

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT RACKS UP RECORD-BREAKING \$1 TRILLION DEFICIT

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

Ms. FOXX. My colleague from Virginia promises jobs from the cap-and-tax bill. If you believe that, then you probably believe the Democrats when they promised that the stimulus bill would provide jobs.

The Obama administration and congressional Democrats promised that their trillion-dollar stimulus would create jobs immediately and unemployment would not rise above 8 percent. But since the stimulus bill passed, 1.96 million Americans have lost their jobs. I suspect that we'll do a lot worse than that under their cap-and-tax bill.

Let me fill you in on some of the economic statistics that we have right now. At the beginning of July, our national debt clocked in at \$11.5 trillion. If you don't have a calculator in hand, that's \$37,609.23 for every man, woman, and child in America.

But the real news is not simply that the national debt is more than \$11.5 trillion. The real news is the Treasury Department announced yesterday that for the first time the Federal budget deficit has topped \$1 trillion. The first time in our history.

To clarify, the deficit is different than the debt in the sense that the deficit generally refers to the amount of overspending in a given year. That means so far in fiscal year 2009, the Federal Government has spent \$1 trillion more than it has collected in taxes.

Rather than trim our budget and make do with less, like the rest of America, Congress has decided to up the ante and will not just maintain current government spending levels, but will significantly increase spending in the coming year.

This kind of runaway spending is part of why we're hearing reports that our \$1 trillion deficit is just the beginning of the story. In fact, some experts are predicting that the deficit could reach \$2 trillion this fall.

What do these record deficits mean for Americans? Massive deficits can only continue for so long. I think we've all heard stories of how crushing debt has forced some businesses or families into bankruptcy. At some point, the pile of cards is coming down, either as the interest rates on the debt spirals up higher, or as those who lend to America run out of cash to loan or simply out of patience for Uncle Sam's spendthrift ways. The American people are hurting. Millions are out of work, and hundreds of thousands lose their jobs each month.

The government spent \$18 billion in June just to pay the interest on the national debt, which works out to \$600 million a day in interest payments. Eventually, American families are going to have to foot this bill.

American people know we cannot borrow and spend our way back to a growing economy. As a record-breaking \$1 trillion deficit causes the national debt to increase at an historic pace, Congress will either have to slash spending in unprecedented ways or raise taxes. And judging by how the current Democrat majority in Congress has proceeded thus far, I'm very skeptical about any meaningful spending cuts. You can probably guess what that means. Let's just say that the tax hike forecast doesn't look good for the American people.

Democrats are on the side of more government and more taxes. Republicans are on the side of the American people.

WATER INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCING

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. One issue that is too often out of sight and out of mind is the quality and the condition of our drinking water and wastewater pipes under the ground.

Just 6 months ago, we all watched in shock as rescue workers airlifted people from vehicles caught in a massive rush of water caused by a water main rupture on River Road just outside of Washington, D.C., because of the failure of a single, corroded pipe installed over 40 years ago. In fact, 72,000 miles of sewer main and water pipe are over 80 years of age.

This morning, there was a water main break that closed 23rd Street at I, near the George Washington Hospital.

The EPA estimates that American communities suffered more than 240,000 water main breaks last year. Combined with overflowing combined sewer systems causing contamination, property damage, disruption in water supply and, often, massive traffic jams.

The American Society of Civil Engineers estimates an average of 6 billion gallons of water is lost every day through leakage—enough to fill over 9,000 Olympic-sized swimming pools. The Engineers have given our Nation's drinking water and wastewater infrastructure a D-minus grade in their most recent report—sadly, a grade that was not improved over the report from 5 years ago.

The House of Representatives recognized the need to upgrade water infrastructure earlier this year, passing H.R. 1262, the Water Quality Investment Act, which would update and reauthorize Clean Water State Revolving Loan Funds. But they simply don't have enough money.

The EPA's most recent estimate is there is an over \$500 billion gap between current investment and projected needs over the next 20 years. Surface and air transportation infrastructure, while facing their own challenges, at least have a dedicated source of funding. Water does not.

In the spring of 2005, the famous Republican pollster, Frank Luntz, released a poll that showed Americans would support a sustainable, dedicated source of water funding for infrastructure.

□ 1045

He found the public sees clean water as an even higher priority than investments made in transportation and airways—71 percent prioritized water above other infrastructure. It is time to stop talking about it and do something: creating a dedicated firewall trust fund for water infrastructure.

This afternoon, I will introduce legislation to create this trust fund financed by a number of funding mechanisms that are simple, equitable and adequate for \$10 billion a year. The Water Protection and Reinvestment Act will establish a trust fund to finance clean water and drinking water infrastructure. Most of the money will go through the State revolving funds for sewage and drinking water improvements.

The financing mechanisms in the Water Protection and Reinvestment Act will include a fee based on water-based beverages, products that are disposed of in wastewater, pharmaceutical products, and corporate profits. These fees would be assessed at the manufacturer level so they will be easy to administer and will have a minimal impact on the consumer. They will be at a level that is so low that it would not place the entire burden on any one industry or group of consumers. With a mix of funding, everyone will contribute to a solution from which everyone will benefit from.

I am pleased that the legislation already has a diverse support of stakeholders from the Associated General Contractors, American Rivers, the National Association of Clean Water Agencies, and Rural Community Assistance Partnership, and a wide range of bipartisan original cosponsors, including Congressmen NORM DICKS, STEVE LATOURETTE, MICHAEL SIMPSON, and THOMAS PETRI, representing a base of support from thoughtful, bipartisan legislators.

While the funding question is always complicated, the public is with us. In January of this year, pollster Frank Luntz released a new poll—and remember, he is the famous Republican pollster—finding that a nearly unanimous 94 percent of Americans are concerned about the state of our Nation's infrastructure. He found that this concern cuts across all regions of the country: urban, rural, suburban. He found that 84 percent of the public wants the Federal Government to spend more money to improve infrastructure, and that 81 percent of Americans are personally prepared to pay 1 percent more in taxes for the cause.

The need is clear. The public is supportive. My hope is that my colleagues will join me in a solution that will

make all of our communities more livable, and our families safer, healthier, and more economically secure.

HONORING MASTER SERGEANT STEVE HOOD

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

Mr. CHILDERS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of an American hero, a Mississippi hero, Master Sergeant Steve Hood of the Mississippi Highway Patrol. On May 29 of this year, Master Sergeant Hood of Guntown, Mississippi, died in the line of duty, the first in a decade. A 28-year veteran State trooper, he passed before his time.

Master Sergeant Hood started his career as a State trooper in 1982 after graduating from the Mississippi Highway Patrol Academy. It was clear when I attended his funeral last month, he was a man who brought comfort and friendship to all he met.

Along with his dedicated service to the people of Mississippi, family and friends will remember him as a Christian who was actively involved in Harrisburg Baptist Church and one who enjoyed singing. Just last year, Master Sergeant Hood returned to duty after recovering from a near-fatal tractor accident that reaffirmed and strengthened his faith.

Master Sergeant Hood was a devoted husband to his wife, Lisa, and a loving father to his children, Matthew, Stacie and Stephanie, and a loyal colleague of his fellow troopers.

Please join me today in remembering the life of Master Sergeant Steve Hood and mourning his death. I thank my colleagues for honoring this Mississippi and American hero, Master Sergeant Steve Hood, and his family at this time.

ENSURE BROADCAST FREEDOM

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

Mr. PENCE. Madam Speaker, the American people love a fair fight; and so do I, especially where the issues of the day are being debated. In a free market, though, fairness should always be determined based upon the equality of opportunity, not equality of results. Everyone should, in effect, have a chance to make their case.

That's why it is so disturbing to many of us that some of the leading voices in Congress over the last 2 years have been calling for Congress to enforce an idea of fairness on the airwaves of America in the form of restoring the so-called fairness doctrine. But our Nation should always proceed with caution whenever some would achieve fairness by limiting the fairness of others.

The American people cherish their freedom. It is, in effect, a blood-bought

right. There is totality of agreement on this floor about that. In fact, I believe that is why President Ronald Reagan repealed the so-called fairness doctrine after it had been in place for almost four decades back in 1987. The fairness doctrine regulated the content of radio for much of the last century, and limited the ability of radio stations to deal with controversial issues without meeting a standard of equal time or balance or record keeping. As a result of that, as many of us old enough to remember will attest, talk radio as we know it today virtually did not exist before 1987.

Well, with some of the talk of restoring the fairness doctrine to the law of the land, Congressman GREG WALDEN of Oregon and I have been working over the last 2 years to ensure broadcast freedom. We have authored the Broadcaster Freedom Act which is cosponsored by every Republican in the House of Representatives. This week we will bring to the floor a broadcaster freedom amendment as part of the Financial Services Appropriations bill. Many who are watching may not know that the Federal Communications Commission receives its entire budget through the Financial Services Appropriations bill, and we believe this is an opportune time, as we were able to do 2 years ago, to use the power of this Congress and the people in this Congress on both sides of the aisle to advocate for the freedom of the airwaves of America by limiting the ability of the Federal Communications Commission to bring back the so-called fairness doctrine.

But first, for the uninformed, the fairness doctrine is something of an Orwellian and Depression-era Federal Communications Commission rule that was devised back in 1949. As I mentioned, it required radio broadcasters to present both sides of an opinion when discussing controversial topics. It put unelected bureaucrats at the FCC in charge of enforcement in determining what speech was legal. Because of lack of clarity in the commission's ruling, broadcasters more often than not opted to offer noncontroversial programs in lieu of hours of paperwork, countless legal fees, and a potential threat to their broadcast license.

Recognizing the chilling effect the regulation was having on broadcast freedom, the FCC began to overturn its own ruling on the fairness doctrine in 1985. Following that change in policy and President Reagan's veto of attempts to reinstate it, the results have been dramatic.

Think about it. Before the fairness doctrine was repealed, there were some 125 talk radio stations in America. Now there are more than 2,000. While names like Limbaugh, Hannity, Laura Ingraham, and other conservative giants are better known to many, the truth is when you look at the totality of the talk radio marketplace, from the local level to the regional level to the national level, there is an extraor-

dinary diversity of opinion. Many progressive, moderate, and liberal programs succeed extraordinarily well at the local level in many markets around the country.

Unfortunately, in spite of this recent history and the breakout of broadcast freedom since 1987, there has been talk in the last several years about the need to level the playing field of radio broadcasting by restoring the fairness doctrine. Let me say from my heart, I believe it is dangerous to suggest that a government bureaucracy would be a competent arbiter of free speech. As a former radio talk show host myself, I know personally what the fairness doctrine meant to radio back in the day, and I know it would ultimately muzzle what is the dynamic public discussion that we call talk radio in America today.

Let me be clear on this. I believe the broadcaster freedom amendment that we will bring this week gives Members of this body an opportunity to say "no" to the fairness doctrine and to say "no" to a new iteration of it that takes the formation of regulations under the rubric of localism, I believe will be met by broad and bipartisan support. If memory serves, 2 years ago when I brought the Pence amendment banning the fairness doctrine from being implemented by the FCC, more than 305 Members of Congress voted for it, including 100 Members of the Democrat majority.

So I urge support for the broadcaster freedom amendment. Join us in embracing freedom on the airwaves of America.

65TH ANNIVERSARY OF LIBERATION OF GUAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) for 5 minutes.

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, the events of World War II seem to be lost in translation, interpreted as events that occurred rather than events that affect. For many, the events of the past no longer shape our views of the future. For this reason, I come to the Chamber this morning to speak about an important chapter in American history. A chapter that too few Americans know.

Early this morning, Congressman SABLAN and I were joined by the Honorable David Hayes, Deputy Secretary of the Interior, Major General Donald Goldhorn, former Congressman Ben Blaz, Congressman JOE WILSON, and friends of Guam in laying a wreath at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier in Arlington. We honored the soldiers, the sailors, the airmen, the marines, and Coast Guardsmen who participated in the battle in the liberation of Guam and the Northern Marianas during World War II.

Our ceremony also honored the liberated, the Chamorros, the indigenous people of Guam, who remained steadfast in their loyalty to the United