

has been regulated because there have been abuses in the past. Before an insurer can offer a policy, the insurance commissions in the various States approve the policy form. What are you insuring against? Do you have little tricks in there that you aren't really insuring people against what they think they're getting? What is the likelihood that there is really going to be a loss? And is the premium right? Is the premium right? Is it not too high so it gouges consumers? And is it not too low so that insurance companies might make a quick profit but not have the money to pay claims when claims come due? And that happened in the past. That's why we have that regulation, and that's what's happened now.

The financial industry has made a huge profit, huge profit. More than 40 percent of all corporate profits by these consumer lending practices. But now that the consumers can't pay their credit card bills and can't pay their mortgages, they're stuck.

The American people are not deadbeats. They're stuck. They are working hard. And if anything goes wrong in their life, if they lose their job or someone in the family gets sick or if they go through a divorce, they really don't have much room to play. And they've got to be able to borrow money.

But the industry made a killing, and now they're getting bailed out. I don't want to go through a cycle of making a killing and getting bailed out, making a killing and getting bailed out.

Let's have a set of regulations in place that provides the American people the kinds of financial services, the kinds of financial products that really meet their needs and doesn't produce this kind of profit, that really produces the kind of profits we had back in the manufacturing days, back when the lives of ordinary Americans and the middle class was improved.

Mr. ELLISON. Well, let me say, I'm proud to be on that bill with you. I think that Elizabeth Warren, Professor Stiglitz and Professor Shiller are all brilliant for coming up with the idea. The fact is, if you look at many of these mortgages, they were not safe at any speed, to borrow a phrase from Ralph Nader.

The fact is, if the only way that this mortgage, quote-unquote, works is if you can refinance it in 3 or 2 years, then that is a mortgage that doesn't work. It's designed to end up in foreclosure but for a very shaky assumption.

If the gentleman would allow me to mention in our waning time, I would also like to say this about the bill we just passed through the House. And that is that many of the properties that have ended up in foreclosure are not homeowner-occupied. In other words, they're multifamily dwellings. They're investor-owned. And in many States across our country, you can be a tenant who has paid every, every rent-

al payment on time, never missed one. And yet if your landlord didn't use that money you gave him to pay that mortgage on that building, you could find yourself kicked out without any notice at all.

Some States have regulations, many don't. This bill gives people 90 days from the date of foreclosure in order to stay and make new plans for their lives.

I think this is a critically important piece of legislation, very important provision in the bill, and I'm glad it is a part of it.

I know you're going to have to wrap up pretty soon, Congressman MILLER, so I just want to yield back to you now.

Mr. MILLER of North Carolina. Thank you, Mr. ELLISON, for participating.

We have covered a great many topics that I wanted to cover. There are many more that we have not. The arguments that the Community Reinvestment Act of 1977 caused our financial crisis in 2008.

Mr. ELLISON. Ridiculous.

Mr. MILLER of North Carolina. Actually, the Federal Reserve Board's statistics show that 6 percent of subprime loans were by lenders who were subject to the Community Reinvestment Act—not all lenders were, or just those with federally insured deposits—and were in the neighborhoods where the Community Reinvestment Act encourages savings. And all the evidence says that that 6 percent perform better than others.

So it is not that that is exaggerated. It is completely untrue. There is no truth to that argument at all.

If we had longer, we could talk about the role of Freddie and Fannie. Certainly they are blameworthy. They acted badly, but they did not lead the financial industry into this crisis, as has frequently been charged.

What led the industry into this crisis was the pursuit of profits and not an honest living but a killing. Not an honest living by providing services to people who needed it, credit to people who needed it on reasonable terms but a killing by cheating people. And we can't go back to that.

What we need to do now is not just climb out of where we are but try to restore what we had before. We need to reform the industry and the consumer lending practices.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think I have much time to yield back, but I do yield back the balance of my time.

ECONOMICS AND ENERGY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KRATOVL). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am honored to be recognized to address you here on the floor of the House of Representatives in this Na-

tion's most deliberative body of debate, at least it used to be, and I hope it is once again, Mr. Speaker.

Having listened to my colleagues here and identified, I think, the centerpiece of this debate that's taking place in this country, I wanted to address, Mr. Speaker, this evening the idea of where we stand with the broad economic view that is what's taking place in the United States of America today, and then I'd like to take us back to where we are with the overall cap-and-trade, cap-and-tax, greenhouse gas, global warming, climate change debate that's going on. The language seems to be drifting and moving a little bit, Mr. Speaker, on this. And I will go to the climate change component of this.

But first, Mr. Speaker, I want to address this situation on where we are from a broad economic perspective so that there is a backdrop in order to think about how we go forward with policy and what is the right policy for the United States of America within the context of the world and the globe.

We are the global economic leader. We are a large percentage of the world's economy. We have been leading this world's economy because we have, are, or were a free market economy. And the foundations for American exceptionalism should be clear to everyone on each side of the aisle.

Of course that foundation is rooted back in the philosophy that is the foundation for our Constitution, which is the Declaration of Independence. It's rooted in the natural law and the natural rights that come from God and that our founders all unanimously recognized. And as they took those principles and laid them out in the Declaration of Independence and then later on, about 13 years later, were able to get that language into the Constitution and get the Constitution ratified and give birth to a nation, what made us such a great nation? Why didn't we wallow back into the problems that so many other nations have had? What distinguishes the United States of America from the other countries in the world?

Now there have been powerful economies in the world. There have been powerful cultures and societies. The Founding Fathers studied a lot of those. They looked at the Greeks and the Romans, for example. They didn't have the opportunity to take a look at the former Soviet Union, but they would have taken a lesson from the former Soviet Union. It seems as though many Members in this Congress have missed that little history lesson, even though they lived it as contemporaries.

But these foundations of American exceptionalism, many of them in the Bill of Rights, the right to freedom of speech, religion, expression, assembly, a right to keep and bear arms, a right to property that was diminished, I think to some degree, by the Kelo decision in the Supreme Court about 3 years ago when they struck three

words from the Fifth Amendment of the Constitution which says, “nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation.”

The Supreme Court struck these three words “for public use” out of the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States. That’s the effect of their decision. And that, Mr. Speaker, isn’t just me. That was my independent conclusion and analysis from reading the Supreme Court decision later on after I spoke on the floor on the issue, and as I prepared to rebut the now Chairman of the Financial Services Committee from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK). So I listened to him in preparation to—generally I would disagree with him on most everything that comes to this floor. This time he and I agreed verbatim. And I read later on Justice O’Connor’s dissenting opinion, which also was right down the line with the position that Mr. FRANK and myself and many others—the Supreme Court had undermined property rights by their Kelo decision.

But that is one of the major keys to American exceptionalism, that right to keep and own property, “nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation.”

But in New London, Connecticut, they took private property and they transferred it over to another private entity, a development corporation, for the sake of what they considered to be a better public interest because they could collect more tax dollars from the developed property rather than the lesser-developed property.

It was a flawed fundamental constitutional principle that they made that decision upon, and now we’re seeing an incremental encroachment upon other property rights in this country. But property rights being one of the pillars of American exceptionalism, I laid out those other points. Many of them are in the First Amendment, the Second Amendment.

But there are other reasons. One is that this Nation was founded by a robust people that skimmed the cream of the crop off of the donor nations as immigrants came to the United States with a dream. It was hard to get here, and yet there was so much to be gained and achieved when they arrived here. And they didn’t all make it. Some of them failed. Some of them went back to their home country. Some of them didn’t make the cut at Ellis Island. About 2 percent were turned around and put back on the boat and sent back to Europe back in those days, 100 or so years ago.

□ 2030

But those that stayed, many of them exceeded their own expectations. The success of the vitality of newly arriving immigrants in this country was another one of the foundations of American exceptionalism built upon these constitutional rights, including property rights, built upon free enterprise capitalism. That desire to succeed and

that will to succeed along with a culture that celebrated success, those being some of the underpinnings of the pillars of American exceptionalism.

Well, as we look at how this has unfolded, these things happened, those pillars that came together at that time flowed from Western civilization, became the embodiment of Western civilization. And while that was going on, this robust people that had these new rights that came from God and this right to property and a right to return on their investment, these new rights that were there also matched up with a continent that was almost unlimited in natural resources and a continent that was being developed by a country that kept taxes low, regulations low, and in many cases nonexistent so that the reward was there for the entrepreneur. And that culture, that tradition, and those rights that are the foundations for the success of this great country are being eroded today at a pace faster than anytime in the history of the United States of America.

Now, we saw these lessons of these failed countries, and we saw Rome rot out from within and corruption that pulled it down. It couldn’t hold itself together because of the corruption that was within Rome. We saw the nation states arise. They started out to be city states, and then to the limits of the languages also went the borders of the countries and the nation states of Europe over the last 250 years or so. And they fought wars that were clashes of cultures and economies to determine the boundaries and the borders of the nation states. But still over the last 200 or more years, the nation state remains as a very essential successful institution on this planet. The nation state that looked out for the interest of its citizens, the nation state that had clear borders, the borders that usually went out to the limits of the language itself because that’s what defined the common interest of the common people, and to a lesser degree that does so today, but it’s been a foundation of a nation state.

And this nation state of the United States of America, this unique experiment that brought people from all over the world and put them in here on this country with these nearly unlimited natural resources, with the low taxes and the low or no regulation, and a culture that was rooted in religious freedom that had at its foundation Christianity and the work ethic that comes from the Protestant work ethic and the Reformation, those things that flowed within that culture, this country became a giant petri dish that was teeming with success. That’s American exceptionalism. It’s who we are. That’s why the rest of the world has had trouble keeping up with us. That’s why the rest of the world doesn’t match up with us in patents or trademarks or copyrights. That’s why the rest of the world hasn’t matched up in the growth of their economy, they haven’t matched up militarily, they haven’t matched

culturally, because we have this robust freedom. And sometimes there’s a price to be paid for that. But we lead the world. We are a nation that leads the world with freedom. And the rest of the world looks on full of awe and respect and sometimes some trepidation because they are really not sure what’s coming out of the United States of America. And, Mr. Speaker, I will tell you that I’m at the point now where I am not very sure either on how this has drifted.

But as I watched this economy that needed to take a correction because there was a housing bubble in this economy, Henry Paulson, then Secretary of the Treasury, came to this Capitol on September 19, 2008, said, I have got to have \$700 billion. I’ve got to have it right now, and I’ve got to pour it into the economy, and I’ll pick up this toxic debt and we’ll do what we can to stop this impending free-fall of this economy. Well, after more than a week of running around this Capitol and out to the White House and doing press conferences and pressing this Congress to appropriate the \$700 billion, we sure saw the economy go into a tailspin in a hurry, and some of it accelerated by that kind of activity. And I would have preferred that that would have been back-channel discussions that could have been kept at a low key so that we didn’t see this economy react the way it did. But it did. And when we saw the stock market spiral downward, a correction that at least in part needed to be made, and globally as the world lost its confidence in our financial institutions, we had the real risk of our financial institutions going under during that period of time, September, October, November, December, January of this year, and into February. As that instability hung in there, while that was going on, we were a nation that I think overreacted, Mr. Speaker.

Some of the things that happened as the economy spiraled downward were people on the floor of this Congress and in our committee and back in our meetings and talking to the press beginning to tell America, Well, I guess that tells you what capitalism does for us, arguing that capitalism had failed and that’s why the economy was spiraling downward.

Mr. Speaker, no economy has ever matched this economy in the United States of America. We have overcome far greater burdens than this one we’re under today. The Great Depression of the 1930s was a larger burden than the one we’re under today, at least by any measure that we can do currently. We don’t know what’s going to happen tomorrow, next week, next month. By this time next year, we’ll look back and we ought to have a pretty good idea. But this free enterprise economy has recovered and bounced back in the face of difficulty after difficulty. It took us through the recessions of the 1800s. It took us through the Civil War. It brought us through the Spanish-

American War, World War I, World War II, the Korean War, Vietnam, and the Cold War.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, of all those things that we had been through, including the Great Depression, which I briefly mentioned, the Cold War itself is a perfect model of what this free market economy can do because Ronald Reagan looked across at the Russians, called them an "evil empire," which they were and are increasingly becoming again, and he went to Berlin at the Brandenburg Gate and he said "Mr. Gorbachev, tear down this wall."

We didn't know at the time how much was going on behind the scenes, how much was going on back channel. But we know, looking back in history and this being reported in the news, that in the nuclear defense negotiations that were to take place in Reykjavik, Iceland, Ronald Reagan walked out of those negotiations because he couldn't get a settlement with the Soviet Union. And the press excoriated President Reagan for being—I don't remember the exact language. Today they would say "cowboy diplomacy," if they called it diplomacy at all. They believed that Ronald Reagan had put this world at risk by walking out of those negotiations. But Ronald Reagan wasn't about to give up our national security for the sake of getting along with people who had lined themselves up against us to be our opposition in the world, to challenge the United States for the title of this world superpower. And for a long time, we went along running in parallel with the Soviet Union competing against the United States for which nation would be the preeminent superpower.

Jean Kirkpatrick was Ambassador to the United Nations during the early part of the Reagan administration. And I believe after 2 or 3 years, she was preparing to step down from that role. And as she retired as Ambassador to the United Nations, she explained something to America that when I read that on Page 3 or 4 of the paper that day, a tiny little clip, actually, it settled in for me the picture that Jean Kirkpatrick had drawn, Ambassador Kirkpatrick had drawn, and it was this. Now, remember we are in the middle of the Cold War. We're perhaps at the height of the Cold War with the maximum amount of tension that's being brought to bear because Ronald Reagan is doing the thing that the leader of the free world would do, and that is playing some negotiating brinksmanship but knowing the card that he holds and having a pretty good idea of the cards that the Russians are holding. But Jean Kirkpatrick described this conflict of the Cold War this way: She said, What's going on is the equivalent of playing chess and Monopoly on the same board, and the only question is, will the United States of America bankrupt the Soviet Union economically before they checkmate the United States militarily? That was the question that she laid out as she

stepped down as Ambassador to the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, when you think about this and come to a realization that a country like the Soviet Union that was in an arms race, building missiles bigger, more of them, and building them faster than they ever had before, pouring a high percentage of their gross domestic product, which is an all-controlled economy in a socialist/communist economy—I'll just call them a communist nation. Their communist economy was trying to produce enough wealth that they could match up against the United States and enter into an arms race and defeat us in an arms race so that we would be looking at so many nuclear-tipped, multiple nuclear-tipped warheads that we couldn't hope then to defend ourselves against the Soviet Union and we couldn't hope to mount enough missiles to provide a deterrent to them. Mutually assured destruction. The Soviet Union was determined that they were going to be in a position where they would assure our destruction and, with the power of that, they would then cause the United States to back down and recede diplomatically and that the Soviet Union would be able to advance themselves around the world and exert their influence into country after country and begin to dominate the world because of the military threat that they would be to the free world, particularly the United States, the military threat that they were in Europe itself, lined up, remember, with the Berlin Wall standing. It was another 5 years before the Berlin Wall came down.

All of this dynamic is going on, and the Cold War is being fought, some say without firing a shot. That's really not true, but without firing a lot of shots in relation to the billions and billions that were invested. The Cold War was not a shooting war. That's why we called it the Cold War. But it was a clash of civilizations. It was a clash of cultures. It was a clash of economies, Mr. Speaker. And as the economy of the United States competed with the communist economy of the Soviet Union, and it has still a vast amount of resources and should have had enough people to produce enough wealth to be able to match up against us in an economic/military contest, the United States economy dominated that of the rest of the world and produced enough wealth that we could grow our economy and at the same time take on and compete with the Russians in the development of our military capabilities globally. And at a point the weight and the burden of trying to compete against this United States economy brought about the economic collapse of the Soviet Union, which brought about the political collapse of the Soviet Union and their satellite states, which softened and prepped the landing zone, so to speak, or softened the area so that the Soviet Union could no longer hang on in their satellite states like

Germany and Poland and Romania and the Baltics. And all the way across Eastern Europe, country after country, Czechoslovakia, became free. Most of that bloodlessly.

The Berlin Wall began to come down November 9, 1989, the date that the Russians stopped requiring the East Germans to defend the wall. And they started to take hammers and picks to chop that wall apart, and people climbed over the top, and they were on both sides and they were celebrating, and families were reunified. The liberal media in this country saw that as family reunification. What they didn't see, and it took them a very long time to understand it, was that the Berlin Wall represented the Iron Curtain. It was literally the Iron Curtain. It was a concrete wall that went around the people that lived in West Berlin and trapped them in, a cage, a fence around the people that lived in West Berlin. But it was literally the Iron Curtain. And when it started to come down, when the Berlin Wall crashed, so did the Iron Curtain crash. And as it came down, people realized the Soviet Union can't make East Germans shoot East Germans for crossing that line any longer. They can't enforce it themselves because they don't have the economic capability to do that. They couldn't sustain their military. Their military was rotting out from within as their economy had rotted out from within because you can't have a managed economy that can compete with a free market economy, Mr. Speaker.

□ 2045

That's the difference, and that's the essence of the victory that the United States, with some of the help of the rest of the world, brought down the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union collapsed. The satellite states claimed their own independence, and there was some blood in a place like Romania when Ceausescu was executed, if I remember, he and his wife executed by the mobs of Romanians who desired to have their freedom, finally.

But most of Eastern Europe was bloodless. It was essentially bloodless in Germany for the wall to come down and free people, to welcome people that had been in slavery, in the slavery of a Communist-controlled managed state for all those years, since the end of the 1940s, and until such time as you had the Berlin airlift.

And one of the things that happened on one of my trips over there into Berlin, we had a tour guide who I will call her a young lady, younger than me. She was a young lady when the wall came down in 1989, and she told us how when they were able to go over the wall and go into West Berlin and go into the shops and stores and see what they had, see the food that they had, the clothing that was there, the appliances, so many things that they didn't have as part of their lives in East Germany or part of their lives in West Germany.

And the contrast in the western part of Berlin versus the eastern part of Berlin was so stark, she told us that they went out and bought all of the wild colorful clothes that they could find, the reds, the oranges, the greens, the bright yellows, all of those bright colors, and they dressed themselves in the brightest colors possible. They didn't have access to those. They were wearing drab, bleary clothing.

But all this bright clothing was available. Anybody could dress in the West any way they wanted. They could have access. You would find in the stores whatever the free market would demand, because the free-enterprise economy produced the kind of clothing people wanted to wear. And the East Germans surely were so glad to have an opportunity to go into West Berlin as the wall went down on November 9, 1989, and buy up this bright clothing and proudly wear this bright clothing wherever they went.

Because it was a symbol that said, I have my freedom back, a freedom back they weren't born into. They had been born since they lost their freedom. They had their freedom back, and they gloried in the demonstration of that to be able to wear colorful clothes.

Wherever they went that sent the message, I'm free, and I can dress as I like. I can do as I like. I can speak as I like. I am free to succeed. I am free to achieve, free to be educated in the way I want to be educated.

You know, the people who have achieved their freedom most recently in that part of the world are the ones that love it the most. The Czechs went to the square in Prague and stood there by the tens of thousands and held their keys up and rattled their keys. Tens of thousands of them rattling their keys, Mr. Speaker.

And that noise, that persistent noise, Vaclav Havel and others brought about freedom in Czechoslovakia in a bloodless fashion. They achieved that freedom later on. They separated the country in the Velvet Revolution, a bloodless revolution.

And they are quite proud of being able to come to these conclusions by the voice of the people, emulating the freedom that we have had here since 1776, ratified in 1789, Mr. Speaker.

So I look at that part of the world, the part of the world that has been the part that has generated the utopian philosophers, those philosophers that shaped the ideas of socialism and communism and national socialism and fascism. These utopian philosophies emerged from that part of the world, thinkers that came from there.

But they believed that they could set up the perfect society and control it and manage it. And the part that's always been missing on the part of the utopianists, those managers, those elitists, they think that they know best for people and that they think that an average common person, they believe, doesn't have the capability of making decisions for their own job,

their own business, their own health care, their own education.

So they want to take that all out of the hands of the individuals of this country and put it into the hands of the liberal bureaucrats who know best, the nanny state managers.

And the great lesson throughout history has been, even if you have smart people at the top, if you have smart people at central planning, and they come out with a 5-year plan—and in the collectivist state of the Soviet Union, they had collective farms. And so they just simply made a 5-year plan and they said, all right, here is what it's going to be, 5-year plan. This field will be wheat. This one will be barley. This one will be hay. This one lays fallow. I don't think they raise much corn over there, Mr. Speaker. I would bring that up.

And they managed it with as good of a skill as they could produce. But out of the government management comes some corruption, a tremendous amount of inefficiency. And if people are not rewarded for their labor—we learned this in the first settlements of the United States—then if they are not rewarded for their labor, they are not going to work the same way they do if they get to achieve the different fruits of their labor.

And so the Russians began to take their labor and let some of the crops rot in the field. Where I come from, on an October night that's clear and still, and if the humidity is right, you can drive across that flat countryside at night, 9, 10, 11, 12 o'clock, 1, 2 in the morning.

And if it's the right night, the humidity will make it so the soybeans aren't too tough and you can look from horizon to horizon. And you can see the yard lights of the farms that are there, and you can see the combines that are running in the fields, with the trucks that are out on the roads taking the grain off, and the tractors with the grain carts that are shuttling those soybeans over to the trucks, sometimes in the field, sometimes in the road.

But you can see they will run all night. They will run till the beans get too tough or the bin is full and their storage is full. They have got to stop and process and then go back again.

But the Russians did it a different way. They didn't let the people have the fruits of their labor. And so when their 8-hour shift was up, or whatever they worked, they would park the combine, park their tractor, park their truck, and they wait until the clock ticked again. And then they would start to work again, if they showed up. And a lot of them didn't.

But the inefficiencies that grow when you start guaranteeing a people a living and they are not tied into having a share of the profit are the kinds of things that we are starting to see in this country more and more and more; less accountability for production and more demands on the labor of somebody else.

But the human nature component of this, the component that realizes that if you don't work, you shouldn't eat, that was how we settled our—the Pilgrims settled it here. They would have starved to death if it hadn't been for that. So they let the people keep the proceeds of their own labor. And then those that were needy lived off of the alms of those that were good producers. And they were helped in proportion to their effort by the alms of the producers, and it made this a far more productive Nation.

And our job here, Mr. Speaker, needs to be, it needs to be to improve the annual average productivity of all of our citizens. If we do that, if we raise our average annual productivity of all of our citizens, we will raise the gross domestic product of the United States.

If our productivity goes up, if mine goes up, if my neighbor's goes up, then that wealth is accumulated into our economy, and it spills over and it blends into other businesses, and it lifts their profitability. And if they are working and producing, they will have more opportunity at success.

But if they are not, if they are hanging back, if they are not responsive, if they have a bad attitude about how they do their work, the customers will stay away from them. Their businesses will not thrive. The bosses who are able to hire good people because they want to pay good wages and good benefits to good people can go off and cherry-pick from those bosses that don't pay good wages and don't provide good benefits and don't respect their employees.

I have been in this business, in the construction business, for nearly three decades writing payroll checks and investing money in heavy equipment and going out and doing jobs, and we have always looked out across the available labor pool and tried to find the best people we could find.

And we wanted to pay them a good, going wage, and we wanted to give them the kinds of benefits and the package so they could have what they needed. They wanted a job that they can go to, that they can take pride in, that they can continue to develop their skills in, and they want to have the kind of environment where they can raise their family and take care of them and have some time to spend with them so that it's really worth the trouble.

This is what a free enterprise economy does. If you allow the businesses to succeed, they will then take advantage of that and succeed.

If this Government taxes them out of existence, that's exactly what will happen. Our businesses will diminish, and they will spiral downward out of existence.

If we regulate our businesses too much, then we will diminish their effectiveness and put a burden on the overhead that is a fixed cost that weighs down everything they do and makes it harder for them to compete against their domestic competitors

here in this country and harder for them to compete against foreign countries as well.

And if we weigh down existing businesses with taxes and regulation, the emerging entrepreneurs, the budding businessmen and women, the people that have the idea, the people that have the dream, the people that want to someday be the one that signed the front of the paycheck instead of the back of the paycheck, create as many jobs as possible, pay as many people as possible, that group of people takes a look at the regulation and the burden of government and too often they decide the juice isn't worth the squeeze, that going to work for the government is the better choice because, after all, the government check will always be there, the benefits will always be there. The stress load there is probably not going to be as great.

Probably you can't measure your achievements the same way you can measure them in the free market system, but if you want to raise your family and come back home and crack a beer and watch the news at night, maybe a government job is for you. We need good people in government, too. But when we raise the salaries and benefits package and we lower the responsibility level, and when we fail as a government to measure the productivity, the output of government employees, then we are creating a scenario by which people are not excelling to the level that they might if they were in a competitive environment.

But business has to produce in a competitive environment; government does not. Government has a monopoly.

Now, to thread an analogy in here, or I should say an anecdote, in a fairly recent trip down to Mexico City, and I sat with a number of government officials and business leaders there, at one point I was sitting at a diplomatic table. And as I looked around the room and each one introduced themselves, I realized that there were many representatives of the monopolies in Mexico sitting at the table.

And they all wanted to make sure that they were not a political target, but the richest man's name in the world is Slim, S-l-i-m. Doesn't sound like a Mexican name to me, but he is from Mexico. The reason he is the richest man in the world is because he has a monopoly on the telecommunications in Mexico. He gets paid for every phone call that gets made in that entire country.

And with the capital that he makes from that, he can invest in other telecommunications in other places around the world. So he's got a protected market that's a monopoly.

And some years ago the Mexicans understood that their state-run enterprises were a burden and that they were inefficient because they were monopolies. They were government monopolies. So I would look at a situation like that, and I would follow the Margaret Thatcher model.

I would take it further than she did. I think she took it as far as she could in that environment at that time. I would follow the Margaret Thatcher model, and I would start to privatize these government monopolies. Well, that first part of the equation worked for the Mexicans. They understood that.

They understood that they needed to privatize the government-run monopolies like telecommunications, let's say cement manufacturing, certain retail outlets, the list goes on, utilities. I think utilities of all kinds. They came to the conclusion they wanted to privatize because government itself was inefficient, how a government monopoly was utterly inefficient, that it begged for corruption—and they had plenty of corruption, still do—but they only went half as far as they needed to go.

When they privatized, they privatized the government-run monopolies into private-sector monopolies so that people like Mr. Slim could run the entire telecommunications industry in Mexico and take the capital and invest across the world.

Now, the shortfall of this is that a government-run monopoly is almost the most inefficient kind of a business model that you can produce if you want to provide services to people at a competitive price so that they can live a good lifestyle and they can have some disposable income to spend somewhere else.

The second to the last thing you would ever want would be a government-run monopoly, because they are inefficient, and there is not an incentive there to compete. But the Mexicans stopped short of where they needed to go, and they just transferred these government-run monopolies into private-sector monopolies, which is the only thing I can think of which is worse than a government-run monopoly.

If you hand someone a monopoly in a market that is not a regulated market and he has the entire market, he has cornered everyone, and he can set the price for a phone call, or they can set the price for a cubic yard of cement, or they can set the price for the electricity that's generated without any check or balance on it.

And so a privatized monopoly is worse even than a government-run monopoly because it incorporates so many of the—there are no restrictions there, and the desire for profit, actually the need for profit, gets added on to the government entity.

So we are here now with an economy that is being shifted dramatically by a majority of Democrats in the House of Representatives, a majority of Democrats down this hallway in the United States Senate, and a President who was elected, I think, with having been rewarded for the most masterful skills in the history of America, of the language of ambiguities.

□ 2100

As I listened to the President speak here in this Chamber, not that long ago, speaking before a joint session of Congress, and as I listened to him speak before our conference, I looked through the speech, and as I marked it up, sitting back here about 20 feet from where I stand right now, Mr. Speaker, I found seven or eight clear ambiguities in the President's speech—the kind of phrase that, if you believe we ought to produce energy in order to have an economy that can compete, you could hear in the President's words that's what he wants to do.

But if you believe you wanted to shut down the energy production in America in order to drive the prices up so that industry would use less, the consumers would use less, so that our economy would be constricted and chase the jobs overseas and all of this fallout that some of the people on that side of the aisle don't seem to understand but cannot hardly deny, but if you're one of those environmental extremists that wanted to shut down energy production, you could find that in the President's speech, the same phrase that I could find that we need to produce more energy.

Now that's just one example. There were seven or eight of those. The master of ambiguities is now the resident of the White House and the leader of the Free World and the Commander in Chief of our military and the mastermind behind the economic changes that are taking place here in the United States. The man who said that—well, he said that he wants to reach out—here's what he said, Mr. Speaker—one of the things that he said.

He said, "Under my plan of cap-and-trade system, electricity rates would necessarily skyrocket. That will cost money. They will pass that money onto consumers." Necessarily skyrocket, Mr. Speaker, my plan of cap-and-trade. It's the President's plan of cap-and-trade. These are exactly the words that he used back when I don't think he expected to be elected President, in January of 2008, meeting with the editorial board of the San Francisco Chronicle.

Now I can imagine what that's like. You would be sitting in San Francisco, tempted to say things to the San Francisco Chronicle that you thought the people in San Francisco would agree with and probably that the Speaker of the House from San Francisco would agree with. And I'm convinced that our Speaker of the House would maybe not agree with this analysis but would agree with the plan of cap-and-trade system.

But here's what's predicted: Electricity rates will necessarily skyrocket, and that will cost money. And it will be put onto the backs of consumers.

Well, that wasn't an ambiguity. That was before the ambiguities had been completely mastered by the now-President of the United States.

This man is driving the reaction to the economic downward spiral. This man is driving the cap-and-trade argument. This man is pushing a hardcore leftist agenda.

Cap-and-trade; what is it and why do we have it, and can you find anyone on the street who can explain the science? I would like to see investigative reporters of all stripes—the San Francisco Examiner, Sean Hannity—you name them. Reporters from Chicago or L.A. or Dallas or Des Moines go out on the streets with an action cam and carry that camera around with a microphone and ask people to explain this idea of global warming. Explain the science.

If you remember, sometimes they will walk along and they will interview people—often on the streets of New York City—and they will say, Who's the Vice President of the United States? And they will give every name except JOE BIDEN, today. He is a little hard to find. I understand why they might not know. But after 8 years of Dick Cheney, you think they would have known. A lot of them didn't. They don't have the basics there.

But I'd like to go to Central Park and put the action cam out with a microphone, Mr. Speaker, and ask them, I don't understand the science around this global warming. Can you explain this to me? And I would like to know how many out of a thousand would even try, but I would be willing to lay a wager that none of them could succeed in making a scientific explanation as to why their emissions of greenhouse gases by man can be a significant contributing factor to the Earth's warming. Which, by the way, even the global warming people, even the Al Gores of the world, have changed the language now. They can't say global warming any more because the Earth's been actually cooling since 2002.

So when you find yourself out there on the end of a limb and you've been saying, Global warming, global warming, global warming, and you've been doing that for 15 or 20 years, and you find out, whoops, I have been making this argument long enough; that the Earth is actually cooling, and maybe the scientists who back in about 1970 predicted there was a coming ice age that couldn't be averted, maybe they were actually right.

I don't know if they were right or not, Mr. Speaker, but I know one of those expert scientists in 1970 that said an ice age is imminent is now an expert on global warming, and he is saying global warming is imminent, and it will happen. But they don't actually use the global warming argument any more. They use climate change.

That's a safe term. I bet they wish they would have started out with a climate change kind of a label rather than global warming, because one thing we know about climate, it's always going to change. It's been changing for thousands of years, millions of

years, and it will change again and again and again, and it will change tomorrow.

But the climate change people that were former global warming people that are now climate change people are going to argue that the Earth is going to get warmer, and there's all kinds of calamities that come out of a warmer Earth. And the Earth can get—what's the most extreme—4.6 degrees Fahrenheit warmer over the next 100 years. Maybe only .15 degrees or so. Depends on which model.

But they didn't make a model 10 years ago that can predict where it is 10 years today or they would have never used the term global warming in the first place. If they had a model 10 years ago, if they had a model in the middle of the Al Gore era.

Let me take us back to—Al Gore was competing for President in 1992. He didn't win that nomination. But when he debated as a Vice Presidential candidate, he matched up against—let me see, Dan Quayle. Dan Quayle said, You are asking for \$100 billion a year to be spent on global warming, on environment, on this climate change piece. And Al Gore said, No, I didn't say that.

And I don't remember the page number anymore, but I'm going to guess, Mr. Speaker, because I remember former Vice President Dan Quayle saying, Yes, you did, Mr. Gore. It's right here in your book.

And he pulled the book out, "Earth in the Balance." He gave a page number. I think that page number was 204. I don't remember for sure. But I went out and bought the book. And I went to the page number that was pointed out by Dan Quayle, and there was the exact language calling for \$100 billion to be spent then back in that year, which I believe was 1992.

So the call for this reaction to global warming in 1929 must have been modeled on something. It must have been modeled on a computer model that had checked the temperatures around the globe and made the adjustments for atmospheric and the greenhouse gases that are there. It must have had some sound science behind it.

And so where is that computer model today? If that model predicted the Earth would get warmer, and we chugged along, and now we're 17 years later and the Earth has gotten cooler over the last 7 years. It was supposed to get warmer over the last 17. Got a little warmer for the first 10 or so, then it got cooler over the last 7 or 8.

How does this happen? Does anybody go back to the computer model that must have been the basis for the science that was driving Al Gore at the time? I don't know that anybody did. They keep telling me they have got better and better models and they're doing a better and better job of monitoring the temperatures on the globe.

I remember also another book that was published I believe that same year, and it was called "Trashing the Planet", written by former Governor of the

State of Washington, Dixy Lee Ray. She starts her book out by saying, In the year 1900, the Earth was a very smelly and dangerous place. And she wrote about the disease and the pollution that was there, the garbage that got dumped out of the windows onto the streets, how the sewage ran in the streets, and how disease was rampant, and the water wasn't clean, the air wasn't clean, the soil wasn't clean.

But as that all took place, she compared 1900 with the late 1980s or so, as the book was put together and drafted and I think published around 1990. Dixy Lee Ray.

She made several statements, God rest her soul, she had a clear idea on this. And she said that technology always improves our quality of our life and our lifestyle. All the improvements that we have—we figured out how to drill for wells and purify water and put it in pipes—clean, sanitized pipes, and send it off into all of our houses. We didn't have water at the turn of the century, 109 years ago. We surely did the latter part of the 20th century.

And clean water was a big thing that ensured a lot more health because people weren't drinking bacteria and nitrates and catching a disease from their drinking water.

I remember going up to Fort Niagara up near Niagara Falls on one of the Great Lakes there. We were in a redoubt that had had several flags fly over it, including the British flag, and they told about how the men slept there in this redoubt, this little fort. The beds were so short.

I said, How come the beds are so short? Well, they were not actually as tall as we are today, but the shorter beds were because they didn't sleep laying down. They had respiratory diseases, respiratory illnesses, so they slept kind of sitting up, propped up.

Another thing they did, they had a chamber pot. And they sent the lowest-ranking troops down the hill to the lake with this chamber pot. So that was the one they used at night when they didn't want to go outside, and it was cold. So they carried the chamber pot down, dumped it out—I don't know where they dumped it out. I presume they washed it out. But they used the same pot and carried it back up and they used that for drinking water during the day.

The British, nor did anybody in the world, understand about diseases back in the mid to late 1700s. But that water cleanliness was a big part. Sanitary sewers were a big part. We got rid of the outhouses and flushed it down to the sewer treatment plant.

I want to thank Lady Bird Johnson. Kids my age grew up shooting rats at the dump. We don't do that any more because we have sanitary landfills and we cleaned this up. We cleaned up a lot of things. We are a lot safer and a lot more healthy because of technology, because the modern world has marched along.

But the technology of calculating global warming doesn't hold itself up.

There was a conclusion that was drawn by Al Gore and others—now he has a Pulitzer Prize—there was a conclusion that was drawn by him back in some year—some year perhaps in the Eighties, and I do not know, Mr. Speaker, what the catalyst was, but I do know environmental groups came quickly and strongly and financially behind Al Gore at a certain time in the late Eighties—almost overnight. And he drew a conclusion that has yet to be shaken by the temperature that's going down incrementally on this planet.

Now this is always mysterious to me, Mr. Speaker. How is it that a conclusion can be drawn that the Earth is getting warmer and we must do something, cut down on greenhouse gas emissions. We can't really explain the science to you because you're just a regular old citizen and you can't comprehend this. Instead, you just have to take the word of the environmental extremists that the Earth's going to get warmer unless we follow them. Follow them down this path of shutting down our production of energy in the United States, closing down the CO₂ emissions, doing the cap-and-trade that is proposed here so that it would skyrocket our electrical costs.

Why is it that no amount of science has shaken them? Why is it that, of all the things that we have collected for data throughout this time, they haven't really stepped up and said, Well, here's the adjustments we have to make now because we know more than we did then. It's as if science didn't march on for the last 17 years, but the politics have marched together in a huge army of politicians and their environmentalist supporters that keep making the case we must do something.

It's as if this Earth is going to keep getting warmer even though it's been getting cooler—and the only thing we can do about it is reduce the amount of CO₂ emissions in the United States. Now how does this work?

And so I have some new numbers that the world has never seen. They are just produced in a spreadsheet in my office indexed back to real facts. I know the doctor from Georgia is going to be very interested in these facts.

□ 2115

And it starts out this way, when there is something going on and somebody says this is the science of it, I usually go out and I ask, what are the big questions so you can lay out the parameters for me, Mr. Speaker?

The first question I would ask is, if we have global warming, and it is because the industry emissions are contributing to the atmosphere, the first question I would have is, okay, how big is our atmosphere? How do you measure all this volume of gases that have settled down to the gravitational pull, come out of outer space and settled down to the gravitational pull of Earth, all that God breathed on and

those little molecules added to it, how much is that? Well they measure that in tons. So the weight, if you could put a scale on all the Earth's surface and weigh this atmosphere, you would find out—we are pretty close on this—5 quadrillion 150 trillion metric tons is the full weight of the atmosphere of the Earth, 5 quadrillion metric tons. That is all the air, the weight of all the air.

Now we are measuring greenhouse gases in tons, in metric tons. So I ask the question, what is the weight of all the greenhouse gas that is in this atmosphere that is 5.15 quadrillion tons? Well, let's take it to the CO₂, because that is the only thing that Waxman-Markey addresses is CO₂. So the weight of all the CO₂ gases in the atmosphere is 3 trillion, try that, 3 trillion metric tons. Three compared to 5.15 quadrillion. So I will tell you this. If all the atmosphere is 100 percent by weight, then the CO₂ in the atmosphere is .0591. That is the CO₂. Now a lot of the CO₂ is there naturally. We don't charge that against industry in the world.

So I take this thing down to what do we charge against this? What do we measure? So I will just take you to the net CO₂ emissions in the United States. I'm sorry, I don't have the numbers from 1600 or 1700. But I do have the numbers from 1800 until 2005, two centuries plus 5 years. So that is pretty much the dawn of the industrial revolution contributed all the way up this way. The net CO₂ from U.S. emissions over the last 205 years, that is hanging in the atmosphere, is 178 billion 792 million metric tons.

So, Mr. Speaker, if you are listening closely, we have an atmosphere of 5.15 quadrillion metric tons, we have a total CO₂ of 3 trillion, and we have the CO₂ contributed by the United States of 178 billion 792 million, is all that is, so the U.S., this is the net, because 45 percent of it goes into sinks, the net greenhouse gas that is contributed in the form of CO₂ contributed by the United States to this overall atmosphere, the net that is hanging out in the atmosphere today is .00347 percent of the overall atmosphere.

Now here is the picture I want to draw and put in the minds of people just immediately before I intend to yield to the gentleman from Georgia, and that is this: if you lay this out in a picture form, in a poster form, and most everybody knows what a 4.8 sheet of plywood looks like. For me, if I reach up, I reach about 7 feet, a little more, so 1 foot above my hand would be the height of a 4 x 8 sheet of drywall, let's put two of those side by side, 8 feet out this way, 8 feet this way, draw a circle the full diameter of 8 feet by 8 feet, that would be a 48-inch radius, whoop that circle around there, a great big circle would be the height of most walls in a person's living room. That would represent the full atmosphere of the Earth. It is volume measured in metric tons of all the atmosphere of the Earth.

Now what are we trying to control here with Waxman-Markey? How big is this piece of the atmosphere that we are trying to affect a part of by reducing its emissions? The total accumulation from the last 205 years, the industry of the United States comes down to a radius, I will just give you the diameter, the diameter would be .56 inches, that is how big the circle is, that is all the complete contribution of U.S. CO₂ emissions in the last 205 years altogether that is hanging out there in the atmosphere. You have an 8-foot circle, imagine the size of the 8-foot circle, but the little circle in the middle is the part that we can control. If you shut it all down, the entire sum total of the accumulated total is the diameter of a lug on your tire. Not the nut. Take the nut off. It is the stud that goes inside the nut. Usually those are a half inch thread. That is what we have got. The size of my little finger is the size of the circle that would represent the complete volume of the accumulated CO₂ admitted by the United States inside of that, inside a circle 8 feet in diameter. And we are going to try to control the Earth's temperature over 100 years by fooling around with that tiny little circle that is a half inch in diameter?

What utter arrogance. What utter vanity. I think we have gone into a new level of vanity here. I talked about the Utopian philosophers that emerged from Western Europe over the centuries that thought they could manage humanity. We have Utopian scientists here who believe they can control the Earth's temperature by fooling around with a tiny little circle that is just .56 inch in diameter. What does a 50-caliber bullet look like? Just about that. A little bit of expansion and you have got it. So we are dealing with, if you have an 8-foot circle, and you put a .45 caliber bullet into the center of that, you are going to be pretty close to the size of the hole that would represent the circle that would be all of the CO₂ that the U.S. has put into the atmosphere that has accumulated in 205 years.

What utter vanity, Mr. Speaker. And I will expand on this thought much more until the American people understand that we cannot be handicapping our economy based upon a science that can't be substantiated. And we can't find anybody in this Chamber that can argue the science even with that single fact that I have laid out there. And so, Mr. Speaker, I make that point.

There is a whole other point to be made on the disaster that will be caused to our economy. But there is a significant point to be contributed by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN), Dr. BROUN, Congressman BROUN, whom I would be very happy to yield to and call my friend at the same time as much time as he might consume.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for yielding. And you bring out a great point.

Mr. Speaker, cap-and-trade is not about the environment. And, in fact,

the President recently said that if this is not passed into law, then he will not have the revenue to foster or pay for the Big Government that he is trying to force down the throats of the American people. This is not about the environment. Mr. KING, you brought that out very clearly. This is about greater revenue. It is a about a tax, cap-and-tax. I call it "tax-and-cap" because tax is what this is all about.

And your chart right there brings out a very strong point. Even the President says that electricity rates will skyrocket. Every single energy source in this country will skyrocket. That means that everything is going to go up in price, food, medicine, health care, all goods and services are going to go up. Why? Because the leadership in this House, the leadership in the U.S. Senate, the administration, wants to continue down a road towards total government control of everything that people do. There is a word for that. It is called "socialism." And that is exactly what they are doing. They are driving a steamroller of socialism that is being forced down the throats of the American people. And it is going to strangle our economy. It is going to hurt the people that our Democratic colleagues say that they represent the most. Electricity costs and heating costs are going to affect the retirees, people on limited income and the poor people more than anybody else.

My good friend from Iowa made some excellent points. And I just want to reiterate what you said. It is going to cost the American people a tremendous amount of money. The American Association of Manufacturers has estimated that every single family in this country is going to pay \$3,128 more in taxes. Everybody is going to have that tax burden placed on them plus the increased cost of all goods and services. And it has to stop.

The American people can do something about it. They can tell their Members of Congress, We don't want this tax-and-cap bill to pass. And it is absolutely critical for the people all over this country to call their Congressman, call their Senators and say "no" to this crazy cap-and-trade policy that is being forced down their throats. And it has just got to stop because it is going to kill our economy. It is going to hurt everybody in this country. And I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman. And I regretfully yield back the balance of my nonexistent time.

THE GREENING OF OUR ENERGY THINKING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, we are at the threshold of energy policy that can transform not only our energy thinking but respond to the economic crises

that are gripping this Nation. With the leadership of a new administration, with a President who has expressed the boldness of a vision for energy generation, energy transmission and energy storage, an innovation economy sparked by that source of greening up of our energy thinking can be just what the doctor ordered in curing our economic ills and allowing us to go forward with a stronger sense of security, security that is expressed by our energy security, our job security, our economic security and certainly for those measures, our national security.

It is no wonder that our gluttonous dependency on a fossil-based economy has caused us to rely on importing, from some of the most troubled spots in the world, our energy supplies. These are countries that have unstable governments that have ruled the day for our economy.

And certainly when we look at the failed measures of the previous administration, the average household has been paying, or the average citizen has been paying \$1,100 more in energy costs because of the failure of that energy policy during the Bush-Cheney administration. So it is a challenge to us and a dictate to the American public to go forward with a new vision, a boldness of greening up our energy thinking so as to spark this innovation economy.

When we look at what can happen in this country, there are many promising statistics. We can understand that some 5 million jobs can be created in the clean energy economy if we were to enhance by 25 percent our renewable energies. And just for the electricity supplies we require and the transportation needs that we have, if we advance a 25 percent improvement by the year 2025, we could realize those 5 million additional jobs in the economy. And dollar for dollar, it is calculated that four times the job growth is realized in the clean energy economy than is realized in the dependency and the continuation of the oil and petroleum economy.

So those statistics speak nobly to the challenge that befalls us, that we need to move forward with a new order of thinking, that we can, as we enhance our energy security, grow American jobs that produce American power for America's energy needs.

Now that is a strengthening of our economy in a way that will put new jobs, job opportunities, on to the grid that have not previously been there. It allows us to cover the array of job opportunities from the trades that are involved on over to the engineering, the inventor, the innovator types that can produce the prototypes and then pulling them into the manufacturing and commercial sectors of emerging technologies that will allow us to very cleverly encourage new generation formats, new storage formats and new transmission opportunities in the realm of energy.

□ 2130

The transitioning will allow us to impact industries from manufacturing to engineering to all sorts of lab opportunities for our given communities.

When we look at situations in New York State alone, we are looking at some 132,000 or so jobs that could be created in a clean energy opportunity in New York State. Obviously with an unemployment rate that is above 8 percent in New York State, that would be a welcomed bit of opportunity.

We need to simply look at the practicality of some of the experiences out there that have enabled us to move forward, to move forward in a way that allows us to utilize the strength of our intellect as a Nation and use that brain trust and invest in our future.

Recently when we were visiting with a former energy minister for the country of Denmark, he had visited with the SEEC caucus that has been formed here in Congress of which I serve as Chair, the Sustainable Energy and Environment Caucus has entertained guests who will share with us their ideas and their success stories.

Denmark has done well by changing its format of energy design. It was important to note that they have very boldly stepped forward and invested with some ideas that actually came from the United States and perhaps even patents that originated here. So it behooves us to move forward and utilize this American think tank and put it to work here in our country to meet our energy needs. While I was at NYSERDA where I served as president and CEO of the New York State Energy Research and Development Authority, we were able to advance several new ideas: kinetic hydro that allowed us to utilize the turbulence of the East River along the Manhattan shoreline, and just utilizing that turbulence allowed us to do subwater surface energy creation, energy generation simply by the motion of the water.

We have several opportunities with the many bodies of water in New York State, and with turbulent bodies as such, to perhaps achieve as much as 1,000 to 1,100 megawatts worth of power.

The demonstration project, funded through the assistance of NYSERDA, made modifications possible through Denver, through the Department of Energy labs, and we have reformulated the design of the energy turbine blades. We have recalculated the assembly, the core assembly of such a turbine, and we are able to go through with these improvements that now offer great hope for the kinetic opportunities.

That is just one sampling of cutting-edge technology, emerging technologies that can strengthen our American economy and our energy consumers' future here in this country.

I think also of the geothermal applications that we have made with campuses like the Culinary Institute of America where the geothermal applications are used now to heat and cool six