

jobs like similar to what Spain has done, and I have a report from the Institute For Energy Research, which talks about other countries.

And what has happened is they have spent billions of dollars of taxpayer resources to subsidize renewable energy programs and to add more greening within their societies. And as they passed some carbon tax-type legislation, it was showing that, according to their results, compared to what the United States could expect, that the U.S. can expect 2.2 jobs destroyed for every one renewable job that is financed by government-based bond, what has happened in Spain. Only one of 10 jobs actually creating a green investment would be permanent. They'd be temporary jobs.

Mr. LATTI. I thank the gentledady.

IMPACT OF CAP-AND-TRADE ON MANUFACTURING

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CARSON of Indiana). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, we've just concluded an hour of debate on manufacturing and the impact that this cap-and-trade system will have on manufacturing. I wanted to add a footnote from the congressional district that I represent. It's the top of the State of Illinois.

And near east of Dubuque, on the Mississippi River, is a company called Rentech that makes hydrous ammonia urea and products for agriculture. They were in the process of switching to what's called the Fischer-Tropsch process—it's an old German process—substituting natural gas and in its place putting coal, bringing coal up the Mississippi River.

And one of the byproducts of that coal would be diesel fuel, in addition to the hydrous ammonia, urea, et cetera, that could come from that facility.

Once the owners found out about a proposed cap-and-trade system, that stopped that half-billion-dollar investment in the congressional district that's smarting with unemployment, running as high as 14 and 15 percent. Just the talk, just the threat of a cap-and-trade has already stifled innovation.

And that's why it's extraordinarily important that we take a look at alternatives such as the ones suggested by GAO that can accomplish the same things without these onerous requirements and regulations on the backs of our American manufacturers.

And so those of us who were really concerned about the loss of manufacturing in this country, those of us who really want to see us become less dependent upon the Chinese and the Indians and the Mexicans and other countries around the world and to look to ourselves for self-sufficiency, to restore manufacturing in America, we cannot have this cap-and-trade system because

that has already stifled a half-billion-dollar investment in the congressional district that I represent.

CHANGING OUR ENERGY POLICY

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, it's been very interesting to have engaged in discussions over the last few months about changing our energy policy, and it's been particularly interesting listening to my colleagues on the other side talk about their vision of where this country goes or, rather, their lack of vision as to where this country will go in energy.

This debate began several years ago. It was very prominent during the Presidential campaign in 2008, and there began to emerge a very clear distinction about two very different visions about what we need to do in this country.

We heard last summer the mantra coming from the Republicans: "Drill, baby, drill! Drill, baby, drill!" That was, in essence, the sum and substance of the Republican Party's energy policy: continue to drill for oil, continue to emit carbon CO₂ into the atmosphere, continue to avoid the tough choices about changing our goals in energy policy in this country, trying to achieve energy independence and, again, relying on the same technologies that we've used in this country for 100 years.

Fortunately, we elected a President who has a very different vision of where we go in energy, a very progressive vision of where we go in energy, a policy that he has proposed, that this Congress is proposing to enact, that will end our dependence on oil and carbon-based fuels, will set a new course to where we are actually using the great gifts of the natural world, such as wind and solar energy, creating the kinds of incentives for businesses to create new jobs and new industries, so that we can create a future that is not only clean but prosperous.

Now, what's interesting in listening to my colleagues from the other side, all very well-intentioned men and women, and I've listened to some over the last hour, is this constant emphasis on the cost of changing direction, the cost of cleaning the air, the cost of truly creating an alternative energy policy in this country. And I'm glad they do that because, as with any good thing, there is a cost to doing it, but what we would like to emphasize in pursuing a new direction is the cost of not acting and not pursuing that new direction.

What have we seen, for instance, in this country over the last decade? We've seen the average citizen's energy costs rise by well over \$1,000 a year, and last summer alone, we saw gas

prices at \$4 a gallon, which certainly is an additional tax on every American citizen who drives a car or who powers anything.

As we project onward, we know that diminishing resources in carbon-based fuel, diminishing supplies of petroleum, the price of gas is going to continue to go up. The price of natural gas is going to rise. So the cost of pursuing the same old status quo is significant.

On the other hand, we can make an investment now. We can make an investment that will save us money, will continue to save us money toward infinity. We can actually harness the power of the sun, the power of the wind, hydroelectric power, geothermal power, all of the alternative sources which we know are available to us. If we can do that—and this bill that we are contemplating right now sets us in that direction, provides the type of incentives and stimulus that will get us to that era—then we will have an era in which we dramatically cut our energy costs. We will save trillions and trillions of dollars as we move forward.

I know just in my own district, I've gone to see some of the new techniques for building homes, for utilizing all of the LEED-certified processes that can cut a 3000-square-foot home's utility costs to under \$100 a month. These are the potentials that are out there for us, and these are the potentials that this proposal that we are dealing with now and considering in Congress can bring to reality.

So this is a debate that's important for this country. In a very real sense, it represents the future of this country, and there are very real differences between the Democratic Caucus and the administration and our colleagues on the other side who again prefer to pursue a 20th-century energy policy, rather than a 21st-century energy policy.

So I'm joined here by someone who has great interest in this subject and many others, who is part of that class of 2006 which changed control of the Congress and set us in a new direction. I'm proud to introduce my good friend and colleague, RON KLEIN from Florida.

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. I thank the gentleman and thank him for his leadership.

As a Member from the Commonwealth of Kentucky, obviously you have a great deal of understanding about energy needs. The cities in Kentucky, the rural areas of Kentucky, the great equestrian and horse industry in Kentucky, all of those require the types of energy that we know are future energy sources for America.

I think this is just such a moment in time that really allows for an excitement. Now, these are challenging times, make no mistake about it. In my lifetime—and I'm 51 years old. Mr. YARMUTH is probably somewhere in that range as well.

Mr. YARMUTH. I thank the gentleman for his flattery.

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. Well, as Americans we understand challenges. We understand crises. Our fathers, our grandparents, our great-grandparents were certainly the architects of us getting through world wars. They fought, they innovated, they came out of it even stronger. My mom was a public school teacher, taught second grade, taught me about how important education is to make a success of one's self.

My dad was a small businessman. I don't know if you remember five-and-ten-cent stores. We called them variety stores. We had them in Cleveland, Ohio, where I grew up, and I worked there since I was 8 years old. And my dad taught me what it was like to balance the books, not borrow unless you absolutely have to. I understood what it took to make payroll. We had eight employees and we took care of them. These were people that he was loyal to and they were loyal to him, and he taught me about work ethic.

But most importantly, he taught me about what it takes to be an American, and given those opportunities to succeed, you will succeed.

And that's why, to me, at this moment of great challenges in our economy, people's jobs may be being lost permanently, that this is the moment that we shouldn't just be incremental. We shouldn't be small thinking. We should be thinking big and look at this as an opportunity, an opportunity to truly change the direction of America.

And that direction takes in a lot of different pieces, but of course, it starts with a solid education. And I know that when my mom made it a necessity for me to go to school, college, I was able to borrow money through the student loan programs to get there. That was an opportunity and allowed me to be standing here today representing people in south Florida. But most importantly was that education that allowed me to see what our great universities can do in terms of innovation and science and business and to combine those great things together.

We know the story of John F. Kennedy, when that little Sputnik went up in space, and for those people who were living at that time, that little can that went up in space was the Russian statement to the world that they were going to be dominant in space, and that scared Americans. Not because they knew that it was a direct threat, but they didn't know what it meant with this Cold War going at that time.

But what John F. Kennedy did by saying, I'm going to put a man on the moon at the end of the 1960s is, he said that we're going to put science first and innovation and challenge, and we built a NASA program, and we put a man on the moon not by 1970, but in 1969, in July. I remember that.

And to me, that is the kind of inspiration that I think our President today is presenting to us, President Barack Obama, about using science, using technology, using business innovation to earn our way and work our way out

of this recession. It's not going to be something we're going to tax our way out of. We're going to grow our way out of this with jobs, with clean energy, with energy innovation, with energy products that not only are going to make us safer and more secure from a national security point of view—because we already know we import 60 percent of our oil from countries outside of the United States, and God only knows that is the wrong place for us to be at any moment in time.

We want to be self-reliant, and we have the capacity to do that with not only oil and gas but solar and wind and wave and nuclear and a whole lot of different things.

And it's about time that we sort of say this is our time, this is our moment to get it back on track. And I think that is what the President is saying to Americans. That's what the President is saying to American business.

I would share with the gentleman from Kentucky—he knows this because he helped write this bill. The big bill that we passed recently, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, the stimulus bill it's called, it has some incredibly positive things in it, not only to stimulate the economy but on energy. It has a smart grid, advanced battery technology effort, and it's millions and billions of dollars for our universities, for our businesses to come together, putting the smartest people at the table from a business point of view, how to take a product to market, as well as the science point of view, to get these batteries for all electric cars and for all sorts of innovation, to come together and say we're going to focus and we're going to do it. We're going to be more successful than any other country in the world.

□ 1645

And you know something, we're not only going to make it good for the United States; we're going to export those products and license that technology. And all the other countries of the world, instead of, you know, exporting to us, we're going to start exporting to them. Great opportunity there.

There are also a whole lot of really good things about energy efficiency, energy savings at home, encouraging people to buy products and giving them tax incentives to buy products that save on energy. Green jobs, green buildings, all these kind of things just offer such great opportunities. So, you know, I look at this moment when we're discussing energy, and not just about a drill, drill, drill issue. That's not the issue. Of course oil's going to be part of our national energy policy and so will natural gas, and we have more natural gas, and that's good.

But I'm from Florida. Florida should be leading the world right now in solar power. We're the Sunshine State, and every State in the country has something to advertise. People come to

Florida for our sun. Well, we should be leading in solar technology at our universities and for consumer purposes.

So I thank the gentleman for raising this today. We're going to be working on this issue. And again, this is not just about climate. This is about energy. This is about environment. This is about national security. Any one of those three, pick them, and I think that we could recognize this is the time for us to really put our foot down and make something happen.

Mr. YARMUTH. And I would also mention that this is about jobs. It's about jobs, jobs, jobs, because this is going to be one of the emerging industries of the 21st century. We know that. The American people know that. I mean, the polling on this topic is actually overwhelming. The high percentage, a majority of the American people understand that we need to go in a different direction in energy, that we need to make the investments, we need to stop global warming emissions. Seventy-seven percent of the voters, according to one recent poll, want us to act to reduce global warming emissions, CO₂. They know that this is what we need to do.

And, you know, this relates to what my colleague has said so well. What we are proposing to do in this legislation, in health care legislation that we're also working on, in the Recovery Act legislation that we've enacted, we're making a bet on America. We're making a big bet on America.

And I know that sometimes we hear our colleagues on the other side say, Oh, gosh, nobody borrows money to make money. Well, no. That's exactly what you do. That's what virtually every corporation that's ever succeeded in this country has done. They've borrowed money and they've invested it in ways that enabled them to make enormous future profits. And that's what we're proposing to do here.

We're going to increase deficits in this country over the next few years in order to enact those policies. But we're making a bet that American ingenuity, American brilliance, will develop the type of advances that will not only pay back that deficit, will not only create millions of new jobs, will not only create an exploding new industry, but will also lead this country into a great era of prosperity and will make life better for everyone, because if we can cut a person's utility bills from \$3,000 or \$4,000 a year to \$500 a year, that's essentially a tax cut, a substantial tax cut.

And I know they like to talk about raising taxes, raising taxes. But again, as I mentioned earlier, what is the cost of not doing something now? What is the cost of reverting to that 20th century economy when gas was \$4 a gallon last summer, and where, you know, we know gas in Europe is \$9 and \$10 in some places. What would that do to the American economy if gasoline were \$9 or \$10 a gallon? It would come to a screeching halt literally and figuratively. And that's why the types of

things we're proposing in this energy legislation are so critical, because we're making the big bet, the big bet that American ingenuity will succeed and we'll once again dominate the world and we'll once again lead the world into a much better era, an era of cleaner skies, cleaner water, and also one of great prosperity.

I'm willing to make that bet on America because America's never failed. And I think that's what is so exciting and inspirational about the administration and the White House and the leadership in this Congress, that they're willing to make the big bet that America will succeed.

I yield again to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. I thank the gentleman for yielding. When I think about, when people talk about the best investment you can make is in yourself, and I know that over the years I've known people that were very successful in their own business and then they sort of went outside, they had a little extra money and they went outside their comfort zone and invested in something they maybe didn't know enough about and sometimes they lost money in that way.

I am so strongly in belief, as you just said, that investing in American scientists, investing in American business entrepreneurs, investing in the confidence that American consumers have, that we cannot only emerge in a stronger position, but we will absolutely dominate this energy field. And I'll give you an example.

The light bulbs that we see up here. These are incandescent light bulbs that were designed by Thomas Edison. The technology, long, long ago, a hundred years ago. And over the years we've made certain improvements to them and things like that, but they're very energy oriented. They really consume a lot of energy.

Well, you've now seen these new bulbs, that sort of circular, looks like a loop kind of thing, and those save a lot of energy. Now, they cost more at the store right now if you go to one of the stores because obviously there is a supply-and-demand issue.

But one of the things that we can do in government that doesn't cost the taxpayers a dime is we can create market, something Europe has been doing for a long time. And an example of this, and I know the gentleman from Kentucky is aware of this: Last year we passed a bill that will phase out the old-fashioned light bulbs over the next number of years, transition. And when we say "phase out," they're going to have to put in, you know, they'll basically be selling new light bulbs, new energy-efficient light bulbs.

Well, guess what that does. Without the government spending a dime, without anybody doing anything, it gives businesses and business entrepreneurs and scientists a signal, a market signal that says there are going to be 450 million light bulbs sold in 2012 of this

type, a big, big market in the United States. That's not the real number, but some extraordinary number, and then around world.

That means that if you design and can build in a cost-effective way and manufacture a light bulb that meets these specifications, there is a big market out there. So it certainly gives you, as an entrepreneur, as a businessperson, the signal to say, I'm going to invest in something that I know there's going to be a big market. And over the next number of years that market will only grow and expand. It's the same thing that we've seen with appliances. It's the same thing with our heating and air-conditioning systems. The refrigerators that were built 20 years ago used, I think, something like 10 times as much energy as they used today, even though today's average refrigerator is larger, does more functions and everything else. And that's because over time, you know, people understood, they wanted it more efficient, they wanted to pay less. So they paid a little more for the refrigerator up front, absolutely recouped that over time.

So, to me, these are the exciting things when it comes to electric automobiles and hybrids and all sorts of new technology that will make our homes more efficient, our buildings more efficient where we work. And it's a moment where I think with a partnership of government sending the right signals and the right tax planning, and businesses and consumers wanting to make these changes, wanting to succeed and create these jobs and wanting to be successful, it's the perfect combination.

And I yield back.

Mr. YARMUTH. I'm glad the gentleman mentioned those types of innovations, because the Consumer Products Division of General Electric is based in my district, and I'm well aware of the incredible progress that's being made in energy-efficient appliances and in those light bulbs. And this isn't the General Electric Company, but another very large company in my district just went through their plant and replaced all of their bulbs with energy-saving bulbs. It cost them \$80,000 to do it. Now, \$80,000 is a pretty substantial sum to a business, but they made the calculation that \$80,000 would be paid back many, many times over in savings as they went forward.

And this is going to happen in business after business, in institution after institution, colleges, schools, you name it, across the country will be making these changes because they recognize the savings.

General Electric has, as do other manufacturers—I'm obviously going to plug General Electric—has new appliances which actually are regulated so that they will actually go on. They're timed so that they will be—let's say a dishwasher or a clothing washer or dryer will actually go on during periods of the day when peak utility usage,

when it's not peak utility usage, when there's actually low demand on utilities. And they think by doing this, by creating these types of very smart appliances, they call them smart appliances, that they will actually be able to save energy costs systemwide because they won't be draining the utilities at the peak usage hours.

So there are all sorts of very, very smart things going on, and the legislation that we're proposing and the government initiatives that we're trying to initiate will go a great distance in seeing that through.

One of the things that intrigued me today, and I'm very proud of not just President Obama but also the automobile manufacturers and the various State governments that were involved in this discussion, to raise the mileage standards for automobiles to 35 miles a gallon by 2016, which is far faster than was provided for in legislation we passed in 2007.

But what's fascinating to me about this, and I think the gentleman would agree, that technology is going to outstrip even these standards that we're setting. I mean, there's a Ford Fusion right now, 41 miles a gallon in the city, a Ford Fusion hybrid. There are going to be electric cars that are coming out within the next year or two that will essentially get far more mileage than the prescription in this agreement that was reached.

So that's just a measure, one more measure of how successful, how innovative our economy can be when given a challenge. And all we're trying to do in this legislation that we're proposing now is to kind of put the challenge out there with the right kind of incentives, with the right kind of government push and funding and let the American spirit and American ingenuity have its way. And I know that this is going to be—again, this is going to be a phenomenal job creator and an economic engine for America as we move forward.

And I'll yield to the gentleman again.

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. Thank you. And I absolutely agree. And if you think about, you know, the automobile, I'm in full agreement. I think it's exciting, and I'm glad to see that our people at the automotive companies understand this challenge, are not standing in the way. They're embracing it, and that's pretty exciting. And I think they're embracing it because they know that their survival is dependent on selling a car that the American consumer will want to buy, will get efficiency in operation, will last, and the maintenance will be minimal. There's a strong warranty behind it, things that were the mainstay of the automobile industry in the United States for a long time and, you know, sort of tapered off over the last few years.

But there's absolutely no reason in my mind why an American automobile can't be as good or better than any automobile in the world and why our

scientists and engineers can't create the best automobile.

There's a company in New Jersey that has been working on a different kind of concept which is very interesting. They're actually pushing—or not pushing. I think they've got the Government of Israel to support this, and I think Finland also, where in Israel they're going to be converting their entire—all their automobiles to electric automobiles over the next number of years.

And here's the simplicity of how this works, because I love when people say, Well, we can't do it, and the naysayers. And, oh, it's too expensive or too this. It just takes a little bit of thought to get it through.

Here's the simple idea. Right now, we have a tank of gas that may get you 200 miles, 300 miles, and then you run out of gas. Okay? So it's finite. It's not like your car runs indefinitely. You have to stop at a gas station. And, of course, in the United States, we have gas stations a lot of different places, but there aren't a lot of places you can get flex fuels and a lot of other, which has held up the alternative types of engine development in the United States.

This group has a car that has a battery, and the battery, I think right now the electric charge is maybe 100 miles, which, by the way, for most people, you don't go more than 100 miles in any city during the day. You may go 30, 40 miles, and then you can swap the battery out. You go to a gas station, which is now a service station. You swap the battery out just like you did with your old—your telephone battery kind of thing, and then you pop it back in and you're ready for the next charge. Or you plug in at night at home.

Now, if you think about it, our utility plants right now operate at peak capacity during the day. In the middle of the night when factories aren't necessarily operating and the peak load for electricity is down, they're operating at 30 percent, 40 percent, 60 percent, whatever the number is. So if you were to plug all these cars in at night with a nominal amount of electricity, no big deal. It makes full use of the existing capacity. You don't need another megawatt of electricity to do this, and you've got a car that has no emissions whatsoever.

□ 1700

We also know that this 100-mile charge, in the next couple of years it's going to be 120 and then 150 and then 200, because the technicians and the science people are going to get these batteries up and running, just like they make cars more efficient over time.

I thank the Senate for passing the Credit Card bill. I think that's a very exciting bill that the House passed already—it's called the Credit Card Consumers Rights bill. I think in a bipartisan way many of us in the House were very excited about the opportunity to try to get some balance in the credit

card world for consumers, particularly at a time like this. So I appreciate the work of the Senate. I know we're going to be working actively to get that bill resolved.

But just to finish the thought, if I can, the gentleman from Kentucky, is just to say that this electric car concept, it's exactly—whether that is the prototype for what is going to work in America, I can't tell you. But I love the idea that great thinkers are out there coming up with new ideas. The simplicity of being able to plug a car into a wall—there's a plug in the most rural areas or there's an electric outlet in the middle of the city.

So I think that's the kind of thinking that I would love to see as we move forward. I know that the tax incentives are in place for the development of our companies in the United States that develop these. I know the American people are ready for the jobs and our economy is ready for rebuilding. I think this is that moment in time as we pass this stimulus bill and we're now moving into the phase of letting the companies compete for these grants and letting our universities participate in the development with our greatest scientists and greatest engineers to take us to the next level so we will have energy security, national security, cleaner environment, and the kinds of economy that my kids, your kids, maybe our grandkids in the future, will be able to enjoy and participate in.

Mr. YARMUTH. Exactly. And millions of new jobs and essentially a reduction in everyone's utility costs that will amount to a substantial tax cut. So, in my view, and I think the view of most Americans, this is a win-win-win-win.

Before we yield to another colleague, I'd just like to go through some of these other poll numbers to show where the American people are, because sometimes we sit in this Chamber—and we have equal time with the minority party so we have equal minutes. Sometimes you might get the impression that there's an equal number of people who agree with that position, an equal number of people who agree with our position.

But this is a poll actually done by a combination of Democratic and Republican pollsters and also by the Pew Research Group. Seventy-four percent of Republicans, 70 percent of Independents, and 74 percent of Democrats believe jobs that reduce our dependence on foreign oil are very important for helping the economy over the next 5 to 10 years.

Sixty-three percent of Republicans, 70 percent of Independents, and 37 percent of Democrats believe jobs that are improving energy efficiency are very important to helping the economy over the next 5 to 10 years.

Fifty-nine percent of voters believe efforts to tackle global warming will help create jobs. We heard from the other side earlier this afternoon that,

Oh, gosh, efforts to reduce global warming emissions are going to kill jobs—millions and millions of jobs—and result in a huge tax increase. Most Americans don't agree with that. Most Americans agree this is going to be a benefit for the economy.

Seventy-seven percent of voters favor action to reduce global warming emissions. Fifty percent of voters say they would view their Member of Congress more favorably if they support a comprehensive plan to create clean energy jobs and fight global warming. Only 22 percent say they would view their Member of Congress less favorably.

So it's pretty clear from these numbers and it's pretty clear from the people I talk to that the American people are strongly in favor of our taking dramatic action to set our country on a new path where energy is concerned toward a cleaner energy future, a more affordable energy future, toward an independent energy future. And I think that the moves we are making in this Congress will take us in that direction. I'm very proud that we're doing that.

I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. I thank the gentleman. I think when we talk about polls, obviously it's interesting to hear what the American people have to say because those are the people impacted by the decisions that are made here in Washington. And particularly at home right now, I know where I live in south Florida, people are hurting, they're suffering. They're looking for what is going on for the future of their jobs, their businesses. If they're senior citizens, they're concerned about what's going on in the economy.

But I think what is going on is there seems to be a little bit of a glimmer of some turn here. It's going to take time. What we all inherited—I'm talking about America, I'm not talking about this Congress—but all of us as Americans, we inherited, unfortunately, a pretty deep situation with the bank crisis and things like that.

We all go through recessions. Recessions cycle out. We do everything we can as a country, both public and private sector, to contract the amount of time it's going to take to allow a recession to go through.

But, again, I see this as a time also with the new President, President Obama, as really taking this moment to say we're going to have to fix some of the problems that have been festering a long time. We have an investment in roads and infrastructure and schools and bridges and things like that.

We have an investment in health care—to try to fix the health care system. We're debating a lot of new ideas right now. I know that every one of us has a family situation with a pre-existing condition. My sister had cancer diagnosed recently, and she's going to have problems with insurance. You know something? This is that moment when you need insurance—not a perfectly healthy person.

But whether it's energy or health care or education or the bridges and roads and universities, things like that, these are the things that I think are really beginning to come out. The polls can say something, as my friend from Kentucky said, but these are Americans talking. These aren't Democrats or Republicans or Independents. These are Americans from all walks of life, from all 50 States, rural areas and industrial areas, areas where there's been a great history of success and areas that are now having great difficulties.

I think that's why it is exciting to have the kind of energy and the kind of leadership that's coming out of the White House. We may not necessarily grant every single thing, but I think that what's going on right now in Washington, there's a great amount of trying that's going on, a great amount of effort going into passing things.

There's been a number of bills passed—everything from health care to the energy issues. We know that as we move forward there are going to be greater issues to tackle. And I know that all of us feel very strongly this is a moment where we want to hear from our constituents, to talk to us, to let us know what is on their mind; not get caught up on the discussions on cable television. Obviously, everybody's got an opinion.

Literally, when we come home and we're talking every day at home with what Americans are talking about, what is important to them, this is that time to share with us. I know that many of you do. I just want to continue that conversation as we move forward.

I just wanted to thank the gentleman for bringing us here tonight to talk about energy because this is something that is going to have one of the biggest impacts on our future, both our foreign policy and our domestic policy. I look forward to working with you and all the Members of Congress on making sure we get it right.

Mr. YARMUTH. I thank the gentleman. He makes a very important point, and that is that you started in this way, that we are at a critical juncture in our Nation's history and the history of the world. We, for once, at least in my memory, are starting to look at the long-term needs of this country and this world.

We don't do that very well in this country. It's always we look to tomorrow, we look maybe to next year, but we don't look at the next generation and the generation past that. And in the debate we will have in coming weeks on energy and later in the year on health care, we will hear, again, this very distinct difference in opinion.

I heard Members this morning and I heard the minority leader on Sunday on television talking about health care, saying the cost of reforming health care is so great, it's going to cost billions and billions of dollars, which we know. We don't know exactly how much it's going to cost to do that,

but we know pretty certainly what the cost of not acting is, because the projections just in Medicare alone are that we're facing something like a \$70 trillion projected deficit in additional deficit in Medicare over the next 50 years.

So we don't have the option of not acting. We don't have that option. Yes, we are going to spend some money in the next few years. But, again, if we don't, we face a certain dismal future. If we act now, we have a chance of turning this country in the right direction and creating a very prosperous and bright future for our country.

Now I'd like to yield to another member of the class of 2006, a good friend and colleague from Indiana, Mr. DONNELLY.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Indiana will control the remainder of the hour. There was no objection.

COMMEMORATION OF THOSE WHO GAVE THEIR LIVES IN THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. DONNELLY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to thank my two colleagues, Mr. KLEIN from Florida and Mr. YARMUTH from Kentucky, for their insightful ideas and words.

Mr. Speaker, as we near Memorial Day, I rise today to offer some words in commemoration of those who gave their lives in the Armed Forces; in particular, three sons from our Second District of Indiana.

I know that words are only a poor and passing memorial, gone as soon as spoken. Flowers, plaques, and even stone—the other tokens we offer on Memorial Day to celebrate our fallen sons and daughters—all of these will decay and crumble. Nothing we give will endure as long as the gifts of these soldiers who, in their death, gave an example of fidelity that will never die.

Lance Corporal Cameron Babcock, was a native son of Plymouth, Indiana, and a proud member of the United States Marine Corps. Cameron lost his life at Twenty-Nine Palms Marine Base in California on January 20.

Cameron was a fine young man. He loved his family and he loved his country. Cameron was fun-loving and was known for his bear hug. He knew the value of the small things that made life a joy—being with friends, playing music, four-wheeling, and spending time with his beloved family. Cameron was successful in enjoying the many riches of life.

His talent with the trumpet led him to compete at the State Jazz Festival in 2005, and his musical talent also led to his participation in the Wind Ensemble, comprised of some of the top musicians at Plymouth High School. Cameron's warm personality attracted to him a wide circle of friends.

But Cameron also knew the value of matters larger than himself. His life-long dream was to join the proud ranks of the United States Marine Corps. Shortly after graduating from Plymouth High School in 2006, Cameron dove right into this dream and enlisted. His energy, enthusiasm, and

many gifts made the Marine Corps, and this Nation, much better.

He became an infantry rifleman, excelling all through basic training. Before long, he proved his bravery by serving a tour of duty in Iraq, spending several months in Ramadi in the Sunni Triangle. In this dangerous setting, Cameron continually did his job faithfully, and he did it well.

He won a variety of honors for his service and, at the time of his death, was prepared to again answer the call of duty for his country and return to Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to recognize the life and service of Sergeant Joseph Ford, originally of Knox, Indiana, a proud member of the Indiana Army National Guard. He died on May 10, 2008, when his vehicle rolled over during a training exercise near Al Asad, Iraq.

For most of his life, Sergeant Ford was simply known as Joey. Joey had a love of learning throughout his life; in particular, a passion for history that led him to attend the University of Southern Indiana to major in history.

Joey's passion for history reflected a passion for his country. This passion—this patriotism—kindled in him the desire to serve his country. The dedication to military service did not come without challenges for Joey. In order to meet the physical demands of the military, he embarked on an aggressive weight loss program, losing over 70 pounds in order to be able to join the Indiana National Guard.

This desire to serve his country did not stop at the water's edge. His commanding officer, Lieutenant Chastain, stated that Ford wanted to be the gunner on an armored vehicle rather than the driver. He said of Joey, "He exemplified what a dedicated soldier is."

□ 1715

This dedication was honored by his posthumous promotion from specialist to sergeant and the awarding of a Bronze Star.

Mr. Speaker, great as his love of country was, he also loved his family, in particular, his parents Dalarie and Sam and his wife Karen.

Joey had met the love of his life while he attended the University of Southern Indiana. His friend and fellow Guardsman, Keith Ausland, noted that his conversations with Joey during training and in Iraq generally ended not with concerns about the mission but concerns about his family. Ausland wrote in his tribute to Joey that, "Joe was a new husband, and he loved his wife dearly."

When his mom Dalarie was asked about the one thing she would want her son remembered for, she said, "He was so kind to everybody. At the memorial service it was amazing just to see all the unique people who loved Joey. He never wrote off anyone, and he was friends with everybody, all shapes, sizes, all walks of life. Joe was a gentle soul." So today we remember and honor Joe Ford, a patriot and a gentle

soul, a proud dad, a proud husband and a wonderful son.

Mr. Speaker, for much of the history of war, the number of soldiers struck down on the battlefield has been dwarfed by those killed by illness and disease. Thankfully, modern medicine has made the scourge of disease far more remote for our soldiers today, which makes the death of Private Randy Stabnik, also of the Indiana Army National Guard, all the more painful.

On February 17, Private Stabnik died from pneumococcal meningitis, a rare and unexpected death. After Randy had joined the National Guard, his family could see how much he was growing to love his service. His dad Jim, when asked about his son's service, said, "When he came home for Christmas, I could tell he missed it. He missed the lifestyle. He missed his friends there. He loved it, but missed his son. They were very, very close."

His son Nathan, only 8 years old, lost his 28-year-old dad. This is part of the tragedy of war. Soldiers fight and die to protect those they love, and we must never forget the burden of sacrifice borne by the loved ones who are left behind.

His son and his family should know that Randy cared deeply for them. His mom said shortly after his death, "Randy was Mom's baby, Mom's angel. He was my heart." And her angel, he remains. But he is also an angel for the entire Nation.

Mr. Speaker, ultimately the greatest memorial to these fallen patriots, to Cameron, to Joey and to Randy, will not be my words nor anything we can build or bestow. Our greatest honor for them will be to look not toward them but to look where they looked, to seek what they sought. If we work for that same good for which they gave their lives, if we create a nation at once more just, more secure, and more free, we will be a brighter beacon in a frequently dark world; and we will have given our fallen brothers and sisters a true memorial worthy of them.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I yield back the balance of my time.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed with an amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 627. An act to amend the Truth in Lending Act to establish fair and transparent practices relating to the extension of credit under an open end consumer credit plan, and for other purposes.

ADDRESSING THE HEALTH CARE CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We're here this evening to begin and continue a very important debate in American society. I think it's probably one of the most important social debates we've had in the last 40 years in this Nation since the debate on Medicare in 1965.

We're here tonight as a Physicians Caucus to discuss health care reform. My background, I spent 31 years practicing medicine in Johnson City, Tennessee, in the First Congressional District. As I've watched our health care system change over the past 30 years, it really spurred me to run for Congress, to come here and be part of this great debate that will affect every American citizen.

I recall when I made my decision to go to medical school, I wanted to be a family practitioner. Somewhere along the way, I discovered I had a great knack and a love of delivering babies. I have delivered almost 5,000 of them, many of whom are now grown. One of the great advantages you have as an obstetrician when you run for Congress is that you can deliver your own voters. There is some advantage to that.

We have a health care problem in America. Some call it a crisis. For some, it is. For others, it's cost. Certainly we know that there are great concerns about the cost of health care.

In the next hour we're going to discuss how we're going to address this health care crisis. We can ensure that every American can get the care they need, protect individuals from costs that can bankrupt them and make health insurance portable so that you don't lose your coverage just because you change jobs or move from one State to another.

We can also take the profits out of health care by reforming the health insurance industry to bring about a patient-centered approach to providing health care. Enacting a public plan will not bring about this type of change, and I'm going to go into that in some detail from the experiences we've had in the State of Tennessee with our Tennessee Medicaid system called TennCare.

If you think you won't be affected by a public plan, consider this: A recent analysis of this plan by the respected independent firm Lewin Group estimated that 70 percent of individuals who have health care coverage through their employer would lose those benefits in favor of a public plan. Now this plan could very easily become a Medicaid-type plan.

When supporters of a public plan say they want the public plan to compete with private plans, the facts show that what they're really saying is that they want Washington bureaucrats to take over the health care decision-making.

I want to talk for a while or speak to you a little while about the principles that House Republicans have put forward to start the debate over how to bring about patient-centered health care.

I want to mention a couple things before we start. Health care affects all of us, whether we're Democrats, Republicans, Independents, or whether we're totally apolitical. At some point in time in your life, you're going to have to make decisions about how I receive and get health care for myself or my family.

We're going to start this evening by giving another opinion or another view of the health care plan and how it is to be administered and obtained. The principles that we're going to talk about for health care reform are, number one, make quality health care coverage affordable and accessible for every American regardless of pre-existing conditions. In a country that spends 16 percent of its GDP, over \$2 trillion a year, on health care, I think there's no question that we can provide a basic health care plan for each American.

Now what I mean by basic health care, it's not a plan where you can get hair transplants or face-lifts or all this. But if you are out there injured in an automobile wreck or have a heart attack or have a gallbladder that goes bad, you can get basic health coverage and care.

I think this is something that all Americans believe in. I think we now have crossed that bridge and believe we can do that. I think the differences we're going to have in this great debate that we're going to have are, how are we going to accomplish this very noble task? In a few minutes I will go through how we tried this in Tennessee, and how it was not successful. But I think it can be.

Most Americans also fear, I think rightly so, that a basic health problem—it may be leukemia or a cancer of some type—can bankrupt the family. Certainly we don't want a situation where a family, through no fault of their own, develops a disease process, and then you use up all the family resources you've saved in a lifetime to provide care for your family.

The second principle we'll talk about is not a government-run health care plan. This eliminates coverage for more than 100 million people who receive insurance from an employer, and it restricts patient choice of doctors and treatments and results in the Federal Government takeover of health care.

Let me sort of explain how this worked in Tennessee. In the early nineties and mid-nineties, the big debate in this country came along about controlling health care costs or managed care. We were going to control costs through deciding who and what care was appropriate and so on. Well, that didn't work. Health care costs have continued to escalate in spite of managed care, and managed care basically has moved the pay to providers over to the third-party payers.

In Tennessee we had a very noble plan. We wanted to cover everyone in our State, and we're not a wealthy