

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

HALLOWEEN BUDGET SCARE

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

Mr. INGLIS. Madam Speaker, tonight I want to talk about where we are with the budget deficit.

Just in time for Halloween, we are looking at scary numbers: an annual deficit of \$1.42 trillion, accumulated debt of \$13 trillion. It's a real fright. So, what does it compare to in our history?

Well, here we have a chart that shows the historical debt levels of the United States. This is debt owed to the public, not intergovernmental debt. But what it shows is that after World War II there was a substantial amount of debt owed to the public; in fact, it was over 100 percent of our gross domestic product. Since then, it has gone down nicely, and that's a good thing. But here, lately, you can see the trajectory over there of where we're headed to, another dangerously high level of debt; again, an accumulated debt right now of \$13 trillion, and this year will throw on 1.42 trillion from this year's annual deficit.

But the historical debt level gives us a little bit of comfort because it shows that after World War II we had a higher percentage of debt than we do now. But there is a big difference between the debt after World War II and the debt today. As you can see here, the comparison of our creditors on this debt is what's really telling and what, again, just in time for Halloween, is rather frightening.

In 1945, 95 percent of the debt was owed to the U.S. public; only 5 percent of it we were looking at back then was foreign investment. Now, then, in 2009, that \$13 trillion debt that I was just talking about, the U.S. public owns only 54 percent of that debt. China owns 11 percent, other foreign countries, 35 percent.

So the very scary thing is that, unlike World War II where we had a higher percentage of debt compared to GDP but we owed it to ourselves, now with this \$13 trillion debt, we owe it to foreign countries, not to ourselves.

The very sad thing for me as a member of the Republican Study Committee is that if we had enacted the conservative budgets that we proposed since 2005, we would be, right now, \$613 billion to the better, because over those years, we proposed here on this House floor the most conservative budget alternatives offered. Had they been enacted, we would have been looking at \$613 billion less than what we are looking at now by way of debt.

Now, from here, it gets even scarier, because this chart shows the effect of President Obama's proposed budget in 2010. As you can see, government

spending as a percentage of GDP—that's what this chart is showing is government spending as a percentage of GDP—you can see it taking off at a trajectory that truly is frightening. The Republican alternative budgets, as you can see there, show a trend line down so that we would be moving away from government spending as a percentage of GDP. It would actually be declining over the years to come.

So, the question for us as Americans is: How are we going to cope with the fact that we've got a \$13 trillion accumulated debt? First thing we could do is cancel the unspent part of the stimulus package; that's \$787 billion. Only 13 percent of it has been spent. Surely we can cut that out. The next thing we can do is make sure we do no harm in health care, and that means avoiding yet another government program like Medicare and Medicaid that involve cost shift. That means that private sector employers and people covered by their own insurance will have to make up for the shortfall created by the cost shift that comes from these underpaying government programs. But even in their underpayment, they create an enormous government deficit problem.

So, Madam Speaker, the message I think to all of us, Republicans and Democrats, the President and the Congress, is to come together to figure out a way to get this trajectory down, to not be looking at this kind of government spending that takes off, but rather to bring that down.

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

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

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

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

ENERGY

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

Mr. BOCCIERI. Madam Speaker, today, we are going to highlight this hour on energy and the needs of the United States in terms of enacting a robust energy policy that is going to create jobs here in America, move away from our dependence on foreign sources of oil, and make our country stronger in the long term.

Now, I want to speak to you from a military perspective, having served nearly 15 years in the United States Air Force. I think that this issue has to

be elevated from just a national debate to a matter of national security. And it's not just Congressman BOCCIERI from the 16th District of Ohio saying this.

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

So, from my own perspective, having graduated with a degree in baseball and minoring in economics, I didn't get into the whole scientific debate on whether climate change was real or perceived, but when the military experts and our intelligence experts speak, I'm going to listen, and I have to tell you that America should be listening as well.

I hope that over this next 60 minutes we will have a robust discussion about how this energy policy is going to move our country down the field so that we can end our dependence on foreign oil and we can make sure that our country becomes energy independent. After all, we did send a man to the Moon in 10 years, and I think and believe in my heart of hearts that we can become energy independent in the next 15 to 20 years. I believe in the innovation of America, and I believe that we can do this if we put our efforts on it.

Now, with the national energy debate comes a sense of trying to correct the status quo. And I know those changes are difficult, but for those who are against a national robust energy policy for the United States, you hear them speak the rhetoric from those who delivered \$4-a-gallon gasoline to the United States of America. We listened to the same talking points that delivered oil prices over \$150 a barrel. We listened to the same talking points who don't want us to end our dependency on foreign oil.

□ 2000

We import 66.4 percent of our oil from overseas; 66.4 percent of our oil comes from overseas. Nearly 40 percent comes from the Middle East. Forty percent comes from the Middle East.

History reminds us that, in 1944, when the United States and our allies bombed the Ploiesti Romanian oil fields, we effectively cut off the German supply of oil; but they quickly transitioned to a synthetic fuel, which is a derivative of coal, and they fought on a lot longer.

So the single largest user of energy in the United States is the Department of Defense. My friends, this is a matter of national security, and that's why an energy policy that moves away from our dependence on foreign oil is going to move us down the field to becoming

energy independent. I believe that the amount of alternative energy our Nation is able to produce is only limited by the amount of energy we are willing to invest in it, and that is why the United States is moving down this track.

We find that our intelligence experts, over serious matters of national security, have talked about this. In fact, General Anthony Zinni, a retired military staffer, has weighed in on this. We find that many of our military experts have weighed in on this as well as the CIA, which last month just set up a national policy and an agency in launching the center on climate change, with national security as a focal point for its work on this subject. So this is not just a matter of climate change but a matter of national security, and the impacting phenomena of such certification is just giving emphasis to the fact that we have got to address this as a matter of national security.

So we are going to talk tonight about energy. We are going to talk tonight about health care. I am joined by some of my colleagues on the floor, and we are going to be able to pivot in between these two subjects tonight as members of the 30-somethings because there are two topics.

There are two issues that confront us as a Nation that offer some serious challenges for our long-term competitiveness. They are health care and energy, health care in the fact that we spend more than any industrialized country on health care. Yet we find that our outcomes, our life expectancy, is on par with Cuba. With infant mortality and with chronic diseases like diabetes, heart conditions and asthma, we rank out somewhere around 38th in the world. So it's very clear that we are spending more than any industrialized country on health care. Yet our returns and outcomes, our return on investment, is not as good as it needs to be. So tonight we are going to talk about those two subjects as 30-somethings, energy and health care.

I am happy to be joined by my colleague from just a State away, JASON ALTMIRE from Pennsylvania. I would like to recognize him for this time.

Mr. ALTMIRE. I thank the gentleman.

I did want to start by joining the gentleman in a discussion of energy. I come from a region of the country where we have an incredible amount of coal reserves and where we have natural gas reserves that exceed anything available literally anywhere else in the world. We have the international headquarters of nuclear, with Westinghouse headquartered in my district, which employs 4,200 people currently; and it's growing literally every day. I have a lot of energy in the district that I represent, and a lot of it is the fossil fuels that you hear about.

When you hear about coal and natural gas, you say, well, that's the old way of doing things. I would certainly take issue with that. I think we can

have clean coal and liquefied coal. I think we can use natural gas to our advantage both from a homeland security aspect and from an energy independence aspect as well. Coming from western Pennsylvania, when you think about that, that does not mean we don't think about new types of energies. I want to talk about solar and about one way western Pennsylvania has taken a leadership role in solar technology.

This week, for example, this House is going to consider Congresswoman GABRIELLE GIFFORDS' Solar Technology Roadmap Act. That establishes a committee to draft a solar energy roadmap for the Nation. Now, this roadmap sets short-, medium- and long-term solar technology goals for the United States of America, identifying research, development and demonstration needs for this technology and identifying opportunities to coordinate that effort all across the country. The bill creates a solar technology research, development and demonstration program that awards merit-reviewed grants for up to 50 percent of project costs to organizations such as academic institutions, national laboratories, industry, State research agencies, and nonprofit organizations.

Now, the reason I wanted to talk is I'm working with my colleagues to incorporate into the bill for one of the fiscal year 2011 demonstration projects a technology called "organic solar technology." Many of us think solar power is a rigid cell of large glass plates, but organic solar technology turns solar cells into high-tech ink that can be printed or sprayed onto surfaces using the same general idea as an ink-jet printer. If you think about the way that works, that's the way organic solar would work as well.

This technology leap allows us to turn lightweight, flexible films into solar receptors, which open the door to using solar power for items like cell phones, laptops and, perhaps, one day, as the gentleman was talking about, for military equipment that can recharge in the field or smart labels to track retail inventory. This technology will potentially cost less than traditional silicon solar technology because it's easier to process. Some manufacturers are confident that they can bring the cost of organic solar technology to one-fifth the cost of traditional silicon technology, making solar technology more attainable for all Americans, certainly western Pennsylvania included.

Furthermore, organic solar cells would potentially be better for the environment than traditional silicon solar technology. Not only does organic solar technology use less energy in production because it requires less processing, but the cells can be easily recycled.

Today, some estimates show that our Nation is falling behind in bringing this technology to the market. Half of the world's organic solar technology

patent filings since 2004 came from the United States. Yet the United States lags behind Europe and Asia in the actual development of this technology in the field according to a Navigant report on photovoltaic markets in 2007.

So two of the biggest barriers to organic solar technology today are how long the cells last in the field and how efficiently they convert sunlight into electrical energy. In closing, my provision would ensure the opportunity for a demonstration project to pursue these and other advancements.

The points of this, as the gentleman was talking about, are military applications and the ways that we can achieve energy independence. This is one example of how western Pennsylvania, which you think of as coal country and as natural gas country—and I told you we have the nuclear headquarters—this is one way that we're taking a leadership role in solar technology as well.

Mr. BOCCIERI. Well, I couldn't agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania more in that we will find the courage to find what is clean coal technology and what we can use clean coal technology for.

Let me just say this: the United States Air Force right now is testing synthetic fuel in our airplanes, and it is using it for other applications broadly across the military because they know that we have more coal reserves in America than we have oil.

For those who may be out there who believe that we should drill in America and should take every last drop of oil out of America, we are going to expand drilling at some point. It's in the Senate version of the bill right now; but we will always have less oil than the Middle East, and right now 40 percent of our demand is supplied by the Middle East. Many have said that we're funding both sides of this war on terror, that we're sending money over to the Middle East and that they, in turn, are sending money to rogue terrorist nations that are actually looking to harm America.

So let's become energy independent. Let's use our resources. Let's use nuclear. Let's use clean coal. Let's use solar. Let's use the type of biofuels that are being researched right in our part of Ohio.

Now I want to speak to you because, if we end our dependence on foreign oil from the Middle East, what will it take? many Americans ask. What will it take to end our dependence on foreign oil?

There was a study issued that said if we put 27 percent of the vehicles on the road in the United States which are gas electric hybrids, like the Ford Escape or the Toyota Prius, we could end our dependency on foreign oil from the Middle East. Isn't that an achievable goal? Eighty percent of the world's oil reserves are in the hands of governments and of their respective national oil companies. Sixteen of the twenty largest oil companies are state-owned—

nations that want to seek harm to the United States.

In fact, we hear from our military leaders, from General Anthony Zinni, a retired marine and former head of the Central Command, who said that we will pay for this one way or another. We will pay to reduce greenhouse gas emissions today, and we will have to take an economic hit of some kind, or we will pay the price later in military terms, and that will involve human lives. It is very clear that this is a matter of national security.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOCCIERI. I will.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. I thank the gentleman for bringing this up, and I would like to really put this in real terms for people.

When I went over to Afghanistan and Pakistan with a group of Members of Congress earlier this year, I, frankly, was surprised to find out that the two major funders, the two major governments putting money on the ground in Pakistan, were the United States of America and Saudi Arabia. Saudi Arabia has the second largest presence on the ground in Pakistan with regard to the direct government funding of social service infrastructure, of educational infrastructure, and of health infrastructure. If you want a real example of how the money that we are paying in gas prices and in home heating oil prices are directly ending up contravening our national security interests, there is a perfect example.

Saudi Arabia is taking the money that it makes off of American consumers of oil, and they are putting that money on the ground in Pakistan to fund the madrasas, the religious schools and many of the efforts that are feeding this growing generation and generations of people who have adverse interests to the United States. They are the recruiting tools of the Taliban and of the al Qaeda funded on the ground in Pakistan by countries that get revenues from the use of their oil.

So, as we try to chart a path forward as to how we are going to make sense of the very direct threat presented to this country by al Qaeda's presence and by the Taliban's presence, giving them cover in Pakistan and in Afghanistan, we can't lose sight of the fact that this isn't just about how many troops we have there and what our role is vis-à-vis direct military action or the training of Afghan troops. This is also about the fact that, while we are funding all of those troops, as you have said, Mr. BOCCIERI, we are also funding at the very same time the efforts that are ongoing in both of those countries to undermine our efforts.

There are, frankly, a dozen great reasons that we need to progress towards energy independence, but with direct respect to the security of this country and to the threats presented to it in the Afghanistan-Pakistan region, we have immediate, immediate impera-

tives to get ourselves off of the oil which is funneling the efforts against us.

Mr. BOCCIERI.

Mr. BOCCIERI. Mr. MURPHY, you are exactly right. This is not a debate that is new just to this year or to this Congress. In fact, every Presidential candidate running for the highest office in this country last year stated that it is a matter of national security.

So I remind some of our friends on the other side who need to be reminded of the fact that some of their leaders who were running for this office suggested that we need a national energy policy that moves away from our dependence on foreign oil, that creates jobs in America and that makes America stronger, not weaker. One of those was Rudolph Giuliani.

To the gentleman from Pennsylvania's remarks about clean coal, he said we need to expand the use of hybrid vehicles, clean coal/carbon sequestration. We have more coal reserves in the United States than we have oil reserves in Saudi Arabia. This should be a major national project. This is a matter of national security. Every Presidential candidate has suggested that. We'll revisit some of their remarks in a few moments, but I want to go back to what some of our national intelligence experts are saying here.

Peter Ogden, chief of staff to the State Department's top climate negotiator, said the sense that climate change poses security and geographical challenges is central to the thinking of the State Department and the climate office. They're citing studies that were done under the Department of Defense which suggested that our National Intelligence experts are suggesting that this will be a breeding ground for terrorists if we do not look at this very seriously.

We are finding that areas which are wiped out by tsunamis and which have these cataclysmic events happening in their regions become breeding grounds for terrorists. They can't fund the national or the basic interests of their communities, of their countries. As a result, the CIA has said that the economic disruptions associated with global climate change are projected to place increased pressure on weak nations which may be unable to provide basic needs or to maintain order for their citizens.

That is critical, my friends. I didn't get into the whole scientific debate of climate change, but I'm paying attention when our military experts and when our Nation's intelligence experts are suggesting that we have to elevate this to a matter of national security.

I know Representative TONKO, from New York, has a few words, and he joins us in our 30-something hour.

□ 2015

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Representative BOCCIERI, for bringing us together this evening. I can't agree more with you and the Representatives that have

joined us here this evening, both Representatives ALTMIRE and MURPHY, who have indicated that there is an importance to looking at the big picture frame that should guide this debate and discussion. It is certainly about energy transformation. It's about energy security that's enhanced. It's about growing our energy independence. But it goes well beyond that. It is a factor; it is a huge argument that speaks favorably to our national security, to our economic security. I think when we look at that bigger framework, we're able to understand the ripple effect of benefits, of good, that comes from the negotiated efforts here in this House to produce a strong bill. For energy transformation, for climate change, for global warming to be addressed in positive, progressive terms.

To have listened to some of the discussion and debate on this floor that denounces some of the studies that were authored out there, where the authors of those studies have suggested to us that you're overstating, exaggerating, if not outright denouncing studies that have been put together that speak favorably to these sorts of investments have not stopped people from using misinformation and growing the arguments out there that are unfounded, unfounded and unsubstantiated by evidence and by truth and by documentation that has been established.

I think it's important for us to look at the facts. If we're willing to continue to invest hundreds of billions of dollars into foreign treasuries, to continue to rely in a gluttonous measure on fossil-based fuels for our energy agenda, shame on us as a nation. We have an opportunity here to go forward with a green energy economy that can create jobs of various disciplines, from Ph.D.s over to those with bachelor's degrees, over to those who have associate degrees and skill sets that have been developed with apprenticeship programs, with vocational programs. Across the board, we have an opportunity to invest in all sorts of disciplines out there that strengthen our economy and strengthen our comeback for job creation and job retention in this nation.

Just the other day we were talking to people in my district from the nanoscience arena. And in a generalization of that arena, what they see from start-up businesses is that we have about 20 percent of Ph.D.s and master's degree holders occupying jobs at those centers, at the various start-up businesses that are being established; we have perhaps 20 percent with bachelor's degrees; and then some 60 percent occupied jobs that are bringing to that table associate degrees and technical training. So I think it's very evident, very obvious, by these calculable sorts of outcomes that speak to what's happening in my district that we're growing jobs in every sphere, in every dimension, with all sorts of skill sets that are required.

It is important for us to go forward with this green energy race. And we don't have a choice whether or not to enter in. We have a choice to be as prepared in that race as possible. I liken this to the space race of four decades ago, where this country vigorously pursued with a degree of passion, a high degree of passion, the efforts to land a person on the Moon. That was more than just a race to land a person on the Moon. It was a growth of technology in all sorts of areas in our life that define our quality of life: in communications, in health care, in all sorts of technical advancements in our society. And it allowed for us to think in bold and very noble terms about the importance of science and technology.

Here today, many more nations are joining in a race, a global race, on green energy, clean energy. And we don't have the luxury to stand along the sidelines and watch other nations prosper and pass us by. That's what will happen if we don't go forward with a plan, an energy plan, that will calculate jobs, that will allow for us to invest and reach to our intellect in this nation. Our intellectual capacity is great. We can't just stop with the ideas. Many of those ideas are being commercialized and deployed into the manufacturing sector in other nations. They're using American patents, they're using American ingenuity, American ideas to make things happen in their nations. We need to invest vigorously in that sort of economy. We can do it by putting together a progressive policy like that of ACES that was voted upon in this House, where we put together the framework, the blueprint—the green print, perhaps—as to how we're going to pursue job creation and responsiveness to our energy needs and a responsible approach to the environmental stewardship that is assigned each and every one of us as American citizens to this globe.

Mr. BOCCIERI. I couldn't agree with the gentleman from New York more, that this is not only about creating jobs, it's a matter of our national security and moving away from our dependence on foreign oil.

In fact, in September, the Central Intelligence Agency, the CIA, is launching the Center on Climate Change and National Security as the focal point for its work on the subject. The Center is a small unit led by senior specialists from the Directorate of Intelligence and the Directorate of Science and Technology. And further, the National Intelligence Council reports that the demands of potential humanitarian responses may significantly tax U.S. military transportation and support force structures, resulting in a strained readiness posture and decreased strategic depth for our combat operations.

This is a telling remark of where this issue needs to be highlighted. I'm a C-130 pilot. We provide humanitarian relief. We support our troops. We will be flying humanitarian relief all over the world if this issue is not addressed. And

they are talking about our readiness as a country. The CIA and others are talking about our readiness as a country. And I think this is very, very important. We can use all the resources that we have at our disposal. Can you imagine one day, my colleagues, rolling into a fuel station and having a choice, between using traditional gasoline, biofuels, biodiesel, ethanol; maybe we plug in our electric hybrid or drive by the gas station or fuel station altogether because we have a fuel cell that allows us to get a hundred miles to the gallon. That is an achievable goal that we should strive towards, having choices, not just using traditional gasoline but having a variety of sources. And, in fact, we can end our dependence from Arab nations and OPEC-producing nations if we put 27 percent of the vehicles on the road that were gas-electric hybrids. That's an achievable goal, to end our dependence from the Persian Gulf.

Would we bring our troops home? Would our national interests now be so closely aligned and attached to what happens in Saudi Arabia and Kuwait and Iraq and all those areas—Iran—that have all the oil, 40 percent of the oil that comes to this nation? We can use the resources at our disposal, and I think that we ought to think about doing that. This is about jobs. This is about national security.

Let me just relate to you something that some of our leaders who are running for the highest office in this land have said. Mike Huckabee himself said this:

A nation that can't feed itself, fuel itself or produce the weapons to fight for itself is a nation forever enslaved. It's critical for our own country and our own interest economically, and from a point on national security, we commit to becoming energy independent and we commit to doing it within a decade. We have to take responsibility for our own house before we can expect others to do the same in theirs.

It goes back to his basic concept of leadership. Leaders don't ask others what they are unwilling to do themselves. That right there, my friends, is something that is very, very important.

We have been joined by one of our friends from Virginia, Congressman PERRIELLO, who has much passion about this topic.

Mr. PERRIELLO. Mr. BOCCIERI, thank you very much for continuing this. Since the last time we had one of these discussions, China has made yet another massive investment of tens of billions, hundreds of billions of dollars in their energy future, in their energy independence. I am sick and tired of us falling behind China. I'm sick and tired of importing everything from there instead of building things and growing things right here in the United States. We can do this better.

The Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Energy came down to my

part of southern Virginia and the Secretary of Energy had just recently gotten back from China. He was looking at the bio refineries in my district and the potential for us to be growing our own energy and keeping that wealth in our communities.

I asked him, How does this compare to what's going on in China?

He said, This is better than anything they have there right now.

But we are not investing and committing to this in the same way that they are. We cannot afford to fall behind. That's why those quotes come from leaders who are trying to show that they're leaders. But what happens once it gets to governing? Leadership cannot stop on election day. That has to be the beginning of a commitment, not the end, to showing your patriotism, to showing that you will put this country's interests ahead of the interests of the next election cycle.

For 30 years, both parties have talked about and understood the importance of energy independence, importance to our national security, importance to our competitive advantage. And yet nothing, year in and year out. This Congress is different. We are not going to allow the problems that have hackled us for a generation to continue to do so.

I was in a group with some regional planners the other day talking about infrastructure investments. They said, Mr. PERRIELLO, do you think that we have an economic development strategy in this country?

I said, Unfortunately for too long we have not, because the economists guiding the way have too often come only from the financial sector, not from the economic development sector. We need to make the commitments on infrastructure, on energy consumption, on efficiency, on smart grid technology that will create the new competitive advantage for the new American century. That is our obligation. And now is the moment where we ask, Are we ready to lead or will we cower? I want to acknowledge your leadership, not only in making difficult votes but more importantly for being a tireless advocate for what we can do in this country; advanced manufacturing of these new means of energy production, producing the energy-efficiency technology. I just cut the ribbon last week on a small business, four or five employees in my district, in a town with over 20 percent unemployment, that is figuring out how to sell the wind and solar and efficiency technologies to small businesses to help make them more competitive and to middle-class families to help them make that family budget that is so tight these days.

Mr. BOCCIERI, I appreciate your leadership. Thank you for including me in this; and we will not rest until we do what is necessary to protect this country and make it competitive again.

Mr. BOCCIERI. Thank you. I agree that this is not only about national security but creating jobs, too. We had a

recent announcement last month that Rolls Royce was moving the center for their research into my district, for fuel cells. We are going to become a leader in fuel cell research provided that we have the courage to invest in it.

You may have missed my earlier remarks because you just joined us, but I said that the only thing that is holding us back in terms of the amount of alternative energy our nation is able to produce is the amount of energy we are willing to invest in it. We have got to find the energy and the courage to make this happen.

I know Congressman MURPHY has been trying to champion this in Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Mr. BOCCIERI, we have the best-educated, most highly trained, most productive, most innovative workforce in the world. You go back over the history of major invention over the last hundred years, almost every single one of them has come out of American ingenuity. Yet today with respect to the global industry that produces advanced battery technology, solar cells, solar technology and wind turbines, in all three of those areas, the United States today has either one or two of the top 10 producers in the world. We have lost ground to Asia, to Europe, because we have been unwilling to be a partner with those industries in getting them off the ground.

This place is obsessed with short-term thinking. Maybe it's because everybody in this Chamber is up for reelection every 2 years. But this is a problem. This is an opportunity that requires that vision that Mr. PERRIELLO is talking about, to extend beyond 2 years, to be able to see pay-offs that may not happen for 4 years, 5 years, 10 years. But the fact is that this place, Washington, D.C., the United States Congress, has been so focused on the short term, has been so focused on how we get from this year to next year that we have caught ourselves in a cycle, a downward spiral, with regard to energy and economic development policy that we are now so far beyond and behind the rest of the world.

This is absolutely about national security, but this is about putting ourselves back on the mantle of leadership with regard to the development of these technologies where we should be today. This is growing jobs in everyone's district, but it does involve some government help at the outset. To simply ask venture capitalists and private investors to put up all of the seed money required to develop these new technologies whose payoff may not come for another 5 or 10 years is unrealistic. And the reason why Japan and Germany and so many other countries are so far out ahead of us with respect to the development of wind turbines and solar panels and advanced battery technology is because they have at the outset partners in government who set market conditions that are hospitable to a public-private partnership in the development of these technologies.

This is going to be part of the story of the regrowth and resurgence of the American economy. But it only happens if we follow the example that unfortunately has had to have been set by these other countries, China included, as Mr. PERRIELLO points out. We can get back to a leadership place on this issue, but it is going to take a Congress and a President and a House and a Senate that's willing to look out beyond the 2-year time horizon, that's willing to make some sacrifices and some tough votes right now in order to get us to that point of energy sustainability and independence in the long run.

□ 2030

Mr. BOCCIERI. Well, I couldn't agree with you more. The gentleman from Connecticut is absolutely correct. This is about creating jobs. So many jobs have been created already in our congressional districts, and let me just highlight a few of those.

In Ohio, he is right about the private venture funds and the public investment that is going to be required to get this started. Ohio is going to see a \$5.6 billion investment in new public and private sources due to programs and incentives under the American Recovery and Reinvestment and American Clean Energy and Security Act. These investments will lead to nearly 70,000 clean-energy jobs in Ohio, even assuming some potential setbacks with respect to how we transition to those new technologies. Presently there are about 35,000 clean-energy jobs in Ohio, and that was as of 2007.

So we can do this. We can create the jobs of tomorrow. We can stand with the innovators and the entrepreneurs, and we can disregard the gibberish and the talk that we hear, the talking points from the status quo folks, who believe and are taking their talking points, quite frankly, from the same people, the very people who gave us \$4 a gallon gasoline, \$150 a barrel oil prices. We can do better than that, and I think it is about our country.

Let me revisit, before we recognize Representative ALTMIRE, what Mitt Romney said. He said there are multiple reasons for us to say we want to be less energy dependent on foreign energy and develop our own sources. That is the real key, of course, additional sources of energy here, as well as more efficient uses of energy. That will allow us and the world to have less oil being drawn down from various sources where it comes without dropping the prices too high to a level. It will keep people, some of whom are unsavory characters, from having an influence on our foreign policy.

Now, even Mitt Romney, who was running for the highest office in the country, had suggested the fact that we get and we fund both sides of this war on terror, because we buy so much oil from overseas. And I believe that every presidential candidate running last year said that this is a matter of na-

tional security, and it is time that we do this.

One last thing. I visited an industry this week in my district that is leading the charge in trying to make our buildings more efficient. We spend \$400 billion a year on inefficient buildings across this country, and I know Representative PERRIELLO said this before, the cheapest energy in our country is the energy that we never use.

To save energy, to reduce our consumption, is very important, especially when you have 3 percent of the world's population and we are consuming nearly 30 percent of the world's resources of energy. That has got to change, and we have got to find our way away from this, and that is what this means tonight.

Representative TONKO had a few words on that.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Representative BOCCIERI.

I have heard all of our colleagues talking about leadership, exercising leadership and putting a plan into action. I think what is most regrettable is that we are still having this debate as to whether or not to enter into a new energy economy, to address the climate change issues that are so much an imperative these days.

All of this discussion is coming while other nations are now investing and investing heavily in their country's economy, driven by these new technologies, these emerging technologies, an innovation economy. So our pace here needs to be sped up. But it has also got to be preceded by a sound plan that is put together. So I would implore this House and the Senate to work in a bipartisan, bicameral way with the White House to make certain that that plan is in place in very short order.

Let me just talk about some of the evidence that I have seen in my district, again with advanced battery manufacturing. I am looking at investments from GE that would allow us to address a number of dynamics that are speaking to the empowerment of the energy transformation where the battery is the linchpin.

We are talking about development at GE that will allow for multiple purposes, for heavy vehicles for their fuel needs, for those heavy vehicles to be empowered by this alternative, but a new format of battery, advanced battery manufacturing. We are talking about creating a power supply with this sort of battery.

We are also talking about their battery development, essential to the storage of intermittent renewables, supplies from the sun, from the wind, that may be intermittent in nature. The linchpin here is to develop the battery manufacturing that will transition us. All of this investment needs to be sped up.

We also need to look at what we can do with efficiency within renewables. I have recently passed in this House a wind energy-efficiency bill that allows us to take a closer look at the manufacturing and the assemblage of those

given sorts of power supply. Those renewables can be done in a more efficient way. Citing the materials that are used, we can reach to nanoscience to develop lighter materials or durable materials. How we assemble the gearbox assemblage is an important bit of R&D that needs to get done, how we develop through manufacturing a better tower system for our renewable supply from wind.

All of this needs to be a huge American investment. Again, we have the energy intellect. We can emerge from this race as a winner, but the time is passing us by. And whichever nation emerges the winner in this race will be that go-to nation that will be the exporter of energy intellect, energy ideas, energy innovation for generations to come.

So, we are going to fail the next generation of job holders, we are going to fail this Nation's economy, we are going to fail the environment agenda, we are going to fail the energy transitioning if we don't move forward intelligently, thoughtfully, progressively, in a way that allows us to capture the brain power of this country that has driven invention and innovation in so many measures, in so many dynamics.

We have it within our grasp. We need to go from research that is done at our universities and the private sector and further deploy into the commercialization zone, into the manufacturing efforts, those ideas. We have failed after that research investment. We need to have that "valley of death," as it is termed, where we don't get the seed money that is necessary for a lot of this innovative spark to take its presence in our American economy. We need that sort of commitment and we need that sort of policy development.

We can do it. This House has offered a great bill. We challenge those in this process to work with us to have an outcome that has a bill on the President's desk that can sign us into a new era of energy policy.

Mr. PERRIELLO. I want to pick up on what Mr. TONKO and Mr. MURPHY said. Right now there are two types of countries around the world. There are those that are looking back 20 years ago and crying over what we have lost, and there are those who are looking 20 years ahead and saying, what could we be?

Right now, this body has too often been a problem in focusing because of the way our campaigns work and other things on how to try to protect what has been, instead of how to promote what could be. We are falling behind in competitive advantage. We still have the best workforce, we have the best capital and innovation, we have the best entrepreneurs, we have the best science. Yet we get out-competed. It is time for this body to be part of promoting what could be.

I found a lot of folks talking during August and other times I have been home about threats to capitalism and

how great capitalism has been for our system. It is truly the economic driver of innovation and growth. But the threat to capitalism right now is not, in my mind, what some people have seen as a secret agenda. It is that we reward failure and we reward the status quo, instead of rewarding innovation. That is what has worked in the past. That is what can work again.

This bill, fundamentally about energy independence, is about finally getting us incentivizing and rewarding the next generation of innovation. That is how we build jobs here. That is how we grow jobs and middle class incomes in this country.

One thing we don't often do in this body is to give credit to our friends across the building in the Senate, but I do want to commend the work and the leadership of Senator GRAHAM and Senator KERRY on a call to action on that side, in the Senate; a call for whether there are 60 patriots ready to go in the Senate and pass this. In particular, I appreciate that they are willing to put the issue of a more robust nuclear agenda on the table.

I think we need to look at everything as part of this. This problem is too serious for any side to dig in its heels to some ideological purity. We must look at how energy efficiency and smart-grid technology will be part of this. We must look at nuclear, wind, solar, biomass, we must look at all elements, because this is that important to our national security and our job creation.

So I hope that there will be a robust debate on that side; that they will find ways to maybe even strengthen what we have done on this side by blazing that trail. That is how we revive innovation, entrepreneurship and job creation in the next generation.

Mr. BOCCIARI. The gentleman is correct that we spend an awful lot of time often looking back at what was instead of looking ahead at what could be. And I remember the words so clearly, reading and hearing about what President Kennedy said: We do these things not because they are easy, but because they are hard.

It is hard to break from the status quo. It is hard to let the folks who have been delivering us \$4 a gallon gasoline, let them go and break our dependence on our consumption of oil that comes from overseas. The opponents of a robust energy policy in this country have been attempting to define this bill and define our movement towards efficiency, towards creating jobs, towards protecting our national security, about cap-and-trade. Cap-and-trade is one section of the bill, one section of the bill that looks at addressing the climate change issue that the CIA, that the Department of Defense and our intelligence experts are looking at.

So, are we going to put our weight with the folks who have been giving us \$4 a gasoline and those big energy industries that have been making a lot of money over the status quo years, or are we going to stand with our intelligence

experts and suggest that this is real? Our intelligence experts are suggesting we need to do this.

Now, when this body was faced with the decision, the section of the bill that deals with cap-and-trade, we had a decision to make. There was a court case at the end of last year that said the EPA was going to regulate emissions in this country. Well, do you want the EPA and bureaucrats in Washington doing it, or do you want the free market to do it? Because I believe, like so many of my colleagues, that the Federal Government has a responsibility to set the out-of-bounds markets, to set the goalposts, let the free market operate in between, and then throw the flag like a good referee does when someone goes out of bounds. That is what we should do. Let the free market drive innovation; let entrepreneurial spirit, let the innovators in this great country do that.

Let's do that. But attempting to define this as a national energy policy, as cap-and-trade, is not only disingenuous, I think it threatens our national security. And those aren't just my words. Those are the words of a fellow who I have a great deal of respect for, JOHN MCCAIN, Senator MCCAIN.

I flew this gentleman, this honorable American, out of Baghdad when I was flying missions over in Iraq and Afghanistan. He said it is about cap-and-trade. There will be incentives for people to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. It is a free market approach. JOHN MCCAIN is saying it is a free market approach. The Europeans are doing it. We did it in the case of addressing acid rain.

He said 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. It won't cost the American taxpayer, he said, because of the free market approach. JOE LIEBERMAN and I, Senator McCain introduced the cap-and-trade proposal several years ago that would reduce greenhouse gases within a gradual reduction. He said we did this with acid rain. This works. It can work—if we have the courage to do it.

We do these things not because they are easy, but because they are hard. That is what leadership does. But if we are worried about the next election and not worried about where our future is going, the gentleman from Virginia is absolutely correct that we are going to continue to be enslaved, like the gentleman from Arkansas said. Like he said, if we can't produce the weapons to fight our own Nation's wars, if we can't find the energy here in our own country, if we can't feed ourselves, it is exactly right that we will be forever enslaved. That is why we have to make the decision now. That is what leaders do.

Mr. PERRIELLO. I have learned a lot from the hardworking folks in my district, particularly in southern Virginia, where we have been seeing job

losses and negative economic growth for years. While the country has been facing this for the past year in particular, we have seen it for a decade-and-a-half while jobs have gone overseas.

One of the things that folks say to me over and over again is, stop offering us quick fixes. We know they are not true. Stop focusing your politics on who to blame for the problem instead of how to fix it. That is what I hear from the hardworking folks of my district. It is time to stop the politics of blame and the politics of lollipops falling from the sky and everybody will be happy on a sugar high. What it is time for is the tough work of tough solutions.

There is no quick fix for regrowing our economy. We have to recreate America's competitive advantage. We are getting out-competed, and there is no excuse for that. And too often Washington has been part of the problem instead of part of the solution.

What we are looking at is things that can not only have some short-term benefits through energy efficiency, but will be part of a long term strategy, 5 years, 10 years, 20 years, 50 years, that keep America on top. Every previous generation of Americans has been willing to step up to the challenge of their times.

□ 2045

They haven't said, What do I do to get to the next election cycle? They say, What do we do to leave America stronger and better than we inherited it? That is the sacred covenant that Americans pass from one generation to the next.

Our generation must deal with these sorts of threats, energy independence and how we compete in a global economy. It's a new thing that we haven't had to face at the same degree in the past. And for me, this is also a question of moral responsibility. We are paying the price for a period of tremendous greed and irresponsibility, from Wall Street and corporate CEOs to the people of this body to individuals buying a home that they can't afford or consuming energy they know they could preserve.

There's an irresponsibility there that we must translate into a new period of accountability and innovation, and that's what this is about. This is about living up to that sacred covenant that the Greatest Generation passes on and on through American tradition to say we have it in our DNA as Americans to not back down from a fight or a challenge, to not do what's easy, but to do what's right. And that's what I'm proud to say we have begun to do here in this body, and it is a seismic shift towards responsibility, and I'm proud to have been a part of it with you.

Mr. BOCCIERI. Well, I can agree with the gentleman more that this is about tomorrow. This is about where we are as a Nation 10 to 15 years down the road, 20 years down the road, where my

children and their children's children will be.

Let me just drive home this point on national security. There was a report that came out in 2009 by the Center for Naval Analysis, coauthored by 12 retired generals and admirals of the United States military, and they found that our dependence on fossil fuels undermines United States foreign policy. It involves us with the volatile and unfriendly powers, endangers our troops in combat, undercuts our economic stability, and drives climate change, which weakens and threatens to destabilize countries and add to an already heavy American military burden. Our military experts are saying this. Our intelligence experts are saying this.

Now, we have to be leaders and say that enough is enough. We can invest in the tomorrow because we have the energy, we have the alternative energy at our fingertips, and we can make this happen. But we have got to find the courage to do this.

I know Representative TONKO wants to speak one last word on some of our colleagues and what they have said. A gentleman that we serve with here in this body, who I have a great deal of respect for, RON PAUL, Congressman RON PAUL, he 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."

Now, what he's saying in the broader context is that this issue of climate change is our responsibility, too. We're great partners and leaders in the world, and we have to lead by example, like Mitt Romney said, like Mike Huckabee said, like the President is saying, like Secretary of State Clinton is saying. We have to lead by example, and that's what America has always done. We've led by example. So this is about where we are reaching down within our own internal national character and finding the courage to lead in this economic challenge that we face as our country.

Representative TONKO.

Mr. TONKO. Representative BOCCIERI, I couldn't agree more. And we do embrace, we can embrace that challenge, the challenge that has been put forth by all of these individuals that you named here this evening and quoted.

I heard you express the free market system and what it can do to enable us to have a better energy and environment outcome. I heard Representative PERRIELLO talk about not accepting the status quo. I heard there, Representative, a kind of a pioneer spirit, a challenge to be those pioneers that we have been throughout our history.

You know, gentlemen, I have the great fortune of representing the Erie Canal communities. Where that Hudson and Mohawk River meet gave birth to an industrial revolution. This whole channel of the waterway, which was seen as a folly approach, became the

empowerment tool, not only in developing this Nation and prospering in the process, but changing the entire world in terms of their quality of life. For in that Erie Canal channel developed a number of mill towns, a necklace of mill towns, each mill town becoming that epicenter of invention and innovation, and they sparked their genius in a way that really transitioned not only America but the world.

We are at that same juncture. We are now at that opportunity moment that can allow us to seize this moment and make a difference. There are those in our country who are those intellectuals that are proposing these wonderful product lines, these wonderful inventions, but they need to transition from that hybrid, that prototype, into the commercialization and manufacturing of that idea.

And today, that new birth of an industrial revolution, a new economy, isn't about mass production, where they might have invented some wonderful object, produced a few numbers within their garage and then, as business grew, created a factory and mass produced. That is a different spot today for us. It's about precision. It's about the prototyping. It's about the testing, and it's about the evaluating. And that, my friends, is a very pricey situation.

There are not a lot of the start-ups and emerging technologies that have available cash at hand, and there is a huge risk factor, and there are ways to reduce that risk or work through it to see if it is, in fact, going to endure the process. But there are also opportunities for the government to invest in high-risk, great opportunities, situations that can take us into new opportunities with battery manufacturing, with new product lines, emerging technologies, that will be shelf-ready for energy efficiency, alternative technologies for producing power supplies, American power needs that are addressed by the American workforce. Think of that as a great, novel idea, growing our economy.

People have said time and time again, we hear it in our districts, Why are the jobs leaving this country? We have an opportunity to create jobs in this country that respond to our social and economic needs, that respond to our environmental curiosity and our environmental responsibility, but we need to seize the moment. We need to express, in very bold measure, that we care about the energy transformation, the innovation economy.

Let's be those epicenters of invention and innovation as those mill towns I represent were in the heyday of the industrial revolution. It is within our grasp, it is within our intellect, and it needs to be within our political will. And being here this evening and expressing with you gentlemen where we can go and where we believe we are growing our way toward is an important statement to make here this evening, and it's a pleasure to have joined with you in this special hour.

Mr. BOCCIERI. Thank you, Congressman TONKO.

We're going to wrap up here with the last 4 minutes just underscoring what we're talking about here today, the fact that we're focusing on our Nation's energy needs and the fact that we have got to move away from our dependence on foreign oil, protect our national security, and create jobs right here in America with our investments in these technologies.

And how disingenuous to some who would use the arguments by the status quo who suggest that we need to continue on the way that we have, where we'll be dependent on foreign sources of energy, on the Middle East, and on OPEC-producing nations when we want to put our faith and our trust and our energy in the innovators and the great thinkers here in America.

And how disingenuous that we attempt to define a national energy policy on an issue of cap-and-trade that has been working in this country since the 1990s, on an issue that really is just one small segment of a national energy policy that will mean the difference of us breaking our dependence and creating jobs.

This is a turning point, a tipping point for America. Are we going to lead or are we going to block? Are we going to believe or are we going to fear? And are we going to look forward or are we going to look back? Those are the questions that we have to ask with the national energy policy. That's what we can do.

Representative PERRIELLO, why don't you finish this up tonight.

Mr. PERRIELLO. Well, I appreciate, again, your leadership on calling us together on this.

It's a very simple question. Do we want to continue funneling our dollars through our gas tanks to the petro-dictators around the world that hate us or do we want to invest those dollars back in the kind of innovation and job creation that has always made this country great? Do we want to continue to support those who undermine our Nation's security or do we want to create the kind of energy independence that is necessary to secure this country and secure our competitive advantage?

And I'll tell you what. It's kind of exciting. It's an exciting moment to be at the forefront of a new industrial revolution and think about just how much American businesses will be able to outcompete and outcreate other countries if we unleash this, if we unleash the innovation and the profit motive that is available through this system, a system developed by Republicans. And more credit to them.

Cap-and-trade is a Republican idea whose time has come, which is how do we use the free market to solve some of the greatest problems of our generation. That's what this new kind of politics should be about, taking the best ideas, whether they come from Republicans, Democrats, or Independents, and using them to solve the problems

for our generation. This is that time. This is that moment with energy independence, to recreate the competitive advantage of this country and to reinforce our national security.

We can do it. We've led the way. We believe we can see this through this year, and we are going to see an incredible amount of potential in this country for job growth and security because of it.

Mr. BOCCIERI. Thank you, Mr. PERRIELLO.

National security, creating jobs right here in America, moving away from our dependence on foreign oil, that's what this bill is about. Making America again the producers of wealth instead of just the movers of wealth, that's what this bill is about.

I'm proud to stand with my colleagues today to talk about our Nation's energy policy and how we move this country down the field. We do these things not because they're easy but because they're hard, as President Kennedy said.

HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to talk about and take this opportunity to address my colleagues about the issue of health care, and let me just kind of frame this and put it in a context that I think will make a difference.

This is, again, one of those opportunities where Washington says, We are here to help, but what we may see is something very, very different. Washington helps the State of Michigan today to about 41 percent of its budget, but what it's really doing is it's controlling the State of Michigan. And along with some of the ill-advised decisions that have been made in our State, Washington policy, antigrowth policies in the State of Michigan, have resulted in Michigan lagging the country. We're number 50 in employment, which means we are number 1 in unemployment, and we've been there for a long time.

Let me explain how this happens. Like I said, 41 percent of Michigan's budget this year, the State of Michigan's budget, will come from the Federal Government directly. It will come with strings attached to it, Washington telling us and our State about how we need to spend our money, what we can and cannot spend it on. And remember, it's our money. It came from the State of Michigan in the first place. It came from our taxpayers. It came from our citizens. Of course, when you have a \$1.4 trillion deficit, we also know that it came from our kids and from our grandkids. But with that 41 percent of direct infusion into our State budget, I think, at a minimum, what we see is

this affects another 20 to 25 percent of our budget.

So, roughly, out of Michigan's budget, more than 60 percent of our spending in the State of Michigan is directed by the Washington establishment, directed by Washington bureaucrats telling us how to spend our money. And some of you may ask, Well, how does that happen? Well, think about it. When you go to the pump and fill up your tank, there's a Federal gas tax. That money comes to Washington. It goes into over 110 different funds, and then it's distributed back to the States. And many of those funds, to get our own money back, we have to put up matching funds.

□ 2100

Think about it, the State that has kind of the economic problems that Michigan has right now.

To get back our own money, we have to put up our own money and we have to put it up in such a way that we have to spend it the way that Washington wants us to spend it, not the way that we need it and the way that we might be focused on it to address the issues and the problems that we are facing in Michigan.

It's disappointing, but Michigan is known as having some of the worst roads in the country. Plain English: we've got lots of potholes.

So it was kind of surprising a few years ago when I found out that the Michigan Department of Transportation was going to build a turtle fence. Think about it. We were going to build a turtle fence. And if you think what do you build a turtle fence for, it's pretty obvious. You build a turtle fence to prevent the turtle from crossing the highway. Over \$400,000 to build a turtle fence, and of course to do the expensive study beforehand to determine that we needed a turtle fence.

Remember, this is a State that has the highest unemployment in the country; it has some of the worst, if not the worst, roads in the country. We send our highway dollars to Washington and we put up our matching funds, and then the Governor says, Well, Pete, the Federal Government has told us that we need to build a turtle fence.

We got it stopped the first time, and I hope the money was used to fill potholes, to build an interchange, or to help build an extra lane in a busy place or perhaps to use it on a project that would improve the safety of our highways. But, no, 2½ years later it came back.

So I am driving north through my district, and I am going through some of the wetlands where they've constructed this highway, and I see people working. I don't need to guess what they're doing. They are constructing a turtle fence. It is a very nice fence. It's about, you know, 2½, 3 feet high, got the plastic tube on it so that the turtle can't climb the fence and then crawl over the top of it. I think it works.

I think that for \$400,000, MDOT, the Michigan Department of Transportation, can build a very, very good and