

letter, but we didn't think it was our purpose to censor her. Let's get rid of censorship and allow the American people to hear the facts as they are argued on both sides.

□ 2030

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

**REVISIONS TO THE 302(a) ALLOCATIONS AND BUDGETARY AGGREGATES ESTABLISHED BY THE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010)**

The Speaker pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SPRATT. Madam Speaker, under sections 442(a) and (b) of S. Con. Res. 13, the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010, I hereby submit a revised 302(a) allocation for the Committee on Appropriations for fiscal year 2010. Section 422(a) of S. Con. Res. 13 directs the chairman of the Committee on the Budget to adjust discretionary spending limits for certain program integrity initiatives if such an initiative is included in an appropriations bill. The bill H.R. 3293 (Making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes) includes appropriations for certain such initiatives in accordance with S. Con. Res. 13. Section 422(b) of S. Con. Res. 13 permits the chairman of the Committee on the Budget to adjust discretionary spending limits for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program under specified conditions. H.R. 3293 meets the requirements of section 422(b) of S. Con. Res. 13. A table is attached.

This adjustment is filed for the purposes of section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended. For the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended, this adjusted allocation is to be considered as an allocation included in the budget resolution, pursuant to section 427(b) of S. Con. Res. 13.

**DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS—APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATION**  
(In millions of dollars)

	BA	OT
Current allocation:		
Fiscal Year 2009 .....	1,482,201	1,247,872
Fiscal Year 2010 .....	1,088,659	1,307,323
Changes for H.R. 3293 (Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act):		
Program integrity initiatives:		
Fiscal Year 2009 .....	0	0

**DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS—APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATION—Continued**  
(In millions of dollars)

	BA	OT
Fiscal Year 2010 .....	846	734
LIHEAP:		
Fiscal Year 2009 .....	1,900	1,463
Fiscal Year 2010 .....	1,482,201	1,247,872
Revised allocation:		
Fiscal Year 2009 .....	1,091,405	1,309,520
Fiscal Year 2010 .....		

**OUR FREE ENTERPRISE SYSTEM AND THE ROLE OF BIG GOVERNMENT**

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

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Speaker, what we will see over the next 60 minutes is a conversation here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives about our economy, this issue of energy, and innovation; frankly, our free enterprise system in the future, the role of the government, and I think the problems with excessive spending.

But I want to open by talking a little bit about how I have vested my time and energies as a Member of the House over these last 15 years—because it's a privilege to serve my last term here in the House as I am a candidate for governor of the State of Tennessee now—but I will tell you, I am one on the Republican side that has been extraordinarily active on alternative energy. For 8 years, I chaired the Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency Caucus here in the House with Congressman—now Senator—MARK UDALL of Colorado.

We built a caucus of over half the House, almost evenly divided between Democrats and Republicans, and advocated while Republicans were in the majority for unprecedented investments in renewable energy technologies. None of us got as far as we would like to have gotten, but we need to be realistic about how far we have gotten and what the capacity is for renewable sources today.

But in 2005, we wrote the Energy Policy Act. Some people didn't like it, others did, but without question it had more investments in the renewable and energy efficiency sectors than any bill that had ever been signed into law before, and I was proud to help write that very language in that bill. So I've got a long history on alternative energy and moving towards new sources.

But I voted against the recent cap-and-trade legislation because the differences today are not differences in goals or motives, because I think all Members of the House want the United States to move away, as much as possible, from fossil fuels or dirtier ways to create energy for our country's competitiveness. But the fact is, we have not developed these alternative sources yet to move as rapidly away as the

leadership of the Congress now proposes if we're going to remain competitive. Their approach is much more a regulatory approach, and our approach is much more an innovation and technology approach.

A year and a half ago, I was in China, in Shanghai, where you couldn't see from one side of the Bund, the river, to the other. Extraordinarily bad pollution. So we broached the subject with the Chinese: Where are you on the environment? Basically, the answer you get from the Chinese is, you are entitled to your industrial revolution; we're entitled to ours.

Well, there's a big difference between when the United States had their industrial revolution and China having theirs now if there's no environmental regulation, because they're literally one-fifth of the world's population and climbing, and they are far and away the biggest polluters in the world. And if you think they're doing a cap-and-trade scheme to regulate their pollution or their air quality or their carbon emissions, you're kidding yourself. They're exactly the opposite.

And here we are seriously considering a scheme that will dramatically regulate our productivity and our competitiveness, raise the cost of energy, frankly raise taxes to pay for it and, at the worst time since the Great Depression, strangle our ability actually to pull out of this economic downturn. And that is the beauty of American innovation.

Not long ago, I was personally speaking with the prime minister of Australia, and he was telling me that he had great hope for the future because the U.S. had such innovation that we would lead the world out of this economic malaise. But I've got to tell you, we are now moving more towards big government regulation and the lack of innovation than at any time in modern history, instead of moving towards it.

Now, I think this is a challenge that we share in the House, but we have got to get back to a reasonable middle ground because American innovation is the only way to turn this economy around. Our entrepreneurship is the beautiful, what I call the goose, that lays the golden egg, the engine that creates the revenues to get back to a balanced budget. That's how the budget got balanced in the 1990s. We did slow the growth of spending below inflation and that was laudable, but it was new revenues in the information sector. People like Bill Gates. We actually led the world for so long on the information revolution that revenues surpassed expenses, and we balanced the budget.

We could do that again with energy. I call it the En-Tech agenda, where we would have a robust, U.S.-led manufacturing explosion in new energy solutions instead of this regulatory scheme that says we're going to actually limit the amount of energy that can be produced by certain sources and mandate a certain amount by other sources. And

the harsh reality is those sources are not available, and the irony of ironies on the floor of this House is that the very people who are opposed to coal and clean coal and new investments on how to better use fossil resources are the same people, many of them, like the gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentleman from California whose very names this legislation is under, WAXMAN and MARKEY, that are anti-nuclear.

The one single technology in the United States that can rapidly move us away from fossil electricity production, they're against it, too. So if you're against nuclear and you're against coal, what you end up being for is a lack of electricity and a lack of energy and a lack of competitiveness and a lack of innovation and a lack of manufacturing.

And the question was asked on the floor earlier this week, where are the jobs? I hate to admit this, but a lot of those jobs are in China and India, and they are going other places. That's where those jobs are, because our manufacturing sector is leaving because we're not unleashing the innovation and the entrepreneurship and the incentives for people to take risk and invest; just the opposite.

And back-to-back behind this cap-and-trade scheme, which is a big regulatory and tax burden on the American people and small business, then you talk about this health care scheme; this is a one-two punch that lands America flat on its back. And I've got to tell you, the American people are turning against it, and that's why the majority party can't pass the bills even through the committees. They have punted for the week, even though they are in a big hurry, because they want to do it before their approval rating falls too low, and they don't have the political capital to do it. And why would you rush the largest transformation in modern American society, this health care scheme, through before your political clout evaporates? That is really an un-American approach.

Now, we've got some people on the floor tonight that want to speak. Dr. VIRGINIA FOXX, an outstanding Member from North Carolina, comes, and I yield to her.

Ms. FOXX. Well, I want to thank my colleague from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP), whose loss to this House is going to be immeasurable. His contribution here in the House of Representatives representing his district in Tennessee has been outstanding. Not only has he done a fantastic job as a legislator, but his leadership in our weekly prayer breakfast has been exemplary. I should think of some better adjectives to say, but exemplary will have to do. He is really a tremendous role model for all of us in his attendance, in his caring for others, and he is going to be very much missed in the House when he leaves here. He didn't pay me to say that. He didn't know I was going to say that, but it

needs to be said. Fortunately, we have him for the next 17 months still in the Congress, and I'm very, very grateful to him.

He has set the stage very well on this issue of the cap-and-trade bill, which the majority in this House pushed through the House with no chance for people to read, a 300-page amendment brought to the Rules Committee at 2:30 in the morning, and then the bill brought to the floor later that day.

There is a lot of sentiment out in the public now by the American people about the fact that people voted for that bill without having read it. Now, fortunately for our side, most of us voted against the bill. We knew pieces of it, and we knew there was enough bad in that bill to vote "no," because the bill is going to do a lot of negative things in this country.

It's going to raise taxes. It's going to raise the cost of utilities. The President warned during his campaign last year, he admitted it—and we're quoting him—he admitted that, you know, under his energy plan, utility rates would necessarily skyrocket. Well, skyrocketing means probably an average of \$3,000 more to pay for energy for the average family. The average family is going to have to pay over \$3,000 more a year for energy.

The American people deserve better, and as my colleague from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP) said, we are the most innovative people in the world, and the reason we are the most innovative people in the world is because we are the freest people in the world. This country was founded on the concept of freedom, founded on the concept of innovation. Many people don't realize that, until this country was formed, never before had a people believed that they weren't the property of another human being. We believed in freedom, God-given freedom, and that's what formed this country.

Now, through the people in charge of this Congress, the Democrats in charge of this Congress, and a Democrat President, they are working at every level of our lives, every aspect of our lives, to take away that freedom. They want to take away our ability to have low-cost energy.

Many people also don't make the connection between the fact that the reason we were such a manufacturing powerhouse for so long was that we had low-cost, reliable energy. India and China didn't have low-cost, reliable energy. They couldn't count on having the energy they needed to run their plants 24 hours a day, 7 days a week like we did. It helped us tremendously to become a manufacturing powerhouse. But with the cap-and-tax bill and the concepts that the Democrats have put forward, it's going to seriously undermine that ability.

Republicans want us to be energy independent, and I am highly insulted when over and over the President and the leadership of the majority party say that Republicans don't have an an-

swer, that we just want the status quo, that we're the Party of No. We're not the Party of No. We're the party of doing things right.

Let's stick with what has worked in this country over the years. We can look at Europe and see what they've done. They've tried cap-and-tax, and what has it done? Bankrupted them. Spain wanted to create lots of green jobs, they said. They have the highest unemployment rate in Europe, over 15 percent.

We can look across the ocean and see how this has failed, and it just is mind-boggling that the people who are in charge of this Congress and in the White House think that they can replicate what was done in Europe and have a different outcome. It's never happened before. It's never going to happen again, and as my colleague from Tennessee said, we are facing one of the greatest takeovers of our freedoms through cap-and-tax and the health care plan that's being proposed.

But you know, the American people are still in charge. They stopped a bad immigration bill a couple of years ago that was being debated in the Senate. They stopped it cold. We can stop these things, too. And what I'm urging people to do is—you don't have to write to most of us, all of us are going to be on the floor tonight—and say, Don't vote for this health care plan. We know that. We're not going to do it.

□ 2045

Cap-and-tax has passed the House, gone to the Senate, but put the pressure on your Senators and write to somebody who lives in a district who is represented by someone who voted for cap-and-tax and tell them you're going to remember that, they're going to remember that. Encourage them to do that.

We have other very eloquent Members on the floor tonight who want to speak on this issue so I'm going to yield back to my good friend, Mr. WAMP from Tennessee.

Mr. WAMP. I thank the gentlelady for her intellect and her insight and dogged determination on behalf of the people of North Carolina. She raised two issues I want to address before yielding to the gentleman from Georgia.

One, she said that sometimes Republicans are called the Party of No. I would say to the gentlelady, if that means saying "no" to tax increases and large rate increases in your electricity bills at a time of economic duress by the people we represent, then, yes, we would be the Party of No.

And she said something about bad legislation was stopped. I remind people that the immigration reform proposals were made by a Republican President, and they were wrong. And Republicans in the Congress stopped the President from going forward.

One question I would ask today is: At what point are the Democrats in the majority here going to stop the Democrat President from a wrong-headed

proposal when the American people are clearly against it? Yet, this is where you have to stand up and say, This is not only bad for America, Mr. President; it's bad for our party. And we said that and immigration reform did not go forward under Bush, because it was wrong-headed. The American people weren't for it.

And here, today, we would ask: Are you just going to follow the President of the United States and his Chief of Staff down this very liberal road? And for how long? And for the 52 so-called Blue Dogs, it's going to be a real test. What are you for? More for the liberal leadership of your party or the values that you say that you represent?

So I'd like to yield to the gentleman from Georgia, Dr. BROUN, who's been a really dynamic Member of Congress in his relatively short tenure, but he worked a long time and worked really hard to get here and he brings a depth of experience.

I yield to Dr. BROUN of Georgia for as much time as he may consume.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Thank you, Mr. WAMP. I appreciate you yielding me some time.

Mr. Speaker, government is growing, freedom is going. Many of us came to the floor through Special Orders and said, Where are the jobs? Mr. WAMP very eloquently told you, Mr. Speaker, where the jobs are. They're going to China and India and Sri Lanka and all the different countries around the world where the energy costs and the environmental regulations aren't such a hamper to industrial growth and development.

Mr. Speaker, I have several manufacturing plants in my district in northeast Georgia that have told me if that tax-and-trade, cap-and-tax bill passes the U.S. Senate, that they're just going to have to lock the door. They're going to lock the door and all the people who work in those factories in northeast Georgia are going to be out of work.

Right now, today, this very day, many of the counties in my Tenth Congressional District of Georgia have unemployment rates pushing over 14 percent. In Georgia, just a couple of days ago, it was announced that the State unemployment rate is 10.1 percent.

I heard today in Augusta, Georgia, which because of all the job-producing entities that have to do with government, State and Federal Government, such as the Eisenhower Army Hospital on Fort Gordon, Fort Gordon itself, the Savannah River site Department of Energy facility over in South Carolina, in my good friend GRESHAM BARRETT's district, and the Medical College of Georgia, my alma mater, those four entities, plus the VA hospital—we have two VA hospitals in Augusta, Georgia—those give a buffering effect to job losses. But in Augusta, Georgia, it's 10.1 percent now, from what I understand.

So where are the jobs? Well, they've left. And why? If you look at what has happened, we see over and over again

our colleagues on the Democratic side blame George W. Bush for this bad economy and all the things that are going on today. I heard Members of the Democratic Party just this week blame the stagnation and poor economy on George W. Bush.

Well, George Bush was a big-spending President. There's no question about that. He did create some deficit and debt. There's no question about that. And I was against that. I wasn't here during most of that period of time in Congress, but the last almost 2 years of his Presidency, I was here, and I voted against every big spending bill, every tax increase.

But I want to remind you, Mr. Speaker, and I want to remind the American people, if I can speak to them directly, that it's been on the Democratic leadership for the last 2½ years that most of the jobs have been lost. And if we look at the deficit and debt that's been created just in the last 6 months under this Democratic administration and under the rule of NANCY PELOSI and HARRY REID in Congress, we have seen more debt, more deficit created than George Bush ever thought about doing.

The Democrats need to quit talking about George W. Bush because it's their deficit, it's their debt.

And then they passed this tax-and-trade bill. They call it that. They also call it cap-and-tax because it's about taxes. The President himself a few weeks ago said he had to pass this cap-and-trade bill to be able to fund his health care reform. Now what's that mean? It means that he needs the revenue.

It's about revenue. It's not about the environment. In fact, that bill, if it passes in the U.S. Senate, is going to cost more jobs. And it's going to hurt the very people that I hear over and over again that the Democrats claim that they represent.

They claim the Republicans only represent Big Business, but actually, Mr. Speaker, it's the Democratic Party that represents Big Business, because Big Business prospers under Big Government.

It's small business that we as Republicans represent. And this energy bill that's sitting over in the Senate is going to hurt small business. It's going to hurt everybody. It's going to hurt the poor people because they're going to be paying for higher energy costs.

Dr. Foxx was talking about it, and I think my good friend Mr. WAMP from Tennessee was saying that everybody in this country is going to have to pay more. They're going to pay more for gasoline. When you flip on the light switch in your home, you're going to pay more for that electricity. When you go buy groceries, you're going to pay more for groceries. When you go to the drug store to buy your medications, you're going to pay more because these energy costs are going to be passed to every single good and service in America. Every single one.

It's been estimated that it's going to cost, because of higher energy costs,

the average family, as Dr. Foxx was saying, over \$3,100 per average family in America. Now some people try to refute that. The MIT economist said, Well, we're taking this a little out of context. But the thing is, what he looks at is not what it's going to cost people out of their pocketbook. In reality, it's going to cost every average family in this country over \$3,100 per average family for higher energy costs if that bill passes the U.S. Senate.

So we're going to lose jobs. We're going to lose jobs because small businesses are going to have a hard time paying the energy costs with this tax-and-trade bill that this House passed.

All small business can do is increase the cost of their goods and services to the public or they have to cut back or they have to cut back on their expenses. And the way they do that is by letting people go or reducing salaries or cutting hours to their employees.

So the average worker in this country is going to take home less money if that tax-and-trade bill passes the U.S. Senate. This health care reform bill that we hear the Democrats are going to bring before the August break is going to cost more jobs.

Well, how many more jobs are these two bills going to cost? Mr. Speaker, it's estimated it's going to cost many millions of Americans, working class, blue collar, small business jobs all across this country.

Just last night, the President said if the burden primarily falls on the middle class, he won't be for it. That's hogwash because his bill, his plan is going to fall on the backs of everybody, including the middle class. It's not true. Middle class is going to pick up the bill for this health care reform, for the tax-and-trade. We've got to stop it.

Now, Republicans aren't going to stop it. Only the American people can stop it. Former U.S. Senator Everett Dirksen one time said when he feels the heat, he sees the light, Mr. Speaker. And what he's saying is when he gets calls and letters, faxes, e-mails, visits about an issue, he starts feeling the heat.

Most Members of Congress in the House and the Senate are going to be running for reelection at some point. Most want to get reelected. And so when their constituents contact them about an issue, that's how we feel the heat.

So, Mr. Speaker, if I can speak out to the American people and tell them what to do to defeat this, Mr. Speaker, what I would tell every single individual who wants to solve the economic problems is to stop this cap-and-tax bill that the Senate is debating, also this health reform bill that's going to destroy quality health care, put a Washington bureaucrat between every patient and their doctor and the decisions are going to be made by that Washington bureaucrat, not by the patient, not the patient's family, but by a Washington bureaucrat. It's not going to even cover everybody, and it's going

to be extremely expensive, according to the Congressional Budget Office.

If the American people really understood what was going on in those two bills, they would rise up and say “no” to their U.S. Senators, “no” to their Members of this House, to their U.S. Congressmen. They can call, Mr. Speaker, they can e-mail, they can fax letters, they can visit the district offices, State offices, and say “no” to cap-and-trade, “no” to Barack Obama’s plan, ObamaCare, and it’s critical that we do that, because if we don’t, our economy is going to be destroyed, jobs are going to be destroyed, the environment is not going to be any better worldwide. In fact, I think it will be worse.

And we’re going to go down a road towards exactly what Mr. Obama’s good friend Hugo Chavez has taken in Venezuela. We have a clear picture of what’s going to happen in America if we continue down this road that this administration and the leadership in this House and the Senate today, the Democrat leadership, has taken us. All we have to do is look off the shore of Florida at Cuba and see where America is going, because that’s the picture of what this country is going to be like several decades from now if we go down this road the way we’re going.

So I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the American people will understand. God says in Hosea 4:6, My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge.

Please, please, our American people need to be informed. We need to have that knowledge spread among the people. And the American people, Mr. Speaker, need to rise up and say “no” to ObamaCare, “no” to cap-and-trade, “yes” to jobs, “yes” to a strong economy, “yes” to creating jobs.

We’re accused, as Dr. Foxx said, of being the Party of No on the Republican side. But, actually, we are the Party of Know, K-N-O-W. We know how to stimulate the economy, we know how to create jobs. We know how to be good stewards of the environment. And we will be. And that’s what we need to do.

I thank the gentleman from Tennessee for yielding. God bless you.

□ 2100

Mr. WAMP. Thank you, Dr. BROWN. And before I yield to the gentleman from Virginia, I just want to follow up to say, in my 15 years here, I have tried to temper my partisanship. And this is not, to me, about Republicans and Democrats. It truly is about all Americans and how serious these choices that we’re making are for everyone. I don’t think either party has an exclusive on integrity or ideas.

The truth is, in 2009 neither party has a whole lot to brag about because, as Dr. BROWN said, the previous administration—and I think President Bush restored honor and integrity to the White House at the time it needed it. He and Laura Bush are two of the finest people in history. But we lost our

party’s identification over these last several years by spending too much, making mistakes, and not being consistent. But that doesn’t mean that what’s happening today is either okay or better. As a matter of fact, it’s like the mistakes we made on steroids.

The budgets proposed by this President so far exceed all of the deficit spending that President Bush had over his 8 years. It’s remarkable. It’s actually breathtaking that we would be doing this. The whole question of “Where are the jobs?” this week came up over the stimulus. Nearly \$800 billion of one-time spending. No way any analyst would say more than 15 percent of that spending would even create a single job. 85 percent of it was, frankly, pent-up welfare and social spending, their priorities that they thought hadn’t been funded adequately over the last 8 years. They threw all that money at new government programs and more government spending. That’s why the unemployment rate in Washington, D.C., is the lowest in the country today, because Washington jobs are growing, but jobs in the hinterland are shrinking.

Now, economies rise and fall. They’re cyclical by definition. But the government can either make it worse or make it better by their policies. Unfortunately, these policies are actually making it worse. That’s why the question comes after the stimulus and the bailouts and the borrowing and the spending, “Where are the jobs?” because we’re going the other way the more you do that.

It didn’t work in Japan. They called it “the lost decade” because they tried to borrow their way into success and a good economy. It doesn’t work. You can’t borrow your way out of debt. You can’t spend your way to prosperity. Other countries have tried it, and it failed. And here we are making this big mistake. It’s not a Republican/Democrat thing. It’s whoever is doing it needs to stop for the good of the American people.

I yield to the very well-schooled ranking member of the Agriculture Subcommittee on Energy and former lead Republican on the Agriculture Committee, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) for as much time as he needs.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Well, I thank the gentleman from Tennessee, my good friend, for yielding me this time and for organizing this excellent discussion about what we need to do about America’s energy policy and about creating those jobs because we know we have the ideas. We have been talking about them for well over a year now in terms of the American Energy Act and things that we have been doing to try to bring this Congress in the right direction on the creation of new jobs by creating an America that is not dependent upon foreign sources of energy.

I have had the privilege of traveling to the gentleman’s district in Tennessee to talk about one of those areas.

We held a conference down there, talking about renewable fuels, particularly fuels generated by switchgrass and other forms of agricultural production other than corn, which has been such a problem in our country today. That is right there, and that is something that we can do.

We all support developing other forms of new technology. We want to find a cheaper way to build solar cells. We want to find a less expensive way to generate electricity from wind or to generate power from geothermal and other new technologies. We also want to encourage as much energy efficiency as we possibly can. All of those things will help our families and help our businesses. It will help them remain competitive and preserve and create jobs.

But we also know that it is absolutely important, if America is going to create new jobs, that we have to utilize the resources that we have in this country, that we have been dependent upon for a long time. And until you have new technologies, you don’t raise the cost of the types of energy that people are dependent upon.

More than half of our electricity comes from coal, a resource which we have in tremendous abundance in this country. Twenty percent of our electricity comes from nuclear power, another area that the gentleman from Tennessee and I share a very strong common interest in, he having Oak Ridge in his congressional district and I having Lynchburg, a major nuclear power center in the country, in my congressional district.

The legislation that we voted on a month ago here in the Congress did nothing to promote the most greenhouse gas-reducing form of electricity generation, nuclear power. That, to me, seemed to be something that was completely and totally neglected in that legislation.

Coal, on the other hand, wasn’t neglected. It was thrown out in a way that will raise the cost of electricity to my constituents and anybody in the country from areas that are heavily dependent upon electricity generation from coal, which, by the way, is most of the country.

So that was the wrong approach. The right approach is the American Energy Act. Many of us—I think everybody who is here this evening—came back here to Washington last August when gasoline prices were \$4 a gallon and oil was \$140 a barrel. We took the floor in a darkened Chamber day after day after day to talk to the people who were touring the Capitol. People around the country were aware of what we were doing to tell the story of what needed to be done.

We came back into session in September, and that was completely ignored. And we never have revisited the need to have a comprehensive energy act where, if we really made this a top priority of our country, we would become free of dependence upon foreign

oil and other foreign sources of energy in 15 or 20 years. And even more importantly, we would create millions of jobs, exploiting those resources that we have in this country.

This is not a new idea. This is how America came to be a strong Nation, a competitive Nation, a Nation with millions of jobs. The reminder of the importance of doing this is right there above us on the wall, above our Speaker's rostrum, above the American flag, above our Nation's motto, "In God we trust," at the very top of the wall, a famous quote from Daniel Webster that says, "Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests, and see whether we also, in our day and generation, may not perform something worthy to be remembered."

That saying, more than 150 years old, is every bit as important today as it was back when Daniel Webster said it. That's what we have to hearken to; not the idea that somehow government will solve all of these problems, that government can provide people with all the health care they need, paying for it with taxes on small businesses and losing jobs, mandating all kinds of new agencies and institutions, more than 30 to run this crazy program; not with the cap-and-tax proposal that will cost American jobs, raise the cost of living for every American, make it harder for manufacturers and farmers and others to be competitive with other countries around the world that have no intention of engaging in a practice that raises unnecessarily the cost of the basic ingredient for manufacturing and agricultural success and really enjoying a good standard of living for anyone's life, and that is having access to affordable sources of energy.

It is certainly not going to be solved by having this government spend through the roof. We saw back in January the most amazing single appropriations bill ever, the so-called stimulus package to create jobs. Now here we are 6 months later, and the question is being asked day after day after day, not just by those of us here in the Congress but by people all across America, "Where are the jobs?"

Well, you don't get them by government spending. You get them by returning to the ingenuity of the American people, their hardworking spirit, their knowledge that it is the free enterprise system that will bring this economy back. But we delay day after day after day and dig the hole deeper and deeper and deeper when we pile up debt like this—\$1 trillion. That is a stack of thousand-dollar bills 63 miles high.

And then in March we went on to pass the budget for next year. We said, "Ooh, I'll outdo that." I voted against it. Mr. WAMP voted against it. Others here talking tonight voted against it. Every Member of our party voted against it, but also a lot of Members in the other party voted against a budget

that has a \$1.2 trillion deficit for next year. That's a stack of thousand-dollar bills 75 miles high, which reaches up into outer space, and we don't see any end to it.

The 10-year projection for the budget passed by the majority party and the President never sees it going below—the highest deficit ever before this year was \$450 billion. It never gets below \$600 billion ever again as far as the eye can see. That will cost jobs. That will raise the cost of living. That will raise interest rates and inflation. It is devastating to our country.

We need to return to sound fiscal responsibility. We need to return to an opportunity to have an American energy policy that creates millions of jobs here by drilling for oil offshore and on Federal lands; by extracting the huge resources we have of natural gas; by building new, safe, more modern, latest-technology nuclear power plants; by using clean-burning coal technology and advancing that and developing new technologies. All of these things coupled together will lead to a bright future. But the path we are on now worries all Americans, and we need to turn off of it as quickly as possible.

I thank the gentleman again and hope that the message that sits on our wall, let us develop the resources of our land—not Venezuela, not Nigeria, not Saudi Arabia. Let us develop the resources of our land. That will lead to the creation of the jobs that people are looking for and the restoration of our economy. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WAMP. The gentleman's comments are spot-on. We're grateful he came and participated and for his really brilliant leadership here in the House.

Another one of our smarter Members from the Republican side is the gentleman from Michigan. There are other Members coming to the floor, so I am going to withhold my comments.

I yield such time as he may consume to the chairman of the House Republican Policy Committee, THADDEUS MCCOTTER of Michigan.

Mr. MCCOTTER. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee.

When the cap-and-tax national energy tax bill was passed from the House, the Congress went on a break, and when people went home on break, they found out how much the American people did not like the cap-and-tax bill that this House passed. In fact, I remember being home—I am sure a lot of Members had this moment, both people who voted for it and voted against it. You go to the grocery store, somebody might recognize you. They would look around. They would walk up and they'd say, Are you my Representative? And you'd say, Yes. They'd look at you and look around again, and they'd say, Dude, this is crazy. This cap-and-tax is crazy. I would just say, Yes, it is. And I said, Especially in Michigan, our State where we have a 15.2 percent unemploy-

ment rate, where we are a manufacturing giant now in difficult times, why the Federal Government would make it harder to manufacture in the United States, why we would be but a Senate vote and a Presidential signature away from a radical, ideological imposition on America's energy future that will raise people's energy taxes and will kill their jobs.

I still can't figure out why we would do this. It is absolutely insane to add massive government spending, debt and regulatory burdens on a recessive economy, and why you would threaten to raise tax rates on people at the very time we need the entrepreneurial genius of the American people to grow this economy, create jobs and start to stabilize ourselves for the future and the international competition in this age of globalization.

Now, when I say it's insane, people say, Well, isn't that a little harsh? I say no. I'm 43. As I was growing up, we had a new book put in front of us in school. It was called Ecology. It had a nice picture of the world on it from outer space. I was like, Oh, this is nice. And in the course of learning about ecology, my generation, Generation X, was told that the greatest threat we faced wasn't the Soviet Union. I tended to disagree even at an early age. I was a bit precocious about the Russians.

They told me in my generation that we would freeze to death in the next ice age if we didn't reduce pollution. Flash forward. My wife and I, our children are in school. Today our children's generation is being told that unless the government regulates the economy and raises energy taxes, they will face a climate change in which global warming will destroy their way of life.

So we have gone from ice to fire, and yet the solution remains the same, oddly, from the proponents of the cap-and-tax legislation who say, We have to have government control of the weather, raise your energy taxes, dictate your lifestyle and devastate your jobs all so that we can prevent global warming. This from the people who told me there was an ice age coming.

□ 2115

That, to me, is not sane. That is not realistic. That is not based on science. That is based on ideology, and ideology applied to a nation at a struggling time leads to dire ramifications for the American people.

I want to show you the extreme to which this goes. When in the majority the Republican Party heard about the debt dangers the United States faced, especially debts from nations such as Communist China, I agree with that. Now that the Democratic majority and President Obama are racking up unprecedented levels of debt and unprecedented levels of spending, I want to show you what the Commerce Secretary said about cap-and-trade regulations in our relations with Communist China. This is from The Wall Street Journal, But yesterday, Commerce

Secretary Gary Locke said something amazing: U.S. consumers should pay for Chinese greenhouse gas emissions. You see, the Communist Chinese, in one of the ironies of life, are tending to protect their manufacturing base more than the free market—United States—from governmental intrusions, regulations, and taxation.

Now, what Mr. Locke, our Commerce Secretary, said was this. It's important that those who consume the products being made all around the world to the benefit of America. And it's our own consumption activity that's causing the emission of greenhouse gas. Americans need to pay for that.

I want you to think about this. After President Clinton signed the permanent normalization trade relations with Communist China, we in Michigan, before the rest of the country, started asking where are the jobs. Why is manufacturing in America hurting? Why is it going offshore? Where is it going? We knew where it was going. It was going to Communist China.

So we have a two-for here. We have the Commerce secretary saying that he doesn't seem to mind that the jobs are going over there and that what we really need to do is, if the United States decides to continue to pass legislation that impedes and impairs and harms its manufacturing base, not that we should seek fair trade with Communist China, but what we should do is borrow money from Communist China with interest to pay them for their greenhouse gas emissions to get them to adopt the very thing that American people do not want to adopt in America. I want you to think about this. I'm going to borrow money with interest from Communist Chinese to give to them so they can be environmentally sound.

Now, I do not understand why, given what happens to our party here in the House, why the Commerce Secretary did not say that the Communist China is the party of "no." And I think it would have been appropriate. But I also would not expect that from an administration whose vice president says we have to keep spending to keep from going bankrupt. I had no idea that that meant that not only would he spend the money here, he'd spend the money over in Communist China and borrow from them to give it back, leaving you, the American taxpayer, with the interest.

And it also would not be surprising to me from an administration who said we have to spread the wealth around. I don't think the President said quite how far he said he was going to spread your wealth. I don't remember him saying that that the world would be a better place in, we take U.S. taxpayer money, send it to Communist China to make red bureaucrats green. I would have liked to have heard that. I'm sure a lot of people would have liked to have heard that around October last year where their money was going to wind up, rather than announced now via the Commerce Secretary.

The frustration that the American people feel is that they realize our prosperity comes from the private sector, not the public sector. They understand that we do not want a radical cold-turkey shift from fossil fuels into some nebulous green energy future. What we want to see is maximum American energy production, common-sense conservation and free-market green technological innovations that will transition us into a more environmentally sound economy of the future.

What we see in an ideologically rife House, Senate, and administration is the opposite. They want to do cold turkey on fossil fuels and the existing economy and move us into a radical, and again, ill-defined green economy that in many ways—with the absence of nuclear and others—proves impossible to obtain in a reasonable period of time without doing more damage to a recessed economy.

I thank the gentleman from Tennessee for his time.

Mr. WAMP. I thank the gentleman from Michigan.

Before I yield time to the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. Speaker, can you tell me how much time we have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. I believe you have approximately 10 minutes.

Mr. WAMP. I just want to point out that I believe there are shared goals in the House, but there clearly is some great difference in the approaches again to these goals. And the problem with these two big issues that are pending before the American people is that they involve energy and health care. And energy is the one big issue that can bring us to our knees economically. We've seen that because of the price of oil, the availability of electricity can paralyze our economy, and frankly, the cost of this move is heavy, the price is high.

And that's why it is so important—really, the big issues in the world today clearly are water—it's a big issue around the world. It's going to be scarce, harder to come by, can create conflict. Energy is going to be scarce, hard to come by. We are all interested in air quality—and the environment is important—but there has to be a balance of regulation.

And then this issue of health. The American people do not want the government to get between their health care provider and themselves, particularly between the doctor-patient relationship. And I have to tell you this leap does that. And you don't see people leaving here to go to Canada and Great Britain now for their health care. It's the other way around because they've already gone on these systems that are being proposed here.

I want to come back before the bottom of the hour and talk about nuclear. But I want to yield to a member of the Commerce Committee, the gentleman from Louisiana who's brought great expertise to the Congress, is an energy production expert because of

the State that he comes from, and knows that we have to increase the energy capacity in order to maintain our competitiveness globally today in a global economy. We can't restrict our sources of energy and stay competitive.

Mr. SCALISE from Louisiana is recognized for such time as he may consume.

Mr. SCALISE. Well, I thank the gentleman from Tennessee. I appreciate your leadership on this issue and the fact that you are willing to come here tonight and talk about some of these challenges that our country's facing. And when you look across our country today, people are facing many challenges.

But I think what's even more concerning to people when they look here in Washington, and they look at what's happening in the Congress, and they look at what this administration is doing, I think it's frightening people across the country. The fact that they see these policies that are being proposed, and some of these policies that have actually passed. In January, when President Obama took the oath of office, one of his first steps was to pass this unprecedented spending bill that he called the stimulus bill and he rammed it through Congress, a bill that everybody knows that nobody that voted for the bill had time to read because they rammed it through so fast, because they said it needed to pass because it was going to stop unemployment from reaching 8 percent. Well, now we're at 9½ percent unemployment, and that number is climbing.

The problem is our deficit is climbing even higher. We exceeded a trillion dollars in deficit just a week ago. Unprecedented in our country's history. And people are looking at that and saying, Why is it that every American family is cutting back to manage and live within their means? State governments have been cutting their budgets to live within their means. Why is it that Washington and Congress, especially, is spending money out of control at a rate that is unprecedented, and it cannot be contained?

And then they look at the policies. And I think that's what's concerning people especially today. And they look at this crazy energy proposal, this cap-and-trade energy tax and this proposal to have a government takeover of our health care system. And clearly reforms need to be made to health care, but there is bipartisan agreement on a number of reforms that can be made to allow people to have the portability so if they move from one job to another, they can take their health care with them.

But a real competition in health care or address pre-existing conditions, there is bipartisan agreement on all of those issues. Not one of those is in the President's bill because he chose to go it alone. He said, I don't need to work with Republicans. And in fact, he's not even working with moderate Democrats. He's decided to go with the most

far extreme leftists that want to just have a government takeover of health care where, literally, a bureaucrat in Washington that's not elected, didn't even go through a Senate confirmation, can have the ability to tell you which doctor you can see or even if you can get an operation.

And we've seen the devastating results in countries like Canada, in England, where they've done the exact same thing. And now those people who have the means in those countries come to America to get health care. Because even with our flaws—and we've got flaws in our system that need to be worked out—but even with our flaws, we have the best medical care in the world. And yet they want to destroy that system by having a government take it over and then add \$800 billion of new taxes on the backs of American families.

And if that wasn't enough, that leads us into the topic that I know my friend from Tennessee really started off talking about, and that's energy. This cap-and-trade energy tax that actually passed this House, and I sit on the Energy and Commerce Committee and we debated that for weeks, and I strongly opposed their bill because their bill doesn't address the energy problems in our country. We don't have an energy policy in America. Imagine that. The greatest country in the history of the world, the most industrialized nation in the world, doesn't have a true energy policy. We've got the ability to create a comprehensive energy policy that actually eliminates our dependence on Middle Eastern oil. And we filed a bill.

Some people would lead you to believe there is no alternative out there. It's just this cap-and-trade energy tax or nothing.

Well, there is a different approach. There was an approach called the American Energy Act, which I'm proud to be a co-sponsor of. I know my friend from Tennessee is a cosponsor of. It's an all-of-the-above policy. It says yes, we should pursue those alternative sources of energy like wind and solar power. But unfortunately, those technologies aren't advanced enough yet. You can't run your car or house on wind or solar. You surely couldn't run a hospital on wind and solar because they're intermittent sources of energy, and so you need some other forms to keep power generating in this country. And so yes, you have coal production and we should advance the technologies to make clean coal technology.

But you also need advance nuclear power; nuclear power emits zero carbon. It's a zero carbon emission source of energy. Eighty percent of Europe is on nuclear power now. It wasn't on their bill. They discouraged it. We need to move towards those other alternatives.

We also need to recognize the existing types of energies we have in our country, and that's oil and natural gas.

It's also some of the new sources and technologies that we have, like these tar sands in the Midwest which right now are prohibited from being explored by Federal policy. In fact, if you go into the Gulf of Mexico, there are many areas there where there are huge reserves of oil and natural gas that are banned from even being explored.

I've taken a few Members out to the Gulf of Mexico a few weeks ago. We went out to the largest natural gas exploration facility in the country. It's called Independence Hub. Nine hundred million cubic feet of gas a day. Actually represents 2 percent of our entire country's natural gas needs. It's out there in the Gulf of Mexico, and they have greater capacity. In fact, we keep finding more and more reserves of natural gas every day. In north Louisiana, I'm proud to have gone out and visited the area in Shreveport, Louisiana, called Hainesville. Hainesville shale find is the largest new find of natural gas in our country's history. It was just found 3 years ago, and we continue to find more and more reserves like that.

So there are all kind of natural resources that our country can use, and yet Federal policy blocks it. And the only answer President Obama gives us is this cap-and-trade energy tax—which actually limits our ability to explore American resource of energy and gives greater power to those oil OPEC barons in Saudi Arabia and other countries in the Middle East that don't like our way of life. So we've got to get a comprehensive energy policy, and we've got to move away from this idea of taxing businesses, taxing families, raising electricity costs—which their bill does—and go to a policy that adopts a comprehensive, all-of-the-above approach.

So here at this time I'm going to yield back to my friend from Tennessee. But we're talking in the same week that Neil Armstrong and Buzz Aldrin and Collins landed on the Moon, the Apollo 11 mission. The 40th anniversary this week. I had the honor of meeting them. True American heroes. When I talked to Neil Armstrong earlier this week, what I told him was, What you did, what your crew did and what all of the NASA officials did, they inspired a Nation because they showed us what the greatness of America can be if we truly set our minds in a bipartisan way. And back then under President Kennedy when he said and set that objective that we were going to go to the Moon by the end of the 1960s, the entire country came together, Republicans and Democrats. We can do that again.

But President Obama's got to set aside the bipartisanship and this extreme radical policy, and we can get there.

□ 2130

Mr. WAMP. I thank the gentleman. As I close out our hour tonight, I want to say when the question is asked,

where are the jobs, if all of the applications pending right now before the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for nuclear plants were approved, that would be 17,500 permanent jobs and 62,000 construction jobs. Nuclear is maybe the single largest step towards stimulus, economic opportunity and global warming progress, all of those things that we need.

We can reprocess and recycle the spent fuel. This administration doesn't want to bury it in Yucca Mountain. They won the election. That's their prerogative. Let's move as France has, and Japan and other countries, towards taking the spent fuel and turning it back into energy. We can deal with this. We built 100 reactors in less than 20 years, and now we know so much more about it, if we said we were going to build another 100 reactors in the next 20 years, we would have a robust U.S. economy with new electricity capacity.

And when we bring on new capacity, we will lower the cost instead of increasing the cost. This regulatory cap-and-trade scheme increases the cost, reduces the supply, by definition, because we're going to need new electricity and energy capacity. So tonight we just close, Mr. Speaker, by saying that American innovation and entrepreneurship, free enterprise, can help solve these problems without the government burden.

#### THE PROGRESSIVE MESSAGE

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

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, what a pleasure it is to claim this hour, this Special Order, on behalf of the Congressional Progressive Caucus. The Congressional Progressive Caucus is the body of Members of Congress who believe that we're all better off together than we are separated and apart. We believe that we need a mixed economy, in which, yes, people are entitled to pursue their private dreams and make their money, but also there are certain things that we should do together, things like take care of the water, things like provide for transportation, things like provide for education and things like health care.

The Progressive Caucus is the body of people here in the Congress who stand by the idea that the civil rights movement was a great moment in American history, that FDR and the New Deal was another great moment in American history and that the steps forward to end slavery was a great moment in American history.

And yet the greatest moments of American history have not yet been written but are really still in front of us. We still have more people to bring into the ambit, bring into the embrace of this great American ideal, the progressive ideal, this idea that America