

As administrator for the Virgin Islands Employees Retirement System, he fought to preserve the integrity of the system, even so far as going to court to ensure that the system's assets were protected and that government contributions were submitted on time. That was quintessential Tappy—fiercely protecting the people of the Virgin Islands in any instance where he felt they or their rights were being threatened.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, many in my community have fond memories of a man who cared for his family, his people, and his islands. His contributions to the formative years of the young democracy that is the U.S. Virgin Islands will be a prominent part of our history.

I extend my condolences to his wife, Juel, his sisters, his children and his grandchildren. I know that his wit and wisdom will remain an indelible part of their and our memories in the days to come, and we thank them all for sharing this lion of a man with us so generously.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MORAN of Kansas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. FLAKE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

HONORING JAMES BARTON "MICKEY" VERNON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SESTAK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SESTAK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to acknowledge the achievements of one of the finest athletes and men ever to call the Seventh Congressional District of Pennsylvania home. James Barton "Mickey" Vernon, a native of Marcus Hook, Pennsylvania, passed away on September 24, 2008, having lived a life of great success and purpose. Today is the anniversary of his birthday.

Long before he became an exceptional professional baseball player, Mickey Vernon's character and work ethic were shaped by his parents, Clarence and Katherine Morris Vernon, his sister, Edith, and the good people of

Marcus Hook, the cornerstone of Pennsylvania.

In addition, he benefited from the dedicated faculty and coaches of Eddystone High School and Villanova University. Ranked among the best players of baseball's golden era, Mickey was twice the American League's batting champ and, over a career that included time with the Washington Senators, Cleveland Indians, Boston Red Sox, Milwaukee Braves and Pittsburgh Pirates, he played in 2,409 Major League games. In each, he played with skill, determination, and a complete commitment to his team and teammates.

More important than his skills on the diamond, Mickey Vernon stands apart for his modesty and unflinching service to our Nation and to our community. I am especially proud to call him "shipmate." Mickey Vernon served in the U.S. Navy during World War II in the brutally hot and dangerous South Pacific. Following that conflict, he continued his brilliant career, and with his lovely wife, Anne, raised a lovely daughter, Gay.

In a year when the Seventh Congressional District lost both Mickey Vernon and Harry Kalas, there is a temptation to feel great pain and sadness, that is understandable; but it is more in keeping with the lives of both men that we celebrate their greatness and decency.

I ask that our Chamber and our Nation pause to honor James Barton "Mickey" Vernon as a model athlete, a veteran, husband, father and friend, an inspiration to us all. He was some man.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. REICHERT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. CARTER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOCCIERI) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BOCCIERI addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MCHENRY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. ROE of Tennessee addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

RECKLESS OVERSPENDING BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

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. Good evening, Mr. Speaker. Thank you for recognizing me.

I am interested tonight in talking about a subject that I think is on the minds of Americans everywhere and has gotten people not just on their minds, but on their hearts as well. They're exercised, they're concerned, they're worried. And that is the subject of taxes, and really reckless overspending on the part of the Federal Government.

We have heard over the past about 6 years or 7 years the high cost of the war, particularly in Iraq. People say, hey, we are spending a tremendous amount of money every day in Iraq, what are we getting for our money? This thing is breaking our budget. We're spending too much money. This is terrible. And then what we see here in the first 5 weeks of the Congress meeting, we saw them passing what was supposed to be a stimulus bill—or I call it a porkulus bill—and that bill, at \$840 billion, was more money than we spent in 6 and 7 years, respectively, in the war in Iraq added to the war in Afghanistan. So we were really burning some serious money just in the first 5 weeks.

Now, let's add to that, turn forward a little bit, and the American public is becoming exercised about this subject. And just this last week, on the day when filing of taxes is due, we saw all across our country a massive turnout of people, just average citizens, largely—at least certainly that's what it was in the St. Louis area—having these TEA parties. And they were very upset. And they carried all kinds of signs to express their concern about this problem of reckless overspending on the part of the Federal Government. Some of the signs read—and they were fairly clever—"Give Me Liberty, Not Debt," obviously taking off of Patrick Henry. And it said "No More Pork." Here's one, "Got Taxes? Got Government? Get Liberty."

□ 1800

Then there was a 6 year-old that carried the sign, "I am 6 years old and I

owe \$36,400 in taxes." And there were a number of other ones that were fairly pointed, "Freedom, not socialism" and things like that.

People are really getting very concerned and with very good reason about our reckless overspending.

In fact, there was enough pressure from all of these different events that happened all over the country that the President felt like he had to make some kind of a statement or gesture. And so he said, very graciously, look, I will tell you what we are going to do. We are going to try to find \$100 million in the budget of wasted spending, to get rid of \$100 million.

Well, we have illustrated that point here graphically to my left.

This first circle is \$410 billion, and that was called an omnibus bill. That was just finishing up the spending for this year.

Then we had two of this supposedly stimulus bill, which is what I was just talking about, at \$787 billion in its final version, and then on top of that is the proposed \$3.69 trillion, so these graphically represent the amount of money we are overspending and Obama's requested budget cuts represented by this spot, even on this chart, the size of an eraser.

To try to put that into perspective, let's say that your family budget is \$100,000. You have a \$100,000 budget for the year, but you are \$34,000 behind. That's like calling the whole family together and saying to them, now, here is what I am going to do. I am going to give up a \$3 Starbucks coffee. That's what this \$100 million is equivalent to: \$3 on a \$100,000 budget.

So these numbers show the fact that the administration and the current Congress just doesn't get it. This overspending problem is really serious, and the public is getting, as I said, very concerned about it.

I have a statement from one of my constituents here, this is what he wrote to me.

He said, this is William from the Saint Louis area, "I am a small businessman in Union, Missouri, employing 12 people. I built my business from practically nothing to a company worth enough to retire on, or so I thought. I am 62 years old and plan to sell my business in 3 years and to retire on the proceeds.

"In the year I sell my Federal tax rate will be 39 percent, that is assuming that Obama does not raise it even further by then, and my Missouri tax rate will be 6 percent. Since I am a service company, we have no real assets to sell. Virtually all of the proceeds will be taxed as ordinary income.

"That means that I worked a good part of my life to build a future and the taxing authorities are going to take 45 percent.

"Since my IRA accounts have been decimated thanks to," I believe he is talking about Congressman FRANK and Senator DODD," it looks like I will have to work until I die."

And then, bitterly, "Only in America."

People around America are very upset about what's going on.

I have a good friend, a Congressman from Georgia, Congressman LYNN WESTMORELAND, I believe that you have a chart also depicting in a different way the seriousness of what's going on with our excessive overspending.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Well, I want to thank my friend from Missouri for yielding some time, and I just wanted to ask one question to the gentleman about the chart that he just had up, and that was the fact that the chart that he just had up, you are telling me that what the President has asked of his cabinet members, if I am hearing you correctly, is that they are to cut, in the next 90 days, they are to cut \$100 million.

Mr. AKIN. That's correct. Yes.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. So the other thing you are pointing out there with your chart is that would be like calling in a family that had a budget of \$100,000, and they had a \$34,000 shortfall—

Mr. AKIN. You are talking about one-third of that \$100,000, they are overspending \$34,000, right.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. I want to make sure we understand this. They had \$100,000 annual spending, they have got a \$34,000 shortfall. If from what I am hearing you say, they would only have to cut \$3?

Mr. AKIN. That's correct. That's why when you say \$100 million with a \$3.69 trillion proposed budget, it's almost a joke. It's almost a joke. By comparison, that spot is \$100 million. That's the size of a pencil.

This looks like the sun. It looks like a small Moon falling into the sun. That's what we are talking about here. Three dollars, they would laugh you out of the family meeting.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. That's what I would call a drop in the bucket or a spit in the ocean or something. I mean, I can barely see the little dot from here.

But that's interesting, and I wanted to show one thing, because I think that's something that everybody can get their head around is the amount of money that the President has asked his Cabinet members to save over next 90 days is equal to \$3 of a family that had \$100,000 spending that had a \$34,000 shortfall.

But to the gentleman from Missouri, this is a debt day, and debt day is when we actually start ringing things up on the charge card that we can't pay for. And so in 2002, and after we went through the 9/11, on September 2 is when we actually started charging things. We had run out of the money, and we had to start putting it on a charge card.

Mr. AKIN. What you are saying is that right after September 11, we are already starting to spend some serious money there. And what you are saying

is that by the time we got to September, we had pretty much used up all the taxpayers' money that had paid their taxes that year, and beyond that point, every day beyond that where we are spending money, that's all becoming part of our debt. Is that what you are saying?

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Yes, I am. And what I am saying, too, is that then the minority party, the Democrat party, was hollering at the loudest point saying we would have deficit spending, that we did not need to have deficit spending, we did not need to increase the debt. They were hollering about that.

And then in 2003 it went to July 29 to when we actually started having to borrow money; 2004 it was July 27; 2005, August 14; 2006, August 27; 2007, September 9; 2008, August 5th, and then we come to this year.

Mr. AKIN. Gentlemen, what was going on there was starting about 2003 or 2004 we started to benefit from the fact that the recession had turned around because of the tax cuts and the economy was doing well and the Federal revenues were coming in pretty strong.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Yes.

Mr. AKIN. That's why we were able to hold things up into that August-September kind of timeframe, even though there was some spending going on.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Absolutely. Remember we were funding the military and the war on terror or now, as it is called, the human catastrophe or something. But in 2009, this year, 2009, debt day comes next week on April 26.

So imagine this, after April 26th, everything that this government does is going to be put on a charge card. After April 26th almost 160 days—

Mr. AKIN. Gentleman, that number really stands out, because what you are saying is we got all the way through the summer all these previous years when we were screaming about spending too much money. And you and I agreed we shouldn't have been spending as much as we did.

But that being the case, what you are saying is this year we barely got the taxes in on April 15, and by the time we get to April 26th, which is that next week—

Mr. WESTMORELAND. That's next week.

Mr. AKIN. We are out of money already.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Absolutely.

Mr. AKIN. I am surprised they haven't put us in jail.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Well, I don't know they haven't pulled our credit card, and I think that could happen, because we are charging this on a credit card to China, to the Middle East, to foreign nations. This is not something that we are borrowing it from ourselves.

This is money that we are borrowing from foreign countries. So at the end of next week, all the money, all the revenues, all the revenues that's going to come into our Treasury are going to be

spent, and we are going to be ringing it up on a charge card.

How many families or small businesses could survive on that? There is not any. We can't do that, and that's the reason that we have given an alternative to this budget that has been proposed by the current administration. That's the reason today that we—

Mr. AKIN. You were talking about the budget, the study committee, which is actually a balanced budget, a certain number of years out, it balances out.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. In 10 years, it balances out in 10 years.

Mr. AKIN. Don't you think that's what the people at these tea parties were trying to say, hey, what's wrong with the concept like every other American, you have to balance your budget. What's the problem with us getting this concept down here in Washington D.C.?

Mr. WESTMORELAND. And that's the point that we have been trying to make. It spends too much, it borrows too much, and it taxes too much.

Mr. AKIN. Well, we are going to get into that a little bit too. We are joined this evening by my good friend from Indiana, Congressman BURTON, a long-time leader in this House, a very respected gentleman.

I would like to yield to him to talk on the same subject. I know it's something you know quite a bit about.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The thing that bothers me is the kind of legacy that we are leaving for our kids and grandkids. The amount of money that we are spending right now, \$3.69 trillion in the budget, \$410 billion in the omnibus, \$14 billion for the auto companies; \$700 billion, which we spent last year on TARP, \$787 billion on the stimulus package.

We are spending trillions and trillions of dollars that we don't have, as my colleague just said.

I would just conclude by saying that we are spending trillions of dollars that we don't have. Our kids and grandkids are going to be paying taxes that they shouldn't have to bear. In addition to that we are going to have an inflationary problem that is going to rival anything that we have seen in the past. In the 1970s and the early 1980s we had inflation that was 14 percent and we ended up raising interest rates to 21 percent to slow down the rate of inflation to get the economy back in shape, and we ended up with another major recession because of it.

We have got to control our spending. We can't spend 8 or \$10 trillion like we are doing. And the thing that bothers me the most is the legacy we are leaving to our kids and grandkids.

I want to thank my colleague for taking these. He comes down here almost every night or every other night talking about these things. The American people owe you a debt of gratitude for doing this. I really appreciate it.

Mr. AKIN. I appreciate the gentleman from Indiana.

Congressman, before you go, just let me ask you a question, you know, both of us grew up and we saw our parents, that had come out of the World War II time period, and they were people that worked very, very hard. They had been called the Greatest Generation, and one of the things that I remember that was just ingrained in my own parents, and I want to ask you whether you had the same experience, but it was the attitude that they were going to do something better for us than they had been able to have for themselves. It was this driving ambition to leave something better, to leave America a better place, a freer country, a safer country.

And so they would say, and their words were, yes, I am going over to Europe or to the Pacific to do my bit, that they were going to give their lives or their limbs. And they had this ideal of leaving America a better place.

And what you are talking about is the opposite. Is that not right, Gentleman?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Yes, I would say to my colleague briefly, that my mother worked 18 years as a waitress, my stepfather worked in a foundry. And I think that he made, before he paid child support, \$75 a week.

And they were very concerned about living within their budget, and they worked very hard to make sure that our family did well without having to depend on the government. And unfortunately today we have a different mindset, and that is that the government can handle everything for us from cradle to grave.

And this attitude that's prevalent in this society right now really bothers me because it has taken such a hold of us that we are now spending trillions of dollars that we don't have. And the things that you and I had as young people and our parents gave to us, even though we had rough times, it's going to be worse in my opinion, because of the inflation we are going to leave our kids and the high taxes that we are going to have to pay to keep pace with the spending that's going on.

Once again, thank you very much. I really appreciate it.

Mr. AKIN. Congressman BURTON, the distinguished guest from the State of Indiana. We are very thankful for the good people that Indiana sends.

We also have joining us here tonight a judge from Texas. When you get a judge from Texas you're talking about somebody that kind of keeps an eye on things. I would like to yield to Judge CARTER, a good friend of mine and a great and patriotic American and an American, as I understand, with some pretty good stories to boot.

□ 1815

Mr. CARTER. I thank my friend for yielding.

I'm proud to join my colleagues in speaking up against this horrendous

amount of spending that's going on in the country today, and it's all done by the Obama administration. They're calling it "stimulus," they're calling it "save the economy," all these things. But I just got back from a trip where I was meeting with some parliamentarians from the European Union. And, you know, I will admit, I will confess that I viewed the European Union—my wife is from Europe. In my experience, the fact that my wife is from Holland, we have visited Europe on many occasions, and I really thought they were much more towards the socialist side of the calendar and that their ideas were much more leaning to the left. And then I went to listen to these folks talk about what they called an economic stimulus package in the EU and what they were calling upon their member countries to do for economic stimulus. And, amazingly enough, it was exactly what the Republicans have been saying we should do to have an economic stimulus. And that is cut taxes, especially on those categories of people that create jobs like employers and business taxes, and cut spending.

Mr. AKIN. Let me reclaim my time. What you're saying is kind of radical here. What you're saying is a bunch of socialistic Europeans are telling us that what we should be doing is providing liquidity for small business to create jobs and to pull our Nation out of recession. That's what I'm hearing you say. You're telling me that these people in Europe are telling us this?

I yield.

Mr. CARTER. Actually that's just it. I wouldn't, after having these conversations, classify them as socialist nearly as much as I might classify the administration we are dealing with today as socialist because their ideas are more that we've got to let the free market work; so we are, meaning the Europeans, cutting taxes, we are cutting spending.

Then, amazingly enough, I think this should be a surprise to everybody: The United States of America could not join the European Union if they wanted to. Why couldn't they? Because our debt ratio is too high. And it's going higher.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time, what you're saying is America could not join the European Union now because our debt is so high?

Mr. CARTER. That's right. They have no more than 3 percent of gross domestic product and we're bumping up against 6 with the Obama plan here.

Mr. AKIN. I see my friend from Georgia here wanting to get a word in.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. I don't know much about the European Union, but I think that's a real wakeup call for the American people if they understand that.

But I guess the whole thing that gets me is that we heard from the Blue Dogs today that the reason this budget was okay and the reason this debt was okay and the reason this deficit spending

was okay was because it was the total picture. It was all put out there. And their complaint was in the past that with the deficit spending and the reason they criticized it so badly is because it was not an open process. It wasn't open, that this money had been some kind of sleight of hand.

Well, I would like to ask the gentleman from Missouri or my friend from Texas, are you aware that they are including in the revenue the alternative minimum tax, \$50 billion of this alternative minimum tax that we have patched that we are not even going to get? So this is revenue that they are using and spending that we're not even going to get in.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time, the alternative minimum tax, usually we have rolled that back every year. Are you saying they're not going to do that this time?

Mr. WESTMORELAND. No, they are rolling it back. But they are claiming the revenue to use in the spending as if they were going to collect the tax.

Mr. AKIN. That's kind of a unique accounting principle.

If you did that in the free market, judge, and let me just yield, what would happen if a businessman were to do to that? What would you do to him if he came in your courtroom?

Mr. CARTER. When we saw voodoo accounting in the Enron case, look what it has done to accounting principles and to accounting firms. That makes no sense, but then there is a lot of this thing that doesn't make an awful lot of sense. That surprises me, but it's kind of the old shell game. Look under this shell. Now, which way is it going? Which way is it going? There it is. We gave it to you. No, wait, what is this? That's what this whole thing is about.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time, I would like to ask a question whether either of you when you were in maybe first or second grade ever saw these workbooks and they had the pictures, what is the line that doesn't fit in? And they'd have a couple of dogs and they'd have a cat in the line or something like that.

Well, let me just ask you, if you take a look at this chart to my left, can you see the thing that doesn't fit in here? These are either budget deficits or surpluses by year, all through these different Presidents here. This is when you had a Republican Congress and a Democrat President and we actually had a couple of surpluses here. This is September 11. We had the war in Iraq; so we were running some deficits. Do you see the line that doesn't quite fit in there?

I yield to my friend from Texas.

Mr. CARTER. If I may answer, of course, the stuff above the line, the surplus, is a little different. But on the below-the-line side, it's clearly the last four lines because there's this one gigantic line which looks like it's this year and then every year thereafter is bigger than the other lines all the way

going back to 1990 or something. What year is that?

Mr. AKIN. This goes back to 1980.

Mr. CARTER. So basically the last four lines are bigger than anything that we've seen since 1980.

Mr. AKIN. Those are the actual economic facts of where we are.

I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. I would like to point out to my friend from Missouri and to, Mr. Speaker, anybody that, if we could talk to them, ask the people that might be watching to understand that that is deficit spending, and that's what I was talking about on this chart. That's the deficit spending that we are doing. We are borrowing the money. After April 26 we are going to be going into debt, and that's what that long line is.

But what we don't realize and what's not on that chart is the amount of debt that we are accumulating. Not just the deficit spending but the amount of debt. And I believe the gentleman has got a chart there that shows the amount of debt.

When I would speak to groups at home or have a townhall meeting, I used to talk about the amount of debt that our children were inheriting. I'm having to include grandchildren now and may very soon have to pick up with great grandchildren. But I think what we need to look at is what this budget does is not just look at the deficit spending but look at the amount of debt. This thing increases our debt to \$14.5 trillion. And I will let the gentleman explain the chart, but as this chart points out, we are almost doubling the amount of debt that it took us 232 years to accumulate in 1 year.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time, sometimes you can talk about big numbers and when you get past a certain number of thousand dollars, it's hard for me to imagine what we are talking about. But here is a different way to look at it: You go from George to George. That's George Washington to George Bush. And you go through all of that, and they accumulated by overspending \$5.8 trillion. That's a lot of money. We shouldn't have that much overspending. I know you gentlemen have voted with me against doing that kind of overspending. But that's the reality of where we are, \$5.8 trillion. But now we're taking a look at this President, and just using the numbers he gave us, these are his numbers, and he has got \$8.7 trillion he's going to add on top of this. So in other words, he's proposing to spend in the next 7 years \$8.7 trillion, which is more than what we had from George Washington to George Bush. Now, that is some serious level of spending.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. To the gentleman from Missouri, now, that is not just spending; that is accumulated debt. This is debt. This is not spending. The spending's going to be way more than that. We're doing 3.6 trillion next

year. That is the amount of debt that he's adding to our national debt. And I'm not sure and I don't want to quote it, but it's a good percentage of our GDP that we are going to be in debt.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time, I appreciate the gentleman's pointing that out, and I misspoke. You're absolutely right.

Mr. CARTER. If the gentleman would yield.

Mr. AKIN. I do yield.

Mr. CARTER. It is certainly enough of a percentage of our gross domestic product that if we were a nation trying to join the European Union, we would be above their joining point.

Mr. AKIN. In fact, what you just said, I think, gentleman, was we are like twice over it.

Mr. CARTER. I was in Estonia, which is protected by NATO but wants to join the EU, and their problem is they are 1 percentage point above 3 percent of their gross domestic product. So they're cutting programs and reducing taxes because they've learned they get more revenue that way so that they can get to the point that they will be able to be admitted to the European Union. It's embarrassing that Estonia is doing better on debt than the United States of America.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time, that's not a good scenario when Estonia is better on their economics than what we are doing in this country. And I think that's what generated these TEA parties and things. I will tell you people in my district, St. Louis, they were mad. They were very upset about this.

I am delighted that we are joined here by Congressman COFFMAN from Colorado. Colorado is a good solid State, and they have elected a great Congressman here. And I look forward to your joining our discussion here tonight.

Congressman COFFMAN, I yield.

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Thank you. I think that what is most alarming about the level of borrowing, as a freshman Congressman, in our orientation process, we had economists of all ideological stripes, and I think that they differed on what was stimulative spending. They maybe differed on the amount of deficit spending that might be required for the recession. But one thing that they were all in agreement with is that we had to close that deficit gap. We had to control our spending within certainly the next 2 or 3 years because if we don't, and this plan that we're talking about that you have just referenced does not in any way close that spending gap, then we are going to have government borrowing competing with private sector borrowing as we try to move out of this recession and it's going to lead to high interest rates, high inflation rates. And if you overlay these taxes that are envisioned in this budget plan, you've really got a recipe for 1979/1980: stagflation, double-digit interest rates, double-digit inflation, slow to no growth in the economy.

Only my worry is, again, unless we control spending, it's not going to be temporary as it was in 1980 and then, of course, we got the Reagan tax cuts and we moved out of it, but that we are not going to return to prosperity and we are going to have some real problems.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time, I appreciate your joining us for the discussion this evening.

Sometimes people want to claim that Republicans don't have any solutions and are just always complaining about the excessive spending or what we really should do about it. But the fact of matter is that there are proven ways of getting the economy back on track when you start into a recession. And one of the things that's absolutely critical, and it works a couple of different ways, but what it does is it increases the amount of revenue that the Federal Government takes in, and that's a way to get a budget balanced. There are two ways to do it: cut spending or take in more revenue. The only trouble is if you tax too much, you kill the economy and you take in less revenue and you create something that's even worse than what you had before.

Now, the way to do it is you want liquidity available for the free markets. You want the people who are the investors and the inventors, the small business people, you want those people to have the liquidity so they can run and manage their businesses. A lot of people don't realize that if you take a business that's got 500 employees down, and that's what we call a small business, they employ half of the people in our country but create almost 80 percent of the new jobs. So you want to make sure those guys have got the liquidity that they need, and that's what the Republicans understand.

□ 1830

That is why we are completely opposed to a whole series of things that the Democrats are doing which are going to make it hard for small businesses. It is exactly what you are saying. You have to get off of this spending, and it seems like our administration just does not understand that and we are going to take a recession and turn it into the Great Depression.

I don't mean to cut in on you, but what you are talking about is the livelihood, the potential jobs that people in America wouldn't have access to because they were never created, because we have just vacuumed the liquidity out of the private sector.

I want to yield to my friend from Texas, Judge Carter, for just a minute.

Mr. CARTER. This spending and this debt record, I am sitting here thinking and contemplating while you all were talking, my children haven't rewarded me with any grandchildren yet, but they will. They don't even come close to taking care of this while my grandchildren are alive. We are talking about my great-grandchildren. In fact, there are people that estimate with the amount of interest that we will have to

bear on this debt, that this goes on for generations not even conceived of today. It could be generation after generation after generation.

When you take what we already considered a troublesome debt of \$5.8 trillion, there was an amazing amount of criticism of the Republican administration under George Bush when that number popped up. Of course, they blamed it all on George Bush. He did certainly increase it, but I am not here to go into that. But that number seemed to concern the Democratic now-majority quite a bit when they were in the minority.

But their President, the new President, Barack Obama, our new President, \$8.7 trillion on top of \$5.8 trillion, and this means that that number that we were talking about could be the downfall of humanity is now almost tripled. People have to just realize what is happening.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time a little bit, first of all, who was it that supported this \$410 billion for the omnibus? Was that the Democrat party? Yes. And then this bill here, this stimulus or "porkulus" bill for \$787 billion, do you recall here in the House Chamber when we voted on this bill, do you recall how many Republicans supported that number?

Mr. CARTER. None.

Mr. AKIN. Not one.

Mr. CARTER. By the way, I didn't support that first one either, or the one before that.

Mr. AKIN. Neither did I, gentleman, and that is why we are here, I believe. So people want to say, well, you know the Republicans, we got a few liberal Members and all that kind of stuff and they want to beat us up for two or three Republicans that might vote for something like this. But there wasn't one Republican that supported that number, is there?

Mr. CARTER. Not one.

Mr. AKIN. All these people have been talking about the cost of the war in Iraq. They didn't seem to worry about spending more than that in the first 5 weeks we were here. I don't understand exactly how that works.

Congressman COFFMAN from Colorado.

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Congressman AKIN, you know, I think that it is best categorized as generational theft. I had a high school senior when I was back home over this Easter recess and met with a high school, with a government class, and she said something very interesting. She said, I don't think this is fair to me, what the Congress is doing.

I tried to describe it to the class as saying it is like if your parents with their credit cards were given no limit on their credit cards and signed you up as the guarantor for that debt. So in trying to put it in something they can relate to, it is very hard to relate to this extraordinary amount of debt that I think the majority in the Congress is thinking about today, and not thinking

about tomorrow. To use the financial crisis as an excuse for their going into debt in the third year and the fourth year and the fifth year and the sixth year absolutely doesn't make sense.

Mr. AKIN. If I could reclaim my time, piggy-backing on what you said, we should take a look at what you said. You said using the financial crisis as an excuse. Of course, that is what we have been doing here. We said, oh, look, there is this mortgage crisis that was created where all of these Freddie and Fannie mortgages were made to people who couldn't afford to pay and the Wall Street community played some funny games with the securities business and we end up in this big mess that was really started by this mortgage crisis. So now we have got the recession started.

So there are really two schools of thought as to what you do when you got a recession going. One of the schools of thought is, and it goes back to FDR and Little Lord Keynes, he was a little weird, he had this idea if you spent enough money you could "stimulate demand" and everything would be fine. It was a little bit like reaching down, grabbing your bootstraps and lifting yourself up and flying around the room.

So they tried this theory about the Federal Government spending tons of money. It was called Keynesian economics. And at the end of 8 years of this experiment of the Federal Government spending tons of money, this guy, the fellow who was FDR's Secretary of Treasury, comes before the Congress, the Ways and Means Committee, and he made this statement. This is exactly his words, Henry Morgenthau. He says, "We have tried spending money. We are spending more than we have ever spent before and it doesn't work." It also shows that we don't learn much from history. "I say after 8 years of the administration, we have just as much unemployment as when we started, and an enormous debt to boot."

Now, this theory is what we are doing, the idea we can fix a recession with excessive Federal spending. If that were such a good idea, with the amount of debt we just saw at \$5 trillion, we should be doing great anyway, if lots and lots of debt is what makes things better. Yet, here we have Henry Morgenthau speaking to us from 1939 like he is out of the grave saying, hey guys, this doesn't work.

The other solution, of course, is that you could do what we said, which is get the liquidity into the hands of the business people. Let's talk just for a minute about small business. One of the worst things you can do for small business, let's sort of tick the things off.

The thing you want to do is you want to tax them so much they can't run their business, right? So where would you start if you were trying to harm small business?

I yield to my friend from Colorado.

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Well, thank you Congressman AKIN. I think

if you wanted to hurt small business, unfortunately, where you would start is certainly by increasing their tax burden.

Mr. AKIN. First off, you are going to increase their taxes. So what is the first thing that the President said he is going to do? Anybody making over \$250,000 a year, he is going to increase their taxes. I don't know if he realizes that more than half of the small business owners make over \$250,000 a year. So if he increases their taxes, then what are they going to have to spend money to help build up their small business? So, right off the bat, he is doing one of the first things to hurt a small business person.

There are other taxes he is proposing. Do you recall some of the others? What else would you do?

I yield.

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Well, Congressman AKIN, I think one of the issues we are going to be debating very soon in the Congress that is in the budget plan is certainly cap-and-trade, that tax on carbon, putting a burden across America from the standpoint of consumers as well as businesses in terms of a carbon tax. I think that is going to lead to the greatest export of America will continue to be jobs overseas. It is an economic development tool for India and China.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time, what you are saying is absolutely fundamental for us to understand. What we are talking about is that the President has said that he is going to increase the cost of energy.

He also said he wouldn't tax anybody making less than \$250,000. He said that. But then he turned around and said, oh, no, but we are going to tax energy. How much are we going to tax energy? They call it cap-and-trade. It is really cap-and-tax.

So he is going to tax energy. So who is that going to affect? Well, the MIT people took a look at the proposal and said we are talking \$3,100 for the average household in America. The average household doesn't make any \$250,000. So he is going to run the tax of energy up. And what else is that going to be? Of course, as you are absolutely right, the astute gentleman from Colorado points out that small business, if it costs more money for energy, it makes it harder to do the business. So we are going to do that.

First of all, we are going to tax them if they are making over \$250,000. Then we are going to tax their energy. Any truck driver or anybody that has to bring supplies to their business is going to pay more money for it, because that is going to be taxed.

So have we let off there or not? No, in fact they thought of some other innovative things.

Mr. CARTER. If the gentleman will yield, let's not forget all the taxes you just rattled off, who is really going to pay those taxes? They are going to be put in the price of goods and services that are provided, and then those goods

and services are going to go to the American people. So they are going to wake up in the morning and they are going to get delivered to their house this month's electricity bill, and, holy cow, where did all this come from? Everybody in America. It is not going to discriminate on whose bill is going to go if you are making \$250,000 a year. No. It is going to every American that is burning electricity, every American that is consuming gas, if they have natural gas in their home.

The American public is going to pay the price. And this cost that we have added to the manufacturers or to the retailers, these small business owners, they are going to put that on the price of their goods and services, and guess who is going to pay that? The people that need and purchase the goods and services. So the price of shirts and suits and shoes and T-shirts and baseball gloves and all of the things we want for our family are going up by the cost of that carbon tax, which that means who is paying the tax? The American people. All of the American people.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time, there are kind of two scenarios, aren't there? Let's say you have a small business that is making a product in this country. They are paying an increased cost of electricity, so they have to raise the price of their product. One of two things happens: Either the American consumer buys the higher cost product or they buy a foreign competitor's product that the foreign competitor didn't have to pay that tax on, so they can sell it cheaper. So then what happens is a foreign job replaces an American job and the jobs disappear in this country. Either scenario is not good policy for our country.

I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Well, thank you Congressman AKIN. We are truly in a challenging time, and the American people have to hope that this budget is not fully implemented, that we in the Congress wake up and stop this madness of spending and taxing. I think it has been certainly said before that this budget spends too much, taxes too much and borrows too much. Again, it is a generational theft.

Mr. AKIN. It is a generational theft. It is a budget that taxes too much, spends too much and borrows too much.

The other thing that is kind of interesting to me was, reclaiming my time, if you take a look at this map of the country, these are manufacturing jobs. These are those businesses that are going to be hurt by this cap-and-tax. If you take a look, the ones that are the most orange are the ones that are hurt the most by this.

You notice that our friends in New England and out on the West Coast don't seem to be affected by this tax very much. But somehow, the Midwestern States are going to get clobbered by this tax. And the tax is justi-

fied on the worry about global warming. But it is not popular to say "global warming" anymore because the world isn't really warming, so we call it climate change.

So the problem is they are claiming we are making too much CO₂. So we are going to then tax nuclear reactors for the CO₂ they generate. That doesn't make a whole lot of sense, does it, because they don't generate any CO₂. Yet we are going to tax them anyway.

So a lot of these manufacturing States where there are a lot of jobs tied to energy, they are going to get hammered with this proposal. So not only is the budget out of control, but now we are trying to raise money with this hair-brained scheme of taxing energy, which is just going to really hurt our productivity, and that is the thing that either chases jobs overseas or it prevents jobs from being created in the first place.

I yield to my good friend from Texas.

Mr. CARTER. And they are taxing energy. If you look at that map, you see that the energy-producing States, right now I am from Texas, my neighbors Oklahoma, Louisiana and New Mexico are all energy-producing States, as is Mississippi to some extent, until you get over to the blackout area around Florida on the coastal offshore productions.

□ 1845

And so we're looking at those States that everybody's been calling, you know, the evil monsters of the oil and gas industry, that that's who we're going to get even with. The tax burden on those States is going to be less than the tax burden on our Midwestern States and some of our Southern States. This has been conceived with a program of attacking people that you can—it's easy, they think it's easy to get mad at. And the reality is this is going to hurt the very people that they're calling upon to get mad. It's going to hurt the Midwest and the Southern States. It's embarrassing how much the public is being fooled by this particular tax. This is just the beginning. We're talking about carbon, not necessarily energy. There will come a time when we figure out other carbon producers that we will tax.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time, I'd just like to try and tick off—I should have a list of them here tonight. Let's tick off what we're doing for our small business people.

First of all, if you're making \$250,000 a year or more we're going to increase your taxes. That's more than half the small businesses. So first we're going to increase the taxes of the people that own the small businesses.

The next thing we're going to do is we're going to tax heavily energy, not only the energy they use to run their own homes, but the energy used to run their business and to buy supplies and things for their business.

Next thing we're going to do is we're going to let the death tax come back.

So now we have the death tax so that the guy that creates a business can't pass it on to his kids, and so he's going to have to sell his business in order to pay taxes when he dies. So some guy dies. The business needs a certain amount of capital goods and equipment to work. You've got to sell the business in order to pay the tax. Now the business isn't viable and the business goes away. Oh, that's wonderful for business, for small business.

And then we're going to do—what else are we going to do with the thing? Well, the other thing we're going to do is dividends and capital gains. Now we reduced dividends and capital gains tax to put liquidity into the small businesses at the beginning, in 2003. And the whole recession turned around to a very strong economy for a number of years, greatly helped by the dividend and capital gains money being plowed back in to investors and inventors and small business people. Now, that tax it is going to go away.

So we're hammering them on the \$250,000. We're hammering them on the energy; we're hammering them on the death tax; we're going to get them on dividends and capital gains. I mean, how can a small business survive?

And then people are going to wonder, gosh, gee, I wonder where all the jobs went?

We're doing the wrong things, and yet we don't have to. We can learn from history.

I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Congressman AKIN, I think what the budget fails to realize is how much the American people are suffering, that the level of stress on small business and the level of stress on the average American family, that it is Congress' first responsibility to stabilize this economy, to end this steep descent into a recession. And then afterwards, we ought to have a debate on energy policy. We ought to have a debate on health care. We ought to have a debate on global warming. We ought to have a debate on all these other things. But our first and foremost responsibility is to stabilize this economy.

And I think that the President's Chief of Staff said it well; that a crisis is a terrible thing to waste, and words to the effect that we need to use it as an opportunity to do other agenda-driven items. And in doing so, I think they compromise the value of the stimulus and stabilizing this economy.

Mr. AKIN. Well, I appreciate your thoughts on that. And again, where we're coming from in this deal is this faulty idea that somehow we could fix the economy by excessive spending. And Henry Morgenthau really shot that thing full of holes. But if he didn't, certainly the Japanese in the 1990s did the exact same thing and it just didn't work. It's really crazy.

And you know, you talk about people suffering. You know, sometimes you think the upside down world in Washington, D.C. just doesn't seem to get it.

Here's a letter I got from one of my constituents, and it just kind of reflects a little bit of the tone. This is Shannon from Baldwin, which is part of St. Louis County. "You asked how I would be affected by the Obama budget. I'm self-employed with my own small business, professional organizer, personal assistant. I do not earn a large amount of money, but it's been enough to live a simple but comfortable life. I do not have credit card debt, and I have always made it a point to live within my means. Yes, my business has been affected by the economic downturn of the last year. Many of my clients have cut back on their spending, which means less work for me. So whether it be increased taxes, spending that affects me directly, or increased taxing of my wealthier clients, it reduces my overall income. But more than anything else, I think the most negative effect of all the spending, bailouts, irresponsibility, etc cetera, has had on me is that I no longer have any faith in my own government to do what is fiscally right for the country."

We are destroying the faith of our constituents that this government is in any kind of control whatsoever fiscally. That's what she's saying.

"The government produces nothing. It has no money to spend except for what it takes from taxpayers. I am disgusted with the enormous spending and bailing out of irresponsible or downright negligent behavior. It seems that while I have worked hard to be responsible and follow the rules, I'm now being punished by being forced to clean up the mess of those who choose not to with my tax dollars."

There's a sense of anger. There's a sense of resentment out there. I think you're absolutely right. And it's interesting that you're sensing that in Colorado.

We also have our very distinguished Congresswoman FOXX from North Carolina. She's maybe not huge, but powerful things come in small packages like atoms, and I would like to yield some time to my good friend, Congresswoman FOXX.

Ms. FOXX. Well, I want to congratulate my colleague from Missouri and my colleagues from Texas and Colorado for spending the time that they have on this special order tonight. And I said I would come over and help a little bit, but you guys have been doing such a wonderful job, you don't need a lot of help.

But I have been interested in talking about what our colleagues in the House said in the past about deficit financing and deficit spending. And I'm wondering, at times, whether they've been on the road to Damascus in terms of the revelations that they've had and the changes that they've made.

I have a quote here from the chairman of the budget committee that I think we ought to talk about. He has talked about betting the budget on a blue sky forecast, and saying that he was concerned about these minor defi-

cits under the Bush administration, a record deficit of \$413 billion. And now they're talking about deficits of trillions and trillions of dollars, and that seems not to bother them in the very least. And I think that the chart that you have, the bar graph there shows the problems that we're facing in this country.

And I've said once before, I went home after we voted for the bailout, and said to my grandchildren when they asked me what were we doing in Washington. And I said, well, we're putting you and your children and your grandchildren in debt. And my granddaughter said to me with the wisdom of a child, Grandma, why do you want to put little children into debt? And I said, you know, I don't want to put little children into debt. But we know now that we have Debt Day the earliest that it's ever been in the history of this country. This coming Sunday is going to be Debt Day. It shows the size of government spending relative to our revenue. Never before has Debt Day come in April. It's coming up several months from when it used to come up. I mean, the earliest that it's ever come up before was in July 2004.

And I think what we also have to remind the American people is that up until the year 2007, there was a Republican Congress and a Republican President. They blame all that's happened in the last 2 years on President Bush. And I find that very intriguing. But when you ask—

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time, I think he's the one that created that hurricane, isn't he?

Ms. FOXX. I think he created the hurricane too. He gets blamed for everything.

But when you point out to them that they were in charge in 2007, 2008 and now they're in charge in 2009 they just don't like to talk about that.

And they want to give President Clinton all the accolades for the budget that he had. But let's point out again, it was a Republican Congress that reined in spending under President Clinton.

So as I pointed out in the Rules Committee one day to the chairman of the Budget Committee, it's so convenient for them to give all the credit to a Democratic President with a Republican-controlled Congress, and all the blame to a Republican President with a Democratically-controlled Congress.

Mr. AKIN. Well, reclaiming my time, what we've got now very clearly is a huge majority of Democrats running the House; they're running the Senate, and they control the administration. So they have everything.

And now what you are saying is, this is the equivalent, I mean, this is really hair-raising what you're saying, the gentlelady from North Carolina. What you're suggesting is that essentially we're like a family and we've been given some money to spend for a year. And we've only gotten to April, April

28th. That's just a little after the deadline that taxes are due, and we've already spent it all. In other words, by April 28, that's next week, we're going to have spent all the money that comes in in taxes in the year 2009. And that's what these different charts are showing in very different ways.

But, you know, you've got the tax day, when you have to have your income taxes in, April 15. And now we've got Debt Day, which is April 28. My goodness.

Ms. FOXX. It's April 26.

Mr. AKIN. 26 is it? Yeah.

Yielding to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CARTER. Well, I'm very sad to say that, to learn that Debt Day, the day we don't have any money that we raise from taxes, is my daughter's birthday. I wish her a happy birthday. But, quite frankly it's coming up this weekend. And you know, it's mind boggling that taxes are paid on the 15th, and basically we'll have spent all the money that we've gotten from tax revenues by the 26th. That's spending some money, folks. That's doing it better than anybody's ever done it.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time, and I note that you are not so different in age than I am, and I'm just asking the same question I asked earlier this evening about our parents' generation. They've been called by some people the greatest generation. And they were called the greatest generation, because, among other things they had this intrinsic compass that said, we're going to leave our Nation better than it was when we were here. And they went to Europe, and they went to the China Seas and they did their bit and they left us a freer country. And they may not have gone through college themselves, but they saved their money so we could go through college, so that we could have a little bit better lifestyle.

Some of those people now are like my own parents. They're just still alive, but they still have that attitude of making this a better country.

And it breaks my heart to say, when I take a look at these numbers, that instead of leaving it a better country, we're leaving debt as an inheritance for our children. And that's tragic.

I thank everyone for joining us this evening; look forward to next Wednesday night.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1145, NATIONAL WATER RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVE ACT OF 2009

Mr. ARCURI (during the Special Order of Mr. AKIN), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 111-82) on the resolution (H. Res. 352) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1145) to implement a National Water Research and Development Initiative, and for other purposes, which was referred to

the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

VACATING 5-MINUTE SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the 5-minute special order of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER) is vacated.

There was no objection.

□ 1900

RIGHT-WING EXTREMISM

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

Mr. CARTER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you for recognizing me for this hour. I'm very pleased to be here.

I'm here to talk about a subject that, I think, is very interesting, and I don't think the American people have really gotten their hands on this subject yet, but it's also extremely concerning. It really concerns me a great deal.

I happen to serve on the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security. We have spent an awful lot of time and an awful lot of effort trying to make sure that we keep our country safe from clearly identified terrorists who, if you have any question of do they mean us harm, then just look back at the Pentagon and the World Trade Center, and then ask yourself: Do they mean us harm?

We have been diligently trying to defend our borders, diligently trying to stop terrorism and trying to catch it before it gets here and trying to deal with these people who have identified themselves and who have told everyone publicly they're here to hurt us. Now we have a new administration, and we have a new memo that has come out from Ms. Napolitano over at the Department of Homeland Security. It would just shock you to know that she is warning not of al Qaeda, not of the Taliban, not of Osama bin Laden. She is warning people about right-wing radical domestic terrorism.

Now, this would be almost humorous, but those of us who have a little age on us, like I do, can think back to the Clinton administration and can remember how many times when anybody ever criticized the Clinton administration you would hear the First Lady then and now Secretary of State say, "Well, it's all a plot by those right-wing extremists, those right-wing extremist organizations." President Bill Clinton would say, "Well, they don't agree with my party and with what we're saying here, but it's really the people you're hearing from who are right-wing extremists." They label talk show hosts as right-wing extremists. All this fear was generated about right-wing extremists. Now we're not

even 6 months into the Obama administration, and the people who are supposed to be protecting our homeland are warning us against right-wing extremists.

This is the intelligence briefing right here. Now, I'm not trying to be mean about all of this. I'm just trying to tell you what they tell me is a right-wing extremist. I just took the things that they tell people who fall into that category, and then I put those classifications in with a poll that we did to identify the nature of my congressional district. Believe it or not, based upon accurate polling data that has been done in my district, 81 percent of the registered voters in my congressional district would qualify as right-wing extremists under Ms. Napolitano's memo—81 percent. They're probably going to come up with a category to cover the other 19 percent. I'm not being facetious about this. I happen to have Fort Hood, Texas in my district. Fort Hood, Texas is the largest military base on the face of the Earth. It has two field divisions of the corps headquarters.

One of the things they tell us in this report is very sad in light of what our Army has been going through, which is to watch out for returning, disgruntled military veterans coming back from Iraq and Afghanistan in that they have the potential to be right-wing terrorists. These young men and women, some of whom have done four and five deployments overseas, some of those deployments for as much as 15 months, have served our Nation as heroes, as the next great generation, and our government is labeling them: At the time they finish their service, we should consider them potential right-wing extremists and terrorists. They are defining them as people the government had better keep an eye on. Veterans who have served in other wars are in here. They classify them as right-wing extremists.

Are you opposed to abortion? It says right here at the bottom of this page: "It may include groups and individuals that are dedicated to a single issue, such as opposition to abortion or immigration."

It's just shocking. It basically says, if you disagree with the Obama administration, you could be a right-wing terrorist. Now, I hate to say that. It talks about people who believe in the right to keep and bear arms: right-wing terrorists. It talks about people who disagree with the stimulus package: right-wing terrorists. It talks about people who disagree with the economic path of recovery that this Nation is taking: potential right-wing terrorists. This is what this report says. I'm sure it's available. It's unclassified. It's for official use. We got it off the Internet. There's more, a lot more.

I have friends here who have joined me on this shocking thing that's going on in this country. I'm going to start with my good friend, VIRGINIA FOXX, who was with us here in the last hour, and I'm very pleased to have her again.