

economy. This program could help the environment and jobs.

HOW THE PROGRAM WOULD WORK

Here's how one bipartisan proposal before Congress would work to stimulate new vehicle purchases. The program would provide vouchers to consumers for vehicles at least 9 years old. The vouchers likely would be worth more than the current value of their vehicle. For example, a consumer who turns in an older car could get a voucher ranging from \$4,000 to \$5,000 to use as a down payment on a \$20,000 car that exceeds 27 miles per gallon. Combined with current auto sales incentives, consumers likely will get unprecedented deals on more fuel-efficient cars.

An independent analyst, Barclays Capital, estimates that this proposal could boost sales by 2.5 million units if 2% of eligible vehicles were traded in. This surge in sales would help preserve American jobs in communities across the country.

Taxpayers are rightly concerned about the federal deficit given the significant spending on the economic stimulus. Let me clarify, Ford is in a different position and is not seeking emergency taxpayer assistance. Nonetheless, Congress needs to spur consumer demand for autos—the largest purchase a family makes after a home.

This vehicle modernization idea would require additional investment by taxpayers. Its cost would be dependent on how Congress structures the incentive and its duration. The alternative, however, if sales do not rebound quickly, is more job losses, more home foreclosures, and less revenue for governments that must provide more jobless and health care benefits.

In addition to its consumer benefits, this initiative would help reduce our carbon footprint. Automakers are accelerating efforts to reduce greenhouse gases, but the latest fuel-economy rules apply only to new cars. This proposal would help America get greener faster by retiring a portion of the 240 million vehicles on the road. It could reduce our CO₂ emissions by millions of metric tons per year.

FUEL EFFICIENCY MEANS LOWER COSTS

The program also would help contribute to greater energy independence. Replacing an older car with a new, more fuel-efficient one drives down gas consumption. That helps consumers, too. In fact, the Department of Energy estimates a family could save \$780 per year by moving from a vehicle with 18 miles per gallon to one with 30 mpg.

The auto industry, both foreign and domestic, needs to work together to do our part in turning the economy around. But we also need to use the tools that our government possesses, and routinely deploys in so many other ways, to help move the economy more swiftly to a better place.

Improved auto sales will be one of the key indicators that America is on the road to economic recovery. As Congress weighs a national energy policy, climate change or even more stimulus measures, we urge lawmakers to consider this market-based consumer incentive. This fleet modernization idea would be a win-win for the consumer, the economy, the environment.

This is a bipartisan piece of legislation. It is very important to say this. This is bipartisan legislation, and it accomplishes two very important goals: First, it gets customers into the showrooms by buying vehicles and, of course, to help keep people working, as well as getting more fuel-efficient cars on the roads and reducing our dependence on foreign oil. So it is a win-win all the way around.

I believe that this is a prescription that our auto industry needs. I think it is a critical component, Madam Speaker, of the road forward for the auto industry and our Nation, and I would urge all of my colleagues to join us to help preserve jobs, to help consumers, and to reduce our dependence on foreign oil and protect this vital industry.

THE BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, the budget is the most important challenge that every Congress faces year in and year out. It reflects our priorities, it shows how we deal with war and peace, the economy, education, and the environment, who pays, and who benefits.

Under the Constitution, this is a uniquely congressional responsibility. The power of the purse is reserved to the United States Congress.

I have been disturbed lately to find one political party being AWOL. In fact, Republican Leader BOEHNER famously announced earlier this month that he wanted the people that he leads in the Republican Conference not to be legislators but just communicators, not be involved in the give and take of the legislative process. And as if to drive the point home, the Republicans last week released a budget proposal that the Associated Press summarized as, and I quote, "a glossy pamphlet, short on details, and long on campaign-style talking points."

There wasn't any substance there. There were no hard numbers talking about what they would do to reduce the deficits and what the deficit would be, what programs they were going to cut. Very, very disappointing to see a pamphlet that basically recycled the policies of the last 8 years of the Bush administration and Republican leadership that drove us into the economic ditch. They proposed their same old tax cuts for people who need them least, and offered an alternative that would provide 25 percent less in tax reduction for lower income Americans than is proposed by President Obama and would run up the deficit even higher than it already is.

We are going to have a week that is dominated by budget discussion. We Democrats are going to bring our budget to the floor on Thursday that builds on the President's challenge: Health care for all Americans; education reform, investing in the needs of education for our children and for people that have lost their jobs or need to change their career track; investing in reducing carbon pollution, climate change, and energy independence to create green-collar jobs that will be sustainable and provide value to the economy while we protect the planet. Our budget is serious about deficit reduction, after President Obama inher-

ited from the Bush administration the largest deficit in United States history.

It is ironic, because when the Bush administration took office, they were facing a projected \$5.2 trillion budget surplus, and Republicans had control of all of the levers of power here in Washington, D.C. Their control created economic problems, the budget deficit exploded, and taxes were cut for people who needed it the very least.

Ours is, I must emphasize, a budget outline that will enable Congress, at least those who want to be legislators and not merely talk about it, to roll up their sleeves and deliver on the challenges that the President made in health care, education, climate, deficit reduction, and tax reform.

There are no specific policy decisions made in the budget outline. That is not what a budget is for. Rather, it is to provide the framework. Budget decisions will be made by the people here who decide to be legislators over the next 6 months. There is still time for people on the other side of the aisle to reject their leadership, roll up their sleeves, and work with us to deal with specifics on carbon pollution, on health care, on education.

It was a little disorienting to hear at the Budget Committee late into the night last Wednesday Republicans talking about objecting to the President's proposal to reform student loans because they were afraid it would cost some bankers some jobs. I did the math. According to their figures, those jobs were at the expense of \$133,000 each, money that the Democrats and the President think ought to be loaned to students, not to subsidize bankers.

We look forward to a spirited debate this week.

TAXPAYER EMPOWERMENT AND ADVOCACY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. BARRETT) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, we are facing serious economic challenges. In my home State of South Carolina, the unemployment rate is right at 11 percent. We all know someone who has been personally affected by these tough times, a friend, a neighbor, a family member. We have all seen the "going out of business" signs hanging in the front doors of local shops and stores.

The people we represent are looking to Congress for answers, Madam Speaker. But the so-called solutions coming from the Washington Democrats call for more spending, more borrowing, and more taxing. The President's budget increases taxes by nearly \$2 trillion, doubles the national debt in less than 6 years, and spends \$4 trillion alone this year. And, of course, who can forget all of the wasteful spending in the stimulus bill: \$50 million for the National Endowment for the Arts, \$300 million for green golf carts, and \$30 million to

protect a mouse in San Francisco. And that is just to name a few.

Taxpayers have had enough. Across our State and across this country, they are gathering together to voice their outrage. Inspired by our Nation's early patriots, thousands of taxpayers are gathering at hundreds of modern-day tea parties to protest Washington's wasteful spending, the Democrat-written stimulus package, the housing bailout, and President Obama's budget. A recent tea party in Greenville, South Carolina, attracted more than 2,000 participants, and a similar rally in Cincinnati drew more than 4,000 dissatisfied taxpayers.

I want to let the people know that I hear what they are saying, and, Madam Speaker, I am doing something about it. Today I am introducing the Taxpayer Empowerment and Advocacy Act, the TEA Act.

Over the next 5 years, the TEA Act will save taxpayers over one-half trillion dollars by reducing spending, restricting the growth of government, and strengthening the definition of emergency spending to close loopholes and prevent abuse.

Across South Carolina, around kitchen tables and behind the small business counters, individuals are making tough decisions about their budgets. But Congress has refused to do the same, and it is time for that to change. I believe the TEA Act is a start to setting Congress on a new, more accountable course, and to protect the taxpayers' best interest. Enough is enough.

I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill and protecting the American taxpayer.

THE BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Well, the Republicans are at it again. It would be funny if we weren't in such dire financial straits as the government is, thanks to a number of years of Republican rule.

During the Bush era, George Bush inherited a balanced budget, he inherited projections of a surplus for years to come, and paying down the debt of the United States substantially. Well, he went to work busily, and using restrictive legislative rules the Republicans passed massive tax cuts favoring the wealthiest of us. Those with estates over \$5 million, those who earn over \$250,000 a year got huge largess from the Republican Party.

Now, in a time of surplus, it didn't hurt too much. But then, George Bush launched an unnecessary war in Iraq and decided to pay for it off the books; i.e., he did not score it in the budget, and just every year declared it as an emergency as much as it might cost. So far, close to \$700 billion has been spent on George Bush's war in Iraq.

□ 1045

Of course George Bush's tax cuts and his off-the-books spending and a mas-

sive expansion of government under total Republican rule, took us from a time of surplus to a time of massive deficits. George Bush set record after record with deficits during his Presidency, and he managed in 8 short years to double the debt that it had taken us more than 200 years to accumulate as a Nation. And the Republicans were all for it.

But now they would have us believe that their born-again fiscal conservatives, with a 19-page document with no specifics—and guess what it contains, this is how we are going to balance the budget, folks—more tax cuts for rich people. Oh, what a surprise. That will solve everything. They do have this cockamamie theory, and it is that if we give all of the money to the rich people, the rich people will go out and invest that money. When they invest that money, the little people will get jobs, and the little people will pay taxes because the rich people shouldn't. That is their budget, plain and simple.

Eliminate the estate tax. That would mean that if Bill Gates died tomorrow, and God forbid, I hope he is healthy and he won't, but if he did, the unrealized capital gains of his stock would then become nontaxable. No taxes would have ever been paid on that stock, passed on to his kids. If his kids invest it for a living under the Republican plan, they would earn capital gains and under their plan investors don't pay taxes. So you can have multi-generations of people accumulating more and more wealth who haven't paid a penny in taxes. But don't worry, the Republicans tell us, they will invest that money in America and put the little people to work. Well, no, maybe they will invest that money in China where labor is cheaper, or Mexico where labor is cheaper, or who knows where. Who knows how they will waste it. Who knows what new, speculative instruments they will come up with. Their so-called alternative would be funny if it wasn't so serious. But this is deadly serious.

President Obama is trying to dig us out of an incredibly deep hole and a very difficult time in the American economy. The radical deregulation of the Bush years and all of that wealth creation on Wall Street, which has now tanked, many people's pensions and their 401(k)s, it is killing jobs, we are trying to fix that, and we are trying to re-instill a sense of fiscal responsibility here in Washington, DC. It will not be easy. And particularly it won't be easy if the Republicans continue to play the clown on their side of the aisle and say eliminating taxes for rich people will solve all of the problems confronting the American people. Maybe it will provide them health care; I'm not sure how that works. Maybe it will help educate their kids in public schools; I don't quite get that part. Maybe it will rebuild our infrastructure; hmm, it won't do that, either. But it will make the rich richer, and that's all they are about.

DEMOCRATS REWRITING HISTORY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, it is very interesting to come and listen to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. It is clear they are living the book "1984" by George Orwell because they are constantly rewriting history to suit their purposes. I want to say that if there is anybody out there who hasn't read "1984" by George Orwell, or hasn't read it in a long time, I strongly urge you to do so because we are obviously living through what Orwell predicted. We are just a few years later than he suggested it would be.

I love the attitude of my colleagues, too, who say we are going to give all of the money to the rich. It displays their approach to our country. Their attitude is that the government owns all of the money and if money is not taken from citizens, then it is being given to them by the government.

Our country is the greatest country in the world, founded on capitalism and founded on Judeo-Christian beliefs, and founded on the rule of law. The money doesn't belong to the government, it belongs to the hardworking people who earned it. I think that in a nutshell sums up their attitude: The government should be in charge of absolutely everything, and we are seeing that play out with the proposals coming out of this administration and out of this Congress. Again, they are doing their best to make excuses for it by rewriting history.

Our economy was doing very well under the Bush administration until January 2007 when the Democrats took control of the Congress. They like to ignore those 2 years they were in control of Congress and President Bush was still President. We had 55 straight months of job creation. Suddenly that ended in January 2007 when they took over. Gas prices started going up, and they reached their peak under this Democratically controlled Congress. And I think it is very, very important that people be reminded of that.

They have said that President Bush created the largest deficit in our Nation's history. That simply is not true, and it isn't true that President Obama has inherited the largest deficit in history. But we are going to do our best to straighten out that issue.

They also like to say that the Republicans have no alternatives to what the Democrats are proposing. That also is not true. We have always had alternatives. This session in particular we have brought forth very specific alternatives. Last week we presented a 16-page document primarily of principles. This week we are releasing our balanced budget resolution, and we will have a balanced budget and it does the kinds of things that the American people expect to be done. It will be balanced, unlike the Obama budget which puts us greater and greater into debt