

health care or can't offer the kind of generous plan that they would like to, they are at a disadvantage against their competitors who can offer that type of health care. They are at a disadvantage against the big employers who can steal their employees away.

So this is really an issue that our small businessmen are waiting to be a part of the solution, and if we can offer them, whether it is through a public option or through lower rates on private plans, a more affordable health insurance option, they are going to take it. They are going to grab it.

You are right, we don't want to set up any incentives where they are going to push people off to the public plan. But we know the majority of folks are going to want to be part of the solution out there, just for reasons of conscience, but also for reasons of their own salvation as a particular business.

Mr. ALTMIRE. And the gentleman hits the nail right on the head, talking about bringing down the costs. That is where we started this discussion. We are going to pass a health care reform bill this year. I am confident in saying that. The public support is there, the support in this Congress is there. We need to certainly finalize the details, and that is going to take some work. But this issue is too important, it is too important to this country, it is too important to families, it is too important to businesses, and it is too important to every individual in this country for this not to become law this year. I am confident that will happen.

We have to bring down the costs of health care. That is why this is so important. We have to bring down the costs for our families, we have to bring down costs for our businesses, and we certainly have to bring down the costs for our government.

As I started our remarks tonight by saying what this is about is the structural deficit over the long term that we have in our budget, and addressing the issues like energy and like education that have led to the skyrocketing deficit and debt that we have over the long term, and the only way you can begin to bring that under control is by bringing down the cost of health care for everyone in this country at every level, both in the private and the public sector. That is what this bill is going to do, that is what this discussion is about.

So, to close it out, I would yield back to the gentleman.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. I thank Mr. ALTMIRE and Ms. BALDWIN for joining us tonight.

Let's make no mistake about this. This is going to be a fight. This is going to be a fight, because to do this right, you are going to have to take on some folks who have gotten real fat over this health care system. You are going to have to take on some ideologues that just don't believe that the government has any role in trying to get health care to people.

There is a polling memo going around Washington written by Newt

Gingrich's pollster essentially outlining in 28 pages how you stop health care reform from happening. That is the agenda of a lot of people in this town, a lot of folks on the other side of the aisle, that they do not want health care reform to happen.

Now, some of it is for good, honest policy reasons. I believe it is an incredibly mistaken belief that the private sector can just fix this on their own. They haven't done it for the last 50 years. How can we expect they are going to do it overnight?

Some of it though is very cynical politics. Some of it is due to people that look back to 1994 and the failure of the Clinton health care plan in the 2 years prior, and believe that if folks can stand in the way of President Obama or this Democratic House passing health care reform, that they will gain some electoral advantage out of that.

Now, I hope that is the minority of people that are standing in the way of this bill. But make no mistake, there are people out there who simply see political advantage against Democrats in general or against the President of the United States in stopping health care reform from happening.

Now, they may have succeeded back in 1993. I wasn't here, Mr. ALTMIRE wasn't here, so we can't speak to all the reasons that happened. But that is not going to happen this time. Not because you have got smarter people in the House of Representatives or you got necessarily a better strategy moving forward, but because the American people are not going to stand for the status quo.

They know this economy is tough and they feel more conscious than ever of the fact that they are just one paycheck away from losing their health care and becoming one of the tens of thousands of individuals out there who have been forced into bankruptcy because of health care costs.

The status quo is not good enough for people out there, and despite 28 pages of polling telling the folks on the other side of the aisle how to stop this from happening, I believe that the will of the majority of Americans is going to bring us together to get a good bill passed.

We are here as 30-somethings in the Democratic Caucus talking about that tonight, but I believe that there is going to be a groundswell of public support that is going to force us, both parties, to come to the table and do something, not small, not minor, not temporary, but something big and permanent to fix all of the underlying problems in this health care system, to make sure that more people have it and less businesses are burdened by it.

So, again I would like to thank Speaker PELOSI for once again giving us the opportunity as the 30-something Working Group to come down here tonight, and remind folks that they can e-mail us at 30somethingdems@mail.house.gov. If you have any questions for us, any

feedback on what you have heard this evening, www.speaker.gov/30something is where you find us on the Web.

NOT LEARNING FROM HISTORY

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. Madam Speaker, there was a cynical comment that was made by people who take a look at history. They say that one of the things we learn from history is that we learn nothing from history. I don't know that that is universally true, but certainly for our subject for this evening, that will certainly be the theme, that we are not learning very much from history.

We are going to be taking a look at the fruit of fiscal mismanagement, and particularly what is going on in our country in terms of a very, very important number, and that is unemployment. The unemployment numbers have continued to rise, in spite all kinds of assurances that by spending tons and tons of money, that we can turn those numbers around.

The historic connector here that is I think quite interesting is a fellow by the name of Henry Morgenthau. Probably you have not heard of Henry Morgenthau, but he was an important figure in his own day. And here in this Chamber, in this House, Henry Morgenthau met with the Ways and Means Committee in 1939.

Henry Morgenthau was FDR's Secretary of the Treasury and he had 8 years working on a theory that is known as Keynesian economics. He was one of the main architects of Keynesian economics, whose idea was that what the government needs to do is to stimulate the economy. You have heard that phrase over and over, stimulate the economy, and the purpose of stimulating the economy is, of course, to create more jobs.

That is a little bit like grabbing the straps on your boots and lifting up and trying to fly around the room. It doesn't work. And after 8 years of failed experience, these were the words, the very quote of Henry Morgenthau here in this building before the Ways and Means Committee.

He said, "We have tried spending money. We are spending more than we have ever spent before, and it does not work." His words are echoing down through history. "It does not work, I say. After 8 years of the administration, we have just as much unemployment as when we started, and an enormous debt to boot."

These are the words coming to us, floating down through history by Henry Morgenthau, the main architect of Keynesian economics. Franklin Delano Roosevelt, the master of the policy of stimulating the economy with big spending.

Maybe we haven't been doing a good enough job on stimulating the economy with big spending, so let's just take a look and see what we have come up here in just the last year or so.

I am joined by a number of my good friends and colleagues who are going to help us in unpacking some of what is in this spending that we have and also going to help talk about this incredible statement that was made by the President last week that, somehow or another, that his administration had created 100,000 to 150,000 new jobs. It is kind of amazing, because all of the actual numbers from the government show that that is not true at all.

□ 2100

So we have quite an interesting evening together. And I'm joined by a good friend of mine from Iowa, Congressman KING, who is here to join us in our conversation tonight. I hope that everybody else will feel comfortable to just tune right in and join us. We're going to have a little bit of fun and take a look at some of the economics. It's a serious picture, but it's an example to us that we must learn from history. It's also an example of the fact that America is on the wrong track.

As we take a look at what's going on with job losses, I think many Americans, Congressman KING, understand the fact that all is not right and that unemployment number jumping up as high as 9-something percent is not acceptable.

I would yield time to my good friend from Iowa, Congressman KING.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. AKIN) for pulling this hour together. And I listened to the first flash of illumination of common sense here coming from deep within history of Franklin Delano Roosevelt's administration, his Treasurer, Henry Morgenthau, saying that Keynesian economics does not work.

And so I wanted to add to this, John Maynard Keynes' philosophy that he spoke about during that period of time of the implementation of the New Deal that was presented by FDR, and historians have taught for years that FDR's New Deal saved us from the Great Depression, although there isn't any evidence of that, especially, FDR's Secretary of the Treasury making the statement that Keynesian economics does not work.

Now, Henry Morgenthau was a contemporary of John Maynard Keynes, and Keynes became prominent in the twenties and throughout the thirties and kind of wrapped up his career in the forties. But Keynes described how Keynesian economics worked. He did this himself, and his description was this. He said, I can solve all the unemployment in the United States. All we need to do is go find an abandoned coal mine and go out in that abandoned coal mine and drill a whole group of holes out there, and then take American cash, tamp it down into those holes,

and then fill the abandoned coal mine up with garbage and turn the entrepreneurs loose to dig up the money. That would solve all the unemployment in the United States of America.

Now, that doesn't sound very rational when I say this on the floor of the House of Representatives, but that came out the mouth of John Maynard Keynes, who inspired this Keynesian economics and Morgenthau's response.

I yield back.

Mr. AKIN. I just have to kind of wonder what he was drinking when he came up with a theory like that. That's an interesting tidbit of history.

Mr. KING of Iowa. And we didn't have EPA approval either.

Mr. AKIN. He didn't have EPA to put the garbage in the mine. I'm sure he would have gotten in trouble with that.

It's just a treat to have, also, my good friend Congressman LAMBORN who's joining us tonight as well. And we're just getting started now, talking a little bit about this idea that somehow all of this spending that we've been seeing in this last year that we've been here together, this incredible level of spending, is supposed to help with this unemployment problem. And yet, just as Morgenthau would have predicted, we're seeing unemployment going up and the spending just totally out of control.

I yield time to my good friend, Congressman LAMBORN.

Mr. LAMBORN. Well, I thank the gentleman from Missouri for letting me have this time. It's good to join you for a few minutes with this time that you've put together to speak and present to the American people and to have a dialogue between each other what the spending is really costing us. And so far it's not producing jobs. I think we hit 9.4 percent, if I have that correct, of what the latest unemployment figures are.

Mr. AKIN. Just affirming that, reclaiming my time and affirming that number, yes, it is now 9.4 percent. You recall that there was a promise when we got to this great big—they call it a stimulus bill. We call it the porkulus bill. When we got to this porkulus bill, they said, If you don't pass this bill, if you don't do that, why we may have unemployment at 8 percent. And here we are at 9.7 percent, and we did pass the bill. And so the excuse is, well, this thing is really helping us a lot. Well, I sure hope it doesn't help us in that direction too much longer because that was what was supposed to be. But I think you're right. Your number is 9.7.

I yield.

Mr. LAMBORN. Thank you. With that amount, 9.4 percent, which I think is the high point for 25 years, unfortunately it's the high point in unemployment in our country for two and a half decades.

And I just wanted to mention, it's so inconsistent or even hypocritical for the press to say that this is not anything other than an unmitigated disaster. They're falling all over them-

selves trying to put a spin on this thing saying, Oh, it's really not as bad as it seems. The rate of growth of unemployed people has slowed down, or it's less than we thought it was going to be.

Can you imagine if we were 12 months ago, 24 months ago, when George Bush was President, what the press would have said? They would have said, It's horrible, and the policies are doing this and driving unemployment up.

Mr. AKIN. Just reclaiming my time a minute. What would the press have said if, under the Bush administration, they claimed that they created 100,000 to 150,000 jobs and they didn't have any documentation for that? Say, Where in the world did you get that number, because the numbers that have just come out show that we've lost jobs. It's gone the other direction.

If you had a track record like that—this is just the year, this year. This is starting in February, March, April, this is another March, 14, 28, April, April, May and May, this is just a few months here. And this is what's going on with unemployment. And you're out here and you claim, Hey, we just created a whole lot of jobs. People would kind of wonder, I would think the press corps would say, Wait a minute. Where'd you come up with this 100,000 to 150,000 jobs that he claimed last week that they created? I supposed he'd say, Well, if we hadn't passed this great big porkulus bill, why, by golly, it would be worse. Of course he hasn't learned from Henry Morgenthau.

I yield back.

Mr. LAMBORN. The gentleman from Missouri is correct. It's so inconsistent. If this was the previous President, the press would just be laying right into him. Right now they're giving the President a pass. And it's inconsistent, and I think the American people can see through that.

And Congressman, you also mentioned, what are these phantom jobs out there that were saved? Anyone can claim, well, there's one or two or 300,000 jobs that were saved. I can't document it, but just take my word for it, and the press isn't looking at that either. I just wish the press would do their job of being an honest, objective observer and reporter of what the facts are. And until the press does that, the American people are really not being served well.

Mr. AKIN. Well, reclaiming my time, I think you're right. And I'd like to just take a moment and get into—these numbers are easy for us to rattle off, just off the tip of our tongue, but let's take a look.

First of all, you've got \$700 billion in this Wall Street bailout. Now, some of this came under President Bush, and I think the people in this room voted against this thing because it didn't make a lot of sense. Half of it, though, is the beginning of this year, and we keep dumping all this money out, and it's not quite clear what we got for it.

And then we get to this thing here, this economic stimulus which is supposed to be fixing this unemployment problem. And what's going on in this bill?

I've got a few, just choice examples I'll share, but I know others of you here have some examples. We're joined by a number of fantastic Congresspeople, and here's one. This is one here, this is you can't afford a bicycle after purchasing a \$1 million home. Okay. This is money for Washington, D.C., part of the stimulus money that's supposed to be helping us with jobs.

Washington, D.C., Department of Transportation will spend \$3 million in stimulus money to expand its Smart Bike program. The money will increase the program by five times, from 10 bike racks to 50 bike racks, and from 100 bikes to 500 bikes. Neighborhoods expected to get the new bike racks include Adams Morgan, Columbia Heights, Capitol Hill, Anacostia and Georgetown, where the average single-family home runs at \$1.2 million. Boy, now there is an interesting use of money. May be a wonderful thing to do, but I'm not sure what we should be taxing everybody to try to create jobs.

And we've got a lot of other fun examples. I'm joined by my good friend Congresswoman BACHMANN, and Congresswoman BACHMANN is articulate and a good friend to people who care about jobs and care about fiscal sanity.

I yield time.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I thank the gentleman from Missouri for calling this together so that we could call attention to the job losses that are happening all across the United States. It's in your district. It's in my district. It's every one of our districts here that are represented this evening.

And I was absolutely shocked, as I've been watching this play out, of the Federal Government jumping in and taking over private businesses, beginning with Chrysler and then now with General Motors. We're seeing something that we haven't seen. I don't know if we ever have seen anything like this in the history of our country, and I am still livid over the conversation I had today.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time just a minute, what you just said is so important for people to understand, and that's because we don't have quite the sense of history. We've just heard from one of our other guests just a minute ago that this is a 25-year high in unemployment.

But what you've just talked about is, when the President goes in and fires the president of General Motors and appoints the people a board and decides to rewrite the bankruptcy laws, this is unprecedented. And I think, my good friend, you have a specific example from your district about what this could mean to Main Street America. I wish you'd saw share that with us tonight.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I do. I had met with dealers in my district before from

Chrysler, and they looked me in the eye and they said they were just flabbergasted. They couldn't believe that they got a pink slip that they were going to be out of business by the end of the month. All the cars that they had on their lot they'd have to sell. They were going have to wrap up and go out of business by the end of the month. And they told me that they were one of the most successful Chrysler dealerships, not just in Minnesota, but in the Nation. They performed 160 percent better than the top performers in the country. They met all the criteria for staying open for Chrysler, and still they were pink-slipped. No one could understand.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time, I'm just trying put myself in the shoes of the family who owned that dealership that you're talking about.

Mrs. BACHMANN. This particular family, Congressman, had put \$5 million into this dealership just prior to receiving this notice. They were slated to adding another Jeep dealership to the Chrysler business that they already had. Significant amount of money, and they produced tax revenue to the amount of \$3 million every year on that 5-acre parcel that they utilized.

Mr. AKIN. Just reclaiming my time, so you have a dealer who's been in business in your town for what, 90 years or something I think you were saying?

Mrs. BACHMANN. This particular dealer had been in the business since the early 1920s. The one that I spoke with today had been in business for 90 years. They were a General Motors dealership.

Mr. AKIN. Ninety years, and their dealership was assessed at, what was the value of it?

Mrs. BACHMANN. There's a recent appraisal done on this dealership, very successful dealership. They have all the debts paid. They own everything outright and clear, and the appraiser said this dealership is worth \$15 million.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time, so \$15 million, and then you wake up one morning and you get this thing in the mail and it says your \$15 million just basically vaporized, didn't it?

Mrs. BACHMANN. Was worthless. Now the only thing that their dealership is worth today is the underlying property that the building sits on. They put all sorts of money into building their building, which is now free and clear. They worked hard to make sure they could pay for it, and now it's a dealership building. And as most Americans know who are listening to us speak this evening, if you have a dealership building, you can't use it for much else other than a dealership. And trust me, there's no one out there right now who's too interested in buying an old used dealership building because there's not new car dealers going up out there.

Mr. AKIN. So once again we have another projection of this example of Washington thinking they know how

to do everything, deciding who's going to be the president of General Motors. All of this money that belongs to our constituents, we're going to dump this money into various companies, and then we're going to try and manage. We can't manage D.C. What makes us think we can manage car companies?

What an example of—and I think there are some other examples of what's going on with some of this spending.

And I see that we're also joined by Congresswoman LUMMIS from Wyoming, I believe. So we've got the West pretty much covered. We've got Iowa covered. We're going to have Georgia in just a minute.

Please join us.

Mrs. LUMMIS. I thank the gentleman from Missouri for pulling us together this evening for this discussion.

In Wyoming, our economy is very much based in the energy industry because we have coal, oil, gas, uranium, wind, solar, biomass, and that is the mainstay of our economy by far.

□ 2115

So as we watch the 350 to 375 very small businesses that are drilling for oil and gas and see the legislation that is coming before this Congress at the behest of the Democratic Party, it will devastate our businesses.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time, so you're talking about the tax that they're proposing to pay for some of the spending that is that cap-and-tax situation which is going to devastate small business, and small business, of course, is where these jobs are created; is that correct?

Mrs. LUMMIS. Absolutely. I think the Americans have the perception that Big Oil is who is recovering these natural resources; but even those firms hire very small, literally mom-and-pop operations, five and six employees to go out and drill the drilling, to do some environmental compliance, to do the surveying, and to complete those wells, and do the fracturing of the deep seams that are required to cause the gas to flow into a natural gas well. These are very small operators. As I said, in Wyoming alone, over 350 businesses.

Yet what we see on the horizon taxwise through the national energy tax that's being called cap-and-trade would be utterly devastating to those businesses.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time, what you're doing is making a tremendously important connection. And I think a lot of people do get that impression that all of the jobs in America are General Motors or General Electric or Mobile Oil or whatever it happens to be. But in reality, as one of the most ranking members in small business, what you find is you define small business as about 500 employees or less. Small businesses create almost 80 percent of the new jobs in America.

So what you're saying is exactly spot on to what all of our data shows, and if you're looking at 80 percent of the new

jobs and you're looking here at an increasing level of unemployment, what you should be paying attention to is what are you doing for small business. And what you're talking about is we're doing something that we haven't learned from history. You're going to slap a great big tax on them to cover up all of this spending. And what's going to happen is you're going to dry up the potential of those new jobs that could come from small business.

I appreciate you making that connection.

And I'm going to just jump over to my good friend from Georgia, a medical doctor, but also somebody who has quite a fair amount of passion about freedom and about some of these economic issues as well, my good friend Dr. BROUN from—is it the Atlanta area?

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. No, sir. I live near Watkinsville, Georgia, south of Athens, and I represent northeast Georgia. And I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The chart that you have down there on the floor. If you put the date of this week on the next bar, going back to what Mrs. BACHMANN was just talking about, these dealerships are shutting the doors. Dealerships may have 20 employees, they may have 30 or 40 employees. I've met with a number of them. There is a dealer in my district in Clayton, Georgia, in Rabun County, right up on the North Carolina line, called me this week and he got one of those pink slips. He is a customer of the automaker, and that's what all of these dealers are, they're actually customers. And what is happening is this administration is forcing the Big Three automakers to fire their customers, and that makes absolutely no economic sense.

But this dealer doesn't do any floor planning. In other words, he doesn't have to borrow money from the automaker to put the cars on his lot. He owns them all. He's paid for them all. He owns his dealership. He doesn't owe anything to the carmaker. But they have fired him. And in doing so, this administration has fired all their employees.

So the next bar for all of these dealerships I think is 780-some-odd just this week that are going to be fired—the dealership's going to be fired, thus all of their employees are going to be fired. And that's going to put that bar even higher. And it's just not right.

This is an unprecedented takeover from the private sector by this administration—by the car czar that has been set up by this President—and it is totally unconstitutional, it's totally against freedom, it's totally unprecedented. And it's exactly the same thing that Hugo Chavez is doing down in Venezuela.

So if we could imagine that next bar on that graph, it's going to be even higher than it is.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time, what I'm hearing you say is—you're a med-

ical doctor. You're not claiming to be some economic expert. You're saying common sense says that this 9.7 percent unemployment that we got right now is not the end of this problem and that the idea of the tremendous level of spending that we're seeing is not going to help. You're agreeing with Henry Morgenthau from 1939 that all of this spending is not going to make this any better. And what's more, a lot of that spending is going to result in more unemployment rather than less.

Is that the bottom line of what you're getting at?

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. If the gentleman will yield, absolutely. That's what's going to happen. You cannot borrow and spend yourself to economic prosperity. And that's what's going on here. We're borrowing too much, we're spending too much, taxing too much, and it's going to cost jobs.

I'm sure we'll come back to discussing what the gentlelady from Wyoming was talking about because there is somebody else that's going to talk a lot of jobs across this country. But we're going down a road that is going to hurt our economy. It's going to cost jobs, as we see an increasing number of jobs on your chart there that are being lost. And unemployment claims, we're going to have more and more of those. And it's really taking away from the future of our children and your grandchildren.

Mr. AKIN. That's the bottom line. I think that's what's gotten us staying here this evening talking about this subject. This is critical. This is a very significant problem.

I would like to jump back to my friend from Iowa, Congressman KING, a gentleman who has run his own private business for many years before he came to Congress, knows a little bit about small business, knows a little bit about taxation and red tape. And he also understands what some of these massive government spending programs in the last year, what these are liable to do in terms of effects on our economy.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Missouri. I started business in 1975, a capital-intensive business with a negative net worth so I had to actually make everything work or it would have collapsed around myself. And I remember prior to that looking for a job. I applied for a good number of jobs. Worked for other people. They worked for me. I had to build a business up a piece at a time, a component at a time.

One of the points that I think would illuminate this when I look at the numbers that are there on the chart: \$700 billion on the Wall Street bailout, \$787 billion in the stimulus plan. That was going to—and I remind everybody here and including Madam Speaker—if she were paying attention—I would be reminding her that President Obama said that his stimulus plan was going to save or create 3.5 million jobs—and that was just back a couple of months ago right there on the time line where

a \$787 billion. 3.5 million jobs saved or created. And I thought at the time, How do you measure a saved job? It was there when you started, it was there when you're done the. It's one that your economic plan didn't destroy, but it isn't necessarily one your economic plan saved.

So now we have the White House saying they've saved or created a dinky little 100,000–150,000 little jobs when their endeavor is 3.5 million jobs. And by the way, that number is not out of thin air. That is off of the White House's Web site, WhiteHouse.gov/economy. So those numbers are real.

Another image that flashes to my mind when I hear the gentleman from Georgia talk about Hugo Chavez, I had a flashback about the visitation that took place between our Commander in Chief, leader of the free world, President Obama and Hugo Chavez down in Central America. And I recall that we needed to have a strong message from the President of the United States that would embrace Colombia and ask for a vote on the floor of this House as was agreed to under those terms. We didn't get that meeting, but we got a glad-handed, big smiley happy face meeting between Hugo Chavez and President Obama.

And I remember the image that flashed in my mind. One of them is Hugo Chavez could declare our President to be El Diablo at the podium of the United Nations and say, The smell of sulfur still lingers from yesterday. And those anti-American people laughed and cashed our checks. And just a few months later we have President Obama glad-handing with Hugo Chavez. And when I saw that image, I realized that the great nationalizer of the industries in Venezuela who had just nationalized a rice plant that belongs to a good Minnesota company named Cargill was standing there smiling next to President Obama who was the greatest nationalizer of all, who has since nationalized two of the three largest carmakers in the world—General Motors and Chrysler—and we've watched the nationalization of our financial institutions, our insurance industry. The list goes on and on.

The free market system from top-down is being swallowed up and nationalized instead of privatized.

And I would also make this point that our President today was elected at least in part because he challenged President Bush and criticized President Bush for going into Iraq without an exit strategy. This President has declared that he doesn't want to own or manage Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac, the financial institutions, the insurance agencies, or the automakers of America. But he has engaged in all of that without an exit strategy.

I call upon President Obama to come up with an exit strategy to divest the Federal government and the taxpayers from this private sector industry that have been so nationalized that he makes Chavez look like a piker.

And I yield back.

Mr. AKIN. That's really quite a summary of where we are. What we're getting at is this disease that struck the Washington area just one year or two ago. It's bailout fever, you know. And we got into this idea that we're going to bail everybody out—at least if you're big and important. If you're a small business, you're going to go bankrupt. If you're a car dealership, you go bankrupt and you lose \$15 million in one day. But we're going to bail out all of these, and in the process, what's going on in unemployment? Is this nationalizing of businesses such a good idea? I think there are a lot of people having some very extreme second thoughts.

This was not going to happen if we voted for that great big porkulus bill. I'm on the Armed Service Committee. When you say \$787 billion, that's more than my paycheck. I tried to figure out how much money is that. And the biggest thing we deal with in any committee is aircraft carriers. These are big things. If you ever get on an aircraft carrier, you could play a game of football on the deck of one. They're really big, and they cost a ton of money. We have 11 in our total fleet. They cost about \$3 billion a piece.

So if you take a look at what happened to us in the first 5 weeks after we've been told that President Bush is spending way too much money, we put this bill in place—this was the trimmed-down version—on this floor we voted for \$870-something billion. That would be over 250 aircraft carriers anchored end-to-end. I couldn't even imagine. You could make a highway across them. That's how much money that's in this package alone.

That's not the Wall Street bailout, and that's not this appropriations bill that's full of goods. That's not this international monetary bailout that they're talking about doing where we're going to take defense money and give it to foreign countries, put it in a fund so that Chavez and the Iranians and other people can take defense money out of the United States away from our taxpayers so that they can fund their governments, and we're talking about doing that. We're wondering why in the world do we have this unemployment. I think we're making some big mistakes economically.

I would like to jump back over to my very good friend Congresswoman BACHMANN who, by the way, is a great articulator of free enterprise principles and does a wonderful credit to Minnesota.

We're delighted that you're here, and please chip in and join in.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I thank the gentleman from Missouri.

And I'm very concerned again about these motor takeovers from the Federal Government. One thing that I am very concerned about, a story came out today where there's been approximately 1,500 letters that have gone out to GM dealerships.

One story that came out today, there is a dealership that I know of that applied to their Democrat Senator to appeal for help so that they could stay open. That Senator was able to arrange a meeting between the dealer and the officials at GM. We all know GM is now Government Motors because it's owned by the American people. It's been nationalized. There is no private corporations the way we used to think of GM. Now, the main stockholder is the American Government. So this Democrat Senator who was applied to for help was able to secure a meeting with General Motors and a car dealership, and they were able to get their dealership back.

□ 2130

Well, that's great, that's wonderful.

There is also another article I saw today where a constituent had contacted one of the representatives, a Democrat representative here in this Chamber, Representative BARNEY FRANK. BARNEY FRANK was able to go and talk to the right people and get this dealership back open. Is that what we have come to in this country, that rather than a private business with a private contract with another private corporation, they're no longer able to work out their agreements because, as columnist Michael Barone has called, he said, Now we've moved into the realm of gangster government. We have gangster government when the Federal Government has set up a new cartel and private businesses now have to go begging with their hand out to their local—hopefully well politically connected—Congressman or their Senator so they can buy a peace offering for that local business. Is that the kind of country we are going to have in the future?

When I was on the phone today for over an hour with one of my local dealers, the very first thing out of her mouth was this, she said, This is the most un-American thing I have ever seen in my life. I can't believe that I lived to see the day that my country would come to this point where, having my dealership for 90 years, I get a letter FedExed to me that tells me I have until Friday to sign this document to not only give up my company that was made worthless—worth \$15 million, made worthless overnight—now GM is demanding that she hand over her customer list, her service customer list to GM. Why? GM most likely will use those customer lists, they will give it to her former competitors. What is she getting for this? What is her remuneration? She had the rug pulled out from her and from her husband. They virtually lost everything overnight to what? To what Michael Barone calls a gangster government.

We need to call this for what this is, my colleagues. We need to call this for what this is. Call it out. The American people need to get outraged and figure out that it could be them next. No business is safe when you see the ad-

ministration appoint czars—car czars, wage czars—there's over 20 czars that have been appointed. And what do those czars do? They bypass the Congress. We are the people's elected representatives; we have been bypassed.

We now have an imperial presidency where the President has appointed various czars reporting directly to him. And now he is reaching into the confines of private businesses and overnight rendering them virtually worthless—unless, unless they have a special tug, a political tie to a local Democrat Congressman. Is that what we've come to? And I yield back.

Mr. AKIN. Well, I just appreciate the lady's passion and strong support for the concept of freedom.

You know, what we're really talking about here is, what is the job of the government? And we have come to a point where we have actually elected people who have forgotten this basic concept, and that is, the government that can give you anything you want can also take away everything from you, including your freedom.

And that is the great danger of this insidious creeping bureaucracy where the Government inserts itself into all kinds of different businesses. The Founders would have been outraged at what you've just described. And even people from not so many generations before us would say, that is impossible, that could never happen in America.

Mrs. BACHMANN. If the gentleman would yield, the Founders went so far as they began a revolution over a stamp tax, over a stamp tax. This is the actual outright taking of someone's personal property. And the Founders were unwilling to pass the Constitution without the Bill of Rights. And as the gentleman knows, the Bill of Rights was to protect individuals, people, not to protect government, but to protect people from the encroachment of big government upon their leaders. And the Fifth Amendment guarantees the right of your personal property. Big government cannot come in, they are prohibited from coming in and taking your personal property without just compensation. Here is a perfect example of violation of these citizens' Fifth Amendment rights.

Mr. AKIN. You are absolutely right. And we have seen other examples of it; the decision in Connecticut where some local municipality decided to trample the Fifth Amendment, just walk right in and take somebody's private home in order to make a strip mall so they could tax the strip mall. And the Supreme Court jumped to the defense of the local government saying, that's just fine. And they just ignored the Fifth Amendment.

And so we see this continuously growing government. And if you take a look at where we are spending money, it is just absolutely amazing. And here is an example. This is a town that is supposedly almost bankrupt—I think it's Pawtucket, Rhode Island, if I remember right. The city on the verge of

bankruptcy spends \$550,000 in stimulus money for a skateboard park. Now, what in the world is the Federal Government doing with bicycle racks in D.C. in million-dollar neighborhoods, skateboard parks somewhere else. We're putting it all in here and claiming somehow it's going to make unemployment better, and yet the numbers are going nuts. The President, it seems—what's going on with the White House Press Corps? He claims they've just created 150,000 jobs, and yet you see the data going, we're already at 9.7 percent.

And it's my understanding, when you jump to the next big tax we're talking about, they want to be like Spain. And Spain has the enviable 17.5 percent unemployment. Is that where we're going? How long is this going to go before the American public says enough already; it's time to change this big spending?

If you want to see this thing graphically, this is a little bit chilling. This is historic budget imbalance. These are the different years of the Presidents. These years over here are President Bush. And those of us here that are Republicans, we didn't like the fact that President Bush was spending too much money. This is deficit spending. This is a budget imbalance. But take a look. When we were kids, didn't you have to go—what was it, first grade, what thing doesn't fit the pattern? Take a look at this year. Take a look at this budget imbalance that we're talking about. You think that's not going to affect jobs? You don't think that means the government is going to get its nose into all kinds of people's business? That's what we're concerned about.

I would like to go to my good friend, Congresswoman LUMMIS from Wyoming. You know, the thing I like about Wyoming and the Western States? You have a sense of freedom and a little bit of a sense of property ownership and you have a sense of small business. And I appreciate that perspective. Please join our conversation.

Mrs. LUMMIS. I thank the gentleman.

In Wyoming, we have had surpluses in our budget for the last 7 years, and it is because of the explosive growth in the production of energy. It has made our unemployment among the lowest in the Nation. In fact, there were times during the last 7 years that we have had, statistically, zero unemployment. Incredible. While I was running for this position, I stopped at a fast-food place to get an iced tea late at night, and they offered me a job and my daughter a job at this fast-food place because they are so much in need of employees.

Wyoming is unique in that regard, and it is because we are producing domestic energy. And there are new discoveries of domestic natural gas all over the United States. The Balkan in North Dakota is fantastic. It is producing wealth for people who have been farming at that very narrow margin of profitability, 0 to 4 percent, for years.

Mr. AKIN. Well, wait just a minute. You're talking about we're creating jobs and wealth and all this, and the government is not doing it? Oh, my goodness. That's a novel idea; the government is not coming in and telling you how to run everything.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Not only are we producing the cleanest burning hydrocarbon that there is, natural gas, but we are doing it in a way that makes us less dependent on foreign energy. And what we are seeing in this Congress are policies that will actually make us more dependent on foreign energy at a time—

Mr. AKIN. Let me just stop you there because what you said is very, very important. You are finding sources of natural gas—one of the cleanest burning fuels that we know, in terms of hydrocarbon-type fuels anyway—and you are finding that, which is making it so that you have plenty of jobs in Wyoming, you are not doing it with a lot of government help, and yet the government is going to try to create policies to make us more dependent on foreign energy. What would that be? I would suppose that one way to do that would be to tax your natural gas, because if that's taxed, then the foreigners have a better chance of getting business here. Is that where you're going?

Mrs. LUMMIS. And to the gentleman from Missouri, we are also proposing in this Congress to tax drilling costs, to raise the taxes on the brackets, to do away with the death tax, to put the recovery of natural gas under the Safe Drinking Water Act. Virtually every time I turn around, almost every day here, we are doing something that will impair our ability to produce our own natural resources.

And it's not just in Wyoming, there have been these fabulous new finds of natural gas that run up both sides of the Appalachian Mountains all the way from Pennsylvania clear to the Southern States. All of those States could have new natural gas production, the cleanest burning hydrocarbon, that reduces our need for foreign energy, that reduces the out-migration of jobs, it keeps them here, it grows them here. It grows revenue for those States.

I can tell you, as our State treasurer in Wyoming for 8 years, we had, just off interest income off State investments, the largest source of income for our State's general fund from one source, interest income off State investments. And all of those State investments, every one of them, came from severance taxes on oil, gas, coal, uranium.

Mr. AKIN. Isn't that something? Well, you are an energetic Congresswoman from an energetic State. And it's encouraging to hear that we do have those supplies of energy here.

It is ironic, I think, that when you take a look back at the history of the Department of Energy, it was created so that America could be energy independent. And they have added many, many jobs to the Department of Energy, and yet we have become more and

more dependent on foreign energy. And if we had more people like you in this Congress, I think that would change, and we would see that we would be getting back to good old American energy of a lot of different types. And we would let the marketplace, and not the government, make the choices as to which type you are going to use in each State.

My good friend from Georgia, Congressman BROWN.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Congressman AKIN, I appreciate you yielding.

I wanted to come back to something that you said that I think the American people need to understand very clearly. The President has talked about looking to Spain as being the model of this energy tax—I call it tax-and-cap because it's about taxes, it's about revenue for the Federal Government, it's about getting more revenue to socialize medicine and other things to nationalize, all of the business and industry that is already being nationalized, and even more. But in Spain, I would like to confirm something. It is my understanding, if you would, please, sir, it's my understanding in Spain, when they put on their tax-and-cap or cap-and-trade policy a number of years ago, they touted it as creating green jobs.

Mr. AKIN. I think they call them subprime jobs now, but go ahead, Congressman.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Well, the point is, they talked about creating green jobs. Just recently, one of their—I think it's members of Parliament—was over here talking to the Conservative Opportunity Society. And he told us—I don't recall if you were there, Mr. AKIN, or not—but he said for every single green job that was produced in Spain they lost 2.2 jobs. The green jobs that were created were temporary jobs; the jobs that were lost were permanent jobs, industrial jobs. And that's what I kind of recall. Is that correct?

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time, that was exactly what he said. And actually, that made common sense to me because when you go back to this Keynesian economic scheme, what they would argue would be, Hey, we just took all this tax money and we hired these people; so when we hired somebody, we created a job; so, therefore, we had a net. We just hired someone to increase the job by one.

And what the economist found was, when you take that tax money out of things, what happens is, when you took the tax money away to hire the one person, you lost 2.2 jobs over in the private side. So that ratio seems to kind of follow the economic principle that when the Federal Government—yes, you can have the Federal Government take a whole lot of money and hire a lot of people to dig holes in the ground, or whatever, but when you do it by taking that money away from the private sector, you are killing those small businesses, which is a source of where you're generating a lot of these jobs. So I think that is where he was going.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. If the gentleman would yield back just a half second. I want to go back to the outrage that my dear friend, MICHELE BACHMANN from Minnesota, was showing us. The American people should be outraged. And the American people can call a stop to this. We can't. We, as Republicans, have offered alternative after alternative. Wall Street bailout; we offered an alternative, and President Bush, Henry Paulson, the leadership in the House and Senate wouldn't accept it. The nonstimulus—as you call it porkulus bill; I call it the nonstimulus stimulus bill—we offered alternatives. The leadership in this House were obstructionists and wouldn't allow us to have an open hearing and discuss it.

□ 2145

The omnibus appropriations, we had alternatives. We have had alternatives for all this. They call us the Party of No, n-o, but really we are the Party of Know, k-n-o-w, because we know how to help stimulate the economy. We know how to create jobs, and you do that through small business and give the money back in ways to create an environment where small business can create jobs. As the gentleman from Missouri so aptly told us just a few minutes ago, small businesses is where those jobs are created. It's about 85 percent of them. But we have offered alternative after alternative. And this what I call "tax-and-cap" legislation has been estimated it's going to cost America, that somewhere between 1.7 to 8 million jobs are going to be lost. In my district in northeast Georgia, we have got in multiple counties right at 14 percent unemployment.

Mr. AKIN. You're talking about millions of job loss as a result of this new tax that's being concocted here.

I would like to recognize another doctor who has joined us. We have got some doctors out tonight, and my good friend Dr. BURGESS, I want to recognize him. What we have been talking about is this incredible trend in unemployment and also the trend of excessive spending.

I would be happy to have your perspective, Doctor.

Mr. BURGESS. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I was watching in my office and heard this discussion, and I did want to come over and say just a few words.

Of course, you're correct. We had a report in our Joint Economic Committee last Friday about the current unemployment rate in excess of 9 percent. Of course, we spent \$878 billion in February of this year. The President told us that was what we had to spend in order to prevent the unemployment rate from going in excess of 8 percent. Clearly we have seen that number already exceeded. And then we heard at the beginning of this week that because of those numbers, the President was going to accelerate the pace of spending, accelerate the pace of dis-

tributing the stimulus money. We weren't spending fast enough was our problem.

Now, of course, Mr. Speaker, I know the comments need to be directed to the Speaker's chair, but I would remind the Speaker that none of us in this room, in fact, no Republican, voted for in favor of that stimulus bill last February.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time for a moment, in a way that's a little bit unusual, isn't it? There are usually a few Democrats who will vote differently than their party or a few Republicans who will vote differently. In this case, though, on this great big porkulus bill, every single Republican voted "no."

Mr. BURGESS. You're absolutely right. Every single one of us did a gut check and said this is not what I came to Washington, DC, to do. It's not what I came to accomplish.

One of the things I wanted to share with the gentleman and share with the House tonight, my hometown newspaper, the Dallas Morning News, runs a column every Sunday by a columnist named Scott Burns, a respected economist. Scott Burns this Sunday was quoting an economist in Austin, Texas, Lacy Hunt. Lacy Hunt, going back to the Great Depression, said, and I am quoting here: "Irving Fisher saw it first. The man who may have been the greatest American economist wrote about the debt-deflation theory of the Great Depression in 1933. He saw that excess debt controls nearly all the economic variables." He went on to say: "Think about it for a minute. It's a very powerful statement. Excess debt controls nearly all of the economic variables."

What does that mean? That means we cannot control the unemployment rate. That means almost everything is out of our grasp because of the massive amount of debt that we have accumulated. And on Monday of this week, the President said he wanted to accelerate the pace of spending because we weren't getting that money out the door fast enough. Again let me reiterate, excess debt controls every other economic variable. It was true in 1933. I suspect the same is true today.

He goes on to say, Scott Burns, "It means that the government stimulus won't do much. Basically you can't borrow your way out of excess debt." I think every Member on the floor here tonight has recognized that at one time or another.

And then the final point that he made: "The only thing that will allow recovery is the passage of time."

Fortunately, Congress is not in control of that, and time will pass at a set rate regardless of what we think that it will or won't do.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time, I want to get what you're saying because I think this is important. You're saying there is a relationship between this tremendous level of debt that we are building and the unemployment numbers. In other words, when you have a

whole lot more debt, particularly debt with spending, and, of course, spending is causing the debt, you're going to have bad trouble with unemployment. Is that what this economist is saying, gentleman?

Mr. BURGESS. Precisely correct. And I thank the gentleman for yielding back.

We are in a period of prolonged economic underperformance is the other statement they go on to make. It will essentially be a lost decade. We will recover, but the operative factor will be time and not actions. That is something that most people do not want to hear.

Again, excess debt controls almost every other economic facet. You cannot spend your way out of this problem. The unemployment rate went up. The correct response is to not shove more money out the door. The correct response is do what you can to get control of that spending and begin to erode the debt, begin to put the debt on a glide path to reduction. That's where the recovery will come, and that will take time. There is no other way around that.

But, again, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I think this is a wonderful discussion that you've had tonight. I thank you for bringing this to the attention of the American people.

Mr. AKIN. I appreciate the doctor from Texas bringing some wisdom here and some economic common sense. And certainly I think most people know intuitively these things are connected. If you spend a whole lot, eventually you're going to go into debt and then the debt is going to influence things. And in this case, I am an engineer by training, not a medical doctor, but it's almost like drawing a vacuum economically in the economy. So those small businesses that we are just hearing about like out in Wyoming, those small businesses don't have the money they need to invest to drill a well or whatever it is; so the main engine of job creation just dries up. So what you are doing is almost like either starving or dehydrating your economy because the government is just becoming so oppressive and expansive in everything that it is trying to do. And as we heard eloquently expressed from the gentleman from Minnesota, the story about what happens when the Federal Government starts to get into the business of running car things. I am picturing there is going to be somebody possibly listening into our discussion that's going to be a cartoonist, and they are going to think about the automobile that is going to be designed by the U.S. Congress, and they are going to have an interesting caricature of what the engine and the wheels look like and how big it is and all kinds of things. There is probably already a YouTube being created or something along those lines. But it's not a pretty picture of having the Federal Government running our business in our private sector. And the genius of our

country is to make that distinction, and we are blurring it badly and it's going to cause a lot of trouble.

I am going to yield to my good friend Congressman KING from Iowa. Please join us.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Missouri for yielding.

There are a couple of points that linger in my mind. One of them is to add to the points that the gentlemen from Georgia and Missouri were making about Spain, and I concur. For every green job created, it cost 2.2 jobs in the private sector because it starved capital, but also each of those green jobs created cost \$770,000 to generate that job. So it was a massive cost in capital.

I want to throw another point into this in a brief way, a teaser in a way. The cap-and-trade component of this legislation that's impending to be driven through this House floor yet this month of June, we have experience with that here in the House of Representatives. When Speaker PELOSI was elected and received the gavel, she declared that this Capitol complex would be carbon neutral. So she ordered that the generating plant that provides the electricity that illuminates this room when she allows the lights to be on would be changed from coal generation over to natural gas under the auspices of this idea that natural gas isn't a hydrocarbon, which we know can't be upheld by an engineer or a doctor or a layperson. But in any case, she ordered the switch over to natural gas, doubled the cost of the electricity, and still found out we were not carbon neutral but we're still emitting a surplus of CO₂ into the atmosphere, so went on the Board of Trade and purchased \$89,000 worth of carbon credits, the very central commodity that is at the middle of the cap-and-trade discussion that's going to be presented on the floor of this House, \$89,000 for carbon credits to offset the CO₂ emissions that are going off into the atmosphere so we can light this Capitol complex. And I chased that back down and found out that some of that money went to no-till farmers in South Dakota. Presumably they had still been farming in South Dakota. It didn't change their behavior. And some of that money also went to a coal-fired generating plant at Chillicothe, Iowa, that had received a government grant to burn switchgrass. I went there and looked at that. They hadn't burned any switchgrass in 2 years and got a check anyway. That's how cap-and-trade will work in the United States of America. If we can't get it right in Congress, we are not going to get it right in America.

Mr. AKIN. I appreciate that vivid example of more wasted time. I am going to yield again to my good friend Congresswoman BACHMANN from Minnesota.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Last weekend my family sat down and we were watching the commercial movie "Titanic." And as I was listening to Dr. BURGESS from Texas talk about the debt and the bur-

geoning debt load that the United States takes, once the ice gash came in the side of the Titanic, which we all remember was called the "unsinkable Titanic," we think of the United States. Nothing can possibly sink the United States. We will always be a superpower. But one thing that has kept us a superpower has been freedom, free market economists. We are in the process of watching the deconstruction of free market economists before our very eyes, something we have never seen. But as the ice ripped that hole in the Titanic, water started being taken on, and the engineer came out and brought the blueprint of the Titanic. Water came into the first chamber, spilled over to the second, spilled over to the third, and by the time it filled up so many chambers, it was over. It was impossible to resurrect that ship.

That's, I think, Mr. AKIN, what you have been bringing before this body this evening. You've been showing to the American people that at a certain point when we have such excessive levels of spending that in turn leads to such excessive level of taxation that in turn leads us to excessive levels of borrowing that at a certain point we wonder what that tipping point will be if the United States will not be able to recover.

We do have an alternative, as Dr. BROWN said. We have a positive alternative that next quarter we could already see growth in our economy. But this plan that President Obama has put forward is the kind of plan that we could watch last night, or last weekend on TNT in the movie "Titanic." If we follow that plan that President Obama has put before us, we know what that outcome will be and a lot of very innocent people may go down with that ship.

Mr. AKIN. I very much thank Congresswoman BACHMANN and the other great guests that we have had tonight. I thank you for this little symposium on freedom and the need to have the Federal Government restrained to its proper limits.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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. Madam Speaker, for the next hour, I am going to be joined by a number of my colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle, and most of them are members of the GOP Doctors Caucus, and we are going to spend time, Madam Speaker, talking about health care reform. Certainly that is the number one thing that's on our plate as we go through these next 6 weeks leading up to the August recess. And, of course, as the President has outlined his desire to have a health reform bill on his desk for signature sometime in mid October of this year, whether or not that can be

done remains to be seen. There are a lot of thoughts out there as to how to approach this, but we feel that it's very important as physician Members. I think there is something like 339 years of clinical experience combined in this GOP Doctors Caucus. About 15 of us are health care professionals who have actually practiced in the field, if you will, most of us involved just in clinical medicine, what I like to refer to, Madam Speaker, as meat-and-potatoes medicine. Not research at some high academic institutions but actually seeing patients every day in the office, in the operating room, in the delivery room. And so I think we have a perspective that we would like to share with Members on both sides of the aisle.

Earlier in the evening, Madam Speaker, we heard from the 30-Something Group on the Democratic majority side. They were very articulate, very well spoken, but I think very wrong in some of the ideas that they have in regard to a government default plan, and we will talk about this during the hour.

□ 2200

I have been joined by a couple of my colleagues, Dr. John Freeman, the doctor from Louisiana; and Dr. PAUL BROWN from Georgia.

I would like to yield time to my colleague from Louisiana at this point.

Mr. FLEMING. I thank my friend and fellow physician and colleague, Dr. GINGREY.

You made reference to the 30-Something Democrats, and I watched that debate, that discussion with great interest because, to be honest with you, with 32 years of medical practice and also owning businesses for nearly as long, when I hear this discussion about how a public plan can work, I really try to view that and try to understand that; but I always come out totally mystified with how this sort of thing could ever work.

And to clarify the debate, basically Congress right now is looking at three different options. One is a total single payer nationalized health care system, Medicare for all. One would be a private system for all, which is what we, on the Republican side, back. And then the other is a public and private system that are competing with one another. So I really watch with great interest our colleagues on the other side—none of whom are physicians, I might add—talk about how this could be a great deal, a great success, where you have a public system that's competing with a private system, somehow that's going to drive cost and prices down, and we're going to get a dividend from that.

Well, what I would do is point out to my colleagues, let's look at Medicare today and Medicaid as well, both government-run systems. Both of them are running out of money rapidly, the budgets are exploding and expanding, and they are living off the fat of the