

And these people don't make any money. The sheriff of Hudspeth County makes \$39,000 a year. Sheriff Carrillo of Culberson County makes \$32,000 a year, and their deputies make about \$27,000 a year. And they are protecting us from the drug cartels moving into the country. A guy just bringing drugs into the United States is going to make up to \$1,500 a load, making far more than our own border protectors.

There are four commodities being traded on the border. Two are going north and two are going south. The two going north are people and drugs, and they're being worked together. In other words, the coyotes work with the drug cartels to smuggle people. The two commodities going south: guns and money, and that's what's being traded on the border with Mexico.

It's important, Madam Speaker, that we provide our border protectors with the Humvees they need. We need to give them better equipment, and we need to put troops on the border because the purpose of government is to protect the people.

And that's just the way it is.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### CHARITABLE DEDUCTIONS AND GOVERNMENT SPENDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, we have an organization in this country called the Independent Sector. It's a nonprofit, nonpartisan coalition of charities, foundations, and corporate philanthropic programs collectively representing tens of thousands of charitable groups in every State across the Nation. The mission of this organization is to advance the common good by leading, strengthening, and mobilizing the nonprofit community.

The reason that I bring this up tonight is that the way that the administration, through the budget, wants to help fund health care reform is they want to reduce the amount that people can deduct when they make charitable contributions. And this organization that represents the Volunteers of America, the Salvation Army, the Red Cross, all these organizations, says that if the legislation passes in the

budget in its present form, they will lose \$4 billion a year in charitable contributions because people won't be able to deduct the same amount that they've been deducting before when they make a contribution to these charities. And I think that's tragic because people who need help from the Salvation Army or the Red Cross or these other philanthropic organizations really need help, and if they can't get it from those organizations, the place they are going to go to try to get it is where? From the taxpayers, from their local trustee, their State government, their city government, or the Federal Government. So what we are going to see is a transfer of responsibility from these independent philanthropic organizations to these local government entities and the Federal Government if we start reducing the amount that people can deduct in charitable contributions. I think that's tragic.

The Secretary of the Treasury, Geithner, appeared before the Senate this past week, and he was asked about this, and he said, well, he thinks there might be other ways that they could fund the health care changes in this country without dipping into the charitable contribution deductions. Well, the head of OMB indicated, I think, yesterday on Face the Nation that Mr. Geithner probably wasn't right, that once the American people see how this money is going to be used, they'll understand it.

I don't believe that, Madam Speaker. I believe the American people, when they give money to a charity, want to make sure that that money is going to that charity and that they get their charitable deduction for that. If they don't get that charitable deduction, they're going to start cutting back on the money they give to charities, and the minute they start doing that, Madam Speaker, then you're going to see these charities start wanting for money because they won't be getting the money they have been getting in the past.

These organizations have said collectively they are going to lose \$4 billion a year if the budget proposed by the administration and proposed by the House leadership and the Senate leadership, if that goes through. And it may go through tomorrow. Then these charities are not going to get that money, \$4 billion in losses, and it's going to be borne by other institutions. And I submit to you it will be the local governments, the State governments, and probably the Federal Government. I think that's just dead wrong.

I want to end up tonight by saying one more thing, Madam Speaker, to my colleagues back in their offices. We have been increasing the money supply, printing more money very rapidly, and we are indebting the people of this country to the tune of trillions of dollars. The Secretary of the Treasury is going to have another \$3 trillion that he's going to have to print to give to fi-

nancial institutions to keep them above water. The budget that we're talking about, the bailout bill that we're talking about, the stimulus package, all of those add up to trillions of dollars more in spending.

If you look at this chart, you will see that the money supply in this country has been pretty level up through the year 2000, and then it starts going up like a rocket, and now it's going straight up. And what that means to the American people, and I hope the American people, if they happen to be paying attention, and I can't talk to them, I know, but if they happen to be paying attention, I hope they realize that the increase in the money supply is going to come directly to them eventually. It's going to affect them in higher taxes and higher costs of goods and services when they go to buy them. If you have more money in circulation, and we're looking at trillions of dollars more that's going to be printed, that money is going to be chasing fewer goods and services. What that means simply is if you go to buy a loaf of bread, it's going to cost more. If you buy a gallon of gas, it's going to cost more. If you buy electricity in your home, when you turn the switch on, it's going to cost more.

So I would just like to say to my colleagues, we really need to do something about spending. We have got to say to the administration and our colleagues in the House and the Senate it's time to cut spending. We don't need to spend more. We don't need to spend these trillions of dollars. We ought to be cutting taxes instead of doing that to stimulate economic growth, and we need to make sure that the American people and the future generations of this country are not saddled with more debt and hyperinflation.

There are so many things going on right now, Madam Speaker, that troubles me, it's not even funny. And it all comes down to spending more money and imposing more burden on the American taxpayers and the future of this country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### ENERGY INSECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. INGLIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. INGLIS. Madam Speaker, I have been doing this series on our energy insecurity problem and opportunity. And it clearly is that. It's both a danger and an opportunity. Our energy insecurity, the fact that we are dependent on foreign nations for our transportation

fuels and the fact that we really don't have a great plan at this point about how to produce electricity. So we've got this energy insecurity and we've got a danger there, but we have also got an incredible opportunity.

But speaking especially to fellow conservatives, I wonder if our conservative environmental policy is being controlled by former Vice President Al Gore. You know, it's said that he who angers you controls you. So I wonder if the fact that when we hear "climate change," we see Al Gore and we get angry; it makes him actually the one that's controlling our view of climate change. Wouldn't it be something if we conservatives were actually under the control of Al Gore because he angers us so much that we can't see past him and some claims he makes about climate change? Some conservatives think that's a bunch of hooey. But if we can't see past that to the job creation opportunity and to the national security risk, then is he really controlling us?

So what I'd like to ask, especially fellow conservatives, to consider is, is that really where we want to be? Do we really want to be controlled by a former Vice President, or do we want to see the opportunity, job creation opportunity, and the incredible national security danger, and then move to act to solve it?

Of course, I think that the solution that conservatives bring is an understanding of markets and how economics work, and how it is that people making profit will actually solve this energy insecurity problem.

So try this out for size: If I'm making Inglis widgets at my factory, and I'm belching and burning and basically dumping ash on my neighbor's property, it's a pretty good deal for me. It stinks for my neighbor. Now, under Biblical law my neighbor would have a cause of action against me. Under English common law, under American common law, and by virtue of EPA and regulations, my neighbor would have a cause of action against me or a regulatory regime to help him out.

Now, if I'm heard to complain to the local congressman, no, now, listen, you can't make me put scrubbers on my smokestack because that will drive up the price of my widgets. Inglis widgets will go up in price, and that will make it so that the customer is hurt. Well, will it? Or will it actually create the opportunity for another entrepreneur across town who is ready to compete with me and take me out because he's got a cleaner process, a smaller smokestack, if you will? So if society wants to move along to that better product that my competitor is offering across town, then what we have to do is figure out a way to make me keep my ash on my property. If you do that, it's called internalizing the externals. It's something that we conservatives can understand. It's a market distortion that we have got to fix. If we fix it, then my incumbent technology, the cheaper widgets because I get to dump ash on my

neighbor's property, suddenly becomes more expensive, and the competing technology now takes me out.

That's where we are with gasoline, for example. The reason the gasoline is so cheap, and it is so cheap, is there are all these negative externalities that aren't recognized by the market: the national security risk, the climate change risk, the environmental problems associated with it. If you stuck those onto the product of gasoline and said, now, gasoline, compete with plug-in hybrids, suddenly plug-in hybrids would be popping up everywhere because the competition would be able to take out the incumbent technology.

I think that's an inherently conservative idea. I think it's understanding how markets work, how economics work, and how profit can solve this energy insecurity. Because if we get to the place where that competing technology can take out the incumbent technology, we will break this addiction to oil, and we will improve the national security of the United States, and we will create jobs, because those new technologies have a lot of jobs in them.

So even if you think that climate change is a bunch of hooey, there are two other reasons to pursue it that are equally valid and very exciting opportunities to fix this energy insecurity that we face, and that I look forward to talking with you again about.

My colleagues, this is an opportunity for us to work together to build consensus, to collaborate as Republicans and Democrats. We can fix this problem.

□ 1945

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MCHENRY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. FUDGE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which Members may revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials on the topic of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

#### CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Ms. FUDGE. I am a member of the Congressional Black Caucus, better known as the CBC. Currently, the CBC

is chaired by the Honorable BARBARA LEE from the Ninth Congressional District of California. My name is Congresswoman MARCIA FUDGE, representing the 11th District of Ohio.

CBC members are advocates for the human family nationally and internationally and have played a significant role as local and regional activists. We continue to work diligently to be the conscience of the Congress.

But understand all politics are local. Therefore, we provide dedicated and focused service to the citizens and the congressional districts we serve.

The vision of the founding members of the Congressional Black Caucus to promote the public welfare through legislation designed to meet the needs of millions of neglected citizens continues to be our focal point for the legislative work and political activities of the Congressional Black Caucus today. More than ever, it is necessary that we, as leaders, help those whom we serve. As the floor moderator today for the Congressional Black Caucus special order hour, I have to add that it is more important than ever that we put the money where our mouth is.

For the past 8 years, we have lived in a cloud of corporate misdeeds, backroom dealings, and extreme tax cuts that have only benefited the wealthiest people in this Nation. Due to the Bush administration's lack of government oversight, intervention and inattention, we now face the toughest economy in our lifetime.

Such neglect and inattention have led to this storm called a housing crisis, a collapse of the stock market and rising health care costs that leaves most Americans in a state of shock. In 2008, nearly 4 million jobs were lost across the Nation. In February of this year, the Greater Cleveland area unemployment rate was at a staggering 10.2 percent. The overall African-American unemployment rate is even greater, currently over 13 percent.

In these dire times, something must be done to help our Nation and our people get back on their feet. The best way to address these issues and illustrate our desire to better the lives of so many Americans is with our budget priorities for the upcoming fiscal year.

I want to thank President Obama for his thoughtful budget that signals a new era of responsibility. I want to applaud his attention to our Nation's most urgent needs, job training and job creation, health care and education.

I would like to thank him for the particular attention that this budget gives to the mental health needs of our veterans. Finally, I applaud this administration for paying attention to those that need us the most, our children and our elderly.

As the former mayor of Warrensville Heights, Ohio, and on behalf of all mayors and all local leaders, I want to focus on the administration's full funding of Community Development Block Grants. The fiscal year 2010 budget provides \$4.5 billion to fully fund this program.