

difficult to do so. So I thank you for the courage to do that.

You know, people forget that just last year when we were running for office we had \$4-a-gallon gas, and people were looking at Congress and saying, What are you doing about \$4 in gas? And I mentioned when that was going on that what we do oftentimes in this country is we deal with the crisis but we don't always deal with the underlying issue that led to the crisis.

And so now as the gas prices have dropped, many have forgotten what we were facing just a year ago. Many have moved on. And yet my view is we should not forget the position we were in 1 year ago because we could, at any time in the future, be again paying \$4 a gallon, \$5 a gallon for gas as long as we are held hostage by those that control our energy. And until we make a decision, as we did in this vote, to move forward towards renewable energy, renewable fuel and ending our dependence on foreign oil, we could, at any moment, face the same situation we faced last year. And none of us as Americans should forget the anger that we had last summer when we were doing that. Many have forgotten. We should not forget that.

We should deal with the underlying issue that led to the energy crisis that we faced last year, and that is reducing our dependence on foreign oil, moving towards renewable energy, and making positive steps in terms of our own national security.

Mr. McMAHON. Thank you, Mr. KRATOVIL, for participating.

And Mr. BOCCIERI, before I yield to you, I hope you will accept my heartfelt apology for even thinking that Congressman KRATOVIL could be younger than you, sir.

Mr. BOCCIERI. You are forgiven this time.

Let me thank my colleagues for joining me tonight on this important dialogue about the course of this country. Now is not the time to let up off the accelerator. Now is the time to put the gas down, put the pedal to the metal to make sure we do this, because this is about our national security, my friends. The CIA is saying it. The Department of Defense is saying it. Both Democrats and Republicans alike running for President said it last year, and a whole host of Presidential candidates and Presidential minds before that said that this is a matter of our national security.

This is not an issue of partisan politics. It's about patriotism. This isn't an issue about Democrats or Republicans. It's about America and where will our course be in years to come.

Forty-four percent of our oil comes from the Middle East where my friends right now are putting their life on the line for our country and for our national security and because of our economic interests of oil in that region. Let's bring them home. Let's become independent. Let's create jobs here in this country. Let's protect our own na-

tional security and move away from our dependence on foreign oil.

Folks talk about the cost. What is the cost of doing nothing? What is the cost of doing nothing? We're going to outsource a trillion dollars of American taxpayer money, a trillion dollars, to enrich regions of the world that don't believe the same that we do when we can believe in Midwest innovation instead of relying on Middle East oil?

□ 2200

This is the time that we can make the decision. This is the time to move away from the politics of the past and look towards the future. We can't allow detractors to use fear as a tool of leadership when we know, as it's often been said, that it is a tool of the status quo.

We will be judged by action or inaction. I'm glad that we chose to act. Thank you for having me tonight.

Mr. McMAHON. Thank you. Congressman TONKO.

Mr. TONKO. I thank Congressman McMAHON.

Representative BOCCIERI asked what is the cost of doing nothing. Well, beyond the lack of progress that we should taste in this Nation, it is the denial of this generation's children and grandchildren who will need those career paths developed by us. We need to cultivate that thinking that will allow them to have these new energy jobs, these new environmental jobs, these new plans for economic recovery. That is what gets really lost in the discussion.

When China's now the number one producer of solar panels in the world, when Germany's number two export after cars is wind turbines, when six of the 30 top advanced battery-manufacturing solar and wind companies are American, we need to do better than we're doing today.

As I made mention, the space race of decades ago was an investment made by this Nation in robust fashion. Today, we're in a green energy race with far many more global competitors. Whoever wins this becomes the go-to nation. They will be the exporter of energy ideas, energy intellect, energy invention.

Do we want to deny this generation, future generations from those concepts, from that prize? I don't think so, and if we're going to deny them, let's at least deal with the facts. Let's talk factually. Let's not create a \$3,100 price tag when we've been warned over and over again by the author of that study that it is grossly inflated. Let's move forward factually. Let's move forward in green fashion. Let's provide for an innovation economy. Let's speak to the generations of Americans that are counting on us to do a job, do it thoroughly, do it directly.

Mr. McMAHON. I thank Congressman TONKO for those inspiring words, and thank you all.

You know, it's funny, but in conclusion, I think we all have hit on the very important themes.

Congressman KRATOVIL pointed out that it is about the domestic side, how much we pay for oil and gas, and what happened last summer, \$4 of gas, America was outraged, that somehow a year later we've forgotten that because there are those in the House of Representatives of the United States Congress who use misinformation and misstatement of facts to somehow take the American people's focus off what has to be done.

Just think about how many people you talk to at home who said, what, now I have to have an energy auditor in my house when I sell my home? We know that's not in the bill; yet, there are those who on the other side of the aisle have used that misrepresentation of fact to scare the American people, and that's wrong.

Congressman BOCCIERI is a great veteran, a great flyer of planes for the United States military service. We thank you for your service, and you remind us that right now there are young men and women wearing the uniform of our country in places like Iraq and Afghanistan and other places, standing in harm's way because we have not dealt forcefully and effectively with our energy policy, and it's time that we end that.

And as I said to you, coming from New York City and having lived firsthand the horrors of the acts of terrorism on our shores, in our country, we cannot forget the sacrifice that was made that day by those who lost their lives and those who got to the site and came to the rescue and continue to suffer the deleterious effects of their health.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2920, STATUTORY PAY-AS-YOU-GO ACT OF 2009

Mr. PERLMUTTER (during the Special Order of Mr. McMAHON), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 111-217) on the resolution (H. Res. 665) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2920) to reinstitute and update the Pay-As-You-Go requirement of budget neutrality on new tax and mandatory spending legislation, enforced by the threat of annual, automatic sequestration, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PAYGO

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I find that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle are going a bit through revisionist history again. We hear them talk over and over again about the things that have happened, what was happening about gas prices last year. They never mentioned that the Democrats were in charge of the Congress

when a lot of these things that they talk about were happening, but I think it's important that we always point that out.

A rule was just reported in by my colleague from the Rules Committee, and I've just come from the Rules Committee myself where we reported out a rule for a bill that's going to be heard on the floor tomorrow called the Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2009, and I thought it might be important to talk a little bit about that rule and that bill tonight because I know this is going to create some confusion in the minds of the American people as to why in the world are we passing something called Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2009 here just before the August recess.

It's also a confusing thing I think to people because they don't understand why we have to pass legislation that says you should pay for things as you go. Most people in this country do that. That's what they expect us to do in the Congress, but that isn't what's going to happen and there's several things going on with that bill that I think need to be explained. Some will be explained tomorrow.

But first of all, that bill did not go to the committee, the Budget Committee, from which it is coming. And when I asked the chairman of the Budget Committee today, he said there just wasn't time to do it. We're dealing with the appropriations bills, we're dealing with the health care bill, and there simply wasn't time to do that. But just like the American public expects us to read bills before we vote on them, I think they expect our bills to go through committee and go through the process of legislating. That's what we're here for.

But, no, there's no time to do that. We keep hearing that from the majority party: there's no time to do what we're sent here to do. But we know that this is just another diversion on their part, and I think I have an appreciation for why that's happening.

Today, the headline in Politico: "Poll, Public Starts to Lose Trust in Obama; Health Timeline on Life Support; Obama Good for K Street; Energy, Health Care and Finance Agenda a Boon to Lobbying."

I think what the majority wants to do is sort of take some of the attention away from some of the headlines that are coming out. One of the interesting things about this bill that's going to be dealt with tomorrow, which is it's supposed to be PAYGO, you pay-as-you-go. However, it exempts 40 percent of our budget. So 40 percent of the budget is not going to be included in PAYGO, and yet they are increasing spending on that 40 percent of the budget at least 8 percent a year.

So how in the world are they going to control spending if 40 percent of the budget is exempt and you're allowing it to increase 40 percent a year? You simply ignore that. It's as though the family sits down—they're always comparing what we do here with what the

family does. It's like you sit down at the family table to talk about your budget and you say, well, we're only going to deal with 60 percent of the budget; we're going to put 40 percent over here and just going to ignore it, and we're going to spend whatever we want to on that side of the budget. That's exactly what they are doing with this, and it just seems really ridiculous, and I think the American public needs to understand that a little bit.

Now, what they say is, well, this was all instituted in the past; we're exempting things Republicans exempted. But the very first PAYGO bill was passed under Democrats in 1990, a bipartisan effort to try to rein in spending. But what's happened since then is they've ignored it. They even had a PAYGO rule in the rules that the Democrats passed when they took over the Congress in 2007, but the rule is not strong enough for them so now they want to put it in statute.

I think it's simply to divert attention from the headlines. The President's approval ratings are going down. The health care bill is creating many, many problems. We asked today 134 times on this floor where are the jobs that were promised. The economy is going south, and what do the Democrats want to do? They want to divert the American public's attention away from all of those things and say but we passed a law that says we have to pay for these things as we go along. Passing this law is going to make no difference to them than their rule does.

You know, I find it just so interesting that when you say you're going to do something you don't do it, but that's normally the way the Democrats do it.

□ 2210

JOBS LOST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER) is recognized for half the remaining time until midnight.

Mr. CARTER. I thank my friend VIRGINIA FOXX for getting up here and kind of giving us some indication of what we mean by PAYGO. That's a very confusing word. Been hearing it a lot. I haven't seen anything, pay or go, since they've been talking about it. But we seem to be pretty good at spending money around here and don't seem to be very good at paying for it.

Just a thought here. We had a stimulus package that was over a trillion dollars, and I believe that was borrowed money. We have a budget that increased our taxes by \$1.4 trillion over the next 10 years. So, that's money they're coming after to pay for it. But I don't think that pays for that \$1 trillion.

Their appropriations request increased all the nondefense spending by 12 percent this year. The number of

months that jobs have grown under the Democrats since we got started this year is a whopping zero.

So they were talking about why were we asking today on the floor of the House, Where are the jobs? I get really excited about green jobs and green energy and the things that people talk about.

I heard our colleagues in the previous conversation, one of them show us a map of the United States and he said this would create 250,000 new green jobs. I think that's fabulous. It's just unfortunate in the last month and a half we've lost 1.2 million jobs in the United States. So they've got to have a comparison.

The conversation that was going on the previous hour was about energy independence. And I'm for energy independence. And any American that's got any sense at all is for energy independence.

I once asked a man how big an array of solar panels would it take to power Austin, Texas. This man was a physicist at the University of Texas—to power Austin, Texas, for a period of time, and what would that period of time be. He said a proper-sized panel in a non-air conditioned time—and you know in Texas it's hot, so air conditioning is our biggest problem, not heat—in a non-air conditioned time, a properly sized panel could power Austin, Texas, for about an 18-hour period of time before the Sun went down and the power went away. And then you would have to have an alternative power to power it during the night, or storage capacity, which our friends were talking about.

So I said, Well, that doesn't sound too big. How big would that panel be? He said, Approximately the size of the Panhandle of Texas, which is about 280, maybe 300 miles long and about 150 miles wide.

I'm not saying solar is not a solution. But are you going to replace the coal-produced power in Pennsylvania with a solar panel in today's world—and do it economically? No. But it will help, and we can help on an individual basis and we can power businesses with it.

Let's be realistic about energy, and let's go after every form of energy and clean up that energy. That's the solution to our problems. That's a real energy plan.

You know, we in Texas have been having an abundance of natural gas for a long time. We're real proud of our natural gas. We think it's good stuff. Burns clean and we like it. A lot of our folks up here on the East Coast, they didn't like our natural gas until they found some. All of a sudden, guess what? They found some gas shale, a lot of gas shale in the State of Pennsylvania, and I'm hearing an awful lot of colleagues that a year and a half ago were bad mouthing natural gas saying, Natural gas sounds good. I'm with Boone Pickens. Let's power our automobiles with natural gas. Let's produce natural gas.