

And speaking of the Wall Street reform, every House Republican voted “no.” The great collapse of the American economy caused by Wall Street excesses. Republicans stood with Wall Street; the Democrats stood for reform.

The American Jobs and Closing Tax Loopholes Act passed by the House and Senate; 90 percent of the Republicans voted “no.” Small business, Republicans voted “no.”

The Home Star Energy Retrofit Act, how we can improve the efficiency of our homes and put thousands of people to work; 93 percent of the Republicans voted “no.”

The COMPETES Act, creating an educated workforce. You and I worked on this in the Science and Technology Committee. So what do the Republicans do? They voted “no.” This is the law that gives us science and technology education, gives us the resources, the research for the next generation, on and on and on.

We need policies that move the manufacturing of America, that put Californians, New Yorkers, Ohioans, Minnesotans, Wisconsin and every other State, those people need to go back to work. The jobs program, the innovation programs, the manufacturing programs, those are Democratic agenda items. We vote them out of this House, the Republicans vote “no” on them, and then it goes over to the Senate where the power of one Senator, usually a Republican, has stalled it all.

We are not finished. We have just begun. We are going to put America back to work. We are going to make it in America, and Americans will make it. That's our agenda. That's what we are all about, and we are going to see that it gets done.

I want to thank my colleagues and thank you for joining us this evening. For the American people, we thank you for your attention.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, American Manufacturing has long been the pride of our Nation and the core of our success. American cars, textiles, steel, aircraft, timber and other industries formed a secure base from which we could provide for our own, with quality materials and support for a strong export economy. However, the erosion of this manufacturing base, with more jobs going overseas, through trade policies and our own government failing to “Buy American,” has led us to a point of crisis.

We are taking steps to right this ship and return us to a place of strength in manufacturing. H.R. 4380, the U.S. Manufacturing Enhancement Act, MTB, is one of the most important actions Congress can take to preserve and expand good American jobs. H.R. 4380 cut the costs of doing business in the United States and boost American manufacturing exports. U.S. manufacturers large and small can use the MTB's tariff suspension provisions to obtain raw materials, proprietary inputs and other products that are not available in our Nation. This reinvestment is critical, as the manufacturing sector has been disproportionately harmed by this recession. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, manufacturing

employment has fallen by 2.1 million jobs since December of 2007.

I also strongly support Representative LIPINSKI's bill to establish a Manufacturing Strategy Board and Task Force with a goal of focusing more attention on manufacturing and coordinating government's efforts to ensure our Nation's competitiveness. The manufacturing sector generates two-thirds of our exports and employs millions of Americans. Equally as important is our ability to support our national defense and to sustain American infrastructure with American products. If we are going to improve our manufacturing base we must back our words with a step-by-step plan and solid goals to reach our vision of a return to the solid American manufacturing base.

This manufacturing strategy goes hand in hand with the newly-formed Buy American Caucus, of which I am a member, that focuses Congressional efforts to promote American jobs; reclaim American leadership in manufacturing; support small businesses; and close loopholes in current law to ensure that the federal government is purchasing American-made products.

Regardless of political party, we must work together as Americans to invest in our country's long term future and create high-paying jobs. Right now, American men and women who are willing to work are still having trouble finding jobs. As Members of Congress, we owe it to our constituents to ensure that jobs created with the assistance of government funding are American jobs and that the benefits go to the American people.

We must inspire continued demand for American products to create a rebirth of our state and nation as the manufacturing world leader. This effort must start with buying American products here at home, especially by Federal agencies, followed by a well thought-out strategy and all the small steps we can take to lower the costs of manufacturing in the U.S. I encourage the Administration and the Congress to press forward to require a national manufacturing strategy and to institute Buy American policies wherever and whenever possible.

□ 1800

#### THE ECONOMY

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

Mr. AKIN. Good afternoon, Mr. Speaker, and good afternoon, friends. This evening we're going to continue in the discussion which has been ongoing.

We've just been treated to a whole series of wonderful promises and all the wonderful things the Democrat Party is going to do for America and how we've created all these jobs and we're doing this and that and the other thing. The only problem is, it's not working.

Now, Republicans, and myself particularly here on the floor, talked a year ago about the proposals to create jobs and what the Democrats were going to do with the economy, and we said it's not going to work. It's not

that we're being naysayers; it's just that we understand how the economy works and the fact that the proposals that have been made don't work. The American public is starting to understand that they don't work because unemployment is still very, very high, much higher than the numbers actually show because after somebody has been looking for a job for a year, they're taken off the unemployment list. So when you see 10 percent or 9.5 percent unemployment, the actual number, because the people who are not counted, who are not working, is far higher.

I think it's helpful to go back and just understand some basic things about economics. I was dazzled, I was amazed Monday of this week as I was going through the airport and I saw our President talking and accusing Republicans in the Senate of being hypocrites—I think “hypocrite” was the word he was using—in the fact that they didn't want to continue people's unemployment. You know, the thing that strikes me as being odd is to have a whole series of policies that are well calculated to get rid of private sector jobs and then be surprised at the fact that there aren't any jobs. And you don't have to really be a wizard in economics to understand that the policies of the last 18 months have killed jobs. In fact, there are Democrats that understand that. We're going to talk about one here in just a minute.

I'd like to go back to 2003, when George Bush was President. I want to go back to September 11 of 2003, which was the date of an article that appeared in The New York Times, not exactly a conservative newspaper. This article said, The Bush administration today recommended the most significant regulatory overhaul in the housing finances industry since the savings and loan crisis a decade ago. So here's 2003, the Bush administration says something is wrong with Freddie and Fannie. What's wrong with Freddie and Fannie? Oh, they lost \$1 billion here or there. Well, you're not supposed to do that. Economically it's considered a little sloppy on the books.

Well, how did that happen? Well, it happened because of the fact that we had created a bunch of laws which said that you have to, if you're a bank, make loans to people who can't afford to pay the loans. Now, I suppose this might have been sold as compassion at one time, but somehow to me it seems like to put anybody in a loan that they can't afford is certainly not compassionate and is not a wise thing to do. But anyway, we did that over a long period of time, the idea being to get more and more Americans to own their own homes, which is nice if they can afford it.

Well, what happened, under the last year of Clinton's administration they increased the percentage of the loans that had to be made that people couldn't afford to make. And what happened also at the same time, the Federal Reserve dropped the interest rate

to almost zero and so there was this huge housing bubble starting up. Houses got more and more and more valuable and people could buy a house, get a loan from someone saying you don't have to make any down payment and you don't have to make any payments at all for 3 years. So you could let the government finance this new big house you built, and 3 years later it might have come close to doubling and you could sell it and just pyramid your money. It was a great deal as long as the music didn't stop.

Well, President Bush said we need to have more Federal authority in Freddie and Fannie. Freddie and Fannie are quasi-public, quasi-private companies. And so what happened over this period of time is that Freddie and Fannie essentially went bankrupt. And when they did, boy did it hit the fan. So we are going to see, this is what Bush was saying he wanted to do. Here was the response of some of my Democrat friends. If they were so good at economics, they wouldn't have gotten it this far wrong.

Here it is: Freddie and Fannie are not facing any kind of financial crisis. Oh, they're not facing a financial crisis, huh? Okay. Who is this? This is Congressman FRANK, who is now in charge of fixing this problem, which he hasn't fixed yet. These two entities, Freddie and Fannie, are not facing any kind of financial crisis. They've got plenty of lobbyists with plenty of money to slop around on Capitol Hill, so we kind of like them. The more people exaggerate these problems, the more pressure there is on these companies, the less we'll see in terms of affordable housing. Interesting. They're not in any kind of financial problem, huh? They brought the entire world economic system down because of these policies.

Now, people had the gall to say that free enterprise doesn't work. My goodness, it wasn't free enterprise when people are forced to make loans that they can't afford to pay. The loans were then cut and sliced in pieces and sold all over the world. So everybody had these things, and there was no market anymore for them. And so we were called in in Congress a number of years ago, a couple of years ago—not quite 2 years—and told, hey, you've got to do this big bailout, \$700 billion you've got to give to get the economy back in line. Why? Because of the fact that we didn't manage this thing correctly.

Now, the interesting thing is, now with the economy going bad, the Democrats in power, with that going on, they came up with how to fix the economy. We're going to talk about that and why it is that—it's not that we're mean spirited, we're just saying mechanically, economically, it won't work.

I'm joined tonight by a very fine Congressman from the State of Georgia. I think he may be the newest Congressman from the State of Georgia and just did very well in his election the other

day. I think he's got one more election to go, and he'll be down here more permanently. But we're delighted to have Congressman GRAVES from the great State of Georgia. And I don't remember exactly where your district is. Could you give a little intro about where your district is?

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Sure. I am from Georgia's Ninth Congressional District, which is north Georgia, north Georgia mountains, a beautiful part of the State.

Mr. AKIN. That's God's country up there. Is that the Blue Ridge Mountains?

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Yes, Blue Ridge. The city of Blue Ridge is part of the district. And I live in the small town of Ranger, a little bitty town, a little farm community.

Mr. AKIN. How close is that to the Chattooga River?

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. To the Chattooga River.

Mr. AKIN. That's about an hour or two drive from Atlanta.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Yes, that's not far away at all, you're right.

Mr. AKIN. My brother is a "rambling wreck from Georgia Tech." He used to go kayaking on the Chattooga and got up into that country. It's a beautiful area, and I think the citizens from up there are wise to have elected you, Congressman. We enjoyed a conversation last week on the floor.

I'd like you to jump in if you'd like to about how this whole thing is going. I was coming through the airport on Monday, and I heard the President screaming and yelling at Republicans about the fact that we didn't want to continue year after year after year paying people for not working and screaming at us that we're insensitive to the job situation. And I'm thinking, this guy has done more to destroy jobs in America than anybody in the history of the country just about, and he has the gall to say that.

And it made me think, it's so simple, I don't see how people can miss it. If you hammer businesses, then you're not going to have jobs. If you destroy companies, then there are not going to be jobs because jobs come from companies. And if you hate companies and you hate the private sector, then how are you going to have jobs? So how can you, with a straight face, complain about jobs when you're trying to destroy the companies that make the jobs? It seems sort of straightforward to me. I don't even know how to explain it any simpler than that. Please join us.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Well, what you're addressing is free market capitalism. We know it works, and America was founded on that. And the fact that the administration today continues this crazy level of spending and then blames businesses for not hiring—and we've heard about hope and change and saved and created jobs, all these different theories out there. But the one theory we know they're using right

now is that Keynesian theory of economics, and that is, the infusion of money through the government into choices of their own.

So they're spreading that wealth that we all know that they said they would not do, but spreading wealth. And where does that money come from? Where does that wealth come from that's being spread? It's coming from the citizens of the United States, the taxpayers themselves, the small business owners.

So if we're going to turn this economy around, we've got to apply a new theory of economics, the supply side theory of economics—free markets, capitalism, competition, all those things that just energize the economy. That's what I look forward to, a new governing majority here in Congress that is going to bring free market and capitalism back to the United States.

□ 1810

Mr. AKIN. Well, I'll tell you something. I sometimes wish the Democrats would just learn from themselves and from their own mistakes, you know, because here is a guy, Henry Morgenthau, who was a contemporary of little Lord Keynes, and he tries this idea. I think it is the equivalent of, if you're from Texas, having those boots with the loops in the back, and you reach down and grab those loops and lift hard and try to fly around the room.

The theory is, if the government spends enough money, the economy is going to get better. Now, if any father of a family in this country did something as stupid as that, they'd probably lock him up and put a little white suit on him, you know? To think that if you're in trouble economically that what you should do is go out and spend a ton of money—I mean maybe the theory is to spend a whole ton of money, eat, live and be merry because tomorrow we die, but as an overall theory of economics, this is really silly.

They tried it. FDR tried it. This is this guy, Morgenthau, who has come back after 8 years, after taking a recession and turning it into a Great Depression. This wasn't just harming free enterprise and companies. Literally, those companies closed their doors. It wasn't that they were just sort of hunkered down. It wasn't that they were just sort of lean and waiting for better times. They closed the doors and stopped the businesses. So this is what he said. In Congress, he said this:

We have tried spending money. We are spending money, more than we have ever spent before, and it doesn't work.

I wish the Democrats could just listen to their own people. It doesn't work.

He says: After 8 years of the administration, we have just as much unemployment as when we started and an enormous debt to boot.

This is Henry Morgenthau.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Was that in 2010? It sounds like today, doesn't it?

You know, it's interesting you bring that up because that's what we're dealing with here in the Congress. What the Senate is voting on, whether today or tomorrow, is the extension of unemployment benefits, right?

Mr. AKIN. Right.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. If the policies of the Obama administration were working so well and if they were saving and creating so many jobs, then why do we need to extend unemployment benefits? Doesn't it seem like an admission to the fact that it doesn't work, that they are failed policies?

Mr. AKIN. That's why I said I have a hard time understanding how you do this with a straight face.

We've just heard of all these fantastic Democrat programs that are working fantastically, that are going along, and everything is fine. Yet we're saying, But we've got this little problem of no jobs. So the government spent even more money, and instead of understanding the nature of Americans—that “can do” spirit that makes America such a special place—and instead of trying to set a system up where people can have jobs and bites at the American dream, we say, “No, we're just going to pay you not to work.”

You know, that's kind of degrading to people.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. You hit on the solution, which is, if we empower the American people—empower the taxpayer, empower the business owners—they will drive us through these tough economic days without any problem because of that entrepreneurial spirit, that “can do” spirit, that grit, that willingness to dig deep and to work hard. We know that has pulled us through so many challenging days. You know, what we've heard for the last couple days—I've heard and I'm sure you have—is the Democrats blaming a previous administration over and over and over.

Mr. AKIN. Oh, man. It wasn't just the Bush administration that brought Hurricane Katrina. It brought every bad thing that ever happened in the whole world.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. They failed to take responsibility for the fact that they took the majority in 2006, that they swore in their very own Speaker in 2007 and yet failed to take responsibility for the actions with the unemployment and with the job losses that we see today. Just blame it on someone else, a previous administration.

Mr. AKIN. You know, there is one thing that is awful hard to argue with—just the plain numbers.

In this year of 2008, Bush was President, but NANCY PELOSI was Speaker of the House. This was the worst spending year of the Bush administration. Did the Bush administration spend too much money? I would say, as a conservative, yes, he did.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Well, let me ask you this.

Mr. AKIN. \$459 billion right here.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Well, where does spending originate? We have branches of government, right? We have three of them.

Mr. AKIN. Right.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. I believe spending and allocation of appropriations originates in the House of Representatives, not in the executive branch, but in the House of Representatives.

Mr. AKIN. Right.

In 2008, that was Bush's worst year—\$459 billion. Now take a look at the first Obama year. I mean talk about a runaway deficit. This cannot continue without the Nation's literally falling apart economically. So what you are seeing is the result of this incredible level of Federal spending, and its effect is very corrosive to jobs.

So how is it that you can say, “Oh, Republicans don't want to keep paying people for not working, and they don't care about unemployment”? It's like you guys are the ones who are doing everything possible to create the unemployment.

I am joined by my good friend, Congressman BISHOP, if you would like to join us.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Thank you.

I am actually very honored to be here with two friends who are talking about the significant problems we have in this country—simply, the lack of jobs. As we all know, government does not create jobs, but government can create a policy to discourage jobs, and that is specifically where we are today.

If I could, I'll just go in a slightly different direction from where the two of you have headed so far.

Mr. AKIN. Yes.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I have my good friend here—the newest Member from the good State of Georgia, so we've got a good southerner here. We have somebody from the Midwest, and I am actually from the West. With all due respect, I think my part of the Nation is taking a bigger hit in this economy, because of government decisions, than are the others. The unemployment rate in the West is actually higher than any other section in this country.

Mr. AKIN. Wow. Why is that?

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. It has been that way for the last 12 months. So, somewhere, somebody has to figure out what is unique about my State and about our area in the West that has given us this wonderful distinction of having the best joblessness in the Nation for well over a year.

I think, obviously, there are a number of causes, but it is also, I think we can say for a certainty, that many of the new policies and regulations that have been adopted during this administration, coming out of Washington, are flat out not helping when we could be unleashing economic upturn as well as providing domestic energy independence for this country, which is a boon to economic development. Yet we're doing the exact opposite.

Let me show you three charts, if I could, simply to illustrate.

You know, every time I come here, I rant about the amount of public lands that we have. The Federal Government owns 650 million acres. That means that 1 out of every 3 acres in this country is now owned by the Federal Government. Unfortunately, in my area—the West—1 out of every 2 acres is owned by the Federal Government.

For example—and this is a different chart than I have used before—if the amount of land owned in the West by the Federal Government were owned in the East, that is how much area, the area in blue, would be owned and operated and controlled by the Federal Government. If, on the other hand, we in the West had as much land owned by the Federal Government as you out in the East—and by that, I mean everything east of the Rocky Mountains, that is how much of our territory would be controlled.

So, obviously, there is a unique element there, which simply means, of the 12 States that have had the slowest growth in their economies, the biggest joblessness increase—and I hate to say that—then 6 of those 12 are in the West. Georgia gets in there. I'm sorry. I didn't leave you out. Six of those 12 have to be found in the West.

If you want to go one step further and look at the 20 largest counties with 25,000 or more inhabitants, counties which have the highest unemployment and joblessness rates, of those 20, 19 of the 20 are found in the West. You have to go down to number 20 before you finally have somebody—in this case, it's Michigan—that breaks through with a higher unemployment rate than Western counties have.

So I am going to make the contention that there is a reason the West has been hit very hard in what I simply like to refer to as an “inexplicable war on the West.” I think the numbers bear it out, and part of it is because of policies. Without taking too much of your time, let me just list off a couple, a slew, of some of those administrative decisions.

Mr. AKIN. Well, I am really interested in what you're going to say because it seems to me that there is a war on Missouri going on and a war on free enterprise going on, but I didn't know about the war on the West, so I am all ears. Please.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Well, we'll all join in the battalion because we are all faced with the results of these decisions.

Let me just check off a couple of things that have happened in the West that have destroyed jobs in the West.

Obviously, in my State, the first thing this administration did is cancel 77 oil and gas leases in the State of Utah, but what we don't know is they have also halted scheduled oil and gas lease sales in Montana, South Dakota, and North Dakota. Wyoming, because of the climate of this administration, only is able to lease about 5 percent of the leases that are put on bid because of what we are doing here.

This administration banned uranium mining permits in the State of Arizona. They put multiple restrictions on oil shale development causes.

In California, they blocked water that goes to ranchers in the central valleys there. So, in some communities in California, up to 40 percent of those agricultural communities are now faced with unemployment. This administration tried to provide \$400 million in stimulus to that area. Well, it's sad. They didn't need to do that. All they needed to do was to turn the water on, and it's free. Unfortunately, much of that stimulus money went to districts that voted to keep the water turned off, which created the unemployment in the first place.

I spoke to the economic development director from the State of Utah, who is in charge of tourism and movies. The West is a great set for lots of movies, but one of the problems the movie industry is facing in the West is, when you go on government lands, the permitting process to just go on there and do this clean energy of companies is taking so long that we basically don't have the situation taking place.

Mr. AKIN. So wait. Now you're really making a case. What I'm hearing you saying is there is a systematic series of decisions which literally creates unemployment. They are government decisions. It is worse in the West because the government controls more of the West, and those decisions systematically destroy jobs while the President comes on and, with a straight face, says that Republicans are hypocrites because of the fact that we don't want to keep paying people for not working.

□ 1820

It just amazes me.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Let me throw a couple more statistics at you, and then I want to do some dialoguing here because the numbers are good, but we have to put them in context eventually.

This administration is always big about saying, well, we need to have alternative energy sources to help our economy grow. I think we need to have all kinds of energy sources. But the Chamber of Commerce has identified 380 renewable energy projects that have been blocked or stalled over the past 4 years. The total cost of those stalled projects is \$560 billion in lost economic activity and approximately a quarter of a million jobs that were not allowed simply because—it doesn't matter whether we're talking about fossil fuels or wind power or solar power or nuclear power—we're not doing anything to develop new energy sources.

Western Energy Alliance did a survey to find out what would be taking place in the West, these areas that I'm saying have been heavily hit. Seventy-four percent of the respondents to the survey by the Western Energy Alliance said their companies are downsizing capital investment in the Rocky Moun-

tain area. That's \$1.1 billion of investment that has been shifted from the Rocky Mountains to other parts, simply because of the inability of the government to try and help us to develop energy sources. That is \$2.8 billion in infrastructure that would have come into the West and has not.

And it has a ripple effect. If you stop an oil lease or a gas lease or a wind power project or a solar power project in the West, you also stop projects that are on private lands abutting that area, and you stop the need of having truckers bring the equipment in and bring people in. And then you lose the mechanics jobs, and you lose the jobs from the hotel industry where they are surfaced.

Ninety percent of the respondents say that their company will continue to divert investment in the Rockies until there is a change in the regulatory process.

We don't have to have this joblessness. This government is creating it by policies that are not intended to build jobs but actually prevent jobs from being created.

I yield back.

Mr. AKIN. The question I have is: How does the President think he can get away with doing this? I mean, all of these people that work in these different companies, when those decisions are made and they get rid of jobs—we were doing the same thing, weren't we, with telling people they couldn't drill for oil in the gulf? Didn't that put lots of people out of work? I don't understand why people don't see that and realize that you can't have a war on private business in America and, at the same time, say you're worried about jobs, because it seems like, to me, people get jobs in businesses. And if you destroy businesses—of course, their concept of jobs is, We'll hire more people for the census workers, I suppose.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. If I might interject real quick here, and I'm going to have to leave the conversation in a few minutes, but what we've seen for over 12 months now is unemployment at, what, 9.5 percent, and we've heard a lot about saving and creating jobs. We've seen a lot of bailouts, buyouts, stimuluses, cash for clunkers, financial reform, TARP 1, 2, and I'm sure there will be many more. The fact is they're not working.

But we're going into January of this year and taxes are going to go up on every citizen of the United States. Every tax bracket will be raised. Capital gains will go up. The dividend tax will go up. Inheritance tax goes up. The marriage tax goes up as well.

And I'm curious, how does this administration, how does the leadership of this House face the American people this November and say that is going to create jobs, that's going to get you back to work? Taxing you more to fund failed programs of the last 12 months is going to get you back to work. I don't know how they're going to do it.

But I'm going to stand before my constituents with a positive message

and let them know that there are men like you and me and others in this Chamber that are going to stand up daily and stand up and put forth positive solutions to get this country back on track. And we're going to get it back on track, but it's going to take a lot of work, and it's going to take pushing government out of the way and empowering the American people to once again dream and dream big.

Mr. AKIN. That is such a refreshing breath, or a little breeze anyway. We're hoping it will be even more refreshing in November.

But what you're saying is, and the bottom line is, the government is not the thing that creates the jobs. And what we've seen is, for 18 months, a policy that says the government is going to take over everything. They fired the President of General Motors. They're going to take over insurance companies. They're going to take over banks. They've decided not only are they going to take over the insurance of flood insurance, they're going to take over the loans for students. They're going to take over whatever it is, one-sixth of the economy with their socialized medicine.

If they could have, they wanted to take over the energy sector with their cap-and-tax bill, which would do nothing for global warming except for more taxes and more big bureaucratic government. And the solution to every problem is more taxes and more government, and they don't learn from the people, from their own party. You know, JFK understood that you've got to back off on taxes.

I thank you very much, gentleman, for joining us, the Congressman from—Mr. GRAVES District, I think it's the Ninth District of Georgia, and really a fine addition here. And I appreciate the fact you have some business sense and some common sense, because America really needs to get back on that.

And I also appreciate my good friend, Congressman BISHOP from Utah. We'll get back to him in just a minute. But the talk about it was the largest tax increase in history. This is the dumbest thing in the world to do when you have a bad economy and no jobs. JFK understood what to do. He cut taxes and cut government spending.

And what are we doing? We've got the largest tax increase in history coming up here. Those paying 10 percent will pay 15 percent. Those paying 25 will pay 28. Those paying 28 will pay 31; 33 goes to 36; 35 goes to 39. That's the biggest tax increase in the history of our country. It's exactly the wrong thing to do.

It's not that we're being naysayers. It's not that we're being critical. It's just that it won't work. And the solutions are straightforward. What you want to do, you want to cut spending and you want to cut taxes.

And here, this is this wonderful recovery plan. The Democrats said, if you vote for this \$800 billion jobs bill, if you vote that, this is what's going to

happen is this blue line. They said, if you don't vote for it, this light blue line is what's going to happen. You could have unemployment as high as 9 percent if you don't vote for us spending \$800 billion, supposedly get the economy back and going.

And so, on a strictly party line vote, the Democrats put in their nifty plan, and here's what happened, actual unemployment. And they're saying the economy is so good and so strong that we now need to extend people's unemployment benefits. There's something about that that just doesn't add up.

My good friend from Utah.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. And I appreciate that. I think if you keep—I don't know if they can keep the cameras on that particular chart, but it is a telling chart. And it's one of the things that I think you are trying to say, that we have yet to learn lessons from history.

It is very clear that we are trying with the stimulus bill, a few of the other bills, right now, creating jobs by having tax-funded jobs being created. Unfortunately, that's a sector that's growing, but that's not a sector that will continue and build and has a multiplier effect in the economy. To do that, you have to have the private sector involved.

I hate to say this, but when we went into the Great Depression, there was the history. We'd already learned after the end of World War I how lowering tax rates actually increased the amount of revenue and spurred the economy. Same thing you mentioned also that took place in the 1960s that President Kennedy clearly understood, and it's happened several other times in the history of this country.

But at the beginning of the Depression, there were many people within the business community who had money to invest in business that could have spurred the economy, created jobs, and grown our economy out of the Depression. But they did not invest that money, primarily because they were afraid of what the tax and regulatory policies of the government would do, and, therefore, they simply sat on it. That's what happened as part of the problems we had in the Depression. People with investment opportunities did not do so.

Unfortunately, I think we find ourselves in that same situation.

□ 1830

The future tax policies, and you just mentioned we don't know what will happen at the end of this year, but it could be catastrophic in raising taxes. But in addition to the regulatory policies that we have placed in effect, the effort of the continuous deficit spending that we have done, all of those have added to a portion of unrest within the business community and it simply says, "I'm going to wait to see where I'm going to invest to see what actually happens eventually." That is why the government doesn't actually create jobs, but the government policies can

destroy the ability for those jobs to be created at the same time.

So I appreciate what my good colleagues have been saying, because it is true. Our regulatory policies and our tax policies have created so much nervousness within the system, we are not doing that which could encourage a multiplier effect within our economy, and that is exactly what we need at this particular time.

Mr. AKIN. So what we have seen, according to what you're saying, is very clear. First of all, you've got the tremendous, tremendous level of spending, which is exactly the wrong thing. And what is happening with that tremendous level of spending, you're getting what you would expect, you're getting a lot of unemployment, and that's making it worse and worse.

As you do that spending, of course, we have a question of who owns our debt. In 1970, the foreign debt holdings were 5 percent. It doesn't seem like 1970 was so long ago to me. In 1990, 20 years later, foreign holdings had gone from 5 to 19 percent. Now 2010, another 20 years later, total foreign debt is now 47 percent. Those are not numbers that make people who understand business and understand economics comfortable with where we are in this country.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Before you actually put that chart down, I think you understated that sentiment. It's not just people who understand business are not comfortable with that. I don't understand business and I look at that chart and I'm not comfortable with that. Any normal American would look at that and say something is desperately wrong with what we are doing.

Mr. AKIN. What we have is foreigners basically bailing us out. As long as they're willing to do that. But pretty soon they're going to say, if you want us to bail you out some more, you're going to have to pay me more interest. And boy, it's going to be a problem then.

This is a comparison. Sometimes it's helpful because when you start talking about billions and trillions of dollars, you say, man, the only thing I can understand is a hundred or a thousand dollars. And so here we are compared to other countries. This is deficit as a percent of gross domestic product. This is the United States here. We are third only to Spain and the United Kingdom in terms of our deficit. The United States is third only to Greece and Italy.

You take a look at these European countries, and they're not just in nifty economic shape. In fact, I heard a statistic today, I don't know if you had heard this before, gentleman, but I was told that if you take a look at what we call the poverty level in America, a person in America living at the poverty level is doing better than a person in the middle of the middle class in Europe. That's what socialism buys you.

I will say that again. A person at the poverty level in America is doing better economically, right at the poverty

level line, than somebody who is a middle class person, an average middle class person in Europe. That says that all of this Keynesian socialistic stuff is terribly inefficient. And here we go right down the line trying to imitate the examples of Greece and Italy and the United Kingdom with the fact that we're just overspending radically.

We go back to this thing. It just seems like, I've talked about this a lot of weeks, you've joined me, and this isn't that complicated. There are things that kill jobs. One of them is excessive taxation. When the government takes too much money, the people that have the businesses can't invest because they're giving their money away. So what are you going to do? You tax all the well-to-do people. It's well-to-do people who own the businesses. You can't have it both ways. If you want to destroy the businesses, you're not going to have any jobs. It can only be one of two ways.

Insufficient liquidity. We have the wrong laws in terms of that policy. You have just given us an incredible example of red tape and government mandates just destroying the job market out west. Those are amazing numbers.

Did your office pull those numbers together, gentleman?

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Actually some of them we did, but the one especially about renewable energy products, the 380 renewable energy products that have not been allowed to go forward, which would be another quarter of a million jobs and \$500 billion in economic input, that was done by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. That actually happens to be nationwide; not just in the West.

Mr. AKIN. Wow.

And then, of course, the economic uncertainty as you're saying. When you see the government taking over the auto industry and the insurance industry and then going to take over the health care industry, that makes people that understand economics very uncertain. They're not going to put a lot of money into trying to create jobs. They'll make jobs. There's a president of a company in St. Louis called Emerson Electric. Emerson Electric says, we'll make jobs; we're just not going to make them in the United States because we can't afford to.

We have created a set of policies that are so toxic, we have done so well with this list of job killers and doing every one of these things very well that he said, Yeah, we'll create jobs, but they're going to be in foreign countries because we can't afford to do business in this country because we've made the environment so toxic.

And yet we talk about saying, oh, my goodness, we've got unemployment, we've done all this wonderful stuff, but now we've still got to do more to help the unemployment, if what we're doing was so wonderful.

Take a look at these policies. Sometimes a picture is worth a thousand

words. Here we have the President saying, "Now give me one good reason why you're not hiring." You've got the government taking over health care, the cap-and-trade, the global warming thing, and all these other taxes that are coming along. As it turns out, health care has got a lot more hidden taxes than we realized in it.

Here's the poor shop owner of the china shop with these bulls marching around; he feels like hiding behind his desk here because of the fact that we just can't seem to understand some very, very basic economics.

Here is what we're doing. One of the big killers, of course, is tax increases. These are the corporate tax rates across the entire world. You see the green line over there, it says the United States has the second highest corporate tax rate. We say, gosh, I can't figure out why we don't have more jobs. But look at what we're doing. It's foolish policy.

And then you can take a look at the largest tax increase that we're looking at starting in 2011 unless Congress acts. Married people; the standard deduction is going to be changed.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Would the gentleman from Missouri simply restate what that first line in black actually means. Unless Congress acts, taxes will go up.

Mr. AKIN. Yes.

Well, if you recall, in 2001, the Republicans inherited a recession. So they had to do something about it. As President Bush was running for office the first time, he said, what we've got to do is cut taxes and cut spending. So what they did was we cut taxes three different times in different ways. Those taxes, because of the way the Senate worked, they were going to go along until 2011, so it was a 10-year tax cut. At 2011, the taxes were going to revert back to the way they were at 2001 when we were in the middle of a big recession.

So we did those tax cuts, particularly a tax cut in 2003 or so, and that was dividends and capital gains. What that did by cutting those things, we allowed those businessmen to invest in their own business. And we saw employment jump up. We saw the economy jump up. And ironically by cutting taxes, the Federal Government raised more money than they had when the taxes were higher. And that worked fine.

So now with the economy in the pits, what we're going to do is raise these taxes, which is just plain crazy. I don't know how long we have to stand on the floor and say, look, the idea of continuing to spend and tax is not what's going to create jobs.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. So what the gentleman is telling me is that if Congress does nothing, there will automatically be a marriage penalty increase. Child deductions will go down. There will be another death tax increase. There will be a capital gains tax increase; a dividend tax increase. Unless we do something proactive, it will automatically happen.

Mr. AKIN. That's correct.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. And so far we're a half a year away from the deadline and we have yet to do anything proactive about it.

Mr. AKIN. Not only have we failed to do anything proactive, but the Democrats have made it absolutely clear that they will not renew these tax cuts. They're not going to do this. So we know that we're going to end up with the biggest tax increase in our history right on top of this huge unemployment and a recession going on. This is not wise.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. While you're there, if the gentleman wouldn't mind for just a minute, let me talk about another concept of taxes which I don't think many people are aware. These are things that will automatically happen. But there are bills that will be coming to the floor sometime soon that deal with tax increases on our form of energy production.

Now one of those things listed in there in the cost of doing business is also the cost of energy that takes place. There is a bill that passed the Natural Resources Committee, it's called the CLEAR Act, which purportedly dealt with what is happening in the Gulf of Mexico which is a terrible crisis and needs to be changed in some way.

□ 1840

But deep within the bowels of this bill is a \$2 per gallon tax increase on all oil produced in the Gulf of Mexico, and a 40 cents I think it's per trillion cubic feet of natural gas that will be produced in the Gulf of Mexico. And one would assume, if we are dealing with the Gulf of Mexico, that money could be for restoration work, for cleanup work, for those who have lost jobs and lost income during that period of time. Unfortunately, that's not what that money will be used for if this bill passes.

That money is all going to go to the Federal department into a specific fund which would now bypass appropriations and be just under a billion dollars a year to buy more land in the Federal inventory. So the amount of blue on this chart could grow in every section of this country, but once again primarily I get the fun of it in my State, where most of the public land is.

That is a tax increase on business solely so the government can grow its hold on the amount of property we own here, and in so doing will infringe upon the ability of producing better energy in the future. And like I say, if we were actually moving forward in alternative energy, as we say we want to, maybe that wouldn't be so bad. But this administration is also shutting down alternative energy projects at the same time it is shutting down traditional energy projects. And that's another tax that goes onto that multitude of taxes you are talking about, and actually goes on to compound the amount of spending that we're doing.

Mr. AKIN. I think that what you are saying is the list I gave you before is incomplete. I said the government wants to take over autos, they want to take over insurance, they want to take over student loans, they want to take over flood insurance, they want to take over whatever it is, a sixth of the economy with socializing medicine, but it's not enough for them to own all that. What they also want is they want to own the land.

So they're going to tax businesses with some sort of a pretext this is a little tax because of the gulf oil spill, and they're just going to use it as a slush fund to buy up more land. It goes back to Rahm Emanuel, he is chief of staff for the President, his incredible statement that let no crisis go without taking full advantage of it.

So we've got a crisis that is largely perpetrated by the Federal Government in the gulf. Certainly BP was culpable for doing some things wrong. But their poor decision-making seems to be eclipsed by the total failure of the Federal Government to deal with something that's fairly fundamental. It's called a hole in the bottom of the ocean. And if you were really going to be on top and show people that the Federal Government was something you could really trust, you would put a fusion cell together, you would get people to make decisions, instead of Governor Jindal asking the Federal Government for permission to dredge up a little sandbar to stop the oil and waiting more than a month, as the oil comes into his wetlands, to get an answer.

I mean the Federal response to this thing, and a lot of the problems on the oil rig, were because of all kinds of Federal regulations as well. So we have this idea of the containment dome. Here's another containment dome that's not working. We're spending some money, and we're spending it at an unusual rate, a rate that would destroy our country if it continues that way.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I appreciate the gentleman expressing I think the frustration that many of us in Congress are feeling in the direction in which this country is going, and that we can look at concept after concept of either outrageous spending, poor policy that deals with tax policy, poor regulatory policy, poor energy development policy, put those all together, and it still spells a lack of jobs. And what was supposed to be a time period where we were going to be creating all sorts of jobs is simply one where we have lost jobs.

Unfortunately, what we are also finding unique about this recession is people who have lost their job are staying unemployed longer or taking part-time jobs instead. The length of the joblessness is unusually long in this type of recession. And I think part of that goes back to the policies that this country is pushing forward that do not encourage investment in our economy and do

not multiply our economy impact, when we have historical evidence of how that could easily happen. We are ignoring that.

Mr. AKIN. I think we need to make sure that given a particular period of time—and I appreciate your joining me here. Thank you very much, Congressman. I am so thankful for some of the very, very fine people that are good thinkers, very thoughtful, coming from all areas of our country that have a deep interest in America.

What you have going on here is a systematic attack on the fabric of what America really is. And you have a belief system if there is a consistency in Federal policies, and that consistency is that the government is taking everything over, and the American public, at least a certain percentage of the American public, is really getting concerned about that. They are concerned because they feel like we're losing our country. The government is not our friend, the government is not our servant. The government is becoming our master. It's becoming a tyrant. And it's taxing us to the point and it's spending to the point that it's going to destroy our country.

You take a look at what's going on in Europe, and you see that we're competing with some of the most fiscally irresponsible nations in Europe in terms of our numbers, in terms of our spending, in terms of our taxation. And this has got a lot of people scared, a lot of people scared. And they have very good reason to be. And the fact of this matter is you can hear all kinds of economists talk about fancy theories, but it's not very complicated. It's as simple as a lemonade stand.

If you tax that lemonade stand too much, the guy that runs it can't afford to keep it going. If you tax it just less than too much, you make it so he is never going to add any new lemonade stands, because that takes extra money, and you took all his extra money away. So when the government takes money and creates jobs, or hires more people, now the government—supposedly, the rate of pay of a government employee is twice what it is of an employee in the private sector. If the government keeps doing that, what happens is it pulls money out of the economy. That creates the unemployment, and then you start to go into this joblessness situation.

So here we are. These things are not complicated. Too much taxation. JFK understood that you can't do that. You've got to cut taxes. Ronald Reagan understood that. George Bush understood it. And when they cut taxes, what happened was we pulled out of the recession.

Insufficient liquidity. This is one of those policies just like Congressman BISHOP was talking about, where the Federal Government is making bad business decisions, making it hard for businesses to get loans. And most of the businesses don't even want loans because the environment is so toxic for

business there is what we say in Missouri, they are hunkered down like toads in a hailstorm. Because they're saying, oh, my goodness, we've got all this economic uncertainty and all this red tape that's being generated, we don't know what's going on next. And as that happens, they're not investing the money. So what happens? We don't have jobs.

So this is all very predictable. It's about as simple as a lemonade stand. If the government red tape tells you that you've got to test every glass of lemonade you make, and you have to put 10 different tests on it, it makes it so expensive that you can't sell the lemonade. This stuff is not that complicated.

What's happened is the government is no longer the servant of the people; the government is taking over massive sectors of the economy, and they are spending way beyond what there is any possibility that we can maintain. And most people, when they take a look at this level of deficit spending, they realize that something has to change.

Now, there's a couple different ways that you can change it. The first you could do is you could just take everything the Federal Government's doing and try to freeze it or reduce it. The problem is that's not going to get it. The second thing you could try to do is get rid of the waste, fraud, and abuse. Well, there are no line items that say waste, fraud, and abuse. And you're not going to fix this problem by getting rid of waste, fraud, and abuse.

What has to happen is we have to go back to some sense of sanity and realize that the Federal Government's job is not to play God, not to try to be all things to all people, but have the Federal Government become limited once again and do the things that it must do. Most of the things we're trying to do now could be done by States. We should send those decision-making policies back to the States. And what we need to do, instead of spending this much money, we need to do the few simple things that the Federal Government can do and must do.

What are those things? Well, first of all national security. States are not going to be able to run our military. That's not the job for State government. That's a job for Federal Government. And the other thing is, of course, our law enforcement system, the fact that we don't want terrorists running around inside our country. So the justice that the Federal Government should be rendering is external, that is our military, and internal in the sense of our police, and laws, justices, courts, et cetera, and jails.

□ 1850

So those are the basic things the Federal Government has to do.

When the country started a long time ago, Washington, D.C. was a boring place. They only had a couple of laws on the Federal books. One of them was against piracy on the high seas. That

was something that the States weren't having to deal with. That was a Federal job. Piracy on the high seas. Another one was counterfeiting. The Federal Government makes the money supply. You don't want people counterfeiting. That was a Federal law. And so you had a few Federal laws, but all kinds of other things were done at the local and State level.

But here what we've got going on is the government is trying to be God to everybody, trying to be all things to all people; and what's happening is it doesn't work. It never worked in other countries. I'm amazed that we would be foolish enough to do this level of spending.

We saw a country, it was called the US—It's something that I recall historically, called the US, and they had a philosophy of government in this particular US that said the government is going to give you food and housing and education and a job, and it's also going to give you health care. That country was called the USSR. That country economically failed and collapsed. We all saw it coming. We were frightened of it because of their nuclear weapons, but we saw that their economy didn't work.

And what are we doing with this? Every single thing the Soviet Union was doing, which is the government is going to take care of your housing, it's going to take care of your food, it's going to take care of your health care, going to take care of your education, and your job because the government is taking over all of these businesses. We're repeating the same thing that didn't work. And Americans all across this country—I'm not talking about just Republicans, Democrats, and independents—it's just people are starting to get it that we're on the wrong track.

So it led to the bumper sticker that said, Had enough change yet? I think that's one of the things the President promised was change. And I think he's certainly keeping his promise in that regard, if in no other.

So these are things that are really upsetting people; and when you take a look at the combination of what's going on, these are really, really serious. The comparison of these other countries I think is really telling. When you see deficit as a percent of GDP and the United States is third worst in terms of deficit—debt is a percent of GDP; United States is the third worst. You go, This is not good at all.

Then you find out the statistic that I just heard about today, which says that the poverty level, the line that says you're in the poverty level in America, that line is the average of the middle class in Europe. The average person in the middle class in Europe lives below our poverty level.

So do we want to go down the direction of what these European countries are doing with the government taking everything over, all kinds of rules and regulations that hamstringing the free enterprise system? I think not.

I'm going to close this evening by talking a little bit about the America that I love.

The America that I love was populated by these crazy people that came here, and they had dreams to do amazing things, things that a lot of people would have said in Europe that you can't do that. And yet these people came to this country with these dreams, and the dreams as they worked on them became a vague possibility and then even a possibility. And finally they became a reality. And so America was built one dream at a time by different creative people that came to our land.

I think first of all of my favorite historic group of people, the Pilgrims coming to this land; and just over a hundred Pilgrims came. They had a dream of creating a civilization different than anything in Europe. You know, the teachers always say the Pilgrims came here for religious freedom which, of course, is silly. They had religious freedom in Holland. They didn't come here for that reason. They came with a much more grandiose idea. They wanted to build a new civilization unlike anything they'd seen in Europe.

And so they gave us certain ideas. They separated church government from civil government. They wrote a written Constitution called the Mayflower Compact, the first time in all of human history that a group of free people under God created a civil government to be their servants. The civil government servant, not master. That piece of paper signed on the great table of the Mayflower. In ye name of God, Amen. Goes on to say, We do covenant and combine ourselves together into a civil body politic for the glory of God, the advancement of the Christian faith, and to frame such just and equal laws would be meet and necessary.

The first time there was a written Constitution under God of a group of free people making a civil government to be their servant, the entire foundation of the American civil government founded in 1620 because these people dared to have a dream, and when they came here within the first 3 months, half of them died. And the Mayflower going back to England said, You guys better give up. You started here as a little over a hundred, 103 people. Now you're down to barely just 50. You need to come back to England and give up. They said, No. We believe God called us here for a purpose.

So they said as they were dying as they got older and as Plymouth Colony survived and did well, they said they thought that they were stepping stones for people who were going to come after to build a new nation because they had a dream in their hearts of what this country could be. By the way, they threw out Socialism in Plymouth Colony because they knew it was unbiblical. They understood in 1620 what we don't understand in 2010.

They were followed by other kinds of people, all of the diversity of these peo-

ple that came with all of these crazy ideas. One of them built a hundred light bulbs and not one of them worked. And his attitude was very cheery. He said, Now I know a hundred ways to not make a light bulb. He kept trying and pretty soon Thomas Edison made his first light bulb.

So America was built this way on free enterprise by people having the courage to take a try at something and fail and try again. But it wasn't built by the government trying to give everybody jobs and the government taking everything over. They were trying to get away from those big kings of Europe. They wanted the government to be simply a servant, just a facilitator, a facilitator so people could enjoy what they believed were their God-given rights, to life, to liberty, and to the pursuit of happiness. They could pursue happiness. They knew the government could never guarantee happiness. But they just knew that they could try.

And so it was for generations and generations. America became one of the most unique and exceptional countries in the world because it was based on a new idea, a new set of principles. Some people call it free enterprise. Some people call it the American Dream. Some people talk about it as the can-do attitude. And what we're doing is we're killing that dream.

And that's why we stand here on the floor and talk about these policies. What we're trying to do is to turn America back into Europe. We left Europe. We don't want to go back to Europe. Some people may want to go back to Europe. Be happy if they'd take a one-way ticket over there. Don't turn us into Europe with the socialistic policies of the government taking over everything.

We've seen so many examples of the Federal Government being lousy at doing what it does. We think about the efficiency of the post office, the compassion of the IRS. Think about the Energy Department. The Energy Department—people aren't aware it was created so that we wouldn't be dependent on foreign oil and ever since the Energy Department was created, we're more and more dependent on foreign oil. Talk about something totally failing in its mission.

And we've just seen what happened in the gulf oil spill. We've seen taking the President 50 days before he even contacted the head of BP. The President having the authority to put a team together of the best resources not only in the country but in the world and being unwilling to take these big ships that foreign countries owned that could come and suck up all of that oil and process the oil and spit the water out. But no, we're not going to do that. Dithering around with more and more government bureaucracy. Is this the sort of thing that we really want to put more trust in our Federal Government?

We've seen historically that federal governments of foreign countries have killed more people of their own citizens

than all the wars of history since the time of Christ. If you add up all of the people killed in wars since the time of Christ historically, there are less people killed by war than there are by governments killing their own citizens. Do we not have some natural fear of excessive government? I don't understand why we have this irrational faith in the efficiency of big government. It seems to me that it's just a very, very unwise place to be putting our faith. Why do we want to go back to Europe? It doesn't make sense.

I think we need to think, rather, in terms of the bright light and the freedom that comes from people being allowed to succeed or to fail, for people to be able to pursue their dreams. The Bible tells us that for every single human being in this world, God made a special job for them to do. And when people have the courage to just chase after what's in their heart, the dream that's in their heart, that's what makes great civilization. That was one of the things that distinguished America that made it such a unique and different Nation because people were able to follow the dream that was in their own heart.

And how can you do that if the government starts to keep taking everything over and taking more things over and taxing you and making it impossible for you to do the kinds of things that Americans for generations have done?

There are two views of America that we see. The view that you see now is the view that reflects the Democrat Party. What you have seen for 18 months is total Democrat decision-making. The Republicans on most of these issues vote "no," and we are totally ignored because we are, quite frankly, 40 votes short in this Chamber. And ignored in the Senate as well.

So what you see is Democrat policy, what you see is European policy, and what you see is the destruction of the American Dream. And that must stop.

□ 1900

#### THE GULF OIL SPILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. RICHARDSON) is recognized for 60 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days to enter their remarks into the RECORD on this topic of the gulf oil spill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Ms. RICHARDSON. I appreciate the opportunity to anchor this special hour tonight. My name is Congresswoman LAURA RICHARDSON, and I represent California's 37th Congressional District which includes the cities of Long