

the effort on debt relief. Because Haiti certainly should not have to repay any loans given the devastation that it has faced not only during this recent disaster, but in the past.

Congressman ED TOWNS, chair of the Government Reform Committee from the great State of New York, with a large Haitian American population, large Caribbean American population, also a minister, who has been a strong voice on behalf of the Haitian people throughout his life. Congressman ED TOWNS.

Mr. TOWNS. I would like to thank the gentlewoman from California, the chair of the Congressional Black Caucus, for her leadership.

Of course I know that the time is running out, but I really wanted to take at least a minute to thank some people that I know have worked real hard to do whatever they could do to relieve in terms of every way to create an atmosphere and climate to get people involved in helping the people of Haiti. Gregory Jackson, who heads the Brownsville Recreation Center in Brooklyn, New York, has been very involved in terms of collecting all kinds of items. Vivian Bright, who heads the women's caucus, she has been collecting things to send to Haiti. And of course I want to salute them.

And then I want to thank Dealmid. Dealmid has put together all kinds of medical supplies. And of course I want to thank Warren Cohn for taking them down. And of course I want to thank the Bedford-Stuyvesant ambulance service, who went to Haiti right away and were able to save lives. And of course not only that, they were able to deliver babies and all of that. So I just want to thank them for their work, and to encourage them to continue.

Let me just say that there are 125,000 people from Haiti that live in New York. And we are not going to forget Haiti. We are going to make certain, the Congressional Black Caucus has indicated over and over, that we are going to be there.

Ms. LEE of California. Thank you very much. And let me again thank you for your leadership, Congressman TOWNS.

I want to just close this evening by first saying that as chair of the 42-member Congressional Black Caucus, I want to reiterate tonight that our thoughts and our prayers continue to be with the people of Haiti during this very difficult period. We know the Haitian people are resilient people and that they will move forward in rebuilding their country.

But we want to make sure that the people of Haiti understand that the Congressional Black Caucus stands with the people of Haiti as they move forward during this next phase of recovery and reconstruction. And we will be doing everything in our power to make sure that once, unfortunately, Haiti does not make the front page of the news, or the 24-hour news cycle ends with Haiti as the lead story, we will continue to be there. This Con-

gress will continue to be there working as we move forward to develop a Haiti Marshall Plan. Thank you again.

I yield back the balance of my time.

THE FEDERAL BUDGET AND THE ECONOMY

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

Mr. AKIN. Mr. Speaker, our topic this evening, and one that I think has received some coverage in the media, and is something that is of concern to many Americans, is the level of spending in the Federal Government, the budget that has been proposed, the size of deficits, and overall where the American economy stands. These are all very important topics. These topics could not be more timely.

The President has just released his new budget for the next couple of years. We can take a look and see exactly what the numbers are. So these questions, probably even more so because of the high level of unemployment, have a quite a number of Americans asking some very serious questions and have, I would say quite honestly, a number of people in elected office here in Washington, D.C., extremely concerned about the fact that we are not doing what we should do in terms of fiscal responsibility.

Now, one of the things that happens in the political world, and this may be a surprise to some people, but perhaps not to others, and that is that sometimes there is a significant gap between what people say and what they do. And so I prepared a few charts here just to give us an introduction to this subject about the budget, about spending, and about what is really true and what is really a significant factor, and what are more peripheral kinds of questions or issues.

Now, the first statement was made by the President, President Obama, in his State of the Union address here in this chamber not very many days ago. This was his comment. He said, "The true engine of job creation in this country will always be America's businesses, but government can create the conditions necessary for businesses to expand and hire new workers." Now, this particular statement is quite true. In fact, it corrects an extreme misconception that some in government would love to have passed onto the Americans, but in fact is not true. And that is that government never can create jobs.

Well, you say, Congressman AKIN, how is it that the government can't create jobs? Can't they take taxpayers' money, go out and hire somebody, and if they hire somebody doesn't that person have a job? Well, the answer is yes, but really no. What happens is when the government hires one person various economists would disagree a little bit on the exact number, but you take

about 2 or 2.3 jobs out of the private sector for every job that you create in the public sector. So the government really doesn't create jobs, it simply takes money away from other people to hire someone. So when you say that the government is going to create jobs, that is actually economically false.

What the President says here is true, "The true engine of job creation in this country will always be America's businesses." That is true. In fact, he went on to acknowledge that it is not just any business, but it particularly is small businesses. Someone has figured the statistic that 80 percent of American jobs are in companies that have 500 employees or less. So small business, that is 500 employees or less, is very much the place where jobs are created.

Now, we have some people in politics that are always blasting those rich guys, those people that own businesses. And we are going to tax the rich guy and make sure that he pays for everything. Well, there is only one little problem with that theory. And that is that a lot of the people that own those small businesses are reasonably well to do because they have successfully put a business together, have managed it, have taken considerable risks, have spent a whole lot of sleepless nights worrying about balancing the books, but somehow, in spite of all of that, they were successful. And they wake up 10 years later, after they created a small business, and they find out that they are a millionaire. Now, they may have started sleeping under a park bench somewhere, and a husband and wife look at each other, and there is a smile, and they look and they realize that their dream has come true.

□ 1845

The American Dream worked for the owner of some small businesses. And what that means is, because those people do have money, they can reinvest that money in their own business. And when they do, they'll add a wing on the building, add some new machine tools or a new process or new idea, and create jobs in America.

So what the President is saying is true—the true engine of job creation in this country will always be America's businesses. But government can create the conditions necessary for businesses to expand and to hire new workers. The government can do that. Maybe it would be more accurate to say that unless the government gets in the way, that's the natural cause of small businesses, to grow and to add additional jobs.

What are the kinds of things that the government can do to try to create those jobs? Well, they want to create an environment. It's a little bit like if you're trying to grow a plant, what do you want for a plant to grow? Well, you've got to have some water, you've got to have some sunshine, you've got

to have the right temperature. You've got to have the soil conditions and chemistry more or less right. In the same way you can grow jobs in America if you keep certain basic factors and functions in perspective. We're going to go into that in a minute. But let's take a look.

This statement being true—these are the words, but here in fact are the actions of what is being proposed as you go further into the speech. First of all, what is being proposed are \$2 trillion in tax increases over 10 years; \$2 trillion in tax increases. We're going to talk about that in a minute, because who's going to pay those \$2 trillion? Where's that money going to come from? You bet, it's going to be taxpayers.

And then we have this job-killing cap-and-tax legislation. My chart says cap-and-trade. People want to call it cap-and-trade. They really want to call it the global warming tax. But this cap-and-tax legislation puts a big tax on energy. Now guess who uses energy, aside from homeowners, aside from people who drive cars. Of course, small businesses. They use energy. Depending on the type of small business, some use a great deal of energy. And so you have here a proposal which is about an even portion of government redtape and government taxation. If I had to judge the bill, I think the redtape may be more onerous than the taxation, which is bad enough. The combination of the two are deadly to small businesses and deadly to job creation. We'll get into that in a minute.

What else is being suggested? We're going to have new taxes on employers who don't offer the government health insurance plan. So now what we're going to say to people if you're a businessman, Yeah, we're going to tax you on your energy, but we've got another tax, too, for you. That is, we're going to tax you on health insurance. And, guess what? You're going to pick up a big piece of the tab for this government-run health insurance plan, which supposedly only costs \$1 trillion.

Now that's not talking about the amount of cost shifting that's going to go to various State governments. But you have an extremely expensive proposal for government to take over one-fifth of the U.S. economy with this mandated, top down—I think I remember 400 or 500 times in this 3,000-page bill you have the "shall." The government shall do this, shall do that. And so this is another proposal which the President says he wants to move forward with. And then it increases taxes on small business owners who make over \$250,000. Well, a whole lot of small business owners can make over \$250,000. But, again, as I have mentioned, if you put the taxes on these people, they'll pay their taxes but they're not going to put that money, that tax money, back into their business to create jobs.

And so what we have here is the words that recognize that businesses create the jobs, and particularly small businesses create the jobs, but then in terms of action what we're doing is

we're doing the very worst possible thing that you can do in terms of creating jobs and helping our economy. Let's take a look. You know, economics can be pretty boring sometimes. I try to make it as simple as I can.

I'd like to talk to you this evening a little bit about job killers. If you want to kill a plant, you don't give it any water. If you want to kill a plant, you let it freeze. There's certain things you can do that makes it so that a plant dies. If you want to kill jobs, there's certain things you can do to kill them and there's also things you can to create them.

Let's talk about the first factor. It wouldn't surprise you perhaps that the one that I would think of first is taxes. Now how does taxation affect small business people? Well, it's this way. If you tax them more and more, they're going to have less money to put into their business and so they're going to have less money to hire people. And that's the same effect I was talking about. The government can tax and hire somebody, but when they do, they're taking that money away from the small business. And so while you add some government worker, you lose two employees from the local company.

And so tax increases are absolutely deadly, and they are going to be a big factor in unemployment. No big surprise. Other people have recognized this. This is not that complicated. This is not rocket science. This is not laser science. This is not quantum mechanics. It's simple lemonade stand-type economics. And other Presidents have recognized the problem. And so what did they do when they got into a recession and they're having trouble with unemployment? Well, JFK understood. He cut taxes. Ronald Reagan understood it. He cut taxes. And George Bush during the recession also cut taxes. In each of those situations the economy responded fairly rapidly to those tax cuts. And why? Because the small businessman is starting to get some money to plow into his business. So, first of all, taxes are a major factor. And if you raise taxes a lot, you're going to kill jobs.

What have we just got over here? We've got \$2 trillion in tax increases. We've got the cap-and-tax bill, the thing on taxing energy with all sorts of redtape in it. We also have the employers—the socialized medicine bill. Where the government to a large degree takes over health care, a trillion-dollar tag on that has to be picked up by a lot of small business people. And then you have, if that's not enough, increases on anybody making over \$250,000. That hammers small business people. And this list doesn't even mention the fact that the tax cuts on capital gains, dividends, and death taxes, which were put in place during the beginning of the last recession under Bush to help the economy, those are going to expire. So they're going to compound this problem. So here we have words. We understand that jobs are created in busi-

nesses, but we don't really understand because our actions are saying we're going to do just exactly what it takes in terms of tax policy to kill jobs.

The second factor if you want to kill jobs is redtape. Redtape means that it's more cost for businesses to do their work. If the government says, Yeah, but you've got to write a report; you've got to do this; to check with this; got to go to court to take care of this; you better do that; all of that red tape may not be a direct tax, but the net effect is it's costing a whole lot of time for an employer to try to comply with government redtape. Do you think we've got a fair amount of redtape in America?

Think about the amount the average citizen has in their own life and then multiply that significantly for the average business. And so redtape is another big factor. We have words. This sounds good and in fact this is even true. The trouble is the actions are the exact opposite.

I recognize that I've been joined by a good friend of mine, Congressman BISHOP, and I'd like to yield you some time if you'd like to talk a little bit about the budget. I'd like to get into tonight a couple of different things that have been said, comments that have been made about this budget. First of all, I want to get a scale of how big it is. Second of all, I'd like to talk a little bit about can you blame it on the previous administration. We keep hearing that it was President Bush's fault that we're in the economic problems. And then I'd like to get back to the job creation question. But I think you've got some specific examples from your district where there were jobs that we're talking about, and particularly an employer that is affected by this budget. Could you share with us, please?

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Well, I thank the gentleman from Missouri for yielding. Yes, this presents a particularly interesting conundrum that we do have here. The President has talked about how our most important element is to create jobs. And it is. For our people we need jobs. I recognize, though, that much of what we have in this budget that you have already mentioned does not create jobs. It actually has a stifling impact on jobs.

Some things, though, in which jobs are our responsibility, we also have put a stifling influence just on the decisions we make. This budget is \$3.8 trillion. That's a whole lot of money. It's \$1.6 trillion more than we have. That's a whole lot of money that's going to go there. And in every one of the budgets that takes place it's about choices. In our own families we do the same thing. We have certain things we want and certain things we need. My problem with this budget right now, specifically in the areas that I am deeply concerned, is that we have a lot of stuff in here that we want that's being funded

and a lot of things that we need that is not being funded.

One of the few constitutional responsibilities we have in this country is defense. Last year, you and I were down here with others very frequently talking about missile defense. It is essential for this country. We cut missile defense. Once again, it was about prioritization. I think and I believe you thought we put our priorities in the wrong place. And you don't build a missile without people. When we cut our missile defense program, we took jobs away.

Unfortunately, in this particular budget, once again we go after another kind of missile program and have decided to take it out. What it simply means is this budget decides to go after NASA and take away the Constellation program and specifically the Ares 1 rocket. Now I hate to say this, but Time magazine determined what were the Fifty Best Inventions of the Year. And the number one invention was the Ares rocket. This is our process to replace the space shuttle. This is how we are moving into space exploration in the future. I hate to say this. I think space exploration is one of the core responsibilities of the Federal Government.

But in taking this out what you are doing is cutting 7,000 jobs nationwide of people involved in space, engineering, math, and science, which—once again, the President wants to encourage kids to study and to go into engineering, science, and math, but we don't have any responsibility of trying to encourage that on the real side. And where the problem comes is the people that make the motors for these rockets make the motors for our missiles.

Mr. AKIN. Let me just get the connect, because you're building up to something here. What you're saying is that there are solid rocket motors that are being built in America, which are very high-tech, and they're being built by a particular company. And they're used for the space program but they're also used for something else. Is that correct?

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. In defense.

Mr. AKIN. In defense. So it's not just space. It's also our defense.

I yield.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Both of those are core responsibilities of the government and one that this administration has decided to cut. And it's not necessarily that they are companies that are making these—there's actually two companies in America that do make those motors; one hasn't made any in a couple of decades. But it is people that do it. When you cut these programs—when you cut the missile defense last year and you cut this rocket program this year, the people with the expertise that we need to build the defense of this country are going to be gone. They're either going to find another job or, unfortunately, they're going to go on unemployment so we can pay them for not doing their jobs that we need to defend us.

This is one of the travesties of this particular budget. And it would be okay with me, perhaps, if they had come up with a new plan, a new role for NASA, something they are going to move us forward with, but they did not. All they did is simply cut the program, throw people out of work—if it goes through, I should say. We still have the right to say what it is. But this budget would cut the program, throw people out of work and, more importantly, fail for us to defend this country, which is our constitutional responsibility. It would fail to allow this country to move forward in space exploration and in defense because the industrial base of this country would be gone.

The acquisition guys over in the Pentagon understand it. They say it's not necessarily about jobs, it's about the kinds of jobs. And therefore it is important for the future of this country to have the right kinds of jobs in the industrial base. And it's not simply a spigot you can turn on when once again we decide, oops, maybe we had the wrong idea and we need more missiles to defend us against the Iranians and the North Koreans and who knows what else might be out there. You can't just pick it up again. If you lose the capability, you lose the capability. And, I'm sorry, in this budget we lose the capability we need to defend this country.

It's not just about the amount of money. It's about where we put our priorities and do we do what we need to do first and then cover the wants. I'm sorry; we're paying a lot of money for a lot of wants. Let me give you a simple example. If you took what we spent in the stimulus last year for ACORN alone, you could fund this program again and still have close to \$2 billion left over.

□ 1900

Mr. AKIN. Wait a minute. You are telling me that the ACORN program, the one where we've got people going to jail for voter fraud and all other kinds of strange and weird behavior, registering illegals, registering people that don't exist, turning them out to vote, and even on videotapes, we see them encouraging people to build brothels and to bring in underage illegal immigrants, that organization? You are saying that funding could be instead directed?

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. That program got more funding in the stimulus bill that was passed last year than it would take to carry on with this program moving forward.

Mr. AKIN. What you have said—and I just want to reinforce. There is a difference between jobs and jobs, is what you are saying. Some of these things are very high-tech kinds of jobs. They require building companies over a good number of years, building capabilities, putting that team together, and you've got to have enough work to keep that team operating or else they just have to dissipate and go somewhere else. And if we need that capability for the

defense of this Nation, that, in many of our opinions, is the primary function that we must perform here. There are a lot of other things that might be nice if the Federal Government did it, but if we have invading armies riding across our country, we're not very effective.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I think you are exactly right, and that's why, with all due respect, this is like a double disappointment to me. Not only are we spending too much and taxing too much, but we are not spending it in the right place.

Mr. AKIN. We're not even spending it in the right place. You know, that's a very, very visible kind of thing. You can see a solid rocket voter has a lot of technical kinds of aspects, how those have been developed, and we have an advantage on that from a technology point of view. Now you are basically saying that we're going to give that up for spending it on what, on something like ACORN? That's why a whole lot of people out there are really wondering what we're doing down here.

Congressman, thank you for joining us. I notice that we are joined by Dr. BURGESS, a good friend of mine. We're talking about the budget and about job creation and how those things connect. I also was trying to take apart a little bit because we hear some good words, and yet the actions of what we're doing don't seem to fit. So if you can join us, please.

Mr. BURGESS. I appreciate the gentleman yielding. When I heard what you were doing, I wanted to come down here and talk. You know, a week ago we heard from the President here in the House of Representatives, and he talked about this recession that he inherited. Okay, it's almost as if no President has ever had to deal with a recession before.

I don't know about you, but 20 years ago, we had a pretty bad recession where I lived in north Texas. In fact, I remember it very well because—I'm a doctor—the medical group that I was in was under such stress from this recession that it splintered apart, broke up. I found myself on January 1, 1990, beginning a whole new venture as a solo practitioner in obstetrics and gynecology in my town. And quite honestly, I wondered how I would make it. The recession was rough. We didn't have anyone coming down from Washington with a big bag of dollar bills saying, You guys doing all right? You need some more cash? We'll be glad to front it to you. At that time, the bad actors were the savings and loans that had imploded. But real estate markets had fallen, energy prices had fallen, and Texas was certainly upon hard times.

The reason this came to mind was the story recently about the number of people in the administration who worked in a private sector job, and the number is astonishingly low. It's in the mid-single digits. No wonder when this administration looks around for solutions, their tendency is not to go to

people who have actually done things in the past that have been creative and successful and created new jobs.

In February of 2000, I had ended my first month in this new medical venture, and I didn't have any money. I couldn't take any money home certainly because I didn't have any money, and I had nurses on my payroll that were depending upon me. Their families were depending upon me. It was a tough time. It was hard to borrow money. I went down to the bank and borrowed \$12,000 to meet payroll for that 2-week interval. The banker was not kind to me. He charged me 14 percent interest.

Mr. AKIN. Whoa, whoa, whoa. Stop just a minute. There wasn't somebody with bailout money from the Federal Government to come just give you some free money?

Mr. BURGESS. No, my bailout was my friendly banker who said—

Mr. AKIN. Fourteen percent interest?

Mr. BURGESS. For a 6-month loan.

Mr. AKIN. You can say that with a smile on your face today, but that banker wasn't too good a friend.

Mr. BURGESS. It was \$12,000 to meet—I realize here that \$12,000 doesn't even calibrate as budget dust with what we do. But \$12,000 was an enormous sum of money to me at the time. I'm not going to be able to take a paycheck home, but I had to be able to pay my employees. No money was coming across the counter because I'm an OB/GYN. You've got to wait a few months before the delivery occurs, and you get paid for the work. I was so scared—

Mr. AKIN. Sort of one of those 9-month lead time type of things.

Mr. BURGESS. Correct. I was so scared about what the future held for me. I did some mental calculations, and if it cost me \$25,000 a month just to pay my employees, what is my world going to look like in June? I'm borrowing for operational expenses, and I have got no way to really catch up that slack. Well, to make a very long story abbreviated, money did start coming in over the counter. That was the last money that I ever had to borrow.

But boy, I'll tell you what, when we come down here and we talk about this budget, I remember just how I felt those days. How was I going home to face my family? No paycheck. You talk about tightening your belt, there just wasn't a belt to tighten. We didn't have anything. I knew I had to continue to perform for my patients because I was obligated to do that. I knew I had to continue to perform for my employees because I was obligated to do that. I didn't ask any questions. I didn't whine about it. I went down and did what I had to do, which was borrow \$12,000, and it scared me to death. It scared me to death.

And we're going to borrow \$1.9 trillion tomorrow just to meet our debt obligations for the next, what, 14 months? Are you kidding me? And the problem is, we've got an administration where no one has ever worked in the private sector. No one's ever had to

go down and borrow that money, put their name on the line. No one's ever signed a paycheck on the front. All of their paychecks are signed on the back. That's our problem. Their natural tendency is to look for the government to get bigger because that's where the solutions come from.

No, the solutions come from the private sector, the small business entrepreneur, the doctor, the cardiologist, the saddlemaker, air conditioner repairman. That's what has made this country great. That's where the recovery of our economy lies, and we are fixing to kill the goose that laid the golden egg with this massive debt.

What's going to happen when we have to monetize \$1.9 trillion? What's going to happen to the interest rates? I paid 14 percent in February of 1990. You know what, that might look like a pretty good deal 10 years hence when we get to monetizing.

Mr. AKIN. You know, Dr. BURGESS, what you have communicated here, aside from being a doctor—we always put doctors sort of in a special category and maybe a little bit of an elevated platform. But what you have communicated is just the heart of a guy that has a business and how much risk you took and how you plowed into uncharted territory, just trusting that you could generate that business and then get the business going. And afterwards, you had employees. You provided a great product for people, and there are a whole lot of Texans who are thankful to Dr. BURGESS for delivering them. But you gave us an understanding of how that whole system works. And just like your one example, there are really thousands upon thousands of business owners that are looking at this thing, and saying, What in the world is going on?

Now we've talked about words and then actions. Here are some words, but families across the country are tightening their belts and making tough decisions. The Federal Government should do the same. Hey, that sounds pretty good. That's what you were just talking about, Doctor, that families have to tighten their belts and take a good look and make choices between one thing and another.

Congressman BISHOP just made a brilliant explanation of why the Federal Government is making lousy choices. Not only are we spending too much, taxing too much, borrowing too much, but we're also doing it for the wrong reasons. And that just doesn't make a whole lot of sense.

This is starting to get to the point where I think things are going to get interesting. We're going to bring on another witness, a fantastic young man who really does know something about budgeting. The big question I think that comes to a whole lot of Americans' minds is this question: When is too much too much? When do we get to the tipping point where the whole thing, just like a table, dumps and the whole economy just basically falls to pieces? You know, just like in your

business, if you had borrowed too much, you could have pushed it too far. You intuitively knew that.

What happens when we start getting into this? We're saying that families across the country are tightening their belts, but we, sure as the dickens, are not because with our actions, we're going to double the debt in 5 years, raise the deficit to a record \$1.6 trillion this year. That's 10.6 percent of GDP.

Let's put this into perspective. It's one thing to have a deficit during a year; but when you compare the deficit to the overall product of the whole Nation, that's a significant statistic. And last year, we set a record. The year before we set a record. During the time George Bush was finishing and NANCY PELOSI had this Congress, we had a \$450-something billion deficit. That was big. That was 3.1 percent of GDP. That was too much spending. And then we come back around to '09 and what do we do? We go from \$4.5 billion—oh, billion isn't a big number anymore. Let's try trillion—to \$1.4 trillion of deficit. That's three times more with the current President, and when you look at it as a percent of GDP, 9.9 percent of GDP.

So now we've learned our lesson, right, for 2010. Certainly that was too much. No. No. We're going to go for \$1.6 trillion instead of \$1.4 trillion and 10.6 percent of GDP. When is enough enough?

My good friend Congressman HENSARLING, I don't want to pick on Texas too much, but you have really taken the lead on a number of these economic issues. We need some help tonight, and we need to ask that question, When is too much too much? Please help us.

Mr. HENSARLING. Well, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I certainly appreciate his leadership tonight on an issue that is of great concern to every American. Every American who has children, every American who has grandchildren and are wondering, What is Washington doing drowning them in a sea of red ink? Again, when you say, How much is enough, we are already there. So I think it's been somewhat of a surreal experience for the American people as of late to see Washington go mad.

Never in the history of our Nation, do I believe, have I seen such an explosion of spending of deficits and debt. As a lot of the public know, the President of the United States on Friday came and spoke to the Republicans in the House, and I give the President credit for doing it. I think it speaks well of his character that he would come and speak to us, something that our own Speaker I don't believe has ever done.

I had the opportunity to speak to the President at that exchange, and I asked our President, I said, Mr. President, your last budget that you submitted tripled the national debt over 10 years and took the cost of government

from its historic level of roughly 20 percent of our economy up to 25 percent. I mean, we haven't seen such levels of government since World War II, the cost of government relative to the economy. I asked the President that question, and the President didn't answer. The President declined to answer the question on Friday. But you know what, he answered the question on Monday, and he answered the question with this document because on Monday, the President submitted his proposed budget for the United States of America for the next fiscal year and for the 9 years following.

Guess what we found out in this document? What we found out was that the answer to the question is a resounding "yes." President Obama has now said to the American people loud and clear, Yes, I will triple the national debt over 10 years. I will triple the national debt. Yes, I will take the level of government to levels we haven't seen since World War II, up to 25 percent of our economy. This is a breathtaking document. The levels of debt, the levels of deficit, the levels of spending are simply breathtaking. The largest budget in the American history, \$3.8 trillion.

Mr. AKIN. I would like to just butt in. I do butt in a few times. And before you jump a little bit further, one of the things that the President said—because I was at the meeting when you asked the question. One of the things that we heard was, Well, you know, I inherited a lot of this stuff. It was like saying, It's not my fault that I'm spending all of this money.

And this is hard for me to understand. I'm thinking, Look, you've got the previous President. He spent, with the Pelosi Congress, about \$450 billion, which you and I, gentleman, thought was too much. It was too much deficit, and we didn't like that. In fact, we vote against a lot of that kind of spending. But that is, in a sense, water over the bridge or down the river or wherever the water goes. Now he is taking that and triples it in his very first year.

□ 1915

How can you blame the guy that came before you when you were three times doing more than he did? Could you explain that, because I don't get it. How can you blame that on someone else?

Mr. HENSARLING. Well, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and it's an important point to make. Simply because, as opposed to leading, too often, frankly, we see the President, we see the Speaker, we see our colleagues on the other side of the aisle saying, Well, the truth is, you Republicans spent too much money.

Well, guess what? I agree. But only Congress, only Congress can spend money. Congress has the power of the purse. The only money the President can spend are those monies that are authorized by Congress. Now, the President can propose. The President may be given pots of money by Con-

gress that he can allocate. But, ultimately, it is Congress that controls the power of the purse under our Constitution.

Now, we had 12 years where Republicans controlled Congress, wrote the budgets, wrote the spending bills. And I wasn't proud of the deficits that occurred in those years, but they averaged about \$104 billion a year.

Mr. AKIN. So, gentleman, just taking a look at some notes I had, this would be about from 1996 to the year 2007, and you total that up at about \$1.2 trillion. So that's 12 years of Republican deficit spending, more or less.

Mr. HENSARLING. Well, if the gentleman would yield, I think the most important point here—and we shouldn't spend, obviously, a lot of time on the blame game. The American people want solutions. But what we typically hear from our friends on the other side who aren't offering a solution to the fiscal crisis is that it's your fault.

Here's what I would say. I'm sorry that Republicans spent as much as they did, but our average deficit when we controlled spending was \$104 billion. We've now had 3 years for Democrats to control spending, and the average deficit is \$1.1 trillion.

And so, what I would tell the gentleman and the American people is that what was an annual deficit under Republicans has turned into a monthly deficit under Democrats. And again, I'm not proud of the spending. Many of us on this floor fought our own party leaders for more fiscal restraint. But as far as an order of magnitude, I mean, you can't even compare the two. When it comes to spending and deficits, Republicans are rank amateurs compared to Democrats.

Mr. AKIN. I'd like to interrupt you just so you can say that again, because that's really hard to get your mind around. In other words, what you're saying is that what Republicans spent in 1 year, the Democrats are averaging in 1 month, so they're 12 times faster spending money.

You have a chart, I see.

Mr. HENSARLING. Again, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Now, this covers the last several years of when Republicans controlled the budget. It's in the blue, and you can see declining budget deficits until the Democrats took control of Congress.

Mr. AKIN. So the blue in your chart were Republican, and those were the budgets, and the amount that's above the line was how much our deficit was, right?

Mr. HENSARLING. Correct.

And so, again, I'm not proud of the fact that there were deficits under Republican control, but look at the 3 years once the Democrats came into control. Look at what happened in 2007. Look at what happened in 2008. Look at what happened in 2009. And again, it just goes to show that what was an average annual deficit under Republicans has now become an average monthly deficit over Democrats.

Now, I know the President, again, is fond of saying, well, it's not my fault. I inherited a mess. Well, I have two observations. You know what I would say to the President? Yes, Mr. President, you're right. You inherited a mess. I agree. But guess what? When it comes to trillion dollar deficits, you inherited it from a Democratic Congress. And also, Mr. President, if I recall properly, you were a Member of that Democratic Congress. You were a United States Senator and your voting record was about as pro-spending as there was. So to some extent, if I had the opportunity to speak to the President again, I'd say, Mr. President, you kind of inherited the problem from yourself to some extent. But even if you didn't—let's just say that the administration is absolutely blameless—then why, Mr. President, are you making it worse?

Mr. AKIN. It's not just making it worse; it's tripling it in the very first year, tripling it from 450 billion all the way up to 1.4 trillion.

I'd like to come back to you, Congressman HENSARLING. I want to ask you that question that I was getting at, and that is—I think a lot of Americans want to know this—when do we hit some tipping point? Does anybody know? Is there a certain point here where we have to really pay attention, that we're going to get things so far out of kilter that the whole deck of cards is going to fall and there's nothing we can do? I'd like to get back to that.

But we have another guest from Florida joining us, Congressman POSEY, and I'd just encourage you to join us on this question about the budget, the tremendous level of spending, the tremendous level of taxing, and the tremendous level of debt that we're picking up.

Mr. POSEY. Well, I thank the gentleman from Missouri for recognizing me.

That's only half of it, and what they are spending and wasting is in the wrong direction. We just want to talk a little bit about the wrong direction Congress is going, and I hope they won't go further in the wrong direction as they continue to follow the President in the wrong direction.

Now, I want to just remind you that when the President was in my district campaigning, he made a pledge—it's all over the Internet right now—that he would close the gap between the space shuttle program and the Constellation program. Initially, it was 3 years that we were going to outsource jobs to Russia to launch our astronauts. It was \$30 million per astronaut for ours and all the international other astronauts that we promised to launch. The gap was 3 years. The gap grew to 4 years, 5 years, 6 years, looking at 7 years now or maybe more. The cost the Russians are going to charge us now is \$50 million per astronaut. And when we have

no more shuttles and no alternative launch vehicle of our own, Lord only knows what they're going to charge us.

But back to the campaign promise. The President promised that he would close this gap, the time period between the shuttle's last flight and the first Constellation flight of the Aries, where we could launch men on the Aries.

Mr. AKIN. So, in other words, for people that are not that familiar with the space program, what we're moving from is the old technology of the shuttle, which we see launched in those beautiful pictures with the hydrogen and oxygen central fuel on the main rocket engines and then the two solid boosters. So you see those two tanks on the sides of the aluminum, and I think it's ammonium chlorate or something. So you've got two solid motors, and you've got the hydrogen-oxygen in the center, those three take off. We're replacing that, right, with a new vehicle? Is that what you're talking about?

Mr. POSEY. Correct. And the new rocket would allow us to go back to the Moon as well as back and forth to the international space station as well as, ultimately, to Mars, our manifest destiny, if you would.

Mr. AKIN. So this is a more powerful system?

Mr. POSEY. More powerful than the Saturn V back in the Apollo days, actually, carry more people.

So the President promised that he would close this gap because, as the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) mentioned, we will lose, if we don't close that gap, 7,000 of the best and brightest space team members this country has ever seen, and he would ensure that we remained first in space.

Now, space is the only thing the United States of America is universally, unequivocally, undeniably respected for around the globe. A lot of countries respect us for a few things. Some respect us for nothing. Some respect us for a lot of things. But the only thing that we're universally respected for, bar none, is our space program. We are first in space. And it's a matter of national security. And it's a matter of economic security. We know all wars aren't fought with bullets and bombs anymore.

So the President made these two promises. They were witnessed and they're online. He also said, we need to lead in this global marketplace in high technology development, and we need to encourage more children to go into math and science. We know now that we are only training one-tenth the number of engineers that we need, and half of them are foreign students that we expect to go back to their own countries. And we know China is graduating 10 times more of these high-trained, highly specialized engineers than we are. That's not a good end game, by the way.

Mr. AKIN. I want to get you to your point. What you're saying is he made a promise that we're going to close this gap. Now, does the budget close the gap or not?

Mr. POSEY. Well, we'll get there. The first thing that happened is he accepted the resignation of Michael Griffin, the inspirational genius behind the Constellation program and the Aries rocket. And for 6 months, when they were having the meetings, the NASA chair remained empty without an administrator.

Mr. AKIN. So first of all, no administrator to replace him, which doesn't look like something is on the fast track.

Mr. POSEY. Six months later we got General Bolton. He's the new administrator, and he's a first-class guy and he'll do a good job. But as soon as Bolton was named, the President created a commission known as the Augustine Commission to tell us how we continue to explore space under current budget conditions.

The Augustine Commission met a number of times. They reported to the Science and Technology Committee, and they basically said in their report, you can't do that on the cheap. You just can't do what needs to be done to keep America first in space, much less close the gap. You can't do it on the cheap. It's going to take about another \$3 billion a year.

Well, we were certainly looking forward to that extra money being put into the program. For as little as 1 percent of the failed stimulus plan spending, we could have flown that shuttle for 5 years and closed that gap.

Mr. AKIN. So 1 percent of the stimulus bill, which was, I think, about \$800 billion or so, was it, the one that didn't work, at least the rocket motor probably would have gone. This one, we lit it and it fizzled.

Mr. POSEY. Well, you know, the stimulus bill was all about supposedly employing people. Now, these are not low-wage jobs in the space industry. I think the average, with benefits, is about 80,000 per, spread out all across this country, and no State is spared the benefit of space technology that's been developed. However, while we are having people train to hold road signs that say "Stop" and "Go" to regulate traffic, we are getting rid of, literally giving the pink slips to the brightest and greatest scientific minds that we have.

And I want to take you back to Apollo and tell you what's going to happen to those people. We had the best engineers in the world who were laid off in Apollo literally pump gas at gas stations until their homes were foreclosed, and then they were forced to move on, never to return to the space program again. We had to completely rebuild the space program again, as Mr. BISHOP very eloquently discussed a little while ago.

Mr. AKIN. I was just going say that you are really, in a sense, making the same case that Congressman BISHOP just made; that is, you get some very, very highly trained people, you get the program all set up, it takes years, a whole lot of research to do it, and then you just cut it off at the knees.

I do have to move along because I wanted to recognize Mr. BISHOP on this

point, and I promised I'd get back to Congressman HENSARLING. So let me come back to you, but we are getting a little close on time.

Congressman BISHOP.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I appreciate the gentleman from Florida and what he's saying. I think we're saying the same thing.

There are some core responsibilities the government would have to do, and the government has promised that they would do these. And the people working on the NASA side are the same kinds of people we need on the defense side. And one would think, as Mr. HENSARLING showed the amount of money that's being thrown around in this particular budget, with all that, with \$3.8 trillion, you could at least cover the needs, at least cover what we have to do.

Mr. AKIN. And gentlemen, both of you have made a very significant point. You're saying 1 percent of that stimulus bill—there wasn't a stimulus bill, of course. It didn't work, and stimulus bills don't work very well anyway. But 1 percent of that would have taken care of that promise, would have kept those very high-tech jobs in Florida, and would have—

Mr. POSEY. Around the country.

Mr. AKIN. Around the country. Okay. And of course the rocket motor, the solid rocket technology, these are places where the priority needs to be, the thing that—what government can provide for the national defense. It's not State governments. This is something that should be fundamental to our thinking down here.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. If I could ask the gentleman from Missouri, because I appreciate you said the key word of "priorities." Before we actually deal with our priorities, we have to look at what is in this budget and what isn't in this budget, and I think what the gentleman from Texas is going to show is we could have done better for the American people in this proposed budget, and we must. The status quo is not acceptable. The way we've been doing things is not acceptable. There has to be a better alternative.

□ 1930

I would be happy to yield.

Mr. AKIN. I would like to yield to the gentleman from Texas, Congressman HENSARLING. I think you have a chart. You want to give us a visual picture. We've been talking some boxcar kinds of numbers, but sometimes a simple graph is worth an awful lot.

Mr. HENSARLING. I thank the gentleman for yielding one more time.

Again, the President, that budget that the President has submitted to the American people is simply breathtaking; breathtaking in its spending, breathtaking in its deficits, breathtaking in its debt.

This is a budget that will ultimately put us on the road to bankruptcy.

There is no other way around it. And I am not exaggerating these points. But look at the trajectory of the spending under the President's proposed budget. And as we continue to run deficits, the red ink is there for a purpose. We have never seen spending at these levels.

Now the gentleman asked a question earlier. At what point do we reach the point where that red light is blinking? We're there. Most economists believe that you cannot sustain a debt to the economy or GDP ratio of over 3 percent, that anything over that long term is unsustainable. The President is proposing a \$1.6 trillion deficit, the largest in American history for this budget, which would weigh in at 10.6 percent of our economy, largest debt to the economy ratio since World War II. The deficit never falls below \$700 billion under his proposed budget plan. They average a trillion.

The deficits under this proposed budget will average a trillion dollars a year. And so the gentleman asks, is this sustainable? And the answer is no.

And what I really don't understand is we had Dr. Peter Orszag, who is the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, who writes this budget for the President. Had him before the Budget Committee yesterday. And in open committee, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget who wrote this said, Yes, it is unsustainable. He himself admits that long term this spending plan of the President of the United States is unsustainable for the American people, which begs the question, well, then, Mr. President, why don't you put a plan on the table to solve the problem? Where's the leadership?

This is a man who was elected to be President of the United States of America. His own director of Office of Management and Budget says this is fiscally unsustainable.

So what do they bring to the American people? They bring a "commission." I am happy to look at a commission if it's fair, if it's real; if it's not just a political figleaf. But it begs the question again. What the administration is counting on is we're going to have some commission, and they're going to propose something and maybe Congress will enact it and we will save money that way.

Again, I would say to the President, With all due respect, Mr. President, where is your plan? If you know that you're on the road to bankruptcy, why don't you put a plan on the table that solves it?

What else does the President suggest? They talk about a vaunted freeze. Well, unfortunately there is no freeze in the budget. After the \$1.2 trillion stimulus plan, after several hundred billion of omnibus spending plans, another omnibus spending plan, after the proposed almost \$2 trillion takeover of our health care system, after a proposed \$800 billion carbon tax, after increasing spending on what we call non-defense discretionary—basically the nondefense component of what Con-

gress votes on every year—that has increased 84 percent in the last 2 years.

And my point is to the gentleman of Missouri is that after this explosion of spending, what we hear is the rhetoric of where we have a spending freeze. But guess what? When you look at it, 87 percent of the budget is not subject to the so-called freeze.

Second of all, the President decides, I am not even going to turn on the freezer for a full year. I am going to wait a full year before I turn on the freezer, and then I am going to turn it right back on after just a few years on 13 percent of the budget.

So when you crunch the numbers, what you discover is what the President's bold plan is to provide fiscal responsibility at a time of fiscal insanity is that he proposes to grow government by 49 percent over the next 10 years instead of 49.3 percent. Now, if that's a freeze, I would hate to see a spring thaw.

I will yield back.

Mr. AKIN. You've really answered the question. We are on some very, very shaky ground economically, and you're saying we're already there.

The thing that is frightening is—and this is something that just kind of amazes me—we got punished by voters to a large degree, from Republicans and Democrats, that said you guys are spending too much. And then what happens is we come down here and triple the rate of spending. No wonder people are mad. It's like the people in this Chamber are tone deaf.

Now, you certainly are not, gentlemen, and I am very thankful. I know the American public is thankful for the fact that you hold the line, and you're making clear what the priorities are and the fact that we can't just run out of control. It's a little bit like the guy that says, I am going to stop smoking next month; I am going to stop eating too much next month, and just continues with a pie eating contest.

Mr. HENSARLING. If the gentleman would yield one more time.

Not only has there been this explosion of debt and deficit, there is nothing to show for it but the deficit and debt. Where are the jobs? We're told that if we have this massive stimulus program that jobs would be created, unemployment would never go past 8 percent—and we are still mired in double-digit unemployment.

Mr. AKIN. The answer to that, as you know, it was a stimulus package. It stimulated the creation of a lot of government handouts and jobs, but it isn't going to fix the unemployment problem.

Congressman POSEY from Florida, I thank you for coming out tonight. Your expertise, particularly the expertise in your district. And Congressman BISHOP, and I just have got a minute or two and I will close with you in a couple of minutes.

Mr. POSEY. Just three quick points.

Not only are they spending too much, obviously, but they're spending it in the wrong direction. They're touting

an extra \$6 billion that they're going to put into NASA to create 1,500 jobs. But I told you how 7,000 of them are going to be lost. How did that make any sense to anybody? It doesn't pass a straight-face test.

I love commercial launches. I support commercial launches, nongovernmental rockets, and the development of them. But we cannot give up a manned space flight program that works, and it's cost effective for us right now.

So I implore Congress to keep the President's promises honest and fulfill those promises that the President made. The President obviously is not willing to do that. I hope Congress is.

Thank you, sir.

Mr. AKIN. Thank you very much.

One of the things is we talk about this deficit budget and all, I think a lot of Americans may not understand we've got something stalking us here. People talk about this, that, and the other thing. If you want to talk about the fiscal concern that we need to be watching in our country, it comes from Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security.

This is the budget that is being proposed. This is how much money we have in terms of receipts. This is the money that is coming into the government. This is what we're proposing spending. And if you take a look at that, more than half of that is Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security.

Those programs are called entitlements. What that means is we wrote some laws a long time ago. It's like a machine and somebody's turning the crank and it spends money, and it's spending more than half of what this budget shows and quite a bit more than what we have in terms of receipts. So that is a big question. And that is one of the things that we must deal with.

Congressman HENSARLING has been very direct in the fact that we need some solutions. We don't need to be on the same drug and drag it out until we're completely on our back. We have to start taking a look at these problems, take some sober-minded solutions and start moving forward with a plan. We've not seen that. We think American people want that leadership.

Mr. HENSARLING. I want to make it very clear. This isn't just us saying it. Listen to this. The Wall Street Journal yesterday, "All of this spending must be financed, so deficits and taxes are both scheduled to rise to record levels."

CNBC, "The deficit for this year would be 10.6 percent of the total economy, a figure unmatched since the country was emerging from World War II."

The New York Times, "The budget projects that the deficit will peak at nearly \$1.6 trillion in the current fiscal year, a post-World War II record. It would then decline but remain at economically troublesome levels in the remainder of the decade."

CNBC, "Part of a record \$3.8 trillion budget that would boost the deficit beyond any in the Nation's history."

It is unacceptable. We have better alternatives.

Mr. AKIN. Thank you, Congressman HENSARLING and Congressman POSEY. And I thank you, also, Congressman BISHOP, for joining us tonight.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think that concludes our hour.

A REDUCED ROLE FOR THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IS NEEDED

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

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, tonight I come to talk about a variety of issues.

You know, clearly the country faces tough times, clearly our States face very, very difficult times. And over the last few months we have had the opportunity to go and to listen to our constituents at the State level talk about some of the issues that are important to them.

My home State of Michigan is struggling today with 15 percent unemployment—the highest unemployment rate in the country. And one of the things that we consistently hear about is, you know, Washington made us do this. I hear people talking about, you know, our State needs to raise taxes. Why? So we can get the Federal highway dollars. And what we forget is that those are our dollars to begin with. Those aren't Federal highway dollars. Those aren't Michigan highway dollars.

As a matter of fact, for 53 years, a State like Michigan has received 83 cents on the dollar—83 cents for every dollar that we sent to Washington for our gas tax. And now Washington tells us in tough times, to get that money back, you have to put up a State match. That is wrong.

In 2001, President Bush passed—with this Congress' help—legislation calling for an improvement in K-12 education. It was called No Child Left Behind, and it put the Federal imprint on our K-12 education system across the country and across the State of Michigan. That's wrong.

Why? Why do we need the Federal Government telling us how to run our schools at the State and at the local level? It's a community issue. It's a family issue. It's not a Federal issue. It's also not very efficient.

Just like in the highway bill, the Federal Government forces a State like Michigan to build things we don't need. We build overpasses, but they're for bicycles. We build fences not to protect motorists but to protect turtles.

You wonder and say, why are we doing this? This is our money. This is not the priority for our State to get our State moving.

So you have got issues with highways, you have got issues with education.

And it's not only that the money is being spent unwisely, but it's also being spent inefficiently.

Let me talk about No Child Left Behind, K-12 education.

I see my friend is going to join me. I welcome him. And, you know, I am talking a little bit about the bureaucracy and the need to return to federalism, and let me yield.

□ 1945

Mr. AKIN. If it's all right, if you take a look at what's happened, over the last 50 years, this government here has just grown like Topsy. For a while, you and I were in the majority. We passed some conservative bills, and we did the best we could. They were mostly blocked by Senators. But I think what the public really wants is I think they want something different out of this city. I think that what they really want is for the Federal Government not to threaten them anymore. I think they want us to deconstruct. You mentioned the No Child Left Behind.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Let me reclaim my time for just a second. I want to make it clear to the people in the Chamber, and I want to make it clear to the people around the country and the people in Michigan, No Child Left Behind was a bill that I voted against because I believed in parental control, I believed in local control, and I believed in State control. I just want to make that clear because I might not have done that as I was describing what this Congress was doing.

I had voted to get rid of the Federal highway program or to basically deconstruct it. I want to deconstruct the Education Department and return the rights back to the States so the States can focus on what they need to do, but more importantly that the Federal Government can focus on what it needs to do, trade policy, national security and those types of things. I will yield back.

Mr. AKIN. Congressman, I really respect you for that vote because what I think a lot of people listening this evening might not understand is Congressman HOEKSTRA took the very first House bill of a Republican administration, it was their pet bill, and you had the guts to stand up, as a Republican, to the Republican administration, and say, no, because I believe education is a local control kind of issue.

Now I have to relay an amusing story because I voted "no" on it too, and some staffer made a mistake and invited me to the bill signing ceremony. So I actually sat in the bill signing ceremony for No Child Left Behind after having voted "no" the same way you did.

And I think that is precisely what the public wants. They want to take this place apart. Education can be done fine at a State level, and in my opinion, as a former State representative, I would say it ought to be done at the local level. But certainly we don't need a bunch of Washington bureaucrats telling us how to educate our kids. I

couldn't respect you more for that independence of thought and the clarification understanding that that is just not a Federal priority.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Reclaiming my time, I think you and I have had a discussion about this. But I really do believe, and I want to build off the thought that you had, is that our constituents want us to deconstruct Washington. They don't want us to tear it down. They want us to constructively go through the process and shed the things that are not Washington issues, move them back to States, move them back to communities, and move it back to individuals. And if we don't do that, they want to be able to hold us accountable.

You and I sat through much of 2009 where we saw an abomination probably much bigger than No Child Left Behind, the health care bill, which was going to take from you and from me, from our doctors, our hospitals, and our States the right to set our own health care agenda. And we were going to probably construct, not deconstruct, but construct a new building here in Washington, D.C., probably several new buildings, filled with bureaucrats, who were then going to make the decisions that you and I historically made about our health care. I will yield.

Mr. AKIN. You are going to wonder where I'm going with this perhaps. Here is what I'm thinking about. I'm a guy that was an engineer. I like geology. And they talk about earthquakes. And they have a scale of how bad an earthquake is. And if you use a Richter scale, an earthquake of about 7 or 8 or 9 is one whale of an earthquake. And if you were to rate how bad legislation is in Congress, the one that you chose to talk about, that health care bill, I would rate that as probably the worst bill I have seen in 22 years. And it is high enough on that Richter scale that when it got done, American civilization would have been shaken so badly, there wouldn't have been much of it left. That was really a bad one.

My rating number two, and I just want to see where you are on rating these things, whether you are the same scientist that I would be, and I would say that that cap-and-tax bill was another one that would be not quite as bad but still a real mess of a bad bill. What do you think?

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I have seen this up close and personal in Michigan. And you may have remembered over the last 18 months that as President Obama was developing his economic strategy, he had the Governor of Michigan sitting next to him quite frequently. And I thought that's a good strategy because he could then ask and say, Governor, did you try this in Michigan? And if the answer was "yes," he would say, well, we won't do that at the Federal level.

But it seems to be that whether it's cap-and-trade, cap-and-tax, whether it is health care, what we have seen is in