DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION—AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATIONS FOR RESOLUTION CHANGES

[Fiscal years, in millions of dollars]

House Committee	2009		2010		2010–2014 total	
	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays
Current allocation:						
Energy and Commerce	11	2	10	13	−10	−2
Ways and Means	0	0	6,840	6,840	37,000	37,000
Change in the American Clean Energy and Security Act (H.R. 2454):						
Energy and Commerce	0	0	9,260	370	266,324	252,354
Ways and Means	0	0	0	0	4,416	4,416
Total	0	0	9,260	370	270,740	256,770
Revised allocation:						
Energy and Commerce	11	2	9,270	383	266,314	252,352
Ways and Means	0	0	6,840	6,840	41,416	41,416

BUDGET AGGREGATES

[On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars]

	Fiscal year 2009	Fiscal year 2010	Fiscal years 2010–2014
Current Aggregates: [1]			
Budget Authority	3,668,788	2,882,117	n.a.
Outlays	3,357,366	2,999,049	n.a.
Revenues	1,532,579	1,653,728	10,500,149
Change in the American Clean Energy and Security Act (H.R. 2454):			
Budget Authority	0	9,260	n.a.
Outlays	0	370	n.a.
Revenues	0	948	260,543
Revised Aggregates:			
Budget Authority	3,668,788	2,891,377	n.a.
Outlays	3,357,366	2,999,419	n.a.
Revenues	1,532,579	1,654,676	10,760,692

[1] Current aggregates do not include the disaster allowance assumed in the budget resolution, which if needed will be excluded from current level with an emergency designation (section 423(b)).

n.a. = Not applicable because annual appropriations Acts for fiscal years 2011 through 2014 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

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

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

ENERGY AND JOBS

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the time.

This is a trying time. And I appreciate my friend from Texas' belief and hope in the future. I just have read enough of this bill and know enough to understand the consequences. And this isn't the whole bill. This is two-thirds of it. The other 300 pages, they allowed me to borrow a copy briefly earlier today during debate right before the debate closed. But this is about two-thirds of it.

We're having a job fair in Longview, Texas, Monday. That arose when I met with a bunch of my constituents, most of whom were African Americans, in a North Lufkin church a month or so ago who had lost jobs because jobs were being moved overseas. Energy was too costly here. The corporate tax is over twice as much here as what it is in China. And I have been hearing from other manufacturers that we have in our district that if this cap-and-trade bill goes through and becomes law, there will be many more lost jobs.

And it breaks my heart. It broke my heart to meet with those people there in North Lufkin and others around my district who have lost jobs. So that's why I got to thinking what can I maybe do to help. I know the Texas Workforce Commission does a good job of having job fairs and trying to match up job openings with people's job skill sets and try to get people a job.

As someone said on the floor earlier on our side of the aisle, Our people are not interested in unemployment benefits; they're interested in a job. That's what they want. That's what they had.

We have continued to take actions for the last 2½ years since our friends across the aisle have been in the majority to place more and more of our energy off-limits, to make it more expensive.

I also have plants in my district that use natural gas as feedstock, feedstock meaning that natural gas is absolutely the most essential element to producing the things that they do like plastics and other materials. And natural gas under this cap-and-trade bill will naturally skyrocket. Our Democrat majority leadership is pushing to regulate and tax hydraulic fracking, which will make much of the gas that we're currently getting unavailable and will shove those prices even higher. I lost around 900 jobs in my district when the Abitibi paper mill closed because natural gas was more expensive here in the United States than it was virtually anywhere else. It was a Canadian company. They held on to the property hoping that one day they could reopen it and get back those 900 good jobs, but eventually they have announced they will not be reopening the plant. That was the price of natural gas that did that.

So I know with the job fair I've got coming up in Longview, we have over 60 employers there that will be offering jobs. We had over 600 people show up looking for jobs at the job fair in Lufkin, and I'm hoping it will go well.

But I have read enough of this bill and I know enough about the energy industry because we produce a lot of it in East Texas. We've got coal, we've got oil, we've got gas, solar, wind. But this bill is going to put a lot of people out of work. It's going to put people out of work all over the country. So the job fairs are not going to be adequate for the damage that this bill is going to do.

I have been joined by colleagues here on the floor who I think are as heartbroken as I am. And you would think we'd be giddy, you know, that our friends across the aisle have passed a bill that's going to come back to haunt them. It's going to cost jobs. It's going to make Americans mad. But I'm nothing but brokenhearted because I know what this will do to individuals.

And I know that my friend Mr. SOUDER is likewise affected, and I would like to yield to him.

Mr. SOUDER. I appreciate the honor of being an honorary Texan here tonight because in Indiana we're still unusual. I mean we still make things. We don't have the mountains like they have out West or beaches. What we have are hardworking Americans who are still competing worldwide in manufacturing.

And if you go into any of the types of plants—earlier I was talking about our steel mills in addition to the two SDI mini-mills with recycled steel. Everything they use, they recycle and use recycled materials, as does NuCor. I have a Valbruna steel mill. One of the interesting things that Valbruna has done is they built an additional facility because they're the number one provider of steel to the refinery industry in Texas and Louisiana. So in my district we're making the things still in America. Your options are basically Korea, Brazil, China, or Indiana steel in many of these cases.

But these factories take an incredible amount of energy. Some of our factories, we have 85 percent coal, 15 percent nuclear in our basic provision of things. And basically this bill doesn't like things that we can use in Indiana. It doesn't like coal. They really aren't too fond of nuclear. I think that a lot of the question of what to do with waste, I used to think it was driven by Jane Fonda in ''The China Syndrome'' movie, but that's us old people. I think the younger people are thinking of Homer Simpson coming in and kind of blowing up the city of Springfield all the time, and they think of that as nuclear energy. There are 13 or 15 or more plants on the drawing board right now, but it may take 20 years to get there.

What do I do if I don't have coal? Well, I could use gas and oil, but, boy, those are kind of bad. We tried to get the BP Refinery done in Indiana to handle Canadian tar sands. There's another one over by Detroit. But they're going to be tied up for 10, 15 years. They were half of EPA discharge. But Rahm Emanuel and others are saying, Oh, no, we can't build that refinery. We don't want any refineries in America. Well, we make 58 percent of the RVs.

□ 2030

What are you going to do, put a little fan up on the roof to try to make these RVs go? International designs—800 people to design the big trucks in my district. How are we going to deliver goods to market? The rail is already jammed, the canals are jammed, the rivers are jammed. If we can't use trucks, which take up about 40 percent of the energy on our roads, how are we going to move around?

The foundries take this—it was the biggest ice cream plant in the world, an Edy's ice cream plant until they built one additional. But when you go in an ice cream plant, how do you think ice cream is made? You have got to deliver it there, the milk in, then you have got to process it and you have all these electrical machines powering this. You know, they can't do that with a couple of solar panels.

I have Kraft Caramels in my district, all sorts of things, not just kind of windshields and axles and stuff. How do you power these kinds of things? I am not against alternative energy at all. I worked hard.

In my district, in fact, Guardian windshields has learned that their process of windshields, if you think about it, took solar heat for a long time. And these solar panels in Nevada and other places are cracking. By going with Guardian, they are learning that they can make these panels more efficient, get 20 percent or more energy, and they don't crack. Spain is using them. The new model projects in the U.S. are using them, and they are going to have possibly hundreds of jobs making the windshields for the solar panel industry.

Of course, they had near a thousand jobs making windshields for SUVs, pickups and things that are now kind of on the bad list, so we will get green jobs, maybe half as many as we had before in that category.

I have Parker-Hannifin in New Haven. We have had an earmark to help them, to try to get the heat down inside of everything from your handheld, your BlackBerry, to wind turbines, and could possibly make the wind turbines 20 percent more efficient. We may have, at some point here, 200 people doing windmill turbines and other things, but that plant had 1,200 supplying traditional energy industries.

I have worked with people who are coming, trying to come up with alternative car engines.

One of my friends and supporters is putting in a huge wind farm. In Indiana, we have two basic areas that we can put wind farms. We might get to 4 percent, but we can't reach the targets in these bills. It's not that we are not committed to alternative energy, but we don't have as much wind and solar. We have to have traditional forms of energy: oil, gas, nuclear, coal, not just the alternative form, especially if they are going to put limitations on ethanol and biodiesel. So this is a critical time, really, where we are trying to decide in America, are we going to have manufacturing or aren't we going to have manufacturing?

Are we basically going to basically have service jobs and then high-tech jobs? Yes, at a coffee house at different universities they sit around and go, Oh, this stuff sounds really great. And the others in their beach houses on the coast go, Oh, this stuff really sounds great. But what's missing in America is we are getting increasingly two classes of people, and the blue collar class of people who made things and had a decent living where they could get a house, maybe a boat where they could go on vacation, they are disappearing.

And the knowledge class, often in the liberal upper groups of the Democratic Party, are basically saying goodbye to their working class. And they are saying, You can either basically maybe bring us a drink, grill us a hamburger, or go get a doctorate and teach at a university.

What we are losing is the middle group of blue collar Americans who worked with their hands and worked in their fields, and they are basically knocking them out, and those jobs are going to other countries.

Mr. GOHMERT. And perhaps, Mr. SOUDER, that's why, on this map we have here, the dark red is high vulnerability under cap-and-tax to losses of jobs. That's why Indiana is in this area up here where apparently it's in the high vulnerability for high losses of jobs.

Texas, where I am from, it's in the medium vulnerability, but I already know. I have seen the loss of jobs we have.

And actually, we have some of the same industries. We have a Nucor, but we have Tyler Pipe, Lufkin Industries involved in steel, but there is going to be a lot of loss of jobs.

Mr. SOUDER. The Heritage study showed that my congressional district is number one is loss. Next to the me is JOE DONNELLY in the South Bend district, who was number two. Congressman LATTA, who asked for the split out, just to my east in Ohio, is number three. MIKE PENCE, who is just to my south in that part of Indiana is number four. Congressman JORDAN is number five and Congressman BOEHNER is number six. Because not only do we have manufacturing, we tend to use coal and nuclear because alternative energy is less of an option in these heavy industrials. Then it kind of jumps up to Michigan.

The other thing that's noticeable in that map where the dark red is and the other is that's really where most of the water is in the United States, coming out of the Mississippi, and to manufacture, you need to have water and access to water. You are not going to move—you will see some in the orange States. You can move some steel and manufacturing into those areas, but basically you can't really transfer to those light yellow because that's mostly desert area. And you can't power these big plants with just solar or wind, and they don't have enough water to supplement the traditional that you need in refineries and in steel mills and that type of thing, and they don't really have a plan.

That's why we Republicans, when you look at the actual details—if you could even stomach, by the way, the government making all these decisions rather than market, that's bad enough. I mean, that document basically is page after page of the government telling us how we should live, the government telling us how we should make things.

But the bottom line, when you look at that map, if it goes out of the red zone, it's basically going to Mexico, to China, to Korea, to South America. Because the areas that are lighter, where you conceivably could shift it, it's just not possible to build these plants there.

Mr. GOHMERT. I appreciate that, that's an excellent point.

For this heavy manufacturing, you do have to have water. Regardless of any other energy source you may have, it takes water. That's a great point, which is why the traditional iron belt was up here in the Midwest. In those areas, you had water. You had all the things you needed. You had good workers. You had everything you needed to produce those things.

And just as an aside, as a history major and history buff, it needs to be noted. When a Nation can no longer make the things from scratch that are required to defend itself at a time of war, then the country will be lost in the next big war. We are losing the steel industry weekly, and it won't be long before we cannot produce tanks, airplanes, things.

Right now, we are barely able to produce tires because so many of the tire plants have moved overseas. You have got to have tires. You have got to have rubber. You have got to have wood. You know, we cut out so much of the wood industry, and that continues to happen, and people would be surprised how much that's used for.

Natural gas helps—is part of the process of making so many of the parts for weaponry, and that will become more and more difficult to obtain.

Mr. SOUDER. Yes, I don't mean to monopolize the time, but when you say these things, to illustrate the manufacturing in my district, Michelin bought a U.S.—bought a BFGoodrich tire plant in my district with 1,600 people in it. They have invested $15 million a year if they can become 5 percent more efficient, so they put $120 million into this huge plant, and people don't even realize what they are putting in. And I was just part of a suit to say stop the dumping, because we can compete with China without the dumping, but not if you add 7 percent health care and then add a cap-and-trade and then add the other OSHA and all the types of regulations that are coming back that we had restricted, we can't compete in tires.

I have a lot of the defense industry. I have a BAE plant with 2,500 people working in it. They do a lot for Boeing. One Member just a moment ago referred to Wilbur and Orville Wright and the amazing thing, but, you know, we are going to go back to these kinds of paper airplanes if we are not careful here. Boeing, that's metal. It takes energy to build every part in that plane, and it takes energy to launch the plane. And it's not—let's just say, they don't have windmills on this thing. They don't have solar panels to get a jet up in the air.

I have NASA satellites. The ones that feed into The Weather Channel are made by ITT in Fort Wayne, and they actually are looking at being able to track, as my friend from Texas earlier said about, we don't really have the science on that. Well, that's what one of the companies in my district is looking at; can we get satellites up in the air to track the climate change? Because the truth is, we are doing this bill with no data.

But put a satellite up. You know what, it has aluminum on it. You know what takes an incredible amount of energy to make, aluminum. The electrical systems in a plane and a satellite are copper. You can't get copper if you can't mine for copper. You can't make—the smelting of copper takes an incredible amount of energy. Aluminum and copper take as much or more energy than steel. How do they think we are going to get airplanes? How do they think we are even going to track the climate change?

It is baffling that this bill could have gone through a Congress. I am going to make a flat-out statement. If most of the Members of Congress were businessmen, this would have never passed.

Mr. GOHMERT. I appreciate my friend's point, and that is a good point.

I think if most of the people in this House had read this bill and been given a chance to read the additional third that was added at 3 a.m. or so this morning, then I don't think this would have passed either.

But we have been joined by another friend, a former fellow judge, a district judge also. I would like to yield to my friend, Mr. POE.

Mr. POE of Texas. Thank you for yielding, Judge GOHMERT. You know, we approach what we consider the most important of all days for our Republic, and that's Independence Day.

And this legislation that unfortunately passed tonight has not made us more independent, but it has made us more dependent. As a Nation, we are more dependent upon, now, government control of every aspect of our lives, our personal lives, our business lives.

When the government starts telling you what type of electricity you can have in your home, when the government starts telling you that you have to pass an energy efficiency before you can sell your home, maybe we have gone too far in the government controlling our lives. But that's just a smidge of what has occurred in the passing of this legislation.

I am not sure what the goal of the legislation was. We heard different things. One was that it's going to create more jobs for Americans. Well, that's just not going to happen. All the sane studies show that that's not going to occur in the United States.

There will be government programs, which means subsidies paid by taxpayers to go to, quote, green jobs. Those are programs, and they will be created, subsidized by the taxpayers, to move us in a direction of the green environment, which I will say just a little bit more about in a minute.

But one group that has not been mentioned today in the House debate that talked about jobs, the National Black Chamber of Commerce said this legislation will cost 2.5 million jobs almost immediately. Well, that's a lot of Americans being put out of work when we are already having Americans losing their jobs.

We do have an example of a country that has tried this legislation. Although they didn't sign this one, it's one very similar. Spain has had this so-called idea of trying to control carbon emissions in their country for several years, and they have created jobs, but they have lost jobs. For every green job that they have created, by their own statistics, two other jobs have been lost.

Now, I am not a CPA like Mr. CONAWAY is, but it would seem to me the more green jobs you create, the more jobs you are going to lose.

And that's what Spain has done, and now they are trying to get out from under their own legislation that has cramped their economy because they are losing jobs by moving to this so-called green job economy. So we are losing American jobs overseas for a lot of reasons already, and a lot of it is because of the high cost of energy. Now we are going to have energy cost increase. So first idea, a goal to create American jobs, that's just fiction.

The second thing is that this is supposed to be a bill to save the planet. You know, humans are bad and that we are creating all this gas that we need to control, and it's all because of energy. And so if we have this legislation that passed, we are going to save the planet.

Up until a few months ago, we heard from those people. That was called global warming. But since global warming is not occurring, it is now changed to climate change. We changed the title, because global warming does not appear to be what those who claim it to be is occurring here.

Now we hear from the Congressional Budget Office, when they testified before the Senate several weeks ago, that the effect of this legislation will have little or no effect on climate change.

□ 2045

Now, the first goal, create jobs, is a fiction. The second goal, to control the climate from bad humans, is not going to have any effect because of this legislation. And the third thing about this legislation is it costs too much; we can't afford it. We can't afford it even if it did create jobs or save the planet. But the billions of dollars in that 1,200 pages you have in front of you there, Judge GOHMERT, that's going to cost Americans. It's not going to result in what we were all promised. So those are two items that I see as a major problem.

And another problem that I think is very paramount is the fact that we're going to turn our lives, our businesses over to government control. The government is going to control all energy in this country and it's going to tax it all. You turn on these lights here in the Capitol—of course this is the government, they don't have to pay their bills—but if you turn them on at home, the cost of electricity is going to go up. If you use natural gas, a hot water heater, that's going to go up. You drive down the street using gasoline, that's made from crude oil, that's going to go up. Because everything that uses energy—which is everything—will cost Americans more. The energy companies, the ones that stay in America, they will pass that tax on to consumers, and the consumers pay because the consumers always pay.

But the hardest hit group is going to be, as Mr. SOUDER from Indiana said, the small manufacturing plants in the United States. They have to use energy to produce their products. Whether it's a paper mill in east Texas or whether it's a van up in Indiana or whether it's a small steel mill in my district, they have to use some form of energy to produce the product.

Now, the cost of that energy is going to go up so high they cannot produce the product and sell it. Because, you see, over in China, they're producing the same product and can ship it to the United States cheaper because they're not bound by all of these energy regulations and are not taxed for use of energy as American manufacturing companies will be. And that's a sad thing because it has always been the small business—and really the small manufacturing companies—that's been the heart and soul of the American economy.

You know, there was a time when you could go into a Wal-Mart—you've got them in your district, I don't know if Mr. CONAWAY has them in his, but we have a lot of Wal-Marts—but you could go into a Wal-Mart and they had a big sign that said ''Made in America.'' They claimed that everything they sold in that Wal-Mart was made in America. Well, that sign isn't up anymore; it hasn't been up in years because I don't think they make anything in America that they sell at Wal-Mart. It irks me to no end. This time of year, you go into a Wal-Mart and you want to buy a flag, just like that one behind the Speaker, and it's made in China. We can't even make our own

flags because manufacturing in this country is being killed by the cost of doing business. And that bill in front of you, Judge GOHMERT, is not going to help that at all. It's going to just make the situation worse.

The last thing that bill does not do is create more energy. It taxes energy. It does not provide for more energy for Americans. Nuclear energy, I mean, even France, 80 percent of its energy comes from nuclear energy. And it can be done and created in a clean and safe way. We don't have any more nuclear plants in this country because of the fear tactics that have been placed upon the thoughts, so we don't use nuclear energy.

So we're not doing anything. We're not drilling offshore even for natural gas. Natural gas is supposed to be the product that we go from this one environment to this beautiful environment. Of course, we can't get there from here. And now the other side that voted for this bill says, well, we need natural gas to bridge that gap because it's clean. Well, they don't allow drilling. You can't drill anymore. You can't drill offshore. You can't drill anywhere that there is natural gas. So how are we supposed to have energy to get to the clean energy if we cannot, as a Nation, even drill for natural gas?

So there's no nuclear, no natural gas, and of course we can't use clean coal. We don't want to use any more of that nasty old crude oil, even though crude oil and its byproducts is in everything Americans use, from plastics to our radios to our cell phones. It's in everything. And it's a derivative of some product of crude oil. We are always going to need crude oil to build the products that we have in this country. You can't build them all from biodiesels.

And so the bill does not do what it's supposed to do. It doesn't create jobs, it doesn't help the climate, it doesn't give us a new alternative for energy until we get to this supposed clean energy. And of course I think the worst thing is it takes control of Americans and their independence and makes us slaves to the Federal Government and the Federal bureaucrats to run our lives every day.

I will yield back, Judge GOHMERT.

Mr. GOHMERT. I appreciate so much those sterling observations about what this bill does and the effect it's going to have.

I know last summer I was approached by so many different people about the high price of gasoline. And I know those same people are going to get hammered again as time marches on—the summer into the fall into winter—if this becomes law. And the only thing standing between it now and becoming law is the Senate, because the President is sure going to sign it if it gets there. But a single mom saying I don't make enough money to live in town, so I'm out in the rural area, which means I have to pay for more gasoline to get into town, I'm maxing out my credit card every month just on gasoline. And it's getting close on whether I have enough leeway each month on my credit card to get enough gas to keep going back and forth to my job, because if I lose my job, I can't pay anything, including my credit card bill. And just the desperation in their eyes.

The things that are in this ''crap and trade'' bill, they're an inconvenience to the wealthy. They will be an inconvenience; but to people like that single mom and to so many others that are just struggling to get by—one 80-plus-year-old lady told me last summer, she said, you know, I started out in a house that had no running water and no power, we cooked with wood. And she said, Because of the price of fuel now, it looks like I'm going to finish my life in a house the way I started. This bill is going to do that.

And I know that privately there are people who are so pleased about this bill because they really believe if gasoline goes to $10, $20 a gallon, people won't use it and they will save the planet. And what they don't seem to understand is the only way you ever get a grip on pollution is to have an economy that is just thriving, that's doing so well in an advanced society, like ours has been, and then they're able to do something about pollution. But with this bill being passed, it is going to so cripple our economy. And when people lose their jobs and they're struggling and they can't make ends meet and they're using wood to cook food, they could care less about the environment. It's unfortunate, but it's true. They care more about living and sustainability.

And so what happens is these jobs will go to places like China, India, Brazil, where the pollution standards are not what they are here. And so they will put out, as we've already heard today, three, four, five, six times more pollution than we would if we kept the jobs here. And guess what? That pollution goes into the same atmosphere that these people over here are complaining about.

So by passing a bill that drives jobs, which this will, to other countries who don't have our pollution control and don't have our sensitivities to pollution, then we are doing such a disservice to the environment.

Mr. POE of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOHMERT. I certainly will.

Mr. POE of Texas. Let me just speak to that issue of jobs. As you know, in my southeast Texas district I have 20 percent of the Nation's refineries; and those are blue collar jobs, union jobs. And it's a tremendous concern for not just management, but for those people who work in those refineries when they're told that the cost of producing energy—because they have to use, as you mentioned, fuel to produce energy—that they will be driven out of business and somewhere else where they didn't sign this 1,200-page bill. You know, China didn't sign that, Cuba didn't sign it, India didn't sign it. They laugh at us for signing it. And they're really doing a better job of making sure that they produce energy cleanly.

Perfect example: as you know, and have also advocated, we should drill in the Gulf of Mexico for more crude oil and natural gas. We can do that safely and cleanly. But we're not doing it. So who's going to do that? The Cubans and the Chinese are going to be drilling in waters that are near the United States where we ought to be drilling. And I can assure you that those platforms that the Cubans are building and the Chinese are helping them build are not going to be near as safe, pollution safe, as what we can currently do. And so it makes no sense that we hurt ourselves in producing energy and automatically say we're going to punish energy consumption by taxing energy and its consumers, the American people, out of business in hopes that we can get a cleaner environment. We'll all be riding bicycles and living in towns where we used to have to use candles because we're not going to have the energy to take care of ourselves as we are doing now.

I would yield back. Thank you.

Mr. GOHMERT. Well, I appreciate those observations.

And we've gotten testimony and evidence in other hearings that indicate if we were to open up the Outer Continental Shelf of this country where drilling is not allowed, it would, within a couple of years, have added 1.2 million jobs—not just on the platform, we're talking about most of those jobs would be added throughout the country.

We also understood from evidence presented that if you allowed drilling in ANWR, 1.1 million jobs added, there would be a handful, there would be some up in ANWR, but around the country to deal with all of that oil that would be produced. There are slopes in Alaska where drilling is not permitted that have incredible amounts of natural gas, that if allowed to drill, there is another 1.1 to 1.2 million jobs that would be added. If we just used the energy with which God has blessed our country, we would have 3.5 million more jobs. And then the President—it would suit me fine if President Obama took credit for it. If we start producing that, then he could live up to his pledge and say, see, I told you I would produce 3 million more jobs. Then he changed that to ''save or produce'' 4 million jobs because he knew nobody could prove if he saved a job or not. But this would nearly produce 4 million jobs. And I would be happy with him taking credit just to have people employed and producing energy, making us less reliant on countries overseas.

And I appreciated the point our friend, MARK SOUDER, made earlier about you do have to use energy to produce these products. And it's the same with agriculture. You know, we have a good bit of agriculture in east

Texas where I'm from. And as one farmer pointed out, they don't make a Prius tractor. There is no hybrid tractor. And when you get away from the barn and you've got to have power, to my knowledge nobody makes a hybrid generator—which is a joke because a hybrid means you plug it in, and if you plug it in, you wouldn't—anyway, I won't explain it. But you have to use diesel, you have to use gasoline, kerosene, something to produce the energy that agriculture needs to produce.

And then the fertilizer, goodness sakes, it takes massive amounts of natural gas to produce the fertilizer that the farmers use to produce all the food we get. And so it is heartbreaking to know how agriculture, you know, it's just going to devastate the middle class, the lower middle class, particularly. And what we are going to see in the next days ahead is heartbreaking.

We are joined also by a friend who Mr. POE indicated is a CPA. And I always appreciate the way he looks at things because it's such a straightforward approach. So I would like to yield to my friend, Mr. CONAWAY.

□ 2100

Mr. CONAWAY. I thank the gentleman. I appreciate that.

These are troubling times, and this bill is awfully troubling. The science that surrounds this climate change issue, everybody gets an opinion about it; but there's only a certain set of facts that we ought to deal with.

One of those facts is, if you would equate the Earth's atmosphere to a football stadium with 10,000 people in the stadium—to you guys from Texas, in Indiana we play a lot of football there. So there are 10,000 people in the stands. About 7,600 of those people are wearing jerseys that say ''nitrogen'' on the front; and about 2,100 or so have jerseys that say ''oxygen'' on them; and about 100 of them, or so, would say ''argon.'' The remaining 100 or so jerseys in that stadium are referred to as trace elements. Among those trace elements are four jerseys—up from three 150 years ago—four jerseys that say ''CO_2.'' So the catastrophic disaster of biblical proportions that is being predicted by the zealots and the religious folks on this climate change thing argue that the addition of one more jersey that says CO_2 on it to that stadium of 10,000 drives the change that they're talking about.

Now I'm skeptical. I get to be that way because everybody gets their own opinion. That's a fact. You get to interpret that fact however you want to. But the truth of the matter is, that's what they're asking us to believe. If you look at the 21 models that the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change used to predict this disaster, and they start in the year 2000, and you plot them on a graph over time, and they start out with a bracket, you've got the worst-case scenario on the top, the best-case scenario on the bottom, and then all those in the middle. They start at a relatively narrow band, and they go out over time. They begin to spread a little bit. Then they get out a certain number of years, and they go straight up, big slash. It kind of looks like a hockey stick at that point. Right there is where Earth ends as we know it, life ends as we know it, under their scenario.

So you've got that graph plotted over time, starting in 2000. If you had plotted Earth's actual temperature for the last 9 years on that exact same graph, it's below the best-case scenario, and it's falling away from the path that their predictions are on.

Now, I've got a lot more experience in financial projections than I do climate change projections, but the concepts are the same. Whatever your time frame on your projection, the most accurate period is the near term. In other words, you should be able to get the close-in years right, so to speak. So what these climate signs are saying is, their 21 models couldn't get it right in the first 9 years.

Now what they've not been able to explain is there's some sort of a self-correcting mechanism in their scheme that somewhere out here, it brings them back in line with what's going on, and it marries it back up. So if your predictions don't get it right in the first 9 years, should we trust those predictions? The other question you have to ask yourself is, Did you come up with the model before you came up with the answer? Or did you come up with the answer, and then you derive a model to get there? I can't answer that question.

Now these models look incredibly accurate because they are fraught with algebraic equations and all kinds of high math and calculus and trigonometry and all this kind of stuff that I'm sure you have built into these things. They look very great, and they look very intellectual. But they are predictions. They are guesses. They start with a series of assumptions. And if you take them back in time—I don't know that if you put it back in time and put the really out numbers in there and ran them forward that they'd get it even better. So the models themselves are not working, and that's what's driving the change in terminology from global warming to climate change, man-made, by the way.

If you look at the quotes from our President, who is one of these aficionados, one of these people who has drunk the Kool-Aid, so to speak—this is a quote from Senator Obama who was then trying to convince us that he should be President of the United States. Apparently he convinced about 53 percent of us that that was a good idea.

I guess he must have been really tired that day, talking to the editorial board because he got very straightforward and didn't mince his words too well. He probably wishes he had these ones back. But he said, ''Under my plan of a cap-and-trade system, electricity rates would necessarily skyrocket.'' Well, to those of us from west Texas, that would mean that if I am paying $2 for something today, then to skyrocket means that I am going to be paying $7, $8, $9 for it at some point in the future. So it increased costs on the skyrocket thing.

And there's a ellipse here of where he goes on to talk about coal-fired powered plants and the coal industry having to be retrofitted and fixed and brought into the 21st century, so to speak, and the costs associated with those, that will cost money. And they, the energy producers, will pass that money on to consumers.

Now you and I are the consumers. Anybody who pays for the turning on of a lightbulb is a consumer in this regard.

Mr. SOUDER. Would the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CONAWAY. Sure.

Mr. SOUDER. If you could put your quote back up, I just want to say that you are just so incredibly not politically correct for this day and age.

Because American electricity rates would go up, but we're world citizens now. Surely you are not claiming that rates would go up in Pakistan, China and other places. We use a disproportionate amount of the energy of the world. So we should be willing to sacrifice so that all the world's citizens can benefit more by taking our jobs and having a better standard of living. Then we can be all more equal. You are just not being politically correct tonight.

Mr. CONAWAY. Well, I struggle with that, obviously.

Mr. SOUDER. You are acting like an American, Congressman.

Mr. CONAWAY. These are American consumers, American jobs and American families that our good colleague from east Texas has been talking about. If you look at what other nations have done—and I am never one to say, Well, if so-and-so is doing it, we ought to do it too. But if you can learn from their example and apply it to your own circumstance, then there may be some value there. Australia, there's an editorial in today's Wall Street Journal that recounts Australia's struggle with this issue. Their Prime Minister, much like our President, ran last year on a platform that he and Obama would, together, cure this issue. To get it through their House of Representatives, he had to delay the implementation of it under their legislation until 2011.

So this urgency thing that you've been hearing about—that if we don't do something soon that life will end as we know it—apparently has softened a little bit under the new terms since the world's getting cooler instead of warmer. But the story went on to say that they would not get it through the senate in Australia.

New Zealand right after last year, right after the new government took over, suspended their cap-and-tax program within weeks of its initial implementation because they didn't believe

it was correct. Poland's leadership is now saying that we are skeptical on the science. The Czech Republic has folks saying, We are skeptical. There are scientists in this country that are beginning to say—politically correct now—to challenge this science associated with this because prior to this if you did it, you were called a Neanderthal, a knuckle dragger. One of our colleagues today called us ''Flat Earth People.'' You know, those kinds of things. But now it's beginning to be a little more politically correct to be able to say, hey, the scientists never settle on any issue, certainly not something as unknown as this is going on. So the science is beginning to push back on them.

And one final thing for my colleague who mentioned the 20 percent refinery. There was an article in Bloomberg today, talking about how major oil companies intend to cope with this bill, and they intend to cope by reducing their emphasis on refining. No more investment. They will shut them in. They would rather buy the oil, produce the oil overseas, refine it overseas and import refined products to this country to sell as opposed to buying it. What we would prefer to do is produce the crude oil from the U.S., and refine it in U.S. refineries. Those are all U.S. jobs. But companies will adapt to this. They will figure out how to make this deal work, and it will be at the expense of the American economy and American jobs and American families who will be punished with this legislation.

So I appreciate my colleague leading the fight tonight, giving us this opportunity to talk to each other and the Speaker about what's going on because this is—as I mentioned earlier this afternoon, there is an old movie that was entitled, ''Bad Day at Black Rock.'' Folks, this was a bad day at Black Rock for this country.

With that, I yield back.

Mr. GOHMERT. Thank you, Mr. CONAWAY.

Mr. SOUDER. Will the judge yield for a minute?

Mr. GOHMERT. I will yield to my friend Mr. SOUDER.

Mr. SOUDER. You have been making a number of parliamentary points today during the debate and on the floor. You are an experienced judge as well as a Congressman. Is he allowed to use factual science on the floor? I don't know if we're allowed to really debate this stuff. This is mostly an ideological bill, not a factual bill. As Mr. CONAWAY correctly said, did they come to a conclusion and then make the facts fit the conclusion? It is really disturbing. Much of what's behind us is, in fact, that there's a group of people who feel guilty about us being such a successful Nation and about Western nations being so successful and that we use a disproportionate amount of the energy of the world and that somehow we should not do that. Some of the other western countries, like Australia and New Zealand, as you pointed out, are like, Hey, what's going on here? Do we have to buy into this? What does it exactly mean that we need to sacrifice and go down in our lifestyle? What will we gain? Is the science really there?

Then the developing countries that want to be like the United States, they look at us like a model, and they are going, like Poland, Hey, what is this stuff here? Is this something that you guys came up with at some university or a couple guys smoking some marijuana cigarettes? Or is this real fundamental stuff? And maybe we ought to prove this before we give up our cars, before we give up our SUVs and our station wagons.

I mean, we've had this debate about the Volt and whether GM should go to an electric car that costs $40,000. We talk about gas and oil and how you power these big trucks that I make in my district and how you power the RVs. How exactly are you going to tow a towable with a Smart Car? That the challenge is, how are you going to move around? And one of the questions is, I think they think that electric cars, when you plug them in, that the electricity is in the wall. What is going to make the power to power electric cars? And how many, kind of, regular people are going to be able to afford a $40,000 electric car?

Which gets to the core of this bill. We've had Members on the floor today say, Oh, well, we're going to fix this because low-income people are going to get exemptions, and there's going to be this class that gets an exemption. About 80 to 90 percent of that bill are government preferences to try to fix the problem they are creating.

In fact, one of our colleagues, the Democrat from Oregon, Mr. DEFAZIO, in his 1-minute this morning made two terrific points. One was, the alternative jobs and alternative energy are being created faster now than they will be under this bill because we're moving in that direction already with the incentives in the market. And with some supplemental funding out of Congress, some tax incentives out of Congress, we're going to get major breakthroughs.

I have a car company in my district that may be able to get 60 miles a gallon out of E85. The test case shows they got 100 in the first test, and it's a new motor. But if we mandate electric cars, it will never come to market. Government doesn't make efficient decisions, that if they protect this class, protect this company, protect the TVA power system but not this power system, you get all these special categories.

But what we know is, as all of you have pointed out, the upper classes will figure that out. They're not going to get damaged much by this; and to some degree, they're going to try to cover and patch up in a mishmash of expensive government regulatory programs. And who gets lost in this? The very people that the other party promised to protect when they ran, the middle class, the forgotten man and woman and young person who is somewhere in the middle, working hard and not, as Mr. DEFAZIO pointed out in his other point, making money on credit swaps.

We're going through one of the greatest financial messes in the world, and we have just set up a cap-and-trade. What does trade mean? We call it cap-and-tax. Cap and send the jobs to China. A number of different things. Mr. GOHMERT a while ago just coined another version of the bill. But the bottom line is, the trade is trading credits and swapping and then securitizing those in markets and encouraging other countries around the world to do this. This will be a boondoggle. How many trees did you plant in Brazil to offset your ethanol plant? How many whatever did you do in damming up a river, which historically the environmentalists were opposed to damming. Now they talk about hydropower. Which is it? You did a hydroplant in Thailand. Therefore, you get to have a credit swap worth $50,000. You put that $50,000 out. A number of people bid on it. That gets leveraged 30 times. We're creating a bigger mess than we have now, based on trying to do all sorts of equalization. This is a disaster, and it cannot happen without basically destroying our country.

We pointed out tonight different angles of this, and this is not—as Mr. POE goes through his list on July 4 and our Founding Fathers and what they sacrificed for. They sacrificed for freedom, not for government setting up credit swaps, protecting one group of people against another group of people, one region against another group of people. Then when you complain, they make deals on the floor during the debate today. Oh, I didn't realize that. There's such a lack of understanding that it takes that many pages. By the time we get done with the regulations, there will be that stack across that whole top of the table, and they'll still be inventing it as people sue and go to court to judges, like my friend Mr. GOHMERT said.

Mr. GOHMERT. I appreciate so much, Mr. SOUDER, your great observations.

Thomas Jefferson said: ''The natural progress of things is for liberty to yield and government to gain ground.'' And that's what we're seeing in this bill, the dramatic gains of the government's right to control your life in this bill are just extraordinary.

□ 2115

I do want to make a couple of quick points. Apparently we have about 7 or 8 minutes left.

For one thing, Mr. CONAWAY had mentioned earlier that it will likely cost the average family across America an extra $3,031. And I know there will be some people out there who have seen some in the mainstream media say, oh, well, we saw where that guy from MIT said it won't cost that much. It may be $300 or $500 or $600, but it won't be $3,100.

Those people just bought the Democratic talking points and didn't bother to check to see why it was that they are saying that it won't cost over $3,000. From what I have read, apparently they are saying it won't cost over $3,000 because even though the average family will pay more than $3,000 additionally because of this bill, they are saying what you will get back from the government in the way of services and benefits will be a wash because of all that you will get out of the government as a result of that extra $3,000 you pay for energy in the first year. It won't be that much, because you will be grateful for all you get. Baloney.

And another thing we heard in debate on the floor today about was, gee, the AFL–CIO leaders and other union leaders, we heard these union leaders were in support of this bill. Well, how about that? They were in favor of the government taking over GM and Chrysler. Why? Because they got a deal. They get to own the companies. Who knows what they have promised the union leaders to support this ''crap-and-trade'' bill.

It is a sad, sad day for America because the rank-and-file people in America are going to pay a severe price. This intrudes into their lives so much. And for my unfortunate Democratic friends who have not read this, they said, no, no, no. This will provide jobs, not take jobs. They just need to go to section 426 where it talks about the climate change adjustment allowance because there are provisions in it. They know that people are going to lose their jobs as a result of this bill. So it is built in here.

Now, you have to understand, though, it says here, you won't get such allowance for the first week you are unemployed. But then it will kick in after that. There is good stuff here. Over here it does mention that you're not going to get an adjustment allowance for that first week either that you're unemployed. They know this is going to cost so many jobs.

There is climate change adjustment assistance and relocation assistance. Unfortunately, it is not going to pay you to go get your job back from China, India, Brazil and Latin America. So that part of the relocation is not going to help. But I'll tell you the one that just galled me to no end. It says here, absolutely part of the law, the Secretary shall conduct a study to examine the circumstances of older adversely affected workers.

In other words, if you're over 50 or so and you lose your job—because you're going to, you're going to lose a lot of jobs here—and you lose your job, when you do as a result of this bill, don't worry. We are going to do a study about you and your lost job. That will warm your heart, won't it? It won't keep you warm on a cold night next winter when you lost your job as a result of this bill.

But the good news is, the Senate has still not acted. Mr. Speaker, it is not too late for people to let their Senator know, look, I know you're a Democrat. I know the pressure is enormous. I know they are promising you all kinds of things to get you to vote for this bill. But don't get sucked in, because we will be the ones, the constituents will say, for paying the price for your sin and error.

I would like to yield to my friend, Judge POE, in our last few minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Thank you for yielding.

The concern that I have about this bill is that, as I mentioned at the outset, we love the fact that we are a free people and that we are an independent Nation. This bill makes us dependent on government. It will control our lives. We have to get permission from the government for every action we will take as individuals and as businesses. We do not have free will to make decisions, because the government won't let us have that free will to make decisions. Decisions will be made by the government. The government picks winners and losers in that bill because it creates great subsidies to some people to make them more dependent on government and government control.

That is not what America is about. America is about freedom. It is not about dependence.

So the sad part about the bill is the aspect that it creates right here in Washington, D.C., as Mr. CONAWAY said, the center of the universe to some, control over everybody from Indiana to Texas to California to Hawaii to Florida. And that ought not to be.

Mr. GOHMERT. Thank you, and I appreciate your observations. I would like to also observe, though, we heard during the debate today that the National Association of Realtors was supporting this. Obviously they didn't know about the 300 pages added at 3:08 a.m. this morning, because whoever that Realtor was that pushed that should lose their job because it is going to cost Realtors jobs. It is going to cost them commissions. It is going to cost them royally.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I would yield back time.

OMISSION FROM THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF THURSDAY, JUNE 25, 2009, AT PAGE H7437

RELATING TO IMPEACHMENT PROCEEDINGS OF JUDGE SAMUEL B. KENT—MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE (H. DOC. NO. 111–53)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the Senate; which was read and referred to the managers on the part of the House appointed by House Resolution 565 and ordered to be printed:

I, Nancy Erickson, having custody of the seal of the United States Senate, hereby certify that the attached record is a true and correct copy of a record of the United States Senate, received by the United States Senate Sergeant at Arms from Samuel B. Kent on June 24, 2009, and presented to the Senate in open session on June 25, 2009.

In Witness Whereof, I have set my hand and caused to be affixed the Seal of the United States Senate at Washington, D.C., this 25th day of June, 2009.

I, Samuel B. Kent, Judge of the United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas, hereby tender my resignation as a Federal District Judge effective 30th June 2009.

SAMUEL B. KENT,

Dated 24 June 2009.

Witnessed: Terrance W. Gainer; 4:44 p.m., Andrew B. Willison.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PETERS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PETERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHIFF, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SPRATT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DOGGETT, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CONAWAY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MCCLINTOCK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CONAWAY, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BOCCIERI, for 5 minutes, today.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House reports that on June 26, 2009 she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills.

H.R. 1777. To make technical corrections to the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 31, 111th Congress, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until Tuesday, July 7, 2009, at 2 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows: