The doctor said, Well, have you seen my patient?
No.
Are you a doctor?
No.
Are you a nurse?
No.
So you’re just a government bureaucrat, is that correct?
Well, I work for CMS.
He said, You’ve not seen my patient at all?
No.
But you have determined that this patient should not be in the hospital, and you want me to discharge her?
That’s correct.
He said, This patient is extremely ill; and if I discharge her, she is very likely to die. I’m not going to discharge her.
The government bureaucrat said, Doctor, you don’t understand. We’ve determined that if you don’t discharge this patient today, we’re going to fine you $5000 a day.
So the doctor went and talked to the patient’s family and the patient. What were they to do? Well, he discharged her. She died that night at home.
Mr. CASSIDY. Reclaiming my time just for a second, CMS is the agency that governs Medicaid and Medicare, the Federal program.
Mr. BROUN of Georgia. This was a Medicare bureaucrat.
That’s the kind of care that the Democratic plan is going to not only give us more of, but it’s going to take it down to lower age groups besides those 65 years of age and older. It’s government intrusion into the health care system that has run up the cost tremendously. CBO has already said that the Democratic plan is going to cost more money. It’s not going to bring the costs down.
Y’all were talking about the cost curve going up. What that means to the people who don’t understand, that means it’s going to be more costly for the health care system under the Democratic plan than what we have today.
Mr. CASSIDY. If I may reclaim my time, I think what’s evolved in what is called as a concierge practice or a patient-centered practice where the patient will prepay you, say, $50 a month; and if you don’t satisfy that patient, she goes to see another doctor. Do I recall that correctly?
Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Well, not exactly. In fact, I have discharged patients at the time I see them. I don’t have that concierge practice where I am prepaid. But actually, I charge less.
My practice was a full-time house call practice. I was not working in an office.
Mr. CASSIDY. If you would yield back, because I just want to mention that one thing. There are some physicians, a lot of them on the west coast, that one thing. There are some physicians that have a practice that is so patient-centered, it works beautifully. In that practice, the patient pays $50 to $100 a month and gets all the primary and preventive services cared for. If the patient doesn’t like it, they find another doctor the next month. It’s like Target or Wal-Mart. If my wife doesn’t like the sale at Target, she goes over to Wal-Mart; and if she doesn’t like the service at Wal-Mart, she will go back to Target. The fact is, is that the physician, knowing that those folks can go, is going to be more patient-sensitive.
Mr. BROUN of Georgia. And the Republican plan allows patients to do that, where the Democratic plan does not.
Mr. CASSIDY. Thank you all very much.

ENERGY IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Boccieri) is recognized for 60 minutes.
Mr. BOCCHIERI. Mr. Speaker, this snuck up on me with respect to the timing. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle finished much earlier; they didn’t have as much to say as we are tonight about clean energy.
I am joined by my colleague from New York, Congressman McMahen, and I will recognize him shortly to talk about one of the pillar issues, one of the seminal issues that we’re going to address in this Congress, in this body.
We’ve already taken action with respect to moving an energy policy forward that puts our country first. And truly, this is about making America stronger, making our country stronger by investing in America.

Now, I know some may think that that’s a novel idea, but this is not about Democrats or Republicans. This is not about their ideas versus our ideas. This is about Americans and American innovation, and it’s something that I feel so passionately about.

Today we’re going to talk about this essential bill that passed through the Congress here, through the House of Representatives. We’re going to talk about what has made this such an important issue in the coming weeks that we hope that the Senate will take action as soon as possible.

Before I get too deep into my long speech here, I would like to recognize the gentleman from New York to say a few opening remarks with respect to energy and what we have to offer here in the House of Representatives.
Mr. McMAHON.
Mr. McMAHON. Thank you, Congressman BOCCHIERI. And thank you for your leadership on this issue.
Mr. Chairman, Mr. BOCCHIERI, it is a privilege and an honor to stand here in the House of Representatives tonight and talk about this important issue. And I bring to it a perspective I think that is very important in this debate. You see, I come from New York City, and I grew up in New York, and I now have the privilege and honor of representing Staten Island and Brooklyn, New York, here in the House of Representatives.

For the last few weeks and months, I’ve been very disappointed at the rhetoric that I’ve heard in this Chamber, and beyond, from those on the Republican side of the aisle. They, quite frankly, have had their heads in the sand. They, quite frankly, have been tied up in the rhetoric of partisan politics. And I say that as a New Yorker, as someone who suffered and saw firsthand what happens when this country doesn’t deal methodically and honestly with energy policy.

You see, September 11, a date that we all know too, too well, in my opinion—and in the opinion of the people of New York and people around the world—occurred because our country has not dealt honestly and fairly with energy policy. Oh, I know it was the act of terror that brought down the Twin Towers, but we, as a country, have a responsibility to deal with energy policy in a way that makes sense for all Americans.

We can’t be dependent on foreign oil. We need to be dealing with the issues of climate change, and how that impacts the world, and how it impacts our own economy. We need to deal with the issue of competitiveness and jobs.

I also want to talk about the fact that America is a great country, and we’re not doing everything we can to let people compete in the world. I mean, I was thinking about this the other day, and I was having lunch with a friend of mine, and she was telling me about her decision to move from New York to Florida. And she said, Frankly, we’re never going to pay our bills, and it’s just easier to go somewhere else where the cost of living is lower. And it’s not like there’s not a market out there.

She went to Florida, and she said, Frankly, what’s holding us back is our inability to provide people with the resources to compete.

So as we think about energy policy here, I think there are a few things. One of the things that I think is important is that we end our dependence on foreign oil. We need to diversify our sources of energy, and that means everything from cleaner coal to nuclear power to alternative fuels—wind, water, solar. And we laced this into our bill.

Another thing I think is important is that we do something about jobs in America. Jobs and energy go hand in hand. We need to be creating good-paying jobs in America, and doing so in a way that’s environmentally sound. And we don’t do that by making it harder for businesses to compete in the world. We do that by doing something about energy policy.

Lastly, and perhaps most importantly, we need to do something about the cost of energy. Again, I talked about the fact that many of our young people have decided to move to places where the cost of living is lower. And it’s not like there’s not a market out there. And I think one of the things that we need to do is deal with the cost of energy. And that’s why I was so pleased when we were able to pass this bill yesterday, because it cuts the cost of energy and it deals with the issue of climate change, and it provides for research and development that’s going to help lower the cost of energy in the future.

So in conclusion, I want to thank you for your leadership on this issue, Mr. Chairman, Mr. BOCCHIERI, and I look forward to working with you on other issues as well.
up too long with an addiction to oil from the countries from which these men came.

Every time an American goes to the gas pump and puts gas into his or her car, they are sending money back to a Saudi prince—to General Motors or to someone who manufactured tires in China. And every time you go to the pump, you're sending money to Iran so Ahmadinejad can send that money to Hezbollah and roundabout to Hamas. We are paying for terrorists to attempt and be energized in a war against America and all the things we stand for.

So I know there can be honest debate on things that we disagree about. I know that we can stand on this side of the aisle and that side of the aisle and have a fair and honest debate about those things. But the things that I've heard over these last few weeks, the lies, the mistruths, the prevarications, are all too much for us to take.

Just the way that the Republicans have tried to scare the American people by saying that if we pass an energy security bill here in Washington it will mean an increase in home heating and energy prices of $1.10 a gallon. And when they did that, they cited a study from an MIT professor. Upon hearing that, immediately that professor said, That is not true, you are misquoting my study. I did not say that. That's not what the study says.

Weeks and months after that professor issued that disclaimer, we continue to hear from the other side of the aisle these very same pronouncements. They are, untruths, they are misstatements, and they are prevarications, and it's time for it to end. The American people deserve more. The security of our Nation deserves more. The people who lost their lives on 9/11, the families who suffered, the emergency volunteers, the service people—the security they deserve. They deserve better. They deserve an honest and upfront discussion about energy policy, what it means to our security, and that if we don't get it right now, then more lives could be lost in the future.

Mr. BOCCHIERI. I am so glad to be here with you to talk about these important issues. And I know that the people from Ohio to New York out to California will be united in knowing that America is a country—we sent a man to the Moon; we can deal with energy policy as well. And it's something that I look forward to working with you on.

Mr. BOCCHIERI. Well, I thank the gentleman from New York. And he is absolutely correct in his assessment of this. This is a matter of our national security.

The American Clean Energy and Security Act that was passed out of this Chamber is about our Nation's national security, moving away from our dependence on foreign oil and, more importantly, creating jobs right here in our country that can't be outsourced. When we build a brand new nuclear reactor, it cannot be outsourced. When we lay the foundation for new solar panels on tops of buildings or on tops of our cars, or even on the edges of our cars, recharging our batteries—there are jobs that can't be outsourced. The maintenance, the delivery, the processing that will go into these jobs are going to create jobs right here in America. And I am so proud that the edge of energy is American.

My predecessor, Congressman McGovern, started investment in these technologies in our district. And I am glad and proud to be following in his footsteps to make certain that these types of energy investments are and will be making our country stronger in the long run.

Let's revisit some of the things that we've talked about here, Congressman McAteer and Mr. Speaker, the fact that this is about our national security. First and foremost, this chart right here really is a tell-all with respect to our national energy crisis that we face. 66.4 percent of our oil comes from the OPEC-producing nations. That is way too high. It comes from the Middle East. And if we can put that synthetic fuel, that clean-burning fuel, that clean coal technology in our airplanes some day, we are going to be less dependent on our foreign sources of energy.

Now, one last point before I turn it over to my colleague for some remarks. 66.4 percent of the oil comes from overseas. Do you know how much comes from the Middle East, Congressman McAteer? Forty percent of our Nation's demand is filled by the Middle East, by OPEC-producing nations. That is way too much. We have two wars going on in the Middle East, we have countless numbers of our troops over there. And it is argued—and, I think, it was argued so many times on this floor—that our Nation's interaction overseas and in the Middle East is about our dependence on that natural resource. And it's time we put America first, we put American jobs first, and invest in our country and our people. I would much rather rely on the innovation in the Midwest than the oil in the Middle East. I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCAHON. Thank you, Congressman.

Congressman BOCCHIERI, I think you have really established and hit home about how this is about national security.

You know, there was a time in our Nation's great history—in fact, throughout most of its history—when we would talk about national security, both sides, Republicans and Democrats, would put down the partisan rhetoric, they would put away the myths and half truths and the prevarications and they would just talk to the facts, because what was at stake was not the
gain of one side or the other, it was about the very essence of our country, our security, and the safety of our young men and women in uniform, whether it is the uniform of our armed services or the uniform of our first responders back home at home.

Unfortunately, what we’ve seen throughout this debate from the Republican side is an onslaught, a deluge of untruths, of myths. I want to talk about a couple of those myths before I turn it back over to you. One is about the notion of the household energy audits.

I have stood on this floor and sat in this Chamber and heard our colleagues from the Republican side of the aisle say, if you pass this bill and if America deals honestly and forthrightly with its national security and energy policy, every homeowner in America is going to have to do an energy audit before they can sell their home. Well, you know, Congressman BOCCIERI, and I know that’s not anywhere in this bill. That language does not exist; it’s not in the bill, it was not in the bill that we passed. The Energy Security bill contains no provision requiring that buildings or homes undergo energy audits as part of an existing home’s energy efficiency.

The bill does create incentives for builders and homeowners to take steps to reduce the waste in their homes and in their new buildings, and that’s to everyone’s benefit. The homeowner would save money on their energy bills, and we, as a Nation, would use less energy and, therefore, put ourselves less at risk. And yet we hear over and over again about these imposed requirements on America’s homeowners. There is no Federal energy audit requirement. And it leaves the decision to the homeowners and the local governments to deal with that. The bill actually prohibits the EPA from regulating residential and commercial building in the Clean Air Act, and yet we hear the rhetoric over and over again.

But, you know, Congressman, in the debate there clearly have been, I believe, people from the other side of the aisle, Republicans, who have talked fairly and honestly about this issue, and I bet you would be able to tell us about some of them tonight.

Mr. BOCCIERI. Yes, I would, Congressman. And I thank you for those remarks.

This is about our national security. This is not something that Congressman BOCCIERI is saying, it’s not something the speaker is saying—because he’s been on this floor right with us before talking about our national security needs—it’s not something that Congressman McMahan is saying. This is something that the Department of Defense is saying and the CIA is saying.

The U.S. Department of Defense, in 2003, concluded that the risk of abrupt climate change should be elevated beyond a scientific debate to a U.S. national security concern. The economic disruptions associated with global climate change are projected by the CIA and other intelligence experts in the United States to place increased pressure on weak nations that may be unable to provide the basic needs and maintain order for their citizens.

So, you see, a component of this energy legislation is about moving away from our dependence on foreign oil, investing in clean energy and technology right here in our country, jobs that can’t be outsourced, producing jobs that can put America back to work. And another component of that is addressing the issue of climate change.

Now, cap-and-trade has gotten all the attention in this energy debate, and it shouldn’t get all the attention because it’s one segment of this bill that we’re working on. But even that, which I know that you have raised on the national security part of it, but even our security experts and our Nation’s military are saying it’s a matter of our national security. Let me give you some statistics here:

Today over 50 percent of the world’s oil reserves are in the hands of governments and their respective national oil companies. Sixteen of the world’s largest 20 oil companies are state owned, are owned by some state. And as you know, those oil companies, this is a matter of our national security, and we have to take action now, and we must move away from our dependence on foreign oil. 

Cap-and-trade and the climate change legislation and the energy security that we can derive from a substantive and robust energy policy in this country is a matter of our national security.

Now, that’s not something that Congressman McMahan is saying. That’s not something that the Speaker is saying, certainly Congressman Bucatinsky is saying. That’s something JOHN MCCAIN is saying, a proud American who put his life on the line for our country, who ran for President. He said that in cap-and-trade there will be incentives for people to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. It’s a free-market approach. Let me repeat that again, Congressman McMahan: it’s a free-market approach. The Europeans are doing it. We did it in the case of addressing acid rain.

In fact, we’ve had cap-and-trade policy that’s been enacted in the policy of the United States that we have found very big successes from. Look, if we do it, we’ll stimulate green technologies. This will be a profit-making business. And it won’t cost the American taxpayer. Let me repeat that again: it won’t cost the American taxpayer. This is something that we have got to enact now, Mr. Speaker. This is about our national security.

In fact, every Presidential candidate that ran this year, Democrats and Republicans alike, said it’s a matter of national security. Let me revisit a couple of what our friends have said.

Mr. Romney, an astute businessman, said that there are multiple reasons for us to say we want to be less dependent on foreign oil and develop our own sources. That’s the key, of course, additional sources of energy here as well as being a more efficient use of energy that will allow the less oil being drawn from the various sources it comes from without dropping prices too high a level, and it will keep people, some of whom are unsavory characters, from having an influence on our foreign policy. That was Mr. Romney.

Mr. Huckabee, he has another quote in addition to this one on our chart here. He said, A nation that can’t feed itself, a nation that can’t fuel itself, a nation that can’t produce the weapons to fight for itself is a nation forever enslaved. And with respect to a national energy policy, he said, It’s so critical that for our own interest economically and from a point of national security, we must not allow energy independence and we commit to doing that within a decade. We have to take responsibility in our own house before we can expect others to do the same in theirs.

It goes back to my basic concept of leadership. Leaders don’t ask others to do what they are unwilling to do themselves. Well, we are a leader here in the United States. We’re a leader. We sent a man to the Moon in just 10 years, and now you tell me that we can’t become energy independent. We can have an energy policy that invests in our people, creates jobs here, and moves away from our dependence on foreign oil because we believe in the innovation of America and we don’t believe that we need to be dependent on Mid East oil.

I yield to my gentleman friend.

Mr. McMahan. You’re so right, Congressman BOCCIERI.

Mr. Speaker, again, it’s just somehow so disappointing. It’s really is beyond words to think that the Republicans try to take an issue that is so important, not just to our economy, not just to our environment, not just to the future of the generations of people who want to live in America and share in the American Dream, but to national security, the lives of our children, the young people in uniform right now, those who have been lost and those who will continue to be at risk.

I want to talk about an important issue like this, and they come up with some quick catch phrases, you know, like the one that they like to use. You talked about cap-and-trade. They like to call it “cap-and-tax.” Why do they do that? There is no tax anywhere involved in this bill. The word “tax” is not involved. In fact, in order to tax someone from the national government perspective, you have to invoke the Internal Revenue Code. The Internal Revenue Code is never mentioned for this. Instead, this is a proven system, as you said, to bring free-market principles to the system of manufacturing that will allow
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for not only a cleaner environment but for a new birth, a new generation, of manufacturing jobs in this country.

We have lost our manufacturing base for a whole host of reasons. But here we are. As you said, when you build a nuclear power plant, you can’t let it sit somewhere and import it. It’s got to be done here. When you build a windmill farm, that has to be done here. And instead of addressing this very important issue, the other side comes up with catchy phrases, and certainly the one that’s going to cap-and-trade across America I think is very shame-

ful.

Let’s talk about cap-and-trade for a minute because some people will say, well, this is a new concept, Congressman BOCCIERI. And how can it be that we know whether or not this will work? Well, there are a couple of ways to know that. We have already done that in this country.

Many Americans, certainly in the Northeast, where I come from, remember the concept of acid rain caused by sulfur dioxide. And in the 1980s we realized that lakes and rivers were dying across this country because of sulfur dioxide. And we implemented in 1990 a cap-and-trade when it came to sulfur dioxide. And what does “cap-and-trade” mean? It simply means that you set a standard of how much pollution can be emitted in the country in a given year and that becomes your cap.

And for what we have done now for the greenhouse gases is the year 2005, and the same was done for sulfur dioxide. And then that allowance to be able to pollute is something that has value to it. You create value. And in the first go-around in the system that we’re implementing, or that we want to implement now, 75 percent of those allowances will be free. So there will be no immediate cost to anyone, no increase in prices.

But over time, by 2020, hopefully we will get to a point where we reduce our reliance on foreign oil, we cut down our emissions by 17 percent, and we move forward with a good national security energy policy. We did that with sulfur dioxide, and everyone thought it would take 20 years, but it took 6 years. In 6 years’ time, without any impact to our economy, we put an end to the over-pollution of sulfur dioxide.

Many plants put scrubbers on them, many smokestacks. And guess what? In the year 2009 those lakes in my home State of New York are alive again. The fish are no longer swimming on top of the water, dead from pollution. They’re alive again. And they are alive with wildlife and they are alive with a future that our country needs. It’s about our water resources. It’s about our environment. It’s about our jobs. It’s about our national security.

So you’re right, Congressman BOCCIERI, when you say it’s about national security. And you’ve got examples of people who put partisan politics aside. They did it when they were running for President. I only wish the Republicans in the House of Representa-
tives and in the Senate will put politics aside and put the interests of the American people first and get serious about an energy policy that deals with national security.

Mr. BOCCIERI. I couldn’t agree with the gentleman more that we have to get serious about our Nation’s energy supply.

And this is not about Democrats or Republicans; this is about making America stronger. And Democrats and Republicans alike in the last Presidential election said we need to create jobs here in America. We need to create jobs here. You know, 8,000 manufactur-
ated parts go into making one of those wind turbines. Can you imagine some day that Timken Roller Bearing in my district would be making the roller bearings that go into these wind turbines or SARE Plastics could make the moldings for these respective wind turbines or the fiberglass components that go into this? These are jobs that can be made and profit right here in America, that can’t be outsourced. And we will be killing two birds with one stone: creating jobs here in America, making us less dependent on energy from abroad.

We have to go back to just a few more of these gentlemen who ran for President last year. I just want to finish up with these two:

Rudy Giuliani, a good Italian, said, we need to expand the use of hybrid vehicles. We need to expand the use of hybrid vehicles, clean coal, carbon sequestration. We have more coal reserves in the United States than they have oil reserves in Saudi Arabia. This should be a major national project. This is a matter of our national security.

Rudy Giuliani got it right because you know what? If we put 27 percent of the vehicles in America, if just 27 percent of the vehicles on our roads in America were gas-electric hybrids, we could end our dependence on oil from the Middle East. We get 40 percent of our Nation’s demand for oil from the Middle East, from OPEC-producing nations, and if just 27 percent of the vehicles on the roads of America were gas and electric hybrids, we could end our dependence on oil from the Middle East. That is a vision that we should all embrace.

Let me talk to you about one of our colleagues here, Mr. PAUL. I spoke with him about 2 weeks ago. He’s one of our colleagues here in the House. He said, True conservatives and libertarians have no right to pollute their neighbor’s property. You have no right to pollute your neighbor’s air, water, or anything. And this would all contribute to the protection of all air and water.

Mr. PAUL is somewhat of a visionary because he believes that in America if we make the right investments, we cannot only protect our country, move away from our dependence on foreign oil, and invest in our people, our way of life, and, more importantly, create jobs here in our country.

I want to yield to my good friend from Virginia (Mr. PERRIELLO). Congressman PERRIELLO is joining us. Welcome.

Mr. PERRIELLO. I thank Mr. BOCCIERI for yielding.

As I said before, the people who have been against this bill, there are two things that bother me about them that I want to mention.

One is these people aren’t just climate skeptics; they’re America skeptics. I am sick and tired of hearing the word “can’t.” They are the same ones who said we couldn’t possibly take the lead out of gasoline. We couldn’t possibly solve the sulfur dioxide problem or clean up our water and streams. We couldn’t integrate our troops or go to war. They’re the ones who said we couldn’t possibly take the lead out of gasoline. We couldn’t possibly solve the sulfur dioxide problem or clean up our water and streams. We couldn’t integrate our troops or go to war.

And there is a second thing that bothers me about this bill in this body of Congress. I can’t find the word “can’t” out of your dictionary. That is not an American word. America is all about how are we going to solve the problem.

We know there is nothing we can’t do if we put our minds to it, put our innovative spirit to it. And we see that here. People keep saying on the other side of this debate, well, let’s just let China do it. That’s basically what they’re saying. We don’t want to go ahead of China. We would rather have China invent all the technologies so we buy it from them? I’m sick and tired of buying everything from China. I want us to be making it right here in America and exporting that technology back to them.

So these people aren’t climate skeptics; they are America skeptics. They have given up on the idea that America can do it better than other countries, but I don’t believe that. We are still more innovative than any other country. We are better capitalists than any other country. We are going to be the first to crack carbon capture and sequestration technology. We are going to be at the cutting edge again of wind and solar and biomass.

The farmers in my district want to be freedom fighters on the front lines in the struggle for energy independence that makes this country safe and makes it competitive again. That’s because we are better at this than anyone else. That word “can’t” that seems to echo across the other side of the aisle does not have any place in this bill because America is better than that.

And there is a second thing that bothers me about those who seem so angry about this bill in this body of ours, which is the intense partisanship of it. The worst kind of partisanship is when you think an idea is a good idea until the other side agrees with you bother me about them that I want to mention.
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And there is a second thing that bothers me about this bill in this body of Congress. I can’t find the word “can’t” out of your dictionary. That is not an American word. America is all about how are we going to solve the problem.
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The farmers in my district want to be freedom fighters on the front lines in the struggle for energy independence that makes this country safe and makes it competitive again. That’s because we are better at this than anyone else. That word “can’t” that seems to echo across the other side of the aisle does not have any place in this bill because America is better than that.
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we can use the power of the free market to solve these environmental threats.

Mr. TONKO. Welcome.

Mr. McCAIN and then Governor Palin both agreed that some form of cap-and-trade was a good idea. Former Senator from my State, John Warner, a great war hero, a great American, also saw the power of a tradable permit. This was fundamentally a Republican idea. And in our spirit of bipartisanship we say, we think this problem is so big, of energy dependence, it is threatening our security so much we will look anywhere. We don’t care if that idea comes from one side of the aisle or the other. We just want to solve the problem.

And as soon as we agreed and said, these are good ideas coming from the Republican side, all of a sudden, the only play they had in the playbook was to suddenly say “Oh, it must be bad idea because you agree with us. We can’t even do bipartisanship when you agree with one of our ideas. This is something that is upsetting the American people when the problems run this deep. Now that this country’s about. It’s about putting problem-solving ahead of partisanship.

So Mr. BOCCHIERI, thank you for doing this hour. It’s so important for our national security, for our national competitiveness, but also for the very culture, the very soul of this country. It is all about that infinite horizon of possibility that says there is nothing we cannot do as a Nation, particularly when we unleash the power of the free market and that call to serve the common good that has led generation after generation to leave this country stronger than they found it.

Mr. BOCCHIERI. I find you very inspirational, Congressman PERRIELLO. You’re exactly right. And it’s often been said that fear is not a tool of leadership; fear is a tool of the status quo. And that’s exactly what we see from the other side right now; injecting fear, talking about taxes. Listen folks, there are no taxes in this bill. Don’t believe me. Believe Senator McCAIN, who ran for President last year. Senator McCAIN said this is a free market approach and it won’t cost the American taxpayers. We know here in this body that the jobs of tomorrow won’t come on the sidelines. We must incubate them and grow them domestically so they can not be outsourced. That’s what this bill is about.

We’re joined by two of our other colleagues, distinguished colleagues, bright minds here, young bright minds. I should say here in the House of Representatives, Congressman KRATOVIL from Maryland, and our good friend from New York, Congressman TONKO. Why don’t we start with Congressman TONKO, welcome.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Representative BOCCHIERI. I listened intently to our colleague from Virginia, and when Representative PERRIELLO talked about the lack of response from the other side, the anger, perhaps, that is expressed, the politics of fear that are engaged, that those in and of themselves would be enough measure of concern. But the fact that that’s coupled with an agenda that is back-burnered over the last administration. Much of the progress, we’re reminded of a huge failure of the delivery system, the energy delivery system, in August of 2003. Here, 6 years later, we’re not responding as well as we should. This measure that’s back-burnered over the last administration. The investment, with an upgrading of the grid.

You know, it was brought to our attention in very painful and dark terms, where blackouts gripped not only the Northeast and the Midwest of the U.S., but Southeast Canada, where two nations suffered from failure in the grid system. We have opportunities to embrace technology, technological improvements, advancements in smart metering, in metering our assets in the grid, to respond to that sort of failure. That was back-burnered. So were the investments in updating our renewable opportunities, investing in renewables.

This measure will allow us to look seriously at the investments across the country. I’m also coupling that exercise with a bill that deals with wind turbine efficiency, where we’ll look at materials that will allow for greater response from Mother Nature, where we’re still able to take the elements of nature and make them work to our energy needs, all through American jobs, to produce America’s energy needs. That will enable us to take the advancements that we know are possible.

We look at situations like super-conductive cable, where, in my district, they are now breaking their own records, super power is, by developing even stronger opportunities for us to respond in the smartest ways in the delivery system, in a way that, again, takes advantage of the intellectual capacity of this Nation.

So this is about entering into a mix that already finds global competitors, but it advances an American agenda in a way that will place us in the role of leader. We cannot continue to sit by idly along the sidelines of this global green energy race and advance the notion that China will build all the solar systems, that we’re not able to take the same sort of renewable or advanced manufacturing processes.

We have opportunities here in this Nation to develop battery response through the stimulus package. I’ve seen what GE is working on, as it enters into this fray, to provide for an array of battery opportunities where it’s not just Lithium ion that we develop but perhaps look at sodium chloride mixed with nickel, where we can address not only energy generation needs for 24/7, but smart—most of the energy storage for intermittent situations, intermittent-type power, and where we can also use it for heavy fleets and lighter fleets for transportation-sector purposes.

There are lots of applications here. Just that GE battery application would find 300 to 400 jobs in my district that will enable us to provide the linchpin to open the limitless possibilities. You know, it’s that sort of fervor that we saw in the sixties, in the late fifties and sixties where, as a Nation, we went forward with the boldness of definition and the expression of vision where we could be better, where we could move into a space race. And we know that we invested, and we won for that investment. We need to do that here. And clean energy jobs for every State in this Nation is a great theme.

And politics of fear that respond to the efforts of progress that we have embraced just don’t have a place in this mix. It is unfair to the American public, as it looks not only for job creation, but for the establishment, for the igniting of an innovation economy.

And Representative BOCCHIERI, thank you for bringing us together so that people can share thoughts of what’s happening today and where we can expand and extrapolate upon that progress in untold terms.

Mr. BOCCHIERI. Well, Congressman TONKO, you’re so right. And I know you and Congressman KRATOVIL believe like I do and like Teddy Roosevelt said, that the worst that you can do in a moment of freedom is to have no energy policy that we have right now in the United States is failing us miserably because we have troops overseas right now that are putting their life on the line for a natural resource that we could become independent from if we just invest in our country and our people.

Mr. TONKO. One of the main reasons I ran for this role in Congress was to establish a comprehensive energy policy where we have the igniting of an innovation economy.

And Representative BOCCHIERI, thank you for bringing us together once again to talk about this. You know, you have mentioned a number of Presidential candidates in the last election that talked about the significance of cap-and-trade and talked about the significance of reducing our dependence on foreign oil. But I think, you know, it’s important that we give some sort of historical perspective to this debate.

You mentioned that what we are doing now is failing us. But it’s been...
falling for 40 years. We have been talking about reducing our dependence on foreign oil for the last 40 years. We've been talking about the significant impact this has on us in terms of our national security. We've been talking about the need to move towards new alternative fuels and reducing our dependence on foreign oil, and yet, we haven't done anything really substantial until now.

Every President since Richard Nixon has advocated the need for our energy independence. Nixon promised we could achieve it within 6 years. Gerald Ford said we can do it in 10 years. And Jimmy Carter pledged to wage the moral equivalent of war to achieve it.

And yet, once again, as years have gone by, we haven't had the political will to do what needed to be done to reduce our dependence on foreign oil. And getting back to some of the comments that Mr. PERRIELLO made about the political part of it, you know, the bottom line is we have to put politics aside and recognize that we are here for a reason. We are here to represent the best interests of the people of this country and not to represent necessarily simply our political parties. And you are right to say that. That's one of the ideas, cap-and-trade, came from the other side of the aisle. And yet, when we pushed that forward, we got very little support from the other side of the aisle.

Now, we did have some courageous Republicans in the House who voted with us. I think there were probably seven or eight who voted with us, but the bottom line is that we have been talking about this for years, and it was time that we did something about it, and I'm happy to be here with those of you who were willing to do what needed to be done to move us towards a better future for this country.

With that, I'll yield back.

Mr. BOCCIERI. Well, Congressman KRAVOTVL, I know you believe in America, that you believe in American innovation and that you believe an energy policy that creates jobs here in America, that moves us away from our dependence on foreign oil and that makes us energy independent within a number of years is the right energy policy and the right economic policy for our country, which is about investing in our people, investing in our ingenuity and in our innovation.

You know, the most that we have at stake in this is the fact that Congresswoman PERRIELLO, Congresswoman KRAVOTVL, Congressman TONKO, and Congresswoman MCAHON—we all have families, and you think about where our moms and dads have come from in terms of what they have seen and the changes they’ve seen. They’ve seen us put a man on the moon. We can do the same in 10 years. Our families have seen a lot, and we can produce the type of innovation with the right policy in this country that will move our nation forward.

I know, Congressman MCAHON, you believe in our nation’s national security. I’ll yield to you.

Mr. MCAHON. Thank you, Congressman BOCCIERI. I know we all do. We all, I think, take serious umbrage at the fact that the Republicans throw out these myths, these lies and these prevarications when it’s about national security. Let’s look at one.

I mentioned how they talked about what it would cost every homeowner, and they said it would be $3,100 a year. This was a study that was disproved. We mentioned that earlier. Yet the Congressional Budget Office, the independent authority that they rely on so often for their facts, at least whenever it favors their position, has said that our clean energy and national security bill, every homeowner in this country on average between now and 2020, will pay $175 extra because of this bill, not per year but over the whole course of the next 11 years.

In many places, like the Northeast, because of how we get our energy already and because of the infrastructure that has to be put in place, the cost will actually go down $5 a month by 2018. Think about that. Some of us will save money, at most $175. Those rates would go up anyway.

On the other side, when it’s about national security, when it’s about young men and women who are risking their lives in the uniforms of our country, they’re throwing out lies. You know, I just want to tell you one quick story about what happened to me today, and it really struck home. It’s about a visit I had in my office.

You know, for 50 years, Staten Island was the site of the municipal garbage dump for the City of New York. Congresswoman TONKO knows the story well because she was involved in environmental politics up in Albany when he was an assemblyman. It took us 50 years to get it closed, and it was 2,200 acres of the largest landfill in the history of the world. Today, because of this law that we passed in the House—and hopefully it will get passed in the Senate—a company came to see me because they want to put solar panels on that landfill.

Wouldn’t that be a great American story? It would be a great success story for Staten Island, for the people I represent on Staten Island, for the City of New York, and for our country that, in a short period of time, within 10 years, you could go from a disgusting landfill and environmental nightmare to a place that is generating energy through solar panels or windmills as our borough president has suggested. What a great thing. That’s America. That’s the America we grew up in. That’s the America we call home.

That’s the America you’ve spoken about. Congressman BOCCIERI, Congressman PERRIELLO, Congressman KRAVOTVL, and Congressman TONKO. That’s the America that we came to Washington to fight for. That’s the America that the Republicans have turned their backs on, and that’s the America that’s worth fighting for.

Mr. BOCCIERI. Well, you’re so right, Congressman MCAHON, you believe in the hope and promise of America, that with the right investment and with the right guidance with respect to public policy in this country, we can become energy independent and can create jobs here in America.

You know, the fear that the other side spews out to try to scare people away from supporting the public policy that, in its essence, was truly a Republican idea in the very beginning. We hear the facts about rates, and we talk about how this is going to, you know, charge up rates and about how these government inspectors are going to show up and check on your light bulbs in your hot tub. I mean, this is utterly ridiculous.

In many places, in the State of Ohio, we have a Public Utilities Commission. The electric industry and other industries in the State of Ohio are regulated industries. They can’t just arbitrarily walk in and raise rates.

In many states, the Public Utilities Commission, PUCO, is a function of State government, and we have empowered State governments in this legislation to make sure that these big utility companies are not going to run away as they transition to alternative forms of energy. So rates will be held in line. Despite what our colleagues on the other side will say, there are no taxes in this bill.

JOHN MCCAIN said it’s a free-market approach, and it won’t cost the American taxpayers. I believe JOHN MCCAIN was right. He introduced a cap-and-trade bill three times with Senator JOE LIEBERMAN. So this is about putting America first.

Mr. PERRIELLO. I know you have a few words.

Mr. PERRIELLO. Well, I just wanted to pick up on what Mr. MCAHON was talking about as far as turning trash into energy. We’re trying to do that in my district in southern Virginia. We’re even trying to turn waste into energy. And by that, I mean manure. We’ve got poultry waste. We’ve got cattle farmers ready to turn this into power. Talk about a country that was built on the idea of making lemonade out of lemons. With what some of our forefathers were handed, this is it. We’re literally making energy out of that.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture has estimated that by 2015 this will deliver over $1 billion to our farmers; and in the decades ahead, it could be up to $15 billion a year extra to our farmers. That’s because our farmers are the hardest working people in this country. They’re ready to be those freedom fighters.

There’s one other thing I wanted to mention. You talked about rates. Not only are there lies out there about what it’s going to do to rates and...
taxes, but the most important thing, I think, in this bill and the one thing I hear so much about, whether it’s from farmers or from business owners or just from people who are trying to keep the lights on in their own homes, is the crazy fluctuation in prices. You know, last year when the oil was $120 a barrel, you were at $3.70 a gallon last summer. Then you’re down to $2. Then you’re heading back up to $3 a gallon.

That fluctuation is driven, in part, by these speculators out there who are just speculation. We actually protected consumers in this bill. And we’ve got to take control in many ways when we’re dependent foreign oil. We should get angry. We should take control in many ways when we’re dependent on foreign oil. We should get even and do what we need to do as Americans to reduce our dependency on foreign oil.

And then a year later, people in this Chamber have apparently—on the other side of the aisle, apparently forgotten. Well, my answer to that is we should never forget that if we were paying $4 a gallon last year, we could be paying $4 a gallon tomorrow. That has not changed unless we take responsibility and do what we need to do in the next 4 years to reduce our dependency on foreign oil and reducing our dependence on foreign oil.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. That’s exactly the point, that if we do nothing—which is what our friends on the other side of the aisle want us to do is nothing. We know that over the last 8 years, $1,100 increase in energy costs. So keep doing that, you know what you’re going to get.

What we’re saying is we can’t afford to keep doing nothing. We have to do something. And what we’re doing is reducing our dependency. Give us control over what we’re doing. We have no control in many ways when we’re depending on sheiks in the Middle East. So, to your point, we’ve got to take control of this issue.

As Americans, we know that freedom isn’t free. Part of that means you step up to the duties of citizenship, that you go out there and that you read the bill. Look at it as an opportunity, as an invitation to be part of this great freedom struggle for our country. We can do this, and this is a great step in that direction.

With that, I yield back.

Mr. BOCCIERI. Well, I thank the Congressman for his passion.

Before we wrap this up this evening, we’ve got to hear from a young, bright mind from Ohio.

Congressman RYAN, thank you for joining us tonight. Give us some of your words.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Thank you, Mr. Bocciere.

I was reading an article—and I was telling the Congressman from Virginia this. This is an article in The New York Times today, because a lot of people in our districts are like, Well, you know, China is not going to abide by this, and India is not going to have to deal with this, and we’re out on our own here, and we’ve got to compete against these people.

There are actually provisions in the bill on steel and paper and some other things that do control imports coming from these other countries; but today in The New York Times, there was an article about this town in China where there was a big factory that was polluting the people who lived within the area. This is a real thing. The people were going to the hospital. They were sick. They were nauseous. It was a bad scene. It was because of the pollution that was coming out of this factory: 400,000 people a year die in China because of air pollution.

And at some point, based on China’s long history, these speculators among the people, the government squelches it and tries to fix the problem. So if you have 400,000 people a year dying in China, at some point those people are going to want clean air. At some point I say this. Let China sleep for a couple of years. Let us get ahead of the curve. Let us make these investments and then produce these products, and finally we can export products to China that they’re going to want because their people are demanding it.

So I wanted to come down and join this chorus because I think this is an opportunity for places like Youngstown, Canton, Ohio; northeast Ohio, where we have a manufacturing base in Virginia or New York or wherever the case may be to finally export things. Eight thousand component parts to a windmill, four hundred tons of steel. Solar panels have all of these complex components. We can do this. This is opportunity. Let’s see it like it is.

And I tell folks back in our district, we have a Lordstown plant, a Lordstown plant, that is going to make this new car, Chevy Cruze. Why are they putting it at Lordstown? Why are they building the Chevy Cruze? Forty miles to the gallon. That’s why. That’s a green car.

Let’s read the tea leaves here. This is where the country is going. This is where we need to be. We can finally be at a point, Mr. Bocciere, where we export products to China and we make money and create jobs here. That’s what this is about. And we can talk about clean air and climate change, and I believe in all of that and I think it’s great, but the bottom line is this means jobs for northeast Ohio.

And I think the more we talk about that, the more we recognize that, the more we plug our businesses in. Mr. Bocciere got a $30 billion amendment in to help the auto industry convert over to alternative energy. Those are the things we need to do, and those are the things we’re going to do.

So I yield back, but I think this is opportunity, and if we see it as opportunity, it will work for us.

Mr. BOCCIERI. Thank you, Congressman RYAN. You’re exactly right that the pillars of this legislation are about creating jobs in America, moving away from our dependence on foreign oil, and making our Nation more secure. National security is a big issue.

Mr. KRATOVIL. You’re absolutely right. There was a lot of talk in the bill about climate change, and that was certainly a significant part of it. But the bottom line is, what was most important to me in terms of voting for this is exactly what you said, national security and creating American jobs. And the energy bill clearly presents an incredible opportunity to spur innovation and create new jobs in this country, and that was one of the big reasons that I supported it.

Also, I want to go back to something Mr. PERRIELLO said about the fluctuation in prices. Again, the irony in this country is that oftentimes we are faced with a crisis and we deal with the crisis, but what we never deal with is the underlying issue that causes the crisis.

And you were talking about the gas prices. A year ago, when the gas prices were $4 a gallon, the entire population in America was saying, My gosh. What is going on? What are we going to do about this? It’s outrageous that we’re paying $4 a gallon. It’s outrageous that we’re sending money overseas to the people that seek to destroy us. What are we going to do about it?

And then a year later, people in this Chamber have apparently—on the other side of the aisle, apparently forgotten.
and take it under the umbrella of the United States of America and stop all of these problems. You're exactly right. If gas is $4 a gallon this summer, we would be getting calls from our constituents, What are you doing? And you know they're right. Now for the-fashioned, it probably would be. So next year, there will be $4-a-gallon gas, and hopefully we're moving along to fix this problem.

Mr. BOCCIERI. Mr. Tonko, why don't you take a minute and wrap it up.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you for bringing us together, and it’s great to develop this colloquy with our colleagues here in the House, but I can’t help but wonder which of us would have the opportunity to serve in this House if we pledged at election time to make certain that we develop jobs in competing nations for developing green energy innovation? Which of us would serve here? And at the end of the day, if we pledged to send dollars to some of the most troubled spots in the world that find us defending freedom-loving nations against some of these forces around the globe? We would be rejected resource electorates.

Well, that’s what’s happening here. The agents of status quo are content to continue this effort to have other nations build the renewable resources out there. They would be content to have the American public send tons of their hard-earned dollars into the economies of the Mideast on which we rely for well over 60 percent of our oil supply. That is unacceptable.

And can we do it cleaner, we can do it greener, we can do it through American resources that develop American jobs to respond to the energy crises around the world. We can become that go-to Nation that will be the exporter of energy, intellelctual, worry-free here if we pledged to send dollars to some of the most troubled spots in the world that find us defending freedom-loving nations against some of these forces around the globe? We would be rejected resource electorates.

We need to win this race. We don't have a choice to enter in. I think that choice has been made because there is a consensus in the country that's being developed with other nations out there. We need to go forward with an aggressive investment.

The investment here is to combat a huge deficit that was inherited by this administration, by the Obama administration. It was driven high and it started with a surplus. They spent away that surplus. They drove us into a deficit situation, and now it is necessary for us to invest in an innovation economy that creates jobs.

Mr. BOCCIERI. I thank the gentlemen for joining us tonight. This has been a very intriguing dialogue, and I hope we garner a deeper appreciation for why we need to be energy independent. You all have the right vision. Now we have to find the courage in the Senate. We have to find 60 patriots in the Senate who will stand up and put America first and suggest that this is about producing and creating jobs here in our country, protecting our national security, and moving away from our dependence on foreign oil.

So with that, I will yield to my good friend from New York as we wrap it up. Mr. McMATHON. Thank you for convening the Freshmen Power Hour, and thank you also for having such a special guest in Congressman Ryan granting us with his presence here, with his maturity and wisdom from so many years here in Congress. You guys have said it all here tonight. This is, quite frankly, a no-brainer. Cap-and-trade was a Republican idea. It makes sense. It's market principles, it brings national security. It’s about jobs, manufacturing good jobs for electricians and carpenters and plumbers and steamfitters and engineers and scientists. It is about our environment, too.

You know, Congressman Ryan, when you were talking about the people in China saying, Hey, we want clean air, in Staten Island in New York, we have the highest lung cancer rates in America. The people of Staten Island and Brooklyn and New York City, we want clean air, too. So it’s about the environment as well.

But this is a bill that allows us to do all of those things in a uniquely American way, the right way. I’m glad we voted for it in the House. I’m disappointed as those times that they keep lying about it, but I hope, as you said, 60 patriots in the Senate will find a way to get this done and we'll send this bill to the President’s desk and get it signed.

Mr. BOCCIERI. Mr. Speaker, let’s get this done for America.

We yield back.

CULTIVATING AMERICAN ENERGY RESOURCES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MINNICK). Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do appreciate the time.

As frustrating as these times are, and as difficult as these times are for America, it never ceases to be an honor to serve in this body and to be serving, in my case, the constituents of east Texas. It does mean so much, and the more that you know about history and where we’ve come from—

Ms. FOXX. Would my colleague from Texas yield for a moment?

Mr. GOHMERT. Yes, I will yield.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state her parliamentary inquiry.

Ms. FOXX. One of the gentlemen just speaking in the Special Order said, “Republicans keep lying about it.” I think there were some concerns about the use of that phrase, and I would like to ask the Speaker if that is an acceptable phrase to be used on the floor when speaking about other Members.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded not to engage in personal attacks.

Ms. FOXX. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Unfortunately, the folks who said it are not here to hear you say that. But thank you very much.

Mr. GOHMERT. I appreciate the gentleman from North Carolina pointing that out. I was in the back, jotting down a few notes. But I have had some concerns about some of the things that I had heard. For example, it is inappropriate under the House rules for someone in this body to call another person in this body a liar. That violates the House rules clearly. It’s inappropriate to call names in here and engage in personality destruction. That’s not appropriate. I’ve had constituents wonder why those of us on the floor don’t call each other names, like Gordon Brown and Tony Blair in Parliament. I have explained to them, Well, we have rules in the House. We don’t do that. It’s entirely inappropriate, and you can be censured.

You can be censured for inappropriate conduct here on the floor and name calling. Engaging, trying, as the Speaker said, in attacks on personality.

But there was a comment I did hear in the discussion amongst my colleagues across the aisle about energy; and as I noted when I brought down the comment was, “If we do nothing like those on the other side say,” and I attribute no ill motive or intent to that comment. But the trouble is, that is not accurate; and obviously, it indicates just a ignorance with regard to what has been proposed on this side.

For example, in the area of energy, we have proposed bill after bill that would provide this country more energy. For example, 80 percent or so of our oil is off-shore drilling off that coast. You can drill off the coast of Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi. There are some areas where drilling is going on. But we have found in Texas that despite all the naysayers who have said it would kill off fishing, when I was growing up in Texas, they allowed platforms off the coast. We ended up having platforms off the coast of Texas, drilling for oil and gas. Lo and behold, guess what happened—fish proliferated out there. They used the platforms as artificial reefs. So now fishing in the Gulf with a guide, they’re likely to take you to an oil and gas platform because the fishing abounds around there. Lo and behold, man and environment can work together for the good of both. Not only would we produce great amounts of energy and avoid this country going back to $4 a gallon gasoline, which we are going to go to because of the policies of the current administration and the current Speaker, who said that we cannot do to them, they are constantly putting more and more of our natural energy resources off-limits, just constantly.