraiser dance to help raise funds for Will's cancer treatment and, thus, "Dance For Dicus" was born.

Brent tirelessly planned and fund-raised, contacting churches and businesses and igniting a spirit of community service. Soon, many people were calling and offering their services and help without solicitation from Brent. All it took was the energy, ambition and selflessness of one person who simply wanted to help someone in need.

To illustrate Brent's true altruism in this situation, I learned that before he began to organize this fundraising effort, Brent did not even know Will Dicus. His desire was simply to help someone who needed assistance.

I'm pleased to report that the "Dance For Dicus" fundraiser was a success. The event raised more than \$5,000 for the Will Dicus fund and, just as importantly, raised awareness of Will Dicus' struggle with cancer. I had the great pleasure to be at the dance and see also the great number of volunteers who were there to help with the event.

Brent, who is the Student Body President at Caldwell Community College, should be inspiration for average Americans everywhere. In a time when many, many Americans are facing real struggles, Brent Whitley demonstrated the power of one person to make a meaningful difference. I applaud Brent for his ethic of community service. His altruistic example is a true inspiration during these difficult times.

#### THE ECONOMY AND OUR FREEDOM

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

Mr. AKIN. Madam Speaker, I'm just delighted to be able to join you here this evening and join my fellow colleagues in talking about some really, really exciting and important topics. The first we're going to talk about this

evening is the economy and a little bit of the background on what's going on, where we've come from, where we should be going in the future. The second topic is going to be the topic of freedom.

One of the things that I have a chance to do is speaking to many audiences is to ask them, what is it that makes America such a special place? Why is it that we love our country so much? And our country is so unique in so many different ways. What is the secret to that unique nature of America? And the word that always comes out is the word "freedom." It's right near the front of the tongue for most Americans. We're going to be talking a bit about the subject of freedom tonight.

But before we do, we do need to take a look at the economy, what's going on there, and what's happened in the past and use that as somewhat of a guide as to where we should be going in the future.

The economy, of course, works on numbers. And numbers, you can't cheat with them too much. People try to, but the bottom line is, somebody ends up having to pay.

And so what we have here, going on in Washington, DC in the last number of weeks has really been incredible. We've charted absolutely new territory, I think irresponsibly. And we have heard for the last 6 years about the tremendous cost of the war in Iraq, how we're wasting money there every single day. And yet, if you add up the entire cost of the war in Iraq, which we now concede is largely won, you take those 6 years of costs, add them to the cost of what we spent in Afghanistan, add those together now, and it's not as much as what we spent in the first five weeks here in this Chamber in this supposedly stimulus bill. Many people are calling it a "porkulous" bill.

And so how is it that the economy got to the point that it would cause people to go into debt so tremendously, spend so much money?

Well, the story really goes back a number of years. It goes back to the Carter administration and really the creation of Freddie Mac and Fannie Mae. What happened was there were areas where it was very difficult for Americans to get home loans, and there were places where banks didn't really want to loan to people for fear that they wouldn't be paid back. And so the Federal Government created Freddie and Fannie, and those organizations are neither private nor public. They're somewhere halfway in between. And so Freddie and Fannie were given authority to help underwrite people's home loans and, actually other kinds of loans as well, but primarily for home loans.

Well, as time went along, various Presidents started demanding that Freddie and Fannie make more and more loans to people who would be considered subprime, or that's a way of saying not as good a risk. And so by the time that we had President Clin-

ton, toward the end of his tenure as President, he required an increase in the percentage of loans that Freddie and Fannie were going to make to people who were considered to be not very good risk kinds of loans. And so, what happened was, you have Freddie and Fannie now underwriting more and more loans, and you started to get a snowballing kind of effect.

At that time, in 1999, the New York Times, in its editorial page reported, I believe it was September, that several people mentioned that this is not safe, that we are starting to create the environment for another savings and loan disaster in America. This is 1999, people were warning that this policy was not a good one.

Was it a free enterprise policy?

People say the reason the economy is bad, it shows the weakness of free enterprise. No, it doesn't. What's created the problem with our economy has nothing to do with free enterprise. It's socialistic programs of government jumping in and telling banks and economists that you have to take loans which we think there's a very good chance people will not pay back.

Well, as the 1999 article in the New York Times indicated, this was a risky thing. As we move forward, we have Greenspan then reducing the interest rate, the economy getting stronger and stronger, the housing market just going up and up and up, increasing at a tremendous rate. In fact, if you looked at its rate of increase historically, you would have to start to worry that it might have been a bubble building.

Well, by 2003 we have President Bush. And President Bush has come to the Congress. He says, hey, this is reported in a September 11, 2003, article, again in the New York Times, saying, I need authority to regulate Freddie and Fannie. We have got big trouble with Freddie and Fannie. They are making all of these loans and if the real estate market comes down some there is going to be the dickens to pay. You have got to allow me to get Freddie and Fannie regulated.

And in the President's request, the Congress, in those days, run by the Republicans, passed a bill to regulate Freddie and Fannie. They sent the bill to the Senate, where it was killed, according to this article, by the Democrats in the Senate.

Now, you have, in that very article that's quoted here, the New York Times, September 11, 2003, this is the Congressman now who is in charge of fixing the problem that was created, basically, another savings and loan type of problem. These two entities, Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, are not facing any kind of financial crisis, said Representative BARNEY FRANK of Massachusetts, the ranking Democrat on the Financial Services Committee. The more people exaggerate these problems, the more pressure there is on these companies, the less we will see in terms of affordable housing.

Now, in looking out the back window, looking through history, we see,

BARNEY FRANK was totally wrong. Freddie and Fannie are the heart of what has fallen apart and created a world economic crisis. The crisis is created by defaulting mortgages, and as that mortgage crisis has spread and continues to spread in the next couple of years, this is what's been driving the bad economy.

So there's an irony here that the person from the House that's in charge of fixing the problem is the one who created the problem. Maybe there's some humor in there somewhere, I suppose.

So I think we need to correct the rhetoric of various people that say that this is a failure of free enterprise. It's not. It's a failure of a big government program that was poorly managed, and it's like trying to make a dollar out of 15 cents.

□ 1730

You can't give people mortgages when they're not going to pay the mortgages.

Of course, it was more than just the Democrats. I'm not blaming this entirely on the Democrats. It was the start of a failure of Congress. Beyond the failure of Congress, you also had other culpable parties. You had some of the people who were rating, some of the rating agencies—Moody's and Standard and Poor's—and they were rating these mortgage securities that would have been chopped up and sold all over the world. They were rating them AAA. Now, how they could do that with a straight face, I don't know, but they fed again on the Wall Street tremendous level of speculation. So that's how we got where we are.

Now the question is: Now that we've gotten ourselves a first-rate recession going, what are the things that should be done to try to fix the recession?

There are two basic schools of thought on this subject. One of them is known as Keynesianism. It was made popular around the days of FDR. Also, it was something that was very much supported by Henry Morgenthau, who we're going to talk about in just a minute.

I do see my very good friend, Congresswoman FOXX, from North Carolina, a lady who has won all kinds of accolades in the last year or two. We think of her a little bit as the toughest grandmother in the entire U.S. Congress, and if there's anybody who is pretty long in what we in Missouri respect, which is commonsense, Congresswoman FOXX is certainly long in that.

I would yield the floor to you, gentlelady.

Ms. FOXX. Well, I want to thank my colleague from Missouri. I hope I can tie in some of my comments with where you're going with that quote from Henry Morgenthau. We've used it a good bit recently, and I think it is a really, really good quote to share with the American people. I think we need to keep doing it over and over.

I certainly share your feeling that this is not a failure of capitalism, what

has occurred in our country recently. Indeed, it has happened all over the world.

Mr. AKIN. Could I reclaim my time for just a second? There's a little, funny story about where this quote came from of all things:

My father is 88 years old. He was reading a flyer that had been sent to him from Hillsdale College, and it was a quote out of a book called *New Deal or Raw Deal*. It has just been published. So here is my father. He gives it to me. "Son," he said, "you don't read enough. Here. Take a look at this." So we've been using it some, but I yield time to the gentlelady.

Ms. FOXX. Well, I'm trying to read *The Forgotten Man* right now. It's a wonderful story about what happened during the Depression and just before the Depression. I have to agree with you that we can't blame all that happened then on the Democrats, although they exacerbated the problem a lot, but I would commend that book, *The Forgotten Man*, to folks who are watching us and to anybody else. It's a history book, but it reads like a novel, and it's really a great piece.

As I said, I want to try to tie in what's going on today with something I read recently. You're right; we don't get enough time to read books. We read a lot every day, but I was thinking that we need to set aside an hour a week, at least, to read books. I'm trying to do that. It's good for our souls to read those kinds of things.

You know, Republicans have been criticized recently for not having new ideas. We've been told on this floor over and over again and we've been told by the administration that doing nothing in this situation is not acceptable, so the Democrats are doing what they say they know to do. They say our alternative is doing nothing. Well, that has never been our alternative. We've presented lots and lots of alternatives, but what we have to get people to understand is that the tried and true issue of keeping money out of the hands of the Federal Government and leaving that money in the hands of the citizens is really the best cure for this problem that ails us. Actually, it's the best cure for a society that is free, and I want to acknowledge that.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time, gentlelady, what you just made is really an important point.

What you're saying is Republicans do have an alternative, and part of that alternative is to stop spending money, but it seems like some people down in Washington, DC and a certain party have their ears plastered. They don't want to hear that as an alternative, but there is an alternative. It is the same thing that every commonsense household in America is doing, and that is, when you're troubled, stop spending money. That's a good first step, isn't it?

I yield.

Ms. FOXX. It absolutely is. Really, the root of our problem is that the gov-

ernment is spending more money than it has. When I talk in speeches or when I'm on the radio, doing radio shows or when I'm on TV, what I keep reminding people is that the government has only two sources of money—that which it takes from us forcefully, from the citizens who pay taxes—and the government does take it forcefully. Now, we know Americans have been good about paying their taxes, and they're actually willing to pay about 25 percent of their income in taxes—we know that from surveys that have been done—but it only has two ways of doing it: taking it from us forcefully or by borrowing it. Those are the only two ways because government doesn't create wealth. Government can destroy wealth, and it can destroy wealth in a hurry. What's happening with the stock market and with other savings plans is a good example of that, and I think my colleague from Missouri knows that.

Mr. AKIN. Well, reclaiming my time, gentlelady, I think there are a bunch of us—and I'm not accusing you of this—in the baby boomer kind of category who have just seen our 401(k)s turn into 101(k)s. We understand, when the government does things the wrong way, it really can be expensive, and there are different ways. One, as you say, is to tax people. You don't have to pay your taxes. If you don't, you go to the free hotel.

Ms. FOXX. That's right.

Mr. AKIN. The other alternative is they can, of course, borrow it. Then of course, within that category, we have the other thing that we don't hear much about but which has happened extensively in the last 9 months, which is printing it, a form of borrowing it.

I don't mean to interrupt, and would yield to the gentlelady.

Ms. FOXX. Well, I want to call to the attention of the American people an article that I read. You know, we've talked about reading. I think I read this during the Christmas holiday. It's an article by Terence Jeffrey. It was published in *Human Events* on the 5th of November of last year. The title of it is "Wanted: Small Government." I just want to read a couple of excerpts from it, and then I'm going to put it in the RECORD.

"Up until the 1930s, the United States maintained a small Federal Government that mostly focused on the limited number of things the Constitution authorized it to do.

"Americans were responsible for their own food, clothing and shelter, and if they could not take care of themselves, they looked to their extended family, their neighbors, their churches, and local governments to give them a helping hand.

"Charity in America, in those days, did not mean the Federal Government compelling you to hand over some of your property to the State so the State could hand it over to someone else.

“Americans did not believe in spreading the wealth—they believed in earning it. The term ‘compassionate conservative’ had not been coined.

“There was no Federal welfare state before the 1930s.

“That year, according to historical data published by the White House Office of Management and Budget, the entire Federal Government spent only 3.4 percent of gross domestic product. Because Federal tax receipts equaled to 4.2 percent of GDP in 1930, there was a Federal budget surplus equal to eight-tenths of a percent of GDP.”

HUMAN EVENTS—WANTED: SMALL GOVERNMENT

(By Terence P. Jeffrey)

Up until the 1930s, the United States maintained a small federal government that mostly focused on the limited number of things the Constitution authorized it to do.

Americans were responsible for their own food, clothing and shelter, and if they could not take care of themselves, they looked to their extended family, their neighbors, their churches and local governments to give them a helping hand.

Charity in America in those days did not mean the federal government compelling you to hand over some of your property to the state so the state could hand it over to someone else.

Americans did not believe in spreading the wealth—they believed in earning it. The term compassionate conservative had not been coined.

There was no federal welfare state before the 1930s.

That year, according to historical data published by the White House Office of Management and Budget, the entire federal government spent only 3.4 percent of gross domestic product. Because federal tax receipts equaled to 4.2 percent of GDP in 1930, there was a federal budget surplus equal to 0.8 percent of GDP.

Within a decade, things changed dramatically. In 1940, Franklin Delano Roosevelt—founder of the modern American welfare state—was preparing to break George Washington’s self-imposed limit of two presidential terms.

Although the nation was still at peace, the federal government had grown almost threefold—when measured as a percentage of GDP—from what it had been in 1930. Federal spending in 1940 was 9.8 percent of GDP. Federal tax receipts were 6.8 percent. The Treasury borrowed 3 percent of GDP to make up the difference.

In fiscal year 2009, according to OMB’s estimates, the federal government will spend 20.7 percent of GDP while taking in 18 percent of GDP in taxes. The Treasury will borrow 2.7 percent of GDP, much of it from foreign creditors, to make up the difference.

And that does not count the \$700 billion the Treasury will borrow to fund the financial industry bailout.

Today, the federal government eats up more than twice as much of our national wealth as it did in 1940 and more than six times as much as it did in 1930.

What did Americans get for this massive increase in government? More of their life is now mortgaged to the government, and they are now more dependent on government.

Most of the growth in federal spending has come in the sector that the OMB calls “human resources.” As currently budgeted, this includes federal spending on education, training, social services, health programs, veterans benefits and services, income security programs, Medicare and Social Security.

In 1940, the “human resources” part of the federal budget consumed 4.3 percent of GDP. In 2009, it will consume 13 percent, or three times as much.

Before the current economic crisis hit, the American welfare state was on an unsustainable trajectory. The Government Accountability Office informed the Senate in January that it estimated there was a \$53 trillion gap between the entitlement benefits the federal government has promised to pay over the next 75 years to people now living in the United States and the tax revenue that can be expected to pay for those benefits. Then-Comptroller General David Walker said that for the government to cover this gap every American household would need to put up about \$455,000.

That is the size of the mortgage the federal government has already taken out in the name of every American family.

We got to this place because politicians for decades have been telling voters they would give them something for nothing—when what they really meant was they would take money from one set of people and give it to another.

When they borrowed vast sums to keep their welfare-state politics rolling, they were taking money away from future generations—our children and grandchildren.

Now we are being told we face the greatest economic crisis since the 1930s. And we are being offered the same solution: more federal programs so Uncle Sam can take better care of us.

In other words, the politicians want to take out a second mortgage on top of the \$455,000 they have already put on our backs.

America is heading down the blind alley of big government toward the brick wall of national bankruptcy. The only way out is to turn the truck completely around and head back toward small government, self-reliance and freedom.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time, gentlery, I would like to highlight what you said.

Those numbers are absolutely shocking. In 1930, you’re saying the Federal Government was spending three point something percent of the GDP?

Ms. FOXX. Correct.

Mr. AKIN. Boy. Oh, boy. I’ll bet you there’s a lot of people who would love to see us get back to that kind of a number. Then the tax rate was four something, 4 percent?

Ms. FOXX. That’s right. No. What we brought into the Federal Government was 4.2 percent of GDP. Now, that could have been in addition to—well, it was mostly taxes, I guess. That’s what it was.

Mr. AKIN. Well, I sure appreciate your sharing that with us.

You know, we are joined by another very good friend of mine, Congresswoman MARSHA BLACKBURN. She is one of our great communicators, a lady from Tennessee.

We’re just delighted to have you with us, Congresswoman BLACKBURN, and would ask you if you want to chip in a little bit here in our discussion on where we are economically. I yield.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Absolutely. I thank the gentleman from Missouri for yielding, and I appreciate the opportunity to participate in the discussion that is here because, as we have all been home over the weekend and have been working in our districts, meeting

with constituents, the economy is the number one issue. I have talked to so many people who are using the words that they are appalled, that they are horrified with what they see happening here. They are very concerned with what they see taking place with the economic policies of the new administration.

Indeed, as a broker from one of our fine banks in Tennessee said to me yesterday, the stock market has voted on the Obama economic policies—on PELOSI, REID and their economic policies—and they have obviously voted “no” because the stock market was over 9,000 before this administration took control, and now we see where it is today, which is at 6,700. It is of great concern to us.

We know our Nation is in a recession. We know that people are hurting. We know that they want to see something done, and most people fully realize that you cannot declare a war on prosperity and get yourself out of a recession.

You both have recognized, Ms. FOXX and the gentleman from Missouri, the quote from Henry Morgenthau and the importance of that, which is that it does not work, that this kind of spending does not work. I brought a chart along that I felt was important to the discussion that we are having.

As my colleagues know, the Democrats took control of this body in January ’07, and we see where we were with the Federal deficit, the green line. The orange line is discretionary spending, and mandatory spending is in the blue. Now, we continued to hear from the leadership—from Speaker PELOSI, from Leader REID and from the President—that they inherited this debt, that they inherited an annual deficit, but I think it’s important to note that they voted “yes” on all of this. It has pushed our spending.

You can see what has happened with the spending in the past year alone. Stimulus I was \$152 billion. You’ll see where it comes in there in ’08, the pre-TARP funds. That was from March to September of ’08, \$323 billion. Then there was TARP, the auto bailout—stimulus II—which was \$787 billion. There was the omnibus, which was \$410 billion. Now what we have seen happen with the spending is, by the end of ’07, the Democrat-led House had moved our same year mandatory spending from \$3 billion to \$37 billion, and by the end of ’08, they’d increased that number to \$333 billion.

Ms. FOXX. Would the gentlery yield?

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I would gladly yield to the gentlery.

Mr. AKIN. I would reclaim my time and yield. I’m the one who’s supposed to do this.

This is part of the dinner conversation here. Being the father and the guy who serves the food at our dinner table, I would recognize the gentlery from North Carolina.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I yield my time to the gentleman.

Ms. FOXX. Thank you. I appreciate the gentleman from Missouri yielding.

I was trying to make this point today, and I think it's so important that you've brought this up.

Let us remind the American people that the Democrats took control of the Congress in January of 2007. Do you remember—I remember—that we had 54 straight months of job growth up until January of 2007? Do you remember that number?

Mr. AKIN. Yes.

I would yield to the gentlelady from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Indeed, you're exactly right. We had had job growth. We had had economic growth. It was basically unparalleled. The 2001 and 2003 tax reductions had worked. We had not seen this kind of growth since Ronald Reagan.

As the chart points out, you can look at where the Federal deficit was, which was at \$8 trillion. You can look at where discretionary spending was placed and where our mandatory spending, this blue line, was placed.

Now, what we see as the mandatory spending alone is that they grew from \$3 billion to \$333 billion in a 2-year period of time. So you can see what is happening with our spending. Whether it is our discretionary or our mandatory spending, it is going through the roof, and of course that runs our Federal deficit and our national debt up.

□ 1745

This year alone, we're at over \$2 trillion in a deficit, and our President has just proposed a \$3.5 trillion budget.

So we know what is going to continue to happen to these lines. You can look at the CBO scoring—and, see, the CBO is a nonpartisan organization. You can look at what is happening in their scoring and see that we're going to have trillion-dollar deficits as far as we can see with the tight spending that we have brought forth.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time.

The gentlelady from Tennessee has a very, very effective chart. And what you're pointing out is that we're in uncharted waters. We have not dared to take and swallow this much debt in the past.

I was trying to put some kind of a handle on what we passed just a couple of weeks ago on this House floor on about—I think it was—what was it, \$840 billion. Now, I don't make that much money. So I tried to think, Well, what's something big that the Federal Government buys. And because I'm on Armed Services, I think of aircraft carriers. They're bigger than tanks. They're like a whale. They're tremendous. Well, an aircraft carrier, we've got 11 of them. And they're valuable. And we put other ships around them to guard them. And we don't make aircraft carriers very often because they're so expensive.

So let's take the average cost of those 11 aircraft carriers and divide it

into \$840 billion that we just spent a couple weeks ago—money that we don't have—and you're talking about 250 aircraft carriers—can you picture that—end-to-end-to-end. This is a lot of money. Or if you want to get one of those kinds of Cadillac aircraft carriers, the big long-deck ones that really do all of the fancy stuff, you're still talking over 100 aircraft carriers. That's money that we don't have that we just spent, and it was supposed to be for stimulus; but we called it "porkulous" because there wasn't really much stimulus.

But that's talking about doing some big-time spending following that same old Keynesian idea that if the government spends enough money, that everything will be okay.

To this engineer, that's a little bit like grabbing your bootstraps, lifting up, and trying to fly around the room.

We're joined by another very good friend of mine, STEVE SCALISE, Congressman from Louisiana. I think you wanted to also talk a little bit about where we are with this level of spending and what's going on with these taxes.

Mr. SCALISE. I want to thank my friend from Mississippi, as well as the gentlelady from Tennessee, because as we start to see the real numbers—and the American public has been concerned about where the economy is—but they are also real concerned—and we're seeing more and more each day—real concerned about the gross level of spending that's coming out of this administration as a response to the crisis.

I think if you look at what's being presented, and as people are now starting to look and grab some of these numbers—and we're not just talking about hundreds of billions of dollars now; we're talking about well over a projected deficit of \$1.7 trillion in this budget. So it makes people harken back and say, number one, what levels do these compare to. And when you look back, you can go back—you have to go all the way back to World War II to find a budget, a level of spending that's presented in this budget, a level of spending that's as high a gross domestic product of a percentage of GDP that we've had. And we haven't had this high a level of spending since World War II.

So if you go back to World War II and, of course, the Great Depression right before it, it really sparks a lot of comparisons that are frightening. And I think that's where the public is, but that's where the markets are. I know my friend from Tennessee talked about that, too. The markets are responding to what's happening here in this city in Washington, D.C., and it's not good. Their reaction is not good, what that means for people's 401(k)s. Just in the last 2 months, people have lost 20 percent of their 401(k)s because of the results of these policies not only that were passed in the spending bill just 2 weeks ago, but this budget that's been

presented with its gross level of spending with its absorbitant level of tax increases.

So if we look here at a chart, this is a break down of the President's proposal of tax increases that's in this budget, this budget that has \$1.7 trillion of new debt—not debt that was carried over from the previous administration. The buck stops here. And this President submitted this budget, he created this new level of spending, and he's choosing to pay for some of it—clearly not all of it—but some of it by one of the largest tax increases in the history of our country.

And while he says that less than 5 percent of the people of this country will pay these taxes, this chart will show you something very different, a stark difference in what we've been hearing; \$1.4 trillion has been proposed by this President in this budget in new taxes at a time, of course, that our economy is in a recession.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time a second.

That should send the alarm bells off in people's minds. When you're having not only just a little recession but what's starting to turn into almost a depression and you're talking about huge tax increases, you don't want those two things in the same sentence, I believe.

I yield.

Mr. SCALISE. I think when we talk about, now that we're in a recession, will we be going to a depression, look at what happened in this 1920s and the 1930s as we did go into a depression. And in many cases, it was policies in Washington, D.C., that not only pushed us into the depression but kept us there for 8 years. We were in the depression for 8 years. It took World War II to get us out of it.

And if you go back to 1932, the President who raised taxes during an economic downturn that was so severe in the 1930s—Herbert Hoover raised taxes, of all things, while the country was entering a depression. In 1932, Herbert Hoover on his way out as being voted out as President, he raised taxes dramatically. We're seeing the same process followed again. And then the people say, "Those who don't learn from history are doomed to repeat it."

When this country was entering the Great Depression in the 1930s, they raised taxes dramatically, and it helped—that and the gross level of spending—helped make that an 8-year process instead of a short depression that we could have gotten out of.

So if I can go back to this chart. Where are the taxes going to be paid? Who's going to be paying for those taxes? It's \$636 billion of those new taxes are going to be thrown onto the backs of our small business owners. So when they talk about people who make over \$250,000 a year—and I know some people want to pay class warfare and try to divide this country at a time when we need to be uniting this country and finding real solutions—they

talk about that top 5 percent. Well, who is that top 5 percent? That's the small business owners in our country who have created 70 percent of our jobs.

So if anybody can explain to me how raising \$636 billion in new taxes on the backs of those very people who are creating the jobs that our economy needs, how is that going to get our economy back on track? That's something that the markets are reacting to and people across this country are starting to realize that it's a frightening realization.

Mr. AKIN. This is something I want to be very clear in our discussion this evening. We're having this, like a dinner conversation.

What I want to make clear is that the Republicans are not just saying "no." What you're saying is, You're doing the wrong thing which will make the economy worse.

Now, what you've gotten to in your chart here is the absolute crux of what has worked in the past to pull us out of a recession. And it's not the government that pulls us out of a recession; it's the marketplace. And it's particularly the entrepreneurs and the inventors and the investors and those small business people. And what do small business people need in order to create all of those jobs—because depending on what you call a small business, you're talking 70 to 80 percent of the jobs in America come from small businesses.

So if you harm the small business guy—even though he may be fairly well-to-do—you're cutting off your nose to spite your face. And what's going to happen when you take \$636 billion out of small businesses—that's the money they need to invest in new equipment, new processes, new procedures and innovation which is going to result in hiring the people that need to be hired.

So what's happening here is this policy is economically crafted to make the problem worse.

I would yield to my colleague.

Mr. SCALISE. What you said is exactly true. And there is a double whammy on this budget on the tax increases that have been proposed. Not only do \$636 billion in new taxes get thrown onto the backs of small businesses all across this country, but then they come through the back door; and this is where the rest of the 95 percent of the people that supposedly aren't going to pay a new dime in new taxes, this is where they get hit.

This is their energy proposal on cap and trade. A carbon tax. This is something that you haven't heard a lot of people on the Democratic side talking about because as people see what this does, they realize this is where everybody else pays more money: \$646 in new taxes on energy production in this country. And, of course, all across this country as energy taxes are increased, who pays for those taxes? That's not something that they just absorb. They have the authority to pass that on to rate payers.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time.

I think there must be something wrong with your chart here because I was just on this floor last week, and I heard the President say that nobody making less than \$250,000 is going to pay any of these taxes. And I said, "I'm glad I'm not going to have to pay these taxes because I make less than \$250,000 a year." And now you're ruining my whole evening by telling me that that isn't true. Is that what you're saying? I yield.

Mr. SCALISE. I'm sorry if you already ate dinner. I'm sorry to upset your stomach. But a lot of people across the country are starting to get very upset as they see the realization of these proposals because change as a concept sounds great. There are a lot of things we need to change about Washington, D.C. In fact, we've proposed an alternative H.R. 470. You can actually go on line. We put our proposals on line. We put that proposal out there weeks and weeks ago. H.R. 470 is a true alternative to get our economy back on track.

What we've been presented with, unfortunately, with this administration is the oldest failed policy that will keep us deeper in a, not only recession, but can throw us into a recession; and that is a tax-and-spend approach, which has been proven to fail every time.

So this cap and trade program right here, this is—they can call it whatever they want, but when you start having to pay higher fees on your utility bills, that's a tax to you. That's a tax increase. If your utility bill goes up and you're using the same amount of energy because of this carbon tax \$646 billion, if people across the country don't think that's going to result in something that's going to have a significant impact on their budgets as they're tightening. And people are conserving energy. People are tightening their belts.

But as they're conserving that energy, they're going to be getting hit with \$646 billion in new taxes on top of the \$636.00 billion that our small businesses will be hit with.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time.

You can be making \$20,000 dollars a year, and you are still going to be burning some natural gas and using some electricity; is that right?

Mr. SCALISE. That's not only right, but those people in the lower incomes are the ones that are least likely to be able to afford these massive tax increases they get on their utility bills. Because if your utility bill goes up even though you're using the same amount of energy, or in some cases you're using less energy—maybe you actually went and put some insulation in your attic because you wanted to lower your rates—this carbon tax is actually going to raise your utility bills even though you've done those things.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time, gentlemen.

You're getting me all upset. You're ruining my entire evening here. But I

have a feeling what you're telling us is true. In fact, I know it is true.

Mr. SCALISE. If I could ask for the gentleman to yield for one moment.

Mr. AKIN. I would yield for one minute.

Mr. SCALISE. There is one bit of good news. While these are difficult times, while there's a lot of bad news—and as people look at these details, it frightens a lot of people. But this has not been passed into law yet. These are proposals the President just filed this last week. We haven't even started having hearings in Congress. If people all across this country—as I'm sure they will do when they start realizing the negative impacts to our economy of these new taxes, these massive taxes—people, I think, are going to start lighting up those phones. They're going to start calling their congressmen. They're going to call the White House. And they are going to say enough is enough.

The spending and the taxes, just like in the 1930s, didn't work. Don't take my word for it. Listen to the Treasury Secretary under FDR. This has been tried before and it's failed before. Not only did it fail, it pushed us into a deeper depression. And I think the public across this country is going to say, "Enough is enough. We're not going to take these new taxes and this ridiculous level of spending," and the public can stop this.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time.

I think you're a little bit of a prophet, gentlemen, because they were dumping tea in the river in St. Louis this last weekend. I think people are starting to get wise and they're getting upset.

I also am just thankful that we're joined by a very good friend, a very distinguished colleague from this House, Congressman PENCE from Indiana.

I would yield time to my good friend. I know that you have very good insights on these issues.

Mr. PENCE. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him and all of my colleagues who will speak here this evening for taking the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to come to this floor and talk about facts.

Facts are stubborn things. And it seems like we're living in a time right now of soaring rhetoric. But the facts underpinning the Democrat budget are jarring, and they represent a fundamental departure from the course of American governance.

□ 1800

And we need to talk about those things. I mean, the American people understand that the Federal budget is, in itself, the way a party and an administration lays out its vision for the future of the country. The American people deserve a budget that is fiscally responsible and puts jobs first. And as has been said on the floor before, the budget offered by this administration and supported by our Democratic colleagues in the House fails on both

counts. The American people know we can't borrow and spend and bail our way back to a growing economy.

And history has shown that the policies that are embraced in the Obama budget will actually take our country not out of recession, but very likely deeper into recession. The last President of the United States to raise taxes during a recession was Herbert Hoover, who managed, by his deeply flawed judgment and policies, to take a strong recession in the 1920s and turn it into a decades-long depression in this country. And yet here we stand again at a crossroads in our Nation's history when so many families are hurting, so many small business owners are struggling under this economic downturn.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time, gentleman, what you're saying is we're just not learning from history. It's not that the economy is brand new, there are patterns here. It's not that the Republicans are the party of "no," it's the fact that these solutions don't work and they're going to hurt our constituents, and that's why we get a little excited about them.

I mean, here you have the quote from Henry Morgenthau, he is the guy that, along with little Lord Keynes, came up with Keynesian economics. And he says, After trying it for 8 years, our theory didn't work. Our unemployment is as bad as it was before, and now we're in debt. And what we're trying to say is, don't accuse us of not having solutions, the solutions are there; but don't repeat history's mistakes.

I didn't mean to interrupt, but just continuing to yield to my good friend from Indiana, Congressman PENCE.

Mr. PENCE. Well, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for his typical eloquent insight. We are not paying attention to history. We are not learning from the candid comments like the Secretary of the Treasury under President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, who realized at the end of America's lost decade of the 1930s that they couldn't borrow and spend their way back to a growing nation. And yet here we are again.

But I hasten to add, not only are we piling on our children and grandchildren a mountain range of debt to pay for—beginning with the stimulus bill, and now the omnibus bill, and now the President's budget—a transformation of government spending priorities along liberal lines, but they intend to pay for it, in part—because we're talking about record deficits. Even if the President hits his deficit reduction mark in 4 years, it will still be a half a trillion dollar deficit, which I remember Democrats decrying during Republican control of the Congress. But beyond all that, they're going to pay for it, in part, with tax increases on small business owners and family farmers.

As the gentleman just described very eloquently, the American people deserve to know a couple of facts. Seventy percent of Americans work in

small businesses in this country and in places like Indiana; 70 percent of people get up and go to work every day in a small business. More than 50 percent of the American people who file income tax returns at or above the level that the President intends to raise taxes are small business owners filing their taxes as individuals. And so we ask the question, Mr. Speaker, of the American people looking in, do you think raising taxes on your employer at the small business where you work is a pathway to recovery in America? Is it going to make your job more secure or less secure? Leave aside the so-called cap and trade bill, but raising the utility rates, the electrical bills for every homeowner in America, every business in America—

Mr. AKIN. Just reclaiming my time for a minute, gentleman, what you're suggesting is, one, what's being done is exactly the wrong thing. And if you want a positive Republican recommendation, it would be to do the opposite of that, right? In other words, what we would be saying would be, look, if you've got 70 or 80 percent—depending on how big you call a small business—if that's where 70 to 80 percent of the jobs in America are, you want those small businesses strong. How do you make them strong? They have to have enough liquidity, enough capital to be able to invest in entrepreneurial ideas, to put in more productive assembly lines or machines or processes. So you have to invest, and you have to let that money work for you. And you have to leave it with the small businessman. But if you vacuum it out of his pockets with massive tax increases, he's not going to have the money to invest, and he's going to lay off more people, it's going to make things worse. So the solution is, quite simply, leave more money for the small businessman and back off the spending pedal a little bit.

I don't mean to get overexcited. I want to yield again to my good friend from Indiana, and then go to a wonderful new Congressman from Wyoming.

Mr. PENCE. Let me say as I close, I want to thank the gentleman for leading this hour of debate and say that there are two things that Republicans believe we ought to be doing. Number one is, we ought not to be growing the Federal budget beyond any reasonable expectation of the American people. We shouldn't be engaging in the runaway spending of the so-called stimulus bill, the omnibus bill and the President's budget. We ought to be doing what every family farm, every small business, every working family is doing, and that is finding places to save, finding places to cut back. And then, as the gentleman said, we ought to be doing what John F. Kennedy did, we ought to be doing what Ronald Reagan did, we ought to be doing, as a country, what this Congress and George W. Bush did after the Towers fell, and that is, not giving Washington more money of ours to spend, but giv-

ing working families, small business owners, family farmers more of their hard-earned tax dollars to keep and spend. That's the pathway to prosperity.

The President's budget, the Democrats' plans are a pathway to increased recession and hardship for the American people, and we must reject them.

Mr. AKIN. Well, I reclaim my time. And I would once again thank the gentleman from Indiana for joining us.

We have all kinds of expertise here tonight. And Congresswoman LUMMIS from Wyoming, my understanding is Wyoming has only got one Congresswoman, if I'm correct.

I yield.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Thank you very much for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it's a privilege to participate in this discussion.

As a new member of the Budget Committee, I learned today that the President's budget would project the levels of spending in the war in Iraq at the same level that they are during the surge, and use that dollar amount and project it out to the year 2019. It does not account for the fact that President Obama has decided to withdraw combat troops from Iraq in August of 2010, but for this manner: if you project that spending is going to go up when you factor in inflation until 2019 at surge levels, and then you project that we're going to withdraw troops, that gives you \$1.6 trillion that the administration is choosing to spend on other programs. In other words, that money won't be saved, it will be redirected into other components of this President's budget.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time, are you saying in a way you've almost got a sneaky cut in defense spending?

I yield.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Thank you for yielding. It does, in a way, accomplish just that because it's taking money that is being spent on defense now and rerouting it into domestic spending that is discretionary and creates new programs. Now, I would not object to that but for the fact that this increased spending is in addition to new taxes. And the gentleman was accurate in pointing out the effect that that will have on small business.

As you know, my State of Wyoming is all small businesses, that an individual tax rate of \$200,000 will trigger a tax increase, that filing jointly at \$250,000 in income will trigger a tax increase. And correctly you have pointed out that the brunt of that is going to fall on small business.

Small business has been pegged as the opportunity for growth in this country through the entrepreneurial free enterprise ethic. And if that ethic is thwarted through high taxes, that will be a component of our country that is not growing. That is the component of our country that is creating 70 percent of the new jobs. So as large employers lay off employees because they were "too big to fail" and then failed

anyway, it would be a robust small business community that could absorb them if the tax structure were such that those monies could be made available by expanding the entrepreneurial spirit.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time, lady, I think what I'm hearing you say is what we've been trying to emphasize all the way along.

There are a couple of basic things we need to do with the situation that we're in, a situation that was created not by free enterprise, but by failed government programs that issued a whole lot of loans with government guarantees on them that people weren't going to pay. And so we got ourselves in a lot of trouble, but it doesn't mean that it's the end of the world. There are ways to fix these problems.

America has been through a lot of hard times. A lot of people are kind of discouraged right now, but they don't have to be. There are solutions, it's been done before—J.F.K. did it, Ronald Reagan did it, even Bush did it in 2003. You can see the result of the dividend capital gains—the exact effect of what you're talking about, putting money in the pocket of the small businessman—not putting it in, but just letting him keep it, just getting off the taxes on the small businessman.

And look what happens here to gross domestic product. These are the years of Bush before this tax cut went in place. And take a look at what jumps. You go from an average of 1.1 percent to 3.6 year after year because of the fact you did just what the wise woman from Wyoming is saying.

And then if you want to say, well, what happens when GDP goes up? Well, here you go; here's what the job numbers look like; same time period, May 2003, we do the dividend capital gains tax cut. These are all job losses below the line, everything above the line is a job gain. It's an investment just basically allowing a small business, like an engine, to have enough liquidity and money to be able to make it run so that it can create those jobs and put America—and the other chart that we're missing is what happens to Federal revenues. And Federal revenues go up like a rocket because you've got all these people working and the economy going strong.

We are also joined here this evening by Congressman CHAFFETZ from Utah. And it is just a delight to have you on the floor and to hear from some people out west. So I hope that you enjoy joining our little dinner conversation this evening.

I yield.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Thank you. I appreciate it.

I am deeply concerned about the direction of this country. I know there are people out there that are suffering.

I recently had an opportunity go to the Payson City Chamber of Commerce and meet with small local business people. The Mayor was there, Mayor

Burtis Bills, a wonderful gentleman. These people are all concerned about the economy. They all have their own businesses, from an auto repair shop, to a local flower business, to a home-based business that was just kicking off and won an award.

The direction that we're taking with our Federal government I believe is an impediment to the success of those people. As I looked them in the eye, I didn't have anything to tell them that the stimulus or this budget would truly help them with. This budget takes from the American people; it doesn't give more of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. And fundamentally, that's what we here in the United States Congress are supposed to be doing. It's about who is going to control the destiny of our country.

I believe in less government. The President says he believes in less government. But when you look at the budget, it's more government, it's more government spending.

I'm mystified when they make the argument—

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time, last week we voted on what was called an omnibus. It was basically nine budget bills all in a row stacked together. And the result of that, just on the surface, was an 8 percent increase, which if you don't believe in increasing government, why kick it up by eight? That's the largest increase since back in the seventies under Jimmy Carter, Democrat Jimmy Carter. But 8 percent is really what it was because you've got to put all that porkulous money into the budget. When you do that, it's an 80 percent increase in the growth of all of these government programs.

Somebody wrote a little note to me, I went to a Lincoln Days talk this weekend, and they said, the trouble with socialism is is that sooner or later you run out of other people's money. And I thought, that sounds like something that might have possibly been coined out in Utah. It's just common sense.

I will yield.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. If the gentleman would yield.

You know, as we look at this, I liken it to a house. The furnace has gone out; it's the middle of the winter and the furnace has gone out. So what are we going to do? Well, we've been off re-decorating the kitchen and we've re-modeled the basement and we bought new drapes. We did everything except fix the furnace. And that furnace is the American entrepreneur, it's that man or woman who is going to start their local business. And you've got to look at the stimulus and say, what's in it for them? Less than 1 percent was tax cuts for that type of person, less than 1 percent.

□ 1815

We said we were going to build roads and bridges and rebuild America; yet only 3.4 percent of that stimulus actually went to those types of activities.

So I think you have to look at it through the lens of the American entrepreneur, the small businessman who's truly going to create that job. How are they going to grow their business from 10 to 20 employees? I visited with somebody in my office earlier today who had 64 employees. The question for us is how are they going to get to 100? And it's not more government. It's not funding these outrageous programs that are going to do nothing for that local entrepreneur.

Mr. AKIN. Well, reclaiming my time, I really appreciate your perspective. And I wish we had a little bit longer amount of time to talk with you because I'd love to get into that subject of freedom a little bit. But I know that we've also got a little Texas wisdom here in the Chamber here tonight, and I just feel like it would be a shame not to yield to Congressman GOHMERT from Texas, actually a former judge and a gentleman noted for a good sense of humor as well, and we need a good sense of humor on this subject; so I would yield to my good friend Congressman GOHMERT from Texas.

Mr. GOHMERT. I appreciate my friend's yielding.

Actually, I don't have a lot of humor to throw into this issue tonight. But I had read a Wall Street Journal article today. It was in today's Wall Street Journal. And just the opening paragraphs, if I might share that because there's a lot of wisdom in here:

"As 2009 opened, 3 weeks before Barack Obama took office, the Dow Jones Industrial Average closed at 9034 on January 2, its highest level since the autumn panic. Yesterday the Dow fell another 4.24 percent to 6763, for an overall decline of 25 percent in 2 months and to its lowest level since 1997. The dismaying message here is that President Obama's policies have become part of the economy's problem."

And to finish up here:

"Americans have welcomed the Obama era in the same spirit of hope the President campaigned on. But after 5 weeks in office, it's become clear that Mr. Obama's policies are slowing, if not stopping, what would otherwise be the normal process of economic recovery. From punishing business to squandering scarce national public resources, Team Obama is creating more uncertainty and less confidence and thus a longer period of recession or subpar growth.

"The Democrats who now run Washington don't want to hear this because they benefit from blaming all bad economic news on President Bush."

This is the Obama economy now. The jobs that are being lost are because companies are finding no hope in this latest stimulus whatever you want to call that package or all the other spending.

And I appreciate the gentleman's yielding because I do find this very distressing. We're in the Obama economy.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time, it does my heart a great deal of sadness

to see my friend from Texas without a little bit of a twinkle in his eye, which is so commonly there. But this is a very serious subject. We try not to yell and scream too much about it, but we know that economically what's being done is going to harm our constituents. It's getting rid of jobs. It's making the small businessmen have to basically shutter down and to keep his operation small, which is exactly the wrong thing for what we should be doing.

And why is it that we need all of this money? That is the question that I think we need to be asking. Why is it that we have to be spending all this money on government programs? And the answer seems to me to be, again, we're not learning very well from history. Just bear with me for a second. I'd like to get your perspective on this.

A certain number of years ago, there was a thing called the Soviet Union, and they were bad guys. And they were a bunch communists and they were socialists. And what was it that they thought? They thought the job of the government should be to provide you, first of all, with a job, and then they wanted the government to give you health care and food and housing and an education. And one thing particular about them, they didn't want you to talk about God ever.

Now, in our country, let's see, we've got all this government spending going on so the government can provide you with health care and a job and food and housing and an education and it's politically correct not to talk about God because if you did that, gentlemen, you'd realize your rights come from God. Life, liberty, the pursuit of happiness, not big government nanny state. And I just wanted to toss that out to you to see if I could get a response from my good friend from Texas.

I yield.

Mr. GOHMERT. If we have time, when I was an exchange student in the Soviet Union back in 1973, I went out to a collective farm, and I've worked on farms and ranches. It was about mid morning. The farmers obviously hadn't been working. The field was suffering. And I said in what Russian I could speak back then, "When do you work in the field?"

And they all laughed. And one spoke for them in Russian and said, "I make the same number of rubles if I'm out there in the field or if I'm here in the shade."

That is why socialism doesn't work.

Mr. AKIN. So reclaiming my time once again, the problem with socialism is sooner or later we run out of other people's money.

That concludes our 1 hour. I just thank all of my colleagues from all over the country joining us tonight. Next week we will try to get into freedom a little more heavily, but the economy is certainly a top topic and that's why we have given it a lot of attention this evening.

God bless you all. Good night.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BACA (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of attending a funeral.

Mr. ELLISON (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of constituent business in the district.

Mr. PERRIELLO (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today and the balance of the week on account of a death in the family.

Mr. STARK (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today and the balance of the week on account of illness.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today and the balance of the week on account of medical reasons.

Mr. KING of Iowa (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of the birth of his grandson.

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

Ms. BERKLEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HOLT, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. FLAKE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WOLF, for 5 minutes, March 4 and 5.

Mr. CALVERT, for 5 minutes, March 4.

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, March 10.

Mr. INGLIS, for 5 minutes, today and March 9.

Mr. MCHENRY, for 5 minutes, today, March 4, 5 and 6.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, March 10.

Mr. PAUL, for 5 minutes, today, March 4 and 5.

Mr. OLSON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. FOXX, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at their own request) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, for 5 minutes, today.

#### SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the fol-

lowing titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S.J. Res. 12. Joint resolution proclaiming Casimir Pulaski to be an honorary citizen of the United States posthumously; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. Con. Res. 9. Concurrent resolution supporting the goals and ideals of Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

#### ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 4, 2009, at 10 a.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

754. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Installations and Environment, Department of the Navy, transmitting notification of the Department's decision to cancel the Office of Management and Budget Circular A-76 public-private competition for the Commander, Navy Installations Command (CNIC) Safety Support Services competition at locations nationwide; to the Committee on Armed Services.

755. A letter from the General Counsel, Government Accountability Office, transmitting the Office's report on allegations involving the Department of Defense Office of Public Affairs Outreach Program, pursuant to Public Law 110-417, section 1056(c); to the Committee on Armed Services.

756. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; New Hampshire; 2009 Motor Vehicle Emissions Budgets for the Boston-Manchester-Portsmouth (SE), New Hampshire, 8-Hour Ozone Nonattainment Area. [EPA-R01-OAR-2008-0485; A-1-FRL-8771-3] received February 24, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

757. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Nevada: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revision [EPA-R09-RCRA-2008-0726; FRL-8771-8] received February 24, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

758. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Outer Continental Shelf Air Regulations Consistency Update for Florida [EPA-R04-OAR-2008-0605; FRL-8769-5] received February 24, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

759. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Outer Continental Shelf Air Regulations Consistency Update for North Carolina [EPA-R04-OAR-2008-0681; FRL-8769-6] received February 24, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

760. A letter from the Chairman, Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board, transmitting