

of African-Americans who advocated, persevered, and helped to uplift our country to live up to its creed as the land of equal opportunity. On March 25, 2009, the world lost the beacon of light that was Dr. John Hope Franklin. To his family, I offer my deepest sympathies and condolences for their loss. And while our nation has lost one of its best and brightest, I know that his legacy is one that will surely endure.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to first thank my colleagues in the Congressional Black Caucus for organizing tonight's Special Order to recognize the contributions of Dr. John Hope Franklin. CBC Chairwoman BARBARA LEE appointed Congresswoman MARCIA FUDGE and Delegate DONNA CHRISTIAN-CHRISTENSEN to lead our CBC message team and they have done an outstanding job of helping to inform our colleagues in Congress and our constituents at home about some of the important work being done by the Congressional Black Caucus.

Throughout his long life, John Hope Franklin wrote prolifically about history—more than 60 years after its publication, one of his books, *From Slavery to Freedom: A History of American Negroes*, is considered a core text on the African-American experience. Dr. Franklin not only wrote about history, he lived it. Franklin worked on the Brown v. Board of Education case in 1954, he joined protestors in a 1965 march led by Martin Luther King, Jr. in Montgomery, Alabama and he headed President Clinton's 1997 national advisory board on race. Franklin accumulated many honors during his long career, including the Presidential Medal of Freedom, the nation's highest civilian honor. He shared the John W. Kluge Award for lifetime achievement in the humanities and a similar honor from the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and the American Philosophical Society, the nation's two oldest learned societies. He also was revered as a "moral leader" of the historical profession for his engagement in the pressing issues of the day, his unflagging advocacy of civil rights, and his gracious and courtly demeanor.

Dr. John Hope Franklin was described in the Washington Post recently as a man who "lived what he taught." I don't think there are many higher accolades. For those of us who knew him and called him friend, it feels as though collectively we've lost a grandfather—a very wise and generous teacher and mentor. For those who don't know about the contributions of Dr. John Hope Franklin, I wanted to come to the floor tonight to add my voice of appreciation and to highlight some of his contributions that I believe are important.

John Hope Franklin, the grandson of a slave, was born on January 2, 1915, in Rentiesville, Oklahoma, a small black community. His parents, Buck Colbert Franklin and Mollie Parker Franklin named their son after John Hope, the President of Atlanta University. His mother was a school teacher and his father was a community leader and they recognized the importance of education.

The realities of racism hit Franklin at an early age. He said he vividly remembered the humiliating experience of being put off the train with his mother because she refused to move to a segregated compartment for a six-mile trip to the next town. He was six years old. With his parents, he lived through the Tulsa Race Riots in 1921, believed to be the single worst incident of racial violence in

American history. Later, although an academic star at Booker T. Washington High School and valedictorian of his class, the state would not allow him to study at the University of Oklahoma because he was black. So instead, in 1931 Franklin enrolled at Fisk University, a historically black college in Nashville, Tennessee, intending to study law.

However, a history professor, Theodore Currier, persuaded him to change his mind and his major and he received his bachelor's degree in history in 1935. Currier, who was white, became a close friend and mentor, and when Franklin's money ran out, Currier loaned the young student \$500 to attend graduate school at Harvard University, where he received his master's in 1936 and doctorate five years later. He began his career as an instructor at Fisk in 1936 and taught at St. Augustine's and North Carolina College for Negroes (now North Carolina Central University), both historically black colleges.

In 1945, Alfred A. Knopf approached him about writing a book on African-American history—originally titled *From Slavery to Freedom: A History of American Negroes*—and he spent 13 months writing it. Then in 1947, he took a post as professor at Howard University in Washington, DC, where, in the early 1950s, he traveled from campus to Thurgood Marshall's law office to help prepare the brief that led to the historic Brown v. Board of Education decision.

In 1956 he became chairman of the previously all-white history department at Brooklyn College. Despite his position, he had to visit 35 real estate agents before he was able to buy a house for his young family and no New York bank would lend him the money.

Later, while at the University of Chicago, he accompanied the Rev. Martin Luther King Jr. on the march from Selma to Montgomery, Ala. in 1965. He spent 16 years at the University of Chicago and then joined the faculty of Duke University in 1982. He retired from Duke's history department in 1985, then spent seven years as professor of legal history at the Duke Law School. Franklin will be honored with a newly endowed chair at Duke Law School.

Franklin was a prolific writer, with books including *The Emancipation Proclamation*, *The Militant South*, *The Free Negro in North Carolina*, *George Washington Williams: A Biography and A Southern Odyssey*, *Travelers in the Antebellum North*. He also edited many works, including a book about his father called *My Life and an Era: The Autobiography of Buck Colbert Franklin*, with his son, John Whittington Franklin. Franklin completed his autobiography in 2005, which was reviewed favorably in many media outlets across the country.

He received more than 130 honorary degrees and served as president of the Phi Beta Kappa Society, the American Studies Association, the Southern Historical Association, the Organization of American Historians and the American Historical Association.

Franklin's best-known accomplishment in his later years was in 1997, when he was appointed chairman of the advisory board for President Clinton's One America: The President's Initiative on Race. The seven-member panel was charged with directing a national conversation on race relations. When he was named to the post, Franklin remarked, "I am not sure this is an honor. It may be a burden." The panel did provoke criticism, both from

conservatives who pressured the panel to hear from opponents of racial preference and others who said it did not make enough progress. Franklin himself acknowledged in an interview with USA Today in 1997 that the group could not solve the nation's racial problems. But Franklin said the effort was still worth it.

And, in 2001, Duke University opened the John Hope Franklin Center for Interdisciplinary and International Studies, where scholars, artists and members of the community have the opportunity to engage in public discourse on a variety of issues, including race, social equity and globalization. At the heart of its mission is the Franklin Humanities Institute, which sponsors public events and hosts the Franklin Seminar, a residential fellowship program for Duke faculty and graduate students.

In a statement to the American Academy of Arts and Letters in 2002, Franklin summed up his own career:

"More than 60 years ago, I began the task of trying to write a new kind of Southern History. It would be broad in its reach, tolerant in its judgments of Southerners, and comprehensive in its inclusion of everyone who lived in the region . . . the long, tragic history of the continuing black-white conflict compelled me to focus on the struggle that has affected the lives of the vast majority of people in the United States. . . . Looking back, I can plead guilty of having provided only a sketch of the work I laid out for myself."

In 2007, John Hope Franklin lent his formidable effort to the issue of reparations for African Americans. Franklin returned to Oklahoma to testify in a hearing urging Congress to pass legislation that would clear the way for survivors of the Tulsa Race Riots of 1921, one of the nation's worst race riots, to sue for reparations.

For Franklin, who continued his scholarly work and public appearances well into his 90s, the work he began in the 1940s still was not finished. He was interviewed earlier this year, when President Barack Obama was inaugurated, and he noted that he never thought he would live to see the first African American President of the United States, but he was so very glad that he did.

Mr. Speaker, I am so very glad that John Hope Franklin shared his life and his work so generously. He taught us about our lost history, and in the process, he set a sterling example of living what he tried to teach that will inspire many generations to come.

Ms. FUDGE. I yield back the balance of my time.

#### PRESIDENT OBAMA'S BUDGET SPENDS TOO MUCH, TAXES TOO MUCH, AND BORROWS TOO MUCH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HEINRICH). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I thank you for that privilege. Thank you for the opportunity to be able to be here this evening and the opportunity to be able to address the American people.

We had a rather extraordinary day yesterday and today with what we have

seen happening in our Nation that has really been extraordinary throughout 2009. We have seen such tremendous differences take place.

The American people are very concerned, and rightly so, about our economy. They are wondering how the economy will turn around, when it will turn around, when their own personal fortunes will change; and they have seen some extraordinary things take place, Mr. Speaker.

The American people have seen the stimulus plan that came through, which was about \$1.1 trillion in spending that was passed by this body, signed by the President of the United States, an extraordinary historic level of spending that we have never seen before just to goose our economy, get it going so that we can get back to where we need to be, to get job creation. That is what people want to see. We all the want to see that. But we all held our breath.

I voted against the stimulus bill. We held our breath thinking, how in the world would we ever begin to replace all of that money that we are about to spend? Because, as everyone knows, there is no vault here in Washington, D.C., that holds \$1.1 trillion that we can just send out to the American people. There is no money there. We have to go somewhere to get that money. We either have to tax it from the American people and bring it to Washington, D.C., and then spread it around so that other people can have it, or we have to borrow it from other countries like China, for instance, who, quite recently, has said to our President that China is very concerned.

The specter of the Chinese communists lecturing the United States on whether or not they feel comfortable about their investment here in the United States is really quite a first. And now, we have seen the European socialists also lecture the United States saying they are worried. As a matter of fact, we saw the Premier from Czechoslovakia say that the road the United States is taking, in his words, is the road to hell. He doesn't want to see the European socialists go down that road as well.

So as the G-20 is about to come together in London to meet and talk about this global economic meltdown, we have seen quite a specter occur. We have seen the Prime Minister from England come here to the United States, as a matter of fact, stand here in this body and address a joint session of Congress and essentially call for a global cooperation to have a global answer to this stimulus. That makes a lot of Americans quite nervous when we hear that kind of rhetoric.

Then, just recently we heard also from a leader down in the Latin American countries say that it is people with blonde hair and blue eyes that have caused this economic meltdown. Of course, that is an outrage to make a statement like that.

All of these things the American people have been seeing, and they have

been thinking about them, wondering, what does all of this mean? And they saw again this body spend \$1.1 trillion, and then shortly after that spend \$410 billion in a budget spending bill that will just spend through this year of 2009. But in that bill, they saw almost 9,000 earmarks in that bill.

And the American people said: Now, wait a minute. I can't spend that kind of money. As a matter of fact, the American people said: Look, I saved 5 percent of my income in January, a historic high of savings for Americans.

Just a year ago or so, Americans had a negative savings rate of .1 percent. Now, Americans have been doing just the reverse. They have been doing what most normal people do when they are in an economic situation of fear. They decide to pull back on their spending, they pull in, and they say, I had better think twice before I buy that fancy cup of coffee. I had better think twice before I decide to plunk down money and buy a new car. They think twice about what they are going to do about changing their home environment and their situation, because they are worried. They are worried about whether they will have a job next week or next month or next year.

So it is very difficult right now, Mr. Speaker, for the American people to make financial commitments when they look at the level of spending that is going on around them. So what are they doing? They are saving.

Just this last month we saw that the American people in the month of February were saving at a rate of 4.5 percent. That is a good thing. I think it is a good thing the American people are showing the example for the United States Congress and for the President to say, this is what we need to do.

Instead of spending money we don't have on a personal level, on a Federal level, on a State level, on a local level, the American people are living through their own lifestyles and their own choices what they wish their government would replicate, and that is this: Start pulling back on the spending.

And what has this government done? What has the Obama presidency done, Mr. Speaker? What has this body done, Mr. Speaker, the House and the Senate? We have done just the opposite of what the American people are doing. The Democrat-controlled Congress and the President have made an unprecedented decision to spend money hand over fist, \$1.1 trillion on stimulus spending money, \$410 billion on budget spending for the rest of the year, along with all of the other money that has been going out the door.

Now, this week we have the President asking the House of Representatives, led by Speaker NANCY PELOSI, to spend, get this, \$4 trillion; commit the American people to spending \$4 trillion in the upcoming budget. This is almost beyond comprehension, \$4 trillion.

What does that work out to? For 300 million Americans, that is an immediate debt burden of \$13,000 per Amer-

ican. Every man, woman, and child in America would have that immediate debt burden placed on their shoulders when they can't begin to afford what the Congress has already been spending, historic levels of spending. \$4 trillion?

And it isn't just the spending alone; it is what is being spent on. We are looking at socialized medicine for the first time in the United States, socialized medicine coming in through this bill. And in one vote, the Speaker of the House and the President are asking this body, the people's House, the United States House of Representatives to spend \$4 trillion of their money for socialized medicine. So serious is socialized medicine that we need to spend some time on that issue, we need to spend some serious time.

Mr. Speaker, I just downloaded off of the Internet today stories about just two countries where socialized medicine was passed into the law and implemented, in the United Kingdom in England and Scotland and Wales, and also in Canada. I have just this many stories chronicling just the last year or so of headlines of what socialized medicine has looked like in those English-speaking neighbors of ours, in Canada to the north and in the United Kingdom.

I think it is instructive for the United States Congress to take a look at what the experience has been of other countries, and I hope we have time to get into some of these stories about what socialized medicine has looked like in these other English-speaking Nations.

Well, that isn't all, Mr. Speaker, socialized medicine and the grand leap forward into socialism. We are also looking at the specter of tremendous new taxes, punishing new taxes, not just for some, not just for 5 percent as President Obama had promised, but for 100 percent of the American people.

When the President of the United States stood here in this body, stood right there at the lectern looking out at the joint session of Congress where Cabinet members were present and where the American people watched in a historic number, 40 million Americans watched, heard the President of the United States say quite clearly to them in a straightforward manner he would not increase taxes on 95 percent of the American people. And in the same evening and in the same address to the American people, the President contradicted himself, Mr. Speaker, with these words when he said he was committed to putting into place the cap-and-trade system, the new global warming energy tax, which will now be a tax on 100 percent of all Americans.

And how is that? It will be felt in the form of our energy bills. Whether we have electric bills every month that we pay or whether we have gas bills that we pay every month, those bills in many parts of the country will in fact double.

I come from the State of Minnesota. Tonight, Mr. Speaker, we are expected

to have 12 inches of snow in Minnesota. We have had quite a week. We had a horrible flood situation up in the Fargo-Moorhead region. Thank God, we saw that recede a little bit. It wasn't as bad as we thought it was going to be. People's prayers were answered. On the front page this morning of the Twin Cities newspaper we saw a beautiful picture of the Assemblies of God Church up in the Fargo-Moorhead region; they had been praying all weekend that God would withhold the waters. And God clearly answered those prayers, Mr. Speaker. Those cities have not been devastated as much as we once thought they would be.

But the devastation that we are looking at now again is in this area of taxing. And in Minnesota, as I said, we are seeing 12 inches of snow in the Twin Cities area and in southern Minnesota in particular, maybe 10 inches in northern Minnesota.

But in Minnesota, Mr. Speaker, the people don't have a choice. Just like in many regions across the United States, the people don't have a choice. They have to turn on their air conditioning in the summer and they have to turn on their furnaces in the winter; otherwise, life is simply unbearable. And what will President Obama and the Democrat's budget look like here in this Chamber?

Well, this week, Mr. Speaker, President Obama and the Democrats that control the House and the Senate are forcing a vote on this body that would mandate that we would have increases in everyone's electric bills. And whether it comes in this budget bill or in a separate bill, President Obama made it clear; he made it very clear last week when he had his press conference, Mr. Speaker, when he said this: It is not negotiable to leave out this energy tax. He is insisting that the American people pay the energy tax. And in Minnesota, we are calculated to see a doubling in our energy bills. A doubling, Mr. Speaker. This is unheard of.

I don't know where people in Minnesota will go. We are experiencing very high, unusual rates of unemployment. Minnesota is a diversified economy. We are such a great State with awesome employers, but for the first time in perhaps 25 years we have seen unemployment in a State as diverse as Minnesota spike.

In one of my largest cities, Mr. Speaker, I was told last week by one of my constituents that, in my largest city, that we are seeing unemployment now at 9.8 percent. In one of my counties, Mr. Speaker, I was told that one of my counties has unemployment now reaching 10 percent.

Where are these people going to go, Mr. Speaker, when this body decides to pass a budget that will tax them \$4 trillion, that will impose out a doubling on their energy bills? What are families going to do?

My husband and I are in a couple's Bible study, Mr. Speaker. And I was so sad to learn this winter in this couple's

Bible study that another couple in one of the family members' churches was turning their heat down to 55 degrees. That is cold, Mr. Speaker. They have little children in their home. And this couple told us their daughter didn't want to go over after school and play in this family's home because it was going to be too cold for her. The last time she had been there visiting her girlfriend, the house was set so cold she was uncomfortable. But this family didn't know what to do. They were worried, they were afraid, they were scared because the husband had lost his job and the wife had lost their job, and they were trying to keep their kids warm. But they had a very difficult time doing it, so they were turning their heat down.

Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, if I have to go back to the sixth district of Minnesota and tell the people in my district that President Obama and the Democrats that run this Chamber have asked me to vote on a bill that would double their energy tax bill? They are at home now, Mr. Speaker, with 55 degrees just trying to keep their kids warm, figuring out some way to get through this very long winter, and now I have to go home and tell them that this body wants to impose a burden on them that would double their tax bill? I can't do that.

□ 2115

And I won't do that. I won't vote for a measure like that. It won't happen. And my bet is that a lot of other Members are going to see it that way too. My bet is, Mr. Speaker, that when we go home after this week and talk to our constituents, they are going to look at us, Mr. Speaker, and they are going to say, are you crazy? Were you crazy in this economic climate to heap yet one more burden on me?

It reminds me of that Biblical story, Mr. Speaker, where Pharaoh said to the Hebrew children, who were slaves in Egypt, when he said to them, tell them to make bricks, but don't give them straw. Let them find their own straw to make bricks. That's what it seems like President Obama and the Democrats that are running the House and the Senate are doing to the American people right now, heaping burdens on them to such an extent that now they are being told that they must find their own straw to make their bricks, when they already are turning their thermostats down so that they can just survive and get through the winter. This is not the United States of America that we grew up in. We don't do this, Mr. Speaker, to our people.

I see that I have two colleagues that have joined me this evening. I would like to defer now to my marvelous colleague from New Jersey, Mr. Scott GARRETT. He serves with me, Mr. Speaker, on the Financial Services Committee. He hails from New Jersey and he is doing a wonderful job on behalf of his constituents working so hard to ensure that this Congress

doesn't spend too much, doesn't tax too much and certainly doesn't borrow too much so that those who are yet unborn and without jobs will have to be laboring away to be able to pay for these profligate spending bills.

I defer now to the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. SCOTT GARRETT.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. And I thank the gentlelady for allowing me to say a few words. And I see also that we are joined on the floor by the gentleman from Georgia as well. And so maybe I will go back and forth and just make some points.

I come to the floor because I heard your remarks just a few moments ago, and I thought they were quite eloquent in trying to put in perspective exactly what is occurring here on the floor of the House and what is occurring here in Washington, D.C., our Nation's capital, as Congress goes about its business of formulating and passing a budget and how we can talk sometimes here in Washington in these global terms and esoteric terms, but at the end of the day it is the American public who actually has to foot the bill. They have to reach into their proverbial pocket and see if—oh, there is a couple bucks here—they can pull dollars out and send them to Washington.

Mrs. BACHMANN. The gentleman may want to hide those couple of dollars. Uncle Sam is looking for a few more.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Since I'm in Washington, there may be a hand out trying to reach into my pocket to try and grab those dollars. Absolutely. But you make the point that we are, in this country right now, and globally as well, in difficult economic times. Whether you are trying to put a few bucks away for your kid's education and now you realize, gee, at the end of the week when you write your checks, you just don't have that money to put aside, or if your kids are already in college and you say, how am going to make this month's or this quarter's college bill that is due? You just don't know how you're going to do it.

I was just talking on the phone before I came here to the floor, honestly, to folks in Upstate New York. And I said, how is the weather up there? They said, it is cold. And you're thinking, well, they have their heat ratcheted up and they are trying to warm their homes and they are paying the fuel costs. Thank goodness that rates have come down a little bit, but not by that much. But the young lady that I was talking to, she was concerned about how she is going to pay her heating bill for the house or the gas to cook the food or the other things they need for her kids around the house. And so we talk about things in global terms, in large terms. And as you know, I serve on the Budget Committee. I have had the honor now to serve on that committee for all 6 years that I have been in Congress. This year, when I served on the committee, this past week we had markup, which as you well know is

the process where the Democrats present their budget to us, give us the opportunity to make some amendments to it, make some improvements, and have some give and take.

I have to tell you that both the time when I was in the majority and the time that now I'm in the minority as well, this was the most distressing, this was the most frustrating, most unfulfilling process that we had in that committee ever. I recall in both scenarios in the past years that there was a give and take, there was an ability to have some discussion on it. Somebody would say, well, you might have an idea on this area and we have an idea on this area, let's come together and try to reach some accommodation on that. Let's see where there is some agreement where we can work together for the American public.

You just didn't see that at all. The meeting started I think around a little after 9 in the morning. We were done there around midnight. So you can count up the number of hours that we were there. We started with somewhere up to 30-some-odd amendments I believe that we had, that Republicans were presenting to the Democrats. And we would say, here is our little slice of our suggestions. And it is not just coming from me. And it is not just coming from the staff. These ideas are coming from our constituents, from Americans across all 50 States, on how to make this budget, this Obama budget, a better budget for America. But not one of those substantive amendments passed. They would not vote for a single amendment that we proposed. They would not vote for a single change, a single alteration, a single—what is that expression, changing a jot or a tittle—they would not allow ne'er a one of those.

Mrs. BACHMANN. What happened to the era of bipartisanship, if I can ask the gentleman?

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Well, there's the rub, isn't it? So many people went into this past election this past November and said we want a new era of bipartisanship. We want to work together. And my gosh, so do I. I want to be able to extend my hand across the aisle and say, here are our ideas. What are your ideas?

You didn't see it at all. And it was very frustrating. But larger than that, larger than the frustration is the irony of it all. The Office of Management and Budget from this administration puts out this blue book. And you have to scratch your head and laugh because if you didn't laugh you would be upset. It's called, this is looking at the budget and what have you, it is called "A New Era of Responsibility." "A New Era of Responsibility." And as I looked at that multitrillion dollar—

Mrs. BACHMANN. How big was that budget deficit, did you say, Mr. GARRETT?

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. That multitrillion-dollar budget.

Mrs. BACHMANN. And this was responsibility, that new era of responsibility?

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. You don't see it in Washington. And the reason I came to the floor is because you were making the point just as I left the office, the administration is asking it from the American people. The American people have to be responsible in trying to figure out how are they going to live within their means? You were citing the examples of cutting back in various facets of a life. And you were also pointing out the fact that the American people are actually doing a very good thing, and that is increasing their rate of savings. Boy, you don't see that aspect of responsibility here in this budget.

And my last point, and then I will yield the floor back to you or to the gentleman from Georgia, is my first point, is that we here in Washington sometimes get into Washington and speak on these things and the global sort of terms on it. And if you're watching that budget meeting, you sort of get the same sense of it. We talk about the fact that now as you look at all the wealth of this country, the GDP, the gross domestic product of this country, you can see the numbers in this budget, meaning that over a quarter of it, up to around 27 percent is basically being sucked throughout all 50 States and sent here right to Washington, D.C., as the GDP, the amount of government spending will be equated to around 27 percent of the gross domestic product.

Mrs. BACHMANN. So that means out of a dollar, Mr. GARRETT, that 27 cents of every dollar that is spent in the United States is spent by government?

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Yes. And that is a historically high figure. And this is the other funny—I say "funny," but it is not funny. This new administration was always rife for criticizing our past administration for spending too much money, too high of a percentage. But historically, we have been around the 20, 22-some odd percent. And we were around that number in this past administration.

Now we are going through the roof on this. But those are esoteric numbers. Those are larger numbers. You can't get your arms around that. But it is the numbers when you talk about your family, when you talk about the cap and tax, \$634 billion roughly of that amount, what does that relate to me or to you, your average family?

Mrs. BACHMANN. And now that has been amended to \$2 trillion because the President's chief deputy on this issue, Jason, I can't remember his last name, his senior aide on the issue of the new global warming energy tax, cap and tax, made the statement last week that it isn't \$646 billion that the place marker is at. It is actually \$2 trillion in new taxes.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. And it is from \$634 of the \$2 trillion in taxes, which is hard enough because that is

money out of your pocket. But we also heard the reports today that it could be even more difficult for the American family, the American worker. It could mean American jobs. And they were talking about the fact that one of two things are going to happen here. The first is that the energy secretary made this first observation was something to the effect of this cap and tax will have the effect of having jobs leave this country because the jobs will go to where the manufacturing and the cost of doing business is cheaper. That makes sense. That means your constituents and mine who have a job right now tomorrow will find out that their job just went overseas as well. And later on this week the secretary made the observation, well, one of the responses that we could do, and not that he was suggesting it I don't believe, was new tariffs.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Actually, that was in the Wall Street Journal today and also in Investor's Business Daily, the Energy Secretary, Mr. Chu, had made that comment about tariffs.

Now this is incredible, because if you look back in history to the time of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, one of the biggest problems that led to prolonged depression was the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act. Now this is something that is being suggested by our Energy Secretary, Mr. Chu, new tariffs. And what he is suggesting is that if other countries don't participate in this new cap-and-tax system, then the United States would charge tariffs equal to what those countries would have to pay in cap-and-tax systems. So we are looking at erecting profound new tariffs that will completely change the United States economy.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. And what will that do in the short term and the long term? Well, in the short term they will say, don't worry. That means that you will keep the jobs here in the United States because they won't go overseas because of the tariffs that we created. That is the short term.

Obviously, the long-term effect is, as you indicate, barriers will be made in all the other countries, as well, which means when you and I go down to the store and buy products which are imported into this country, manufactured from other places, what is going to happen to the price? It is going to go through the roof.

Mrs. BACHMANN. They will jack up.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. How are we going to be hit here? Several ways. First, we are going to be hit potentially by losing our jobs. Secondly, we are going to be hit with the new taxes, several thousand dollars on the families for new taxes, if you have a job. And thirdly, the expenses at the store, if you do have a job, and you still have some money in your pocket after your taxes and you're able to go to the store and do some shopping, what are you going to find? You will find that prices are going to be going through the roof. So one, two, three,

we are going to be hit in three separate ways because of this budget. Those are the practical aspects.

I see the gentleman from Georgia here is nodding.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) because in Investor's Business Daily today, they had a chart that perfectly illustrated what you were saying with the Great Depression. If you look at the skyrocketing prices that we will see under a tariff-based system and the skyrocketing taxes and the job losses, those three together are the great indicators of another Great Depression.

We are not here fear-mongering. That is not what we are interested in doing. But what we are doing is laying the table for the Obama administration's budget. The Democrats control the House and Senate. They are laying out the budget this week for this body to take a vote on. And the specter of having leakage, which is massive outsourcing of jobs, high taxes and high prices, that is not what the American people are asking for.

We are joined this evening by Dr. PHIL GINGREY, a gentleman from Georgia who is a tremendous advocate for free markets and for free markets and health care who is down here on the floor helping us frequently on these measures.

And Dr. GINGREY, I now yield to you so we can go back and forth. We would love to hear what you have to say on this subject of the budget.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady from Minnesota for yielding and also my colleague from New Jersey, my classmate, Representative SCOTT GARRETT. This is the week that we take up the budget, Mr. Speaker, as all of our colleagues know, and we are going to have, we have the Obama version that came over from OMB, the Office of Management and Budget, which crunched the numbers for the President. And it is a budget that calls for, well, I have the numbers right here, Mr. Speaker. And it sort of has a side-by-side comparison of the Obama budget, the House version, which we will take up in this Chamber, and the Senate version.

□ 2130

I just noticed, I can't help but just be absolutely astounded, Mr. Speaker, by these numbers. But in the President's budget, he calls for spending \$3.67 trillion, \$3.67 trillion. That's the 2010 Fiscal Year budget.

Now, when the Congressional Budget Office, the bipartisan number crunchers for the Congress, for the House and the Senate, when they looked at the Obama budget, they said, you know, instead of creating something like \$7 trillion worth of debt over 10 years, it's going to be \$9 trillion worth of debt over 10 years.

And we heard on television, Mr. Speaker, immediately, the concern expressed by the Democratic chairman of

the Budget Committee, Senator KENT CONRAD from North Dakota and also the concern, even, you could see it in his face, the concerned expression on the face of the chairman of the House Budget Committee, JOHN SPRATT, our friend from South Carolina, that, goodness gracious, based on these Congressional Budget Office estimates, non-partisan, that this presidential budget of \$3.67 trillion was not sustainable.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that's what the Congressional Budget Office said. This level of spending is not sustainable.

So I really expected some significant cuts in the budget proposed by the House and proposed by the Senate. And yet, when you look at these side by side, as I said at the outset, the President Obama budget \$3.67 trillion, the House budget which Mr. SPRATT will present to us in the next couple of 3 days, \$3.55 trillion, the Senate version, \$3.53 trillion. Well, to my surprise, there is not much cutting here. 3.67 trillion versus 3.55, the House version, or 3.53, the Senate version, my colleagues, that is a lot of spending and very little cut.

I have to do the quick math, and I would say that we're talking about one one-hundredth of a percent, or maybe it's close to one one-thousandth of a percent of cut. So you can posture, you can use a lot of rhetoric about what you're doing in regard to being fiscally responsible. But you'd have to say, and hearing those numbers, well, gee, I guess what the Democratic Congress, who enjoys the majority, the majority party, basically makes some tweaking around the edges posturing, I think, to some extent, but there's no significant difference in the President's budget and what we're going to have to vote on here in the House and also over in the Senate.

So I think, to suggest is very, very misleading to suggest that this body, or this Congress, both chambers, is exercising fiscal responsibility. I think these budgets are not sustainable, just as the President's budget is not sustainable.

And if my colleague from Minnesota will continue to yield, I've got a slide or two that I want to show, because, Mr. Speaker, I hear so much, and I watched some of the Sunday morning cable programs and network news, where most of the time it's the Senators that are getting interviewed, or the administration. Of course, Geithner was on this weekend, as he's been on a lot with this, what he's doing with the Treasury Department and the recommendations for getting us back on the road to fiscal recovery.

But I heard him say, the Treasury Secretary, "well, you know, we inherited a bad situation."

Mr. Speaker, I know you've heard it. My colleagues, Mrs. BACHMANN, I know you've heard it, you know, this creating a straw man and saying, you know, well, we inherited this mess, talking about the budget or indeed talking about the situation in Afghani-

stan or Iraq. We inherited this bad policy.

But, in regard to the budget, that's where I really wanted to focus my attention. They keep saying that this deficit for the Fiscal Year 2009, which now is approaching 1.8, 1.7, \$1.8 trillion, I mean, that's four times as large as any deficit under the Bush administration. Go back and look at 2004 or 2005, 2006. Our deficits were coming down.

And the Democrats have been in control, Mr. Speaker, since January of 2007. So you know, when you say that you inherited, well, what party was it that refused to pass nine spending bills in the Fiscal Year 2009? Which party was that? Well, it was the majority party. And the reason that they did not want to pass those bills is because the President, the former President simply said, this is too much spending, and if you send those to my desk, I will veto them.

So the Democratic majority, Mr. Speaker, just held back on those spending bills, and we had these continuing resolutions to fund the government because they knew when they got the presidency, which most polls suggested at that point, that they would, and they did, and then brought forward, in the first part of this year, those nine bills that increased spending by 8 percent.

If you add the money that was put in the so-called economic recovery spendulus package to the 8 percent, it turns out that on those nine bills we increased the spending by 80 percent. Eighty percent. And so, you can't blame the previous administration for a \$1.7 trillion deficit. You know, you can say, well, some of that we voted on in regard to the TARP money, the \$700 billion, that vote occurring in October/November time frame of 2008. And you say, well, yes, that added to this deficit.

But who was it that voted for that and approved that in the House and the Senate? The Democratic majority. They're the ones that voted for it. A few Republicans, sure. But it was the Democrats that—they could have stopped it. They could have stopped every dime of that \$700 billion TARP, Toxic Asset Relief Program which, as it turned out, was never even spent for that.

So as we look at what's going on in the future, just as the Congressional Budget Office did, over the next 10 years, you see what we're talking about, these deficits that go out into the future as far as the eye can see. And so at the end of 10 years, our debt is increased—well, real quickly, just another slide to show that. In 2019, that 10-year budget window, we're going from something like almost \$6 trillion of debt to 14, almost \$15 trillion of public debt by the year 2019. Man, if anything is unsustainable, that is unsustainable.

And to show it in a pictorial form, and I think we can bring this home to our colleagues so much with this next

poster, Mr. Speaker. President Obama would more than double the Federal debt to \$14.5 trillion, with a T. It took 43 presidents, here's their pictures, 43 presidents, 232 years to build up \$5.8 trillion in publicly held Federal debt. Under President Obama's proposed budget, over the next 6 years, we're going to add \$8.7 trillion to that.

These are staggering numbers and, as the CBO says, Mr. Speaker, unsustainable. I just wanted to make sure my colleagues understood what we're talking about here and the magnitude and the significance of this.

I'm going to yield back to the gentle-lady from Minnesota who controls the time. I know we have other colleagues here that want to speak. And I will enjoy continuing the colloquy during this hour.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Thank you so much, Mr. GINGREY.

We have several other things to talk about that occurred today, one of which was talked about, I think, in almost every paper across the United States, as well as every media outlet. On the Wall Street Journal today the headline today was "Government Forces Out Wagoner at GM." This really is unprecedented.

And Mr. Speaker, I just need to read the first opening paragraph. It says, "The Obama administration used the threat of withholding more bailout money to force out General Motors Corporation chief executives, which marked one of the most dramatic government interventions in private industry since the economic crisis began last year."

Now, this is in the United States. We have the presidency, under some authority, pushing out a CEO, the head of the largest car manufacturer in the United States.

This goes on to say, "The government has demanded the ouster of the head of AIG, American International Group, but only as it took a majority shareholder position." In this case, in GM, the administration has ousted a major CEO as part of an ongoing restructuring.

When we thought we couldn't be outraged any more, when we thought we wouldn't see anything more audacious, we see it yet again. Here is a company, Mr. Speaker, where we have the President deciding who's going to lead the company and who isn't going to lead the company.

And I was so curious today, I listened to President Obama's remarks that he made. This is from the White House. I encourage all Americans to go and read these remarks for themselves. It's remarks by the President on the American automotive industry. I don't think we've ever seen anything quite like this. It's emblematic of where this administration is taking the American taxpayer in this budget.

Now we're seeing the President and the Democrat-controlled Congress wanting to run virtually every aspect of American's lives, from health care,

every aspect of health care, which is 18 percent of our economy, to running the banking system, to running the largest insurance company in the United States, to running the secondary mortgage market, and now to running the largest automobile company in America and the second largest automobile company in America.

Today, President Obama said, "We cannot and must not, we will not let our auto industry vanish," which is great. And I'm wondering how he'll do it. With cutting taxes? I've read his speech. There's nothing here about cutting taxes. With cutting regulations maybe. That might help Detroit. There's nothing in here about cutting regulations.

How about cheaper energy? Wasn't that a big problem last July when gas prices were soaring over \$4 a gallon on their way to 6, 8, who knows what? Maybe cheaper energy. Maybe we'll be able to start getting that oil, the shale oil out of the Western Rocky area. Maybe cheaper oil. No, there's nothing in these remarks about cheaper American oil. Nothing at all. In fact, what we see is just the opposite.

We see the President of the United States intervening personally to topple the head of GM. And then we see the President intervening personally to take a hand at rewriting the restructuring of these two once great American car companies.

And as a matter of fact, he goes on to say that he's made a decision to have these car companies become, telling them what they're going to produce with their products with the new clean car companies. And, in fact, he goes on to say that the car industry isn't moving in the right direction. He's going to decide what that direction is. And it's not moving fast enough. The President is going to decide how fast it's going to move. He goes on to say, the United States government has no interest in running GM. But then in the next line he says, but we're going to give GM an opportunity to finally make those much-needed changes.

He goes on to say that General Motors, which I think now we'll have to call Government Motors after this move, that the new General Motors is going to have to work together with the Obama administration to clean up their balance sheets, consolidate unprofitable brands, and figure out what future investments they're going to make.

But then he goes on to Chrysler, and the President says this. "The situation at Chrysler is more challenging. It's with deep reluctance that we've determined, after careful review, that Chrysler needs a partner to remain viable." And we find out that the President has already worked with an international car manufacturer, Fiat Motors, and he wants Fiat Motors to come in, merge with Chrysler. And then, upon a successful merger, under President Obama's plan, then the American taxpayer will be good enough, Mr.

Speaker, to come in with \$6 billion. And now the company will be owned by Fiat, a foreign company, located in the United States, but with \$6 billion in American taxpayer money.

□ 2145

Mr. Speaker, the President's remarks today are nothing more than industrial policy that you would see in Eastern bloc nations. I urge every American to download the President's comments that he made today. This is the future that we are looking at in the United States. It is not good enough to have the Federal Government just take over banks, to just take over insurance companies, to just take over secondary mortgage markets, to just bankrupt our country, and to punish with new energy tax increases.

Now the American Government is thinking it is smarter than car companies, and they are going to approve plans, decide which product, and then the American people are going to come in and buy the cars—buy fleets for bureaucrats. That is in President Obama's remarks. American people will be buying new cars for bureaucrats. That is how we are going to bail out Detroit. Now, this would be humorous if it were not so serious. This is all part of President Obama's plan.

Mr. Speaker, make no mistake: this has absolutely nothing to do with free markets. Nothing. That is why the Chinese Communists are very nervous right now about the American economy, because they kind of like the way our free markets work. Otherwise, they would have invested in Communist countries; they would have invested in socialist countries, but they chose to invest in a free market country, but now the Chinese Communists are nervous, and they are telling President Obama, we're not too sure about your investments, and European socialists are saying the same thing: We're not too sure about your investments, because what is it that the President now, Mr. Speaker, is embracing? He is embarking upon an industrial policy that this country was smart enough to have nothing to do with.

I encourage the American people: you need to download President Obama's remarks today that he made from the White House on the United States essentially taking over and running roughshod over GM and Chrysler.

With that, I would like to hand it back to my colleague from Georgia.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. I thank my colleague for yielding. She brings up such a good point.

Mr. Speaker, I don't stand here and say that President Obama is deliberately trying to destroy markets, but as my colleague points out, this, in effect, is exactly what is happening. What will be the result? I hasten to say that what we are talking about here in regard to General Motors and Chrysler and the speech that the President made in regard to what he is doing sounds so much like what was done in this body

last week in regard to these bonuses that were paid legally and legitimately. Although, public outrage suggests that the recipients of those bonuses from AIG—because we, the taxpayers, had bailed them out to the tune of \$170 trillion—clearly, should voluntarily give those bonuses back.

It isn't for us to trample all over the Constitution and to have a trial by legislation of these recipients of the bonuses. A bill of attainement is what article I of the Constitution calls it, or violating the takings clause of the fifth amendment, and we knew that. Every Member of this body, I think, knew exactly that they were voting for something that was unconstitutional, just to sort of show, oh, gosh, you know, we are the fiscally responsible ones. The bonuses amounted to 1/1,000th of the amount of money that this Democratic majority and that even the previous administration had bestowed on this company like it was the only insurance company that existed in the United States of America.

I don't get my life insurance from AIG, and here we come along with this plan of telling the CEO of General Motors that he has got to step down. Do you know what I fear, Mr. Speaker? I fear that, once again, this is just posturing to set us up for another bailout. They want more money. General Motors wants more money. I am sure Chrysler does, too. So we hear this plan of, Oh, we're going to really crack the whip and crack down on these egregious folks, like the chairman and CEO of General Motors, and make him step down. I would really like to know—and hopefully, some good investigative reporter, Mr. Speaker, will find out—what kind of golden parachute he gets as he steps down.

Mrs. BACHMANN. If the gentleman would yield, I think it is even more than just taking a look at another bailout. There is certainly another bailout on the horizon. The President even indicated as much in his remarks today. He has already told these companies what it is going to be. Chrysler would get \$6 billion if Chrysler, essentially, goes away and lets Fiat buy them out. That is what is going to happen. The American people need to realize this. Under President Obama's plan, Chrysler will be history, and Fiat will come in. A foreign company will come into the United States, will purchase Chrysler, and then we taxpayers are expected to pony up \$6 billion to a foreign company to give them the capital that they need. Just so the American people know, these are President Obama's words today:

He said, "But just in case there's still nagging doubts, let me say it as plainly as I can. If you buy a car from Chrysler or General Motors, you'll be able to get your car serviced and repaired just like always. Your warranty will be safe. In fact, it will be safer than it has ever been because, starting today, the United States Government will stand behind your warranty."

So how do you like them apples? Here we have, Mr. Speaker, the United States of America standing up almost like a used car dealer, saying, "Don't you worry. The United States Government is going to back the car warranty on your car. So go down to the GM. Buy yourself an Impala because the United States Government is going to stand by your 3-year warranty, and if you're really good, maybe it will be a 5-year warranty."

So here you have the United States Government intervening, not only like the Wall Street Journal said—by lopping off the head of the CEO of General Motors, now called Government Motors—but now we have the Federal Government deciding it's going to be the pitchman, and it's going to back your warranty.

In fact, not only that, but President Obama said, "We recognize there's a weakness in our economy." He said, "To support demand for car sales in this period, I am directing my team to take several steps. Here is the first one: We're going to take money from the stimulus to purchase government cars as quick as we can for Federal bureaucrats." So this is going to give a lot of aid and comfort to the American people in knowing that their bureaucrat is going to be driving a brand new car, purchased at government expense. So their taxes are going to have to go up to buy cars for bureaucrats.

"Number 2: We're going to accelerate our efforts through the Treasury Department." Now, I thought the Treasury Department had quite a bit on its plate right now. They're not even able to fill positions in their office, but now they're going to open up a brand new consumer lending department rather than have the car companies', like GM's auto finance. They are gone. The Treasury Department, which is the new investment bank in the United States, is now the new consumer and business lending initiative. Our Treasury Secretary, who, apparently, doesn't have enough to do is now going to be the new loan officer for the cars in the United States, but it gets better.

Third, the IRS, which is now our new friend under President Obama, will be the new marketing arm of the Federal Government because they are going to launch a campaign to alert consumers of a new tax benefit for car purchases made between February 16 and the end of this year. If this doesn't sound like an ad you would see on late night TV: If you buy a car this year, we will deduct the cost of sales and excise taxes. In fact, we think we will sell 100,000 new cars.

Mr. Speaker, Detroit sells millions of cars every year. So we are going to have the Federal Government take over these two car manufacturers so they can sell 100,000 new cars? That would be a bad day for Detroit if that's what they would all sell, but that's not the end of it.

Then the President went on to say today, "Several Members of Congress

have proposed an even more ambitious incentive program to increase car sales while modernizing our fleet." That is really going to comfort the American people in knowing that Congress has come up with a plan to sell cars to the American people, and such fleet modernization programs will provide generous credit to consumers who turn in old, less fuel-efficient cars and who purchase cleaner cars.

Again, I say to you, Mr. Speaker, this is so pathetic to think that now Congress is going to come up with a way to sell cars better than the private markets and that we are going to have bureaucrats driving new cars while the American people are limping along in their old cars. They cannot afford to buy cars. This is unbelievable.

I urge the American people to download the President's remarks from today. This has very little to do with the free market. It has everything to do with failed Eastern European industrialized policy. This is not what the American people want. They want their taxes cut. They want jobs in the United States, and they want to be able to have less burdens on their backs from regulations.

I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Well, the gentlelady from Minnesota, I think, put it so well, and I think you and my colleagues would almost have to agree that this sounds so socialistic.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Perhaps because it is.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. There are worse terms you could apply to it, and the gentlelady may have one that she wants to express.

You know, as to this Government Motors business of, look, we have to do this so that people will be confident in the company and will buy these automobiles because now they feel secure in their 3- to 5-year warranty, listen, I would feel so much better with the chapter 11 option and if General Motors had to restructure under the bankruptcy code. Then nobody would lose their jobs. Maybe there would have to be a little cut in pay, and the vendors would take a little haircut, but this company would continue to be viable.

I want to just very quickly tell my colleagues about a company that is very important in my district, the 11th Congressional District of Georgia. We have a lot of poultry industry in northwest Georgia, and the big name that you hear about when you think about poultry processing—across the country, in fact, certainly not just in Georgia—is a company called Pilgrim's Pride. People know about Pilgrim's Pride. Well, they're financially struggling, and had to lay off literally thousands of workers and temporarily shut down for about 3 months until they made the tough decision to go into a bankruptcy reorganization under chapter 11.

I talked to some of the company executives within the last week when I

went back into the district, and they said, Congressman, we're doing fine. Everybody is back to work. We're going to work our way out of this, and we're going to end up being a much stronger company in the long run. That is the magic of the free market, Mr. Speaker, and that is exactly what we are talking about here tonight.

I commend MICHELE BACHMANN for her wisdom in presenting this, and I yield back to the gentlelady.

Mrs. BACHMANN. If the gentleman would yield, what you're talking about with Pilgrim's Pride, the great chicken producer in your district, that could have been done by our car manufacturers here in the United States without one dime of taxpayer money going into the auto industry.

I sit on the Financial Services Committee. We had the Big Three automakers in front of our committee, and I asked that question when the gentlemen were there. I asked, "Wouldn't bankruptcy protection be your best friend? It would shield your company from further legal liability, and it would allow you the freedom to restructure your contracts and to restructure your organization." That would have been a great tool that would not have cost any money.

Unfortunately, our President has made a decision to take the most expensive and the deepest government intervention route that we have ever seen in the history of our country. My fear, Mr. Speaker, is we will never again see a free car manufacturer, an American-made car manufacturer, in the United States. Is there any industry that thinks, once the government gets its fingers at the level where it approves your business plan and then backs up the warranty of your product and decides what your product will be and who the purchasers of your product will be, that the government will ever get out of the car business? At that point, what are we going to have left to buy—pogo sticks?

We are not going to have much of a car industry left once the United States Government gets done with it. It's kind of like free health care. We will never see more expensive health care than when the Federal Government gets involved.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Well, if the gentlelady will yield, she kind of perked my interest a little bit there as she was starting to talk about health care.

Mr. Speaker, you know I am one of the physician Members of this body, and have practiced a long time—delivering babies in Marietta and in surrounding counties—and I am so glad that health care has been brought up tonight because the President just feels like government-run programs work better than the free market. We are on the verge of seeing Hillarycare all over again. I don't want to totally shift gears here on this subject, but it is such an important point, Mr. Speaker.

We don't necessarily try to say that the free market system of health care

is perfect or that we don't need to do some things to try to get the 47 million or so who are uninsured in this country health care that is accessible and affordable and portable, that they own, where they can control their own destiny and where we can encourage them to adopt wellness policies regarding their own health.

□ 2200

That is a subject maybe for another hour, and I will yield back to the gentlelady from Minnesota.

But clearly, we Republicans, the minority party, feel that the marketplace is the best place to solve these problems. And I don't want, Representative BACHMANN doesn't want, and nobody in this Chamber should want government motors.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I thank the gentleman and thank you for this time.

We yield back. Thank you.

#### REPUBLICAN CONGRESSIONAL HEALTH CAUCUS

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I am coming to the floor of the House tonight to talk about health care. We had the occasion this morning over in the Library of Congress to have the first forum from the Republican Health Policy Caucus. This will be the first of several that we will do over the coming months. Obviously, health care is going to be a subject that receives a lot of discussion and a lot of debate, as it should. It's an important topic, and it is going to occupy a great deal of Congressional attention.

Let me just speak a little bit about the Caucus, and then I want to talk about the event that occurred this morning.

The Congressional Health Caucus was founded at the beginning of this Congress, the 111th Congress, and it was formed with several purposes in mind. It is a caucus on the Republican side, it is to educate members and their staff on the issues surrounding health care policy, and certainly, Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the caucus is to equip those same members with the resources for fostering debate and, of course, ultimately serving the American people with the most effective policy. It is designed to help members and their staffs communicate effectively, and we do welcome debate. It is not a closed-end caucus. Certainly we welcome a variety of members.

And perhaps one of the most important things that this caucus can do, this is an inclusive caucus. It does include members, is open to any member on the Republican side—I actually thought about the possibility of a bipartisan caucus but there wasn't much interest in that. But nevertheless, from our side of the aisle—and certainly

we've had discussions with members of the other body as to whether they might be interested—but the idea is to have an inclusive discussion on the things surrounding health care reform.

But perhaps one of the most important things that I envision—one of the most important roles that I envision for this caucus is to take the discussion beyond the Capitol, beyond Washington, beyond the Beltway, the Potomac and all of the accoutrements and all things that are Washingtonian and speak to those patients, those doctors, those nurses, those hospital administrators who are actually doing the work in the trenches day in and day out and are actually looking toward Washington and wondering just what it is that we're up to now because, of course, some of them have seen this before. And it caused a great deal of disruption within the medical community some 15 years ago. They didn't see much that changed that was positive. Perhaps we allowed HMOs to get a more greater foothold in many markets across the country after the failure of the plans of health care reform 15 years ago.

So there is a great deal of interest but also a great deal of skepticism as people who work in the field—again, the doctors, the nurses, certainly the patients and their families, certainly the hospital administrators, people who work day in and day out delivering health care to our patients, our seniors, our youth, our families—there is a great deal of skepticism about what they see going on in Washington right now.

Well, in pursuit of those goals that I outlined, the events and resources provided by the caucus will be designed to prepare members to engage intelligently and effectively during this debate that we're going to see over the next several months and then beyond that. Whatever policies are arrived at or not arrived at, it will be the implementation of those policies, it will be the forward activity that occurs as a result of enactment of sweeping health care reform or the failure thereof.

Remember back in 1993 and 1994 when the bills did not get out of the—the bills did not become law, what was the focus then of the United States Congress on health care going forward? What type of attention was paid? It will be the purpose of this caucus that regardless of what happens, whether reform is enacted or not, that we will not take our eyes off the ball, and we will continue to be vigilant for the sake of the American people.

Now, Mr. Speaker, for reasons that I don't quite understand, I was invited down to the White House a couple of weeks ago to participate in the White House forum on health care reform, the White House Health Care Summit, and the President, in his remarks to us as the afternoon was concluding, was that it was his job to offer guideposts and guidelines, but principally he was there that day to try to find out what works.