far as energy independence has gone. Let me give you one example.

In 2008 at this time, in the United States proper we had 1,808 rigs drilling for crude oil and natural gas. A year later, we only have 1,128, so that means 680 rigs fewer now than we did a year ago producing oil and natural gas. What has happened? Well, things have only gotten worse.

We have, or this body passed, barely, legislation to punish energy consumption by the cap-and-tax bill, which means that if you use energy in this country, natural gas, electricity, you use gasoline, you're going to have to pay more down the road. Hopefully, the Senate will not pass this legislation.

And we have fewer rigs and we are not more independent. We're more dependent. And who are we dependent on? We're dependent on the countries who hate us, some countries in the Middle East, some countries that we know and we have heard that actually the money that we spend on crude oil that we send them finds its way to people who don't like America and funds their organizations.

Why do we continue to do that? Because we don't take care of ourselves. We hear about clean energy, and we all want to go to alternative energy, but we're not there yet, Mr. Speaker. We need to do the simple things. We need to use and drill for our own natural gas and our own crude oil, and we can do that in the United States, in ANWR. We can do that offshore, and that keeps the money in the United States. It produces jobs for Americans, and doesn't send those jobs overseas. It keeps our oil companies and our natural gas companies in the United States. It's a good thing for America.

But because of the fear lobby, we're afraid to drill for natural gas and crude oil. And that is a mistake, because it can be done safely, and it should be done safely. The places that we drill offshore, it's been proven that it can be done safely. And we should continue to do that. So, a year from now, hopefully we won't be in a worse situation, depending on foreign countries for our energy.

We should do the obvious. Take care of America. Drill safely, drill anywhere that we have natural gas or crude oil and help bring energy back home to America, furnish jobs, keep that money in the United States and quit sending it overseas to people who don't even like the United States.

And that's just the way it is.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 172. Concurrent resolution providing for a conditional adjournment of the House of Representatives and a conditional recess or adjournment of the Senate.

□ 1430

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

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

AMERICA'S FINANCIAL CRISIS

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, the financial crisis has resulted in the largest transfer of wealth in U.S. history, from Main Street citizens to Wall Street titans, and Wall Street insiders made huge profits off the Ponzi scheme they set up that led to the real estate bust and to our economic demise.

As the rest of America tries to dig itself out from the rubble left in their wake, The New York Times reports today that the nine biggest banks paid $32 billion in bonuses to their employees of the $165 billion they got from us, the taxpayers; 4,793 bankers and traders got a minimum of an additional $1 million each. The average dealer at Goldman Sachs will earn $750,000 extra. Meanwhile, Wall Street is dumping their bad loans on us, through the government, while dragging their feet on the mortgage workouts.

Bear in mind, some people in this Congress and in the Obama administration decided to pay servicers to do mortgage workouts because they weren't doing them themselves. So, rather than holding them accountable and rather than this Congress' holding them accountable, the administration is paying them, and they're still not doing it.

Look at the rogues gallery. Bank of America got $45 billion in TARP funds while pulling in $2.7 billion in profits last quarter. They're going to pay $3.3 billion in bonuses. Wells Fargo got $25 billion in TARP funds and turned a $2.6 billion profit, and they will pay $980 million in bonuses. J.P. Morgan is one of the worst. They got $25 billion in TARP funds, and wracked up $2.7 billion in profits last quarter, and they will pay $8.9 billion in bonuses.

I am introducing legislation today to place a full excise tax on all of those Wall Street bonuses, to recoup the taxpayers' money and to direct it be used to do real mortgage workouts across this country on behalf of the American people to get our local real estate markets working again from coast to coast.

You know, Wall Street gorges itself on profits while unemployment is rising across our country, while foreclosures are rising and while pink slips are rising.

Look at JPMorgan. Within one week—and this happened in Ohio—on a Friday, they invited borrowers to attend a workshop for workouts. One little problem: Nobody from JPMorgan showed up until our office had to do their work and call their staff and get them there hours late. Only five of the original 20 borrowers who showed up to the meeting were left because they'd all taken off work, and they'd been able to get sick time to go to the meeting. Then we invited JPMorgan to a workout, and they said they'd send three staff. They didn't. The event went on with one staff member, and people left frustrated.

This is what is going on across our country, so the Obama administration called the 25 servicers up to Washington this week, and tried to talk sweet talk to them. The New York Times said it right yesterday. Here is what they said:

Why aren't these companies cooperating? We're enriching them, but beyond that, "Even when borrowers stop paying, mortgage companies that service the loans collect fees out of the proceeds when homes are ultimately sold in foreclosure. So the longer borrowers remain delinquent, the greater the opportunities for these mortgage companies to extract revenue—fees for insurance, appraisals, title searches, and legal services."

A Florida lawyer who defends homeowners against foreclosure, Margery Golant, says, "It frustrates me when I see the government looking to the servicer for the solution, because it will never ever happen."

The tax laws favor them. So, despite the Federal Government's chickenhearted efforts, the servicers will have none of it because they can make more money with all of these bonuses and in letting people lose their homes.

Look in your neighborhood. How many more foreclosure signs do you see there? When America went to war in the early 20th century, each citizen sacrificed for the Nation. Now it's all about the big shots. It's all about their bonuses and their power.

Has greed really become the top American value? Foreclosures are rising. Unemployment is rising. Ninety percent of the people in our country say the economy is not working for them, and Wall Street banks just can't seem to help themselves. They're squeezing more profits off of our people's misery.

What is wrong with this Congress? What is wrong with the Obama administration? What was wrong with the Bush administration that preceded it? Somebody had better stand up for the interests of the Republic.

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

(Mr. JONES addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

CAN GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS STAY WITHIN BUDGET?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, today, the House rushed through a bill that provides an additional $2 billion for the so-called Cash for Clunkers program. Apparently, the lure of free money from Uncle Sam provoked such a tsunami of clunkers that the program is already broke.

Mr. Speaker, everyone loves ''free money.'' The bailed-out banks loved their $700 billion last fall. The bailed-out automakers loved their $86 billion. So it's not a surprise that the initial funding for Cash for Clunkers dried up in a matter of days.

So the question is: If the government so underestimated the cost of this program, and if the backlog of requests from dealers is already so huge, what does this tell us about these types of government programs—that maybe they don't always function as they were predicted to, and that sometimes they cost taxpayers much more than was estimated?

One large dealership group in Utah had this to say about the hoops they had to jump through to avoid the fines for noncompliance: The auto dealer said, ''Dealers are being asked to be compliant with several rules that are often confusing and unrealistic . . . it is apparent that those writing the rules don't understand how a car deal actually happens.''

This dealer went on to say that the government agency in charge of the Cash for Clunkers program has ''threatened large fines for noncompliance. We are a top-10 dealer group in the country, and have gone to great lengths to be compliant, but it is even confusing to us. It will be a nightmare for the many smaller dealerships around the country.''

So far, we've learned several things from this Cash for Clunkers program. Lesson 1: Businesses and consumers really love free money—except when they're the ones paying for someone else's free money. Lesson 2: The government is abysmal at predicting how much programs will cost. Lesson 3: Complying with Federal mandates is a nightmare.

Of course, we should not overlook the fact that there may very well be some unintended consequences of this program. For instance, The New York Times reported in April that France had a similar program from 1994 to 1996. Guess what? It worked. Well, kind of. There were lots of auto sales initially, but the program was followed by a severe drop in auto sales in 1997 and in 1998. Isn't that interesting? It turns out the program was simply shifting demand forward. What is keeping the U.S. Cash for Clunkers program from doing the same thing? Nothing.

Let's return to Lesson 2: Congress' inability to accurately estimate the cost or the effect of new government programs.

Based on research from Congress' Joint Economic Committee over the years, congressional estimates of the cost of health care programs have been extremely unreliable. For example, when Congress was considering Medicare part A, the hospital insurance component, Congress estimated it would cost $9 billion by 1990. The actual cost in 1990 was $67 billion, 7 times more than Congress estimated. The 1967 estimate for the entire Medicare program in 1990 was $12 billion. The actual cost? $111 billion. It was almost 10 times the original estimate.

Later, in 1987, Congress estimated that Medicaid's disproportionate share of hospital payments to States would cost less than $1 billion in 1992. Five years later, the results were in. It was $17 billion, which is an incomprehensible 17-fold increase over the estimate from just 5 years earlier. You get the idea.

Today's Cash for Clunkers example is just the latest in a long line of programs that turned out to be dramatically more expensive than anyone predicted, not to mention notoriously difficult to comply with or to figure out. Perhaps the most amazing part of this example is that it reminds me of the ongoing discussion over health care reform.

Here we've got a health system that is in need of reform, and some people are pushing a bill that amounts to a government takeover of health care. They like to call it a ''public option.'' The Congressional Budget Office already has said it would add $239 billion to the deficit over 10 years, but as we've just seen, government programs have a tendency to take on a life of their own and cost taxpayers way more than was originally estimated or envisioned.

While I'm willing to allow for some margin of error in estimated costs—they are estimates after all—what concerns me is that, today, we're starting out with estimates for huge deficits with this health care plan. At the same time, we're paying for it out of the pockets of America's job creators—small businesses.

If the current proposal becomes law, are we going to be coming back to these small businesses with another tax increase in 5 or 10 years? With our track record on programs like Cash for Clunkers, that wouldn't surprise me one bit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. GOHMERT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. MORAN of Kansas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. BACHMANN addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. PAUL addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

REFILE THE VOTER INTIMIDATION CASE AGAINST THE NEW BLACK PANTHER PARTY

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, earlier today, I sent a letter to Attorney General Eric Holder, which I submit for the RECORD, imploring him to refile the voter intimidation case against the New Black Panther Party that was inexplicably dismissed in May.

This case was brought in January by career attorneys in the department's Civil Rights Division against the party and several of its members for deploying uniformed men to a polling station in Philadelphia on election day last November to harass and intimidate voters—one of whom brandished a nightstick to the voters.

The public can view video of the incident as well as other examples of their intimidation in a January 2009 National Geographic Channel documentary that is posted on the Web at www.electionjournal.org.