

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 Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GOODLATTE 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 Maine (Mr. MICHAUD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MICHAUD 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. CONAWAY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. CONAWAY 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 (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

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

(Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut 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.)

PUBLICATION OF THE RULES OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY, 111TH CONGRESS

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

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library held its organizational meeting for the 111th Congress on Thursday, April 23, 2009. I am honored that the committee elected me its chairman. I look forward to working with my committee colleagues to discharge the panel's responsibilities.

As required by the rules adopted by the committee, I submit those rules for publication in the RECORD:

RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE OF CONGRESS ON THE LIBRARY, 111TH CONGRESS

TITLE I—MEETINGS OF THE COMMITTEE

1. Regular meetings may be called by the chairman, with the concurrence of the vice-chairman, as may be deemed necessary or pursuant to the provision of paragraph 3 of rule XXVI of the Standings Rules of the Senate.

2. Meetings of the committee, including meetings to conduct hearings, shall be open to the public, except that a meeting or series of meetings by the committee on the same subject for a period of no more than 14 calendar days may be closed to the public on a motion made and seconded to go into closed session to discuss only whether the matters enumerated in subparagraphs (A) through (F) would require the meeting to be closed followed immediately by a recorded vote in open session by a majority of the members of the committee when it is determined that the matters to be discussed or the testimony to be taken at such meeting or meetings—

(A) will disclose matters necessary to be kept secret in the interests of national defense or the confidential conduct of the foreign relations of the United States;

(B) will relate solely to matters of the committee staff personal or internal staff management or procedures;

(C) will tend to charge an individual with a crime or misconduct, to disgrace or injure the professional standing of an individual, or otherwise to expose an individual to public contempt or obloquy, or will represent a clearly unwarranted invasion of privacy of an individual;

(D) will disclose the identity of any informer or law enforcement agent or will disclose any information relating to the investigation or prosecution of a criminal offense that is required to be kept secret in the interest of effective law enforcement;

(E) will disclose information relating to the trade secrets or financial or commercial information pertaining specifically to a given person if—

(1) an Act of Congress requires the information to be kept confidential by Government officers and employees; or

(2) the information has been obtained by the Government on a confidential basis, other than through an application by such person for a specific Government financial or other benefit, and is required to be kept secret in order to prevent undue injury to the benefit, and is required to be kept secret in order to prevent undue injury to the competitive position of such person; or

(F) may divulge matters required to be kept confidential under the provisions of law or Government regulation. (Paragraph 5(b) of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate.)

3. Written notices of committee meetings will normally be sent by the committee's staff director to all members at least 3 days in advance. In addition, the committee staff will email or telephone reminders of committee meetings to all members of the committee or to the appropriate staff assistants in their offices.

4. A copy of the committee's intended agenda enumerating separate items of committee business will normally be sent to all members of the committee by the staff director at least 1 day in advance of all meetings. This does not preclude any member of the committee from raising appropriate non-agenda topics.

5. Any witness who is to appear before the committee in any hearing shall file with the clerk of the committee at least 3 business days before the date of his or her appearance, a written statement of his or her proposed

testimony and an executive summary thereof, in such form as the chairman may direct, unless the chairman waived such a requirement for good cause.

TITLE II—QUORUMS

1. Pursuant to paragraph 7(a)(1) of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules, 4 members of the committee shall constitute a quorum.

2. Pursuant to paragraph 7(a)(2) of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules, 2 members of the committee shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of taking testimony; provided, however, once a quorum is established, any one member can continue to take such testimony.

3. Under no circumstance may proxies be considered for the establishment of a quorum.

TITLE III—VOTING

1. Voting in the committee on any issue will normally be by voice vote.

2. If a third of the members present so demand, a recorded vote will be taken on any question by rollcall.

3. The results of the rollcall votes taken in any meeting upon a measure, or any amendment thereto, shall be stated in the committee report on that measure unless previously announced by the committee, and such report or announcement shall include a tabulation of the votes cast in favor and the votes cast in opposition to each measure and amendment by each member of the committee. (Paragraph 7(b) and (c) of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules.)

4. Proxy voting shall be allowed on all measures and matters before the committee. However, the vote of the committee to report a measure or matters shall require the concurrence of a majority of the members of the committee who are physically present at the time of the vote. Proxies will be allowed in such cases solely for the purpose of recording a member's position on the question and then only in those instances when the absentee committee member has been informed of the question and has affirmatively requested that he be recorded. (Paragraph 7(a)(3) of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules.)

TITLE IV—DELEGATION AND AUTHORITY TO THE CHAIRMAN AND VICE CHAIRMAN

1. The chairman and vice chairman are authorized to sign all necessary vouchers and routine papers for which the committee's approval is required and to decide in the committee's behalf on all routine business.

2. The chairman is authorized to engage commercial reporters for the preparation of transcripts of committee meetings and hearings.

3. The chairman is authorized to issue, on behalf of the committee, regulations normally promulgated by the committee at the beginning of each session.

THE FIRST 100 DAYS

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. Thank you, Madam Speaker. It's a pleasure to be able to join you, my colleagues and friends this evening.

The topic for our Wednesday evening discussion is "the first 100 days." It has become kind of a tradition for people to take a look back at previous Presidents and at the current President and say, "What happened in the first 100 days? What kind of records were set?"

What sort of tone was set? What were the accomplishments? What was sort of the pace of how the new President has approached the office?"

It's quite interesting. Obviously, there are very different Presidents, different political points of view, different things that they're going to focus on, and there are different times and different challenges. Tonight, we're going to take a look at that. We're going to take a look at those first 100 days. There were some records that were set, and there was a record that was set in a unique situation because, unlike any other time and for a long time, the Democrats have been totally in charge in Washington, DC.

In the case of our own House here, this is a body that, as to whichever side has the majority of votes, it pretty much does what it wants without too much regard for the other side. That has been fairly traditional, but it is even more so now under the Congress of Speaker PELOSI. They can do what they want, and they do do what they want. In fact, a lot of the legislation is written directly with the staff, and it comes to the floor and is voted on.

The Senate is a different matter. The Senate has always required 60 votes to get a bill before the Senate for just a regular vote. So you have 100 Senators. If you have 51 Senators voting in favor of something, you can pass a bill, but unless you have 60 votes, you can't get it to the floor to get it passed. It's kind of an odd rule. Many people don't know that. Of course, the Democrats almost have the 60 votes they need to control the Senate as well, and of course they have the Presidency. So we have here on the flip chart "100 Days of Democrat Dominance." It is certainly the case.

Now, as to one of the things that the President challenged Americans to do when he came to office, he said, "I want you to hold our government accountable. I want you to hold me accountable." So we're going to take a look at these first 100 days and see accountable and what regard and what sort of records have been set.

One of the records that we set was accumulated debt. That's kind of an interesting number. If you take a look at President Clinton, in his first 100 days, he managed to rack up \$86 billion of debt. This is President Clinton. President Bush didn't rack up any debt at all. In fact, he had \$70 billion of surplus at the end of his first 100 days. The clear winner in this regard is President Obama with \$564 billion of debt. That's half of \$1 trillion of debt. So the clear winner in the accumulated debt contest has to go to President Obama.

Now, in coordination with this, if you take a look at National Debt Day—and we have a National Debt Day. That's the time when we have finished spending all of the money we've collected that year in taxes. As you know, we get the taxes in on April 15. People send their taxes in. The government gets its money, and it has been spending since the beginning of the year.

The question is, "How far do you get into the year before you run out of money?"

A lot of families have that problem in terms of the family budget, but usually what happens is we get to about, you know, August, sometimes to July in a bad year or to September. Not so this year. We have set another record in terms of debt day. It's already gone. It was 2 days ago. It was April 26. By April 26, we'd spent all of the money that was coming into the Federal Government in taxes this year. That's not a good sign. That says we're creating a tremendous amount of debt.

Therefore, that leads to another record. We have a clear winner in terms of who can pile up the most debt in a very short period of time. If you take all of the Presidents added together from George Washington to George Bush—the two Georges—you have a total of \$8.5 trillion in Federal debt. With President Obama—with his own numbers and with his proposed budgets—you have \$8.7 trillion, so he beats by 1½, just by his own spending alone, all of the other Presidents combined. So we have another great record that was set.

There have been other kinds of records, but I notice my good friend is here, the gentleman from Texas, Judge CARTER, a highly respected judge. There's something about judging, and there's something about Texas which sort of combines common sense and not putting up with a lot of flowery kind of stuff.

Judge, you're known as a man who gets right to the point, so I'd like to yield you time. Help us and join in. Take a look at these last 100 days. Let's talk about records. Let's talk about holding people accountable. What has been going on?

□ 1900

Mr. CARTER. These are really not the kind of records we like to have. We don't try to set these kind of records. These are records that we will be paying for for generations to come.

I want to remind you that this is 100 days of Democrat dominance. So the President had some help on these things, and that is the Democrat majority and the House and Senate certainly helped to move this along—in record time, I might add. Sometimes those things just completely almost bypassed the whole process and just came popping up on the floor kind of like a Jack-in-the-Box surprise. "Here we are. Let's vote." And sure enough, we managed to break all kinds of existing records.

And I have to point this out because my daughter, I promised her I would. The last time I talked about this Debt Day, I failed to say that was my daughter's birthday. Danielle Carter. Her birthday is on the 26th day of April. And she probably, in her lifetime, has probably not gotten the biggest present in the world because it was so close to tax day that maybe she didn't get it.

So she understands how close her birthday is to the day we pay our income taxes.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time, she really did get a present on Debt Day in a sense because that debt is being unloaded on her, isn't it?

Mr. CARTER. Oh, yes. It's like that college debt. It's going to go on forever. That's something that we ought to be thinking about as we run these things up.

I find it phenomenal that we can, in actually less than a hundred days, spend more money than everybody else spent in 200-and-some-odd years, including George W. Bush. Add them all together and sure enough, this Democrat Congress and this Democrat President managed to outspend them all. I mean, I tell you what, that's breaking some records right there.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time, there are some records being broken, aren't there? What we've seen is a lot of complaints over the last years about the high cost of the war in Iraq, the high cost of war in Afghanistan, President Bush just squandering and spending way too much money. And a number of us voted not to spend some of that money. But there were a lot of complaints.

And then you take a look, you add up the entire cost of the war in Afghanistan and Iraq, add it together, and within the first 5 weeks here in the Congress, the Democrats passed a bill at \$840 billion that was more than those two wars combined over a 6- and 7-year period.

This is a record-setting Congress when it comes to spending. If spending is going to make the economy strong, we're going to have the best economy the world has ever seen.

We're joined by a good friend from Louisiana, Congressman SCALISE. Comment on this first hundred days. Let's talk about records and what kinds of things we've seen here.

Mr. SCALISE. I thank my friend from Missouri for continuing to host these discussions where we can really talk about the policies, what happens here in Washington, how it affects people across the country.

But as we stand here today on the 100th day of President Obama's administration, it's going to become a tradition, as you said, going back to FDR—which there are a lot of ironic similarities to FDR in this administration—but that's when they started measuring Presidents by their first hundred days. A lot of people like doing letter grades for a President's first 100 days.

Mr. AKIN. What you're saying is A to F, is that what you're suggesting?

Mr. SCALISE. Some people stop at F. I actually use a different rating, and I have been asked, How do you rate President Obama's first hundred days? And I've said that I rate President Obama an "L" for "liberal."

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time, that's cheating. I thought it was A to F. You're going all the way to "L" for "liberal."

Mr. SCALISE. Congressman FLAKE from Arizona, when we first had this conversation, and I agreed with him, and really, it's a characterization based on policy.

I think in terms of personality, clearly President Obama is one of the more articulate speakers in Presidents that we've had. I think President Reagan still rates up there as probably the top. Unfortunately, I don't think we have had anybody like Reagan since he left office and unfortunately passed away.

But in terms of policy—and I think this is really what really matters and that is what the American people are watching—it's this reckless spending. Spending at record levels. A budget that just passed today here on this House floor that all of us opposed but unfortunately passed, the largest budget in the history of our country, a budget that would double the national debt in 5 years, triple the national debt in 10 years.

I think if you look at what happened just a few weeks ago with these TEA parties, these taxpayer TEA parties, where hundreds of thousands of people showed up around the country. They weren't necessarily revolting against this President or revolting for a party or against a party. A lot of people really don't understand what happened in the media who were covering the TEA parties.

What really happened on that day back on April 15 was people across the country said—maybe some of them voted for the President, some of them voted against—but they said, We're very concerned about the direction of our country because of the reckless spending and borrowing that goes with it and what it would do to our future generations, to our kids and grandkids, where, literally, we will be borrowing this money from China, from India.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time, I also had a chance to go to the TEA party in St. Louis, and parking in St. Louis is a real pain in the rear. And yet you had 7,000 people jammed into this square, and they were exercised. I mean, this was not politics-as-usual in America. And I think you're right. I think the high level of spending, but I think there were other things that were getting them energized.

There are some of these sort of interesting juxtapositions. Here's one that caught my attention.

The Obama administration announced a \$1.4 billion cut to missile defense, and the same week, North Korea launches their missile. That's the sort of thing people go, Wait a minute. I don't understand this. The North Koreans just launched this big missile. They are obviously working on nuclear devices and developing the technology through a missile to deliver a nuclear device and so they are shooting off their missile and we are cutting missile defense. That's the kind of thing in our TEA party, people were really mad. When I went down there they said to me, By golly, you've got courage to

even show up down here because you come from Washington, D.C.

Judge Carter.

Mr. CARTER. Not only has this administration cut missile defense, but they are also cutting the F-22 fighter, which, by all analysis, we need a new fighter because of some real technological advances that the Russians and the Chinese have made in their fighting planes. And we have had fighter pilots telling us this for years. The F-22 has now been scrapped, the missile defense, as you point out, has now been scrapped.

So you can't accuse this budget of overspending in the area of defense because it actually is going less in the area of defense and is spending in other areas. Many of which, I would argue, are some sort of voodoo economics. But that's my personal opinion.

But make it clear, missile defense we need.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time, the argument is going to be made as we slash the defense budget, we see a lot of things that are being axed, being on the Armed Services Committee, I am seeing those. And the argument is going to be made, Hey, you know, you can't just afford everything.

And what struck me was when we came here after the first 5 weeks the Congress had been in session, we're going to pass this, quote, stimulus—which I still call a porkulus bill—and I came across this floor—we just smoked \$840 billion. I started dividing that thing out because in the committee that I serve on, the biggest thing you spend money on is aircraft carriers. I mean, even the average person on the street knows aircraft carriers are big and expensive. They have got a whole wing of airplanes on them and thousands of people on board. Aircraft carriers, that's a substantial investment.

So we have 11 aircraft carriers. You take the average cost of that and divide that, about \$3 billion, into \$840 billion. Oh my goodness. You picture this. You're looking at 250 aircraft carriers end-to-end. I don't know how long they would go, but you're talking about a lot of aircraft carriers.

So we start talking about, well, we're going to cut missile defense right at the time when the North Koreans launch their missile. And then the other thing—talk about juxtaposition in timing—the Obama team sent a video to the Iranian people talking about a shared hope, and the Iranians responded by opening a plant to produce weapons-grade uranium. Somehow or other it's like ships passing in the night here. It's like, wait a minute, what are we talking about here?

We've been joined by another great Texan, a Congressman from the Brady district. KEVIN, we would be happy if you want to join us in our little discussion. We're taking a look at the last 100 days and different things, records that are being set, things that are a little unusual, distinctive characteristics.

I yield.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Thank you. I appreciate you leading this discussion tonight with the American public. I'm glad to join my other friends, conservative friends, who, frankly, are worried about what the first 100 days mean to our country. I didn't move to Washington. I live in Texas with my family and just commute to work each week to Washington. Continental has given me my 1 million miles flown card, which is a lot of keeping in touch.

Sometimes you wonder, you know, the people up in Washington, they seem to be in a bubble. It's just so disconnected from the real world. I asked some of our Facebook friends what they thought of President Obama's first 100 days, sort of an out-of-Washington look at the Nation.

Rachel, who is a Sam Houston State University alum, said she was really disappointed to see all of the spending on unnecessary programs that do not help the economy but, rather, put a further strain on it.

Norma expressed her disappointment to the taxpayer-funded spending spree. She said, It's a disaster. She wrote, At the current spending rate, the deficit is going to be an anchor around not only our necks but our grandchildren's as well.

Norma, you're right.

Melody said if she were to grade this President, it would definitely be a flunking grade. In the debates, he promised to cut spending and reduce the size of the deficit. Ha. I am sickened by the wasteful spending. It is like watching a train wreck happen.

I will come back in a minute and tell you a little more about my thoughts. But that's just an inkling of what real Americans think about this first 100 days.

Mr. AKIN. I appreciate you sharing that and particularly asking that question of just regular people. I am the same as you are, flying back and forth to Missouri, the Show-Me State, or some people like to call it the Great River State. And I am not sure that their perspective is quite the same as it is in D.C. as well.

Judge CARTER, did you have a thought or two about other kinds of records or unique circumstances? I think there are quite a few things as we start to think about it.

Mr. CARTER. There is so much to talk about, but the one that just pops off the page is the promise that was made that I will cut taxes on 95 percent of the American people. That's what the President of the United States told us during the campaign. "I assure you I will cut taxes on 95 percent of the people."

He also said he was going to raise taxes on the wealthy. You may have heard me talking earlier—one of the indications of social Democrats is class warfare, the hardworking American worker versus the rich man. How many times have we heard that?

But now we've got this great energy tax that they call cap-and-trade, which

makes no sense at all. Even the name makes no sense. But the reality is, it's a tax on energy, all sorts of energy. And it's a tax on existing energy that's going to make everybody's bill go up because the American people are going to pay that tax, and that means the middle class.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time, let's take a look. What you're talking about is some of the promises that the President started out by saying, "I want you to hold our government accountable. I want you to hold me accountable."

So what we've done here, I've got some slides, and these are things that are quotes out of the President's speeches and all.

This one, as you recall, he says, "I can make a firm pledge under my plan, no family making less than \$250,000 a year will see any form of tax increase." Now, when I heard that, I breathed a sigh of relief. By golly, I don't make \$250,000. I don't need to worry about any tax increase because he promised me that. Not your income tax, not your payroll tax, not your capital gains taxes, not any of your taxes.

□ 1915

Now, he repeated this promise to all of us in this Chamber before, saying, hey, if you're making \$250,000 a year, don't worry about paying any taxes. And now you're getting me very upset, judge, because what you're telling me is he's going to put a tax on energy. And my family doesn't make \$250,000 a year, but we turn on light switches. We burn propane gas, and we also burn gasoline in the cars.

Mr. SCALISE. Will the gentleman yield.

Mr. AKIN. Yes, I yield.

Mr. SCALISE. I sit on the Energy and Commerce Committee, and for the last 2 weeks we've been having hearings on President Obama's cap-and-trade energy tax. A number of things have come out that Judge Carter and that you've mentioned that are very frightening that have not been conveyed to the American people, in fact, go directly against President Obama's pledge there that people making less than \$250,000 would pay no new taxes. The President's own budget, again, a record budget, the largest in the history of our country, a bill that passed this House today, his budget has a line item in it that allocates \$646 billion that would come in the form of new taxes from this cap-and-trade energy tax. Now, that is a tax on energy that every American family uses.

A few of the things that have come out in committee that have not been denied by anybody: Number one, the President's own budget director just a year ago was testifying before Congress, when he was the head of the Congressional Budget Office, he said this cap-and-trade scheme would roughly add \$1,300 per year more to every American family's energy bill, their utility bill. That's a low estimate. We've had revised numbers that have

gone over \$3,000 per American family that they would pay in higher energy taxes if this cap-and-trade energy tax passed.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time, I thought I heard the MIT professor say it was \$3,100 per average family.

This is something that's a little upsetting because first we have this promise. It couldn't be any more clear: If you're not making \$250,000, you don't have to worry about this tax increase.

Now, the energy tax hasn't been passed yet; right?

Mr. SCALISE. Fortunately, it has not. It's in committee still.

Mr. AKIN. So in that regard, he hasn't broken a promise. He's just proposing it. But then how about this SCHIP that we voted on? This thing has got a tax increase in it for people making less than \$250,000.

You know, this kind of thing, saying one thing, doing something different, is what creates some of that tension, that frustration that we saw in the people with tea bags wanting to dump them in the Mississippi River.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. I agree exactly with what has been said today. And I can tell you from the Ways and Means perspective, from the tax perspective, the President isn't keeping that promise. We saw that right off the bat. The second bill he signed was an increase on a lot of low-income and middle class families to the children's insurance program. And the budget that was rushed through Congress today that I will bet not one Member who voted for it actually read this multi-trillion dollar budget—again, this first 100 days has been a rush to bad legislation—it includes tax increases of \$1.5 trillion, the highest in American history.

As the gentlemen from Louisiana and Texas and as you pointed out, in addition to the national energy tax, you're looking at increased taxes on professionals and small business people; increased taxes on independent, small energy companies, the ones that drill 90 percent of the wells here in America; so we're going to outsource our American energy jobs. The climate change national energy tax. Increased taxes on capital gains and dividends, a source of a lot of revenue for our seniors in America and a source of capital. New taxes on real estate partnerships. On U.S. companies headquartered here who are trying to sell their products around the world, we're actually going to penalize them for selling American-made products around the world. It is crazy the number of tax increases.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time, how do you explain this promise in the context of what you're saying?

I yield.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. The promise was: "Under my plan no family making less than \$250,000 a year will see any form of tax increase." That promise has already been broken. And the budget we passed today ensures that it will be broken even further.

What everyone knows is with this spending, there's no free money. Someone is going to have to pay for this record deficit. It's going to be middle class families. It's going to be small business people. It's going to be people that make a whole lot less. And a good example, look at the stimulus bill. It started phasing out all of these benefits if you make \$80,000 a year. That's what it started to do, including the Making Work Pay tax credit, that measly \$1.10 in your paycheck. They start phasing it out at \$80,000. That's who this White House believes is wealthy. We've already seen the model.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time, it seems to me that pretty much everybody in Washington, D.C., and across the country, as we started this 100 days, if you asked what do you think the main deal needs to be? What does Washington, what does our political leadership, what does the President have to be paying attention to? Wouldn't you agree that that would be the economy? I mean I think everybody, regardless of your political stripe, would say you've got to pay attention to the economy.

And so if you take a look, one of the ways we measure the economy is the gross domestic product. That's how are things working? Is the machine oiled properly? Is it tuned properly? Is it running smoothly? And we got a number today. As I understand it, we set another record. We have a lot of records we've been setting. Unfortunately, they haven't been very good ones. And that was that the gross domestic product number for this quarter, the first quarter of the year, was that we had shrunk the economy by over 6 percent, which is how much the economy shrunk in the previous quarter. When you put those two together, it's the biggest shrinking in the economy in 60 years. Now, that's a record. I'm 61 years old. That's a record for me. But that's not a very good record.

And some of you who are on committees that deal immediately with the budget might want to comment. What does it mean to have the gross domestic product in this country shrink by 6 something percent? That never happened under President Bush's leadership. Anybody want to comment?

I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. SCALISE. What you're talking about, and we touched on it a little earlier, over the last few years we've heard a lot of complaints about previous Republican Congresses and the spending. I was definitely one of those people that was not happy with some of that level of spending. In fact, if you look back in 2006, the last Republican Congress that we had, I was not here, but in that 2006 Congress, the deficit, the Federal deficit, was about \$160 billion, a number I think that was too high, \$160 billion. Today, just 3 years later, with a Democrat Congress and the White House, that deficit went from \$160 billion in 2006 to what it is today, \$1.9 trillion.

So for those of us who had concerns about the deficit 3 years ago that are voting against this reckless spending today, what I think is hypocritical is you hear some people complaining about the spending that went on 3 years ago when it was \$160 billion, but yet they're voting for the spending today when it's \$1.9 trillion of deficit just this year.

So I think the American people are watching all of this. Clearly they were watching it when they took to the streets on April 15 in those TEA parties and said enough is enough. We have got to stop this reckless spending because of what it's going to do to future generations. I have got a 2-year-old daughter, and my daughter, Madison, she's going to be the one, her generation is going to be the one, that's going to have to pay these bills.

And those of us that were here voting today, this is my voting card, and this is the card that Members of Congress use to cast their vote. Some people up here think that this is a credit card, that they can just rack up trillions of dollars of debt that the future generations of this country are going to have to pay. That's not responsible. Obviously that's what we are trying to stop.

Mr. AKIN. I would like to get back to that before we close tonight because I want to contrast that mentality with the mentality of what has been called the Greatest Generation, the generation of our parents and what they did.

Judge CARTER.

Mr. CARTER. You asked what that two consecutive quarters of 6 percent negative growth means. That means, I believe, and I know my friends talk about this all the time on the Ways and Means Committee, I believe that means recession. Two consecutive quarters is the definition of recession. So we are now in the Obama recession. So it's one of those things you've got to think about. As we keep blaming other people, at some point in time you have to take credit for what happens on your watch.

I heard two Members arguing today, an interesting argument: How long is it going to take us to pay off this debt we are accumulating? One of the Members said, well, it's estimated 3,000 years.

The other one said, no, that's not right. It's maybe perpetuity.

He said, how do you get that?

He said, the only way you get that 3,000 year number is you've got to show a surplus. And there is no surplus projected within a couple of lifetimes, based upon what we are doing right now. So, therefore, it's like this never-ending debt.

And another one said, well, that's like a Ponzi scheme. You get one bunch of investors to invest in your product, and this is like our boy that's in jail right now, and then you get another bunch of investors and you pay these investors from these investors, and then you pay these investors from these investors. Why isn't this a Ponzi scheme?

Mr. AKIN. What do you do when people do that? Don't you put them in jail?

Mr. CARTER. That's what we are supposed to be doing with them.

We have got to wake up and realize what we're creating. We're creating another generation paying for this generation and then another generation will pay for that generation. And at some time when you get numbers like these, it becomes so overwhelming, what are we going to do?

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time, the trouble with the Ponzi scheme is sometime the music stops and there aren't enough chairs and then the proverbial stuff slides down the wall and then there's a big problem. That's part of what started this whole thing, what was effectively a pyramiding scheme in a sense.

But some people want to say this is a failure of free enterprise, the problem that we're having in the economy. It's not a problem of free enterprise; it's a problem of socialism. It's a problem of this government telling Freddie and Fannie that they had to make loans that weren't going to work. If you tell someone you've got to do something and they're saying to you economically this isn't going to work and you force it and you keep doing that and then you have a bunch of other people playing along with the scheme and give it a AAA rating and sell it all over the world, pretty soon the music stops. And now what's happening is it's affecting the entire economy.

I yield to my friend from Texas, KEVIN.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. I wanted to answer the question, what does this double quarters of 6 percent mean? What it means for average Americans is that America is going to go much deeper into debt and our kids are going to have a burden that they can barely carry.

What's interesting is that the President's budget, the one that was rushed through the House again and Senate today, it based its assumptions and its huge deficits on a contraction this year, a shrinking of our economy, of 1 percent. They've used such rosy economic indicators.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time, you're saying the budget today that we passed said the economy is going to shrink by 1 percent. Is that per year?

Mr. BRADY of Texas. By 1.2 percent this year.

Mr. AKIN. This year. And then how much did we just shrink in the first quarter?

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Six point one percent and on top of 6.3 percent last quarter.

Mr. AKIN. I've heard of optimists before, but this stretches the long arm of conscience.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. I'm glad you raised that. The President said this is the most honest budget ever presented to Congress.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time, the President made some promises. One of

them was there weren't going to be any tax increases if you made less than \$250,000. For "Show Me" guy from Missouri, that's puzzling, that promise.

Here's another promise: He promised transparency. He says, "I will not sign any non-emergency bill without giving the American public an opportunity to review and comment on the White House Web site for at least 5 days." So we are going to have some transparency here.

Now, I wonder how much transparency there was in that budget you're talking about that says we are just going to assume it's going to contract 1 percent when this quarter it has already contracted 6 and it contracted 6 the last quarter. What kind of numbers are those?

I yield.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Well, they're bad numbers. And I think that's why it was rushed through Congress so that people couldn't ask those questions. But the truth of the matter is the result of that, of cooking the books with rosy numbers that don't exist that no one agrees with, is that we will face close to a \$2 trillion deficit just this year.

□ 1930

There are trillion dollar deficits as far as the eye can see. So when Judge CARTER said we may not see another balanced budget in our lifetime, that's no exaggeration. We may not see a balanced budget in our lifetime.

Let me make one correction that I hear, I guess if you repeat something often enough people believe it, but you often hear up here Democrats who say President Clinton gave President Bush a surplus, and President Obama inherited a huge deficit.

That's awfully misleading. The truth of the matter is that the surplus that was given to President Bush wasn't created by Democrats in Congress but by Republicans in Congress who sat down with President Clinton and said we are going to balance this budget. And I was here on a night like this night where we passed the balanced budget agreement.

And guess who voted against it? Democrats.

And then, when you talk about the deficit President Obama inherited, that didn't come—

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time, let me just summarize and see if I got what you said. What you are saying is we kept hearing from the Democrats that President Bush inherited all of this surplus, and it was somehow because, I guess, President Clinton had done something right.

But, in fact, those years, the Republicans controlled the House and they forced President Clinton to balance the budget, and that's why he got his surpluses because you guys made him have a surplus. Did I understand that correctly?

Mr. BRADY of Texas. And congressional Democrats voted against the

balanced budget agreement. So that's the first part of the equation. The second one is President Obama did inherit a big deficit, but he inherited it from congressional Democrats who held power for the last 2 years. They didn't even send President Bush a budget because they knew he would spend less.

And so my point of that is that you can't take credit for a surplus you didn't create and avoid blame for a deficit you did. That's one of the big, I think, misperceptions, the big lies in Washington, D.C.

I agree with other conservatives that Republicans, I think, got fired because we didn't control spending well enough, even though we whittled that deficit down, and we are learning from those mistakes. That deficit now is 10 times greater, and we are in a mess we may never recover from.

Mr. AKIN. Gentleman, you just said that you are talking about a deficit, was it \$2.1 trillion just for the next 2 years?

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Almost \$2 trillion just for this year.

Mr. AKIN. To put that into context, if you go from George Washington to George Bush, and you add up all of the debt that's been accumulated, you are looking at \$5.8 trillion. So what you are saying in 1 year, we are going to do not quite half of that, everything since 1770s to now, we are going to burn that in 1 year? My goodness.

Judge CARTER.

Mr. CARTER. And that's the deficit. The debt is worse than that, because we are borrowing all this money that we are spending right now.

And so when you look at all these packages that we put together, and you total them up, that's where your \$8.7 trillion comes in right there that you have got demonstrated there. It's the debt.

In addition, as KEVIN points out, they made false assumptions of the growth of this economy. Based upon those false assumptions, everybody's already told them they weren't going to work. They were told by all the authorities that look at these things, these numbers don't work. They went ahead with them, anyway, and now we're looking at a \$2 trillion deficit. So the debt gets even worse.

I heard somebody say this morning, somebody ought to tell every graduating senior this year that they can add \$156,000 to their school debt, because that's what they are going to have to pay off. That's going to be their share of what they are going to have to pay off in their lifetime.

Mr. AKIN. You said \$156,000?

Mr. CARTER. That's what the guy said. I don't want to take credit for that number. I am just telling you I heard it on the television this morning, and it shocked me.

Mr. AKIN. Some of these numbers do involve making certain assumptions, and if you doctor the assumptions, the numbers may look better than they really are. We just talked about one

where they said the economy is going to contract by 1 percent, and we have already gone through 6 in the first quarter.

I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. SCALISE. You know, when we throw all of these numbers around, obviously the massive amounts of money—and when you talk about trillions of dollars, it's such a large number that it's hard for many to grasp just what that really means.

When we talk about the budget, and ultimately you look across this country, we are in tough economic times. Families across this country are actually cutting their budget. They are tightening their belts to live within their means.

And I think what frustrates most people is when they look at what's happening in Washington, whether we are talking about hundreds of billions in deficits or trillions in deficits, which, unfortunately, we are in today, they look at these numbers and they say, what's happening up there in Washington when we are tightening our belts, we are cutting back, Washington is actually mushrooming spending.

There is a lot of blame to go around. But when you look at what happened just a few weeks ago when the first budget came up for a vote here on this House floor, it didn't get any attention, but there was a balanced budget amendment that was proposed that day. Many of us proposed that amendment and voted for that amendment.

Mr. AKIN. All of us standing here voted for it.

Mr. SCALISE. What's ironic is over 100 Republicans just 3 weeks ago voted to balance this Federal budget, to balance it.

And this is during the cries of many on the other side who were criticizing all the spending that went on. And as they were criticizing the spending, they were raising spending by 10 times what had happened under Republican administrations, not one Democrat voted for that balanced budget amendment that was proposed on the House floor while many of them turned around and voted for the largest budget in the history of the country.

I say that because people don't want to hear about the partisan politics. But what many people are being told by this administration, incorrectly, is that there are no alternatives proposed by the other side, and that the Republicans are the Party of "No." They don't propose any alternatives, which is clearly disingenuous because we have proposed many alternatives. They have been the party, not only of "no" because they have opposed those alternatives, they have been the party of fiscal recklessness, fiscal irresponsibility, of spending large amounts of money that literally will double our national debt in just 5 years. That's what I think has gotten most Americans frustrated now is that they know what they are doing to take care of

their business. They are cutting back, and they are watching this Democrat leadership in Congress and this administration spending record amounts of money, running up the debt and the deficit at record levels, and money at record levels that we know nobody can sustain. So I think when people look, they say, this has only been 100 days. We have already, today, as we stand here, added 20 percent to the national debt, money we can't even get back.

The stimulus bill alone added almost \$1 trillion of new debt, and we are still seeing some of the wasteful, frivolous spending.

Mr. AKIN. There is this transparency promise, that what's going on in Washington D.C., the public should be able to see it. You see this kind of transparency promise. And then when you take a look at what happened, the President first broke the promise of transparency in January when he signed this legislation which was the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act. It was passed January 27. And he since continued the problem with the State insurance, the SCHIP bill. It wasn't 5 days.

And the reason I mention this is when we came to that supposedly stimulus bill, our staffs got that thing at 11:30 at night, and we're supposed to vote on a 1,000-plus page bill the next day. Now, I am not a speed reader, and my staff doesn't sit around at 11:30 just waiting for some announcement from the Democrat Party.

Now I don't understand the transparency in that situation. But I do understand a little bit, because I don't know what \$780 billion is. I started to put it in terms of aircraft carriers, because I understood that. I understood that it was more than the war in Iraq for 6 years and the war in Afghanistan added to it for 7 years. I understand it was more than 250 aircraft carriers. We only have 11 of them. The debt service on it was nine aircraft carriers, and it's all money that we don't have.

So we have got a series, again, going to this 100 days, there is a lot of new records that are being set, particularly in the debt area. But there are other kinds of things, I think, that get these people at the tea parties upset. One is, have you ever heard of the President firing the president of General Motors? I have never seen that before.

I yield to my friend from Texas, Congressman BRADY.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. There is so much truth in what you say. I was referring back to, again, one of our Facebook followers, Melody from my district in east Texas, that she wrote that if she were to grade our new President and Democrats in Congress, she said it would definitely be a flunking grade. It is like watching a train wreck happen.

It's interesting. President Obama is very sincere when he says, I was elected to change the direction America could go, and he is very up front about it. I give him credit for that.

But from my way of thinking, in the Eighth District of Texas, we believe he

is wrong on spending. He is wrong on nationalizing so much of our free market. He is wrong on Guantanamo. He is wrong on the CIA memos. He is wrong on this new national security threat of our veterans and our pro-life and our States' rights people.

I think just generally he is wrong in the belief that you can tax and spend and borrow our way back to prosperity. It won't work. I would say this. You always want to be helpful as a Member of Congress, so my advice to the President on this 100th day is, one, stand up to NANCY PELOSI and the Senate leaders in Congress. Be your own man and don't let them run the show as they have done for your first 100 days.

Extend a hand to Republicans who have got some great ideas on how to lower taxes, how to help small businesses create jobs, how we really get out of this economy and we are willing to work with you.

The final piece of advice is do less press conferences like tonight and more working meetings with Members of Congress who want to work across the aisle to solve these problems without going into a debt so staggering that we can never hope to get out. There are some great ideas up here, but so far for the first 100 days, it's been the congressional Democrats show.

Really, it's time for the President to follow through on his promise to change the way we work in Washington.

Mr. AKIN. I sure appreciate your making some positive comments. And I think it's important that when we are critical that we also offer a better idea.

I was taught that as a kid growing up. If you want to be critical of something, okay, but then say how would you do it better. I think that's an honest way for us all to proceed, and we certainly have a lot of ways to do that.

I would like to just take a few minutes and talk about what are some of the better ways to do things. You just mentioned Guantanamo. The numbers I have is that our best estimate is that 61 of those detainees are now fighting against us. After we let them go, they are back again in the battle fighting against our sons and daughters. My recommendation is when you get people that dangerous, don't let them go so easily.

Let's talk about some solutions. Let's just talk about how would we approach this situation. The economy has now been shrinking. We see this debt that is really skyrocketing, excessive spending on the part of all the Democrats.

Let's just say that working for the day, or we are President, we are responsible for turning this around, what are the steps we are going to take. I think it's fair to ask that question.

I will go to my friend from Texas, Judge CARTER.

Mr. CARTER. You've hit upon something that everybody needs to think about. First, you have to start with the premise that the government doesn't

make any money. The government takes the citizens' money. That's the way it works. They are not a creator of wealth. They are a taker of wealth and a distributor of wealth. But they are not a creator of wealth.

So all this stimulus we have looked at, its purpose is to give a shot in the arm to the economy, if you believe in the Keynesian theory of economics, a shot in the arm to the economy, and make it start creating wealth again. But, in reality, we have seen no real indication. Japan can tell you for 10 years they did that and failed miserably. Most people will point to the Great Depression and say it failed miserably.

So the real solution is real wealth for America. You do that by putting more money in the American people's pocket, making it easier for people to be entrepreneurs. For small businessmen, don't tax them. Give them a chance to grow their small business. They employ the vast majority of the American people.

What we have got to turn around is real wealth from real jobs from real businesses for real people. That's what we've got to have.

Mr. AKIN. Summarizing what you said, Judge, what you are saying is, first of all, the Federal Government does not create wealth, other than we print money, which just waters down.

We tax people, slop the money around. But we never create it. We just redistribute it.

So how do you actually take an economy and help everybody to do better? And what you have to do is you have to allow the private sector, the entrepreneurs, the investors, the inventors, the small business people, to get out there and do that, the American dream.

Let freedom work and let people go and use their ingenuity and ability to actually create wealth.

□ 1945

Wealth is not static. It grows if you fertilize it the right way. So what you are talking about is doing things that are going to help small business.

Just an interesting number that someone tossed to me, and that is you take a look at companies with 500 employees. That is what is called a small business, 500 employees. Half of Americans work in a business with 500 or less employees, and those companies create 78 or 79 percent of the new jobs in America.

So if you are worried about the people not having jobs and you really want to turn the economy around, what you want to do is you want to fire that engine of small business, you want to get those 80 percent of the new jobs, you want to start getting those things going. And what do you do to do that? You have to have liquidity for those companies to work.

I recognize another good friend of ours and an expert on small business, Congressman BRADY.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Well, thank you, sir. Most people in my district know that I was raised in a small business. I was a Chamber of Commerce manager my whole life. So I ran a small business, made payroll, had to cut staff in the recession and work with other small businesses. So I know how hard it is for them these days.

But there are three ideas Republicans came forward with, I think better ideas. In the stimulus, in that stimulus bill, billions and billions of dollars, there was more money to buy public art in America than to help small businesses survive.

Mr. AKIN. Well, reclaiming my time, you are saying that porkulus bill that we passed, it had more money to buy artwork than it did to help small business that creates 80 percent of the new jobs in our economy?

I yield.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. The line item for the National Endowment for the Arts was \$50 million. The line item to help small businesses to buy new computers and equipment was smaller, \$41 million.

What we said as Republicans was, we said, look, let's create a 20 percent income tax reduction across-the-board for small businesses so they can keep more of their money, keep good workers on the payroll, maybe buy that new computer or piece of equipment, or just survive through this recession. We thought that was a better idea.

On housing, the government has come up with this new \$2 billion pool of money to buy foreclosed homes in your neighborhood and mine. The Republicans said wait a minute. Given a choice between having the government buy a home in our neighborhood or our neighbors buy that home, maintain it, keep it up and sell it once the market recovers, we created incentives that said, look, if you look around your neighborhood and community and you buy one of these distressed homes, foreclosed or someone who is in trouble, it is abandoned, we will treat it just like your own home. If you keep it up and maintain it, when you sell it, you can keep the profit.

Now, who is going to keep better care of a home in your neighborhood? Uncle Sam, or one of your neighbors?

Mr. AKIN. That is a no-brainer, gentleman. Keep going.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Absolutely. Then on health care, they are looking at this big government-run health care system. Many Republicans, including me, are proposing this backpack, where for the first time workers get an option where they can choose a health care plan that is right for them, just like Members of Congress do. They can put it in a backpack and take it with them throughout their life, from business to business or to home to raise the kids, or if you are going to start your own small business. Basically you get the same tax breaks businesses get. But you have one that you choose. It is your doctor, your relationship, the hospitals you choose to go to.

Mr. AKIN. That sounds like freedom working, doesn't it?

Mr. BRADY of Texas. It is. Instead of government one-size-fits-all, why don't we give more freedom and more incentives for people to have a health care plan that fits their needs?

We have great ideas. My colleagues here tonight I guarantee you could spend a lot of time with these new ideas. But we need a President who will be open. We need a Democrat Congress who will quit rushing bills through this Chamber and give a chance for those good ideas to come forward.

Mr. AKIN. Just reclaiming my time, if I were to list off some things for small business, and you have run a Chamber and run your own small business, it seems like to me there are some things we are doing that I just wouldn't do.

The first thing is the death tax. That is a bad idea. We are having that death tax come back so some poor guy loses his business, I mean he dies, and his son is going to run the business, but now he has to sell half the business to pay the tax on it. What is the logic of that? That destroys jobs and destroys small businesses. So first the death tax.

The next thing it seems to me like dividends and capital gains, boy, did we see the economy jump when we limited that and allowed people to keep more liquidity in the economy. So that is another thing we could do.

Another thing, it seems to me, is when you say you are going to tax people making \$250,000, a whole lot of money, those are the guys that own the small business. Do you want them to create jobs, or do you want to suck all the money away from them like some sort of leech until they are so dry and withered up they can't hire anybody anymore?

I think there are some things that we just didn't do. Just leave them alone and let them do what they do so well, which is follow the American dream.

I yield to my friend from Louisiana.

Mr. SCALISE. I thank again my friend from Missouri. You know, there are very critical areas of our economic problems that we have proposed alternative solutions to, three in particular I think that are critical to what is happening today that we presented to President Obama. Unfortunately, he hasn't taken them in the first 100 days. Hopefully he will take them in the next 100 days.

But if we talk about the overall economy, number one, the banking system, which is still holding back our economy; number two, energy policies, where we still don't have a comprehensive national energy policy; number three . . .

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time, are you saying that hugging Chavez is not really a national energy policy? Is that what you are trying to say?

I yield. I couldn't resist that.

Mr. SCALISE. Well, if you start with the overall economy, one of the biggest

things we can do, rather than just massively growing the size of government and adding trillions of dollars to our national debt, we can empower our middle-class families and our small businesses. We presented a bill to do just that, a bill that would actually cut taxes for middle-class families and for small businesses, who create the bulk of our jobs.

What some people on the other side have said is, it is the tax cuts that have gotten us into this problem. What they fail to recognize is history. Every time we cut taxes, you can go back to when John F. Kennedy cut taxes or when Ronald Reagan or George Bush cut taxes, revenues to the Federal Government actually increased. What was always wrong was that the Congress spent more money than came in from those tax cuts.

So tax cuts clearly have worked. It is the fiscal discipline in Congress that has always failed us. So maintain fiscal discipline, cut the taxes to get the economy back on track, go into the banking system—we had proposed alternatives that would actually get the banks working again.

Mr. AKIN. You are talking so fast and what you are saying is so good, you are really referring to three different times in history, where instead of doing what FDR did and Henry Morgenthau tried to do, and came before Congress and said it failed, it doesn't work, this stimulus idea, this Keynesian idea, what has worked was what JFK did, what Ronald Reagan did, and what George Bush did, three separate times at 20-year different intervals, and that was they actually cut the taxes, and this seems like water going uphill, and the revenues of the Federal Government went up.

That is kind of an interesting phenomena, but it has happened time after time. And the reason behind that, I will go ahead and yield and let the gentleman explain that.

Mr. SCALISE. The problem is fiscal discipline hasn't been maintained by Congress. For all of the new revenue that came into the Federal Government, Congress always went on to spend even more money. So that is one area you can address.

On the banking system, we still have major problems in our banking system, a lot of it created by irresponsible lending by groups like Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, who gave loans to people with no ability to pay, and they were encouraged by government. We need to end that.

On a comprehensive national energy policy, we can actually use our own natural resources, continue drilling for oil, natural gas, cleaning coal up and using nuclear power and take that extra revenue with those millions of jobs we would create and fund the alternative sources of energy, like wind and solar, to get us to that next level of jobs, rather than a cap-and-trade energy tax that would run millions of jobs out of our economy and also raise taxes on American families.

So we have presented these alternatives. In the first 100 days, unfortunately, President Obama has not worked with us to embrace any of these ideas, but hopefully that will change as more people become concerned about this record level of record spending.

Mr. AKIN. Congressman SCALISE, I really appreciate your positives and giving very specific kinds of things that can be done to turn the economy around, to reduce this level of spending.

We are just about out of time. I appreciate your expertise and joining us tonight. I am going to just recognize my friend Judge CARTER for a minute, and then we are going to have to wrap things up and I will come back to you.

Mr. CARTER. I just want to point out there are a few things we haven't talked about, like apologizing to the terrorists; labeling enemy combatants, they are now foreign detainees; labeling the war on terror as international contingencies; labeling the terror attacks as man-caused disasters; hugging up to the Castro brothers, who tried to make their island a launching platform for intercontinental ballistic missiles within my life; and hugging up to Hugo Chavez, the man who hates this country more than anybody, and taking his book, which is all about venom against this country.

These are just a few of many, many other things we haven't talked about tonight.

Mr. AKIN. It was basically labeled a Communist rant and an idiot's Bible, I think, by various people that reviewed that book.

Going last to my good friend, a very senior and distinguished Congressman from Texas, KEVIN BRADY.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Well, I think the way you started this, and the issue is freedom, Thomas Jefferson said a government big enough to supply all your needs is big enough to take everything you have. It is important we keep that in mind as this country grows deeper, deeper, deeper into debt.

Mr. AKIN. I appreciate all of you joining us in this nice family discussion and hope that it has been of interest to our colleagues. I just ask us please to do a little better in the next 100 days.

FISCAL ISSUES AFFECTING THE COUNTRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. MARKEY of Colorado). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CAPUANO) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. CAPUANO. Madam Speaker, I am here tonight to talk about some of the fiscal issues that have affected this country and how they were caused and maybe a little bit of who caused them and who didn't cause them.

Over the last several months, obviously there has been a lot of debate