Washington do is disconnected completely from reality. The reality is in Johnson City, Tennessee, they are asking their agencies to fund a 5 percent cut over last year's budget.

All over America, families and State and local governments are tightening their belts and making do with what they have. Only in Washington do we respond to a huge drop in tax receipts by spending even more money.

Now the administration has proposed a $3.9 trillion budget, which will be 27 percent of gross domestic product of this country. This will create the largest Federal Government since World War II.

This budget is especially troubling because it's coupled with tax increases, and our job creators have to pay for it. The math of these policies seems to be more government spending, plus higher taxes, equals more jobs and economic growth.

If this equation seems questionable to you, I'm right there with you. This budget spends too much, taxes too much and borrows too much.

I think the American people are beginning to question everything they hear being done in the name of economic stimulus and recovery. They heard ''fiscally responsible'' during the campaign and assumed that meant we would be looking for savings from ineffective programs and keep income in families pockets where it's most needed. They are getting just the opposite.

My House Republican colleagues prefer a simpler strategy that has proven effective time and time again. First you want to leave the money in the hands of the families to decide how to spend their own money. We proposed lowering the lowest two tax brackets from 15 to 10 percent and 10 to 5 percent respectively.

We would like to create tax incentives for small businesses, the engines of our economy, to create these jobs. We believe it's important to eliminate taxes on unemployment insurance, which will help those who have lost their jobs stay afloat until they find a new job.

And I believe we should invest in our transportation, water, education, and infrastructure. As a fiscal conservative, I generally don't like deficit spending unless future generations will get to enjoy the benefit of the spending.

By leaving a lasting infrastructure in place, our children will be able to enjoy the benefits, even if they are asked to pay for some of the costs. While I am hopeful we can consider these commonsense solutions, the fact is Republicans are in the minority. We don't have the ability to stop these harmful policies from going forward, only President Obama, and Democrats and Congress can.

I urge the American people to ask President Obama and his Democratic colleagues to fulfill their campaign promises of fiscal responsibility and stop these tax increases and wasteful spending, and help restore our economy, which is still the strongest in the world.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CORRINE BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

OUTRAGED

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

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, I found it almost comical today, as I watched both on the floor and from my office, as one Member after the other has come to these podiums all across this Chamber, and they pounded on their desk, and they have screamed and they have all used the same word, ''outraged.''

They are outraged over the $165 million in bonuses that AIG has paid and the $90 million that AIG has paid to European banks and Wall Street investment firms. But I am outraged about something different. I am outraged that they are outraged, and the reason is because I am only one of 17 Members out of 435 Members who voted ''no'' on every single one of these so-called stimulus and bailout packages, for one reason: we didn't think it would work.

Mr. Speaker, as we were trying to raise our hands and just ask intelligent questions about them, we were finding that people were ignoring the rules and they were rushing them through, that there was a whole set of people out there screaming and yelling, if you just didn't pass this bill in this form, the sky was going to fall and the world was going to come to an end, and they pushed these bills through without legislative analysis. While we were trying to just tell people what was going on and simply ask the question nobody wanted to hear, they just wanted to pass the bills.

Mr. Speaker, I have a suggestion: just read the bills. If we had read those bills, we would know what most of the analysts are telling us now, and that is that it would take 100,000 to 250,000 government bureaucrats just to monitor where this money is going and how it's going to be spent.

And instead of coming to the podium and pounding it and saying how outraged they are, wouldn't it be novel if they came and just said ''we are wrong. We admit we are wrong. We are not going to make those mistakes again.''

But, Mr. Speaker, coming here and saying you are outraged is not some kind of get out of political hot water free card. In fact, it's like a sitcom. Imagine this situation: a husband goes out in this economic situation, buys an expensive new boat.

A few weeks later, the bill comes in the mail, and his wife opens it up. And she is steaming and seething and looking at how they are going to pay this payment.

And he walks in, and he looks at her, and she throws it across the table. And he picks up the bill, and he looks at it, realizes he can't make those payments, looks at her steaming and mad, and all of a sudden he pounds the table and he says, ''Honey, I am outraged over this bill that I am having to pay.'' And that's where Congress is finding itself today.

Mr. Speaker, we wouldn't run our businesses that way. Only the government and AIG run theirs that way. We have a lot of people calling our offices and saying ''What can I do?''

Well, here's what you can do. Go find out how people voted and then call them up and ask them why.

The second thing we can do is make sure we are going to stop this bailout madness and then simply do this. Before we take more options away from our children and grandchildren by mortgaging their future, let's simply ask these four questions: Where is the money actually going? How do we know it's going to get there? Will it work once it arrives? And how will we pay it back?

□ 1615

Mr. Speaker, I would submit that perhaps if we do that, next time there will be more than 17 of us justified and actually coming to the podium, beating on it, and saying we are outraged.

CAP-AND-TRADE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SCHAUER). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CAPITO. Thank you.

I rise today to talk about the President's program for cap-and-trade. I'd like to take just a few minutes to explain it a little bit and talk to people about what this is really going to mean to them.

I represent the State of West Virginia. But here in the United States, coal is our most abundant resource. We have recoverable reserves that are sufficient for at least 250 years. Coal currently fuels 50 percent of all the electricity generated in this country.

In my home State of West Virginia, 98 percent of our electricity comes from coal. Our State has abundant resources. We give, and we turn on the lights in America.

There's been a lot of discussion surrounding the future of coal in this global warming debate. The first thing we need to remember is that anything we do, whether or not it's climate change, is inextricably linked with energy policies that are going to cascade across the environmental, economic, and social issues of the day.

So cap-and-trade. It sounds nice. Cap emissions and then trade away. What does that really mean?

It means, basically, a tax increase on carbon dioxide emissions that will lead to a reduction in energy use. That sounds good. But it will also lead to an enormous erosion of America's family budget. This will tax every single American and tax those who are in most difficulty and who have most difficulty making ends meet.

The administration's budget calls for a 100 percent auction of allowances under a cap-and-trade system to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Sounds good, doesn't it?

The President's ''cap-and-tax'' proposal will impose mandates and further regulations on manufacturing and will dramatically increase the cost of energy and electricity. This proposal will create a great transfer of wealth between coal-dependent States like West Virginia and those that rely on alternative resources, with no change in the ultimate environmental outcome of the cap-and-trade policy and a huge estimated GDP loss.

I think there's one thing we know here in this time and right now is that a solid economy is the best way to innovate and create and solve problems that we need help with.

So you say, Where does the money come from? If you're going to trade and buy, where does the money come from? That money will come from the individual consumer because the manufacturers, the electricity producer, all the folks who are going to be trading allowances are going to have to find that money somewhere, and it's going to be tacked on as a form of an energy tax to every single American.

Under the Lieberman-Warner legislation of last year, the EPA estimated a rise in electricity costs between 44 and 79 percent. In West Virginia, the price of our electricity would go up between 103 and 135 percent. That is going to hurt folks on fixed incomes, our elderly, and it's going to hurt the poor the most, who cannot afford the huge chunk out of our budgets that energy takes right now.

The revenue returned to consumers from the President's budget, he says he's going to give money back to folks to help them meet this high cost. But that is not even close to covering the increase in household electricity costs.

When the President was a candidate, this is what he said, ''What I've said that if we would put a cap-and-trade system in place that is more—that is as aggressive if not more aggressive than anyone else's out there, so if somebody wants to build a coal-powered plant, they can, it's just that it will bankrupt them because they're going to be charged a huge sum for all that greenhouse gas that's being emitted.''

Remember, the State of West Virginia, 98 percent of our electricity is generated by coal.

Manufacturing output will fall considerably if the President's plan goes through. The whole idea is to tax the consumer, to bring down emissions, and no consideration has been made as to what this is going to do to the rank-and-file everyday citizen.

What is the job loss? In West Virginia, under Lieberman-Warner—and I realize that's not the President's bill. The President's bill is even broader reaching than this one. The estimation of the job loss is between 7,000 and 10,000 jobs between now and the year 2020.

Addressing climate change concerns is a global challenge requiring global solutions. We need common sense. We need to slow down here because unilateral action by this Congress and by the United States will have no impact, or very little impact on global emissions but will also have a great impact on our economy and on our citizens.

We need to innovate and use technology. We could use the development of advanced clean coal technologies; most importantly, CCS, or carbon capture and storage technologies.

We need technology to push as hard and fast as we can. I urge caution. We need to slow down. For the sake of my constituents and those in States like mine, we should not forget this as our debate moves forward.

KEEPING PROMISES MADE

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

Mr. GOHMERT. We've heard a lot about AIG and how they shouldn't have been getting those bonuses they got—$165 million—but let's take a real objective look here.

These executives took one of the biggest, most important companies in the world, in the country, and they ran it into the dirt. They bankrupted a lot of other companies. But they didn't have to go into bankruptcy because they convinced the government to come in with taxpayer dollars and give them $173 billion.

Now that's pretty extraordinary. They still have their jobs. Why wouldn't they get a bonus? Good night. You run a company into the dirt and then talk the government into giving you $173 billion in taxpayer dollars, that's deserving of something, and apparently somebody thought it was worth a bonus.

Well, the fact is they shouldn't have gotten bonuses. They should have been in receivership. But I keep looking for people to finally keep the promises that they have made.

We heard that we were going to get change that people could believe in. We saw with the bailout back in September what some of us knew was a horrible mistake, and we said it then.

Even though I am a Republican, I was looking forward to change from the deficit spending. Yet we have just gotten more and more and more of the same. When are we going to get change? Isn't it about time we quit the deficit spending? It would sure be nice.

We were told that there would be no more lobbyists in this administration. I liked the sound of that. It sounded good. Well, it turned out he meant no lobbyists except for the ones they actually hired to be part of the administration.

We were told there would be new ideas in this administration; we'd go in a new direction; we'd have change. But then we got a Secretary of the Treasury that is given credit for thinking of a lot of the plan that Paulson had, even though I still haven't been able to figure out what plan that was.

So we didn't get change. We're getting more of the same. More and more of the deficit spending. When are we going to get the change?

We have heard from the majority over and over again for the last 4 years that deficit spending is bad. I agreed with them my first 2 years here, 2005 and 2006. So when they took the majority, I thought, Well, the good news is they'll finally stop this ridiculous deficit spending. But they didn't. It got worse and worse and worse.

Then when they found that there was a President from the same party, instead of together, since they control the House, the Senate and the White House, to completely bring an end to deficit spending, it's just gotten worse and worse.

This madness has to stop. We are blessed right now with a President who's one of the most gifted communicators I have ever seen in my lifetime. But what we are finding is that true leadership is not going to be found between the lines in a Teleprompter. You can look at the Teleprompter, you can read from it, but that is not where leadership is.

I heard right here from that podium, Mr. Speaker, at the State of the Union last month these words: ''We're going to assure the continuity of a strong, viable institution that can serve our people and our economy,'' and President Obama said, ''I understand that on any given day, Wall Street may be more comforted by an approach that gives banks bailouts with no strings attached, and that holds nobody accountable for their reckless decision. But such an approach won't solve the problem.''

He went on to say, ''This time, CEOs won't be able to use taxpayer money to pad their paychecks or buy fancy drapes or disappear on a private jet. Those days are over.''

And then here we come the following month—there were no strings attached—to say, You know what? You ran this company in the ground. You don't get a bonus with taxpayer dollars.

I'm kind of outraged over that. Like my friend, Mr. FORBES, I'm kind of outraged that people are outraged they didn't stop this, when some of us—you go back to some of our comments on this very floor—we said, Read the bill. It's a problem.