

If we emphasize and create an environment that empowers small business and empowers Americans and we focus on job creation, we stop the attack on the West and other areas of public lands and the people who live there and allow them to develop the resources that we have been given to create real jobs in this country, we can do that. That is still an option that we have. But we have to do it, and we have to do it together.

There are a lot of other examples that I would like to go into, Mr. Speaker, but time does not allow that—maybe at some other time—where decisions by this administration have actually harmed families and their creation of jobs. Once again, we have to change directions. That has to stop.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

COMMUNICATION FROM OFFICE OF ATTENDING PHYSICIAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Justin Cox, Physician, Office of Attending Physician:

OFFICE OF ATTENDING PHYSICIAN,
U.S. CAPITOL,
Washington, DC, July 21, 2009.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a subpoena for trial testimony issued by the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia in connection with a criminal case now pending in that court.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and rights of the House.

Sincerely,

JUSTIN COX,
Physician.

ENERGY INDEPENDENCE IS A MATTER OF NATIONAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAFFEI). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCMAHON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MCMAHON. Mr. Speaker, it's my privilege and honor to stand here in the House of Representatives, representing the people of the great boroughs of Staten Island and Brooklyn in New York for the Freshmen Energy Hour. I am privileged to be joined by my colleague, as I come from Hudson Valley in New York, my colleague from the Ohio Valley, the great JOHN BOCCIERI, the gentleman from Ohio, who will join me in this Freshman Energy Hour.

Mr. Speaker, we're here today to talk about the American Clean Energy and Security Act, which was passed recently by the House, and to speak to its merits in order to urge the Senate to pass it as well. I sat here and lis-

tened to our great colleagues from across the aisle for some time this evening speaking on this issue. They conclude that they hope that the Senate looks upon this bill unfavorably as they criticize the initiatives of this bill.

I know that my colleague will mention it, but I would just like to remind them what their former candidate for President in last year's election, Senator JOHN MCCAIN, said about the cap-and-trade legislation as recently as February 17, 2009. He said: It's cap-and-trade, that there will be incentives for people to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. It's a free-market approach. The Europeans are using it now. We did it in the case of addressing acid rain—look, if we do that, we stimulate green technologies. I have great faith in the American industry. This will be a profit-making business, create jobs. It won't cost the American taxpayer a thing.

So I am pleased that those who spoke before me from across the aisle in opposition to this bill referenced the opinion of the United States Senate. And I am glad that Senator MCCAIN was honest and forthright enough to admit that this legislation does, indeed, create jobs, provides for the security of our Nation, and takes care of the environment as well, and, indeed, it is important for us for our future.

As we know, the recently passed Energy and Security legislation comes at a time when inaction will have undue consequences. This comprehensive energy and clean environment bill is a necessary vehicle to ensure our future economic and environmental viability in the 21st century green economy.

I would like to start out by commending the leadership of the House who brought forward this bill and saw that it was passed. The regional differences arising from energy-based issues are often quite lofty, but the leadership did an outstanding job of moving through the legislative process with consideration for different Members' interests.

Since the bill's passage before the Independence Day recess, many Members, myself included, have experienced varying degrees of concern from our constituents, particularly regarding the cost and impact of the bill to their wallets, and quite a lot of this concern has been raised because of misrepresentations from our gentle colleagues from the other side of the aisle as to the aspects of this bill. Together with Mr. BOCCIERI, I would like to address some of these concerns and the pervasive misinformation that has been put out there today and explain how this information will be a cost-saver for consumers and homeowners, will cut down on pollution, and will increase our national security.

At a time when we are importing increasing amounts of energy from hostile regions of the world, we cannot afford to go down the path of energy insecurity. This legislation will redirect

us on a path towards energy independence.

Mr. Speaker, you know, I sat here and listened to our colleagues from across the aisle this evening and all day long, hundreds of minutes, I understand, that they spoke about this issue and the creation of jobs in this country. What I found very disconcerting as a New Yorker is that they've totally forgotten the issue of national security and how important energy independence is to this Nation. It's so important to me, Mr. Speaker, because I come from Staten Island and Brooklyn, New York, where, on 9/11, over 10 percent of the people who were killed in the attack on the World Trade Center came from our boroughs, although we have less than 5 percent of the population in that area.

I remember that day as clear as any other in my life—in fact, more profoundly. It was a bright, sunny day. And I remember it because I was involved in my first election campaign that day. It was a primary for the New York City Council. We were in church at about 9 a.m., as we do on every Election Day after opening the polls and campaigning a bit. The police officer who I was with received an emergency call and took us out and said that something terrible had happened and we have to go down to the harbor.

When we got down there, we saw the World Trade Center aflame, and the second plane had just struck. We went back to our office to close down the election, and as we were there, we saw the horrors of what transpired on television as the buildings collapsed. I will never forget it. I will never forget being on the pile the days after and the bucket brigade. I will never forget seeing President Bush say to our Nation and to those who lost their loved ones that we will never forget.

After we closed down the election, we weren't sure what to do that day, so we went to the local hospital and set up a blood bank to await the injured people to come back from the site. But as hour and hour went on, we realized that no one was coming back and the enormity of the tragedy. I mention this because I think it's so important that our Nation does not forget the costs of dependence upon nations around this world for oil who want to see our great American democracy torn down. Our way of life is an affront to them, and they will do anything to tear down America.

So when you have this discussion about energy and whatever they want to call it, let us never forget that this is about energy security first and foremost. America cannot go on the way it has, relying on foreign oil from countries who want to tear our country down. Even though we made a pledge at that time to end dependence on foreign oil, the chart that I have here will show that just in the last year, in 2008, the amount of oil that we imported from foreign countries was 66.4 percent of our usage. The dollars we spent overseas, \$475 billion. How many of those

dollars go to al Qaeda? How many of those dollars go to terrorists who want to bring destruction and terror to our country and to our allies' countries around this world?

How dare anyone stand on the floor of this House of Representatives, this noble and esteemed body, and not talk about this anytime they talk about energy, anytime they talk about this bill. I consider it an affront when people misrepresent the facts of this bill for their own political reasons and not to bring the true facts to the American people.

Look again at the ways, since the time that the attack occurred, the way that our dependence on foreign oil, our imports have gone up so dramatically. We have, indeed, forgotten. We have forgotten those who we lost that day. We've forgotten our pledge to have security, to have energy independence, and it is something that this bill will seek to do.

At this time, I would like to ask my colleague, Mr. BOCCIERI, to share with us some of his thoughts from the perspective of the people of the great State of Ohio.

Mr. BOCCIERI. Well, I thank the gentleman from New York and his insight and accuracy with respect to this issue and the importance that it has for our Nation. Now, I must give you this prelude.

I approach this legislation from a very deep perspective that I've had throughout my life. For the last 15 years, I have served in the United States Air Force as a C-130 pilot, and I have to tell you that there is no matter before this Congress more important than the steps we are taking to create a situation by which our Nation can become energy independent.

I must tell you that I hail from the Midwest, and I know my friend hails from New York, but I have to tell you that this bill and this legislation coming before the Congress is about Midwest innovation and breaking our reliance on Mideast oil. The pillars of this legislation are creating jobs, thousands of jobs in our country and hundreds of thousands of jobs alone in my district in Ohio, the 16th Congressional District.

The pillar of this legislation is about national security, about moving away from our dependence on foreign oil. Those two noble causes right now are a track worth defending right now. I stand here with my colleagues today to tell you that we must do something. We will be judged by two measures, Mr. Speaker, two measures: by action or inaction.

I remember in the 1970s when I stood with my father in line to wait so that we could fill up for a tank of gas. Back then, back then we had a Democrat-controlled Congress. We had a Democrat President, but we didn't have the political will to make this happen. This Congress and this President are saying, No more. No more to outsourcing our dependence to foreign petro-dictators,

if you will, that don't have the interests of the United States at stake.

My colleague talked about some of those, and let me just put this down to you right now. In 2003, a U.S. Department of Defense study concluded that the risk of abrupt climate change should be elevated beyond a scientific debate to a U.S. national security concern. We talked about how much oil we've used from overseas. We imported over 66 percent just last year, accounting for nearly 16 percent of all import spending.

My friends, we must do something. Now, this is not just John Bocciari saying this on the floor of the House of Representatives. This is not my friend Mike McMahon from New York saying this or my friend Frank Kratovil from Maryland suggesting this. Every Presidential candidate running for the highest office in our country last year said that this is a matter of national security.

You heard the words of my friend from New York when he talked about Senator John McCain, who I have great respect for, a man who I flew out of Baghdad while he was visiting our troops, a man who put his life on the line for the country. I want the American people and our colleagues here tonight to listen to this. It's about cap-and-trade.

There will be incentives for people to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. It's a free-market approach. Let me repeat that. It is a free-market approach. The Europeans are doing it. We did it in the case of addressing acid rain. We're doing a cap-and-trade program right now in the United States here that's been in existence for 19 years. Look, if we do that, we will stimulate green technologies. This will be a profit-making business. It won't cost the American taxpayer. Let me repeat that again. John McCain said that it's a free-market approach and it won't cost the American taxpayer.

Joe Lieberman and I introduced a cap-and-trade proposal 7 years ago which would reduce greenhouse gases with a gradual reduction. We did the same thing with acid rain. This works. It works. My friends, this is about our national security. John McCain and every other Presidential candidate running for office last year said that it's a matter of national security.

□ 2115

The Department of Defense is saying it's a matter of national security. But all of a sudden, our friends here that we have this debate with are running away from national security. For what, I have no idea.

But I'll tell you this much. This is our opportunity to put America on a track where we can create jobs in the heartland and in the cities of great New York and in the suburbs of Maryland. We can create jobs and we can protect our national security.

After having fought—one last point, Mr. MCMAHON. After having served

overseas flying wounded and fallen soldiers out of Baghdad, it is very clear that our presence in the Middle East is about that 66 percent that Congressman MCMAHON talked about, because 40 percent of that 66 percent that has come from overseas comes from the Middle East. And this is the time that we have to act.

Mr. MCMAHON. Thank you, Congressman BOCCIERI for that passionate insight on this issue. And as you point out, I talked about the horrors of our energy dependence on the Middle Eastern countries here on foreign soil, on our domestic soil and through terrorism.

But certainly, we thank you for your service to our country. And also it's quite clear that the men and women who are wearing our uniforms right now fighting in Iraq and Afghanistan are doing so, so much so because we can't get off our addiction to that foreign oil, particularly from the Middle East, and that's what this bill is about.

We'd like to hear from our equally great colleague from the great State of Maryland, FRANK KRATOVIL.

Mr. KRATOVIL. Let me thank the gentleman from New York for, first of all, leading us in this discussion this evening on such an important topic and, of course, my friend and colleague from Ohio, Mr. BOCCIERI, for passion.

I want to follow up on just a couple of things that you had mentioned, Mr. BOCCIERI, talking about this issue from a historical perspective. You know, so many times in this country we talk about for years and years the things we need to do, and yet when push comes to shove, we don't always have the political courage to do what needs to be done. You were speaking about discussions you had with your father.

You know, every U.S. President since Richard Nixon has advocated the need for energy independence. In 1974, Nixon promised it could be achieved within 6 years. Gerald Ford promised it could be done in 10 years. And Jimmy Carter pledged to wage the moral equivalent of war to achieve it. And yet, here we are, in 2009, and for the first time really we have made steps, really aggressive proactive steps in reducing our dependence on foreign oil.

I want to read you something that President Nixon said at the State of the Union address in 1973. Looking at the year 1974, which lies before us, there are 10 key areas in which landmark accomplishments are possible this year in America. If we make these our national agenda, this is what we will achieve in 1974. We will break the back of the energy crisis. We will lay the foundation for our future capacity to meet America's energy needs from America's own resources. That was Nixon in 1973.

Gerald Ford, in 1975, said, I am proposing a program which will begin to restore our country's surplus capacity in total energy. In this way we will be able to assure ourselves reliable and adequate energy and help foster a new

world energy stability for other major consuming nations. We must develop our energy technology and resources so that the United States has the ability to supply a significant share of the energy needs of the Free World by the end of this century. President Ford, in 1975.

So, looking at it from a historical perspective, we have talked about this for years and years because Presidents in the past have recognized, and Congresses in the past have recognized, that it is essential for our own national security that we reduce our dependence on foreign oil.

In 1970, our oil imports have grown from nearly 24 percent in 1970, to nearly 70 percent of our total consumption now. Last year alone, the United States spent \$475 billion on foreign oil.

Needless to say, as Mr. BOCCIERI mentioned, and as you mentioned, much of this funding benefits nations that support terrorism or, at the very least, anti-American political extremism. How long should we continue to provide dollars to nations that seek to destroy us?

And so, although this bill focused also on the issue of climate change, for me, and I'm sure for many other Members, this issue had more to do with, from my standpoint, an issue of national security, reducing our dependence on foreign oil and doing what we should have been doing back in the 1970s and moving our country forward.

Now, let me say something about our colleagues on the other side of the aisle. Objections have been raised with a number of bills that have come before this Congress, and arguments that we are moving too quickly. Some of those arguments I've agreed with. But the key in moving this Nation forward is not simply to have people that stand in the way of making progress. Regardless of arguments that they make, if we were to give as much time as our opponents on the other side of the aisle would allow, many of them would still object to moving this country forward.

So we need to find a reasonable balance between some of the objections that are made in terms of process and yet, at the same time, make sure that we are not simply standing in the way of progress simply as a result of being in opposition for whatever we do to move this country forward.

And with that, I'll yield back to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MCMAHON. Thank you, Congressman KRATOVIL. And those are points extremely well taken. And you can only wonder whether President Nixon and President Ford would be very disappointed, having understood how important this issue is to our national security to have the other side of the aisle, as you say, really giving out such misinformation about the effects and particulars of this bill to really scare the American Nation. And I can tolerate that when it's issues of a more domestic nature and whether, you know, we should, when it comes to

different types of issues that we vote on on resolutions before the House or domestic issues.

But when you talk about national security, it really borders on unpatriotic, in my mind, to use misinformation to scare the American people at a time when we can really get ourselves off foreign oil.

You know, how many times have we heard about the study from the MIT economist that, according to the other side of the aisle, will cost every American family \$3,100 under this bill? That very economist has come out in public and said that it is untrue, that they are misrepresenting the conclusions of his report.

And everyone from the CBO to everyone else down has pointed out that when you take in all the different ramifications of the bill in consideration, that at worst, in the year 2017, I believe it is, that the average American family, at most, would see an increase of \$175 a year. Now that's in 8 years. So between now and 8 years from now there is no increase, and there are natural increases anyway. And in fact, in some parts of the country, like the Northeast, which I represent, there will actually be a decrease in cost because of the way that we generate our energy now and the way it's transmitted.

In fact, the National Resources Defense Counsel says that in the Northeast they will see a decrease of \$5 per month on your electricity bill. That's why three Republicans in New Jersey voted for this bill. That's why a Republican in New York voted for this bill. They didn't listen to the misinformation. They understood it was about national security, and it delivers electricity to homeowners at a cheaper cost.

Yet, I believe to engage in misinformation on this very vital issue of national security is wrong.

Congressman BOCCIERI, I'd like to yield to you, sir.

Mr. BOCCIERI. I thank the gentlemen from New York and Maryland for their insight. And we talked about what our friends on the other side are suggesting about the cost. But let me ask you this profound question: What is the cost of doing nothing? What is the cost of doing nothing? 500 billion, \$1 trillion overseas?

This is a matter of our national security. And I must tell you that if 27 percent of all America's cars were hybrid electric gasoline vehicles, much like Ford has produced with its Escape, and much like we have with some of the other models coming before the market, if just 20 percent of all American cars were hybrid gasoline electric models, the United States could stop importing oil from the Persian Gulf. Just 20 percent of the vehicles on our roads, we would end our dependence on oil from the Persian Gulf.

This is the pillar of our legislation, national security, creating jobs and moving away from our dependence on

foreign oil. That's what an energy policy in the United States should encompass. That's what it should evolve into, and that's what this legislation is about.

If you will just indulge me, I want to read some quotes here from some of our colleagues who were running for President on the other side of the aisle. Rudolph Giuliani said we need to use and expand the use of hybrid vehicles. Remember, just 27 percent of all vehicles on the roads of the United States would end our dependence on oil from the Persian Gulf. Clean coal, carbon sequestration, which is very important to a State like Ohio, where we have a great abundance of coal and carbon capture. We can use that in Ohio. \$180 billion in this bill for carbon capture and sequestration and studying that.

The United States Air Force is testing synthetic fuels right now, blended fuels at Wright Patterson Air Force Base because they know, back in the 1940s, when the United States bombed the Ploesti Romanian oil fields and cut off the Germans' supply of oil, the Germans quickly transitioned to synthetic fuel, a derivative of coal. We're reaching that in Ohio, and the United States military is doing the same.

We have more coal reserves in the United States than oil reserves in Saudi Arabia. This should be a major national project. This is a matter of our national security.

Let me reference our friend, Mitt Romney, a good American, suggested that there are multiple reasons for us to say we want to be less dependent on foreign energy and to develop our own sources. That's the real key, of course, additional sources of energy here, as well as more efficient use of energy. That will allow the world to have less oil being drawn down from the various sources it comes from, without dropping prices to too high of a level. It will keep people, some of whom are unsavory characters, from having an influence on our foreign policy.

Let me add Mr. Huckabee. Mr. Huckabee, a good American, plays the guitar very well by the way, I should add. Mr. Huckabee said, So it's critical that our own interests, economically and from a point of national security, we commit to becoming energy independent and that we commit to doing it within a decade. We sent Americans to the Moon in a decade. We can become energy independent in a decade. We have to take responsibility for our own house before we can expect others to do the same for theirs. It goes back to my basic concept of leadership. Leaders don't ask others to do what they are unwilling to do themselves.

Very, very profound statement right there. And we know it's often been said that fear is not a tool of leadership; it's a tool of the status quo.

One last one. Our good friend, Mr. PAUL. We serve with him here; I just spoke with him the other day on the floor. Mr. PAUL said, True conservatives and libertarians have no right to

pollute their neighbors' property. You have no right to pollute your neighbors' air, water or anything. And this would all contribute to the protection of all air and water.

One last point, Mr. MCMAHON. The Truman Project suggested that economic disruptions associated with global climate change are projected by the CIA and other intelligence experts to place increased pressure on weaker nations that may be unable to provide basic needs and maintain order for their own citizens. This is a matter of national security.

I yield back.

Mr. MCMAHON. You're so right, Congressman BOCCIERI, and you put that so eloquently. And you have to wonder why it is that the national leaders of the Republican Party get it, yet it seems to be that the Members of the House of Representatives from the Republican Party don't get it at all.

Before I yield to our great colleague, also from the great State of New York, Mr. PAUL TONKO, I just want to make two points because on the issue of national security, I was shopping in my local supermarket over the weekend, and I spoke to a gentleman who had heard some of the myths about the bill and we spoke about national security. He said to me, well, if we just drilled all our oil in this country, we wouldn't have this problem. Well, we know that physically that couldn't happen immediately. But even if it were to happen, the truth of the matter is, a generation from now those resources would be depleted as well and we'd be in the same place that we are now.

The point of the matter is that we cannot go on the way that we have. And, certainly, I know that there are some who will say, well, global warming, that's a myth. Okay. Take that, if you want to make that argument, go ahead. But pollution and the effects of pollution are not a myth.

In my district we have the highest rate of lung cancer in America. And why? Because we're downwind from the factories in New Jersey and Ohio and across this country. And it blows across and into the people of Staten Island and Brooklyn, and we breathe, and also from the cars and the smog, that terrible air. And it's time, across this country and all those places and those great States that I mentioned, and in my area as well, to have clean air.

□ 2130

There was a very disturbing report on TV this morning. You know, children who are conceived and who are born in areas that have high levels of pollution, that have high levels of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, or PAHs, if they're in the womb when they're exposed to that, their IQ rates are four or five points less than those of children who are conceived and who are born in areas that do not have that pollution. So you could argue about global warming until the cows come

home. We know that it's real, but even if you think it isn't, pollution is not a fiction.

As JOHN MCCAIN mentioned, and as we know in New York—and my great colleague is about to speak from Upstate New York—acid rain was a problem, Congressman TONKO. Certainly, in the lakes in Upstate New York, in the Adirondacks and in the Catskill Mountains, they were dead. The lakes were dead, and that was caused by pollution from sulfur dioxide. We now know, because of cap-and-trade, a program which was implemented in 1990 at a third of the projected cost at that time and in half the time projected to clean up, it is very successful, and those lakes again are alive.

Referring to Upstate New York, it's a privilege and an honor to welcome our colleague from the great State of New York, one who is a real leader on the issue of energy and on a clean environment, PAUL TONKO.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Representative MCMAHON. It's a pleasure to join with you and with our colleagues from Ohio and Maryland in dealing with the facts of the matter and not with the fiction.

I know that you had earlier gone through the mathematics and the calculations of the impact, as reported by the opposition in the House, as to what this is costing us. To take claim of \$3,100 and basing it on a study done where the author has said you have misapplied that information from the MIT study and to grossly inflate it at \$3,100 when, more appropriately, it's between the range of \$65 and \$80, it has an impact on a family. Then the author further addresses it by saying that it needs to be additionally calibrated to go toward the final package that was passed by the House, which has an even lesser impact. Yet leave that aside, and talk about the cost of doing nothing.

Many people will lament, I'm certain, in each one of our districts, as we travel through our districts, about the job loss, about the exportation, and about the offshore/across the shore of American jobs. Well, no one is there to talk about that same impact of sending \$400 billion a year to regimes that are unfriendly, that are terrorist in nature, that are certainly not the most secure or stable governments in the world, and we're supplying \$400 billion a year. That is the cost today. That is a tax. Call it what you want. It is a tax on the American public. We can go forward and address, in a more secure and energy-independent manner, the sort of solutions that will then grow American jobs. American clean energy jobs are what this whole proposal is about. So it speaks to our sustainable quality that we can encourage that which allows us to grow energy security.

How so?

Well, the Union of Concerned Scientists has said that the renewable electricity standards in our package in the House version will produce well over 300,000 jobs. Then we also have the

American Council for an Energy Efficient Economy that is talking about energy efficiency standards that are, again, part and parcel to this package that will grow over 225,000 jobs.

So there, just in a sampling of what can happen, you see how American jobs begin to grow and how they get cultivated from this very aspect of legislation. Those are real jobs. Those are factual bits of information that need to be exchanged and shared with the American public.

People know that our destiny here is controllable by our own actions. They know that. They want us to go forward. They want us to grow this green energy market. They want us to be able to respond in analytical terms where we embrace the intellectual capacity of this Nation and where we grow those technical jobs. There are incentives in this legislation. There are those underpinnings of support to, again, foster those kinds of jobs so that we can stretch this innovation economy and so that we can enhance the number of jobs that are science-and-tech related or are coming through ancillary forces out there that further extrapolate the good outcome and that grow the jobs that are so essential.

American jobs producing American power to then retrofit all of that activity into the American job market: manufacturing, making it more efficient.

We want to keep jobs here. Let's produce a package that retrofits American manufacturing centers to allow them to produce a product wisely, more effectively, efficiently, and then, yes, more competitively in the global market. It all begins with sound energy policy.

They don't want to face those facts. They just want to use applications of fear and say it will cost every family \$3,100 when they have been defied in that statement by the very author of the study they cite. That is unacceptable, and the public deserves better than that. They deserve the facts that show how we can grow jobs, how we can create United States' jobs—American jobs—and how we can make us a global technology leader. We need to do it so that we can compete globally. If we're not creating these products, if we're not implementing those sorts of changes, we're falling drastically behind places like China, Germany and Japan, and we can continue to list those countries. It's imperative that we do this.

Mr. MCMAHON. I think it's rather telling—and before I defer to my colleague from Maryland—that, today, the other side of the aisle did 130 one-minute speeches, asking the question: Where are the jobs?

Quite clearly, as you have stated and from these independent studies, from the balance of the studies, by 2020, there will be either 250,000 or 300,000 green jobs created in this country, as shown on this map of our country. It shows where the jobs will be created all

across this great Nation. Each circle indicates from 4,000 to 85,000 to 250,000. All of these jobs across this country will be created. This is where the jobs are. It is in doing legislation that is insightful, that is thoughtful, that takes some courage to stand up and to deal with difficult issues, and that doesn't run away from the fact that this is, indeed, an issue, not only of domestic financial security but of, first and foremost, national security.

Congressman KRATOVIL from Maryland, I yield to you, sir.

Mr. KRATOVIL. Thank you for yielding.

Mr. TONKO, thank you for your comments.

I want to follow up on something you said. You were talking about misstatements that were made in terms of the costs. I want to go back to that in a minute.

You know, one of the misconceptions that you hear when you're back in your districts and elsewhere across the country and that was played up nationally is that, you know, the status quo is acceptable, that Congress doesn't need to take any action, that we're good where we are, and that, at this time, we don't need to do anything. Of course, that is not accurate.

As you folks know, the Supreme Court ruled in 2007 that the Environmental Protection Agency has the authority to regulate greenhouse gas emissions under the Clean Air Act, meaning that the EPA today, without congressional action, could take action on their own to reduce greenhouse gases without any of the protections that were provided under the bill that we passed here in the House. So the argument that Congress could sit back and do nothing is clearly inaccurate simply based on the Supreme Court case in 2007 that demonstrated otherwise. So that ship, in a sense, has sailed.

Congress had an obligation to do it, not simply because of the Supreme Court case, but as we're talking about here, obviously we needed to do it in terms of national security and in terms of reducing our dependence on foreign oil. Mr. MCMAHON, as you pointed out so clearly and also you, Mr. TONKO, in terms of moving us forward in these new green energy jobs that we need.

In terms of the cost issue that you raised, that is the best example of how in a national debate statements are made that are so clearly factually inaccurate. As you folks know, I spent 14 years as a prosecutor, and my life and profession were governed by facts. When you see a misstatement like that in terms of facts, it's somewhat overwhelming, particularly, as you said, in the study that was cited by our colleagues on the other side of the aisle. The author of that study that was cited came out publicly and said that he was being cited inaccurately and that that was not what he said.

The interesting thing is, in looking at it in terms of energy efficiency, not

only, arguably, will it not cost our constituents more, but arguably, it will cost them less because of the energy-efficiency savings that will result from that bill. In Maryland, as an example, the study that you cited, Mr. MCMAHON, indicates that Marylanders could arguably save \$8 per month as opposed to the arguments that they're going to pay \$3,900 more. So the facts that have been given are oftentimes inaccurate.

As you go around and as you're having this discussion with people on whether we should have the policies that were included in that bill, it's interesting from a Maryland perspective, because I heard quite frequently people saying, You know, Mr. KRATOVIL, we don't want cap-and-trade. Well, in Maryland, we've had cap-and-trade since 2007. Maryland has participated in a regional greenhouse gas initiative since 2007, so we already had that.

Again, the interesting thing is, in terms of the Federal standards that were set in terms of reducing greenhouse gas emissions by 17 percent, in Maryland, it's 25 percent. So, in many ways, in Maryland, the argument wasn't so much whether or not we should have these policies; the question was whether or not we should have these policies nationally so that we're all playing by the same rules.

So many of the facts that have been given are inaccurate. As I said, it is incredible when you think about the fact that, for the last 40 years, there has been a recognition among Presidents that, in terms of national security, we must reduce our dependence on foreign oil.

Ronald Reagan: The best answer, while conservation is worthy in itself, is to try to make us independent of outside sources to the greatest extent possible for our energy. 1981, Ronald Reagan.

President George H.W. Bush, October 25, 1991: When our administration developed our national energy strategy, three principles guided our policy—reducing our dependence on foreign oil, protecting our environment and promoting economic growth.

Arguably, this bill does all three.

Yet, despite that recognition dating back to Nixon, despite the fact, as Mr. BOCCIERI has correctly pointed out, that every major Republican Presidential candidate acknowledged the need for reducing our dependence on foreign oil and despite the fact, as was mentioned, that Senator MCCAIN specifically promoted cap-and-trade, when we take the vote in the House, we only have a few brave Republicans who are willing to cross party lines.

Now, why is that?

In my view, despite arguments that are made in terms of process, despite arguments that are made somewhat substantively related to the bills, the bottom line is, ultimately, the votes that are being taken on major issues facing this country are still predominantly based on politics and are not

based on what is in the best interest of this country.

As we talked about after this vote, were we to have the vote tomorrow, I would make it again. It was a vote that was very important to this country. It is a vote that will move this country forward, and we need to do what we're doing tonight to convince the people of this country that we were right, as I think we were.

With that, I will yield back.

Mr. MCMAHON. Thank you, Mr. KRATOVIL. You did that very eloquently, and I think it certainly moved some of the people who are watching.

You know, before I yield to our great friend from Ohio (Mr. BOCCIERI), you had pointed out about how facts are so important for a prosecutor and about the author of that study and that the facts were being misused. Publicly, the author said, No, you're misusing my study. These are the real facts. I could see people would misuse it until he made that statement. Maybe they misunderstood it. Yet, when he clarified it and said that they were misstating it, can you imagine that I heard it cited on the floor of this House this evening just prior to our hour here? I find that incredible, and it's certainly something that speaks to the fact that, for some, unfortunately, it's more about politics here than it is doing what is right for the American people.

I yield to our colleague from the great State of Ohio, JOHN BOCCIERI.

Mr. BOCCIERI. Thank you, Congressman MCMAHON.

So let me get this straight: The pillars of this legislation are about creating jobs right here in America that can't be outsourced. When you build a brand new nuclear reactor, when you build an electric hybrid car, when you build an electric grid, those are jobs and those are materials that cannot be outsourced. So it's about creating jobs. Another pillar of this legislation is about national security and about moving away from our dependence on foreign oil. Who wouldn't be for that? Let's go over this again.

In 2003, a Department of Defense study suggested that the risk of abrupt climate change should be elevated beyond a scientific debate to a U.S. national security concern. The CIA and other intelligence experts said that the economic disruptions associated with climate change are projected to put pressure on weak nations that may be unable to provide the basic needs and maintain order for their civilians.

□ 2145

If we just invested in electric hybrid cars and 27 percent of our vehicles here in the United States were gasoline-electric hybrid models, the United States could stop importing oil from the Persian Gulf. 66.4 percent of our oil came from overseas last year, over 40 percent came from the Persian Gulf. We're fighting two wars there. Our Nation's military is there. It's time to bring our troops home safely, honorably and soon, end this addiction that we have to Middle Eastern oil.

Teddy Roosevelt, a great Republican, said this: In a moment of decision, the worst thing that you could do is nothing. What about drilling? In the Senate version, we're going to expand drilling here in the United States. Expand it in the Gulf of Mexico. We know that we can't sustain that, though, with 22 million barrels of oil consumed here in the United States every day and only 3 percent of the world's reserves here in the United States. After we consume 25 percent of the world's oil, we can't sustain it. Do the math.

What about jobs? Manufacturing, in 1950, accounted for over half of every job in America. We're at 10 percent now. Let's produce jobs here. Let's make solar panels so that they can recharge our batteries. Let's do things like fuel cell research like we're doing in the 16th Congressional District. Let's do electric hybrid vehicles, plug-in hybrids like we're doing in the 16th Congressional District. Let's research clean coal, and coal is an abundant and cheap source of energy. We're going to use it, we're going to make it cleaner, and we're going to make certain that it is a long and sustaining source of energy for us for years to come.

Let's talk about the 8,000 manufactured parts that go into a wind turbine. Can you imagine the Timken roller bearings being made in my district making the roller bearings for these big wind turbines? Can you imagine SARE Plastics in my hometown making the molding and the plastic molding that would go in to making the fiberglass infrastructure. These are jobs that cannot be outsourced because we're going to use them. We're going to consume right here, consume that energy right here in the United States.

This is one of the most important issues that we have to tackle. This is about the longevity of our country, quite frankly, my friends. This is about what my four children will have to look forward to, a Nation where we've become, like Mike Huckabee said, a Nation that can't feed itself, that can't fuel itself, or produce the weapons to fight for itself will be a Nation forever enslaved. Are we going to be economic slaves to a condition that we can correct? I think not. We have the courage. We can make that happen if we can find 60 patriots in the United States Senate to make sure the United States is ending our addiction to foreign oil.

Mr. MCMAHON. Thank you, JOHN.

I now yield to the great gentleman from the great State of New York, Mr. TONKO.

Mr. TONKO. It is a pleasure to join with all of my colleagues in this colloquy.

Just yesterday and today in this Nation's Capital, a number of people got to meet the Apollo crew. They got to shake hands with astronauts that made history. They set foot on the Moon. We won a space race that took and demanded a huge investment by this Nation in science, technology, in growing our intellectual capacity, in creating a

vision, in stating in bold measure how we were going to reach that goal.

We're at that same moment of challenge. Just think of it. If we had allowed defectors that perhaps divided us or shared misinformation or preached politics of fear, we perhaps wouldn't have won that race. And that was so critically valuable and important to the American Nation, to Americans at large.

That same sort of challenge, that sort of boldness of leadership, the demands for truthful exchange are upon us today, and to grow these opportunities, we'll deal with the facts. And I'm impressed by this House for the leadership and the membership that has really embraced that sort of factual information and advanced an agenda like the legislation that we're proposing and promoting here this evening.

You know, when we look at situations, as Representative BOCCIERI made comment, we can grow jobs but we can also grow intellect. We need to grow the brain trust of this Nation. This measure invests in that development of the human infrastructure. And certainly when Representative KRATOVIL talked about previous administrations through the decades talking about reducing our demands on foreign importation of oil, 60 percent of what we consume today imported from some of the most troubled spots in the world with unstable governments, it's more than that. We have a gluttonous dependency.

Efficiency can reduce the demand side, and for far too long we did not have a comprehensive energy policy in this Nation. We addressed only the supply side and ignored the demand side. Well, now we're talking about both sides of that equation: producing our own supplies and reducing per capita usage of that precious resource. That's what this is about.

Now we talk about innovation. We talk about growing those jobs. All of us have cited moments in history that have inspired us. I represent the city of Schenectady in upstate New York, dubbed the city that lights and hauls the world. Just over a century ago, they were the epicenter of invention and innovation. They allowed the world to be changed by the simple dynamics of creative genius in that location and an outstanding workforce. Blue collar, white collar workers that rolled up their sleeves and got the job done.

Over a century later, we're at that same point where we need an energy revolution. This Nation is poised for that sort of development. Are we going to walk away? I don't think so. I think it's that boldness of leadership that will bring us to the point that we need to be.

And speaking of GE, as a center in that city of Schenectady, they are already inspired by this legislation because we have advanced within the framework and the multiple needs that are addressed by this legislation, bat-

tery innovation, advanced battery manufacturing, batteries that can respond to energy generation, batteries that can respond to storage of intermittent power like wind and solar, and batteries that can address transportation sectors, both heavy fleets and lighter fleets. They have a battery application that they believe can respond to those multiple needs.

And they have proposed, at a press conference, to be the site in my district to do advanced battery manufacturing. They are competing for the dollars that are part of this package if it is successful and certainly working on the input that came from the stimulus package, from the Recovery Act.

Working with those applications, they want to go forward and make certain that we can build in this State of mine, in New York State, and your State, MICHAEL, in a way that will have 350 to 400 jobs in the manufacturing sector of advanced batteries. That is progress. That is stability. That is security. That is a greening up of thinking. That is job growth. That is intellectual capacity that is stretched to a far greater degree.

And think of it again. 40 years ago this week, we accomplished our goal because we committed to that goal. We didn't stand up in a House of Representatives and deny the facts or twist the facts or reject the truth. It all began with an honest exchange, and that's what we're doing here. We're going the make certain that the facts are addressed.

Mr. MCMAHON. Thank you, Congressman TONKO, and you put that eloquently. And certainly when the other side was engaged today in just long-winded speeches asking the question, "Where are the jobs?" you certainly will tell them with the stimulus package and with the ACES bill, with the Energy Security Act, we have jobs in Schenectady, New York, and Staten Island, New York, and anywhere else where we can build wind turbines and get back the technology that we invented and is now being used overseas.

Gentlemen, we have about 9 minutes left or so, so maybe I could ask you all to kind of make a final remark. And we'll start with certainly the most youthful member—that's a tough one to say.

Mr. KRATOVIL. I think Mr. BOCCIERI is younger than I. You certainly look younger.

Mr. MCMAHON. The person who lives the closest to Washington.

Mr. KRATOVIL. Since this will likely be my last round here as we go through this, let me thank the three of you for the courage to take the vote that you took on this bill. And as I mentioned in the last few discussions that I have had, I do think that it's important in moving our country forward that we do have people in this House that are willing to make difficult choices and to take difficult votes that ultimately are the best for this country even at times when it's politically

difficult to do so. So I thank you for the courage to do that.

You know, people forget that just last year when we were running for office we had \$4-a-gallon gas, and people were looking at Congress and saying, What are you doing about \$4 in gas? And I mentioned when that was going on that what we do oftentimes in this country is we deal with the crisis but we don't always deal with the underlying issue that led to the crisis.

And so now as the gas prices have dropped, many have forgotten what we were facing just a year ago. Many have moved on. And yet my view is we should not forget the position we were in 1 year ago because we could, at any time in the future, be again paying \$4 a gallon, \$5 a gallon for gas as long as we are held hostage by those that control our energy. And until we make a decision, as we did in this vote, to move forward towards renewable energy, renewable fuel and ending our dependence on foreign oil, we could, at any moment, face the same situation we faced last year. And none of us as Americans should forget the anger that we had last summer when we were doing that. Many have forgotten. We should not forget that.

We should deal with the underlying issue that led to the energy crisis that we faced last year, and that is reducing our dependence on foreign oil, moving towards renewable energy, and making positive steps in terms of our own national security.

Mr. MCMAHON. Thank you, Mr. KRATOVIL, for participating.

And Mr. BOCCIERI, before I yield to you, I hope you will accept my heartfelt apology for even thinking that Congressman KRATOVIL could be younger than you, sir.

Mr. BOCCIERI. You are forgiven this time.

Let me thank my colleagues for joining me tonight on this important dialogue about the course of this country. Now is not the time to let up off the accelerator. Now is the time to put the gas down, put the pedal to the metal to make sure we do this, because this is about our national security, my friends. The CIA is saying it. The Department of Defense is saying it. Both Democrats and Republicans alike running for President said it last year, and a whole host of Presidential candidates and Presidential minds before that said that this is a matter of our national security.

This is not an issue of partisan politics. It's about patriotism. This isn't an issue about Democrats or Republicans. It's about America and where will our course be in years to come.

Forty-four percent of our oil comes from the Middle East where my friends right now are putting their life on the line for our country and for our national security and because of our economic interests of oil in that region. Let's bring them home. Let's become independent. Let's create jobs here in this country. Let's protect our own na-

tional security and move away from our dependence on foreign oil.

Folks talk about the cost. What is the cost of doing nothing? What is the cost of doing nothing? We're going to outsource a trillion dollars of American taxpayer money, a trillion dollars, to enrich regions of the world that don't believe the same that we do when we can believe in Midwest innovation instead of relying on Middle East oil?

□ 2200

This is the time that we can make the decision. This is the time to move away from the politics of the past and look towards the future. We can't allow detractors to use fear as a tool of leadership when we know, as it's often been said, that it is a tool of the status quo.

We will be judged by action or inaction. I'm glad that we chose to act. Thank you for having me tonight.

Mr. MCMAHON. Thank you. Congressman TONKO.

Mr. TONKO. I thank Congressman MCMAHON.

Representative BOCCIERI asked what is the cost of doing nothing. Well, beyond the lack of progress that we should taste in this Nation, it is the denial of this generation's children and grandchildren who will need those career paths developed by us. We need to cultivate that thinking that will allow them to have these new energy jobs, these new environmental jobs, these new plans for economic recovery. That is what gets really lost in the discussion.

When China's now the number one producer of solar panels in the world, when Germany's number two export after cars is wind turbines, when six of the 30 top advanced battery-manufacturing solar and wind companies are American, we need to do better than we're doing today.

As I made mention, the space race of decades ago was an investment made by this Nation in robust fashion. Today, we're in a green energy race with far many more global competitors. Whoever wins this becomes the go-to nation. They will be the exporter of energy ideas, energy intellect, energy invention.

Do we want to deny this generation, future generations from those concepts, from that prize? I don't think so, and if we're going to deny them, let's at least deal with the facts. Let's talk factually. Let's not create a \$3,100 price tag when we've been warned over and over again by the author of that study that it is grossly inflated. Let's move forward factually. Let's move forward in green fashion. Let's provide for an innovation economy. Let's speak to the generations of Americans that are counting on us to do a job, do it thoroughly, do it directly.

Mr. MCMAHON. I thank Congressman TONKO for those inspiring words, and thank you all.

You know, it's funny, but in conclusion, I think we all have hit on the very important themes.

Congressman KRATOVIL pointed out that it is about the domestic side, how much we pay for oil and gas, and what happened last summer, \$4 of gas, America was outraged, that somehow a year later we've forgotten that because there are those in the House of Representatives of the United States Congress who use misinformation and misstatement of facts to somehow take the American people's focus off what has to be done.

Just think about how many people you talk to at home who said, what, now I have to have an energy auditor in my house when I sell my home? We know that's not in the bill; yet, there are those who on the other side of the aisle have used that misrepresentation of fact to scare the American people, and that's wrong.

Congressman BOCCIERI is a great veteran, a great flyer of planes for the United States military service. We thank you for your service, and you remind us that right now there are young men and women wearing the uniform of our country in places like Iraq and Afghanistan and other places, standing in harm's way because we have not dealt forcefully and effectively with our energy policy, and it's time that we end that.

And as I said to you, coming from New York City and having lived firsthand the horrors of the acts of terrorism on our shores, in our country, we cannot forget the sacrifice that was made that day by those who lost their lives and those who got to the site and came to the rescue and continue to suffer the deleterious effects of their health.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2920, STATUTORY PAY-AS-YOU-GO ACT OF 2009

Mr. PERLMUTTER (during the Special Order of Mr. MCMAHON), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 111-217) on the resolution (H. Res. 665) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2920) to reinstitute and update the Pay-As-You-Go requirement of budget neutrality on new tax and mandatory spending legislation, enforced by the threat of annual, automatic sequestration, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PAYGO

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I find that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle are going a bit through revisionist history again. We hear them talk over and over again about the things that have happened, what was happening about gas prices last year. They never mentioned that the Democrats were in charge of the Congress