Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. LUJÁN, I just want to echo, if I may, what you just said about national security. It is another cost to the United States. Every year, because of our growing appetite for foreign oil, we are putting money into the hands and into the pockets of many countries who don't necessarily have American interests at heart. Is that not true?

Mr. LUJÁN. That is absolutely true. And we saw with some of the charts that Mr. TONKO was sharing with us, as we see what is happening with the U.S. imports of crude oil, we see what is happening, you go back to the time period we are talking about here, Mr. CONNOLLY, you go back here to 1977 and you see some of the changes that resulted and going forward with what has happened with imports and what can be done here. What didn't we learn when we saw these increases and spikes starting in the 1970s there? We have an opportunity to learn and to make a difference here.

And I know that Mr. TONKO had the other chart there, and I will yield to Mr. TONKO to be able to explain what has happened with the dollars again.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. CONNOLLY, this chart says it all, what you're raising as a very strong concern. Somehow there is a willingness to spend, export $475 billion out of the U.S.

When you think about the impact that has on our economy, the jobs that could be created if we relied on American-produced power, if we put American brain trusts to work, what couldn't happen? Might we not see this as a tax, a situation that finds us dealing with a dreadful blow to our economy and impacting in strong negative measure our environment which we borrow and need to send on to the next generation in even cleaner format?

So when I look at the small microcosm of the country expressed by the 21st Congressional District in New York, I see so many opportunities that require that overlay of energy policy and energy resources from a Federal perspective. And that is why the President and the leadership in the House, the Speaker and our Chairs and our rank-and-file Members are to be encouraged, I believe, to move forward on this matter.

We have, within the 21st New York Congressional District, semiconductor investments, nanoscience investments, emerging technologies all on a green campus, R&D investment centers through General Electric's emerging wind institute that will also embrace other renewables with their ecomagination situation and private and public sector campuses that are investing in R&D. We have superpower which is breaking its own record in superconducted cable development that can be used to transmit far more electrons over similarly sized traditional cable.

So all of this is there as an undercurrent, an underpinning of support that can then blossom into its fullest potential if we allow for policy to take hold. And that is what the moment is about and leadership expressed in the greatest, boldest green upturns.

Mr. LUJÁN. Mr. TONKO, I would be remiss if I didn't include the faith community. They came together and they wrote a letter to the members of the Energy and Commerce Committee, the Coalition on the Environment and Jewish Life, the Episcopal Church, the Evangelical Lutheran Church of America, the National Council of Churches USA, the United Church of Christ, Justice and Peace Ministries, and the United Methodist Church General Board of Church and Society. They said, ''The American Clean Energy and Security Act lays a necessary foundation to begin addressing the global climate crisis. We urge you to oppose any attempts to further weaken the bill as it goes through committee and continue moving this legislation forward while working to strengthen key provisions and ensure a just and sustainable future for all of God's Creation.''

Understanding how we can work together again, Mr. TONKO, it is truly amazing, and it is great to see that we can come together to get great things done.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Representative LUJÁN and Representative CONNOLLY.

Representative SCHAUER, we are going to let you close our hour here because we are running out of time.

Mr. SCHAUER. Thank you. This is why we are here. I came to Congress to help fight for Michigan's economy, help move our country in a new direction, and energy policy is going to help us do that. We have touched on so many of those pieces this evening. As new Democratic Members of the U.S. House of Representatives, we will continue to lead to make sure we invest in our country, invest in protecting our planet, and invest in new clean energy jobs in this country.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you so much to my colleagues from the freshman class, Mr. Speaker. I yield back the remainder of our time.

CALCULATING YOUR SHARE OF ''CAP-AND-TRADE''

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

□ 2100

Mr. AKIN. Good evening, Mr. Speaker. It's a pleasure to join you and to take a look at a very interesting topic today. The whole idea of, it's kind of a combination of thoughts, first of all, the idea of global warming, and then how that relates to this cap-and-tax bill that we've been hearing more about, and exactly what's behind all of this discussion, because what we have here is something that is, if you want to talk about change, there's a whole lot of change here.

This is a very, very significant proposal that's being made in terms of the size of the tax that's involved, and the proposal that we're actually going to change the climate of the world by some of these different things that are going to be done by the government, a very interesting thought.

And so I thought, when we talk about global warming, there's a little bit of the story that I think has been forgotten. Some of it, not surprisingly, is the history of what's going on. I'd like to go back just a little bit in what's been going on.

Let's go back to the year 1920, when newspapers in the 1920s were filled with scientists' warnings of a fast approaching glacial age. The Earth was going to get cold. And so you had to really be stocking up on extra coal and overcoats and things in the 1920s.

In the 1930s it seems that the scientists changed their opinion, and they reversed themselves, that there was going to be serious global warming in the 1930s.

By 1972, Time magazine was citing numerous scientific reports of imminent runaway glaciation. So it's going to get cold again.

In 1975, Newsweek reported that the scientific evidence of an ''Ice Age'' called to stockpile food. And we also were even engaged in discussions about melting some of the Arctic ice cap or something because of this Ice Age that was readily, eminently approaching.

By 1976 the U.S. government said the Earth is heading into some sort of mini ice age. And now we have back again, global warming. In fact, global warming is even getting a little bit out of fashion now, and people want to talk about climate change. It's a little safer to talk about climate change because you're not predicting whether it's going to get colder or warmer. But anyway, we've had some considerable amounts of disagreement, depending on what year you're on. So we go back and forth. It's either going to be the sky is going to fall because it's going to freeze, or the sky is falling because it's going to get warmer.

So we have today this whole subject of global warming. That's what the most common term that you hear nowadays is global warming. And I think the facts of the matter are that there has been a considerable amount of disagreement, depending on which decade you're living in.

I'm joined this evening by some very good friends, some respected colleagues, a medical doctor, as a matter of fact, and another gentleman from Pennsylvania, a very big coal and energy producing state. We're going to be chatting with them in just a minute.

But I thought it would be appropriate just to kind of lay down, first of all, historically some of the differences of opinion, depending on which decade you live in.

The general theory today, the way it works is the idea that mankind is creating CO_2. We do that when we breathe,

so there's not much scientific argument about that. There are other ways that CO_2 is produced as well. Whenever we make a campfire we produce a certain amount of CO_2 as we burn some combustible with the oxygen in the air.

And the theory is that this CO_2, because we're burning so much in the way of hydrocarbons, now is actually affecting the environment. And so we're going to take a look at that.

And the question is whether or not, really, this CO_2 is affecting the environment. I think most scientists agree that when we create or when we produce CO_2 it has some impact on the environment. The question is how much. And then it's also a big question as to whether or not there's anything we could really do about that in a practical sense, or are there any sort of cost-effective solutions. And of course there is a solution that's on the table that's being proposed. It's a cap-and-tax bill that's being proposed by the Democrats. And it follows the pattern of most Democrat bills, and that is, I've got a great big whopping tax increase, and it has a whole lot of government regulations.

If we go back in history a little bit, history is an amusing thing to take a look at. One of the things that history tells us is how effective the U.S. government is in solving these kinds of problems.

We created a thing called the U.S. Department of Energy. Maybe a lot of people know we have a U.S. Department of Energy, but they may not recall why it was that the Department of Energy was created. Well, the fact of the matter is the Department of Energy was created so that we would not be dependent on foreign energy. And so, for years we've added more and more employees to the U.S. Department of Energy so that we won't be dependent on foreign energy, and each year we become more dependent on foreign energy. So it's amusing to postulate that we're going to solve this problem using a lot of taxation and a government solution.

I think the Republicans—I'm a Republican, my colleagues that are joining me tonight are Republicans—I think that we prefer a more free enterprise kind of solution, and we want to take a look at the premises behind what we're talking about.

I'm joined by my good friend, G.T. THOMPSON. He's from Pennsylvania. I'd like to recognize Congressman THOMPSON, who is already making himself a name here as being a very feet-on-the-ground, commonsense kind of guy, has an intuitive sense for free enterprise, and also potential dangers that come from this idea of we can solve all the problems with a great big whopping tax increase and government regulations.

Please, I yield time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Well, I thank the gentleman from Missouri. Your overview of this, your reference to real science is refreshing. In the debate and most of the debate of the majority party here, it's not so much based on real science as political science or even, to some degree, science fiction. And so, to look at why this—and I looked at every piece of legislation in terms of cost benefits. And when we look at the benefits of this, I think human activity, it's acknowledged, does contribute towards carbon dioxide emissions. But it's less than 4 percent. To put that into perspective, forest fires, wildfires contribute 10 percent of CO_2 emissions. And so not even with the debate of, you know, are we warming the Earth or not warming the Earth, there's a lot of smart folks out there that are publishing research or earning their dissertations based on debating that science. But what the experts agree upon, the researchers agree is, human activity is less than 4 percent contributes towards CO_2 emissions.

You know, in terms of the cap-and-trade, cap-and-tax that we're discussing——

Mr. AKIN. Could I interrupt you just a minute because I thought you were on a rather important topic, because the whole crux of the idea for this huge tax proposal and all kinds of sweeping changes and government power and influence and regulation is based on the fact that CO_2 is such a bad thing, and it's based on the assumption that the CO_2 that we're releasing by burning fossil fuels is creating some kind of a problem. I mean, that's the whole linchpin that this debate is going around.

And yet you have, here's kind of an interesting quote here. And I think I'd like to get into this just a little bit. Here's a former U.S. Senator and he says, we've got to ride the global warming issue. Even if the theory of global warming is wrong, we'll be doing the right thing in terms of economic policy and environmental policy.

So, in other words, there's a solution that they have in mind, whether global warming is going on or not. And the thing that's been embarrassing, you've noticed we don't hear as much global warming. We hear climate change, and the reason is because the planet has not really been warming the last number of years as all of these economic models were saying that it was going to. And that doesn't necessarily mean the CO_2 that we've generated hasn't created some warming. It just seems that the world climate is more connected to sunspot activity than these other things.

But here you're just talking about the effect of CO_2, and I thought this was interesting. This is how much does the human activity affect greenhouse gases? The block in light blue here represents all the greenhouse gases, which comprise only 2 percent of the total atmosphere. So this is all the greenhouse gases.

And that yellow block over there on the end is the CO_2. And the little tiny red block inside the yellow block is the part that our human activity is creating. And so the question is, in terms of leverage, does this little red dot over here have that much impact on the climate?

And this is, I don't think anybody disputes the percentages of these gases and the mixture. So the question then is, is this stuff that we're doing really that important?

And you just said the forest fires, which were created by poor environmental policy by the way, a lot of them, because we're not allowed to clean that brush out, the underbrush, and then it burns everything and burns Bambi and snowy owls and everything else because we didn't want to clear the brush out, and that's generating, what is that, 2½ times more than all of the coal and oil and things we burn.

I didn't mean to interrupt you, but I think it's important for us to stick on what science, what really does science say. And this is not an easy thing for any scientist to figure out, is it, because what's happening is there's all sorts of things that play together, and so, the CO_2 we generate could be warming the planet some, but it could be also that we're in a time where the planet is growing colder. So all of that, we don't really understand that totally, do we?

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. I think the gentleman points out an important point. These are all based on models and strictly speculation.

Mr. AKIN. Some of the models said that we're going to have surf at the front steps of the Capitol pretty soon. I was really looking forward to that.

Go ahead. I yield.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Well, and the purpose overall of this is to really eliminate all energy other than green energy. And today, I mean, the energy sources that are only seen as viable by the majority party under cap-and-tax are, frankly, solar and wind. And today, that represents less than 1 percent of meeting our energy needs in this country.

So say we work real hard and we give it that Manhattan Project, and we absolutely double that, the energy capacity of solar and wind, well, that's 2 percent. We still have a huge gap that this country has that we need to be able to fuel our vehicles, heat our homes.

And I'm from a very rural district. The folks in my area, we have some pretty harsh, frigid winters, and we need to heat our homes. We commute in my home for work, for groceries. You know, frankly, a lot of folks in my area commute just to pick up their mail. And the cost of cap-and-tax, I believe, is projected, well, with, just on gasoline alone to increase by over 70 percent.

Mr. AKIN. I appreciate your bringing that up, and I'd like to get into that just a little bit more as we move on this evening into that area, about the Democrat proposal, what it does to people's costs, average costs.

But we're also joined by a good friend of mine, Dr. FLEMING. And people that

have a technical or scientific background are a little rare in the Chambers here. So to have actually a guy who's passed high school science is tremendously helpful. And Dr. FLEMING is from Louisiana.

I'm a misfit in politics. I'm an engineer by training. I don't know how they ever—there's few of us in here that are engineers.

But Dr. FLEMING, I would be encouraged if you'd join us too in our discussion.

Mr. FLEMING. Well, thank you. And I want to thank my friend, of course, from Missouri for having this hour discussion, very important discussion, coming right at the heels of our classmates from the other side of the aisle speaking on the same subject, but with a different opinion.

I also thank my fellow Republican classmate, Mr. THOMPSON from Pennsylvania as well for his discussion.

Well, let me just point out that, you know, you don't have to be detailed in the science to understand one empirical fact, and that is, this globe has warmed and cooled several times in its life before there was the first emission of fossil fuels.

So, that being said, we already have proof positive that the Earth can warm under its own circumstances and its own environment and its own test tube, if you will. And you just mentioned sunspots and other activities. There are many things that go into the global warming effect and global cooling effect.

And as you say, now that we're not able to accurately actually predict that the globe is warming, now the whole issue is changing to climate change, so that whatever happens different than what it is at this moment can somehow be blamed.

□ 2115

Mr. AKIN. Just reclaiming my time, somehow or another, this whole thing strikes me, if it weren't so serious, as being a comedy. You know, we just went from winter to spring in Missouri. When we go from winter to spring, that's a good climate change. I don't want to stop that climate change, you know. Who in the world would want to put politicians in charge of the weather anyway? What a dumb idea. Anyhow, we need to be a little bit serious because this is a tremendous tax that we're talking about, a tremendous removal of freedom away from Americans, and it is a tremendous investment in more and more big government solutions. That is extremely scary in spite of the fact that the science seems to be a little bit amazing. We'll get into that, too.

I was just recalling that my friend from Pennsylvania was here with the guy from Spain, I think it was, 2 weeks ago. They were talking about how Spain has driven this cap-and-tax, and they were talking about what has happened, and we're going to get into it. So it isn't something we're going to speculate about. It has been tried. We can say: here is what happened in Spain. Do we really want to reproduce this or not?

I didn't mean to interrupt you, Doctor. Please continue.

Mr. FLEMING. Thank you. To sort of gear down to the real topic tonight, I heard talk from the other side of the aisle this evening about terms such as ''investment,'' which really, to me, is a code for tax, and also ''jobs'' or ''green jobs.''

Mr. AKIN. You have to translate. ''Investment'' means we're going to tax you.

Mr. FLEMING. Exactly. Exactly.

Mr. AKIN. Thank you, Doctor.

Mr. FLEMING. Also, it was very interesting that the discussion hinged somewhat on the fact that this investment creates more jobs and that it creates revenue down the line. If you listen closely to the discussion, what you hear is really good old-fashioned subsidies. That is, whenever the government is subsidizing forms of energy that are not cost-effective at this point and whenever the technologies are not there, what we really get is a pass-through of taxpayer dollars that goes into what I would call artificial, or papier mache jobs, so-called ''green jobs.'' We'll learn from the Spanish experiment that has been going on now for 10 years that, for 2.2 jobs that are lost, there is only one so-called ''green job'' gained. That job 90 percent of the time is in implementation and construction. It is not a continuous job.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time, as for the green jobs that are being talked about, we're going to create all of these green jobs in Spain. They call them ''subprime jobs,'' you see. This is the same old warmed over Keynesian economics that we've been hearing since the days of FDR. That is, if the government taxes everybody a whole lot and takes the money and pays people to do stuff, then we've somehow created jobs.

The trouble is, when you tax them, you have prevented other jobs from being created. So, in effect, what you've done is, yes, you've created jobs, but you've lost 2.2 jobs. So what sort of math is that? That's not a very good mathematical formula. So there's this talk about green jobs. In Spain, they call them ''subprime jobs,'' and they've now got, I think, 17.5 percent unemployment as a result of this nifty project that they're doing to get rid of CO_2. The trouble is, even measured on the face of it, they're making more CO_2 than they did before, so it isn't working.

Anyway, proceed, Doctor.

Mr. FLEMING. Well, just to extend that a little further, where are these jobs going?

It turns out that some of the Spanish jobs have come to America because we understand that the net effect of tax, or cap-and-trade, or cap-and-tax as we call it, is that there is a higher cost to produce goods for manufacturing. So as a result, for someone who owns a factory or a company that perhaps owns a factory, he has to find the most cost-effective location for that factory. Otherwise, he can't compete in the worldwide economy. We know today that this is, indeed, a worldwide economy. We can't get away from that fact.

Just today, a Chinese company bought Hummer—a portion of General Motors. So we know that to be true. Well, we actually have received a dividend from Spain going down this road. We've actually had companies coming to the U.S., and we've actually gained jobs as a result of Spain's having gone down this cap-and-trade boondoggle.

Mr. AKIN. If I could just interrupt and go over to my good friend from Pennsylvania, to Congressman THOMPSON, let's flesh out this idea.

If you do this solution that the Democrats are proposing, which is a cap-and-tax or a cap-and-trade or whatever you want to call it, how does that end up with our losing jobs? Let's go through that very specifically so that people can understand it, because that's what we're talking about. That's what happened in Spain. Let's go through that model and identify where those jobs went.

The brag that the Democrats were saying an hour ago was that they're going to create jobs and that everything is going to be better. Yet the very thing they're proposing in Spain has gotten them to 17.5 percent unemployment. Let's go through how that happens.

Can you please help us with that, Congressman THOMPSON?

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Sure. I think the important baseline on that 17.5 percent unemployment today in the country of Spain is the fact that, when cap-and-trade was instituted, it was 7 percent. Unemployment was 7 percent.

Mr. AKIN. So they've driven it up 10 percent.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Over 10 percentage points is the outcome. Those really are the only two major outcomes that I see of cap-and-trade—higher unemployment and higher energy costs.

In terms of the job losses, that's what this bill is all about. This is a jobs bill. They're correct on that part; but, unfortunately, it's a job loss bill. You know, they talk about all of the green jobs that were created in Spain as a part of cap-and-trade and the proposal of cap-and-trade here to create jobs. Well, in Spain, for every 10 green jobs that were created, mostly related to solar or to wind, only one was sustainable within that economy by the industry that paid for that job and for its implementation. As my colleague from Louisiana talked about, nine out of those 10 jobs are still around today because the country of Spain doesn't want to see unemployment driven higher.

So how do they hang onto those nine out of 10 jobs? It's a subsidy bubble. There are tens of billions of dollars annually that the country of Spain has to

infuse into the alternative energy industry so that it doesn't drive their unemployment up over 20 percentage points. You think about what this does to cost. There is no industry that will go untouched. Any industry that uses energy—and that's all of them—is going to see significant energy increases and costs. Today, especially in these economic times and even in the best of times, to be competitive globally and to have our costs be put up by—I don't know—say 30 percent or more, that totally makes us uncompetitive within the world.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time, let's go through this. So in other words, let's say we did what the Democrats want to do: let's do this great big tax increase. This is a very big tax increase. So what we're going to do is essentially tax energy. Now, as to energy issues within companies, some companies are using more than others, particularly aluminum manufacturing, steel manufacturing, your basic, hard manufacturing jobs. These then support lots of other burger flipping types of jobs that are very heavily energy intensive, but also food is very energy intensive. So now what's going to happen?

You're going to tax energy. When you tax it, it means the prices go up. The energy-producing company doesn't just pay the tax. It pays the tax, and it passes it on to the consumer. So the person who flips the light switch on or the person who lights up his pilot light to run his stove or his heater for natural gas or the people who fire up their diesel engines or their gasoline engines are paying more money. Therefore, those businesses are less competitive. In being less competitive, there are more foreign people who can compete and who can send products into this country. We can't compete against them because our prices go up. So, effectively, we send jobs overseas that way. We're less competitive. So the jobs go away.

The government taxes everybody in the private sector. The money comes out of the private sector. They use it to hire somebody. This then displaces a couple of jobs, and here we go around in this circle. This is basically what Morgenthau tried, the Secretary of the Treasury under FDR. He said that we're going to raise the taxes a whole lot, that we're going to spend a whole lot of money to ''stimulate the economy'' and that it will drive unemployment down.

Then he came here to this Chamber 9 years later, before the Ways and Means Committee, and his quote was: ''We've tried it and it doesn't work.'' Those were exactly his words: ''It doesn't work.'' So he said that now we've got high unemployment and a whole lot of taxes and a big debt to boot.

So this is the same old tried-and-true Democrat scheme of raising taxes and of creating and trusting the government, of trusting that the government is going to run it better than would free enterprise. Yet we've got this Department of Energy out there that was founded to get us off our dependence on foreign energy; and ever since it has been founded, it has gotten worse.

I yield to my good friend from Pennsylvania.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Well, thank you, sir.

You mentioned natural gas. We could talk all evening on different types of manufacturing that utilize natural gas, not just as a process for heating and for energy but also as an ingredient. Natural gas is a key component in almost any type of manufacturing. I want to just focus briefly on two.

You know, some of the folks who help feed us are our family farms throughout the Nation; and I don't care what they're raising or what they're growing, many of those family farms use processes that use natural gas, specifically with fertilizer for growing crops—for growing our food. It feeds this Nation. When we see under the cap-and-trade of natural gas, it's clean. It's a very clean fossil fuel, but it's a fossil fuel that's going to be punished and penalized under cap-and-trade. We're going to raise the cost of food for America because of cap-and-trade and feel the impact of taxing the use of natural gas on our farmers.

Mr. AKIN. Just reclaiming my time, you know, I've got a chart I'd like to talk to you about because we figured out what the size of this tax is. You take the average per family, and we're going to go in a minute and take a look at what it is going to cost the average family every year for the next 8 years for this $1.2 trillion tax increase.

We've been joined by another doctor, a medical doctor but also a guy who graduated from high school science as well, from Georgia, my good friend, Congressman GINGREY.

It's just great to have you in our discussion this evening. Please jump in. I yield.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Missouri for yielding time to me and for bringing to this body this important hour.

I was watching our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, the Democrat majority. I think they were mostly freshmen who had the previous hour, and they were praising, of course, the American Clean Energy Act and Security Act of 2009, and they were talking about all of the great and wonderful things that it does.

Certainly, there are some good things in the bill. I'm not going to stand here, Mr. Speaker, and completely criticize every aspect of it. Our freshmen colleagues—our Democrat colleagues—spoke very eloquently, but they never talked about the whole picture. I don't know where they were. They obviously were not Members of this body in the 110th Congress when we Republicans stayed here a year ago in August rather than going home for our vacations, or for our August recess, or for our codels. The Speaker and others rushed out of here to head out to foreign places, leaving Americans high and dry with $4 a gallon regular gasoline at the time. That's when the real commitment came on our side of the aisle to say it's unconscionable to leave this body and to do nothing for the American people and to say, oh, well, we'll take care of it in 5 weeks when we get back in early September. That's exactly what the Democrat majority did a little less than a year ago.

When I heard my freshmen colleagues on the other side of the aisle talking about how wonderful this new cap-and-trade energy bill is, I think one of them even described it as the foundation for new prosperity from sea to shining sea. Well, let me just tell you, Mr. Speaker: the folks in the 11th District of Georgia, in northwest Georgia—in fact, in the entire State of Georgia, in fact in the entire Southeast—don't think this is a foundation for new prosperity from sea to shining sea. It might be wonderful for northern New Mexico. It might be good for upstate New York. It may be good for some parts of Virginia. It may even be good, I guess—although I can't imagine how—in some parts of Michigan, which are the areas that these freshmen represent on the Democratic side of the aisle.

I want to tell you that it is not good in the Southeast. I think my colleagues have already pointed out that what the Democratic majority has done with this American Clean Energy and Security Act of 2009 has crammed down the throats of the American people not a comprehensive, all-of-the-above approach. It is not going to be a foundation for new prosperity from sea to shining sea because what it does is raise energy prices for every American family by an average of $3,000 a year.

Mr. AKIN. I can't help but jump in here.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. I would be glad to yield back to the gentleman who controls the time. I thank him for allowing me to be part of the discussion.

Mr. AKIN. It's a treat to have you. I think you brought up a couple of very, very significant things.

First of all, we stood in this Chamber just a couple of months ago and heard the President say that anybody making less than $250,000 doesn't need to worry about any tax increases. Yet, this tax increase that is being proposed happens to anybody who flips a light switch. That means you could make a lot less than $250,000 a year and get hit with a tax.

This cap-and-tax—these circles here—represent different, expensive things that America has bought.

□ 2130

This is the war in Iraq and this is the Korean war, and you have got the gulf war over here. Over in the far right you've got Hurricane Katrina, different things like this. This is World War II,

this big blue one. This is this tax: $1.9 trillion worth of tax. That's what's being proposed here. And we're just told if you're making $250,000 or less, you won't get any tax, and yet this taxes you when you turn the lights on, when you turn the thermostat up, when you start your car. That's what this tax is about right here. And when you eat food, that's what this tax is about.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. If the gentleman will yield for an additional few seconds.

Exactly. You break down this cost right at $3,000 a year for a family of four, it breaks down, as the gentleman has pointed out, Mr. Speaker, a 90 percent increase in the cost of electricity, 74 percent increase in the cost of gasoline, 55 percent increase in the cost of natural gas.

Now, when I was home during this Memorial Day remembrance and district work period, I went to visit one of the plants in my district—again, northwest Georgia, the 11th—Dow Chemical, and what they do is make all kinds of products out of polyurethane, and the dashboard in your automobile is an example. And the cost, their feedstock is natural gas. And what we're doing is putting additional costs on all of these manufacturers, everybody that produces electricity, and it was a cost that was never there before. And somebody has to pay for that cost. And who is that somebody? The American public.

I yield back to the gentleman.

Mr. AKIN. We've also been joined by my very good friend, Congressman BISHOP, who talked before on this subject, very knowledgeable.

And I would yield time to Congressman BISHOP. Please jump in.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I, unfortunately, don't have the wonderful accent that my good friend from Georgia has, but I will try and slur some words together to see if I can emulate that in some small way.

The problem that I think all of us here in Congress are facing, as well as the people out there are facing, is that the government has promised they're going to do something. Not market forces. The government is going to do something. And this cap-and-tax policy is an effort of the government to try to ratchet down carbon emissions into the atmosphere by changing the way industry works in an effort to have them changing the way they produce things. That change passes on to the consumer. Everything we use, as the gentleman said, has some kind of carbon footprint. The essence is that not only industries but individuals will change their lifestyles.

I don't care how you went to spin it. It is still a tax on people—we are looking at estimates around $400 billion—a tax on people that doesn't go to changing the amount of energy we have or changing the way we live our lives to better the people's lives. It's an amount of money that goes simply to the government. It is a windfall to the government.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time.

They're talking about using that for socialized medicine or something, right? It has nothing to do with CO_2 at all.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. That is exactly the point there. If people are going to actually put out that kind of money, they should know what they're going to get and they should know what the goal of all of this is.

The goal has been stated that we'll have an 80 percent reduction by 2050. Sounds wonderful. In my particular State of Utah, we have a carbon footprint of roughly 66 million tons of CO_2 per year and a population of 2.6 million. If you simply do the math, 80 percent by 2050 means we will be producing in 2050 2.2 tons of CO_2. Sounds like a lot. Except the last time in the history of the State of Utah we had a carbon output that was that low, I'm sorry, Brigham Young wasn't there. If you tried to do something for this Nation, the Pilgrims hadn't landed before you do that. So the question is how do we actually do that? How do we reconcile a lifestyle with these elements, especially when there are 6.2 billion on the Earth, 2 billion who have never switched on a light?

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time.

Those numbers are incredible.

What you're saying is we want to maintain—maybe we don't want to maintain our current standard of living but we want to go back to a pre-Pilgrim America in terms of CO_2 output?

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. It's the only way it works as long as you can keep the other 2 billion people in the world who don't have electricity today from ever getting electricity.

We can keep our lights, our flat-screen TVs, our computers, our cell phones, everything that uses electricity now, our low-cost food without bugs because fertilizer is fossil fuels. We can keep the clothes and the plastics. You go into an emergency room, everything except steel is part of fossil fuels. Composites made for airplanes now that make them lighter weight and more efficient is all gas. You fly here back and forth on gas.

The problem we have with this entire concept is basically we're saying we're going to get rid of fossil fuels at the same time we live with fossil fuels, and that is simply nothing short of schizophrenia on our part.

Here's a problem. I had a great friend that gave a speech at one point. And one of the things we need to be looking at is the fact that all of these, what we classify as alternative fuel sources, really are supplemental fuel sources. If you add everything we do from solar and wind power together, it's one-sixth of 1 percent of our energy consumption. You try to make one of those pie charts with that and it's a thin line. You can't get anything more than that. That's the best a PowerPoint—which also uses electricity—would ever produce. And we get that with 20 years or 30 years of the government having spent $20 billion to try to increase wind and solar power.

President Obama said we want to double that figure. Actually, in the last 3 years of the Bush administration, we doubled that figure. Admittedly, it's a higher base now. It would be harder to do at the next doubling. But if you double it, you go from one-sixth to one-third of 1 percent. And that's on the assumption that no economy grows anywhere else. Everything remains flat.

Mr. AKIN. Now, just reclaiming my time.

Now, my understanding was what we heard from the guy from Spain, he said that they had been able to get a lot of windmills and solar panels out there and that it was a significant part of what they generated. But he said here was the problem: When the weather didn't cooperate, they had to tell the big industries, You can't make any aluminum today because we don't have any electricity because the wind isn't blowing or the sun isn't shining. And they told the steel manufacturers, You can't make any steel. And so these companies are moving guess where? To America. They're moving out of Spain because of the fact that the energy is no longer reliable.

To make things worse—what they described to me was really chilling, and I need to jump over to my good friend from Louisiana who is also here on this, but this is what really stuck in my mind. He said what they did was they took a whole bunch of bureaucrats and they guaranteed them that they could sell energy to the government at a certain high price so those people would invest in solar panels and windmills. They guaranteed the price, and now they've got this thing created and it's a political monster because you have all of these people with windmills and solar panels and they don't want to politically change it because that's where their revenue is coming from. So they've created this thing that's driving over 17 percent unemployment and all kinds of people are in on the government take and they don't want to change it.

My good friend from Louisiana, Congressman SCALISE, please jump into the conversation.

Mr. SCALISE. I thank my friend for talking about this issue.

This cap-and-trade energy tax, this proposal that this administration and this leadership in Congress has brought forward—you're talking about the Spain study, and Spain is an interesting study because there are other countries that have gone down this road. So there are some good models to look at and see what is cap-and-trade, what has this national energy tax done to other countries, and you go to Europe and see the devastation to their economies.

And you look at Spain. They just did a study on the Spain experiment in cap-and-trade, and they came back with some numbers that showed, for every green job they created, they lost

2.2 regular jobs. And what's even more than that is that 9 out of 10 of those new jobs they created were temporary jobs.

So, in essence, for every one permanent new job they created with cap-and-trade energy tax, they lost 20 regular permanent jobs in their regular economy.

So if you look at what's happening here in the United States with this proposal, this cap-and-trade energy tax, it literally would run—estimates by the National Association of Manufacturers say that it would run 3 to 4 million jobs, American jobs, run them overseas to countries like China, India, and Brazil that are not going to comply with this.

So the real irony is for those people who really do believe that we need to reduce carbon emissions—ultimately we all recognize that carbon emissions have the same effect if they're emitted in the United States or in China. And so the real irony is, if you want to reduce carbon emissions, if you support cap-and-trade, you're going to have an increase in worldwide carbon emissions because the jobs that are done here in the United States, for example, that produce steel, to produce steel in the United States, and that same steel is going to be produced in China, for example. The same steel produced in China will emit four times the amount of carbon that the steel in the United States would emit because we already have tougher environmental regulations in place.

So for the people that are trying to use cap-and-trade, this energy tax to reduce carbon emissions, you'll actually have an increase in carbon emissions because the jobs that are in America right now that will go overseas, that we will lose in our economy, the 3 to 4 million jobs we will lose in tough economic times while American consumers actually end up paying over $2,000 or $3,000 a year in their electricity bill, those jobs go to China.

Mr. AKIN. What you're saying is, in simple terms, this cap-and-tax not only won't work; it's going to make a bad situation worse. It's not only going to create unemployment, but it's going to create more CO_2.

The amusing thing is there is a chart here that—I just discovered this. If we were to double our nuclear power production—we're currently producing about 20 percent of our electric power through nuclear, 25 percent, somewhere in that range. If we were to double it, it would have the same effect as taking almost every passenger car off the road in terms of getting rid of CO_2. And yet the funny thing is, do you know what happened in Spain, what they did with nuclear? They shut their nuclear stuff down, which is absolutely insane, because nuclear is the one kind of energy that doesn't make any CO_2 at all and yet they shut it down. So this whole thing about CO_2 being such a big problem, it seems like we're talking out of both sides of our mouth.

I promised my good friend from Utah I would let him have the last word before he had to scoot out of here.

Okay. We'll go back over to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. SCALISE. Ultimately, we need a national energy policy. We don't have that in our country. So you've got very clear differences. The approach that we here that have been talking tonight support is a comprehensive national energy policy that understands that we've got our own national resources like oil, natural gas. We can develop clean coal technology. We can promote more nuclear, and we can use that to fund more solar and wind and other alternative sources of energy, but using our natural resources in America, not shipping jobs overseas like the cap-and-trade energy tax proposal by our colleagues on the Democratic side.

Mr. AKIN. Now you're getting me excited. You're talking about freedom instead of a whole bunch of government taxes and bureaucracy. What you're talking about allows Americans, empowering Americans to use the resources that we have, the technology, the innovation, and to develop energy from all different kinds of ways within our country and let that energy compete in a free market sense and let people buy the energy they want to buy.

Mr. SCALISE. And reduce our dependence on Middle Eastern oil while creating good jobs here in America, as opposed to their plan which taxes people on their energy bills and runs jobs to countries like China and India that will emit more carbon for doing the exact same thing we do here.

So I yield back.

Mr. AKIN. I really appreciate your emphasis on free enterprise, free solutions, and not government bureaucracies. But it still just dazzles me that the Spanish were able to sell this thing politically that they're worried about CO_2 and they shut down the nuclear, where we say here we just double our amount of nuclear and we get rid of all emissions of almost every passenger car on our highways. That's incredible.

Congressman BISHOP.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I am glad you feel excited right now, because one of the things that we are talking about in Congress is alternatives and other ideas. And as we have gone through this, we have shown that the cap-and-trade policy is nothing more then a tax. There are lots of negatives that go around with it. It's idealism, because the alternatives we have are not able to replace fossil fuels yet unless we want to totally change our lives. And there are easier ways than government mandates to get it done: allowing the markets to work—which I hate to say, especially from a ''just say no'' party, but if you include the no cost stimulus bill that many of us here have sponsored, H.R. 2300, which is from the Republican Study Committee in the Western Caucus—I think all of us here sponsored—those are viable options that make life better by having a reliable and sufficient energy to drive down the costs to help us find a bridge to come up with supplemental, not alternative, but supplemental energy and to do it in an orderly and efficient manner where people get to choose.

The government doesn't pick the winners. People get to pick the winners. There aren't those options out there. And what you got excited about is exactly what many of us here are trying to do. It is another voice. It is another option. Let the American people know it is out there and available.

Mr. AKIN. I appreciate that great plug for freedom. I think there is something—there are a few statistics that all of our guests here tonight know these things.

□ 2145

But an awful lot of people don't know about it, and here's something that I thought was just amazing. If I were to say to you that this place where we work here, the U.S. Congress, is polarized between Republicans and Democrats on the abortion issue, you'd go, yawn, well of course they're polarized.

But what I don't think a lot of people know is that this Chamber is more polarized on the energy issue than we are on the abortion issue. We went back and took a look at about 8 years of voting between the two parties on developing American energy. And you know what we found? It's no surprise to you gentlemen. Ninety percent of the time where there is some proposal to help the development of American energy, Republicans voted for it, and even in the most mundane or the most easy to get along with politically, 86 to 88 percent of the Democrats voted ''no.'' There is a huge party-line difference on the development of American energy.

And I just think a lot of people aren't aware of that, but people say there's no difference between the parties. Boy, there sure is on this issue, isn't there?

And my good friend Dr. FLEMING, I would appreciate you again joining us in the discussion here.

Mr. FLEMING. Well, I thank the gentleman. I think that really the extension of what you just said is what is the real agenda behind this, and I think that we've recognized in the last few years that the American taxpayer has had enough. They don't want to pay any more taxes. Americans feel like they pay enough on the city level, county level, State and Federal level, and I think that our more liberal friends, our tax friendly friends, have realized this, and now they're coming up with schemes to disguise taxes.

And I think Congressman DINGELL said it better than anybody in this Chamber—and of course, he's a Democrat—that this is a tax, a very big tax, and I think that really strikes to the heart of what the purpose of this is. Someone a moment ago made reference to the fact that we're going to need at least $1.2 trillion if we go forward with a single-payer, comprehensive health care system, Medicare for all, if you

will. And I think that those who support that are scrambling around to find a tax that can be defined as something not a tax, and I think they've got this cap-and-tax program squarely in their sights.

Mr. AKIN. Just reclaiming for a moment here, just to support what you're saying, this is kind of interesting. This is a Gallup poll about how do different people that are concerned with the environment, how do they rank global warming as compared to other kinds of environmental issues.

And this is March 2008 and March 2009. You can see both of these charts. It hasn't changed that much over a year, but the thing that was the most important to people in terms of environmental was the pollution of drinking water. That was their number one thing, and then they wanted water pollution, was also eighty-something percent, very important to people in terms of environmental concerns. All the way down, all the way over here to the smaller side, global warming is the last one, and yet that's all we've been doing for a month is global warming, and it suggests that maybe global warming isn't the real issue. Maybe that's just the horse that's supposed to pull a big fat tax increase. That's what we're starting to see here, and I yield to my friend from Georgia.

Mr. GINGREY. I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me, Mr. Speaker, because this is a great segue into what I think is the bottom line here.

When Madam Speaker became the Speaker in January of 2007, it was clear that her signature issue was this issue of global warming, and shortly after that Al Gore got a Nobel Prize. He shared it with an intergovernmental climate control panel of the United Nations, and of course, he came before the Science Committee and Energy and Commerce Committee. This was their signature issue. This was the most important thing, and here we are in 2009 in the deepest of recessions, the worst recession that we've experienced since the Great Depression—

Mr. AKIN. Since Jimmy Carter.

Mr. GINGREY. If the gentleman will allow me, just on that same theme that you were just mentioning, this is not the number one concern of the American people today. The number one concern of the American people today is their jobs and their families and the cost of all these things, not just the cost of electricity, but everything that they have to purchase and concern over what's going to happen to Social Security and Medicare. And here we are going crazy about this cap-and-trade when we're taping our hands behind our back, penalizing the American people and losing jobs by the hundreds of thousands. It is pure idiocy, especially in an economic time of crisis like we're in.

Mr. AKIN. I would just like to discuss this a little bit with my good friend from Pennsylvania, Congressman THOMPSON. You know, I'm from Missouri, and I've been a legislator now a number of years. One of the things that is amusing is that the legislature passes some bill to do something, and the exact opposite thing happens of what they meant to have happen.

I'm just picturing some of my friends here tonight from Georgia and from Pennsylvania and Louisiana. I'm thinking about Missouri. And you put a big old tax on natural gas and electricity, and you know what the good old boy is going to do? They're going to break out that steel chainsaw. They're going to go to the wood lot. They're going to be cutting firewood, and they're going to be heating with wood and generating twice the CO_2 that would have happened if this silly bill hadn't been passed.

And the funny thing is it must be happening that way in Spain because their CO_2 has gone up in spite of the fact they got all this unemployment and taxes and this huge government bureaucracy they've created.

I just wanted to allow my friend from Pennsylvania, if you wanted to jump in on that subject.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Absolutely. I appreciate that.

I mean, this is a tax that hits everybody and everything, every business, every industry, every family, and it's a tax on everyone. And I tell you, the folks, I tell you what makes it an immoral tax is the fact that it taxes those folks who are just now maybe getting by paycheck to paycheck, those people that work hard every day and do their best and they're just making it. You know, what they bring in income, they're putting out on bills. And in Pennsylvania because our electricity, 60 percent of it comes from coal, we have about 35, 38 percent that comes from nuclear and nuclear's taxed. Even though there's no CO_2 emissions, under cap-and-trade, nuclear is going to be taxed the same way.

Mr. AKIN. Just stop for a minute. That just absolutely dumbfounds me. The whole point of this deal is not to make any CO_2 supposedly, so we are going to tax the nuclear power plant that doesn't make any CO_2. What's the logic of that?

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. One of my opening comments was the fact that it is refreshing to be here debating real science versus political science or science fiction. And here's the thing: The alternatives are out there. Republicans have been working hard. We've got an energy solutions group. We've been putting that out there. During the district days, we were in Pittsburgh and Indiana and out in the West Coast, and we were talking about a better solution for America. We've been hitting on parts of it tonight.

I view that that solution would provide us an energy margin. You know, what is it, 9 months ago where gas was pushing $4 or $5 a gallon? And gas prices are going up now again, and yet we're furthering our dependence on foreign oil. The President has shut off the tax deductions for domestic drilling and shut down areas in this country for domestic drilling, including through the Forest Service, an area in my district, Allegheny National Forest, really slowed down to a screeching halt new drilling.

And we could have an energy margin with the proposals put forward by the Republican Party that will allow us to have the domestic energy resources so that in the future when there's a hurricane, or where a foreign country that we have been dependent on for our energy resources decides to shut down that flow or some other catastrophic attack, we actually have an energy margin where our energy prices remain stable. And that's good for America. That's the type of energy policy Americans expect.

I'm actually blessed here standing between two physicians. I'd like to take the opportunity to call on their expertise—I worked in health care myself in rehab for about 28 years, but not as a physician—to get their diagnostic opinion on this. This is all in the name of green, greening America, specifically solar and hydro, but in terms of the economy, the other green that comes to mind is gangrene. And I just would defer that, though, to my colleagues who are physicians to have a better feel for that.

Mr. AKIN. Well, now you're really hurting me when you start to get into that, but you know, that idea is that what you're doing is you're doing something that makes the economy sicker. That doesn't seem to be the thing that we want to do.

You know, the thing that strikes me, too, who is going to be paying this big tax? It's going to be the guy that is using electricity, the guy that's using natural gas, the guy that's buying food. Who is that? Is that rich people? No. That's, as you say, those are average Americans just trying to get along, barely got their lips above water, economy's in trouble, they're wondering whether they're going to have a job, they may have a kid home because the kid lost a job.

What are we talking about? We're talking about with this cap-and-tax, this proposal that's been proposed by the Democrats, what we're talking about here is every year you're going to have to come up with the amount of money you spend on for the average family on meat, poultry, fish, eggs, dairy, produce, juices and vegetables, that is how much extra it's going to cost you. Or you want to put it in something else, consider furniture, appliances, carpet, and other furnishings. That's how much. All of these different categories here are smaller than what this tax is going to cost the average family.

This isn't something that the President says, hey, $250,000, don't worry, we're not going to tax you. This is taxing all of these families, and that's why

we get excited about it, and it doesn't need to be done. The fact of the matter is that we can have that energy independence just by using basic freedom.

I'm going to go to my friend from Louisiana. Congressman SCALISE, if you could join us.

Mr. SCALISE. Again, what we're talking about here is this is a proposal that just passed out of committee 2 weeks ago, a very detrimental proposal to our Nation's economy, a proposal that threatens our energy security at a time when we've got proposals and solutions that we've presented that actually would allow America to have energy independence. So it is a true debate between the two parties where we have very different views.

Their proposal is this cap-and-trade energy tax which, literally, to that senior citizen who is on a fixed income—the President's own budget director, President Obama's own budget director, said this proposal, cap-and-trade energy tax, would add another $1,300 per year to that fixed income senior citizen's electricity bill. Now, I don't know how they're going to go explain that to people, that this is what they're trying to do to them as we're talking about a summer coming up where people want to run their air-conditioning to stay cool. They're going to just tell those people to turn the air-conditioning off.

When people start wondering why we're not developing our own natural resources, in my State of Louisiana and in Dr. FLEMING's own district, my colleague from Louisiana, the largest natural gas find in the history of our country was found just 3 years ago in Haynesville, enough natural gas to supply all of our country's natural gas needs for 10 years.

And then in my colleague from Pennsylvania, Congressman THOMPSON's district, another find, the Marselles find, which could be even bigger. They're just discovering how big that find is, could be even bigger than the Haynesville find.

We've got kinds of natural resources: oil, natural gas, clean coal, not to mention the nuclear capability that Europe and other countries have gone to in large proportions, that we are denying by policy, and they're saying don't use our own natural resources, which then increases dependence on Middle Eastern oil. We're trying to put up a proposal here to say let's use our own natural resources, not send jobs to China and India like cap-and-trade, not raise people's electricity bills. We've got the ability to create our own energy independence and secure our future while creating good jobs, and that's the true difference right now between their cap-and-trade energy tax and our American Energy Solutions Act, which is a very different approach to a comprehensive energy national policy.

Mr. AKIN. Just reclaiming my time, I think you're being reasonable. You're talking about there's a contrast, two different approaches to solving where we're going with energy. And one of them is we're going to use the instrument of a great big tax increase and a lot of government regulations, and the other one is free enterprise.

What you're talking about is the fact that you're exploring. You're talking about finding more natural gas. I don't know if people are aware of it, but by things that have been passed on this congressional floor, eighty-some percent of our continental shelves are off limits for any exploration. What's the logic of that? I remember thinking the reason that the liberals didn't like nuclear was because of the waste, and yet we had a 100 percent vote in the Science Committee not to recycle nuclear waste.

I appreciate your joining us tonight. I think these are things that are of importance to Americans.

Thank you all. And thank you, Mr. Speaker.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today and through June 15 on account of medical reasons (surgery).

Mr. SULLIVAN (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today and the balance of the month on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

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

Mr. CUMMINGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CONYERS, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today, June 3, 4, 5, 8 and 9.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, today, June 3, 4, 5, 8 and 9.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today, June 3, 4 and 5.

Mr. WOLF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PAUL, for 5 minutes, today, June 3, 4 and 5.

Mr. FLAKE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. INGLIS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KIRK, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. Con. Res. 19. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the Shi 'ite Personal Status Law in Afghanistan violates the fundamental human rights of women and should be repealed; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House reports that on May 21, 2009 she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H.R. 627. 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.

H.R. 131. To establish the Ronald Reagan Centennial Commission.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. AKIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 3, 2009, at 10 a.m.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Speaker-Authorized Official Travel during the first and second quarter of 2009 pursuant to Public Law 95–384 are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO REPUBLIC OF CUBA, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 3 AND APR. 7, 2009

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Barbara Lee	4/3	4/7	Republic of Cuba		680.00		(3)		787.02		1,467.02
Hon. Emanuel Cleaver	4/3	4/7	Republic of Cuba		680.00		(3)		416.66		1,096.66