

Darfur, accusing them of cooperating with the ICC investigation. These non-governmental organizations include many of the most respected humanitarian organizations in the world. Among them are Oxfam, Doctors Without Borders, International Rescue Committee, and Mercy Corps.

The withdrawal of these organizations will leave millions of civilians without access to food, clean water, and medical assistance. This outrageous action is just another example of the cruelty of the Government of Sudan towards its own people. And it proves that the ICC's decision to issue an arrest warrant for Bashir was entirely justified.

The Government of Sudan has been carrying out a campaign of genocide against the people of Darfur since 2003. The Sudanese government is supporting militia groups that are engaged in genocidal practices in communities of African farmers in the Western province of Darfur. These militias are razing villages, systematically raping women and girls, specifically targeting and destroying food and water supplies, and massacring communities. In the last five years the conflict has taken the lives of hundreds of thousands of civilians. On October 1, 2008, the United Nations reported that there were almost 2.7 million internally displaced persons in Darfur, almost 300,000 of whom were newly displaced in 2008, and an additional 2 million people continue to be directly affected by the conflict.

In July of 2007, the United Nations Security Council passed Resolution 1769, which authorized the deployment of a joint United Nations/African Union peacekeeping force in Darfur, known as UNAMID. The force was to consist of a total of 26,000 troops. However, UNAMID was deployed at only 63 percent of its full strength as of December 31, 2008, and does not have the capacity to fulfill its mandate to protect civilians in Darfur. UNAMID must immediately deploy its forces at their full strength, and take all necessary and appropriate action to protect the people of Darfur.

Early in 2006, I visited the Darfur region with my good friend from California, Speaker NANCY PELOSI, and I was deeply disturbed by what I saw. As far as the eyes could see, there were crowds of displaced people who had been driven from their homes, living literally on the ground with nothing but little tarps to cover them. That was three years ago, and yet this genocide has been allowed to continue.

If we are serious about opposing genocide, we must take decisive action to stop it.

We must demand that all nations respect and enforce the decision of the ICC.

We must demand that humanitarian organizations be allowed to return to Sudan.

We must enact and enforce comprehensive sanctions against Sudan without exceptions.

We must demand that China stop bankrolling the genocide.

And we must demand that the United Nations immediately deploy its peacekeeping forces and do everything necessary to protect civilians and save the people of Darfur.

It's long past time to get serious about genocide.

ECONOMIC SITUATION FACING OUR COUNTRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of Jan-

uary 6, 2009, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to address the House for an hour. We're going to be talking about the economic situation facing our country and specifically the budget situation.

Just about a month ago, the President right here on this floor laid out some of the proposals for what his budget would represent, and then the next day he laid out the blueprint for that budget. And I think it caught a lot of people around the country by surprise, really caused some great concern by people, especially as it relates to this record level of funding, taxing, and borrowing.

And over the last few weeks, you've heard a lot of people laying out those details, just what that spending means, just what those taxes mean in terms of the average cost to American families. The middle class families, not just rich people as was purported, but middle class families will be paying over \$3,000 on an energy bill.

And then what I think really frightened the American people was the record level of borrowing that this budget represents, and with over \$1.7 trillion in the first year in next year's budget that the President has submitted, over a tripling of the deficit that was, quote, unquote, inherited.

And so, as these record levels of spending and taxes and record levels of borrowing have been laid out, you've heard a chorus of echoes, not just by those of us here in this Chamber who are strongly opposed to that irresponsible spending, to that unprecedented level of taxing that will literally stifle the growth of small businesses and middle class families, but also the borrowing that affects our next generation. This isn't money that we have. This is money that would be borrowed from our children and our grandchildren, saddling them with, on estimates, of over \$3,000 of debt just in the President's spending bill, that \$800 billion piece of legislation called stimulus, that just in its first few weeks added more than \$3,000 of national debt on to the backs of every man, woman and child in this country.

And so with that, I wanted to lay out some of the details of just what the spending means, just what these record deficits mean to the American people, to a budget process, and historically, to lay out where these deficits that the President's budget really stand in relation to history in time because these are things that have not passed yet.

And the American people all across the country, they've had these tea parties that have been sprouting up in States all throughout the Nation and literally hundreds, in some cases thousands, of people are showing up and saying enough is enough, Mr. President and Members of Congress, stop this reckless spending, stop and back away

from these tax increase proposals that will stifle middle-class families and our small businesses and don't go and borrow trillions—not hundreds of billions—but trillions of dollars from our families, from our children and our grandchildren who we want to leave a better life to. We don't want to saddle them with trillions of dollars in new debt.

And some of these charts that we're going to show and talk about really illustrate what this means, what these budgets mean because these budget documents that are being debated up here in Congress, they talk about big numbers and they talk about programs. And some of these are government programs that are good, successful programs. Some of these are government programs that should have never been in place in the first place. Some of them are programs that are failing, yet will be getting more money from the Federal Government.

And where is this money coming from? And as people look and ask these tough questions, what they realize is this is money we don't have. This is money that would be borrowed in record numbers, and this chart right here shows real well, leading into this administration taking office just 2 months ago, the fact that the deficit at the end of the current fiscal year will be more than tripled by the President's proposed budget.

This budget in 2010 is the President's proposed budget, over \$1.7 trillion, and in fact, on Friday, the Congressional Budget Office came out with revised numbers. And unfortunately, those revised numbers were not good for the President. They surely were not good for the taxpayers of this country. They were not good for our children and grandchildren.

My daughter, Madison, who's 2 years old, will be inheriting more of this debt, thousands of dollars in national debt. Now this deficit that was projected to be \$1.7 trillion has risen to \$1.9 trillion just in the last few days.

□ 2100

There's no end in sight. What we're saying is: Mr. President, don't go down this road. There is a better way. We need to rein in the spending that is going on here in Washington. We need to look out across the country and see what other people that are dealing with these tough economic times are doing.

Families are cutting back, Mr. Speaker. Families are cutting back to deal with these tough economic times. They're making adjustments in their household budget. They're stretching their dollars. Some people are saving and paying down debt. And at time that we're seeing families making responsible decisions and States dealing with their deficits—and yes, States are hurting too—but States are making cuts to be responsible.

It seems like here in Washington is the only place where spending is out of

control and people just think there's no end. But there is an end. As people ponder these record deficits that are shown on these charts, one of the things we're going to try to do here in this House, at least, is to let the people's voices be heard and say: Enough is enough.

We've got to stop this out-of-control spending. It hasn't happened yet. These bills have not even been filed yet. Just the outlines. This \$1.7 trillion number for next year's deficit hasn't even gone through a committee process yet.

So there's still time to stop this. There's still time to stop this out of control spending. That's what we're going to be talking about tonight.

We're going to show some more charts and we're going to talk some more about the historical and future numbers. First, I'd like to yield to the gentleman from Ohio, a friend of mine who has been talking about this same issue for weeks and months as well, my friend, Mr. JORDAN.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. I thank my friend and colleague from Louisiana. I appreciate his good work on this issue and many others. My friend mentioned the tea parties that are taking place across this country. The reason you see families and taxpayers and Americans gathering at these events is because they get it. I learned a long time ago that the people always get it before the politicians do. And they understand that this kind of spending and what it means for their kids and their grandkids and what it means for future generations of Americans is just plain wrong.

My colleague has pointed out some of the numbers. But just put it in perspective of just what has happened in the last 6 weeks. First, we had the \$700 billion so-called stimulus and all the program spending that was in that bill. The bill was designed to help jumpstart our economy, but we all know it was mostly just spending on Federal Government programs.

Then we had the \$410 billion omnibus with its over 800 earmarks. Now, this week, with the budget vote going to happen in the Budget Committee, which I have the privilege of being a member of, we will now have, as my colleague pointed out, a budget that has the 10 largest annual deficits in American history. A budget that will go from—and this is important—from 29 percent of GDP spending to over 28 percent of the gross domestic product. A budget that will increase spending over \$1 trillion this year; a budget that will double the national debt in the next 8 years.

Frankly, and I think this is interesting, a budget that adds more to the debt in 6 years—now, think about this—this administration is going to add more to the national debt with their budget numbers in the next 6 years than it took all 43 previous Presidents to accumulate. So more than 6 years that it took over 200 years to get to. That's how much spending we are talking about.

You don't take my word for it. Take the statement that Senator GREGG made today, where he said this budget is going to, in his words, "bankrupt the country." This is the same guy that the Obama administration wanted as a part of their administration. Initially offered him the job of Commerce Secretary.

Take some senior Democrat Members of the Senate. Senator CONRAD said, "More discipline on the spending side is also going to be required of this budget." Some Democrats are getting the idea this budget is way out of line. They understand what my colleague talked about, and that is this budget is harmful to future generations of Americans, harmful to our economy, and is the wrong direction to go.

We need a budget that spends less, taxes less, and borrows less. That is what we want to talk about this evening.

I'm happy to yield back to my colleague, and look forward to participating more in this hour. But I appreciate his leadership on this issue and reserving this time this evening.

With that, I yield back.

Mr. SCALISE. Again, I want to thank my friend from Ohio for pointing that out. One of the things you talked about is where all of this spending has gone just in the last few months. We've heard a lot of talk over the past few months—the last 2 months, really, that President Obama has been in office—about all of the problems that have been inherited; that were laid on his doorstep when he became President.

We've got to be very careful at paying attention to the facts and looking at in fact how we did get here today, now that we are in March. This isn't something that started before January 20 when the President took the oath of office.

We've got a chart right here that actually shows some of the spending that my friend from Ohio was talking about. When we go into this stimulus bill, as it was called, a stimulus bill that spent \$787 billion in today's dollars, the Congressional Budget Office expects that with interest and debt service it will end up costing over \$1.2 trillion in deficit spending—money we did not have.

This bill was a bill that President Obama himself filed—not a bill, in our opinion, that will help get the economy back on track. It was a bill that did some spending on some infrastructure issues. Less than 10 percent of that bill in fact was spending on infrastructure.

The vast majority of that bill was spending on government—growing the size of government, both Federal Government and State governments, and actually adding employees not to the private sector, which is what many of us want to see. When we talk about stimulus, we think about how we help those small businesses get that loan to go out and use their entrepreneurial spirit to create jobs in the private sector, to put people to work, to give people the opportunity for a lifelong ca-

reer, not creating more jobs in government, growing the size of a government that's already too big.

In fact, that's what that stimulus bill did. It added over \$1 trillion. And you see a spike in spending there. And then immediately right after that, less than a week, a bill that got little notice because it happened right after the President's spending bill, which he dubbed the stimulus bill, was this omnibus spending bill—over \$400 billion, a bill that grew the size of government by 8 percent in 1 week. In 1 week.

Over \$400 billion coming on the heels in February of that stimulus bill. And you see the spike that it created in spending. None of this was spending that the President inherited. This was all spending that he created on his own. In fact, we just found out—we're going to continue for months, unfortunately, finding out some of the things that were in that bill because that so-called stimulus bill was over 1,000 pages long. Again, over \$1 trillion in actual spending.

That bill was filed on a Thursday night. That final bill that was voted on in the House on a Friday, it was filed at 11 p.m. on a Thursday night. Nobody on the Democratic side, even those who were actually on the conference committee, had the opportunity to read it.

And now we are starting to find out some of the things that were in that bill—not things that help stimulate our economy to get our economy back on track. In fact, just last week we found out as the country was outraged, rightfully so, finding out that executives from AIG were receiving bonuses—over \$160 million in bonuses—from Federal money that they got from that financial bailout, which many of us here opposed.

But we found out that they got that money under the authority of language that was put in the President's stimulus bill. That's right. The stimulus bill that this President signed in February actually contained language that was inserted by dark of night. No one wants to take credit for it. But we know now Senator CHRIS DODD, the Democrat chairman of the Banking Committee, was instructed by White House officials to put language in the President's stimulus bill protecting the ability of AIG to give out bonuses. That was in that stimulus bill.

Who knows what else is in there because we continue to find out more of the damaging repercussions from that bill. Yet, that bill gave us over \$800 billion of immediate increased national debt. Over \$3,000 for every man, woman, and child came from that stimulus bill in new deficit spending.

Again, another chart that displays just how high these record deficits are, because when you start talking about numbers and billions of dollars become hundreds of billions and then it becomes trillions of dollars, as we're talking now, sometimes it's hard for people to grasp numbers when you get into that range because it's just numbers that this country has never seen

before. These are unprecedented amounts of spending.

Yet, when you talk about a \$400 billion deficit, which occurred in 2004 and, as can you see, there was a trend downward. Those deficits were actually decreasing under President Bush. Still, spending that many here are not comfortable with and would not have liked to see continue.

I am a cosponsor of a bill to balance the Federal budget. We should have a balanced budget in Washington. Unfortunately, we don't. But at least there was a trend downward to reduce the size of those deficits. Then, here comes the President's budget. Files it. Over \$1.7 trillion in deficit spending. You see this massive spike. Largest deficit in the history of our country. That comes off the back of the President making the quote, "We cannot simply spend as we please and defer the consequences."

President Obama said that right here on this House floor on February 23. "We cannot simply spend as we please and defer the consequences." Then, the next day he filed a bill, his budget outline, that actually adds a \$1.7 trillion addition to our national debt in 1 year.

So, ultimately what people are more concerned about is the actual deeds. Not as much the words, but the actions. The actions are scaring a lot of people in terms of these record levels of spending.

With that, we've got a friend of ours from Louisiana, a new Member, somebody who has been passionate in this cause of controlling deficit spending, getting a hold of runaway spending in Washington, Dr. Fleming.

Mr. FLEMING. Well, I thank the gentleman, my fellow Louisianan, Mr. SCALISE, for yielding for a moment. I also thank my friend from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN) for his comments as well.

You know, we are talking a lot about budget deficits. And we hear this word to the point where we're almost numb. We have to ask ourselves: Well, what difference does it make? If we go another year in deficit spending or perhaps over \$1 trillion in deficit spending, is it going to change our lives?

So I think the average person out there who's maybe watching us on C-SPAN this evening has got to contemplate: What difference does that make?

Well, let me point out a couple of things in history that maybe we should think about. You may recall that during World War I, the allies defeated Germany and, after doing so, we required war reparations. The only way that Germany could deal with that, could actually make those war reparation payments, was just to print more money. They had to deficit spend big time.

It became such a problem that it literally took a wheel barrow to carry enough currency to go buy a loaf of bread. Of course, that sounds silly. It sounds like a caricature. But these people were in desperate need.

We, of course, suffered during the Great Depression. But the Germans,

because of this, were in a tremendous need. It caused a complete collapse of their culture and their society. And what did we get in return? We got Nazism. We got Adolph Hitler. He took control of Germany only because that country became so desperate that it could not keep what was otherwise a democracy, could not keep that going.

We fast forward to the 1960s when we went through this second wave, if you will, of social programs in America; the first being, of course, the New Deal under FDR and so forth.

We have Lyndon Johnson who, of course, instituted many entitlement programs, many of which we have today. We saw that that deficit spending began at that point, and it began to accelerate. It was worsened by a prolonged war in Vietnam. But we really didn't see evidence of it, just like today.

Well, are we really seeing evidence of budget deficits? Are we really impacted in our daily lives?

Well, slowly but surely as the seventies rolled around and we began to also have problems with energy, we began to see inflation going up to the tune of 10, 12, 13 percent. We also went into a period of stagflation, where the economy became stagnant, prices remained high. The people who were hurt the most in all that were people on fixed incomes, because every year their dollars bought less.

□ 2115

And so then this country got into something we call cost of living increases, and everybody looked forward to that. They had to have the cost of living increases. But some got more than others and some didn't get any at all, and so we saw the deterioration in our economy and our standard of living as a result of inflation. To solve this, we put the hammer down by cutting off the supply of money, which made interest rates go up. I can remember trying to buy a house and getting a mortgage for an 18 percent interest rate, and that is because we were trying to bring the growth of money under control.

Mr. Speaker, the impact of deficit spending and budgets that are out of control do affect us in everyday life. I am old enough to have seen this happen, have studied it in school, have family members who were injured during World War II indirectly as a result of some of these financial consequences that occurred.

I feel like one of the main problems we have with our government today is we don't learn from history. History just seems to repeat itself over and over and over again. If there is anything we have learned in the past, that is that we have got to have fiscal discipline in our government. At home, I have to balance my budget, as difficult that is sometimes. My city, my State, they all have to balance the budget. Why is it that my Federal Government, the most important government, the most powerful government in this

world, why is it that it can't keep its fiscal house in order?

I am a newbie Congressman, I have only been here 2 or 3 months. Before I came here, I really have had this nagging question: What is it about Washington that Washington can't get it right? And I was hoping that in coming here I would get at least some insight as to why we do crazy things with our spending and so forth. Unfortunately, now that I am here, it is worse than I ever thought. I am still seeking those answers.

Mr. SCALISE. If I can reclaim my time. I sure don't want to discourage you. There is a Chinese proverb: May you live in interesting times. And we are definitely living in interesting times.

I think the good news is, this is the best time for people with the focus that you have got, as a new member, somebody coming here to try to rein in out-of-control spending, this is the exact time to be here because this is the time where speaking up can stop this train, this train of runaway spending, as this bill that has been proposed has not passed into law yet.

The public is starting to have the same level of discomfort that those of us here tonight have, and I think the opportunity for us to galvanize that energy that is going on all around the country as we talk about these tea parties that people are having spontaneously to protest about this record level of spending and borrowing and taxing. We have got the ability to stop this from happening, because some of this has happened, as we have pointed out, but the worst has not yet happened. But if nothing changes, then it will happen. And that is where we have an opportunity. And I know my friend from Ohio has something to add, and then we have other people to join us.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. I appreciate the gentleman.

Not only is it record levels of spending; it is being done at a record pace. Let me just give you a couple facts. Think about this. This is why Americans, as we have talked about already, are showing up, Mr. Speaker, at these tea parties, because they are sick of this type of activity from their government that their tax dollars support.

Think about this: \$24 billion is being spent each day. Over the first 50 days of the new administration, Democrats have spent approximately \$24 billion a day, most of it with borrowed money. Over the first 50 days of this new administration, Democrats have spent approximately \$1 billion an hour, most of it with borrowed money.

So it is not just the amount; it is the pace at which this spending is going on. And you wonder why thousands of people are showing up in cities across this country, families, taxpayers, small business owners are showing up and saying, enough is enough. We are tired of this bailout fever, this spending fever that has got a hold of Washington. We want some sanity back in

our government. We want some sanity back in our Congress.

And it's not just about the numbers. We are going to give tons of numbers here in this hour, and the gentleman from Louisiana and the doctor from Louisiana have given some numbers and some history as well. But in the end, it is about people and the impact this has. Think about this budget that is going to be in the Budget Committee for a vote this Wednesday, 2 days from now, this budget with record levels of spending, record deficit, tenth largest annual deficit in American history over the next 10 years, think about this budget. And I don't think it is being an alarmist to say this: This is an attack on freedom, because think about what this budget does. It is the largest tax increase in history. When you take money out of the pockets of families, and I have said before, I am convinced some politicians won't be happy until they have an IV hooked up to the taxpayers' wallet and they can hit the drip button any time they want. They want the money. They think they are smarter than the American family out there.

So record level of taxes, unprecedented continuation of the spending that we have been talking about, a further nationalization of health care. Now, think about all three of those for a second. When they take your money, you have less freedom. When they spend and spend and spend and mortgage our kids' and grandkids' future, that simply means the next generations of Americans are going to have less freedom because they are going to have to pay that money back, which means less money in their pockets to go after their goals and dreams. When you have a further nationalization of health care and you have some centralized board here in Washington deciding what kind of health care you and your family are going to get, that is a loss of liberty. And the worse one, which we haven't even got to, and I know my colleague from Louisiana understands this issue probably better than anybody on the floor tonight, that is this cap-and-trade, cap-and-tax concept, which will be the largest tax increase in history. Every single family, every single business owner is going to pay more in energy and utility costs. All those in this budget.

So I think when we talk about an attack on liberty and an attack on freedom, it is not using too strong of language, I think it is just being honest. Because the word and principle we most associate with the United States of America is freedom, and that is what this budget is attacking. And that is why we are here tonight under the leadership of our friend from Louisiana talking about how bad this is and the direction that it takes our country, and why we think our policies of keeping taxes low, getting spending under control, not imposing this crazy cap-and-trade concept on American families and business owners is the right approach to take.

With that, I yield back to my colleague from Louisiana.

Mr. SCALISE. Again, I thank the gentleman from Ohio. And what you talked about, we definitely are going to cover in detail later on throughout this hour tonight on both the historical side, as my friend from North Louisiana talked about even going back to World War II and some of the flaws of the spending that was encountered during the New Deal leading up to World War II, but also on today's proposal, that proposal that you will be looking at in the Budget Committee.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things we want to point out on this tax proposal, because when the President talked throughout the campaign, when he talked here on the House floor just a few weeks ago, one of the things he said was 95 percent of the American people will not see their taxes raised by a dime. And while he may have been technically accurate in that statement, what many people are finding out now by the cap-and-trade, what many of us call an energy tax or a cap-and-tax proposal, those American families that are making in the bottom 95 percent, so to speak, in this country, they won't be seeing a dime increase, they will be seeing over \$3,000 a year in tax increases in the form of higher energy bills, and that is this proposal that is in the President's budget, \$1.4 trillion in new taxes.

Some of this falls on the people making over \$250,000. Here, we are playing class warfare, something that I don't agree with because it is not good policy. But this right here, the small business and investor's tax, generates \$630 billion. This is what the President talks about when he says for those people who are in the top 5 percent of income earners, people making over \$250,000, will see a tax increase. What he is talking about is a \$636 billion tax increase, half of which will fall on the backs of small business owners in this country. The people that actually employ more than 70 percent of the American workforce will be seeing a tax increase.

Now, anybody that can explain how that is good fiscal policy, especially during tough economic times, the floor is open for them to discuss it, because no one has yet to come and explain that. This is a horrible proposal. But on top of that, what they have also proposed is this cap-and-trade tax, and it is \$640 billion. That hasn't been talked about much by the President in terms of its impact, but what this tax means, in fact the budget director for the President just 1 year ago when he was working for the Congressional Budget Office said that this would mean over \$1,600 a year in new taxes that people would pay on their electricity bills.

So I guess what he means when you are not going to pay another dime, \$1,300 to \$1,600 a year in new energy taxes is not a dime, but it something that would break many families in this country. But it would fall on the backs

of every family in this country. No family under the current proposal is exempted. So a married couple making \$30,000 a year with two kids will be paying about \$1,300 a year more in energy costs from the President's own budget.

This is bad policy. This is policy that we are going to fight. We are going to fight it in committee. It hopefully will not get to this House floor, but we will fight it on this floor. And one of the people that will be fighting that battle with us is our good friend from Georgia (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I thank my good friend from Louisiana for yielding.

This is a steamroller of socialism that is being shoved down the throats of the American public, that is going to strangle the American economy and is going to choke the American people economically. NANCY PELOSI, HARRY REID, and Barack Obama are driving this steamroller of socialism. Socialism never has worked, it never will work. It is not going to work today, and it hasn't worked in the past, as our doctor colleague from Louisiana was just talking about the history, and I agree with that.

The thing that this is going to hurt most, though, are people on limited income. We hear from our friends on the Democratic side that they are for the poor people and for the disadvantaged, but this cap-and-tax policy, or cap-and-trade as it is called, is going to hurt the most the people on limited income, the retirees. It is going to hurt people who are at the bottom end of the social ladder; because, as you said, Mr. SCALISE, it is going to be \$3,000 per family that they are going to have to pay, not only for energy costs, but when gas and diesel prices go up, that means it costs more to get food to the grocery store. That means that grocery prices are going to go up. It means that it costs more money to get medicines in to the drug stores, so medication is going to go up. Every single good and service in this Nation will go up because of this cap-and-tax policy that is being proposed by this administration and by the liberals on the Democratic side. It is going to strangle our economy, as I just mentioned, and it is going to hurt the people who can least afford to pay the \$3,000.

I am a physician, as the gentleman knows. Many of my patients can't afford to pay an extra \$3,000 out of their pocket to pay for this crazy idea of taxing energy at this kind of rate. It is just untenable, it is totally unacceptable, and we have got to stop it. And that is what Republicans are doing here tonight, is talking about this, and we are going to continue to fight to stop this.

In fact, the reason I came down here tonight to join you in this discussion, if you would just take the top chart down and we will look at the top chart as well as the one just below it that you just covered up.

We keep hearing from our Democratic colleagues that all this financial problem is something that they inherited and they are trying to fix it. Well, they didn't inherit it; they have created it themselves. And the chart that you have up top just shows that the budget deficit is going to climb markedly under the proposals that have already been passed by this House. We have just seen bill after bill after bill that has increased the deficit.

We are borrowing too much money from our grandchildren. I don't know a grandparent in this country that will say anything but, I will try to sacrifice for my children and for my grandchildren. That's what parents and grandparents do, we sacrifice for our children and our grandchildren. But the Democrats don't want to do that. They want to take from our children, they want to take from our grandchildren.

Republicans have presented many, many alternatives to the housing bill that this Congress passed that is going to increase the cost of housing loans to everybody, and it is going to actually deny people, particularly just getting in the market that don't have good credit ratings, it is going to deny the poor people from being able to get mortgages in the future.

We saw this awful TARP bill that President Bush and Hank Paulson pushed forward, we have seen how that has been mismanaged. That is borrowing from our grandchildren. We have seen bill after bill, and now this budget on top of that, we are borrowing too much, we are spending too much, we are taxing too much, and it has got to stop.

□ 2130

Republicans have offered many alternatives. But the Democratic leadership are being obstructionist. They won't even hear of our plan, because they are driving this steamroller of socialism down the throats of the American people. I'm beginning to think that there is a very concerted effort to try to change the philosophy of government in America, one, as Mr. JORDAN was just talking about, where we are going to lose our freedom. We have seen that happen historically. We have got to put a stop to it. It is up to the American people. It is up to the American people to put a stop to it by demanding that we not pass this budget that the Democrats in this administration are bringing forward.

We have got to stop bailing out AIG and all these other entities that are just taking us down the road to financial serfdom of the American people. We have got to stop it. It is up to the American people, and it is up to Republicans to stop it. We have got to get the American people to demand that our voice as Republicans is heard so that we can present our alternatives that NANCY PELOSI won't even bring to the floor. She won't allow our proposals to be heard in committee. We can't get a vote.

It is wrong. It is hurting the American people, and it is hurting the people who the Democrats say that they want to represent, and that is the poor people and the disadvantaged people, the people on limited incomes. So we have proposals, Republicans have proposals that will stop the spending, that will stop the taxation, that will look to the free enterprise system, that will get our economy back on the right road so that we can solve this financial crisis that we have and even get the housing market back on the right road. But our proposals need to be heard on this floor.

So the American people need to demand that our proposals are heard, voted upon and let's have a debate. We would want to join with our Democratic colleagues to find some commonsense, market-based solutions that will maintain freedom and stop this steamroller of socialism that is going to take away from not only this current generation, but it is going to put our children and our grandchildren in a position that their standard of living is going to be much lower than ours is today.

It is up to us. And we are going to continue to fight. That is what we are doing here tonight. I congratulate you, Mr. SCALISE, for being down here tonight with these charts to try to show the American people the direction we are headed by this administration, by the leadership in this House and this U.S. Senate. We have got to stop it. We have got to put the brakes on this steamroller of socialism so that the American people can be free and can throw off the shackles of the Federal Government, can run their family, run their businesses and run their lives without all the government intrusion. And that is what we are here fighting for tonight.

I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I yield back.

Mr. SCALISE. Thank you. Reclaiming my time, I appreciate what the gentleman from Georgia talked about, because that is, in fact, the reason that we are here tonight. It is not that we are willing to throw in the towel, take this and just accept this train to run down the track. What we are trying to do is talk about this problem and not just lay out the proposals that are here before us, but the implications of those proposals, to families all across this country. In fact, these proposals fly in the face of the decisions that families across this country are making themselves. As they deal with tough economic times, people are actually acting in a responsible way. They are cutting back their spending. They are setting money aside and paying down debt. But they are sure not going deeper into debt. If you have got a high credit card balance, the last thing you do is go order two more credit cards and then run up the balance on those.

That is what the President's proposal in his budget does. It, in fact, triples the current year level of deficit spend-

ing. I want to make this point again as we talk about the history revisionism that is going on as people talk about what they inherited. There was a deficit that President Obama inherited. The problem is that he is tripling that deficit in his first budget out the box. He is tripling that level of spending in a way that is irresponsible. He even acknowledges, as he is doing it, that deficit spending is irresponsible. And anybody is free to go back in time and criticize people in the past who helped create this national debt that we have. I have surely done it. Many others have done it. But when you criticize something, you don't replace the thing that you're criticizing by doing it two or three times even worse.

So, if he is going to stand with us and criticize the deficit spending, then he needs to actually stand with us and start cutting this Federal budget, not tripling, tripling the size of this debt, the national deficit that we are going to be facing next year. And so that is what we are talking about tonight is what we are going to be fighting in the coming months.

One of the people at the forefront of that fight is my friend on the Budget Committee, Mr. JORDAN from Ohio.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. I just want to make a quick point and just reiterate what my friend from Louisiana just had mentioned. Think of the contrast of what American families are having to do with their budget in this tough economic situation they find themselves in versus what the Federal Government is going to do. I just want to go back and talk about one fact I had talked about earlier, because when you talk about spending at this rate, the new administration, the Democrats in Congress, are spending approximately \$24 billion every day in the first 50 days of this administration. This is unprecedented spending. When you spend that fast, when you spend that much, it is no wonder you make mistakes like this AIG fiasco we had last week.

So again, the contrast could not be more clear with what American families are doing in the tough economic times they face and they have to deal with versus how the Federal Government is reacting. Families are tightening their belt. They are doing what American families have had to do many other times in history when things got tough. But their government is spending at unprecedented levels and at an unprecedented pace, making mistakes as they do it. And we saw that last week.

So again I yield back to my friend and colleague and thank him for his work on this important issue.

Mr. SCALISE. I think when people look to Washington, they are looking for leadership. They are not looking for just more checks thrown around or cash thrown around to States or to people. What they want to see is policies, good sound policies to respond to the things that are happening across the country. I think people are very

concerned. We are finally starting to see people speak up and not just complain at home or sit on their couch. They are literally standing up and going to these tea parties that they are having all across the country now. In fact on April 15, the day that many of us dread, the day that we pay our taxes, that is the day that many of these tea parties are going to be held throughout the country where people are in essence revolting against this record level of spending, this record level of borrowing, deficit spending and taking money that we don't have from our kids and grandkids to run up these massive deficits each year under the President's budget.

They are doing it because they know that this hasn't happened yet. They are proposals by this President. But this is a President like any, and this is a Congress like any, that needs to respond to what people are saying across this country. And so while we are speaking on this floor tonight talking about the dangers of deficit spending and record borrowing and these taxes that are being proposed, and we are trying to stop this from happening, people across the country are doing the same thing.

I think my friend here is going to chime in as well and talk about this.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Thank you. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

I have just a couple of comments. I was back in my district this weekend and talked to some of our local governments. My background is a physician and a local mayor. And the community that I was mayor in just before I came here is looking at making a 5 percent cut in their budget, worst case scenario. They are looking at what they have to do to balance their budget. I also talked to a town administrator of Morristown, Tennessee, this past week. They were looking at their MTPO funds. They got an extra \$720,000 in stimulus money for a bus system. To show you how out of touch the Federal Government is, they had about \$600,000 in MTPO funds, that is Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization funds, and they can buy buses with these funds and they can build bus stations. There is just one small problem in that community. Their general fund budget has got a \$1.6 million hole in it. They have 16 people they can't hire right now that they normally do. They can't afford to hire the bus drivers.

That is something that gets lost in this place up here is that we spend at these record deficits, and local communities are making these tough decisions. And they are tough decisions. Business leaders are doing exactly what they are doing with their budgets, tightening their belts. What do we do up here? In the omnibus spending bill, which I call the "ominous spending bill," when everybody else is cutting it, what are we doing? Up 8 percent. Now, how can I go back to Tennessee and explain to people that we print money—or borrow it—and then go back and spend at that level while

they are having to make these tough decisions? I yield back.

Mr. SCALISE. I thank my friend from Tennessee for talking about the challenges as people look at what is happening up here in Washington and they are dealing with tough economic times back home. And this isn't something that families and States are new to. It seems like budgets are cyclical, sometimes you're up, sometimes you're down. But ultimately, you have to live within your means. And families are doing exactly that. Then they are looking at Washington and they are seeing what's happening up there when in just 2 months of a new administration where people were promised change, where a President stood here on this House floor just a few weeks ago and said, "We cannot simply spend as we please and defer the consequences." And I think we all agree with those statements. But the problem is people then look, and the next day, the very next day after the President made those statements, he files a bill that spends and borrows at record levels, \$1.7 trillion in borrowing and \$1.4 trillion in new taxes. Many of those new taxes will fall on the backs of middle class families and small businesses.

People are saying, "Wait a minute, that wasn't the change we were told about." If they made less than \$250,000, they surely didn't think they were going to see a dime of new taxes. And then they see that bill, the President's cap-and-trade bill, that actually adds roughly \$1,300 just in energy costs. The estimates are that it will be more than \$3,000 per family—not people making over \$250,000, but a middle class family or a family making maybe \$20,000 a year will see roughly \$3,000 when you count up your higher energy bill, your higher gas bill at the pump and when you go and pay for products that use energy, like food. Any food product you use there is energy, transportation, related to that. So people look at all of this combined and they say, "this doesn't add up to the things that I was hearing and that I was excited about." And so they are speaking up.

What is important is that people are not just going to sit back and let this happen. We are not going to sit back and let this happen.

I'll yield back to my friend.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. We have already had a perfect example of cap-and-trade. It was last year when oil prices went to \$147 a barrel. Every American citizen knows that that went straight out of their hip pocket. And like you pointed out, everything you buy at the grocery store, every product that is transported by energy pays for that. And we have already seen that. We know what will happen with cap-and-trade.

Mr. SCALISE. Reclaiming my time.

One other thing that was not brought up yet but a bill that was just filed about a week and a half ago that the President said that he supports is this bill called the Employee Free Choice

Act, which has just perplexed the business community throughout this country. Small businesses are literally shaking at the thought that their employee workforce and employees across this country—we have already started hearing from employees who are very angered and disappointed that Democrats in Congress would take away their right to a secret ballot vote when it comes to deciding whether or not they want to form a union. And yet that is now part of the President's agenda, an agenda item that is estimated to cost this economy in our country over 600,000 jobs in the first year in a tough economic time when we need to be creating jobs. The bill that they are filing could actually cost, run jobs out of this country to the tune of about 600,000 a year.

I yield to my friend from Georgia.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. You brought up a good point there. In fact I was talking to a manufacturer in my district not long ago about this so-called employers free—

Mr. SCALISE. Employees Free Choice Act, which it is not.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. The reason I have a hard time remembering that is because there is nothing free about it. It is actually a method of trying to force unionization on employers and employees alike. It is going to cost jobs. In fact, what I just was fixing to say was that I was talking to an employer in my district who said to me that if this act passes, he is going to shut the doors, and his business is going to go offshore. And that is going to happen all over this country. It is going to cost thousands and thousands of jobs.

Why is that happening? It is happening as a payback. It is happening as a payback to the Democrats who get all this money and all the support from the labor unions because the labor unions want to make an environment where they can force unionization on small businesses and large businesses all over this country. And what is even more egregious is the forced arbitration that is in that bill that is not free either. It is totally wrong. Again, this is a steamroller of socialism being shoved down the throats of the American people. And we have got to stop it.

□ 2145

But it is going to cost jobs. And what it is going to do is it is going to put us in a bigger financial mess as a Nation. When we have the cap-and-tax placed on all energy, it is going to drive up the cost of all goods and services. Just like Dr. ROE was just talking about up in Tennessee, folks up there already saw what happened. We have already seen in Georgia what happens. People stop utilizing energy. It is going to actually cost the Federal Government money instead of—and it is going to cost jobs.

I am beginning to think that that is the purpose of all this is to try to put everybody on the government dole, try

to create a big socialistic society where everybody gets a check from the Federal Government.

But the thing is, America's hurting. America's hurting terribly. We have got to do something and we have got to do it now. But going down this road towards bigger deficits, borrowing more, spending more, taxing more is not the solution. The solution is stimulating the free enterprise system. Free enterprise is the economic engine that pulls along the train of economic security in America. And we are killing that engine. We are throttling it down, and we are shutting it off.

And we have got to create jobs. We have got to create good-paying jobs. Building a bigger government, borrowing from our children and our grandchildren, is not the solution. And so we have just got to do everything we can to stop it.

And I applaud you, Mr. SCALISE, for bringing all these issues forward because it is just absolutely critical that the American people understand what is going on.

You brought out the quote from the President. The problem is, what he says and what he does are two different things. He said he would never, never sign a bill that has earmarks in it. Well the first bill, that omnibus bill, was nothing but earmarks. It was just a payback to the liberal entities, as well as all of the liberal agenda that they have had stuck in some drawer somewhere. They just dusted them all off and brought them forth. We don't have the money to pay for that. And it markedly increases the size of government.

We saw that with the budget that he has been proposing. And everything we are going to see is, we just see over and over again, the President says one thing and he does another. He says, we cannot simply spend as we please and defer the consequences, but that is exactly what he is doing.

Mr. SCALISE. Well, reclaiming my time, one of the things that you talked about, you know, as you talk about the concern that your business people in Georgia have, I have heard the same thing from not just employers but from employees, workers in South Louisiana, who are very concerned that their ability to, their right to a secret ballot would be taken away. In fact, while it is called the Employee Free Choice Act, myself and others call it the Secret Ballot Elimination Act, because all of us in Congress, the President, even the leadership on the Democratic side, we are all elected by secret ballot. There is a secret ballot right that people have, and part of the reason for that is it protects employees from coercion and intimidation and those kind of threats that have happened throughout our history. And that is the reason that that is in place. And that a bill would be filed as part of the President's agenda that would take away somebody's right to a secret ballot, something that is at the heart of

any democracy, I think, is offensive. And it shows people which road they are going down, that while we have got problems with our economy and we need to be focused on creating jobs, they see what this administration is really focused on. Taxing people's energy bills, taxing small businesses for the work that they do, that hurts their ability to go out and create more jobs to hire people in this country. And then passing legislation that would actually take away somebody's secret ballot, it is something that has gotten people's attention. They are seeing what these deficits will do to our future, our children and our grandchildren, and people are starting to speak up. And I am glad somebody else that is going to be speaking up is my friend from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. I appreciate the gentleman yielding. There have been so many wonderful points made here. I say wonderful as an adjective, when actually it is tough to say wonderful about such a very perplexing and disconcerting issue.

One thing that I haven't heard mentioned yet is about another issue that is contained in the budget, and that is with regard to restrictions on charitable deductions. Has the gentleman mentioned that?

And I appreciate the time you yield.

What struck me this weekend as I thought about President Obama and the Democratic leadership trying to restrict the deductions for charitable donations is, why would you do this? Because we know, worldwide, the best help that goes to people in need, whether they are starving or after an emergency, comes from the charities, the American charities. They can go straight in and start helping those people, whereas, our government, it has to go through the other government, often a third-world government, and sometimes we end up propping up really bad governments, just trying to help the people if we go through the government.

So why would the Democratic leadership and the President be wanting to cut down on charitable donations?

And that is when it hit me this weekend. It is about the GRE, the GRE, the Government Running Everything. That is what it is about. It is about power. That is where this restriction on deductions for charitable contributions is coming from. They want the government controlling everything. They see how philanthropic the American people are, how they want to help out of the generosity of their heart, and they say, gee, these charitable organizations, they are nongovernment organizations, NGOs are doing a great job. That ought to be us. Why don't we control that too?

When the government's job ought to be making sure there is a level playing field; everybody has an equal opportunity, not equal results, but an equal opportunity. And our job is to provide for the common defense against en-

emies, both foreign and domestic. And if we do, we go after the cheaters. That is our job.

But we have been so busy trying to run everything, we have not been going after the cheaters effectively; not on Wall Street, not in corporate America, not out there in the streets. That is what we have got to get back to.

But I appreciate the gentleman yielding. But I just had to share, that is what hit me this weekend. It is about the GRE, the government running everything. This group running things now wants all power, including the power of charitable organizations.

Thank you. I yield back.

Mr. SCALISE. Well, I thank my friend from Texas. And you know, coming from Louisiana, right after Katrina, with all of the failures of government, from the Federal Government to the State government to the local government, it was our charities, it was our faith-based organizations that were the first ones in and consistently delivered so much relief and, in fact, are still in the New Orleans area today helping people rebuild, helping families get back into homes. It is those charitable organizations that don't get anything from government in most cases. And they just do it out of the goodness of their own heart and the divine providence from the Lord. And the fact that this President's budget takes away people's ability to deduct those charitable donations, clearly threatens a lot of those organizations themselves.

And I know our time is limited. One thing we wanted to touch on as we have talked about the spending and the borrowing and the taxing, where is this money coming from?

We had actually done some research on the President's budget. And in the first 4 years, in President Obama's first 4 years in office, and I am sure that the limits on the elections will dictate if there is going to be another four, but I think as people look at this and they get more concerned, where is this money coming from? Who are we borrowing this from? This isn't money we have.

The first place the President is going in his budget is raiding the Social Security Trust Fund. And senior citizens out there who, justifiably, are dependent on that fixed income from Social Security, and future generations who want to expect something from Social Security, are very alarmed to see that in the first 4 years, the President takes over \$900 billion out of the Social Security Trust Fund. And so, record levels, again, of not just borrowing, not just record levels of taxes, but record levels, never before in the history of our country have we seen nearly \$1 trillion taken out of the Social Security Trust Fund in just 4 years.

And so, as we see the record levels of spending, and people can even look at this budget and they might find items in the budget, not in the baseline budget, but new levels of spending that they might like and think sound good. But

then as they compare that against where this is coming from, is it worth adding to the Federal budget to take from Social Security, to take from our children and grandchildren, to tax small businesses and to tax every family on their energy bill? These are the questions that Americans are pondering. These are the questions we are fighting.

And I will finish with my friend from Georgia (Mr. BROUN).

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for yielding. One other place that they are proposing taking money from is from our defense, from procurement. They are going to take away from our troops, and that is absolutely the worst thing to do. We live in a dangerous world. And we hear people talk about we have got to support our troops. But they want to take away the procurement that is absolutely critical for us to have a strong national defense. Constitutionally, that is the major function of the Federal Government. And the liberals want to take money away from our troops who are fighting for our freedom, who are giving up and their families are giving up sometimes their lives, their limbs and a whole lot of sacrifices that they are giving. And what we are hearing from the other side is they want to take away from our troops and take away from our defense.

The anti-missile defense system is another area that they are talking about taking money from. Just last week I went and watched a rocket shoot down another rocket, a SCUD missile. It was just a phenomenal test, and they want to cancel that, which is going to make us less secure as a Nation. We can't continue down this same road. We have got to stop it.

Thank you.

Mr. SCALISE. I thank my friend from Georgia. And that is why, we are living in challenging times, but that is why we are proposing alternatives. As we have talked about the problems of this budget, we have good alternatives we will be talking about more throughout the course of this year.

And I thank the Speaker for allowing us this time.

HEALTH CARE REFORM IS NEEDED

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

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank you. And I thank our side of the aisle for having the opportunity to speak to our colleagues, both Republicans and Democrats tonight, about a very, very important issue. The team that just spoke, Mr. Speaker, on the floor of this House about much of the spending and the plans and the too much spending, too much taxing, too much borrowing theme, which is absolutely what the American public, Mr.

Speaker, needs to know about, including the plans and the spending and to have a comprehensive health care reform plan that we would vote on, we literally, Mr. Speaker, would vote on before this body and the other body goes on the traditional August recess. That is what, just barely a little more than 4 months away. And the big question is not do we need health care reform? I think my colleagues, and particularly my colleagues on this side of the aisle, who are doctor Members of this body, who are with me tonight to discuss this, the issue of health care reform, we do not disagree, Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues, that this needs to be done.

Nobody, whether Republican or Democrat, whether majority or minority, would want to see 47 million people in this country to have no health insurance whatsoever, and maybe another 25 million that are underinsured. And, yes, indeed, it could happen to one of my adult children and their young families. They all have decent jobs, but one major illness away from being underinsured and possibly ending up in a bankruptcy court, facing foreclosure on their homes and these kind of crises that we all agree we need to avoid.

So the reform of the health care system is not really a question of whether or not this side of the aisle agrees. We do agree. It is a matter, though, of how we do it and when we do it, and what we can afford to do. And I think that what the President has proposed so far is, just as we hear about his overall budget in a 10-year projection, and the numbers that we received over the weekend from the Congressional non-partisan budget office, of unsustainable debt, deficits that will lead to possibly doubling of the national debt within 10 years. It is something that really has to be addressed.

Well, Mr. Speaker, tonight, we are here with, I am leading the hour, but I am very pleased that some of my colleagues on the GOP Republican Doctors Caucus have joined with me. And I wanted to set the tone for what we will talk about during this hour, and that is about physician work force; and will we have the manpower, when those 47 million hopefully do have health insurance, and the under-insured are fully insured, where are we going to come up with the doctors, the health care providers, to be able to provide that care?

Having a plastic card, Mr. Speaker, that says you are covered and you have access doesn't guarantee any individual that they are going to be able to have a provider who is going to see them.

□ 2200

And my fear is that they will not be able to have that access, particularly if the majority is successful in their plans to have a government default option to go along with, let's say, Medicare and Medicaid and TRICARE and veterans' health care benefits and the CHIP program. It is just adding one

more responsibility of the Federal Government to control all of health care, and that is really what we are going to talk about tonight.

As I walked over here, Mr. Speaker—I was walking in the building, into this great Capitol House Chamber, the people's House—there was an emergency, and I saw physicians from the office of the House physician—paramedics, nurses—sprinting to the ambulance that is parked right outside this building for just such an emergency. I thought to myself, you know, thank God for the health care system that we already have. We definitely can improve upon that, and we will talk about that tonight, but thank God that we have that ability to respond in that manner.

It makes me think, Mr. Speaker, of the tragedy that occurred up in Canada in regard to this famous actress—and I will not mention her name—the tragic death of that actress after what seemed like a fairly routine, snow-skiing fall in which she got up, dusted herself off and said: I am fine. I do not need any medical care. Let me just go back to my resort hotel room. I am fine. Of course, that is what she did, and we all know now that 2 hours later, when she began to get into trouble and, maybe, passed out and a 911 call was made, it was 4 hours later that she was finally seen at a major medical center that could respond to this subdural hematoma that she obviously had developed. By that time, she was brain dead, and a life was lost, not just a life of a famous person and a prominent person but a mother of young children and of a devastated family.

So when we, Mr. Speaker, hear this talk about a single-payer system, of a government-run system not unlike the Canadian system—I am not necessarily picking on Canada. They are our good friends and neighbors to the north, but the same thing could be said, I think, about the system in the U.K. or in Taiwan or in any of the other countries that have a national health insurance, government-run program. If this accident had occurred, I think, out in Colorado in the United States, that young mother and famous actress would be alive today.

So these are some of my thoughts as we begin to discuss. I call on my colleagues, the doctor colleagues, who are with me tonight. I want to ask my colleagues to focus their attention on this first poster. It is titled "A Second Opinion," and then, of course, it is subtitled "Strengthen the Doctor-Patient Relationship." That is what we want to do, and that is what we will talk about.

With this second opinion theme, I think, most people associate a second opinion with a medical opinion, and understand that, when they go to the doctor, sometimes a second opinion is very, very valuable. In fact, I think almost always it is very valuable. So it is important when the other side of the aisle—when the majority party—says or some of their news media, co-conspirators, if you will, who support a