

and said, Work with me. I have a going business. I have issues. I will get my money and I will pay you. And they said, Sorry, Charlie.

□ 2115

Now what's wrong with this picture? What should an average person back in their living room, back home, if they're watching this, think, that we've got special treatment for a man who comes from Goldman Sachs—is that where he came from?

Mr. GOHMERT. Well, he didn't. But he had been the former Chair of the Federal Reserve, which is an elected position by the bankers of that area.

Mr. CARTER. He originally was in Goldman Sachs, wasn't he? I think everybody who has been Treasurer for the last, I don't know, 20 years have been Goldman Sachs people. There's something interesting there, something we ought to look into.

Anyway, I want to know why Mr. de la Torre can't write "Geithner Rule" across his tax return and ask them to treat him this way, to let him be assessed with no penalties and interest which would drive him into the poorhouse. This is the kind of question I think the American people want to ask. I think they want to know, because the man they elected President said that he wasn't going to have a world where men and women of power got treated differently than ordinary citizens. That's why we are here. We're here fighting a good fight for what President Obama had promised this Nation would be the agenda of this administration. I think it's time to step up to the plate and start swinging because these fastballs are getting thrown at us. They are coming in high, hard and inside, and we've got to deal with them. With that, I will yield back to Mr. GOHMERT.

Mr. GOHMERT. Well, in conclusion, I think there's nothing that says it better than President Obama did back on February 3, 2009: "I don't want to send a message to the American people that there are two sets of standards—one for powerful people, and one for ordinary folks who are working every day and paying their taxes."

Well, unfortunately that is exactly the message that's being sent as the Federal Government and the cronies that have surrounded this administration—they're getting away with all kinds of stuff, getting away with not paying taxes, not paying penalties. They're not producing jobs. They're killing jobs. Mr. de la Torre has a regal heritage. He was proud of that. He is a man of integrity. He wants to do what's right. Those are the kinds of people that make America great, and that is who deserves special treatment, not those who are parasites on the system.

#### THE 30-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP'S HEALTH CARE AND ENERGY HOUR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of Jan-

uary 6, 2009, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to be here. I will be joined shortly by a colleague of mine from Ohio (Mr. BOCCIERI) and maybe several others to talk about a variety of issues that I think are pressing the country right now and that we want to inform our constituents about and speak to the House of Representatives about. You know, I think it's important for us—and I think every time I've been on the floor in the past year or two, I follow some of our Republican colleagues, and I feel the need to just kind of clarify the record as to how we ended up getting to the spot we're at now.

I realize that in a democracy like this, we always have the opportunity to criticize each other, and I think that the beautiful thing about this democracy is that, you know, we do have the opportunity to come to the floor of the House of Representatives and speak directly to the American people, live on TV, live to all of our other colleagues, and speak in a way that is pretty straightforward. That's a beautiful thing about this country. But if we look at where we are today, and if we look at where we were just 7 or 8 months ago, our economy was on the brink of collapse. Unemployment rates were climbing at unprecedented rates, where we were losing 600,000, 700,000 jobs a month. The stock market had crashed. The housing market had crashed. Our budget deficit just ballooned. And all of this was because of the policies, Mr. Speaker, that we had in this country from 2000 to 2008.

And if it weren't for an election in 2006, we would have went further over the cliff. Those are the facts of the matter, and the facts of the matter are that during that time, the House, the Senate, the White House were all controlled by Republicans. And we got the Milton Friedman, supply-side, Ronald Reagan, cut taxes for the wealthiest 1 percent of the people in the country and hope that health care would get fixed, energy would get fixed, and the economy would get fixed, and then people would get jobs at some point.

Well, it's important for all of us to recognize that we don't have to go to some theoretical schoolbook to figure out if the supply side Republican neoconservative domestic and foreign policy program works. It has been implemented, and it has been an absolute failure on all accounts, by all measures. Our friends on the Republican side now who say, Oh, my God, this health care bill that the Democrats are trying to push is going to cost \$800 billion, \$900 billion over 10 years. But it's important for us to recognize that it was the Bush tax cuts, that went to primarily the top 1 percent of the people in the country, that cost \$2.5 trillion over 10 years. So don't come to us about a health care bill that costs \$800 billion or \$900 billion, that would end

up saving the country a bunch of money in the long run, end up fixing the health care problem, because you were the ones and they were the ones, Mr. Speaker, who were walking in lockstep, following George Bush right over the cliff, \$2.5 trillion in tax cuts, primarily to the top 1 percent over 10 years, bankrupted the country.

Now all of a sudden everybody's concerned about the budget deficit. All of a sudden, everyone's concerned about borrowing money from China. What we're saying is, the investments that we are going to make are going to stop health care projections from growing at 9 percent a year and try to bring some justice to the system so that average people can afford health care, so that average people don't get sick and then try to go get health care and an insurance company says, We can't cover you. You have cancer. But my cancer's fixed, the patient says. But it hasn't been gone for 10 years, so we can't cover you.

Or when we attempt to change the energy policy in this country—which my friend Mr. BOCCIERI has become an expert on because of his position in the military and his recognition of this as a national security issue—when we send \$750 billion a year from the United States of America to Middle Eastern countries and foreign countries to buy oil—countries who don't traditionally support our views, our values or our Democratic principles—we send this every year to them, money that goes out of our economy into these OPEC countries. Then a couple of years ago, Mr. BOCCIERI, we spent \$115 billion or \$120 billion out of our defense bill to escort Exxon-Mobil ships and big oil ships, coming into and out of the Persian Gulf.

So all these tea baggers who want to stand up like they're the most patriotic people in the United States of America are saying, We shouldn't change our energy policy. We should just continue sending \$115 billion a year out of our defense budget to escort these big oil ships in and out of the Persian Gulf. Is that pro-American? I don't believe it is. Is it pro-American to allow health care to grow at 9 percent when our GDP grows at 3 percent so that insurance companies can make money hand over fist and deny American citizens coverage?

I'm going to ask you a question: Where are the family values there, Mr. Speaker? That we want the government out. The only entity left to protect people who are getting screwed to the wall by the insurance companies is the government. We need to make rules to make sure that these people, these insurance companies stop hurting people. They're hurting people.

Now I'm sorry, but we had to listen all August about all this nonsense that's going on. In Ohio's 17th Congressional District, we will have 1,600 families go bankrupt next year if we do absolutely nothing about health care. Now I'm sorry. That's not right. And if

we have to act and maybe take on the insurance companies, then so be it. Let's clean this up, what's happened in this Congress and with this new President over the last 7 or 8 months, let's clean this whole thing up.

We've taken on the big oil companies. We're taking on the big insurance companies. We're taking on the big pharmaceutical companies. Today we extended unemployment benefits for another 13 weeks so that average people who can't find a job will have a little peace of mind for 13 more weeks. That's what we've been doing. Our policies have been clear, Mr. BOCCIERI. We're not hiding behind them. We're trying to reduce our dependency on foreign oil, bring that investment back to the United States, take money out of the hands of the insurance companies, bring it back to the average people so that they have better health care, and transform our country, get us ready to go.

We recognize that there are going to be some powerful interests that aren't going to be for this. But tough. Tough. You can't make money on the backs of human beings, of American citizens, and think it's okay because it's not. And we are going to do something about it. You can scream and yell. I want to just ask one question. These people talk about, where's our liberty, where's our freedom? Well, first of all, we're giving you more choice in your health care. But where's our liberty? Where's the liberty and where's the freedom of the United States citizen that's sick and can't get health care? How free of a citizen are you? You're not free at all because you're sick. You're in your home. You're in a hospital. You're in a nursing home. There's no freedom there. So you can talk freedom all you want.

I stood at the Canfield Fair, the biggest fair in Ohio, for 4 hours. For 4 hours I talked to every single person that came by that wanted to chat, and I had two people in 4 hours tell me they were against health care reform. Some wanted some clarification, some wanted to know exactly what was going on. But the people were for it. If we pass this, the people are going to recognize that we wanted the reform, the people voted for the reform, and the people got the reform.

I yield to my friend from Canton, home of the Football Hall of Fame, the National First Ladies' Library.

Mr. BOCCIERI. There's no question. Congressman RYAN has been a mainstay for supporting those types of projects throughout Ohio in his position on the Appropriations Committee. Congressman RYAN and I both came up together in the legislature. We cut our teeth together in the State capital, and now we're in Washington, trying to fight for our part of Ohio, to move our State and to move our country forward.

The gentleman from Niles is correct that the two largest issues that confound our economy, confound our Na-

tion and really threaten our long-term competitiveness as a Nation are energy and health care. Energy and the fact that we bring more oil to the United States than any other country: 66.4 percent of our oil is imported from overseas, 40 percent comes from the Middle East alone. I talk to my friends who are still serving in the military in the Persian Gulf right now, and we often chat. I remind them of what we did as a country, the Greatest Generation, back in 1944 when we bombed the remaining Ploesti oil fields and we effectively cut off the German supply of oil. And they quickly transitioned to a synthetic fuel which is a derivative of coal.

Ohio has a lot of coal. And we know that right now, the single-largest user of energy in the United States is the Department of Defense. This is a matter of national security, and this Congress stood up and took bold initiative to take on the big powerful special interest groups that always challenge us and act as barriers to passing good, sound public policy. It is about time we put America first, and it's about time we put the American people first, and we put the special interests on the back burner, because we can no longer continue to operate the way we've been doing.

We've seen what happens when we have an administration that really doesn't reflect on the amount of money that we're spending and the amount of money we're borrowing from overseas interests, doesn't reflect on the amount of oil and the amount of energy that we bring in from different countries. This is about putting America first. The gentleman is right; health care is affecting our long-term competitiveness as a Nation. I can't go to any small business in the 16th Congressional District of Ohio or any large business, for that matter, and every governmental agency from the most local to the most Federal, has said the fastest-growing line item of their expenditure sheet is health care costs.

□ 2130

We know we spent \$2.5 trillion every year on health care. There was an article, Congressman RYAN, that came out at the beginning of this year in the spring, and it said that one-third of that \$2.5 trillion never reaches the doctors or patients. It's lost somewhere in the administration of the system, in the delivery of health care. So we're losing almost a trillion dollars in inefficient practices. And when you start peeling back that onion, really, quite frankly, where the fingers meet the onion, when you start peeling back that onion, you find out that insurance companies have over 15 percent administrative costs, administrative costs of 15 percent.

I went back and spoke to some of my doctors, and it may shock some of the folks who are listening tonight, but I've got to tell you they said the most efficient payer out there is Medicare.

Medicare, with 3 percent, 3 percent overhead costs.

There was a study that came out last year, Congressman RYAN and Mr. Speaker, that said that \$84 billion is spent every year to block, deny, and screen people from seeing their doctor by the insurance companies, when it will only cost \$77 billion to cover all those uninsured and underinsured people in our country. It would actually be cheaper. Keep the \$77 billion, insure everybody, make sure that they have access. Let's help reduce our costs in the long run. That is sound public policy.

Now I agree with what Congressman RYAN has said when he stood at his county fair in his district, that folks are concerned about the fact that this is going to be some encroachment on their own health care policy. Look, government has the role of setting the goalposts, of setting the out-of-bounds markers, of letting the free market act in between, but act as a good referee. When someone goes out of bounds, you throw the flag. And we ought to throw the flag right now, because we have citizens in this country who are being denied access to health care because they were sick before they got a new job, and to me, that makes absolutely no sense.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Reclaiming my time, I think it's important because we tell our seniors and they hear that there are going to be all of these cuts in Medicare. There's going to be savings in Medicare. There's actually going to be an increase in the benefits.

I want to say two things, one about part D, which is the drug program. Right now if you qualify for Medicare and then you get part D up to like about \$2,700, you're covered, and then coverage for your prescription drugs completely falls off and then it picks back up at \$5,000 or so. I got a letter from a doctor in Warren or Howland that said, I have a patient. She used up all her \$2,700. She now fell into the doughnut hole, so they had to change the drug that she had. I think it was diabetes. It was a diabetes drug. They had to change the prescription. They changed it after she got into the doughnut hole because they had to go to a cheaper drug. There was a reaction because of the change. They changed it again, changed it again. She ends up in the hospital.

So what we're trying to say is by filling in this doughnut hole and paying just in this one instance, this woman, covering her for another thousand dollars or two would have saved the Medicare program thousands of dollars because she went from not qualifying anymore for part D, falling into the doughnut hole, to into the hospital.

Now, let's use, as my grandmother used to say, our "medulla abingatta," the Italian version. But let's use our brains. This makes no sense what we're doing here. It makes no sense and it's hurtful to the patient and it wastes money.

But one of the main ways how we're going to save money and start to bend

the cost curve on Medicare is in areas especially like ours in northeast Ohio, Pennsylvania, Indiana, Michigan, the older industrial States, we have people 50, 55 years old and they lose their job. So they lose their health care or they just lost their health care and they keep their job. We had a lady on one of our telephone town halls who kept her job and lost her health care, 60 years old.

So when you're 60 or 55, you start saying, I don't know if I can really get insurance or afford it, so I'm going to wait this sucker out. I'm going to wait until I get into Medicare because they'll pay for it and then I'll be good. I can maybe get a supplemental, but most of it will be covered. So we have a population of Americans who are getting into the Medicare program sicker than they need to be and sometimes chronically, which is really driving up the cost of Medicare.

So what we're saying is we're paying for these people anyway because they're going into the Medicare program. But if we want to save money, wouldn't it be smarter to make sure that these people have some basic health care before they get into Medicare, because it will save us money because they'll get preventative care. They may not have cancer as bad. They may catch breast cancer early or cervical cancer early or prostate cancer early as opposed to letting it develop and then getting dumped into the Medicare program and costing everybody a bunch of money. This is basic ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure.

Mr. BOCCIERI. The gentleman is correct. I've seen more and more constituents coming into our office suggesting that they had health care insurance, that they had good private insurance, but when they got into that age group of 62 to 65, seemingly they were pushed off and pushed into the Medicare system, the government-run program, if you will, the Medicare system.

To me, I think your insurance policy is something that you and your employer pay into for all these years, and then all of a sudden when you get to the age of where our seniors are when you're going to have to rely more and more on a very good health insurance program that you're going to be using it more because you may become ill or have to use it to see your doctor more often, this is the time when they push you into the Medicare program. Now, you should have some ownership of that policy. It should amount to something, as an annuity, or you should have some ownership like a whole life policy.

But more than that, we ought to focus on what the guideposts are in this public policy debate on where we go with health care, Congressman RYAN. And I have always talked about, when I cross my district, the six Ps of health care. The first P is to make sure that all people have access to health care insurance. All people have access to health care insurance.

I don't know if you know this, but in 2004 our Secretary of Health and Human Services, Tommy Thompson, flew to Iraq with one of many billion dollar checks in hand to make sure that every man, woman, and child in Iraq had universal health care coverage. So while Americans are sending their tax money to Washington so that we can send it to Iraq to make sure that when Iraqis get sick they can see their doctor, and I have constituents showing up in my district who say they can't see their doctor because of being denied because of a preexisting condition, something's got to change. We need to have this debate, Congressman RYAN, and that's why all people need to have access to affordable health care coverage.

The second P is to make sure we have portability in our system. That factory worker in Canton, Ohio, that gets a pink slip, their health care effectively ends when they get that pink slip because they cannot afford the COBRA premiums, oftentimes as much as their own salary, to pay for coverage while they're unemployed or looking for another job. So they oftentimes go without health care. But if they were a diabetic and got rehired at another factory or another company, well, guess what. They're not going to have access to health care because they have a preexisting condition now. And when they have to show up at the hospital emergency room because they had no health care insurance in that time when they were unemployed or looking for new work, they cost all of us in the system five times more, and that's why we need portability and we need to end this practice of preexisting conditions.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Can I make a point on your second P there?

When you talk to people, when you talk to educators that are talking to our kids that are going to high school, going to college, guidance counselors, what they tell these kids today is that you are going to have seven, eight, nine, ten different jobs throughout the course of your life. You need to have skills that are mobile because it's not going to be like the 1960s where you're going to go to a General Motors factory or you're going to go to Youngstown Sheet and Tube and you're going to work there for 40 years, get a retirement and you're done. It's over. You work for one employer your whole life. Our educators are telling our kids how many different jobs they're going to have to have.

So does it make any sense to have a health care system that locks people into their employment because they have a spouse or they have a condition that some insurance company, some jerk that a doctor calls up to try to get coverage and the person at the insurance company says, Nope, sorry, we don't cover that? Well, it's in my policy. Sorry, we don't cover that. You are preventing people from going out and starting businesses because they're afraid they can't get any health care

coverage. You're locking people into work that they may not like or enjoy when they have another opportunity elsewhere but they know they can't move because of this.

The health care system needs to reflect the dynamism of the economy, and it doesn't now. So it's stifling creativity at a time where we need people to be out creating jobs and creating work.

Mr. BOCCIERI. That's correct. So making sure that all people have access to health insurance, making sure that we end this discriminatory practice of preexisting conditions, and making sure that we have portability in our system so that workers can take their health care from job to job without any interruptions or without any distortions in their coverage.

The fourth P is to make sure that physicians, physicians, not bean counters or bureaucrats, are making the calls for health care.

I had a woman show up in my office. She was crying. She was a middle class worker, showed that she had this condition and the doctor said that she needed to get an MRI. She knew she was going to have to pay some out-of-pocket expenses, so she went to her health care provider, her private insurance company, and they said, No, we don't want you to get an MRI. We want you to do therapy. So she went and did therapy, went back to her doctor with the results, and the doctor said, No, we need an MRI. She went back to her insurance company, and they said, No, you're going to do an X-ray, not an MRI.

Now, to me, Congressman RYAN, that sounds like rationing of health care. Rationing of health care. Some bean counter at an insurance company somewhere is telling this person in my district what type of health care she can get. One out of every five individuals that asks to get some sort of health care coverage or some treatment is being denied by an insurance company, and that needs to be corrected. We don't need bean counters or bureaucrats deciding who is going to get health care. Physicians need to make that call.

The fifth P is about prevention. And Congressman RYAN was a stellar, stellar athlete back in his day, could throw the football a mile.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Keep talking.

Mr. BOCCIERI. He was a good athlete. And we know that prevention is worth so much. For every \$1 that we spend on prevention, we can get, on average, and this is a conservative estimate, \$3 in return. Prevention, living right, eating right, exercise, diet, and nutrition to help correct these chronic diseases like diabetes, heart disease, and asthma that costs 75 cents out of every health care dollar that we spend, prevention should be a big part of this discussion.

Am I right?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Exactly. And right now we spend four cents of every

health care dollar on prevention when we know that's the big saver.

But there's a point that we all need to remember. We are fighting for the public option and whatever. Some people are for it, some aren't. I don't know if it will be in. Who knows. But we have to remember that if we have everybody covered and everybody is going to be covered by primarily private insurance, then the whole dynamic of the system changes. So we say to the insurance companies, as you said, and I like that analogy that we set the ground rules basically. And States regulate insurance now, so we're going to say, Here's the goal line. Here's the end zone. Here are the goalposts. Here are the rules. And the rules that we want to change are that you can't be denied because you have a pre-existing condition. If you have diabetes, heart disease, the insurance company has still got to cover you. There will be a cap on how much you can spend a year so you're not going to go bankrupt over a health care crisis.

□ 2145

But the dynamic that changes when every single person can have health care insurance and the insurance companies have to cover you where they can't shake you any more, because now the insurance companies are spending money saying let me see what you've got, and I shouldn't have called somebody a jerk because they are just trying to make a living, and so I apologize for that. But you call up and the game now is the insurance company tells you, sorry, you have a preexisting condition. They spend money hiring bureaucrats within their organization to deny people coverage.

But this all changes if now I am the insurance company and I have to cover you. So now all of a sudden it is in my interest to make you well. So I'm going to spend money and time and energy and effort working with your employer, creating incentives for you to go work out, stop smoking, do things that are going to reduce your stress level, because I know stress is a killer. I am going to do things from an insurance company perspective to make you healthier. That is something that we have failed to talk about.

Once everybody is covered and we all get married to our insurance company and they can't get rid of us, their incentive changes from denying you coverage and getting rid of you to making you healthy. That is part of this whole preventive thing that you are talking about.

Mr. BOCCIERI. That is a good distinction, Mr. RYAN.

Mr. Speaker, when you enact a policy that helps people live healthier, live longer with screenings—and I had someone in my district argue with me, that is going to cost money over the long run, enacting provisions that are going to require people to be screened. I argued with them that I believe if we let that go to a point where they have

prostate cancer or some chronic disease that could have been prevented with early intervention, that is costing more money at the back end. That is not what this should be about. This should be about catching diseases early. It will help spawn research, in my opinion.

The last "P" is probably the most significant, Mr. Speaker. I believe this is where perhaps some of my colleagues and I disagree. I will tell you that the last "P" is, How do we pay for this? How do we pay for this? We know, as Congressman RYAN said, there is a cost of doing nothing and then there is a cost of doing something. The cost of doing something should be enacting a public policy that takes money out of the system. We spend more than any industrialized country on health care, \$2.5 trillion. It is almost 20 percent of our gross national product, more than any industrialized country. And yet we have nearly a trillion dollars of inefficient, wasted, bloated bureaucracy from bean counters, and even the government can be to blame as well.

We have to find every efficiency we can within that system, draw that money out, and find a way to pay for these reforms. That's where I think the rubber meets the road in this debate, finding money within the system, taking every last dime out of an inefficient system and making it work for the American people, making it work for those people who go without health care insurance and worry every day, who are one accident, one medical emergency, one diagnosis away from complete, utter bankruptcy. And that has to change.

We have a responsibility to set the goal posts, to set the out-of-bound marker, let the free market operate in between, and throw the flag when we see a flagrant violation. And it is flagrant when we deny people health care because of a preexisting condition. It is flagrant when we don't allow people to take their health care from job to job. It is flagrant when we allow bean counters and bureaucrats to provide a prescription of health care rather than letting the physician do it. It is a flagrant foul when we don't enact some sort of prevention, some sort of ability that all people are going to have access to some preventive care; when we spend 4 cents out of every dollar on prevention, and then end up spending 75 cents out of every dollar on chronic diseases that can be managed like diabetes, asthma and heart disease. Those things can save us money with the right public policy.

This should be the framework of our debate as we go forward.

You know, Congressman RYAN, this is not a Democrat or a Republican issue or challenge. This is not a conservative or liberal challenge; this is an American challenge. And energy and health care deserve American solutions. So we are waiting for our friends on the other side of the aisle to come to the table and offer us solutions on how we fix this American problem.

We can do this. America is much stronger than the challenges that confront us. We find our strength in challenges. We do these things not because they are easy but because they are hard, as John Kennedy said. That is where America has always found her strength.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Part of this prevention component is training our physicians in a way, first and foremost, having policies, and part of the rules of the game need to be making sure that physicians don't have to practice defensive medicine. That is one thing. Another is to make sure that our physicians are trained. The average physician spends 7 minutes with a patient. I think there are a lot of ways in which physicians can stop spending a lot of money on things that maybe they see as an opportunity that they need to cover their own rear ends, but also to spend some time and figure out that people have life-style issues that need to be changed. And that doctor and that patient should both be rewarded for improving their health.

That is in this bill to make sure that you are not just getting rewarded for the tests that you run and paid for the tests that you run, but you are getting paid for making sure that the patient is healthier, comes less often, and doesn't come back to the hospital. All of these are incentives built into the system.

But let's look at energy and health care in America in 2009.

I think it is important for us to recognize that it may be easy to go over, Mr. Speaker, and bury our heads in the sand; and if you look at what our friends did when they were in control here, they basically continued to subsidize Big Oil to the tune of a couple of years ago \$117 billion to protect Persian Gulf ships coming in and out of the Persian Gulf. So our carriers and our battleships are protecting these oil ships coming in and out of the Persian Gulf. Our money. So let's look at this.

If we want to be competitive in the 21st century, we need to get that investment, that \$750 billion that is going to these oil-producing countries, and get it back invested into coal, nuclear, drilling in America, oil shale, algae, the whole nine yards. Instead of the investment being somewhere else, we want the investment here. Instead of hiring oil workers in Saudi Arabia, we want them hiring coal workers in Ohio. And the technology in Ohio, the scrubbers and everything else getting manufactured in Ohio.

So you take the energy investment back into the United States. You take all of the venture capitalists that sit in my office and say that they want to put money into this and that, private money, you take the energy money, \$180 billion that we are putting into coal in the energy bill that passed here, along with a health care bill that will reduce costs for small businesses and allow them to reinvest back into their business, you have the recipe and the

strategy for long-term economic growth.

I know that may be hard to believe; but some of our friends, who will remain nameless, supported policies that said if we cut taxes for the top 1 percent, that that will lead to long-term economic growth. That if we deregulate Wall Street, that will lead to long-term economic growth. And all those things did was lead to an economic collapse that if we didn't have the social programs from the Great Depression in place, that would have led to the Great Depression, the second Great Depression in the United States.

So, fortunately, we have moved off that track into a track of responsibility, sound fiscal policy, sound investments in the future, and a strategy to let businesses grow as we reduce their health care cost burden.

Mr. BOCCIERI. The gentleman is correct: the two largest issues that confront our United States economy are health care and energy. This Chamber took bold action in trying to craft, in attempting to craft, a national energy policy that makes sense for our country. Energy efficiencies.

You know, I had a hospital in my district, Mercy Hospital, that put some variable-speed fans in and carbon dioxide detectors. When you walk into a room, the lights will turn on when someone starts breathing. These types of efficiencies are saving them a million dollars a year, a million dollars every year. That is the type of efficiencies that we need with a national energy policy because we know that the cheapest energy is the energy that we never use.

We passed an energy policy that moves away from our dependence on foreign oil and focuses on creating alternative forms of energy and in the long term creates jobs here in our country and increases our national security.

One day we roll into a fuel station and have a choice between traditional gasoline, biofuels, ethanol, plug in our electric hybrid, or maybe drive by the gas station altogether because we have a fuel cell that allows us to get 100 miles to the gallon that was researched right in our part of Ohio. That is the type of choice and diversity that we need to make our country stronger.

Or how about investing in alternative forms of energy, like what is happening in the 16th district, not only fuel cells and electric plug-in hybrids; and at the Ohio State Ag Research and Development Center in Wayne County, we are researching these anaerobic digesters and making compressed natural gas out of our own waste and selling it back to the grid. This is the type of innovation that will make America stronger in the long term and increase our national security.

Congressman RYAN and I have talked about this often, the fact that 80 percent of the world's oil reserves are in the hands of governments and their respective national companies. Sixteen

of the world's largest 20 companies are state owned. State owned. And when we import 66.4 percent of our oil from overseas, and 40 percent from the Middle East. We know that makes our country vulnerable, very vulnerable. Knowing that if we just put 27 percent of the vehicles on the road today, if they were these gas electric hybrids like the Toyota Prius or the Ford Escape, we could end our dependency on oil from the Middle East.

That is the type of energy policy we need; but yet we have big special interests here in Washington and around the country that are trying to prevent this from being enacted, a national energy policy that is about national security and creating jobs in our country, moving away from our dependence on foreign oil.

We know that the amounts of alternative energy our Nation is able to produce are only limited by the amount of energy we are willing to invest here in Washington and across the 50 States of our great country.

Now this bill, the American Clean Energy and Security Act, gets a lot of attention, but not for that name, Congressman RYAN, but for the name of cap-and-trade. Cap-and-trade.

We heard from two court cases at the end of last year the fact that the EPA was going to regulate emissions, and we decided in the House we were going to allow a free-market approach to handle this rather than have the United States EPA regulate emissions in this country. That is going to make our American businesses stronger, by allowing the Midwest innovation to drive this instead of our dependence on foreign oil. The innovation of America is going to drive our future progress in this realm.

But let's revisit what some of our colleagues have said about the cap-and-trade system, as they like to call this new energy solution that we are going to find for our country. It is about cap-and-trade, as JOHN MCCAIN has said. There will be incentives for people to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. It is a free-market approach. Let me repeat that, Congressman RYAN: it is a free-market approach. The Europeans are doing it. We did it in the case of addressing acid rain. If we do that, we will stimulate green technologies. There will be profit-making in the business arena. It won't cost the American taxpayer.

□ 2200

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. This really works. The Republican Presidential candidate last year introduced a cap-and-trade bill three times in the United States Congress because he believes it's a free market approach and that it won't cost the American taxpayers.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I had an interesting conversation with someone from

Babcock the other day. They're in Barberton, Ohio. They're in your district, Congressman. They do a lot of defense work and a lot of work with the military.

I asked the guy, What portion of your employers work on these kinds of "green" technologies?

He said that half of their workers are employed, the engineers and other workers, on the issues of cleaning up the air—the scrubbers—the technology that goes into power plants and into other facilities to help clean some of the poison out of the air that was causing all kinds of health problems.

There are industries that pop up to clean the air. These are economic development opportunities. Now, that \$750 billion that goes abroad will come back to the United States. The money will be invested into windmills, into solar panels, into batteries, into new autos, into all kinds of different things.

The other day, we were in Kent, at Alpha Micron. They're making a liquid crystal-based technology that is film on windows. It darkens when the sun comes out to keep the house cool in the summertime. They just opened up a manufacturing facility in Kent, Ohio. They have 45 people working there now. Once this product catches on, there will be hundreds of people working there, making this special liquid crystal technology film that will be going into the homes to conserve energy.

The economy will adapt. People will find ways to make money and to make profits off of these things. Yet, when you go to the gas tank, you might as well send the check to the OPEC countries. Now, let's be honest with each other. What we're saying is, when you stop at a gas station or whatever kind of station there's going to be in the next decade or two, we want that money staying in Ohio—in the Midwest, in America. So you send the \$750 billion off. Then you pay your tax bill at the end of the year, and you send money to the Federal Government. Then you find out that the Defense Department is sending \$120 billion of your tax dollars to escort oil ships that are going in and out of the Persian Gulf.

Does this make any sense to anybody? This makes no sense what we're doing here. We've got to stop it. Then we send subsidies to the oil companies so that they can keep going. This doesn't make any sense. I'm sorry. I don't know any other way to say it. We need to stop doing this. It's going to have some disruption, and everyone is going to have to figure this out, but we have smoothed this over for over 20 years, and no one is jamming this down anybody's throat.

These manufacturing facilities have all kinds of credits. We're holding harmless a lot of manufacturers, a lot of consumers. We'll see infinitesimal increases 10 years from now. It may be \$100 a year, but the benefit is that \$750 billion is going to come back to the United States and is going to get invested here. The Defense Department

won't be spending money escorting oil ships in and out of the Persian Gulf.

I mean let's stop this. This is insane. It doesn't make any sense. It's wasting all kinds of money. It's polluting the air. It's empowering countries that are on sand. Then they hate America, and we get tangled in all of these geopolitical problems that we don't need to be involved in. Let's invest the money back into the United States. I mean, do you want to talk about a pro-American position? There couldn't be a bigger one. You know that. You've been to Iraq four times, five times.

This young man has flown in and out of here. By "young," I mean 5 years older than I, but he has flown in and out. He has flown soldiers back over here who have died while serving their country, and he's saying we can't keep doing this. JOHN MCCAIN, who served the country so nobly, said the same thing, that we can't keep doing this. Stop. That's what this is about.

It's about leadership. It's not about just going down the same road and about doing what's comfortable. That doesn't get you anywhere. This is about leading. There is going to be a transition; but at the end of the day, you're going to provide a safer country for your kids, a less entangled geopolitical situation for our country, and you're going to create jobs in the United States. This is a win-win-win.

Mr. BOCCIERI, Congressman, if you would yield, just yesterday, we had wonderful news in the 16th Congressional District. Rolls-Royce is anchoring its world headquarters for fuel-cell research in our part of Ohio. The robust research that they're doing on fuel cells is going to be anchored in our part of Ohio because we're beginning to take action where there was none previously. Let me just say this:

Quite frankly, I believe that we will be judged in next year's elections by two measures—whether we acted or whether we did not, by action or inaction. Teddy Roosevelt said that the worst thing you can do in a moment of decision is nothing, and we know that the status quo is unsustainable with an energy policy in this country which continues to empower petro dictators who hold America hostage by our importing 66.4 percent of oil from around the world. We're going to expand drilling in the United States here. We know that this will not be the answer to all of our energy woes here because we only have 3 percent of the world's oil reserves in the Northern Hemisphere, but we consume 24 percent of the world's oil, so we've got to find diversity. We've got to find a way to become diverse Americans in our energy consumption, which will be by investing in these alternative energies. Whether it's switchgrass or algae or whether it's ethanol or biofuels or whether it's fuel cells, we've got to make this transition now because it is about our national security.

So, next year, when we go before the voters, when we go before our citizens

and our constituents, they are going to ask us: Did you act to make America stronger?

All of us know we have relatives and friends, and friends of mine, who are still serving over in the Middle East right now. We are there, fighting for countries that provide us a whole lot of oil. In fact, 40 percent of our oil comes from the Middle East. Like Rudolph Giuliani said last year, if 27 percent of the vehicles on the roads were gas-electric hybrids like the Toyota Prius or the Ford Escape, we could end our dependency on oil in the Middle East. That is a goal we should all strive towards.

Rudolph Giuliani said that we need to expand the use of hybrid vehicles and of clean coal—\$324 million of research in clean coal in Ohio every year, Congressman RYAN, and in carbon sequestration. We have more coal reserves in the United States than we have oil reserves in Saudi Arabia. This should be a major national project. Let me echo that again in this Chamber. This should be a major national project. This is a matter of our national security. We've got to act, Congressman RYAN.

Now, I graduated with a baseball degree, and I minored in economics in college, but let me tell you this: In 2003, our former President said this about a Department of Defense study: The risk of abrupt climate change should be elevated beyond a scientific debate to a U.S. national security concern. The Department of Defense was saying this under our previous President.

He also said that the economic disruptions associated with global climate change are projected by the CIA and by other intelligence experts to place increased pressure on weak nations that may be unable to provide the basic needs and to maintain order for their citizens.

We've got our CIA saying this. We have our Department of Defense saying this. We've got every candidate running for President last year saying this is a matter of national security. What did we have? We had a vote along partisan lines.

National security is about America. It's not a Democrat or Republican challenge. It's not a conservative or a liberal challenge. It's about making America stronger. When we invest in ourselves, we will become stronger. This is about our future and about our children's future. It's about creating jobs here in Ohio, Congressman RYAN, like we did with Rolls-Royce and like we will do with so many others that are beginning this burgeoning industry.

□ 2210

Having a diversity of energy, we should all agree, is going to make our country stronger. And these two long-term challenges of health care and of energy should be national projects, national projects that make our country

stronger and protect our national security in the long run.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. The thing is, too, with this manufacturing, this green manufacturing, we have Thomas Steel in Warren, Ohio, is now making the specialty steel. About 300 steelworkers signed a contract with a solar panel company from Toledo, a very exciting proposition, because when the solar panel industry takes off, a local steel company in Warren, Ohio, with United Steelworkers of America that have good health care benefits and a decent pension are going to benefit from this.

And the more solar panels happen, the more steel they are going to buy from Warren, Ohio, the more steelworkers that are going to go to work. Ohio Star Forge on Mahoning Avenue, they make a bearing that goes into the windmill, 4,000 component parts. No, 8,000, 8,000 component parts that go in the windmill. That's what we do.

Does anyone else have a better idea how to revive manufacturing in the United States of America than to have us supplying 8,000 component parts and 400 tons of steel that go into a windmill? Does anyone have anything better? Cut taxes for the rich people and hope it trickles down? That's not a manufacturing policy in the United States of America.

But what we are doing here with the Volt at General Motors, with the new battery storage, the hybrids, we drove in a car the other day, Congressman INSLEE and ISRAEL and I, that went from California to Washington, D.C., on algae, on algae. Do you know how you grow the algae? You pump a bunch of CO<sub>2</sub> in it and it grows the algae.

So here you have an opportunity to learn, make cars that run on algae, grow the algae in places like Ohio that, unfortunately, or maybe fortunately, at some point, give off all this CO<sub>2</sub>, grow the algae, put it in cars, and we have a clean economy, and it's a new economy.

And, let me tell you something, there is not a lot going on manufacturing-wise in the United States anymore. But if you take the \$750 billion that we keep sending abroad to oil-producing countries and that money comes back to the United States, that's a heck of a lot of investment here to go into companies that are going to make these 8,000 component parts that are going to go into the windmills, that are going to make the 400 tons of steel that are going to go into the windmills and the cars and the solar panels and the biodiesel facilities. I haven't heard a better idea.

It's nice to be against everything, but does anyone have another idea on how to get 750 billion that's going right out of the country back here?

Come on, let's be smart. Let's keep our money in America. That's what this is all about. This is the most pro-American, pro-independence, pro-freedom, pro-liberty bill you could ever get your hands on because it directs investment into the United States of

America and puts Americans back to work.

You know, if you are refitting homes with insulation, with special roofing to capture rainwater, those are sheet metal workers. Those are carpenters. Those are building tradespeople that you and I live and work with every single day. Put them back to work. This is great.

I don't see it, other than being against it.

Mr. BOCCIERI. Well, they weren't against it last year. In fact, I point to my friend Mike Huckabee who suggested that a Nation that can't feed itself, a Nation that can't fuel itself, or a Nation that can't produce the weapons to fight for itself is a Nation forever enslaved. He also said that it's critical that for our own interests economically, and from a point on national security, that we commit to become energy independent and we commit to doing it within a decade.

We sent a man to the Moon in a decade. I think in 20 years we could become energy independent. I believe we can. We have to take responsibility in our own House before we can expect others to do the same in theirs. It goes back to his basic concept of leadership, that leaders don't ask others to do what they are unwilling to do themselves. That's why leaders who ran for the office of the Presidency last year believe that a strong national energy policy is about making America stronger, relying on the innovation in the Midwest rather than relying on Middle East oil. That makes America stronger.

In 1950, over half of the jobs in this country were in manufacturing. We are at 10 percent now because we exported our ability to produce and build things here. We are becoming the movers of wealth instead of the producers of wealth.

Let's invest in something that we have to use every day, and that's energy. Let's invest in our own future, produce things here. Let's build windmills here. Let's let Timken in Canton, Ohio, make the roller bearings for these huge wind turbines. Let's let SARE Plastics in Alliance build the moldings and cast moldings for these wind turbines. Let's let fuel cells be developed at Rolls Royce so that we can put them in our cars and have them recharge batteries and use the solar panels that are developed in our part of Ohio recharge the batteries that are being developed in Medina County in my congressional district.

Let's use that compressed natural gas now that we are using and researching at the Ohio State Agricultural Research Center in Wooster, Ohio. Let's use that compressed natural gas to turn our generators to heat and to produce electricity for our homes.

That's the type of innovation and diversity of energy that will make America stronger in the long run and focus, focus on our economic interests as a country.

As John Kennedy said, we do these things not because they are easy but because they are hard. Because they are hard. But we know that if we don't make this transition right now, decades later we will make America very, very vulnerable.

When I go back and answer to my constituents, when I go back and answer to the people, I want to tell them I stood with them, and I stood with making America strong.

#### INCREASE SOURCES OF ENERGY

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, what a glorious evening it is to come to the floor to remind my colleagues about a little fact and about a little truth. I have heard so many things over the last 15 or 30 minutes, Mr. Speaker, I am not quite certain where to begin.

But I guess I would begin by imploring my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to talk to the Speaker. Goodness gracious, talk to the Speaker. When they talk about expand drilling, oh, they could talk to the President as well, expand drilling. You betcha, Mr. Speaker, you betcha that that's what we want to do is expand drilling.

When they talk about clean coal technology and advancing clean coal technology, you betcha, Mr. Speaker. The problem is, the Speaker of the House and the President of the United States don't support it. That's the problem.

I would encourage them to talk to their own leadership because the principles and the policies that they have just espoused over the last 15 to 30 minutes are as strong as we have on our side of the aisle, the Republican side of the aisle, espoused over the last number of years. I would encourage them to talk to their leadership. I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that one of the things that was said is absolutely correct, and these aren't Democrat problems and these aren't Republican problems. They are American problems.

To that end, I want to talk about what America has been concerned about. Mr. Speaker, if you think about what happened in August in this Nation, all across this Nation, it was a remarkable outpouring, a remarkable outpouring of concern, yes, and of fear, yes, and of anger about the direction in which the American people see their Nation headed.

What they said, I believe, in town hall after town hall and meeting after meeting after meeting was, Washington, you are not listening. You are just not listening. We thought that we were electing change in November of 2008, and, in fact, we have elected change as a Nation.

□ 2220

The problem is the change that's being instituted by my friends on the

other side of the aisle and the Speaker and the President are not the change that the American people wanted. That's the problem.

So they come out to these meetings and they come out to talk to their Representatives, if even they will meet with them. So many of my friends on the other side of the aisle refused to hold town hall meetings. But they come out to these meetings and they say, Please, please listen to us. Listen to what we're telling you. Your policies are killing us. They're killing us from an economic standpoint, too many taxes. You're spending our children and our grandchildren's money. You just can't do that. We can't do that at home. You can't do that at the Federal level.

And so what they want are solutions. And my friend on the other side of the aisle earlier talked about solutions. And I'm going to talk a lot—a lot—about solutions this evening, because even this evening my two grand colleagues from Ohio reiterated this fabrication, this falsehood. Oh, yes, Mr. Speaker, something that isn't absolutely the truth when they say that Republicans have no solutions; they don't bring any solutions to the table.

Well, we're going to talk about tonight a couple of solutions just in the area of energy and health policy. And if you, Mr. Speaker, would like to go look at our solutions, they're on our Web site. I'm privileged to chair the Republican Study Committee, the largest caucus in the House of Representatives, that puts solutions on the table for every single American challenge that we face, solutions that embrace fundamental American principles that are optimistic and forward thinking and upbeat and realize that the reason we're the greatest Nation in the history of the world is because we have followed fundamental American principles.

So you can Google Republican Study Committee or go to [RSC.price.house.gov](http://RSC.price.house.gov)—and look at our solutions. Look at our solutions for an economy that we've seen a nonstimulus bill that is driving more individuals into unemployment, that is losing 4 million jobs just in this year alone.

Look at our solutions, which is the contrast to a budget that was passed by this House of Representatives that spends money that we don't have, borrowed from the Chinese Government; money that makes us \$1 trillion in debt year after year after year after year. And the American people are fed up with it, Mr. Speaker.

Look at our solutions that say that the way to be able to utilize American resources responsibly so that we solve the energy challenges that we have, there's a way to do that that makes it so that the government isn't put in charge and also so that we aren't taxing the American people to death.

Mr. Speaker, look at the solutions at [RSC.price.house.gov](http://RSC.price.house.gov) for the health care