

cities, it affects every community in every State. However, the effects on the black community are especially pronounced because of the lower level of homeownership. For many black families, home equity is the main source of wealth because most have lower incomes, little to no savings or investments, and no life insurance policies.

The decline of the housing market is at the center of our economic crisis. Home prices have dropped 18 percent in the last quarter of 2008. It is estimated that each foreclosed home reduces surrounding property values by as much as 9 percent, causing increased concern for even those who are not directly affected by the housing crisis. Nearly 6 million homes are facing foreclosure, and nearly one in five homeowners owes more than their home is worth, and many cannot afford to refinance.

The foreclosure crisis affects every sector of the population, and nearly every person in this Nation. Cities across the Nation are experiencing a crisis that imperils communities and cripples the economy. In my district, the Center For Responsible Lending projected 5,500 foreclosures in 2009—just in the 11th District—and 18,500 foreclosures over the next 4 years. Within the State of Ohio the projection is very grim: 87,500 foreclosures in 2009. In Cuyahoga County, 13,858 were foreclosed in 2008. Cleveland is one of the Nation's big cities in the most need due to its large population of poor families. The city has set aside nearly \$11 million to handle some 10,000 homes that have been abandoned primarily due to foreclosure. Much of that money, about \$7.5 million, goes to demolition, while the remainder takes care of vacant lots, boarding up windows, picking up trash, and mowing lawns. This money could be used to hire more police officers and to keep more teachers. But because of the risk that goes with abandoned neighborhoods, money needs to go towards foreclosed properties.

As we see far too often, for communities with foreclosed homes, it is a short road from nuisance to blight to crime. Blight affects a city's morale and slows economic growth and development. Abandoned homes also become harbors for criminal activity.

Typically, it is our inner cities that bear the brunt of vacant homes and community blight. But now it can be seen in each and every community, in every development and in every neighborhood. Even the affluent suburbs face the same problems. The suburb of Shaker Heights spent nearly \$1 million on foreclosed properties. The city of Euclid had to tear down 18 homes, and Cleveland Heights spent a great deal of money on maintenance on over 250 properties.

I spoke recently with Ms. Arnetta Parker, a long-time resident of Richmond Heights, Ohio, a nice, upper-middle-class suburb. She and her husband have resided in the area for over 35 years and are currently doing fine.

However, their community is struggling greatly. Her subdivision has about 80 homes, and on her street alone, four of those homes are vacant. She recalled one of the first times she saw a family be required to move out of their home and how much it hurt her to see a hardworking couple lose their home. The displaced couple had two kids, a teenage son who was very involved in sports and a very young girl. They were uprooted from what was familiar to them, from their schools, their friends and community. They became a part of the crisis.

Just this month, foreclosures.com, a Website that looks at the rise of foreclosures in the United States, found an increase in foreclosures of over 60 percent from January to February. The organization's president, Alexis McGee, opined if foreclosures continue unabated, then the United States could see 1.2 million homes back in lenders' hands by the end of this year.

The Center For Responsible Lending estimates there are 6,600 new foreclosures every day, and that equates to one foreclosure by one family that loses their home every 13 seconds.

This Nation cannot sustain a system in which mortgage servicers prefer foreclosure over mortgage modifications. The Homeowner Affordability and Stability Plan creates incentives for lenders to modify mortgages by bringing mortgages more in line with the value of the home and should reduce the number of home foreclosures. It also encourages servicers to modify mortgages for at-risk homeowners before they are delinquent.

Recent reports show that homeowners are not the only ones suffering in this crisis. Renters are also becoming victims as their landlords lose property to foreclosure. Usually renters are not aware of the foreclosure proceedings. Once the lender has foreclosed, they often provide little notice to tenants before demanding that the tenants vacate the property. Forced from the property, renters may lose their security deposit and everything else they have.

To help insure that similar crises are averted in the future, regulations must be developed that combat mortgage fraud and predatory lending practices. In general, predatory lending covers those practices that are deemed deceptive or fraudulent, that manipulate borrowers through aggressive sales tactics, or that unfairly seize on the borrower's lack of understanding about loan terms.

Predatory lending strips borrowers of home equity, increases the homeowner's chances of foreclosure, and destabilizes communities. Vacant properties invite criminal activities and affect neighboring property values.

□ 2045

The most common predatory lending tactics include excessive fees and abusive prepayment penalties. For example, borrowers with high-interest loans

have a strong incentive to refinance as soon as their credit improves. However, as the Center for Responsible Lending estimates, up to 80 percent of all subprime mortgages carry a prepayment penalty. Homeowners become trapped by such provisions, leaving them unable to make cost-effective decisions.

Moreover, studies have shown that predatory lenders often target vulnerable groups, including minority groups, females, elderly, and low-income borrowers. The evidence is clear by the concentration of predatory loans in low-income and minority neighborhoods. Congress and President Obama have both designed legislation to curve the downward spiral in foreclosures. These plans are coordinated among major government and regulatory agencies to bring targeted relief to the American housing market and to homeowners.

The Helping Families Save Their Homes Act, H.R. 1106, is designed to stabilize the housing market by reducing foreclosures, and to help responsible, hardworking Americans who are losing their homes during this economic downturn. It could reduce foreclosures by 20 percent.

The bill ensures that those who seek recourse via chapter 13 can do so through a uniform process. Several important points about the bill are that it protects lenders from lawsuits, it fixes the Federal Housing Administration's HOPE for Homeowners Program by lowering the fees paid by borrowers and lenders, and by providing \$1,000 payments to servicers for each successful refinance of existing loans. It reduces current fees that have discouraged lenders from voluntarily participating. As a last resort, it allows bankruptcy judges to modify the terms of loans for families with existing mortgages, just as investors in vacation homes, real estate speculators, and corporations have been able to do for years. And it helps veterans, and others, to avoid foreclosure by allowing the Department of Veteran Affairs, the FHA, and the U.S. Department of Agriculture to guarantee or ensure mortgage loans modified either out of court or in a bankruptcy case.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for allowing the CBC to have a Special Order this evening. It is my pleasure to have anchored those hours.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 yielding, and I thank you for this opportunity and the kindness to be able to address this body on the issue of taxes. We're very excited to be able to have this opportunity.

I'm joined this evening by two wonderful colleagues, Mrs. Foxx of North Carolina, and also Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, who have indicated, also, willingness to speak to this important topic.

We see that there is a tremendous change that is about to occur in our Nation. And I just want to begin by talking about the real problem that we have at hand, and that's the issue of certainty versus uncertainty in our economy.

There are many people right now who have been unwilling to make decisions about investing in the economy, spending money, buying something, should they save money, should they spend it, can they get a job? And the worry has been "certainty." What's going to happen next? They feel like one shoe has dropped, when will the other shoe drop? What's it going to be? What's going to happen? People are just nervous.

I don't know about you, Mr. Speaker, I was back in my district this weekend, I'm sure you were, too, and people that I saw are very worried about what's coming down the horizon because they just saw, in the last 55, 60 days, they saw our Congress spend \$1 trillion dollars and more, once you count the debt service on the stimulus bill. They're very nervous when they see that level of spending. They've never heard of that before. It's historic, it's never happened before.

They saw that, and then right after that they saw us take up the appropriations bill for the rest of the year which spends for the Federal Government, and it's \$410 billion. And then they heard it had 9,000 earmarks contained in the bill. And they thought, what in the world is going on? I thought this was an emergency. I thought this was a time when we're supposed to be careful with our money. And the American people are socking away money as much as they can.

It was just only about a year or so ago that we saw that the savings rate in the United States was minus 1 percent. During the Great Depression, the savings rate was minus 1.5. What was the savings rate in January? It was plus 5 percent. It's plus 5 percent because the American people have figured out, we're in trouble. And so they are battening down the hatches and they're doing everything they can to make sure their ship is in order, their house is in order so they at least have a job and so that they can at least take care of their bills.

What has Congress' response been? It has been to spend \$1 trillion, and then \$410 billion—plus 9,000 earmarks contained in that bill—and sandwiched in between was something called a Fiscal Responsibility Summit. Now, people are scratching their heads saying, you people call yourselves fiscally responsible when you've just spent that kind of money, let alone what's happened with the Federal Reserve and all the money that the Federal Reserve has committed?

The reason why I'm bringing that up, Mr. Speaker, is because today marks a very important anniversary. I know Mr. GARRETT remembers this anniversary. It was 1 year ago today that for the very first time in the history of our country the Federal Reserve opened the discount window to a private investment bank called Bear Stearns. We all remember that, it was \$29 billion. Just preceding that, this body had spent the outrageous sum of \$168 billion in a stimulus package that was supposed to rescue our economy from diving into the doldrums. So what did our body do? We spent \$168 billion, and we got into helicopters and we dropped checks all across the United States and said, "Have a good time. Spend money so that our economy doesn't tank." Our economy tanked because people said you can't spend money like that and think that your house is going to be in order. So people got nervous, they got very worried.

Then they saw us bail out a private investment bank at \$29 billion. Well, it wasn't long after that that we heard that Freddie and Fannie, the secondary home loan mortgage companies, they were in bankruptcy. We had to bail them out. So the Federal taxpayer had to cough up \$200 billion to bail out Freddie and Fannie. This really scared people.

At the same time, the Federal Government took \$400 billion and infused that money into the Federal Home Loan Association. People thought, my stars, what's about to happen? Well, they didn't even catch a breath, and the Treasury Secretary said, now we need \$700 billion; we've got to have \$700 billion for the TARP program, which was to have money to be able to buy troubled assets, the mortgage security bailout.

And we were told we had to get this done within a week or the whole economy was going to fail. Well, we had that tussle, we had that struggle. And you remember, Mr. Speaker, that last September we were all here in this Chamber. We came in, the galleries were filled with people, the press was up in the press box; what were we going to do? We were going to pass this historic level of spending, \$700 billion, and the vote failed. It was a Monday. No one could believe it. So there was regrouping going on; took another vote, the vote passed. Only this time it was wrapped in another \$110 billion worth of very expensive gift wrap called "vote buying." And so that bill was passed. Pretty soon, the year went by, and between this body and the Federal Reserve trillions of dollars flew through the door.

People were looking for hope and change; I was looking for hope and change. And when January 20 came and the Obama administration was sworn in, what did we see? We saw over \$1 trillion worth of spending out of the gate. And what did it do? Has it calmed the waters? Has it brought us certainty? Are you kidding? We saw GDP

tank. We saw the Dow Jones Industrial Average go to such historic lows, no one could believe it. We were looking at 6000 on the Dow Jones. We saw job losses spike through the charts, unbelievable levels of job losses. Where is the certainty?

Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm here to say, there is a certainty that we can tell the American people tonight, and that certainty is that their taxes are just about to have the roof blown off. They're going to have the roof blown off. And it was here in this body, not too long ago, when President Obama stood right here and he told the American people in that camera right up there, he said, "I will not raise taxes on 95 percent of the American people. You can take that to the bank." And in the course of his remarks, he said that he is going to pass the cap and trade tax. That's the new tax on energy, which 100 percent of Americans are going to be spending.

That's what we want to talk about tonight, Mr. Speaker. We have to talk about this tonight. We've been talking about all the spending; now it's time to talk about the taxing. And it's really a shame because the time to have been talking about taxing is when we were talking about spending.

We didn't even have a paragraph of conversation on this floor about how we're going to pay for all this spending. Congress just had a sugar high. It's as though every Member of Congress just ingested a 24 pack of Mountain Dew and said, "Hallelujah. I'm on a sugar high. We're going to spend money and we're going to rev this economy up." Well, I'm telling you, if you had a 24 pack of Mountain Dew, you would not only be on a sugar high, you would be zooming, but you would crash. And that's about what we are going to be seeing. That crash is called taxes, Mr. Speaker. And the American people haven't seen anything yet when they open up their tax bills.

At this point, I would like to yield to the gentlelady from North Carolina to take it from there. And we're going to go in a game of tennis here tonight. We're going to volley back and forth and we will have a great discussion on taxes.

I yield to the gentlelady from North Carolina (Ms. Foxx).

Ms. FOXX. I thank my colleague from Minnesota. It's a little hard to follow her. She is so energized and so enthusiastic. The rest of us here tonight are that way, too, but we don't have the same presence she has, but we are so fortunate to have her in the Republican Caucus.

I want to add to what she is saying, and then yield in a couple of minutes to our colleague from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT), who has a lot to say about this subject tonight.

I want to point out that our colleague from Minnesota has set the stage for what we're going to talk about tonight, and there are lots of things to try to remember. She has

gone over a whole list of all of the spending that was done last year, what has been proposed so far this year. But I want to help people just keep in mind three simple concepts about what has been happening in this Congress so far.

The budget, which the Democrats support, President Obama's budget, spends too much, taxes too much, and borrows too much. Those are three simple concepts for us to keep in mind. We can talk a lot about bailouts, stimulus, budget, omnibus budget—there are many, many terms. I know the American people have difficulty keeping up with them because I have difficulty keeping up with them. It's like you're in a whirlwind here with so many things happening.

The Democrats are living what the Chief of Staff of the President and the former head of the conference here said. He said, "Let's never let a crisis go to waste." He wanted, with a Democrat-controlled Congress and a Democrat in the White House—talk about being on a sugar high, that is really a sugar high because this is the first time in over 8 years that they have had that situation. And I think it's important that we point that out because there are still many people in this country who don't realize that the Democrats are in charge, they've been in charge. In fact, our economy started tanking when the Democrats took over the Congress in 2007. I think I have a chart to show that; but again, I think it's really, really important to talk about that.

I want to say that our colleagues who were speaking just before we were made a comment about how it's Congress' job to assure jobs for Americans. Well, the budget they support and the policies that they have followed thus far have done just the opposite. They've done everything they can to kill jobs in this country. And let me point it out.

The Democrats took control of the Congress in January of 2007. That's not something they like to be reminded of. They want to say that all of the economic problems that we have in this country are the result of George Bush's presidency. However, we had 55 straight months of job growth up until January of 2007; that's when the Democrats took control.

And look what started happening? This is the chart. The graph is a little bit tough to read, but this is the loss of jobs going up. We probably should have had it going down to make it be a little more specific on what we're talking about. But as they said, they don't want to let a crisis go to waste, but they don't want to accept the responsibility for what their getting in control of Congress did.

For 6 years, the first 6 years of President Bush's administration, the Republicans were in control. Did they do all the things they should have done? Did they do everything right? No. They absolutely did not. I was here for 2 of those years, and colleagues of mine did

our best to cut spending. And we actually did cut spending that cycle, but we never got any credit for it because of the news that came out about the elections and that kind of thing.

□ 2100

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. If the gentlewoman from Minnesota would yield.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I yield to the gentleman.

Ms. FOXX. This is my colleague from New Jersey, Scott Garrett.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. I just want to touch on that one point as far as the perception of what the Democrats did and what the Republicans did. And I do this not for any partisan reasons because I do honestly believe that all of us here tonight actually believe, as the majority of the American public believes, that we are in a difficult situation; that people are hurting; that jobs are being lost, as your chart so adequately demonstrates there; and we don't need to be partisan about it, but we do need to set the record straight. And I will tell you this little story.

I have served here for 6 years now, and I have served on the Budget Committee. And I was here when the Republicans were in charge. And I, like you, was frustrated with the fact that many times during our tenure in office when Republicans controlled the House we were spending too much money. You and I voted against a lot of those expenditures, but as a party we were. And that's why in 2006 the American voters voted with their wallets, if you will, and said let's throw them out and let's put in a party that is campaigning on a platform of fiscal responsibility. And the reason I point out that I serve on the Budget Committee was because for 4 years when they were in the minority, they were saying a lot of the things that you and I agreed with and that you and I were saying, that we were spending too much money and were going in the wrong direction. So I perhaps naively hoped that in 2006 when they took the majority, they were going to put in practice much of what they said about the budget on their campaign trail in their rhetoric. But, you know, they didn't. They don't do it in 2006, and they didn't do it now in the 2008 election as well. And that's where we are right now.

However, I will credit them with being able to say that they have inherited the problems, but, of course, the facts don't speak to that as well. You're looking at a chart right there that says "jobs lost since the start of the Democrat majority," and even without my glasses on, I can see at the bottom of the XY-axis, it is January of 2007, and that is the starting point, and then the line goes off the charts. All you need is a little rocket on engine of how to succeed in business without really trying and just shoot up through the end over there, if you're familiar with that movie, and you would see that during their tenure, you lost the

jobs. But it's not only the fact that they didn't inherit the lost jobs because they were in control of the House and Senate. I don't have a little easel here, but let me just share this chart. I don't know whether you have one up there by you as well.

The other mantra that they will say in the media, and I've been on TV shows and radio shows, and the anchors will say, well, didn't the Democrats inherit all of this spending? Not exactly, not when you really look down to it. Let me give you about five quick points that I can run through here. This too is going back to the bottom of your XY-axis, January of 2007, when HARRY REID was in charge over in the Senate and Speaker PELOSI was in charge here as Speaker of the House. Let's see what has occurred from January, 2007, to where we are now, and this is March. I will just run through a few quick numbers.

The omnibus, most recent, fiscal year 2009 omnibus, \$410 billion. That didn't occur under Republican control. That occurred under Democrat control, spending. Stimulus 2, \$187 billion, again occurred under Democrat control and leadership. Auto bailout, of course, that too, \$14 billion, and that occurred again during Democrat control of the House and Senate. TARP, something that I have been on the floor hours upon hours talking and railing against how we're spending so much money there. First it was \$350 billion at the end of last year, and then they added another \$350 billion on that. People say we're bailing out Wall Street. We're just finding out now where some of that money is going. Apparently it's going to AIG executives, who made some of these great decisions that brought that company down to where it is today, in bonuses and what have you. So there's \$700 billion in TARP under Democrat control. The next one, pre-TARP loans, \$300 billion. And, finally, a stimulus bill, stimulus 1, that was July of last year, if I'm not mistaken, \$152 billion.

So you add them up, and I'm not going to do that in my head, but you have 400, 187, 14, 700, 300, \$152 billion. This all occurred during the time that Speaker PELOSI and HARRY REID were running things on the floor. They could have stopped, and it's easier in the Senate than here, but they could have stopped each and every one of these. They could have put any restrictions on each and every one of these. And maybe the gentlewoman from Minnesota would like to chime in on this one, and that is to talk about how they didn't put any restrictions on these points. They basically said here's \$700 billion, out the window, any way you want to spend it.

Ms. FOXX. And is it your memory also that President Obama, then Senator Obama, came back here off the campaign trail and put his blessing on the TARP bailout? It was my understanding that the Congress was controlled by the Democrats and that

President Obama, then Senator Obama, said, "I support it too." Is that your memory?

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. It's absolutely my memory. And the reason I remember it is because there were a few of us in the House who were raising our hand at that time and saying what are we spending \$700 billion on? The idea was the so-called purchase of toxic assets, which never did occur, and we said shouldn't there, A, be other alternatives considered; B, another implementation; and, C, shouldn't there be restrictions or strings, if you will, attached to some of this? All of that was dismissed and put aside. But you're absolutely correct. Senator Obama at that time supported it, as did the leadership of this House. Not only did they support it in this House, they pushed it through so quickly that none of us really had an opportunity. We never had any markup on this bill.

That's the other little frustrating thing about all of this, and the American taxpayer must be so frustrated with how, quote, "their government," and it is their government, works, how Washington works. We spend the money today, and then a day or a week or a month from then, we'll come back and say we are going to have a hearing on this and see exactly what we spent the money on. We spent \$350 billion, then \$700 billion without so much as a markup on it, which is, for folks who don't know, the way the bill goes through and you can say I want to put this in or take that out. Without so much as a markup, we spend this \$700 billion; then Congress can come back and says let's take a look at this. We saw that on TARP 1. We saw that on TARP 2. In essence, you could say we did that on the stimulus as well. We rushed right through how many pages? I'm forgetting.

Mrs. BACHMANN. It was 1,073 pages on the stimulus, which not one Member of Congress read. It wasn't released to the public until after midnight. I kept my staff here until 9 o'clock at night hoping we could have a chance to read this bill. I released them at 9. It didn't come on-line until after midnight. And had the Members of Congress stayed up all night and had we not taken one break and just read it, we would have had 23 seconds per page to read that. Not one person could read it.

I think there is a reason for it. We know why. There was no stimulus contained in the stimulus bill, nothing that would help small businesses. We even had essentially an admission of that this morning from President Obama because President Obama said now he has to have a plan for small business. There wasn't much of anything to speak of in the stimulus bill or in his budget bill for the rest of the year; so now he wants to have a new small business bill that is quite a bit of money. But what does it do? It funds the SBA, government. It funds more government. It has no nothing to do with tax reductions for small business.

You talk to any businessman. I'm a small businessman with my husband. We started a business from scratch, and I'll tell you what would help: Lower the tax rate for businesses. American businesses pay the second highest tax rate in the world, 34 percent. Imagine. You want to have certainty in the marketplace? Bring the corporate tax rate from 34 percent down to 9 percent.

The world right now is nervous. We think we're nervous in the United States. The world doesn't know where to invest. How do we know that the world is nervous? This weekend, and this is humorous, you have the specter of the Chinese communists lecturing the Obama administration, could you please stop spending so much money, President Obama? You're making me nervous. I'm worried that I am going to lose my Chinese debt pretty soon if you don't get a grip on your spending. Then you have European socialists saying to the Obama administration, gee, we don't want to spend all the money that you want us to spend.

Isn't it interesting that you have an American President now that's making the world nervous? We were all told that the President was going to bring the world together. We were going to have unity. All of our allies were going to be on board. Our allies are running like mice off a sinking ship saying we don't want any part of this out-of-control spending because our allies have been down that road themselves.

I'll tell you if this out-of-control spending would have worked, Japan would have been looking great for 10 years rather than this "lost decade." Europe would be the beacon, the envy of the world for investment. Instead, these are economies in shambles, and I think that's what the American people are worried about.

And I yield back to the gentleman from New Jersey. I think they're worried because they know. The American people get it that they're going to have to pay the bill.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. The American people get it, although we did that hear from our President here a couple of weeks ago. He said, "I get it." Unfortunately, I don't think he does. I think what he does get is the idea of a new movement he is leading, and that is a movement of redistribution of the wealth in this country, and basically he's doing it by burdening the responsible taxpayer, the responsible family, the responsible American, and putting it on the irresponsible ones. And it's sort of funny, and maybe "funny" isn't right word for this, but if you look at the budget documents that came out, the title of it is "An Era of Responsibility." This is anything but an era of responsibility.

And I will close with this: Just as I was hopeful in 2006 and 2007 for the Democrat leadership that they would be responsible in this area, I honestly was hopeful that when President Obama became the President that he

would fulfill his pledge that he would give the American public and all of us in Congress the opportunity to have 4 or 5 days actually to have any bill up on the Web site so they could see it and read it and comment on it otherwise. And you pointed out so accurately that in this case with an 1,100-page bill, it went through and no one saw it.

Ms. FOXX. I wanted to say some of the same things. I think that you and I and conservatives here in Congress really were hopeful that when the Democrats took control of Congress, when President Obama was elected, that they would keep their promises.

I agree with you. We wanted change. We wanted to cut spending. We wanted an era of different government. But all we have dealt with has been a series of broken promises. One promise after another.

You highlighted the issue of not having 5 days to read the bill. I think that that's an extremely important thing. The American people take our job seriously even if some of our colleagues don't take their job seriously, but they expect us to be here to vote and they expect us to read the bills. I am getting more and more questions from people, have you read the bills? I am being much more diligent about reading bills these days because of that. But all we have gotten are broken promises from the President and from the Democrats who are in charge. And I think that's really a sad situation.

Earmarks, for example, as our colleague from Minnesota pointed out, the bill that was passed the other day, the omnibus bill that was passed the other day, had 8,500 earmarks in it. Now, it may be that some of those are worthwhile projects, but we had a promise from our President that he would not sign any bill with any earmarks in it. He would go through line item by line item and take those out. That is another promise that's gone by the wayside. It's just not going to happen.

I think what we are seeing is the comment that he made without his teleprompter that he does believe in wealth transfer. I think we know now why he always wants a teleprompter in front of him because when allowed to speak off the cuff sometimes he says some things that really reveal what it is. The comment about "never let a crisis go to waste," of course, he didn't say that, his Chief of Staff said it. But the wealth transfer I think is something that the American people are beginning to understand.

Mrs. BACHMANN. You had mentioned that you felt that the President maybe was revealing his true colors in an off-the-cuff remark, but I have in front of me a copy of the President's budget. This is in black and white and anyone can read it. And this is page 5, "Inheriting a Legacy of Mismatched Priorities." I think the President is pretty clear about wealth transfer. He's been very clear. He's got it down in black and white. And I will quote from it. It says this: "While middle class families

have been playing by the rules living up to their responsibilities as neighbors and citizens, those at the commanding heights of our economy have not.”

□ 2115

He is saying that people, the top end, have not been playing by the rules. Now, this is a canard that gets repeated over and over and over again, saying that people have not been paying their taxes, somehow it's been unfair and they have skimmed.

But as the gentleman from New Jersey knows, and that as our colleague who has joined us, Dr. BROUN, knows, I know the gentelady from North Carolina is aware of this, the top 1 percent of income earners in the United States pay 40 percent of all the taxes in the United States.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Wait a minute, would you please repeat that for the people who are watching tonight so that they understand very clearly what you just said? Say it slow for us down south.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I know these Minnesota accents are a little tough to get through, but I also want to mention, just for point of reference, I am a Federal tax attorney. That's my background. That's what I do. Taxes are us.

But the top 1 percent of income earners pay 40 percent of all the taxes. The top 5 percent of income earners in the United States pay 60 percent of all taxes. The top 10 percent of all income earners pay 80 percent of all taxes.

Today in the United States, 40 percent of all Americans pay no taxes. And under President Obama's plan, 50 percent of all Americans will pay no taxes.

This weekend I was up in the northern part of my district, probably no one in this group made more than \$50,000 a year. All the people I spoke to were very upset with President Obama's plan. They were upset because they believe in tax fairness. They believe that every American should pay something, no matter what their income is, everybody should have something in on the deal.

Why? We all benefit from national defense. We all benefit from roads. We all benefit from corrections. All of us benefit. All of us should be paying it.

I will yield to our counterpart from Georgia.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I thank the gentelady.

I just came from a meeting where I heard some very interesting information about this taxing, this cap and tax, as we are calling it. The Democrats call it cap and trade.

But there is a video called "Apocalypse? No!" This was Christopher Lord, Christopher Monckton, one of the greatest outspoken people in this world, about how the global warming is just totally a farce, and he was talking about how it was going to hurt the poorest of people, not only in the United States but in the world. He was

begging for us, not as a Congress, as a government, for us to not put this cap and tax policy in place, because what it's going to do is it's going to put people out of work, it's going to lock them into a welfare state, which is going to hurt everybody's pocketbook long term. It's going to hurt small business, it's going to hurt the economy of not only the United States, but the world.

And he was begging us not to pass a cap and tax policy here in the United States and was saying that we in America need to do the right things. He was showing us graphs, and the lies, actually, that are being put out by a NASA scientist by the name of Mr. Hanson and others who are promoting this, now they talk about climate change.

But Lord was saying in the last 7 years we have actually had global cooling, global cooling. So they have stopped talking about global warming because we have had global cooling for the last 7 years. And this was in the normal variability of climate going up and down over the years.

And he was pointing out that sun spots, sun activity actually has more to do with the temperature than the CO<sub>2</sub> that has been emitted.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Yes, that's the solar flares, that's true.

As a matter of fact, in President Obama's budget, which he has already submitted, and which we are going to be taking up, and we are going to be voting on with appropriations, he has already included, as a baseline part of his budget, remember, his budget is historic.

It's so huge, the trillions of dollars are so huge we can't even get our arms around it, 646 billion in new taxes for the energy tax. I am sure that the gentleman and his constituents from Georgia, and I am sure that the gentelady from North Carolina and her constituents, and the gentleman from New Jersey and his constituents would be interested in knowing, well, what does that work out for me? What does that mean that I am going to owe?

Well, people in the Sixth District of Minnesota, we need heat. We don't have a choice in wintertime. We have to turn our furnace on. This is very, very large concern, and I hope we have time to discuss it before the Democrats ask us to vote on this bill.

Because we are looking at a good \$4,000 per household in increased costs right away to pay for energy. Energy touches every part of our life, and we have got a graph up here that talks about what President Obama and the Democrats' tax plan will do.

Gas prices are going to go up. We all remember how much fun it was last July to pay over \$4 a gallon and we thought we were quick on our way to \$6 a gallon, \$8 a gallon? Well, remember that? Welcome back to it. That's called cap and tax. Welcome back to now seeing your home heating fuel, or in the case of Georgia, going up 40 percent. Can you imagine if your constituents

get an electric bill that will be 40 percent higher than what it was before?

Remember also what happened at the grocery store last summer when gas prices went up. The food prices went up. Why? Energy is in everything we eat.

Also if you go to Wal-mart, if you go to Target to buy something to wear. Energy is a component, a basic building block of everything.

I know that the gentelady from North Carolina has a great graph on this.

Ms. FOXX. Well, there is a chart here that showed that in addition to the high rate we are going to be paying for the cap and tax that the President has in his budget bill, what I wanted to point out and wanted to ask the gentelady, it's my understanding again that the President promised that he was going to cut taxes for 95 percent of taxpayers; is that right?

Mrs. BACHMANN. That's right. That's what he said to the American people.

Ms. FOXX. And yet he left out saying he is going to raise taxes, though, a lot more for 100 percent of the people by instituting cap and tax.

Again, they like to call it cap and trade, but it's going to be cap and tax. Because as you so eloquently pointed out, it's going to raise the cost of energy for everybody in this country. And these people, I think they are just playing God.

I think they think that we human beings are going to offset the action of the sun. They think they are God, and they are going to be playing that role.

But I wanted to point out something tonight that we haven't said that I think is very important to point out, and I think our colleague from New Jersey reminded me this is something we should be saying, we know, as Republicans, that Americans are hurting. We know lots of people in our districts who are suffering as a result of the actions and the policies that have been taken, particularly in the last couple of years, and we don't want that hurt to go on.

So Republicans have been offering alternatives. The Democrats are accusing us of being the Party of "No." You know, that's a cute little thing that they can try to hang around our necks.

But I saw something today in Roll Call, can't take the credit for it, wish I could. I love it the way cartoonists can sometimes put in just a couple of words what we are thinking about, but there is a cartoon that says the Party of "O" and showing a picture of a donkey.

Now, I like that. We are not the Party of "No" because we have presented alternatives. Last year we presented alternatives when it came to energy. We had an all-of-the-above energy plan. We have an alternative to the budget.

We had an alternative to the stimulus, but we are being accused of being the Party of "No," but I think calling

them the Party of "O" is the appropriate thing to do, because they don't want to take responsibility. It's all a sham.

I tell you, again, this place reminds me of the emperor's new clothes. You know, there is this feeling that there is something out there, and it's going to take people who are willing to say the truth to tell the American people. Those stories you heard, those promises you were made, not true.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I just want to inject, actually, this economic situation that we are in is not too tough to figure out. It's real doable. We have a plan for it, and it's pretty simple.

We have a very high rate of tax on investments. If we would take that tax off, it's called capital gains, and zero it out and shout out from the house tops, for 4 years we will have a zero capital gains. You invest, take your money off the sideline, put it into the marketplace, any profit you get back, it's yours, 100 percent.

If we would have a zero capital gain, and if we would take our corporate tax rate from 34 percent down to 9 percent, cut everyone's marginal tax rate by 5 percent, even President Obama wants to increase the death tax. We say kill the death tax. That's not a good idea to have Uncle Sam reach into somebody's coffin after they have died and take 45 percent of what they own.

And get rid of that alternative minimum tax. You do that, next quarter you have an increase in GDP and jobs. Next quarter you have the Dow Jones up. Next quarter, you are going to see unprecedented levels of growth and unprecedented levels of investment in the United States from the world markets. This is pretty easy to solve.

But the Obama administration has taken a completely different view. They have taken the view of the French Revolution, which is to tax, tax, tax and spend, spend, spend. And now they have even taken another cue from them, off with their heads.

Because in their budget proposal, by their own language, the evil are the top 1 percent of income earners. And that's who they want to whack off their heads.

But the Wall Street Journal even had a great article that said this. It said you could confiscate the wealth of everyone making \$75,000 or more, it still wouldn't be enough to pay for all the spending that President Barack Obama wants to spend.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. And there was a whole bunch of points I wanted to raise on the things you said right then, but I will go with the whole bunch of them.

On the middle point with regard to taxation of capital gains and what have you, it may sound, at first blush, that when you say, well, we have to address the capital gains situation in this country, we are talking about the rich out there. But when you realize that as across the board, Americans are hurting generally pretty much across the

board. A lot of people who are hurting are senior citizens, retirees, people who rely upon their pensions, whether it's union pension or private pension or otherwise.

They are saving to pay for college, what have you, they are seeing those funds go down. What can we do to try to turn that around?

I can't guarantee that it would turn around by tomorrow, but, as you said, pretty darn soon if you can get the trillions of dollars, as people say, are sitting on the sidelines and to start investing it. How can you do that?

You can do that in a couple of ways. You hit on the main ones by lowering the capital gains tax. Honestly, right now, people aren't saying I don't have any capital gains in this marketplace. But if you gave that incentive to say get into the market today, you will be tax free or have a lower rate, people would get off the side and they would get into the market immediately.

The other point that I just wanted to touch on, the other point here, I will spend 2 minutes on it. In the spending plan we have had in the last several weeks, actually several months now, we have had hundreds of billion of dollars. And this is a side note, other people are criticizing the other side of the aisle, how much debt the Bush administration added during their 8 years in office, it was something like \$4.6 trillion in his 8 years in office.

Just in 3 years, it's doubling. But, basically, remember these numbers, President Bush was in office for 8 years, he saw it go up about 4.6. President Obama has been in office for less than 2 months or something like that, a month, and you will see the debt go up by \$5.6 trillion in a 3-year period of time. It is incredible.

Part of that money, where is that money going to, deals with what the gentlelady from North Carolina was talking about before. And that is to the whole foreclosure situation, home pricing, what have you, and just follow with me on this.

Their argument is this, foreclosures are happening out there right now. We agree. That is causing problems across the board and it is causing a devaluation of people's homes across the board. Therefore, everyone must pay higher taxes, increase spending to try to prevent the foreclosure problem.

Now, you raised some of the avenues of what we could do to address foreclosure, and I can go into them as well. But I just want to give some facts, and I can do it with a picture. It's not a cartoon like Ms. FOXX had over there, actually had a picture. This was actually in USA Today, and what does this chart show, yes, it's pretty neat. It shows county-by-county the number of foreclosure actions, defaults and notices on auctions and repossessions per 1,000. Basically, this is a chart to show you where the problems are in this country.

□ 2130

So as people look at this and they think to the rhetoric that we hear from

the other side that, Oh, there are a lot of foreclosures. Yes, the rate has gone up in specific areas out here in California, Arizona, and certainly down here in Florida and up in your neck of the woods as well. But the vast majority of the country, fortunately, is not seeing the systemic problems of more than 60, more than 40, or even more than 20.

What does that mean? That changes the whole nature of the discussion as to how we go about fixing the problem. If the problem is in certain areas, then you don't need a specific blanket approach across the board in order to do it. You don't need to raise taxes on small businesses or families in my neck of the woods or in your neck of the woods to solve the problem.

You need to target some of the relief. More importantly, you need some of the Republican solutions, and I'll yield back to you on this, as the RSC, the Republican Study Committee, has already come out with, addressing capital gains, corporate taxes, section 179, and the like, as far as encouraging businesses and individuals to get their entrepreneurial spirit going again.

Those sort of things will address this problem in a way that will affect everyone and improve lifting up the prices again and getting it back to the marketplace where we want it to be.

So I just wanted to bring that one little chart to try to set the record straight as to where the foreclosure problem is in this country, how it is actually impacting only a segment of the economy, and what we need to do is address this in a widespread approach, as I'm sure you're addressing and I'm sure the gentleman from Georgia would also like to address as well.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Isn't it interesting that we are getting a blanket approach to about everything there is. I know the gentleman from Georgia had brought up the whole cap and tax thing, where we have to have a global warming tax, an energy tax, and everybody has to pay.

I thought it was interesting. I was back in the district over the weekend and I heard President Obama on the radio admitting essentially and saying that he wants to have this new energy tax passed, but he does not want implementation to occur until after 2012.

The reason why, he said, is because the economy is in such rough shape right now, businesses and the economy couldn't take it. And that's a general admission that this new energy tax is going to tank our economy. As a matter of fact, I had a conversation over the weekend with some people who are experts in this area, and they said this new energy tax literally has the potential of reducing American's standard of living 30 percent. Thirty percent reduction in standard of living because of this energy tax.

The worst feature of all is that it gives all the power to Washington, D.C., and takes it away from the individuals by putting this right of taxation in the Federal government's

hands. It's almost like an invisible tax that is put into every aspect of our lives. How do we ever get rid of it? How do we deal with it?

We are losing freedom by the boatload. That's the difference between, I think, what the Republican agenda is and the Democrat agenda. We believe in the Constitution. We believe in the first amendment, religious freedom, freedom of speech. We believe in the second amendment, the right to hold and bear arms. We believe in these important values. We believe in bedrock values for our country.

Marriage should be between a man and a woman; life should be protected from the moment of conception. We believe in these values. We believe in securing our Nation. We believe in taking on the enemy and winning and not being ashamed to win.

One thing we don't believe in are open borders. We don't believe that we should have open borders. We believe that we should deal with the drug problem that is coming across, and the illegal alien problem. And we believe in low taxes. We don't believe in high taxes. And our country will change forever if this new energy tax comes in.

Did the gentleman from New Jersey have something you wanted to say, or can I go to the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Thank you for yielding. In fact, you're exactly right. I think one point I really want to reiterate about this cap and tax or cap and trade issue—whose going to be hurt the worst? It's going to be the poor people in this country because groceries will go up, the cost of medications will go up so the elderly and the sick and the people who are on fixed incomes will have more to pay for their drugs.

It's going to hurt the poorest and the people who are in the least position to be able to take care of paying this higher tax. And this cap and tax is going to hurt everybody. But it's going to cost jobs. So that is going to make more people unemployed. Not only that, as the chart says, President Obama's budget spends too much, it taxes too much, it borrows too much. But it also hurts the poor too much.

Mrs. BACHMANN. It hurts the poor and it hurts every segment of the economy.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Absolutely.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Because, remember, how did this start? The housing problem. Mr. GARRETT started talking about that with foreclosures. This hurts the housing segment where you showed on the chart—Florida, Arizona, California, Nevada. They have all sorts of trouble. What does President Obama want to do? He wants to take away the home mortgage interest deduction that will hurt people who have already made 30 years' worth of plan on their finances. They took this interest deduction out, and now it's going to be taken away from them. That is going to hurt the housing industry.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Absolutely. Every single policy that we hear from this administration is going to hurt the most vulnerable in our economic system.

Mrs. BACHMANN. It's raising taxes.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. In fact, he wants to cap charitable giving in this country, which means people won't give to the Salvation Army, people won't give to the Red Cross.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Imagine what it will do to churches. Imagine—already churches are being decimated. There's a foundation in Minnesota that does good work all across the world helping people to learn how to hear. They have had donors already this year pull \$300,000 worth of donations because they are going to lose that donation.

We're going to see donations dry up to some of the best organizations; ministries, churches, synagogues. This is serious, what's happening right now.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. If the gentleman will yield, down in my part of the country, down the in southeast, we had a couple of little hurricanes a few years back. Hurricane Katrina and Rita.

If you look at the Federal response and compare it to the private response, where FEMA came in. People are still living in trailer houses. The neighborhoods are still empty, businesses are still boarded. But where the private sector, churches, synagogues, and other private entities went in to help these people in need, communities are back functioning. People are back in their homes, they're back in their businesses. The communities are back functioning.

What that shows is that the private sector works a whole lot better than how the bureaucracy works when it has all of its encumbrances. How it crawls slowly and how it cannot really respond.

Now, we have an administration that wants to take money away from those entities that work the best to help people. I just don't understand it.

We have, as Republicans, we have solutions. We are not just the Party of "No," as Ms. FOX was saying. We have presented solution after solution after solution.

Unfortunately, on the Wall Street bailout, President Bush and his Democratic Treasury Secretary, Hank Paulson, wouldn't consider our proposals. Our proposals were to cut the capital gains tax. That would even bring a lot of money offshore into America and free up a lot of capital so banks could start loaning to banks again. Banks could loan to people again. We had other solutions that President Bush and Hank Paulson wouldn't consider.

Since then we have had proposal after proposal that this House, the Senate leadership, as well as President Obama will not consider anything that we bring forward, which, actually, every single solution that we bring forward will help small businesses, it will create jobs.

Just in Georgia, the proposal that we had on the stimulus would have created twice the number of jobs—73,000 new jobs above what the Democrats say that they hope to save or create, using their own rules.

Mrs. BACHMANN. If the gentleman would yield, the jobs that are being created are new government jobs. They aren't new jobs in the private sector. They're government jobs that will somehow have to be continued and sustained.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. We would have created 73,000 more jobs in Georgia alone, under the Republican proposal, at half the cost. And we would not have borrowed any money at all. We would not have borrowed from our grandchildren like the stimulus bill or "non-stimulus" bill did.

Mrs. BACHMANN. If the gentleman would yield, the cost of these jobs in the stimulus were easily \$300,000 per jobs. Some of these jobs were \$650,000 per job that they created.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. I was just going to raise that point. As I am standing here listening to your facts, I'm looking down at the floor at the well and I see President Obama's budget and the three points that are a takeaway from tonight: Spends too much, taxes too much, and borrows too much.

It spends too much of our current hard-earned dollars that everybody has to work so hard to earn; it taxes too much on the American family and the small business and the farmer; and it borrows too much from our children and our grandchildren because they will be the ones who actually pay for all this.

On the spending side of the equation, I know it's hard to get your hands around some of these numbers sometimes. You just did when you gave the number. First it was 2 million, then it was 3 million, then it was 4 million jobs that this administration said they were going to save. Whichever number it is, if you add it all up and divide it out, you're right, it comes to around \$300,000 per job that they're going to be spending to save.

But it's a heck of a lot of people in my district, and I'm sure even more down in Georgia, who would love to have a \$300,000 job, even if it is only for a week, a month, or half a year. That's the type of job, by the way, that the government's creating—short-term job. These are not careers.

Once this job screwing in light bulbs, which was one, or painting a fence, or another, once that job is done, that job is done.

So on the spending side of the equation, and you were alluding to this point before, what it means is we are getting to the point where around over a quarter of all the growth and wealth of this country—GDP, gross domestic product—all the growth and wealth, over 27 percent is going to be sucked right out of this country, across the borders, as my picture here of the

United States, and brought right here to Washington or this body and all the bureaucrats to spend however they want to.

Is that what Americans want—more than a quarter of the wealth of this country to be spent right here as opposed out of their own pockets?

And taxing too much. You hit the numbers before as far as the tax rates and how it's going to hit on the families and the budgets. And the last one on borrowing too much, the debt of this country, again, it's impossible to wrap your hands around these things, but the debt of this country, the public debt will reach 58.7 percent of the GDP this year, and eventually rise to two-thirds of GDP in a couple of years.

Last time it was like that was in early 1950s after the war, and what have you, and it's been on a steady decline ever since even then. Charts show it's a rocket ship going right back up again, all in the last 3 months and projected over the next 10 years.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield? The sad thing is our children and grandchildren are going to live at a lower standard. Their standard of living is going to be lower than ours today because they are going to be saddled with this huge debt.

You cannot borrow and spend your way into prosperity. In fact, our President has, if you all remember, came and told the Republican conference that he wasn't going to make the same mistake that Franklin Delano Roosevelt made when FDR got scared and quit spending. Our President said he was going to continue to spend. And it's just wrong. That policy during the Depression did not get us out of that Depression.

Warren Buffet just last week said he thinks we've been pushed off the edge and our economy is heading into a very severe depression or a very severe recession. And we may well be. I hope and pray that we aren't.

But, I know this. Every single thing that this administration and the leadership in this House and this Senate have proposed is going to hurt our economy. It's going to deepen the recession, it's going to prolong it, and may push us into a severe depression.

We keep hearing this is the worst economic time since the Great Depression. No, this is the worst time since Jimmy Carter and those failed policies. What our President has done is he's bought into that philosophy, that Keynesian economic policy, which is socialism. That's is exactly what he's bought into.

In fact, the way I have described it in some floor speeches is that we have a steamroller of socialism being shoved down the throats of the American people. It's going to strangle the American economy and it's going to slay the American people economically. And it's going to.

That steamroller of socialism is being driven by NANCY PELOSI and HARRY REID. We have got to stop it be-

cause it's going to hurt the poor people in this country. It's going to hurt the small businessmen and women in this country. It's going to hurt the most economically disadvantaged in this country.

We have policies that we are proposing that will actually help small businesses, that will create jobs. It will create paychecks instead of welfare checks. That's exactly what we are trying to promote, is giving people a paycheck instead of a welfare check.

□ 2145

Mrs. BACHMANN. We haven't even talked yet about socialized medicine. We talked a little bit about cap and tax. We haven't even talked about socialized medicine. Find me one model anywhere in the world where socialized medicine has delivered better care at a cheaper cost. You want to talk about tax increases, socialized medicine will break the bank in the United States, because now President Obama even voted for the SCHIP bill, which we all know will now for the first time swing the door wide open for illegal aliens. I know one thing, the people in my district are not interested in paying for the health care for illegal aliens that are coming across our border to be yet one more magnet to bring people in that should come here legally. That is a very real concern that we are addressing, and that is why I think people are so concerned right now about what they are seeing on the taxing climate.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. And health care issues, and we have a doctor here with us tonight, is obviously something we are all concerned about. We know too many people who are in small businesses who just say, I just can't afford to buy insurance for my employees. We know too many individuals who are not working right now, and they say they cannot afford to pay for the health insurance costs, not because doctors charge too much, and we have a doctor right here, but just because of the nature and the system that we have in place.

The system we have right now, again, to get back to the facts, we do not have a free market health care system in this country; we have a government-regulated monopolized system in this country. But we do agree, the three of us here, I believe, without putting words in your mouth, that we do have a problem with health care affordability for a vast majority of Americans, and we do need to address that. But you do not address that, as is done in President Obama's budget, which spends too much, taxes too much, and borrows too much, by putting in placeholders of \$634 billion, which we do not have today, which goes to point three, borrows too much, that \$634 billion to pay for our health care today, which will basically come from our kids and our grandkids. We do not solve the affordability issue by simply spending more money and taxing more

money. You do it by ways that I know the good doctor has addressed on this floor before, by reforming the system, getting out inefficiencies in this system, providing for the competition on various levels under the system, to basically overhauling the system to make sure that health care is available to every American citizen, young and old alike. We have talked about that on the floor before. We need to do that. Spending, taxing, and borrowing is not going to fix the health care system.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Let me tell you about one government regulation that came in to the health care system when I was practicing medicine down in rural South Georgia to show you and just give you a picture of how much government regulation increases the cost for all of us.

I had a small automated lab with quality controls, because when I did tests I wanted to make sure that the tests were appropriate and that they gave good results so that I could treat my patients in the best way. Well, Congress passed a bill that was signed into law called the Clinical Laboratory Improvement Act, CLIA. If a patient came in to see me and had a red, sore throat and I want to find out if they had a bacterial infection or a viral infection, I would do a CBC. It cost \$12 and I could do it in 5 minutes. CLIA shut down my lab. I had to send them to the hospital. It cost \$75 and took 2 to 3 hours. That is with just one government regulatory burden.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. WELCH (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today and March 17 on account of attending a Vermont health care summit.

Mr. BOUSTANY (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today and the balance of the week on account of attending funeral services for Charles Boustany, Sr.

Mr. DREIER (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today and March 17 on account of a death in the family.

Mr. LUCAS (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today, March 17 and 18 on account of family business.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California (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 Ms. WOOLSEY) 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