

could see. Unfortunately, in 2001, we passed tax cuts that we could not afford, collapsing revenues and, in fact, even increased as a percentage of GDP, increased spending, creating this deficit. We have to get back under control where the revenues are more than the expenditures.

This year, we are out of control because we have had the stimulus package, we have had the bailouts, and everything. But this is just a 1-year spike. And we need to get the budget back under control. And we can do that. Under the Obama budgets, we will be back into more traditional levels of deficits.

But, when we get down here, that should not be the end. That is just the first step. We are going to have to continue bringing spending down and revenues up so that we will have our surplus so that we will be able to afford Social Security.

The President's budget, the first thing it does is reinstates what is called PAYGO. One of the reasons that we could maintain fiscal responsibility in the 1990s is we had a process called PAYGO. Pay as you go. If you offer a spending program, you have to pay for it. You have to raise the taxes to pay for it or cut some spending somewhere else. If you want to cut some taxes, you have to cut some spending or raise some other taxes. Everything do you, have you to pay for it. And if you don't pay for it, you can't pass it.

Unfortunately, in 2001, PAYGO expired, and the tax cuts were passed without paying for it. Increased spending took place without paying for it. And we got into the ditch that we are in. We now are back under PAYGO, where we are going to have to pay for what we do.

One of the things that the Obama budget does, it presents an honest budget. There are many things in the last few budgets that were just kind of left out. We knew every year we'd been continuing some tax cuts year after year. We knew each year we'd put those back in. Those weren't in the budget as introduced.

□ 2015

The war spending. We know we are at war. There was zero for the war in Iraq and Afghanistan in the budgets as introduced. We knew we were going to spend money on those wars. In fact, there were about \$250 billion worth of known expenditures that we knew we were going to spend that were left out of the budgets. The Obama budget includes everything that everybody knows that we are going to spend.

So with PAYGO and fiscal responsibility, we are going to at least reduce the deficit 50 percent in the first term of President Obama; and after we get there, we will continue to make progress.

The President's budget makes significant investments in energy, getting us from dependence on foreign oil and creating millions of jobs in energy, cre-

ating clean energy jobs. His budget brings down the skyrocketing costs of health care, and makes focused investments in education, one of the things on energy, alternative forms of energy and conservation and significant research investments.

In health care, we need to make investments in cost control to make sure that we can control health care. The Social Security chart and the Medicare chart are very similar. The Medicare chart is actually even worse because of the accelerating health care costs. We need to get those costs under control, because if we don't get Medicare under control, health care generally will consume the entire budget. We need to make sure that we are investing in access to make sure that those who have insurance can keep it, because as the costs go up, people are losing their health insurance.

He is making significant investments in education, making sure that tax credits for education expenses are increased and Pell Grants are increased so more and more people can go to college. And we want to make sure that we invest in elementary and secondary education, particularly early childhood education.

The budget makes a unique investment in nurse home visits. These have been shown to significantly reduce a lot of problems, one of which is child abuse, which is highly correlated with future crime by these nurse visits. The nurse visits have been studied. I serve on the Judiciary Committee, and they have found that those who have had the advantage of the nurse visits were one-third as likely to be arrested 18 years later as those who did not have the visits; education is much better off; child abuse is down. So those visits will be a very important investment in our future.

And, finally, the President's budgets continues large increases in veterans health care. We had significant increases 2 years ago and last year, and we will continue those increases so our veterans get the health care that they certainly have earned and deserve.

We need to make some tough choices. The President says one of the most difficult choices are making expenditures today that save money in the future. Nobody wants to spend the money today if the savings won't occur for 5 or 10 years.

One of the bills that I have introduced is the Youth Promise Act that makes investments in young people to keep them out of trouble. We are spending more money per person in incarceration. We have got more people locked up today per hundred thousand population than anywhere on Earth. We could significantly reduce the need for that correlation if we made investments up front, getting young people on the right track and keeping them on the right track. The Youth Promise Act does that. It has an interesting aspect to it. When you save money, the localities that come up with their local

plans will try to identify where they are saving money, and those agencies should kick in to keep the program running.

The State of Pennsylvania did the collaborative approach that is anticipated in the Youth Promise Act, and they funded a number of programs for a total cost of approximately \$60 million, \$60 million, and they calculate they save over the next few years over \$300 million, because they made those investments and reduced crime significantly. Nobody wants to make the first investment; so the Youth Promise Act will make those investments and, hopefully, the localities will continue the programs, saving significant money in the future.

But we have to make the tough choices. And if we don't make those tough choices, if we don't get the budget under control, we are going to be spending entirely too much money on interest in the national debt, we will jeopardize Social Security and Medicare. But with the leadership of President Obama, the Congressional Black Caucus is committed to addressing our priorities in a fiscally responsible way. Social Security, Medicare, and our future depend on it.

Again, I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio for her leadership and giving us the opportunity to talk about the budget today.

Ms. FUDGE. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. BOBBY SCOTT.

For those of us in the Congressional Black Caucus, we clearly know that Representative SCOTT is the best in the Congress when it comes to analyzing budgets and providing information to his colleagues. So, again, I thank him.

Madam Speaker, I thank you. I thank the members of the CBC for allowing me to act in their behalf tonight; as well as I want to say that we do very much appreciate the fact that we now have an administration and a President who does believe in an honest budget, who does believe in doing the things that are necessary to get this country back on track.

I yield back the balance of my time.

#### FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

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

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. BIGGERT. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Madam Speaker, I rise tonight to call attention to our economy and the fiscal discipline we

need to implement to get our country back on the right path.

Right now, the American people are hurting; and Republicans want to work with the President to get the American people back to work. We want to get the economy going again. But we do know, and the American people know, we cannot tax, spend, and borrow our way back to a healthy economy. So we really want to be included in the opportunity to solve our problems, and this is a huge problem.

Just a couple of days ago, there was a summit held at the White House on health care, and they had Members of Congress, they had experts in the health field come together to look at how we are going to solve this problem.

The economy right now is the hugest problem that we have. Why aren't we working together and really coming together to solve this problem? We have so much expertise in this Congress. We have economists, we have people in the industry. We really should be sitting down to solve the problem, rather than going back and forth and arguing on the House floor, because our country and the international economy is suffering. And it is not the first time nor the last. We have seen crisis like this before and we have pulled through. So I am optimistic that we can get together and really work to solve the problem.

And look what happened on 9/11. We came together. We came together as a Congress, united to face that problem and to face that challenge, and to find the solutions and how we were going to deal with it. This is another problem. Not maybe as quite the magnitude; maybe it is, but we need to get together and really work together.

We face the largest economic decline since World War II, along with unprecedented domestic unemployment. February's numbers show that there was 8.1 percent unemployment. And we face unprecedented foreclosures, facing about one in nine families right now. It is time for us to unite again as leaders and pull through once more.

I wish that the administration would convene this bipartisan, bicameral summit to focus all of our energy on solving economic problems. We want to solve health care, we want to solve energy, we want to solve climate change. We want to do all of these things. We want to solve education. But I think all of that energy really needs to be brought to one force to come back and address the economic situation. We should be focusing on saving and spending plans that put America on a path to responsibility and long-term success.

With TARP money of \$700 billion, a housing bill that was \$300 billion, with the recent passage of the \$825 stimulus package, and with the Federal Reserve putting so much money into some areas, and a pending \$410 billion appropriation bill, I have to say that my constituents are upset. They are upset because the spending appears to be

recklessly out of control, with no accountability or direction. And, unfortunately, with the recent release of the administration's budget for fiscal year 2010, we continue down this heavy spending path. And while we only know the basics of the budget proposal, it certainly has been a mixed bag.

So tonight we are here, and we want to address the concerns in the budget. There are the good, the bad, and what we call the ugly. I have a little chart here that addresses the President's 2010 budget. As I said, we have got the good, the bad, and the ugly.

We acknowledge that there is an entitlement crisis, that there is a budget fix for the AMT. We are looking at the Medicaid part D. With the bad, there is an increase in spending of \$3.9 trillion in 2009. It increases nondefense appropriations by 9.3 percent. The war funding is a gimmick. The ugly, a \$1.4 trillion tax increase in a recession, \$1 trillion entitlement expansion, in the 2009 deficit, \$1.8 trillion. And we double the debt.

These are the things that we are going to be discussing tonight, and I am glad to have my colleagues here to participate. I would like to call on the gentlelady from Tennessee for her comments right now, MARSHA BLACKBURN.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I thank the gentlelady from Illinois so much for yielding, and I appreciate her yielding the time to me. And we have other members of our Republican conference who are here, female members, who are coming to talk about the issues that we know are affecting our constituents and we know are affecting women in our districts.

As the gentlelady from Illinois has mentioned, the number one thing that we do hear from our constituents, and especially our women small business owners, is their concerns over the economy; and they are concerned about the economic security, the retirement security that is in front of them as they look to winding down their careers. And they are also very concerned about what is happening for the secured opportunities of future generations and the security that they will want to enjoy.

I have a chart with me that I think says a lot about what we see happening here in Washington now as well as what is going to be coming in years to come.

Let's go back and look at the deficit. We are hearing a lot about the deficit and the data. Some of my constituents last week were saying, well, we continue to hear this comment that they inherited this debt. How could that be? Everyone has been voting on this for years.

So we made a chart looking at Federal spending going back to January 2007 through today. And, of course, in 2007 is when all of the problems really started to manifest themselves in the housing industry and leading toward the situations that we saw happening with the banks that began in early

2008, and then moving on into the budget situation that we have today. So we prepared a chart to lay out what has happened since January 2007, with our Federal deficit, which is the line that you will see in green, the graphing in green.

Then, discretionary spending, which is that portion of our budget that we actually can get into and make some decisions about how we are going to spend those dollars, and that is where we should be reducing what the Federal government spends.

Then, mandatory spending. Much of that is the entitlements which the gentlelady from Illinois just referred to mentioning very appropriately that, yes, indeed, we do have an entitlement crisis that is coming, and that is spending that is going to have to be dealt with in order for the future generations to enjoy security, whether it is economic security, whether it is freedom and opportunity.

□ 2030

Take a look at what has happened. You can see where we were in January 2007. And the debt, the Federal debt, at that point in time was right over \$3 trillion. Our deficit in 2007 was just over \$400 billion.

Now let's look at what happened. The first stimulus plan that was passed early last year, \$152 billion, you can see what that did to the federal deficit. It really popped it up. You can also see what that did to discretionary spending. And then look at what happened with pre-TARP, the amount of money, the \$300 billion, that went into those loans from March to September of 2008 when we were dealing with Bear Stearns, Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac, IndyMac and AIG. You can see what happened with our deficit, which is the green line, the discretionary spending, and the bump-ups that came there, and then you see the mandatory spending rising as we move through that. Then TARP in September 2008, you can see what happened there with the \$700 billion and the escalation that has carried forth there, the auto bailout of \$14 billion.

President Obama's second stimulus, we call this plan B, and that ended up being \$1 trillion. You see what it did to our deficit. We are at over \$2 trillion in deficit for this fiscal year so far. Also you can see what happened with our discretionary spending. And take a look at what has happened with our mandatory spending through there. And then of course the omnibus, the \$410 billion omnibus bill that had passed the House and it is still in the Senate without a resolution to it.

So through all of these votes, I will highlight that the Speaker, our President who was in the Senate, and Leader REID in the Senate, all were "yes" votes on that. They were part of driving this deficit and these discretionary spending hikes, the mandatory spending spikes that you are seeing over there also.

And by the way, going back to January 2007, that is when the Democrats took control of both Houses, both Chambers, the House and the Senate, and started pushing forward the spending increases. And they have now moved the national debt from just over the \$8 trillion that was here to nearly \$11 trillion. As of January 3 of this year, the debt was at \$10.7 trillion. And as I mentioned earlier, that big green spike over there is for the \$2 trillion in deficit spending they have already accrued this year. And we are hearing that once they pass the \$410 billion, that it is going to be even higher. And we are also hearing that they are going to come back and ask for more TARP spending.

So when I talk with females and with female-owned small businesses in my district, the number one thing that comes up is the economy. And what does this do? Knowing that political freedom and economic freedom are linked, what does this do to future generations? From the women in my district, I have heard repeatedly, they understand that we cannot spend our way out of this recession. You can't spend your way to recovery. You can't spend your way to prosperity. You can't build prosperity on a foundation of debt. And so many of our small business owners understand that. And women every single day come to me and say, Marsha, it is time for people to address these economic issues and do it with wisdom, do it with some forethought, and be very careful that we are not passing on to future generations a debt that they are unable to handle.

I was out visiting with some women's groups a couple of weeks ago. A lady came up to me. She was carrying a young infant. And I noticed this because I have a 9-month-old grandson, Jack, and I have another grandchild, Chase, who will arrive in June. And the lady walked up to me with this child in her arms. And she said, "Marsha, I want to tell you something." She said, "it absolutely infuriates me when Congress spends money I haven't made yet. But now I have got this 6-month old grandbaby. And let me tell you something. It makes me so angry. I want to come to Washington and bang on the doors because it makes me so angry that you're spending money that she has not made yet. And she doesn't even know to be upset with Congress." She said, "I know you're voting 'no' on all these spending bills. Please do all you can to arrest the out-of-control spending."

And I will yield back to the gentlelady from Illinois. I thank you for the time. And I thank you for the efforts to help work to preserve our economic freedom for future generations.

Mrs. BIGGERT. I thank the gentlelady from Tennessee. You have done so much in bringing out all of this to our attention. And I really appreciate it.

I would like to just read a paragraph from one of my constituents, a woman in the district named April. And she

said, "First, thank you for voting against the stimulus package at the beginning of February. As an independent, I am disturbed by what has happened in Washington these past few weeks. I am urging you and Members of Congress to exercise restraint when examining the President's budget and any other stimulus packages. Eliminate wasteful spending. The American people are mindful these days of their own budgets at home, and so should the Federal Government.

"In addition, what happened to the President's and other Members' promise that they would eliminate earmarks? It seems like Washington needs some management. Thank you for your time."

And with that, I would like to call on my good friend from Florida, GINNY BROWN-WAITE.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. I thank the gentlelady from Illinois.

Last week I had some folks in town from Florida, and they didn't get to see snow very often obviously living in Florida. And when they came here, it was about some of the tax issues. And they were darn mad, the same way that Mrs. BLACKBURN's constituents were. And when they came into my office, I said to them, "so what do you think about the snow?" They said, "do you mean the snow job of the stimulus package and then the budget that the President came out with?"

These are small business owners who are very concerned about their ability to stay in business. We all know that the majority, about 80 percent of jobs created recently over the last 8 and 10 years, have been from small businesses. And they realize that they are the ones who are going to be hit very hard by President Obama's proposed tax increases.

This chart clearly shows the 2010 tax increases that are proposed by President Obama. It shows cap-and-trade, which most business people call "cap-and-tax," at \$646 billion increase, small businesses and investors, the red color, \$635 billion tax increase, and other tax increases, about \$149 billion. Now, where are those tax increases going to come from? Obviously by taxing the small business person. We have heard about how the higher tax won't affect anyone earning less than \$250,000. The truth of the matter is that it is actually at the \$200,000 level, that is the level at which the Obama tax increases begin to take effect for small business owners filing as singles.

My husband and I owned a few businesses. And we were always what is called a Subchapter S corporation. And a Subchapter S corporation, or a partnership, or a limited liability, LLC, at the end of the year, they take the profits, and they add it to their income, and they pay income tax based on that. Well when you combine a hoped-for profit as a Subchapter S corporation or a partnership and you add it to whatever income you may have drawn from

the business or your spouse may have brought from another job, you're at the \$250,000 level, very, very quickly. But if you're a single taxpayer, it is \$200,000. We don't hear a lot about that. We only hear about \$250,000, which to the average person sounds kind of like a lot of money. But we must remember that over 3 million taxpayers with small business income actually earn more than \$250,000. That is the level at which these tax increases are going to take effect. These, again, are the people back in our districts. These are the Barbara Manzis in my district. She has a metal fabrication business. And you cannot continue to tax these job-creating small businesses out of existence.

A constituent sent me a cartoon. It happens to be the Wizard of Id. And it is someone running for office. And in this, it says, "what are you offering the peasants in your election speech today?" And the politician goes on to say, "nothing they can afford to refuse. Elect me and I promise free health care, free housing, free clothing, food stamps and jobs for everybody." And then he asks the crowd, "are there any questions?" And someone yells out from the crowd, "who needs a job?"

Well, that is exactly where we are going in this country with some of the tax policies. If everything out there is "for free," and you have the President and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle saying that we need to have some people in this country just paying a little bit more, I'm sure that my colleagues forget that many of the taxpayers in these top two income tax brackets earn significant portions of that income from being a major employer. So we are going to really end up taxing those who create the jobs.

I did a telephone town hall last week in my district. And when you do a telephone town hall, you don't select just people in your own party. In my case I do it by county, county by county. And we call individuals and we try to ask them their opinion. Overwhelmingly, whether it was a Republican or a Democrat or an independent, the President's budget was not popular, nor was the stimulus package. The concern was that it really did not help small businesses. And in my district, I don't have major employers. The majority of the employers in my district are either health care, remember this is Florida, are either health care, government, or small businesses. So we are going to limit it to the previous two, because under the Obama Democrat tax plan, we are going to be putting a lot of these small businesses out of business at a time when they are struggling to stay alive in this economy.

The folks back home quite honestly don't understand how this phenomena can be, how people think that they can tax their way out of this declining economy. Because all increased taxes are going to do is make sure that the declining economy continues. And that is pretty darn sad.

We also on this chart had some figures for cap-and-trade. What cap-and-

trade is going to do, most people call it cap-and-tax, is it is going to raise taxes on small businesses. It is going to raise energy costs on small businesses and certainly on residents at a time when people are already struggling. I go home every weekend to the Fifth Congressional District. And people up there say things like, "are you the only sane one there who is voting against this?" I assure them that my colleagues, like the gentlelady from Illinois, the gentlelady from Tennessee and many other Members are concerned and are also voting against it. What we are going after here is trying to bring some common sense and help for small businesses.

Unfortunately, President Obama's wealth distribution plan would not even cover the increased energy costs associated with his cap-and-tax, or cap-and-trade, plan. It is really cap-and-tax plan. It is a tax plan, ladies and gentlemen.

Americans fear that we are going down the road to socialism. And I recall Margaret Thatcher's comment about socialism, and that is, the problem with socialism is that eventually you run out of other people's money. Unfortunately, with the budget that the President has proposed, the TARP spending, deficit spending, the proposed budget and the stimulus package, I believe, and I know that the gentlelady from Illinois believes, that we are headed down to a path of possible socialism.

That, my colleagues, is not acceptable. And that is not what our American economy needs at this time.

With that, I will yield back to the gentlelady from Illinois.

□ 2045

Mrs. BIGGERT. I thank the gentlelady for bringing up the tax issue. I am reminded of the words of Ben Franklin: "In this world, nothing is certain but death and taxes."

We certainly have to think that the President's recent budget proposals essentially, and unfortunately for American families and small businesses, can bring a certainty to the latter, and that is taxes, and increased taxes to be specific. I appreciate you bringing that up.

I have another letter from one of my constituents, Rich. He says, "The current budget proposal is a path to nowhere, in my opinion. It will lead to a tax increase for all Americans. There should not be a carbon tax on businesses. All that will do is raise prices and cut jobs. Instead, put an incentive for businesses to lower energy. Also, why increase capital gains taxes at this time, or at any time. All that does is force businesses to go elsewhere. We need to keep the taxes where they are or lower for businesses. We need to encourage companies and people to invest in the U.S. The net effect is more profit which leads to more tax revenue for the country. Just taxing the rich doesn't work." And I thank Rich for that letter.

Let me talk about a couple of other taxes because I think the important financial task before Congress right now is fostering economic growth. Number one is keeping taxes on families down; and number two is helping American business stay competitive; and three, eliminate wasteful spending in Washington.

In one of my former lives I was a probate lawyer and estate lawyer. I frequently witnessed the devastating effect that the estate tax or death tax had on family-owned farms and businesses. I think that we did put a limit on that. We changed it. Since 2001, Congress passed a 10-year tax cut package that included a provision that would slowly phase out the death tax and eliminate it all together in 2010.

However, the administration budget proposes that we continue to tax, to use the estate tax at 2009 levels instead of what we should be doing and permanently zeroing out this onerous tax, this double tax. So instead of 2010 when it would have been eliminated permanently, if this passes, and you have to remember the President proposes and the Congress disposes. But if it were to happen, we would continue with a tax that taxes about 3.5 million at a 45 percent rate. That's a little lower than it has been in the past sometimes. The only good thing about it is it does bring back the step up. During these uncertain times and turbulent times, I don't think that it is time to place another tax burden on families and small businesses. It is certainly time to cut taxes and encourage businesses and families so they will be able to create jobs.

One other tax that really concerns me is the budget proposes to limit deductions for charitable contributions, and we know how much contributions have meant for this country from the time of early on in the country with all of the things that so many of these famous families did, like the Rockefellers or the Carnegies. Each year many people give contributions to charities and nonprofits. Why should we discourage this in any way, especially right now. So many people benefit from so many charities like, Catholic Charities or the Jewish Federation and all of the small charities. So I strongly believe in charitable giving and have supported many bills to encourage it instead of asking the Federal Government to do it, and that is like bringing back much more big government. So I will continue to support tax policies that encourage charitable giving.

Regarding homeownership, here we have been dealing with families and foreclosure rates and what is happening. And now the budget proposal is to limit the mortgage interest deduction. This is a direct hit to family budgets and discourages homeownership at a time when we need to encourage homeownership. It is limited. Again, it is to the higher rate taxpayer. But this again is going to trick-

le-down with what it does with homeownership. We need to make homeownership more affordable. Homeowners may currently deduct the interest paid on mortgages from their interest tax liability. So millions of homeowners enjoy the benefits of this deduction which does encourage homeownership through an annual tax savings. Although general support for this tax remains strong, I think it is irresponsible to slash this benefit. I support tax policies and now will yield to another one of my colleagues, the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN) who is here to address some of the women's issues and how we approach the budget that we are looking at.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Thank you so much for yielding. I thank the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT). She has served long and hard on the Financial Services Committee, and I know that she shares my opinion that these are historic times and we have never seen anything quite like this in the financial services sector before.

Beginning in the housing industry, we watched the market just collapse and we saw the economy flat line and go down into the negative column, and women all over the United States started feeling very insecure. I think as mothers and women, that is very important to each one of us. It is a sense of security, not only for our own well-being but for the well-being of our children.

I know that we look at our mothers. I look at my own mother, Jean, who lives in Anoka, Minnesota. She is going to be 78 years young in just a few months, and she is very concerned as she looks at the value of her 401(k). She, like many Americans, has opened up her statement and seen that her 401(k) has dropped by 50 percent. My mother is a wonderful woman. She does samples. When you go to the grocery store and see those sample ladies, my mother is a samples lady. She has worked all of her life, but she wants to do this because she loves people and she wants to be with people.

But at 78 years of age, she may not always be able to work. And she looks at what she has worked so hard to save for. She never had a high-paying job, but my mother was extremely frugal and extremely prudent, and taught me to be the same way. There are women on fixed incomes all across the country who did the same thing. They took care of their children, raised them, scrimped and saved and clipped coupons, and now here they are, looking at their savings and seeing the value of their savings diminish before their eyes. They are very concerned, and they wonder what in the world has gotten into Congress. What in the world has gotten into this new Presidential administration. They really had high hopes for this administration, and they are looking and saying as a senior citizen, my options are limited. Maybe my husband has already passed away or my husband is infirm. What am I

going to do; I can't go out and get a job. They look at this administration, and in the name of economic stimulus, they saw that this current liberal administration has legislation that is overflowing with wasteful government spending.

And they might have heard about one of these wasteful projects. It is a brand new, billion-dollar high speed train that is going to go from Disneyland up to Las Vegas. A billion dollars of a widow's money to go to pay for a brand new ride essentially from Disneyland to Las Vegas. HARRY REID, the Senator from Nevada, was behind this measure, and it makes us wonder, is he more interested in making sure kids start gambling at younger ages?

We also see the Speaker of the House, NANCY PELOSI, she was behind passing our nearly 1,100-page stimulus bill, brought it to the floor, and not one Member of Congress was able to read that bill before we were asked to vote on it. I don't know if any other Congress was asked to pass a bigger spending bill than this bill with less time to read it, digest it, and even know what was in it. That is not something I want to go home and tell my elderly mother or tell people back in the State of Minnesota, that is Congress is here spending more money than we have ever heard of before, money we don't have, and we are spending that money without even having a chance to read the bills.

I kept my staff here until 9 at night before we were supposed to vote on the stimulus bill. I released them to go home. They had worked all day long. I kept them here until 9, hoping that the Democrats would release the bill so we would at least have a chance to read it. They went home. It wasn't until after midnight that the Democrats finally put the bill online. There was absolutely no way to read the bill. That's shameful. The American people deserve better than that.

And then we see that the President is now telling 92 percent of the American people who are currently paying their mortgages on time that it isn't enough that they pay their own mortgages, now they have to pay the mortgages of the people next door who maybe took out a home equity loan or bought more home than they can afford and got out on a limb, now 92 percent of the American people are seeing their 401(k)s disappear before their eyes, or seeing jobs disappear in their city and community. And they are being told that now it is their responsibility to pay the mortgage of 8 percent of the American people.

And now we have our second spending bill that has come before us, the largest budget that we have had for discretionary spending, \$410 billion. It is an 8 percent increase from the last budget.

I hear the Obama administration telling the average American it is time for you to sacrifice. One thing I don't see is that the Federal Government is

having to sacrifice. They are not sacrificing. They are increasing their spending by a whopping 8 percent on the Federal budget, and this is what we have to see for it. We are looking at a doubling of the national debt. Here we are at \$5 trillion, which worried me back in 2000. And now projected going forward 2019, we are looking at a deficit north of \$20 trillion. We have never seen anything like that.

In the previous hour we saw the Democrats up here speaking. And one of the charts that they had up talked about how very quickly now we are going to see Social Security spending going from having money in the bank for coming in for Social Security. Very soon we are going to go underwater and we are going to have less money coming in for Social Security than what is going out. We will be looking at having about a trillion dollars in obligations that we currently don't have money to obligate to pay for those bills. This is concerning. These are elderly, senior citizen females that are again worried about their own security. No wonder the stock market has dropped more than a thousand points since President Obama took office. No wonder more Americans are blazing mad right now, and they are saying we are not going to take it any more. So you see all across the country tea parties breaking out, people saying I can't pay these taxes any more.

Every promise that was made to the American people during the last campaign by the current Obama administration on fiscal accountability has already been broken. And we only have 45 days in this administration. Every fiscal accountability promise has been broken, and it is a travesty.

□ 2100

I called a friend of mine who is a tax accountant today; she's working really hard because all of the tax returns are going to be due now April 15. I called her to see how she's doing. And I said, tell me, what is some of the information that you're seeing; what can I tell the American people? And she told me about a tax return that she's doing. And I will close with this.

I talked about elderly ladies and their concern about security. Let me tell you about a younger female American, she's just 8 years old; lovely girl, tragic story. She was born in the year 2000, and she had a wonderful family. Her father was a great patriot who wanted to serve his country. He went to Iraq. When she was 4 years old, her father was killed serving his country in Iraq. And now this little girl is receiving money from Social Security disability payments, and she's also receiving money from the United States Defense and Accounting Service which the U.S. Military annuity pays. These are the right payments that she should be getting because of the service that her father gave to her country. But with this money that's coming into this little girl, this little 8-year-old

girl is paying Federal taxes on the amount of money that she is receiving as an orphan. She's not only paying Federal taxes, she is also paying what's called alternative minimum taxes. That's how out of kilter and how drastically this government is spending your money in an out-of-control fashion, that not only is this government now going to widows for more money and increased taxes, we're even reaching into the pockets of orphans to tax them with alternative minimum tax, a tax that was meant for rich people so that rich people would not escape paying taxes. Now orphans are being subject, at very low levels, for alternative minimum tax.

I would repeat what we saw a reporter say on CNBC: "Mr. President, are you listening to the American people?" We cannot afford a doubling of our national debt. We cannot afford to impoverish America's widows. And we certainly can't afford to be taking money out of the pockets of orphans whose fathers were killed serving this country in the Iraq war. This must end. And the Obama administration must stop taxing the American people.

And with that, I would yield back to the gentlelady from the State of Illinois, Mrs. BIGGERT.

Mrs. BIGGERT. I thank the gentlelady from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN).

I know that this is what we're hearing from I think all of our constituents about having their life savings, their retirement accounts decline. I've got a letter here from another one of my constituents saying, "My life savings, including retirement accounts, have declined to the point where I am unsure I will ever be able to retire or make another major purchase of any kind. How many more negative Wall Street stock market losses will it take before the new administration realizes that their reckless spending without a true plan to correct the economy will destroy all of us to a point that retirees and us close to retirement may never recover from their continuous blunders?" So I thank the gentlelady for bringing that to our attention. I appreciate it.

And now I would like to ask the gentlelady from—Wyoming. I'm sorry I messed up on a new Member's State, but the gentlelady from Wyoming, CYNTHIA LUMMIS. I'm happy that you're here.

Mrs. LUMMIS. I thank the gentlelady from Illinois for this fine session this evening.

The American people know, and particularly women in this country know, that you cannot tax and spend your way into economic prosperity; and furthermore, you cannot tax during a recession. Yet, that is what is being proposed, and those taxes will fall on you.

One of the ways in which those taxes will fall on you during this recession is through something called cap and trade. Cap and trade is a tax, so I'm going to go over and change this and add the word "tax." And I want to talk

specifically about how it's going to affect family budgets.

Cap and trade is a tax that will be used to change the way that you use power—meaning electricity, oil, gas—and anything that comes from carbon—meaning oil, gas, or coal, specifically. And those sources of energy represent 50 percent of the electricity in this country, which comes from coal, and also a significant amount, of course, of our gasoline coming from oil, and natural gas, which is used to heat our homes. These all emit carbon. And in order to change the American behavior and the way that we use these carbon-emitting substances, the Obama administration proposes to tax them. It will be called a cap and trade system, which is a market-based system, but it's cleverly disguised as a market-based system because, in reality, it is a tax, a carbon tax, and it will be paid by the American consumer. So if you use electricity, if you heat or cool your home, if you drive an automobile, if you use public transportation, you will be paying this tax. And here's how it will accrue to you if you are an average household.

Gasoline is in blue on this chart, natural gas in red, electricity in green. And as you can see, the cost of these for an average household without the cap and trade tax is on the left, and the cost with cap and trade is on my right—the left of someone who would be viewing this chart. So you will see it will have a 9 percent increase for electricity in the average home, 14 percent increase for natural gas, and a 16 percent increase for gasoline in the average home.

Now, I can tell you, in my home State of Wyoming it will be much higher than that because in the winter it costs more for us to heat our homes. In the summer, admittedly, it costs less for us to cool our homes. But we consume more gasoline per family than any other State in the Union and that is because there is no public transportation in Wyoming. The distances are too far. We are the ninth largest State by land mass, and we have the smallest population in the Nation. Consequently, we can't go anywhere on public transportation; it is all automobile-based. That's why we consume more gasoline than other States, and that's why the effects of this tax will fall very heavily on people who live in rural areas, and also in areas with extreme climate changes or extreme temperature changes, places that must heat their homes in the winter and cool their homes in the summer.

So if you fall into any of those categories, you're going to see much higher expenses because all of the cap and trade taxes are going to be passed on to you. They are not going to be absorbed by the companies that are producing oil, gas and coal. However, there is going to be another impact on those businesses, and that is job loss, job loss at a time when this country is in recession, at a time when job losses are al-

ready driving us more deeply into recession. And that job loss looks like this: 2011, over 200,000 jobs lost; and each year thereafter, climbing to the year 2015, to about 1.5 million jobs lost due to this cap and trade tax. And once again, I'm going to write the word "tax" on this chart.

What's worse, this is being foisted on the American people in the name of climate change, in the name of global warming. And those who believe that global warming is man-made—and there are many, I would say a preponderance of people believe that climate change is man-made—believe that if Americans change their ways and consume less carbon-emitting substances, that they will be able to change climate. I learned last week in a Natural Resources Committee from an international expert on energy and climate that that is not the case, that America could cease all economic activity, that Japan could cease all economic activity, and that Europe could cease all economic activity, we could turn off our lights, we could quit using our cars, we could stay home, we wouldn't work, the factories would shut down, in all three of those large economies and it is not going to have one iota of influence on the amount of carbon in the atmosphere unless China, Russia and India change their climate policies.

China desperately wants each person in their economy to have a light bulb in their home. That is their goal, a light bulb in every home. And in order to put a light bulb in every home in China they are building one new coal-fired plant a week, and they will have to continue to do so for a very long period of time. No one can blame China for wanting a higher standard of living for every person in their country, and no one can fault them for wanting them to do it with resources they have—like coal, oil and gas—and for wanting to do it with the cheapest source, hydroelectric and coal. Consequently, the costs that will be borne by the American consumer are going to have not one single effect on carbon emissions in this atmosphere. That's where rational thinking goes out of the way and the American consumer foots the bill.

I want to close—and I thank the gentlelady from Illinois—I want to close with this thought: You can't tax and spend your way out of a recession. And taxes during a recession is the absolute worst consequence on a family in America in the 21st century with these problems.

Mrs. BIGGERT. I thank the gentlelady from Wyoming. Thank you for your expertise on this issue. I think that you've really been able to bring new thoughts on this and really put it very succinctly in what's happening in this. And next we have to deal with nuclear energy, too, and really continue to build that up. So I thank you for doing that.

And next we have the gentlelady from North Carolina, who you see on

the floor a lot. She provides us with so much knowledge, the gentlelady from North Carolina, VIRGINIA FOXX.

Ms. FOXX. Well, I want to thank my colleague, Mrs. BIGGERT, from Illinois for organizing this Special Order tonight and bringing together a group of—those who have already spoken—exceptional women who have shared their expertise with us tonight.

I have a quote that I want to use, it's from Pericles, from 430 BC. Pericles said, "Just because you do not take an interest in politics doesn't mean politics won't take an interest in you." And I think what all of us have been trying to communicate tonight is that there's a lot happening that needs to be shared with the American people. And many people, particularly women, every day are going to work, doing their jobs, coming home, taking care of their families—be it their nuclear family or their extended family—and many don't have time to get involved a lot in the political life. March is Women's History Month, and I think it's important that we talk about the role of women in our culture and how what's happening here is going to have an impact on them.

We don't have a lot of time left tonight, but I do want to say that I share with my colleagues the concerns that they've expressed in terms of how raising taxes during a recession is the wrong thing to do, how raising taxes on energy is the wrong thing to do, how raising taxes on small businesses—the engines of job creation—is the wrong thing to do, how raising taxes on investments instead of encouraging economic growth is the wrong thing to do, limiting tax incentives for charitable giving is the wrong thing to do. And I could go on and on about what's wrong with the budget that President Obama has submitted, and which it looks very likely that this Democratic Congress is going to endorse.

□ 2115

What we need to be doing in our culture and in our country is to be promoting job growth, promoting economic recovery, and yet everything that's being done seems to be wanting to drive down the economy and harm the economy and the American people. It is a very difficult thing to deal with when you see that happening and you know that's the impact of what's happening, whether it is designed to be that way or not.

Today someone gave me an excellent article from National Journal of March 7 by Clive Crook, the title of which is "The End of the American Exception?" And he goes through this and talks about how it appears as though the present administration is trying to take us to the place that Europe is right now and compares us to France. I will submit this article in its entirety tonight.

Again, I applaud my colleagues for the work that they have done tonight. I think we have just scratched the surface in what we need to be presenting

to the American public, especially American women.

Right now 59.3 percent of our labor force is made up of American women over the age of 16. There are 71 million of them working. They are 46 percent of the total labor force and projected to account for 47 percent of the labor force in 2016. They are also projected to account for 49 percent of the increase in the total workforce. They're doing a tremendous job for us in this country, but they're going to be hit by this. And many of them are not participating in politics. They're not able to because of the demands of their jobs and their families. But I think it's important that we point these items out to them, and I hope we will be doing another Special Order this month so we can do more by way of educating people about the effects of this budget on the average American family.

And with that, I yield back to my colleague from Illinois, who has done such a great job tonight.

[From the National Journal, March 7, 2009]

THE END OF THE AMERICAN EXCEPTION?

(By Clive Crook)

During PBS's NewsHour With Jim Lehrer last Friday, the program's resident pundits, David Brooks and Mark Shields, had an interesting exchange about President Obama's first budget. They agreed that the administration aimed to be "transformative"—and Brooks conceded, "I think we all want that." The real question, he said, is how transformative.

Brooks: "The debate will be over the nature of it: If it's a transformative relationship that basically keeps the American model with repair, you'll get a lot of people in the center for it. If it's a transformative relationship that turns us into France, with a consumption tax and a much bigger federal government, you will not."

Shields: "That's a straw man, turning it into France. That's not the case."

Is it really a straw man? I was hoping that Brooks would press Shields to say what exactly it is about France he objects to, what makes him recoil at the parallel. Where has France gone too far, in the view of an American liberal?

Presumably, liberals approve of the universal health care, the generous and extensive welfare state, the comprehensive worker protections, the stricter regulation, the vastly more-generous subsidies for higher education, the stronger unions, the higher taxes, and especially the higher taxes on the rich. At least I assume they do, since they advocate all of those policies for the United States. Have I left something out?

As far as social and economic policies are concerned, Democrats really ought to be holding up France (or maybe Italy or Germany) as the model to which they aspire. The fact that they do not—that they even deny the validity of the comparison—seems revealing. No doubt it is partly a matter of tactical calculation. The idea that the United States should model itself on any other country, rather than offer itself as the model for the world, would be new to most American voters and would take some getting used to. But I do not think it is just that.

Perhaps some liberals privately long to make the United States over in the image of France, but the great majority, I imagine, are more interested in taking the things they regard as best in the European eco-

nomical model—all the things I just listed—and combining those "socially enlightened" policies with the traditional economic virtues of the United States. Take French social policies and welfare-state institutions and add them to the American work ethic, spirit of self-reliance, and appetite for change. Et voilà, the best of both worlds.

Color me skeptical. Culture shapes institutions and vice versa. Culture—that bundle of traits of self-reliance, self-determination, innovation, and striving for success—underpins the American exception. To state the obvious, it helps explain why this country has a markedly different form of capitalism than Europe, based on smaller government and lower taxes.

In ordinary times, this culture makes it hard for a government to push the United States in a European direction: Voters push back against bigger government and higher taxes. But now, maybe, the time is ripe. This unusually severe economic crisis has called American capitalism into question, highlighting its weaknesses and making it easier to forget its strengths. Liberalism has a rare opportunity. And just as this opportunity has arisen, American liberals also have, in Barack Obama, a remarkably popular and appealing leader to press the advantage.

But the interaction between culture and institutions works both ways. Change the system and, with time, you will change the culture. How much you will change it is debatable, and so is whether change of that kind would be good, bad, or indifferent for the country's economic and political prospects. But it would be an error to assume that the policy transformation that some liberals long for—and which Obama, if his budget is any guide, appears to be aiming for—would leave America's unusual cultural traits unaffected.

I had better declare an interest on this question of good, bad, or indifferent. As you may recall, I am a Brit who lives in the U.S. Politically speaking, I think of myself as an old-fashioned English liberal, a comically outmoded orientation that has little or no voice in modern European or American politics. In U.S. terms, you get a sense of where I stand if you think "liberal on social issues, conservative on economic issues" (but with exceptions; so do not hold me to that).

To put it mildly, I admire this country's instinctive suspicion of concentrated state power; its anti-collectivism, its veneration of the individual spirit and individual enterprise. At different times and in different ways, Democrats and Republicans alike have been at war with aspects of that mind-set, but as an admiring foreigner; I am here to tell you that this culture survives, that the American exception is alive and well, and that it is more than likely the secret of this country's awesome success.

If I were a citizen with a vote—as one day, immigration authorities permitting, I hope to be—I would need to think long and hard before casting it for "transformation." Repairs here and improvements there, of course, but transformation? It would be a shame to see America revert to the Western European norm. It would mean I had wasted a trip, for one thing, and I am not sure where I would go next.

Brooks's invoking France as a possible destination for Obama's social experiment does seem far-fetched. But the staggering breadth of Obama's ambition makes it reasonable to ask where all this is heading. Thoroughgoing health care reform would have been a bold undertaking by itself, one for which there is broad centrist support. But the budget and the fiscal stimulus also call for wide and on-going commitments to public investment.

Obama is fond of saying that the question is not big government or small government,

but what works. The fact is, whether his programs work or not, taken together they represent the biggest and fastest expansion of government since the New Deal. Moreover; the tax increases to pay for this expansion, he says, are to fall entirely on high-earning households. So his plan to enlarge government is married to an uncompromising assault on economic inequality.

And if all of this is not enough to remind you of Europe, Obama has also expressed strong support for the Employee Free Choice Act, arguing that bigger and stronger unions are a vital part of sharing prosperity more widely. To somebody who watched unions cripple the British economy, until voters elected Margaret Thatcher to sweep them away, this is the part of Obama's program that seems most in need of an international reality check.

This promised transformation is not a move into unexplored territory, after all. The policies that Obama is proposing have all been tried elsewhere. Ideas that look bold and new in this country are old hat across the Atlantic. And we know something about how well they work.

A strong case can be made for many of Obama's proposals, taken one at a time. I admire his ambition to mend the country's failing, unjust, and needlessly expensive health care system. I also applaud his focus on raising the incomes of the working poor, through tax cuts and wage subsidies (such as his "make work pay" tax credits). But trade-offs need to be faced. A good hard look at Europe makes this plain.

Bigger government requires higher taxes—in the end, for most taxpayers and not just the rich. Europe shows that tax systems tilted too far against high earners stifle the incentives that spur economic growth. Welfare systems that are more generous and have fewer strings tend to raise unemployment. Stricter regulation can and does retard innovation. Stronger unions can raise unemployment and, in the aggregate, lower incomes.

The president cannot be accused of misleading voters. For the most part, he is planning to push through the policies he advocated during the election—policies that the country voted for. His apparent determination to keep his word is unusual, and a little startling, but this is more a criticism of other politicians than of him. Although he cannot be accused, not yet, of breaking promises, I think it is fair to ask whether he has thought through the implications of his agenda taken as a whole. His style of explanation, or salesmanship if you prefer, is heavy on pragmatism and on mending one thing at a time. But the breadth of his program, and the connectedness of his ideas, belie that modest stance.

As the president said during his Inaugural Address, "It has been the risk takers, the doers, the makers of things . . . who have carried us up the long, rugged path toward prosperity and freedom." That is a very American sentiment. It is fair to ask what the full scope of Obama's transformative agenda implies for the risk takers, the doers, and the makers of things. Aside from higher taxes if they succeed, obviously.

Mrs. BIGGERT. I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina, who has been such an outstanding spokesman for, I think, the women on our side of the aisle, and I appreciate all that she has had to say.

Let me just kind of return to kind of the thought that I had when we started this Special Order. I think that we really do still have to recognize that the American people are hurting. It doesn't matter if they are low income,

middle income, or high income. We have to call attention to our economy and the fiscal discipline that we need to implement to get this country back on the right track. Not only are our people suffering but our country is suffering and so is the international economy, and I think that we really need to work together.

As I said before, we want the President and the administration to succeed. We need to find the solution to the problems that we face in this country and our economy, and I think that we stand here ready and willing to help. But we have to do it right. We have to make it happen. And I think that's when we'll all work together, and I would hope that there would be some sort of a summit where we really focus. I think that we are spread out in this first 6 weeks, 7 weeks of an administration in what has been happening in health care and the economy and education and energy and sciences and all the things that we are trying to do at once. I think we need to focus that energy on solving the problems of the economy.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ABERCROMBIE (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today and until 5 p.m. on March 10.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of death in the family.

Mr. STARK (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of medical reasons.

Mr. LUCAS (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of family business.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today and the balance of the week on account of medical reasons.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. McMAHON) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFazio, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. POE of Texas) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today, March 10, 11 and 12.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, for 5 minutes, March 16.

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, March 16.

Mr. MCHENRY, for 5 minutes, today, March 10, 11 and 12.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, March 16.

Mr. INGLIS, for 5 minutes, March 16.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia, for 5 minutes, March 10 and 11.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.J. Res. 38. An act making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2009, and for other purposes.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. BIGGERT. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 10, 2009, at 10:30 a.m., for morning-hour debate.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

798. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Famoxadone; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2007-1192; FRL-8400-9] received February 26, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

799. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Fluazifop-P-butyl; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0066; FRL-8401-1] received February 26, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

800. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Propoxycarbazone; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0065; FRL-8400-4] received February 26, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

801. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Tebuconazole; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2005-0097; FRL-8399-3] received February 26, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

802. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Chlorothalonil; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2007-1106; FRL-8402-7] received February 26, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

803. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Dimethomorph; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0258; FRL-8401-6] received February 26, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

804. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; Sa-

vannah River, Savannah, GA [USCG-2008-0352] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received February 26, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

805. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; Savannah River, Savannah, GA [USCG-2008-0353] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received February 26, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

806. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; Savannah River, Savannah, GA [USCG-2008-0361] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received February 26, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

807. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; St. Thomas Harbor, Charlotte Amalie, USVI. [Docket No.: USCG-2007-0162] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received February 26, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

808. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; Savannah River, Savannah, GA [USCG-2008-0382] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received February 26, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. OBERSTAR: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 1262. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to authorize appropriations for State water pollution control revolving funds, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 111-26). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. BILBRAY (for himself, Mr. SCHIFF, Mrs. BONO MACK, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. FILNER, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. ISSA, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. RADANOVICH):

H.R. 1382. A bill to provide assistance for ultra efficient vehicles under the advanced technology vehicles manufacturing incentive program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. COLE:

H.R. 1383. A bill to provide that, for purposes of certain Government facilities, the rate at which a Federal employee earns compensatory time for irregular or occasional overtime work shall be increased so as to permit greater parity with rates of overtime pay; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. PRICE of Georgia:

H.R. 1384. A bill to amend part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act to remove