

than a month away. We cannot forget about the promises we have already made as we brace for the next disaster to strike American soil.

Last year saw record disasters around the country. Floods soaked the Southeast, wildfires burned the West, and record snows blanketed the Midwest and Northeast.

□ 1630

It is understandable that FEMA used up all of its budgeted resources. Congress must now act to provide our communities with the funds they were promised.

Mr. Speaker, I am a committed fiscal conservative, and I believe we should closely watch every dollar we spend. I welcome a debate on how to reduce Federal spending and reform the way FEMA operates in order to make it more efficient; however, the time for that debate is not while our communities wait for necessary and guaranteed Federal funds.

In closing, let me once again urge the Senate to act on this very pressing issue. As the summer nears, we simply cannot afford to ignore this problem any longer. The Senate needs to do what the House has already done and pass, very quickly, emergency funding for FEMA, and pass it quickly so that they don't have to wait any longer.

#### WHAT GOT US INTO THIS ECONOMIC MESS?

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. Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure to be able to join you and my colleagues and others who are gathered here to talk about something that has been on our minds for some considerable time now—many months, even 1½ to 2 years—and that is the subject of the economy and jobs and what's really going on in America.

I'm a person who is of that baby boomer-type cycle—I'm 62—and there are many other people such as myself in America that have done a lot of work and tried to save our money and all of a sudden something seemed to go wrong in the economy. We lost a lot of money in 2008, and there is a real concern out there about jobs, the economy, and what's going on in the policies. And so I thought, in that we have 1 hour—we don't have to do everything in 1 minute or 5 minutes, but we have 1 full hour today—that I would open the subject. I will invite my other Republican colleagues to join me. You may see some coming in before long. And I want to talk about this whole situation, and because we have more time, I can go back just a little bit.

I would like to go back to how is it that we were kind of cruising along, things seemed to be going pretty well by about 2006 or so with the economy,

and then all of a sudden, in 2008, we really seem to have come to "grief on a reef," so to speak. So what went on?

Well, let's go back to an interesting article in the New York Times, not exactly a conservative oracle. It was September 11—not in 2001, but September 11 in 2003—the New York Times reported this, that there is a new agency proposed to oversee Freddie Mac and Fannie Mae. Well, why would there be a new agency to oversee Freddie and Fannie? Well, Freddie and Fannie were these quasi-governmental agencies, and their job was to help provide Americans with affordable loans so Americans could buy houses.

So here we have in this article, it says: The Bush administration today recommended the most significant regulatory overhaul in the housing finance industry since the savings and loan crisis a decade ago.

Oh, my goodness. So President Bush is saying we need to overhaul Freddie and Fannie. They were quasi-private, quasi-public. Why would he want to overhaul? Well, they just had misplaced a few hundreds of millions of dollars and gave people a lot of concern that maybe Freddie and Fannie were not in good shape economically. Well, then the question becomes, if they're not in good shape, what would that mean? Well, that would mean, guess what? The American taxpayer may be asked to bail out Freddie and Fannie. So the President is saying, Hey, I need some more authority to make sure that Freddie and Fannie don't do some dumb things that cost us a whole lot of money. So that's what the President is saying in this article. Again, this is 2003.

Following that, we read further in the article, and we have another interesting situation here where we have the gentleman now who is in charge of trying to fix these Wall Street institutions, that is, our current Congressman BARNEY FRANK. And this was his statement in the same article in 2003: These two entities, Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, are not facing any kind of financial crisis. The more people exaggerate these problems, the more pressure there is on these companies, the less we will see in terms of affordable housing.

So this is something we have a clear party line difference. The President is saying Freddie and Fannie are not managing things properly, they were a risk to our economy, and you have a Democrat, who is now the ranking guy on this committee, that's saying, no, they're fine, Freddie and Fannie are just fine.

Well, of course, hindsight is always 20/20. It was obvious that what was said here by Congressman FRANK was completely wrong. Freddie and Fannie were in trouble. They did mismanage things, and they have now been taken over by the Federal Government, more or less. And guess who has to pick up the tab? You guessed it. The American taxpayer.

Now, how did this whole situation develop and what happened? Well, part of what happened was people came to the conclusion some number of years ago that it would be nice if people could get loans to buy houses. And what happens for the people who don't have very good credit ratings? How about the people who are a bad security risk? What are we going to do with them? Well, we're going to say, You can get a loan, too. That's what he's saying in terms of affordable housing.

So somehow, in the name of compassion, we came up with this idea that the government was going to allow people to get loans and not check whether the person had a capacity to repay the loans. And at the height of the big bubble that was going up on home prices, just about anybody, regardless of their credit rating or anything else, what job they had, could go in and get a loan to buy a great big house. And it worked pretty well for a couple of years. You could go in, buy a house, and then wait a couple of years. The price of the house would double, and you would sell it and buy some other big house.

And you could pyramid your money up even though you were borrowing money and you didn't have any way to pay it back, because these loans were so good you wouldn't have to pay anything for a number of years at all. You could get a loan that would say you don't have to pay anything for a couple of years at least. So you could buy something. It would appreciate. You could sell it, and then move on and do that. And so people were starting to do that with houses. The trouble was, of course, that the bubble burst, and all of the house of cards came tumbling down.

Now, we understand what caused the problem originally was the concept that the government requires the banks to make loans to people who can't afford to pay. That's a bad policy, because when people can't pay, somebody's going to have to pick up the tab. And guess what happened? You guessed it once again. It was Uncle Sam passes it on to the taxpayer to pick up the tab for this failed policy.

So you want to ask, How did we end up with this 10 percent unemployment? How did we end up with a very weak economy? How did we get into this trouble? The trouble was caused, about 90 percent, by the U.S. Government. It was caused by people who meet in this Chamber and various administrations.

At the end of the Clinton administration, the Clintons decided that what they were going to do was to increase the percentage of those bad loans that banks had to approve. What did the banks do with them? They passed them on to Freddie and Fannie. What happened to Freddie and Fannie? Well, Wall Street sliced and diced the loans up and sold them all over the world, and Freddie and Fannie then get into a big problem.

Now, what was the political organization that forced all of these loans to be

made to people who couldn't afford to pay it? You guessed it. It was ACORN. ACORN was involved in a lot of voter fraud, but it also was involved in forcing banks locally to take loans that they shouldn't have taken. So this is a piece of what happened.

The other piece was the policy of the Federal Reserve. Because of the recession that we came into in 2001 when I was first elected, the Federal Reserve decided to increase liquidity. But particularly what was happening, Greenspan decided to reduce the interest rate. Now, this idea of increasing liquidity is the equivalent of the crack cocaine of economics. What it is is it's a government—in the old-fashioned world, you would say the government is running the printing presses.

Well, that's what we did. We ran the printing presses, but we also reduced the cost of money to very low, to about zero percent, and held it there for some period of time. By dumping lots and lots of dollars into the economic system, people that had the dollars go, Hey, I'm getting these dollars for a very, very low interest rate. What can I invest in? Hey, why not invest in the housing business, because housing prices are going up like a rocket. I can borrow money at a couple percent, or even less, and I can double my money, almost, in the housing business in a couple, 3, 4 years. So why not do it?

Well, everybody did for a while until this very low interest rate, the high level of liquidity, and boom, you get another bubble. It's like the high-tech bubble, because we're using liquidity to try and pull ourselves out of problems. We'll come back to that in a little while.

So what was it that really caused the economic crisis? Well, first of all, it was lousy policy set right here in Congress about making loans to people who couldn't afford to pay them and then not holding Freddie and Fannie accountable for what they're doing. And by doing that, we ended up with the beginning of the recession.

Now, following that, we start to go into recession. The idea then was, just in Bush's last year or so and when I was here, we had Paulson come to us and say, Hey, look, everything's in trouble. You guys have got two choices: Either the entire world economic system is going to melt down—I mean, the Earth is going to crack. Hailstones are going to come from heaven. I mean, it's going to be terrible, and there's going to be riots in the streets because the dollar bill won't work anymore and the banking system will collapse—or your other alternative is, give me \$700 billion in unmarked bills in a brown paper bag. Those are your two choices, Congress, and we're going to the public and letting everybody know. And if you do the right thing, hopefully there will not be this terrible calamity.

And so Congress was supposed to give \$700 billion to Hank Paulson. Well, did he really need that? No, he didn't need

it. In fact, it was part of the same mistake that we make frequently here, and that is that every time there's a problem economically, the government has to jump in and fix it, bailout fever. And this was, of course, the beginning of the big Wall Street bailout.

Unfortunately, some Republicans supported that idea, along with most of the Democrats, and we took \$700 billion away from the American taxpayer to buy these supposedly troubled assets that had been created by Wall Street. Well, it's pretty hard to buy something when there isn't a market in it, so we took \$700 billion out of the market—about \$350 supposedly spent during Bush's last year, another \$350 in Obama's first year—and that was the beginning of our big spending. And again, it's based on this concept that the government should jump in and fix everything and that the government is going to be able to fix the U.S. economy. That turns out to be a troubling assumption, and it continued to get us in trouble over the last year or two, which has then made the economic situation even worse.

The next thing that happened was, after we did this Wall Street bailout, we decided that what we had to do next was a stimulus package. The proposal was that we're going to do this stimulus. Now, the whole concept of stimulus is pretty much like the idea of, if you had a pair of boots on, what you're going to do is to reach down, grab your bootstraps and lift hard, and if you lift hard enough, you can float around the room. And this is the concept in economics that was known as Keynesianism. It was the idea that if the Federal Government just spends a whole lot of money, it will make the economy better when you have a tough economy.

If you think about that from a commonsense point of view, picture you're trying to run your family and you realize, hey, there's really some economic problems our family is having, so the solution is go out and just spend money like mad. Now, would you think that would be a very smart idea? Well, most commonsense people—certainly people from my State, the State of Missouri, would say that's not very smart just to go out and spend a whole lot of money. Has that idea been tried before? Well, yes, it has. It was tried by Henry Morgenthau back when Little Lord Keynes was first proposing this theory. It's a lovely theory if you're in government, because the theory says you can just spend lots and lots of money that's not your money.

People in politics think that's nice because people like it when I spend lots of government money. The problem is that Henry Morgenthau, who was Secretary of the Treasury under FDR, managed to use this policy to take a recession and turn it into the Great Depression. And so he came, at the end of 8 years, before the House Ways and Means Committee here, and Henry Morgenthau says that we have tried

this theory of spending money. We've spent and spent and spent, and we have not seen any change in unemployment. We have terrible unemployment and a huge debt and deficit to boot. So this is the guy right alongside with Little Lord Keynes that said this didn't work. We tried it for 8 years, and it just created the Great Depression in America.

We should learn something from history, but, no, we decide what we're going to do is we're going to come up with the "stimulus bill," another 700-and-something billion dollars, \$787 billion. And here we have our new President here. He says, like any cash-strapped family, we will work within a budget to invest what we need and sacrifice what we don't. The things on this side of the chart sound pretty good. If I heard somebody say that that was my President, I would say, Hah, this is a pretty good idea.

This is what the President said at the beginning of the year.

□ 1645

The only trouble is there is this huge gap between what is said and what is done. So what we do, we start with: Is it any real serious budget reform? No, it is not really budget reform at all.

In fact, what has happened in terms of the Federal spending? Have we learned anything after the stimulus bill? What should we have learned from the stimulus bill? Well, we were told that if you do not pass the stimulus bill, if you don't pass it, here is what is going to happen, so you better look out. If you don't pass the stimulus bill, that is what is going to happen to unemployment, this line here. But if you pass a stimulus bill, here is what is going to happen, it will keep this unemployment down. So we were told that if you don't pass the stimulus bill, unemployment could go as high as 8 percent. And if you pass it, it will bring it on down.

Well, that was all based on this silly idea that if you spent lots and lots of money, everything would be okay. This really wasn't even a good FDR stimulus bill because if he had been doing it, it would have had a lot of concrete in it. It would have been hydroelectric plants and roads. This had much more food stamps and aid to States that overspent their budgets and things like that. So we spent \$787 billion on the stimulus bill, and here is what happened. This red line. So you think a whole lot of government spending is going to fix unemployment? Absolutely not. We have already tried it. One more time, if we didn't learn our lesson from Henry Morgenthau, we have another chance. Here we go. Same dumb idea, still doesn't work. You can try it as many times as you want. It is not going to work. So the unemployment now jumps up. In many places it is more than 10 percent. These numbers are pretty conservative. If you have been looking for a job for more than a year, you are not counted anymore in these statistics. So people without a

job for a year—maybe some have given up in despair of ever getting a job—they are not even counted in these numbers. So this idea of a whole lot of government spending didn't work, and so we have unemployment.

I am joined by a good friend of mine, Dr. PRICE, who is really on top of some of these things. I would ask if he would like to join in the conversation a little bit here this afternoon.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for his leadership on this and all issues, and especially for highlighting the challenges Americans face all across this land.

But pointing out, as this chart so aptly does, that the "solution" which has been put in place by this administration has, I would argue and I know you would, has in fact made things worse. So here we are with the Nation being promised a little over a year ago that if we spent hundreds of billions of dollars in an effort to try to get the Nation back moving from an economic standpoint, that we wouldn't see an unemployment rate of 8 percent.

Mr. AKIN. Right. If we didn't pass it, 8 percent.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. That was going to be the high point. And here we are at 9.7 percent, and it has been higher than that. And the take-home message on that is what they are doing doesn't work.

I told a fellow the other day, I said, They are thinking about doing a new stimulus bill, a new jobs bill. You know, they tried millions and then they tried billions, and I guess we are going to move to gazillions next.

Mr. AKIN. Don't forget the trillions. We are working on trillions right now.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. And as you well know, it is money we don't have. It is money that we don't have, and that is the troubling thing for the American people all across this land because they know the policies that have been put in place not only haven't worked, they have been destructive to job creation, which is what is frustrating to those of us on our side of the aisle who know that fundamental American principles, if you follow them, actually can allow you to create jobs.

So what does that mean? It means spending less. You've got a great chart right there, and people rail on the amount of spending that was done at the end of the last administration, and we did as well. But if you might share with folks the numbers that have happened since Speaker PELOSI and her crowd have taken over.

Mr. AKIN. Right. You know, I appreciate your bringing that up because one of the things that Americans intuitively understand, they are not really buying this idea that by spending tons of money the Federal Government is going to make everything better. Maybe some ivory-tower people, but most people on the street know that doesn't make any sense.

They also know we as Republicans did the wrong thing; we spent too much

money. And the worst year in terms of spending too much money was Bush's last year in office and our deficit was \$459 billion. That is this box here. The reason it is red is because this is when the Pelosi Congress took over, so it was George Bush with the Pelosi Congress. And of all of the years that President Bush had spent too much money, this was his worst year right here. We follow that up with 2009 and this \$459 billion jumps to \$1.4 trillion. Now when you really think about it, that is really a tripling of the amount of deficit.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. It really is astounding. And the picture—they say a picture is worth a thousand words. That picture is worth over a trillion words, and that is because that is money we don't have. It is money that puts greater deficits and debt on the backs of our kids and our grandkids. It is mortgaging the future.

Right now we are seeing the consequences of reckless and irresponsible spending at a national level in another nation—Greece. And if you look at the trajectory, the spending path we are on, and the debt and the deficit path we are on, we are not far behind the incredible irresponsibility that is now being addressed in the nation of Greece.

Well, the American people know that is wrong. They know they can't go to the garage and print money, and that is what the Federal Government does. That is what the Obama administration has done. Those red columns there, those red lines there, demonstrate clearly that the deficits and the debt that are being run up by the Obama administration and Speaker PELOSI and the majority party right now are unparalleled in our history.

Mr. AKIN. It seems like people think politics is complicated, and all this economic stuff is complicated. It doesn't have to be nearly as complicated as people think it is. For instance, take a look between the parties. The Democrats, their basic idea of a solution to a problem is that the government has to get bigger and spend more money. That's the way they always look at it. They think that the solution is the government, and we think that the problem is the government. This thing here is an indication that with a completely Democrat House and Senate and President, this is what happens. We triple this amount of deficit to the point now when the Federal Government spends \$1 today, 41 cents of that \$1 is borrowed.

Aside from this just insane level of spending money that we don't have, which is basically taxing our grandchildren—I have some grandchildren, I've gotten old enough, and I don't like the idea of taxing them any more than paying taxes myself.

My background is engineering and the manufacturing business. You know, this idea about unemployment is not that complicated. It is really very basic. Anybody who has tried to run a

little lemonade stand knows more or less how businesses work. What I have done, I have created a list that if you want to kill jobs, if you want to declare war on business in America, these are the things that you want to do to create unemployment. And the tragedy is we are doing all of the things that are well calculated to create unemployment.

Now, I guess the good news is that the jobs that would have been created here by American businesses and American ingenuity are simply going to be done in plants that are overseas, and so those jobs go to other countries. We will still use our intelligence. In my own city of St. Louis, we have a guy who is the president of Emerson Electric, it is a big company, and it has all kinds of divisions and it has all kinds of technology. They create tons of jobs. The president of Emerson says, Look, when you do all of these things to us, you are forcing us. We will still grow. Our stock will do well. We will create jobs, it just won't be jobs in the U.S., they will be somewhere else. So what do you do? If you think about this, it is not very complicated.

The first thing is, if you have a tremendous amount of uncertainty, you don't know what nutty thing the government is going to do next; if you're a businessman, you're going to say, I think I'm going to hunker down. I'm not going to make any big decisions because I'm not sure whether the last couple of dollars I have in reserve I am going to need for some other hare-brained idea that these guys in Washington come up with.

So if there is economic uncertainty of any kind, that is going to tend to undermine job creation. And then if there is a slowdown, that is what we have been seeing, that doesn't help because you don't have the orders coming in. And here is the big one, excessive taxation, because what President Obama has promised is that he is going to tax those people in the \$250,000 bracket. Well, I'm glad he is going to do that because I don't make that much money, so I don't need to worry, right. Oh, no, I do need to worry. I need to worry because the people who are making \$250,000, a lot of those are the guys owning these small businesses that make all of the jobs. And the guy who is making \$250,000, you say, I don't feel sorry for him. But you better, and here is why: because that guy is going to put that money back into his business to put a new wing on a building, put a new machine tool there, or develop a new process. Which is going to hire more people. So if you kill him, if you take all of his money away through excessive taxation, he won't invest in his business.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. You mentioned how our good friends on the other side of the aisle look to government as the solution to everything, and they do. They believe that Washington and government has a better answer. We sometimes get criticized for

saying government can't do anything. There are some things that government ought to be doing, but they ought not be owning banks, they ought not be owning automobile companies, they ought not be running our health care system, they ought not be deciding whether or not there is any risk at all in the market.

Our friends on the other side of the aisle believe that the government ought to control all of those things. And when they control all of those things, what happens is that you decrease all of the ingenuity and entrepreneurship and genius of the American people.

So what I like to say is, when you have big government, you have small citizens. When you have small government, you have big citizens. And we believe in big citizens as opposed to big government.

Checks and balances are what is necessary. You wouldn't have these kinds of crazy things going on up here in Washington if there were checks and balances here in the Federal Government. And the people across this land know that. They know that runaway government on either side, frankly, is not what they desire. So they look to Washington and say, My goodness, what the heck are they doing? We have to put some checks and balances in place.

Mr. AKIN. The President says here that families across the country are tightening their belts and making tough decisions, the Federal Government should do the same. Yes, we should do the same, but what are we doing? Let's take a look at the policies: Wall Street bailout, \$700 billion; stimulus package, another \$700 billion; then in this House we passed that goofy cap-and-tax bill which is going to put the government in charge of trying to reduce CO<sub>2</sub> in the country by making the Federal Government in charge of all of the building codes for houses. You can't even add an addition to your house without making sure that it is safe from a global warming point of view. And there goes another number of billions of dollars in taxes. And then, of course, socialized medicine that we just got done with, which is absolutely the biggest government takeover. It is one-sixth of the U.S. economy. The government can't run Medicare and Medicaid and keep them in the black, so what are we going to do, take over all of health care?

The families are tightening their belts, so what is the Federal Government going to do? They are just absolutely going to go on another spending spree. So what does that do? Excessive taxation. What's that do? It kills jobs. What does that do? It takes away freedom because it makes you little and Big Government big.

Here is a question for you. Thinking back about what phenomenon in all of human history should human beings be most concerned about, should it be the problem of war or should it be the

problem of Big Government? It is an interesting question. Why do we have this faith, why do the Democrats have this faith in Big Government? Is there anything historical to suggest that they are a solution or is it more to suggest that they are a problem.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. In the area of health care, which I know a little about, having practiced medicine for over 20 years, what we have seen is the intrusion of the Federal Government into the practice of medicine, into health care, is only destructive to all of the principles that we hold dear for health care.

So whether it is affordability, or accessibility, or quality, or the responsiveness of a system, or innovation, or choices, all of those kinds of things that we as Americans hold dear in health care, they all get destroyed with the Federal Government. You know that. That is what results in that kind of economic uncertainty for the businesses of health care.

I can't tell you how many letters I have received that have told me, from my colleagues, my former medical colleagues who, since the bill has been passed and signed into law—these are people in the prime of their career, those who are taking care of literally thousands of patients across this land—who have said, Look, with the oppression of the Federal Government at this point, I'm going to do one of three things. Either I am going to close my practice, I'm leaving, and that challenges the accessibility problem. Or I am going to limit the number of patients I see that have some type of government health care because of the intrusion. In fact, virtually all of us will have government health care when this crowd gets done with their plan. Or third, and something that you've touched on, which is the alternative for business-minded individuals in an economy like this where the politicians are picking the winners and losers: They are heading elsewhere. They are going offshore.

Mr. AKIN. A little island in the Caribbean, come on down. A big hospital and a landing strip.

□ 1700

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. There are actually hospitals being built in the Caribbean right now.

Mr. AKIN. In expectation of this thing. So what you are saying is really not very outlandish, from a common-sense point of view. It is not like you are speculating and saying this thing is not going to work.

We have seen European socialized medicine. We have next door the Canadian socialized medicine model. And I think it was about 10 years ago the head of Canada, their prime minister said, We have got the best health care system in the world, as long as you are healthy. It was that little "as long as you are healthy" piece that is the problem. If you are not healthy, you go down to America to get it taken care

of. So we have seen it not work in Europe.

I am a cancer survivor. I see what the cancer rate statistics are in England. I don't want to be a cancer guy in England. I wouldn't want to be a cancer guy here. So you see it hasn't worked in England, it hasn't worked in Canada, as well as our system currently works.

Then, of course, we saw Massachusetts and Tennessee take bold forays into this socialized medicine field, and they got hammered by it. So what do we do? We do the same dumb thing.

I was going to jump to something even more basic, though, if you think about it, and this was a statistic that kind of surprised me—some of them are in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—and that was the number of people that were killed by their own governments.

If you take a look, you know, at the good old communists. You look at Stalin, he basically had murdered about 40 million people. Now, he was pretty good at murdering people, but not nearly as good as Chairman Mao in China, who has credit for killing about 60 million Chinese.

Now, this is government-on-citizen crime. This was not a war. In fact, if you add just the people killed in various communist countries that killed their own population, the governments killing their own population, you have more people killed by just communism alone than all the wars in history since the time of Christ.

So the question is, is it really rational for human beings to put so much trust in government? That is not talking about Nazis or the other types of dictators that killed lots of their own citizens.

So why do we have this great faith in government, when we see it doesn't work for health care, yet we have the government in charge of that? We are putting government in charge of student loans and in charge of insurance for flooding, and we have got the Federal Government in charge of housing and in charge of education. We have got the Federal Government in charge of car companies, insurance companies and all.

Let's see, the Soviet Union, what was their model? The government was in charge of, well, let's see, education, health care, your house, your food and your job. It didn't work for them. Why do we want to do the same thing here?

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. It is very concerning. And I think that is exactly the picture that is being painted for folks all across this land and why they have the kind of frustration and anger and angst and anxiety about the future of their country. It is why they are saying, look, to Washington, are you not listening to us? Can you not hear us?

They know. They know that the government ought not to be owning banks. They know that the government ought not to be owning automobile companies. They know that the government ought not to be running health care.

And they know that not because it is just not right; they know it because it doesn't result in the highest quality of opportunities and choices and dreams realized for individuals.

Remember, big government, small citizen. Big government, small patient. Big government, small consumer. You've got small government, you've got big patients, you've got big citizens, you've got big consumers, and more dreams realized.

Mr. AKIN. And that is really what you are saying, is basically you are losing your freedom; a little bit here, a little bit here. You are losing your freedom, and pretty soon you feel frustrated, you feel angry, because you have some common sense, and you know what it takes to make jobs, and we are doing all the wrong things.

But there are so many people on the street, and they are looking to you, they are looking to me, to try to help turn this thing around and get jobs going. And, of course, we don't have enough votes to turn these policies around.

Another one of these things that is really tough on jobs is insufficient liquidity. What that means is that a business needs to be able to borrow money. But the banking regulators are so tight now that a lot of businessmen can't get the loans they need to make their business go.

Of course, excessive government spending, we have been talking about that, and excessive government mandates and red tapes. Boy, talk about that. And this health care bill, of course, is leading the charge and damaged all these areas. And the end result is what? Well, unemployment. Not a big surprise, particularly, because we are doing everything wrong.

And yet here is an interesting question. Apparently what is happening is Wall Street seems to be doing a lot better. Is it because we have turned these bad policies around and are doing the right thing in D.C.? No. We are still doing everything wrong, and yet Wall Street seems to be doing better. Well, what is the logic of that?

Well, you know, to some degree it goes back to that same problem that got us into this housing bubble, and that is the crack cocaine of the government Federal system. That is, they can create unlimited liquidity.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. And unlimited amounts of money is what that means.

Mr. AKIN. Unlimited amounts of money and very low interest rates. So you have got lots of money with very low interest rates, and it comes down and starts to create these bubbles. So we really haven't fixed the job problem.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. You are absolutely right. I think that is so important because when people look to the items that need to be fixed from a financial standpoint, they look and they see that Washington has had its hand in some things that have been very destructive.

Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, for example, are really at the epicenter of the challenges that we have had in the economy. And the bill that is being proposed and the bill that came through the House earlier to assist in "fixing" things, their solution doesn't address Fannie and Freddie at all, which is so frustrating because the American people know that there are positive solutions. And you with the Republican Study Committee, we have been working diligently on putting forward those positive solutions to all of the challenges that we face that embrace those fundamental American principles.

So whether it is health care, whether it is energy, whether it is the economy, whether it is jobs, all of those things have fundamental principal solutions that don't require putting the government in charge.

Mr. AKIN. You are absolutely right, and it doesn't involve the government taking everything over.

We're going to take a break and yield because I believe there is some business that needs to be taken care of.

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5019, HOME STAR ENERGY RETROFIT ACT OF 2010

Ms. MATSUI, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 111-475) on the resolution (H. Res. 1329) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5019) to provide for the establishment of the Home Star Retrofit Rebate Program, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

#### WHAT GOT US INTO THIS ECONOMIC MESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri may proceed.

Mr. AKIN. Mr. Speaker, we are just taking apart a little bit some of what has been happening the last couple of years, why the economy has been struggling some, and why we are having a lot of unemployment and problems. Some people have a hard time understanding why it is that we are having a hard time. This little cartoon kind of comes along the same lines.

"Now, give me one reason why you are not hiring." And you have coming into the China shop a couple of bulls. You have the health care reform and the cap-and-tax and the war on business tax. That is basically businesses getting just hammered with taxes.

Of course, the picture here is we are not doing the right things that we need to be doing to keep the economy going and to create jobs. In fact, we are creating a perfect storm. People have said we have a war going on business, and we really do. We are doing everything wrong to try to create jobs and try to get the economy going.

So, on the one hand, we are making the statement here that families across

the country are tightening their belts and making tough decisions. The Federal Government has got to do the same. What is the Federal Government doing? Oh, we are doing the Wall Street bailout, we are doing the stimulus bill, we are doing the cap-and-tax bill, we are doing the socialized medicine bill. And now we are proposing institutionalizing bailouts, so that anytime anything goes wrong, the Federal Government takes your tax dollars and goes in and picks the winners and losers and bails companies out. That is exactly the wrong message.

I am joined by a good friend of mine from the wonderful State of Pennsylvania, and I would yield to him just a moment to share along the same line.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Well, I thank my good friend from Missouri for leading this very important Special Order where we are talking about jobs.

You know, I don't want to misquote, I believe it was President Reagan—I will give him credit at this point anyway—that made the statement that the best welfare program there is is a job.

Mr. AKIN. Get him a job, yes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Give him a job. And that is what we have not been doing.

Mr. AKIN. Do you think people want to be bailed out? Do you think people want their unemployment to be extended? Would they rather be sitting being unemployed, or would they rather have a good job with really good prospects and a bright future? I think people would rather have a strong economy.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. I think so, too. I talked with a constituent of mine from Lock Haven, Pennsylvania, today, and he was calling to talk about the unemployment because he has been without a job. And as we got talking, it was very clear that what he wanted was not so much the unemployment check, but he really wants a job. We got talking about the things that go into that and why we are not seeing the job growth. We are still bleeding to death in terms of our jobs in this country.

As I go around the district and I talk with job creators, the job creators are, I think as you know, our small business owners. The large majority of work is provided through small businesses.

Mr. AKIN. The gentleman is right. I think, if I recall, if you take 500 employees or less, that is 80 percent of the jobs in America. So 500 employees or less, which 500 is kind of more of a medium size, but 500 down, that is 80 percent of U.S. employment. So policies that affect those small businesses are a big deal in terms of jobs.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. They are. And I heard you use the word "uncertainty." I guess I kind of fall back on my health care background, and when it comes to jobs in this country, my diagnosis is we have a psychological problem. We have a total lack