

our Congress, this body, takes up comprehensive health care reform, I believe we the pro-life group in this body must mobilize and ensure that our voices are heard so that our Nation's voices are heard. Because if we don't act, every American will be forced to pay for these services, whether through their premiums or taxes. Abortion rates have fallen over the last 30 years, but if we fail to act, I wholeheartedly believe we will see abortion rates skyrocket.

Health care, you know, Dr. FLEMING, and you know this all too well—you took that oath—is about saving lives. It's about providing our help, our love, our compassion, our prayers to the young women who need it. Health care reform should be about finding ways to do that better, not mandating coverage that we all agree will not do that. We should be doing things to make abortion rare. After all, everyone, including that unborn child, deserves the right to life.

Dr. FLEMING, thank you so much for bringing this to the attention of this body and of the American people. You are a great American and hopefully you will save a life because of this action.

Mr. FLEMING. I thank the gentlelady for yielding back, and I apologize, from Ohio instead of New Jersey. I'm getting my Schmidts and my Smiths mixed up this evening. Briefly in the final moments, I want to pitch back to Mr. SMITH from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Dr. FLEMING, thank you and say to my friend from Ohio, thank you for that extraordinarily eloquent statement, as usual.

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Thank you very much.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Let me just make a couple of points, Doctor. The abortion industry is seeking a bailout. This is the abortion bailout bill and it needs to be seen as that. The number of abortions are going down because of ultrasound and because of educational efforts. This would mandate private insurers to cover abortion—and public as well—expand venues, the killing centers, to do abortions.

But there's something that I would like your take on. The former director of the National Abortion Federation has said that the number of abortions are going down, also, because there are physicians who either can't or won't perform this, quote, essential service in her view. The American Medical News reported that abortion is a matter of choice in this country, not only for women but for physicians as well. All over the country most physicians are choosing not to do it. The San Francisco Chronicle has said those who run abortion clinics, even in large cities, say that recruiting doctors is now their most serious problem. To which we say, thank God that doctors are doing what the Hippocratic oath has told them and admonished them to do.

I would like your take on that.

Mr. FLEMING. I appreciate that. We're going to be running out of time

and I'm going to give you a brief response to that. When I was in the Navy, I had a friend who was an OB-GYN who specifically refused to do abortions. He said it was against his conscience. He retired and went into the local town nearby to go into practice and his practice began a little slow and soon within months he became the most prolific abortionist in town.

So in answer to your question, the reason why so many people, or those who have done it in the past have done it, it's obvious. It's money. It's a very lucrative trade. But on the other hand in the medical communities, in the communities at large, there's been tremendous social pressure against that. As a result, I think many have decided it isn't worth the money.

This has been a wonderful hour. I do thank my colleagues for visiting and adding so many wonderful comments. We could spend another couple of hours on this.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### CLEAN ENERGY

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

Mr. BOCCIERI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It's an honor to be in this Chamber, in this body, to talk about an issue that is so important to our country. I'm so happy to be joined by my colleague Steve Driehaus from Cincinnati, a fellow Ohioan, and my good friend and neighbor in the Longworth Building, TOM PERRIELLO from Virginia.

Tonight we're going to have a very spirited dialogue about clean energy and about the American Clean Energy and Security Act that passed this Chamber and the necessity of enacting this legislation very soon as it pertains to our national security.

With that, let me begin by suggesting this, my friends. In this Congress, we were elected to represent the people of Ohio and Virginia collectively here with my colleagues, but to represent the interests of the United States in much broader terms. And after having spent 15 years in the United States Air Force as a C-130 pilot flying all over the world, to 60 different nations, visiting places I never dreamed I would see, seeing people, meeting people I never dreamed I would meet and doing things that I never dreamed that I would do, it only takes one trip outside the borders of the United States to understand how good we have it here. And when you think about all the blessings that this country has been given in terms of the abundance of natural resources, in terms of the opportunity to write our own destiny, we are truly a blessed nation. And I say this because we find ourselves at a crossroads in our history as it pertains to energy.

Now we have 3 percent of the world's population but we consume nearly 40

percent of the world's natural resources. The United States has a very big demand, whether it's electricity, whether it's our dependence on foreign oil, or whether it's our overreliance on other fossil fuels that make this country very dependent on international geopolitical forces.

I've got to tell you, what specifically concerns me with respect to our energy policy is the fact that 60 percent of our oil comes from overseas. Sixty percent. And 40 percent comes from the Middle East, where we find our military engaged in two wars on two different fronts in a region that has an abundance of oil but a lack of democracy and a lack of attention to humanitarian interests and a democracy that works for the people.

So while we become very dependent on overseas supply of oil, we find ourselves now at a crossroads. We were elected, and we're freshman Members here, it's our first term serving in this august body, but I will tell you this, that we will be judged by two measures. We will be judged by action or inaction, and now is the time to take action for our national security, to create jobs in this country that cannot be outsourced and to make sure that we move away from our dependence on foreign oil. It's in this spirit that I look for a robust conversation about how this protects our national security.

I will yield to my colleague from Ohio.

□ 2200

Mr. DRIEHAUS. Thank you very much, Congressman BOCCIERI, and I would agree that this is about action versus inaction.

From 1994 until 2006, the Republican Party ruled the Congress. They ruled the House of Representatives, and they were at the root of the inaction. This energy crisis didn't sneak up on us. This health care crisis didn't sneak up on us. The housing bubble and the financial crisis didn't sneak up on us. We could have done something. We could have done something about our reliance on foreign energy. We could have done something about health care. We could have done something about the financial institutions. But my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, rather than act, they chose not to act. So I agree wholeheartedly that we will be judged on what we are willing to do for this country.

I have a couple of observations about the bill that we passed, and I have never seen so much information—misinformation, on a bill in my life as I saw on this one.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle—who are chatting—were spreading rumors. They were spreading rumors about costs of \$4,000 a year in tax increases on the energy bill.

Now, I don't know about you, but I talked to my energy friends back home. I talked to my friends at Duke Power, and they suggested that the potential increases, if there are increases—and I would argue that those

increases are going to be offset by savings and they're going to be offset by job creation—but they were spreading misinformation about the cost of this bill; yet it went on and on and on and on.

And then they talked about the fact that no one had read the bill as they searched the Chamber for an amendment that sat right in front of them. Their leader came to the floor with the very amendment and went through page by page that he had earmarked, clearly having had time to read the bill.

The fact of the matter is we have been discussing our reliance upon foreign oil. We have been discussing energy for years.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DRIEHAUS. No.

Mr. KING of Iowa. The gentleman made an allegation, and I would be very happy to respond to that. I appreciate it if the gentleman would yield.

Mr. DRIEHAUS. I'm talking about the misinformation.

Mr. KING of Iowa. That's what I hear, and that challenges the integrity of some of the Members. I asked the gentleman to kindly yield. It's a courtesy that's commonly offered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOCCIERI) controls the time.

Mr. BOCCIERI. It is up to the gentleman from Cincinnati if he would yield.

Mr. DRIEHAUS. No, I won't yield. I have heard misinformation after misinformation come to this floor, and the American people deserve the truth. They deserve the truth.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. KING of Iowa. Parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio will suspend. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, is it inappropriate under the rules of the House to challenge the mendacity of any of the Members in this House?

Mr. DRIEHAUS. Mr. Speaker, point of clarification. I am challenging the facts.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I made a proper parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's remarks did not target any individual Member.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker. I can't hear you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's did not target any individual Member.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. KING of Iowa. The gentlemen from Ohio alleged intentional misinformation on the part of members of my conference, and that, I believe, challenges the mendacity of Members of this Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's remarks did not specify any individual Member.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Is it the ruling of the Chair that the gentleman from Ohio can challenge the mendacity of a Member provided he doesn't name them specifically?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded not to engage in personalities.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I think everybody gets the message here.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. BOCCIERI. Mr. Speaker, I want to yield to the gentleman and my colleague from Cincinnati to finish his remarks.

Mr. DRIEHAUS. I will further clarify it for my colleagues on both sides of the aisle that I believe there was gross exaggeration engaged in on the debate with regard to energy. And the attempt wasn't to solve a problem. The attempt was to scare the American people. They scared the American people rather than addressing the problem, rather than taking on the problem. The attempt was to scare the American people, to scare the American people and suggest to them that this was some type of massive tax increase when, in fact, this is about the energy security of the United States of America. That's what this bill is about. And that's what we had the courage to do.

It is about the job creation for our State of Ohio. It is about job creation and clean energy and new energy jobs across the United States, and it is about ensuring the energy security for our children and future generations. And that's the courage that it took to pass this bill rather than letting it go, letting it go, taking the ostrich approach of sticking your head in the sand and ignoring the problem.

So I appreciate the opportunity to speak, Mr. BOCCIERI.

Mr. BOCCIERI. Thank you for those comments.

And there is very clearly misinformation out there. I have had a number of inquiries into my office, both here in Washington and back in the district in Ohio, that have clearly been misrepresented of what the bill actually stands for and what it actually means.

And with that, I will yield to my friend and colleague and neighbor in the Longworth Building, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. PERRIELLO).

Mr. PERRIELLO. Thank you very much, Mr. BOCCIERI.

It's very easy to focus on the normal misinformation and all of the bad news that people expect from politics, but what we miss in that is this tremendous opportunity, the excitement of this moment. We are betting on America again. We're betting on innovation. We are better at this than any other country on Earth.

And the fact of the matter is I'm sick and tired of going to the gas pump and knowing that my hard-earned dollars are going to support petrol dictators overseas instead of American innovation back at home. Sometimes you have to put America ahead of Ahmadinejad, and this is one of those moments.

We can make a choice that America will be at the forefront of the clean energy economy. This is our time. Both parties, for the last couple of decades, have had a disastrous strategy on international trade and other things that have sold the middle class and the working class of this country down the road.

It is time to reinvest in America again, and the new energy economy is a big part of that. We are one of the only countries in history that have been funding both sides of a war. Under President Bush's Department of Defense in 2003, they wrote the risk of abrupt climate change should be elevated beyond a scientific debate to a U.S. national security concern.

We spent \$357 billion last year on foreign crude oil, 2.3 percent of our GDP. That's the bad news. But the good news is we are getting ahead on this now. And this bill helps create the incentives to reward success, to reward leadership instead of continuing to reward failure and reward the lack of innovation that we've seen in recent years.

And with your discretion, Mr. BOCCIERI, I would like to brag on south side Virginia for a second.

My part of the country has been hurting. We've had 20 percent unemployment in parts of my district. We've been hit hard by the exporting of manufacturing jobs, textile, furniture, tobacco farming. But we're now hearing phrases like "first in the Nation," "best in the Nation," moducraft homes, the first and best on energy-efficient modular homes.

Red Birch, a truck stop owner who turned his truck stop into the front lines of the freedom fight for energy independence by developing the first farm-to-fuel closed-loop system, not only is he keeping those dollars in America, he's keeping them in the community. When you go to that truck stop to buy a high cetane premium diesel fuel, 92 cents on every dollar stays in the community. Moducraft homes, Red Birch, Windy Acres, these are things to be proud of.

And let me mention one other thing, Mr. BOCCIERI. I don't care whether a good idea comes from the Democratic Party or the Republican Party. I only care that it's a good idea. And the fact is you wouldn't know it from this debate, but cap-and-trade was a Republican idea. The tradable permit scheme was invented and produced under the first President Bush in the effort to combat acid rain.

□ 2210

One of the most efficient and effective environmental laws ever created

under the leadership of Bill Riley at the EPA and the first President Bush, tradable permits were a smart Republican idea that said we can use the free market and capitalism to drive that innovative edge and that competition.

It's something that Senator MCCAIN and the former Senator Warner and others have supported as being the right mix of a national security solution using free-market strategies.

So this was a Republican idea that was good enough for this country until Democrats also supported it, and this is what Americans are sick of. They're sick of the idea that we're going to put scoring political points ahead of patriotism and problem-solving.

The fact is this was about putting the best ideas on the table to solve what is one of our leading national security threats, one of our leading economic threats, and get America right back on to the cutting edge.

It's a great thing that we've done. We've stood up to the special interest groups, and for once, in a few years, we're going to be able to start supporting an energy economy that's creating jobs right here in America and selling that technology all around the world.

Mr. BOCCIERI. I appreciate the gentleman from Virginia's comments, and he is exactly right on. A good idea doesn't have to be a Democrat or Republican idea. It's an American idea. And while we may disagree about some of the approaches, let's look at and revisit some of the comments of some of the leading leaders who ran for the Presidency last year and talked about how climate change and our dependence on foreign oil is a matter of national security.

Let's visit the Presidential candidate for the Republicans last year, JOHN MCCAIN, who I incidentally flew out of Baghdad, is a man of honor and integrity, and this is what he has to say: It's cap-and-trade. There will be incentives for people to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. It's a free-market approach. Let me repeat that: it's a free-market approach. The Europeans are doing it. We did it in the case of acid rain. Look, if we do that, we will stimulate green technologies. This will be a profit-making business, and it won't cost the American taxpayer. It won't cost the American taxpayer. JOE LIEBERMAN and I introduced a cap-and-trade proposal several years ago which would reduce greenhouse gases with a gradual reduction. We did the same thing with acid rain. This works. It works.

Mr. DRIEHAUS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOCCIERI. I will.

Mr. DRIEHAUS. This goes back to the question of action versus inaction, and the question is, if you don't embark down this road, if you don't address the energy crisis, if you don't work toward a system of cap-and-trade, what's the alternative? And the alternative is simply this:

The EPA comes out with rules cracking down on utilities and emitters of

carbon, which would in fact be a massive tax, a massive government mandate on utilities and manufacturers, killing jobs, raising rates for businesses, raising rates for residential consumers. Instead, the choice we made, the choice for action was about using a free-market approach to incentivize job creation, to incentivize creativity, just like we did with telecommunications.

We now have the opportunity to do the same with energy. We believe in the American economy. We believe in the innovation that can be released through the use of a free-market system like cap-and-trade. That's why we went down this road, and that's why we chose to act.

Mr. BOCCIERI. Let me just expound on the gentleman's remarks there.

I believe that this truly is about our national security, and I'm going to go over some facts here in just a moment. But back to revisiting what some of our colleagues have said running for President. Mike Huckabee really summed it up best when he said, A nation that cannot feed itself, that cannot fuel itself or produce the weapons to fight for itself is a nation forever enslaved.

And he further added, So it's critical that for our own interests economically and from a point on national security we commit to becoming energy independent, and we commit to doing it within a decade. Within a decade. We went to the Moon in less. We can do this in less than a decade. We have to take responsibility in our own house before we can expect others to do the same in theirs. It goes back to my basic concept of leadership. Leaders don't ask others to do what they are unwilling to do themselves.

This gentleman was right on with his remarks. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. PERRIELLO. Well, you know, Mr. Huckabee is a great man of faith, and I was meeting with a number of evangelical leaders today, and they were talking about the frustration they've had with some people in the pews about the seriousness of this issue. And they say, you know, some people get so caught up on whether climate change is a partisan issue, whether this is about some Democratic conspiracy theory to tax or whether it's some Republican denial of scientific evidence.

And the evangelical leaders were saying to me that do you realize over the next 10 years 250 million of God's children in Africa could be denied access to water because of the effects of climate? How willing are we to roll the dice on this uncertainty to do nothing, to accept inaction when we know that our national security demands it, when we know that our innovation and our job creation demands it, when we know that our conscience demands it, when so many of those who had nothing to do with creating the problem, the most vulnerable amongst us, 250 million in

Africa alone could be denied that access to water?

Mike Huckabee has been a leader on this. He's talked about the importance of climate, as has JOHN MCCAIN, as has Sarah Palin and others.

The reality is, we all know how important this is, but somehow in this body here we can get lost in scoring political points for the next election instead of doing what's right for our country and for our economy. You served in uniform, and we appreciate that service, and once again, here we're doing what we need to do to keep this country safe and to keep it strong.

Mr. BOCCIERI. I cannot agree with my gentleman and neighbor as he so eloquently suggested that this is about the faith that we have in our own innovation, the faith that we have in our own country and our own people to come up with ideas that can make our country stronger in the long run. And let me revisit some of what our faith leaders have said.

Billy Graham said that the growing possibility of destroying ourselves in the world with our own neglect and excess is tragic and very real.

Pope Benedict said, The brutal consumption of creation begins where God is not. I think, therefore, that true and effective initiatives to prevent the waste and destruction of creation can start only where creation is considered as beginning with God. Particularly, attention must be paid to the fact that the poorest countries are likely to pay the heaviest price for ecological deterioration.

Pat Robertson said, I have not been one who believed in global warming, but I tell you, they are making a convert out of me. It is getting hotter and the ice caps are melting and there is a buildup of carbon dioxide in the air. We really need to address the burning of fossil fuels because if we are contributing to the destruction of the planet, we need to do something about it.

Dr. Rick Warren, author of "The Purpose Driven Life" said, We cannot be all that God wants us to be without caring about the Earth.

Now, our faith leaders are telling us, our national security folks who are in charge and responsible for our national security are saying it, the Congress has spoken, that this is a matter of national security, creating jobs here at home, jobs that cannot be outsourced and moving away from our dependence on foreign oil.

Let me touch on just a few points before I yield back to my friends.

Eighty percent of the world's reserves of oil are in the hands of governments and their respective national oil companies. Sixteen of the world's 20 largest oil companies are state-owned. We import 60 percent of the world's oil. We know that we're going to, with the Senate version of this bill, we're expanding exploration and drilling right here in America in the Gulf of Mexico, knowing that that's not going to be enough to sustain our 20 million barrels that we consume every day. We

only have 3 percent of the world's oil reserves, but we can consume 25 percent of the world's oil. It is very clear that we have to move away from our dependence on oil.

One last point before I yield to my colleague from Ohio. The largest consumer of oil in this country, the largest consumer of oil in this country is not the American. It's the Department of Defense. The United States Department of Defense consumes more oil than some countries overseas. In fact, it consumes more oil than Greece in 1 year. So our Nation is dependent on 60 percent of that oil coming from overseas sources, from Venezuela, from Mexico, from Saudi Arabia in particular, which is one of our largest producers and suppliers of oil, and this makes our country and puts our country in a compromising position.

I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

□ 2220

Mr. DRIEHAUS. I appreciate that, Congressman. I think it begs the question: Do we want the future of this country dependent upon the innovation of the American worker; do we want the future dependent upon green energy and new technologies that will be driven by the American people; or do we want to rely upon and depend upon the sheikhs in Saudi Arabia, as we do today and as we have in the past?

Our dependency is growing, not declining. This bill provides us an opportunity for a future, a destiny controlled by Americans, controlled by the American worker, and unleashing the innovation of the American worker.

I was dismayed during this debate when I heard critics suggest that maybe we shouldn't go first. Maybe shouldn't lead. That we should wait for others—maybe developing countries, maybe others in Asia to lead before we move forward. I don't know when we became a Nation of followers. I am not of that belief.

I believe the United States of America has led time and time again for this vote on issues of freedom, on issues of democracy, on issues of economic innovation. And we should be the leaders on new technology when it comes to energy. We need to lead and we should set an example for the globe.

I am not one to follow the examples of countries on the other side of the world suggesting to us what we should be doing on our energy policy. We should be leaders. And we need to restore our place as leaders when it comes to energy.

Mr. BOCCIERI. I couldn't agree with the gentleman from Ohio more. I think that he speaks with passion and conviction about what this means and what stake we have in making certain that we move away from our dependence or foreign oil.

I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. PERRIELLO. I think the gentleman from Ohio makes a great point. These people aren't climate skeptics, they're America skeptics.

We all come from manufacturing areas in this country that led the world. And we sat by while both parties let that manufacturing go overseas.

We have a chance to be the first to craft carbon capture and sequestration technology. We have a chance to lead on nuclear and lead on biofuels and bio refineries. And this isn't just about switching from one fuel to other. It's: Who's going to make those wind turbines? Who's going to make those batteries for those hybrid cars that could free us from this dependence on foreign oil? Who's going to make those?

Do you want to buy them from China or do you want to sell them to China as they are building what will become the biggest auto consumer market in the world.

I want to build them here. And those climate skeptics or America skeptics want to sit on the sidelines and let all that technology and let all that manufacturing happen overseas. We are better than that. We can lead. We can do this better than anyone else. We can out-innovate. We are better entrepreneurs. We will do that.

But we don't do it by sitting on the sidelines. We don't do it by making easy choices and waiting for others to lead. We do it by putting solutions above special interests, by putting this country first—even if it means an unpopular vote, and going out and explaining to the American people that this is why this is going to be great for our country and great for our region.

I am proud that we have put ourselves back in a position to lead. That's what the American people deserve. I yield back.

Mr. BOCCIERI. I couldn't agree with you more, Congressman PERRIELLO.

Before I yield to my good friend from northeast Ohio, Congressman RYAN, who's joined us tonight, let me just revisit two more of these quotes from our colleagues who ran for President and suggested that American innovation, American entrepreneurship, and American ideas are stronger than our dependence on oil overseas.

Mr. Giuliani, a fellow Italian, he said, We need to expand the use of hybrid vehicles, clean coal, carbon sequestration. We have more coal reserves in the United States than they have oil reserves in Saudi Arabia. This should be a major national project. This is a matter of our national security.

We went on: Mitt Romney said, There are multiple reasons for us to say we want to be less dependent on foreign energy and to develop our own sources. That's the real key. Of course, additional sources of energy here, as well as more efficient use of energy. This will allow the world to have less oil being drawn out from the various sources it comes without dropping the prices to a high level. It will keep people, some of whom are unsavory characters, from having an influence on our foreign policy.

RON PAUL, who we serve with here in this Chamber, said, True Conservatives

and Libertarians have no right to pollute their neighbor's property. You have no right to pollute your neighbor's air, water, or anything, and this would all contribute to protection of all air and water.

Mr. Gingrich said, The concept of reducing the amount of carbon emissions over the next 50 years is a totally sound concept.

These are not Democrats saying this. These are Republicans who are standing with us tonight in spirit, I know, saying that this is about our national security, saying that this is about geopolitical balance, and this is about creating jobs here in our country.

I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I appreciate it. I want to take off on what the gentleman from Virginia was saying. I was reading an article the other day. In China, 400,000 people a year die from air pollution. And if you look at the history of China, you will see that they have periods where there is a very tumultuous uprising within the country. And if you can read the tea leaves here, you will see that at some point China and the people of China will demand clean air. There's no question about it. And they're using dirty coal. I mean, it's dirty. And those of us who have been there recognize—with the Olympics especially—how many months ahead of time they had to stop letting people drive cars into the city and everything else.

So the point that the gentleman from Virginia was making is that this is an opportunity for us. And some people say, Well, China and India aren't going to do this, so why are we going to do it? Let them not do it. Let us jump ahead. My goodness gracious, it would be like saying, you know, the Soviet Union is not going to continue their space program back in the Sixties. Great. We'll jump ahead of you.

That's basically what we have here. And we have an opportunity to seize this moment and then begin to develop this technology, invest this money, get our manufacturing going here in the United States, and export—things we have been talking about in our district for a long time.

When are we going to manufacture? When are Americans going to make things again? When are we going to export? This is the opportunity. And the same people that call on the talk radio that say, When are we going to make things again, are the same people that are against the cap-and-trade bill because the dots aren't connected here.

This is the opportunity. Take the \$700 billion that we're shifting abroad, focus it on the United States, revitalize manufacturing, and export this stuff, because China at some point is going to recognize they're wasting a lot of energy, their people aren't as healthy, their people are dying because of this, and they're going to want them to be healthy. So that's one point I wanted to make.

The other point I want to make is, Congressman BOCCIERI and I, Mr.

Speaker, were on a radio show a few days ago and a gentleman called in who had some business issues, other issues, but he says, I like the alternative energy stuff.

So I asked him what he did. He makes the technology, manufactures the products that go into the scrubbers that go into the power plant and go into the steel mills to keep the air clean.

And here is a businessman in Youngstown, Ohio, who had, I think he said, 70 employees, who's manufacturing these scrubbers that were a result of the Clean Air Act. Because of the Clean Air Act, there's someone in Youngstown making these products.

I think it's important for us to let everyone know this is opportunity for us. These are jobs that are going to be revitalizing communities in all of our districts.

Mr. DRIEHAUS. Just to back up the gentleman's point, China is moving down that road. They're not waiting. The week after the vote, Jim Rogers, the CEO of Duke Energy, went to China. And he went to China to check out the carbon sequestration that they're currently employing on new Chinese coal-burning power plants. Because the Chinese aren't waiting. The Chinese are moving ahead with new technology.

So we have a choice. We have an opportunity. Do we want to continue with business as usual and just sit still as China moves forward, or do we want to be at the cutting edge, do we want to be leading when it comes to new energy technology?

This is an opportunity. We need to seize that opportunity. And this legislation allows the free market to do that. So that's what this is about. This is about creating jobs and creating an economic future for the United States.

Mr. PERRIELLO. In many ways, if I may, it's also a chance to reward the people who are already innovative. In my district, I have poultry farmers coming who want to turn the waste into energy; not only energy, but produce a low-sulfur fertilizer that's even better for our aquifers and our Bay.

I have dairy farmers who want to take the manure from their farms and turn that into energy. What's stopping them? We aren't on the cutting edge of smart-grid technology. We don't have the technology in place, and we don't have the incentives that this provides.

What this does is give a profit motive to people for doing the right thing. I think we have had far too much in our financial system and elsewhere of rewarding people for failure, rewarding people for irresponsibility. For once, we have a system that's going to reward everyone, from the homeowner to the capitalist, for doing the right thing.

□ 2230

Again, I know I'm surrounded by folks from Ohio, but I can't say enough about the people—

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. You're so lucky. Do you have any idea how lucky you are?

Mr. PERRIELLO. Hey, you know, my grandparents grew up outside of Toledo, Ohio, in Sylvania, but we're from Virginia, and I will tell you that we have farmers ready to do this. Like you all, we have a lot of manufacturing plants that have shut down. We have hardworking people who are ready to go to work, and they would love nothing more than to have a job and to have a job that's making this country safe, that's keeping our country safe. Now you've done that in uniform. This is a chance for every worker to be part of that effort of national security, and we're fired up to do it.

Mr. BOCCIERI. People are asking, What does this mean for the average consumer? What does this mean for the average Ohioan and Virginian? This is what it's going to mean: When you roll into a fuel station someday, you're going to have a choice between traditional gasoline, traditional oil. You're going to have a blended fuel that may be ethanol-based or cellulose-based. You may have an opportunity where you plug in your electric hybrid or where you drive by the gas station all together because you have a fuel cell that allows you to get 100 miles to the gallon.

Now, how is that for American innovation? How is that for opportunity? How is that for standing up for the innovation, entrepreneurship, and for the longevity of American ideas and thinking? That's what this bill does, and that's what this idea is. It's of moving away from our foreign dependence and reliance on overseas oil to make our economy drive.

Let me just say this: In my district, we are researching fuel cell technology. We are very close to having some sort of prototype ready to go. They're researching this with the Department of Defense at Stark State Technical College, Community College. We have the opportunity there to be leaders in Ohio. We also have the opportunity to do research at the Ohio State Agriculture Research and Development Center. That is in Wayne County, in my congressional district, that right now is using anaerobic digesters like you were talking about. Imagine this: I know Congressman RYAN—whose birthday it is today. Happy birthday.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. What does that have to do with anaerobic digesters?

Mr. BOCCIERI. You may be too young to remember.

It was when I was standing in line with my father, waiting for oil in the 1970s. I remember seeing that movie *Back to the Future*. The professor comes in. He has a DeLorean, and he opens up the trash can and starts jamming in waste—garbage—into his DeLorean to fuel his engine. Now think about this: What they're doing at this research center is taking sewage sludge. They're taking manure from dairy farms, and they're adding 20 per-

cent biomass—a busted up watermelon from the supermarket, cooking grease from the local restaurant. Just by adding that 20 percent biomass, they're increasing the BTUs by 50 percent of that compressed natural gas. They're actually selling it back to the grid.

This German CEO who was doing this research, Schmack Industries, suggested this: He said, You Americans are doing in 2 years what it took Germany 20 years to do, and we have 3,800 of these anaerobic digesters that are actually producing energy—compressed natural gases that light our cities.

The city of Canton is getting ready to—or is thinking about building an incinerator for its sewage sludge. Could you imagine if they turned that into renewable energy and if they actually created compressed natural gas and sold it to the utility or if they heated some homes or if they turned on some lights in the city? This is the type of innovation that has driven America to be one of the great producers of wealth that we are.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. If the gentleman would yield.

Mr. BOCCIERI. Sure.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I don't know if anyone followed when Barack Obama was in Russia, but there was a deal made and struck where—Exxon is, obviously, doing business there, and they are opening up a refinery somewhere in New England to process the oil coming back from Russia.

So this is what we're trying to get away from. This is what this energy bill is all about. We can't get in the position where, yeah, it may be over the next 5 to 10 years where this is something that needs to happen for the transition. This is an example of the road we don't want to go down, the road relying on Vladimir Putin's Russia for oil for the United States. You know, the American people don't want that. That's not good geopolitics. That's not good for our manufacturing base. That's not good for a variety of reasons that are all pretty obvious to anybody who has blood running through their heads right now. You know, this is pretty basic stuff here. We don't want to rely on Russia for our oil.

The other point is, whether it's in Cincinnati, in Virginia, in Canton, in Akron or in Youngstown, we have these manufacturing facilities that are just sitting here. In my district, there's a company called Parker-Hannifin. It's a big company in Cleveland and in Youngstown. They have 1,000 workers, steelworkers. They make the hydraulics that go into the back of, you know, waste management—you know, garbage trucks. They do the hydraulics. These same hydraulics go into windmills.

We have a specialty steel company called Thomas Steel, in Warren, that has about 300 workers. They make a decent wage. Their specialty steel goes in the solar panels. We have a company called Roth Brothers in the Youngstown area. There's a new wind cube

that you can put on top of big buildings in downtown areas that will generate wind. You plug it right into the building, right into the grid, to generate energy that can turn and face the wind and that can really harness all of the wind no matter what the direction change. This is right in Youngstown. They said, If this wind cube takes off, we'll hire 100 people like that.

So we have it here. It's not so much new business—although, there will be a piece of that. It's also about the businesses that we already have, those that can grow and that can manufacture. They're good-paying jobs. They're steelworkers. You know, they're people who can make some money and who can revitalize the middle class again.

Mr. BOCCIERI. Let's address something that's important to all of our States—to both of our States that we're discussing here presently. It's the use of coal. We've heard a lot of talk from those, at least from the detractors of this bill who have now somehow fallen off their plateau of suggesting that this is about national security, who are suggesting that coal-intensive States are going to be disproportionately hurt. That is completely false.

We have worked together to make sure that coal, which is the most abundant and cheapest source of energy that we have in this country, is going to be used for a long, long time. Right now in Ohio, we are investing in some very, very awesome opportunities for job creation. The company Babcock & Wilcox is researching right now using pure oxygen and pulverized coal and mixing it in these huge burners to make near zero emission burners. They capture this carbon, and then they inject it back into the wells, into the very wells from which we're drilling for oil, to push out those last remaining drops of oil.

I have a chart here—and I'm not going to get into the technical parts of it—but those scientists who may be watching and listening to us tonight can refer to this because it is very important that we understand that we will continue to use coal. This is carbon capture sequestration. The bill provides \$180 billion for this type of innovative research that is going to be the next generation of coal use.

In the 1940s, when the United States of America bombed the Ploesti Romania oil fields, we essentially cut off the oil for Germany. What did they do? They quickly transitioned to a synthetic fuel, which is a derivative of coal. We're testing this right now at the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base in Ohio. We're testing blended fuels on our military aircraft. We're testing the new fuels that are going to drive the innovation of tomorrow and that are going to make our country stronger.

I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

□ 2240

Mr. PERRIELLO. I wanted to pick up on something that Congressman RYAN

said which is to cull out what I call paper tiger patriotism, this ability to talk tough about Chavez, Ahmadinejad and Putin until you actually have to do something about it. It's one thing to give speeches against these guys on the floor, but then to not have the guts to vote for the very policies that will cut them off at the knees. Here we are at one of the most crucial moments in Iran's history, where we have people risking their lives in the streets of Tehran; and then people in this body will stand up and vote for the very policies that keep a petro-dictator in place. This is about crushing that paper tiger patriotism and putting in its place the courage that American people deserve because we do, in our core, have it in us to lead in all of these areas.

This is an unprecedented renaissance for clean coal technology. It's the first bill in a generation that actually opens up opportunities for nuclear at the same time that we see wind, solar and biofuel. But we also know that the cheapest energy is the energy you never have to buy in the first place because of energy efficiency technologies. And that's what we can see through smart grid technology, through the advanced battery manufacturing. This is our chance to crack that technology for the whole world in the same way we did when we had the guts to go to the Moon.

This really is one of those moments. And I go back to the point where you started, Mr. BOCCIERI, which is, why was this idea good enough for Republicans when it was their idea but as soon as we started to support it, they ran away from it as cap-and-trade? Cap-and-trade was something the Republicans should be proud to have come up with. The first President Bush was a great conservationist, a true conservative, who understood the challenge of acid rain, the challenge of the Earth's summit and other things, that this was a time for America's leadership heading into the 21st century. We need to focus on, what are the ideas that keep us safe and keep us strong, not what are the ideas that score us points for the next election cycle. I think all of us came in and changed elections because people were sick and tired of that. These are the kinds of solutions the American people deserve.

Mr. BOCCIERI. You are right. Mr. Speaker, I will remind the folks listening tonight that Teddy Roosevelt said that the welfare of each of us is dependent upon the welfare of all of us and that in a moment of decision, the worst thing that we can do is nothing. What is the cost of doing nothing? We're going to continue to be dependent on foreign oil. Maybe it rises from 60 percent to 80 percent. Maybe we don't create the jobs that we need to right here in our country that can't be outsourced, like a nuclear reactor. Congressman RYAN always talks about the 8,000 manufactured components that go into making a windmill. You

know, these are the types of jobs and the types of innovation that makes our country stronger.

Mr. DRIEHAUS. I will just go back to the analogy of telecommunications. If you remember, it wasn't more than a decade or two ago when you were paying exorbitant rates on your long distance bills; there were a very limited number of channels on TV. And then through the Telecommunications Act, we made sure that we allowed for innovation and competition. We allowed for the cable companies and the telephone companies to use those same broadband lines. We required that to happen. And now today broadband is across the country. We have the potential today to unleash that same type of innovation that was unthought of 20 years ago in telecommunications; but we all know it today, as people send IMs, as people e-mail each other—that wasn't thought about 20 years ago—the hundreds of TV stations that you get on cable TV. I don't think we can begin to imagine the innovation that we are going to see over the next several decades in the field of energy because of the steps of this House, because of the steps of this Congress, the courage to move us from the status quo toward energy security for the future and unleashing the innovative nature of the American people.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. If the gentleman would yield, if you just think about the history of this country—and I don't want to get corny—but there has never been a scenario where we have said as a country, we want to do something, and it's not happened. I mean, let's be honest. Because of the system of government that we have, because of all the DNA that happens to be in our great country, because of people having the courage to get on a boat with no money, and all that DNA, all that courage that it took to get here is here now; and it's been replicating itself. There is something special about whether it's World War II or it's storming the beaches of Normandy or it's going to the Moon or it's getting out of the Depression or it's that we need to be educated or the number of patents that we get. Whatever it may be, we have the ability to do this. And I think when you look at this policy in particular, the energy policy, the more I read about it, the more I like it. And when people say, Well, how is it going to work? I get excited about explaining it to them because here we are in northeast Ohio where we have all this manufacturing, and it has been dead for 30 years. We've not had any opportunities coming down the pike, like clean energy, in 30 years. This is something that is so exciting for so many people because they recognize that—I think it's 400 tons of steel that go into a windmill or 8,000 component parts that go into a windmill, and the Midwest being the Saudi Arabia of wind, and the Southwest being the Saudi Arabia of solar. My goodness gracious, what an opportunity. We can't let this

slide by. We capture it. We take advantage of it. We make it work for us. That's what we do as Americans, and this is an opportunity for us to do that and to grow all of these companies. Putin, be gone. Chavez, be gone. Middle East sheiks, be gone. We're going to take care of our own business here.

Mr. BOCCIERI. Let's revisit the three pillars of this legislation. Number one, create jobs in our country that cannot be outsourced; number two, that it's about national security, moving away from our dependence on foreign oil and other energy sources; making sure that we have those homegrown energy jobs right here in our country. Those are the three pillars of this legislation. When we think about the two largest countries that market natural gas, it is Iran and Russia, when if we invested in the technology that we recently just talked about, anaerobic digesters and the like, we talk about these different opportunities, we can actually create natural gas and harvest natural gas from our part of the country. This is important that we understand that moving away from dependence on imported sources of energy is going to make our country stronger.

So national security, creating jobs, moving away from our dependence on foreign oil, that's what this legislation is about. That's what this opportunity is about. And I believe in the innovation and entrepreneurship of Americans. I believe in our success as a country when we challenge each other to think outside of the box, to move ahead. And if we just allow ourselves to be bogged down by the fear of the past and bogged down by those detractors who are now saying, this is not the right time—well, when is the right time? When is the right time, when we have 80 percent of our oil coming from overseas? When is the right time, when energy costs are through the roof? Now is the time because our country can make these investments and create jobs here.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I would just like to say, I don't think anybody here is anti-nuclear. I think we all recognize how important this is as a part of our portfolio. There is no one here who is against coal. We represent Virginia and Ohio and think it's a good way to do it. That's why there's \$180 billion in here to figure out how to make it clean and make it work for us. We're not saying that there's only one specific way to do this. We recognize you may need to drill a little bit, you may need to take advantage of nuclear and coal and all this. But look at the advantage. We have \$700 billion going to these other countries that could be coming here, revitalizing the United States of America, and I think that's important for us to remember.

And lastly, because I think we're winding down, and I want these guys who are a lot smarter than me to be able to talk, our friends on the other side, who have been so critical, had control of this government, had control

of the House, had control of the Senate, had control of the White House. Their energy policy was nonexistent. It was more subsidies for oil companies, more subsidies for the big power companies, and got us to where we are today. Which means over the last 8 years, an increase of \$1,100 just in gas prices for the average family. And the same group of people who thought that cutting taxes for the top 1 percent was somehow going to be to the benefit of all hasn't worked. We've got two wars going on, and a war our friend has served in here. That's \$1 trillion dollars, \$3 trillion when you factor in the costs of the veterans' health care. That's not a good energy policy of us having to go over, getting into the middle of the desert and getting ourselves in this sticky web of politics in the Middle East. Why are we doing that?

□ 2250

We don't have to do that anymore. And that is what is at the heart of this bill, and I think that is the magic of this bill, rely on the innovation, the spirit of the American people and reduce our dependency on all those other countries.

Mr. BOCCIERI. I agree with you, Congressman RYAN, and this is the time to do it. We have about 6 minutes remaining. I would like to yield each of the gentlemen at least a minute or two.

Happy birthday, Congressman RYAN.

Mr. PERRIELLO. First of all, your reference to back to the future, he also says that where we are going, we don't need roads. And as a member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, I have to take issue with that. But otherwise, I support the amendment.

On a serious note, every one of us here, I believe, is also a supporter of the Second Amendment. We are pro-freedom people. And what you described before is about the freedom for me to go to the gas pump without having to support petro-dictators because of that decision. It is the ability to buy a car with a battery that is manufactured here in the United States. That is the kind of freedom that we believe in.

This is also about honor and integrity. And part of integrity means being true to your word. I just want to say that I think this is about rising above partisanship in the way that you said. Sarah Palin wrote an op-ed recently bashing the cap-and-trade bill. But there is a quote from her in the campaign where she was asked, Do you support capping carbon emissions? And she said, I do, I do. You have a quote from JOHN MCCAIN. These are leaders. These are leaders who understood when they were ready to lead that this is what it looked like.

It looked like taking on the biggest national security challenges we face and doing so using the free market and the innovation that makes America

great. If those ideas made sense then, they need to make sense now when you have to make the tough votes to do what is right for our country.

I think it is a very exciting time for America. It is an exciting time for south side Virginia. I believe we are on the cusp of a great, new economic revolution, full of innovation that is going to bring those jobs back to the United States. I'm proud to be part of it. I think we will look back on this and be very, very proud.

Mr. BOCCIERI. So let me get this straight. This is about jobs that can't be outsourced, about our national security and moving away from our dependence on foreign oil. JOHN MCCAIN said it. He said it. He was introduced to a cap-and-trade bill three times. Three times, he said it is a free-market approach that will stimulate green technologies, a free-market approach. And he said that this is a matter of our national security. That is what this legislation is about.

It is so important that we enact this very soon so that we can move away from our dependence on these foreign sources of energy.

I will yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. DRIEHAUS. I appreciate the opportunity, Congressman BOCCIERI, to be here tonight with you. And I think there is a reason that you see four relatively young Members of Congress standing here talking about the future of energy in the United States. We all have a vested interest in this. We all understand how important this issue is for our future and the future of our kids.

We sat on the sidelines for far too long, as the other side did nothing, as Congressman RYAN explained. They had an opportunity to act when it came to energy policy, creative energy policy that would move us forward into the next generation, but they failed to do it. We have been elected to take responsibility and to move forward on critical issues that are impacting our families today and will impact them in the future. That is what we are doing on financial services. That is what we are doing on energy. That is what we are doing on health care.

On energy, this bill takes us down that road for ensuring a future of prosperity for our children. It is the right thing to do for the country today. It is the right thing to do for our children tomorrow.

Mr. BOCCIERI. Well, let me just wrap by saying this: this is about jobs in our country that can't be outsourced. It is about our national security. And it is about moving away from our dependence on foreign oil.

We have set up a free-market approach, one that is supported by both, or was supported by both, Democrats and Republicans before we introduced it and passed it, but one that is a free-market approach with no taxes that invests in regional opportunities for States like Ohio and Virginia to make

certain that we have an energy policy that works for this country.

I flew wounded and fallen soldiers out of Baghdad. And it is very clear that we have two fronts over in the Middle East, in Afghanistan and Iraq and a much broader region because of the oil that that area produces. This is about making our Nation stronger. We have to do this now. The Department of Defense realizes this, and that is why they are testing alternative fuels. We can make that innovation. We believe in the American people. That is what this bill is about.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I just want to add, the answer that our friends on the other side have given when we said, increase the Pell Grant, no; increase minimum wage, no; change the energy policy, no; change health care policy, no; add a stimulus bill that is going to keep people working, no.

That is not leadership, and this is bold stuff that we are trying to do. We are trying to lead the country. At the end of the day, that is going to pay off for everyone. I yield back.

Mr. BOCCIERI. You're exactly right, Congressman RYAN. We are going to be judged by two measures in this Congress, two measures, by action or inaction. And I am so happy that we had this opportunity to speak tonight on clean energy and our national security.

#### SETTING THE RECORD STRAIGHT

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the privilege to be recognized here on the floor of the House. I would remark that the common courtesy here is to yield. And I'm happy to yield to the gentlemen who are here if we could carry on this dialogue with or without that particular yielding. I know it is only four to one, so it would be an interesting engagement that could take place.

I have to correct a few things on the RECORD. One of them is, as the gentleman from Ohio challenged the mendacity of the Republicans, who had said that there is a \$4,000 increase on a payroll, that is exactly the number you get if the payroll is \$50,000 and you tax it at 8 percent. That is in the bill, Mr. Speaker, and that is a precise number, and that is what I sought to offer that could have been injected in for an open dialogue.

But we do deal with the facts. It is hard to get those facts when you have a bill that is drafted and a bill that has to be drafted to match a CBO number. The Congressional Budget Office came out with an estimate of a \$1 trillion health care plan, and we found out that the Congressional Budget Office came out with that number without having read the bill, Mr. Speaker.

So we are poised to go down a path by tying a blindfold around our eyes and charging off into the abyss of so-

cialized medicine with a \$1 trillion price tag, a little less than that, that is slapped upon a bill that nobody has yet, well, I suppose some now have completely read, but the Congressional Budget Office did an estimate on the cost of this socialized medicine policy over the telephone with the staff of the committee of the Democrats, not even a bipartisan staff.

And that is how we make policy in the United States of America? And it is adequate to stand here on the floor and utter platitudes about what your political philosophy might be?

I think it is interesting that I get to hear the quotes from Republicans, JOHN MCCAIN, on cap-and-trade. Well, I can think of the time pretty recently that would have been after this particular quote that we saw a few moments ago, the time I most emphatically agreed with JOHN MCCAIN, and that is when he said that President Obama has more czars than the Romanovs. That was something that I think illustrated part of the big picture that we should be talking about.

This is a government that is out of control. It is overreaching. It is creating the nationalization of industry after industry in this country. It is breathtaking, the scope of the reach of this White House that is supported by the Democrats in the House and in the Senate. And who would have thought—let's just say if we just roll back in our memory and our mind's eye back to election day in November of 2008, what if somebody would have said, now you're ready to go to the polls, think about what you're going to do. Because if you elect President Obama, he is going to go in and nationalize three huge investment banks, the large insurance company, AIG, Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, General Motors and Chrysler. All of these huge eight entities all wrapped up together will all be controlled, if not controlling interest, in the hands of and in control of the White House.

Then he is going to manage those by appointing 32 czars, and this will be hundreds of billions of dollars. And the idea will be that the economic stimulus plan is going to be FDR's New Deal on steroids.

□ 2300

And now, never mind that if one goes back and reads the data from the 1930s from that Great Depression—there was nothing great about what people had to go through during that decade of the 1930s. But if one goes back and reads the data and tries to index it back to the actions of the New Deal and this Keynesian economics of borrowing money and trying to actually replace private sector jobs with government jobs is what was going on in the New Deal—the CCC camps, the WPA, and the list of these acronyms went on. But what it did was it created a lot of debt, and it delayed the recovery that would have come from the private sector of the economy. It competed directly with the private sector.

One of those examples would be the Tennessee Valley Association where there was private-sector investment that was prepared to go in and develop just what the TVA turned out to be. And FDR went in and stomped on the private sector and grew a government instead.

This is what was the model for President Obama.

So he set forth—and he told us on a day on or about February 10, 2009, he said that FDR didn't go far enough, that he lost his nerve. He got worried about spending too much money. If he hadn't gotten worried about spending too much money, the economy would have recovered. But he didn't spend enough money and, therefore, along came World War II first and became the largest stimulus plan ever.

I don't take issue with the last part of that statement. I just take issue with the prediction that the New Deal would have worked if FDR would have spent a lot more money.

This President hasn't lost his nerve. He is spending a lot more money. And if there is any doubt in anybody's mind about whether Keynesian economics and spending borrowed money to dump it in and grow government at a time of economic crisis actually heals up the economy—there isn't any doubt in my mind because I've read the data. In fact, I went through every newspaper from the crash of the stock market in 1929 until the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, reading for the economic news so I could understand what people were living through during those days of the stock market crash and the deep, long trough of the Great Depression and then the shock of the attack on Pearl Harbor that launched us into a world war.

I wanted to understand what that was like for the people that lived during that period of time. But I couldn't find evidence that the New Deal was a good deal on any kind of a broad scale, small little place as it was. It bought some friends, sure, but I couldn't find evidence that the New Deal worked. And economists that have gone back and studied that era can't show you the data that indicates the New Deal worked.

But if anybody wonders, they can study this era 25 years from now when it will be clear—there won't be any question about, no more arguments can be brought up. No future President will be able to say of President Obama, Well, his stimulus plan would have worked but he just lost his nerve and didn't spend enough money.

This President has not lost his nerve. He has spent way too much money, and he has nationalized eight huge entities. He's landed blow after blow against the private sector, the free-market economy that is the engine that drives this economy, and it sets the economy for the world, blow after blow.

And they'll look back at this and they will say, \$700 billion in TARP, \$787 billion in the stimulus plan, untold